SHELTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES

SHELTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING JANUARY 19, 2017 AT 7:00 P.M.
CITY HALL, AUDITORIUM, 54 HILL STREET, SHELTON, CONNECTICUT

PZC Commissioners Present:
Chairman Ruth Parkins
Vice-Chairman Anthony Pogoda (by conference phone)
Secretary Virginia Harger
Jimmy Tickey
Elaine Matto
Charles Kelly
Alternate – Ned Miller

Also Present:
Richard Schultz, AICP, Planning and Zoning Administrator
Anthony Panico, Consultant (by conference phone)
Pat Gargulo, Stenographer
Karen Kemmesies, Acting Recording Secretary

Chairman Ruth Parkins called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., took the roll call and the Pledge of Allegiance.

Public Hearings
Application #16-33 Paula Anthony for Re-subdivision Approval (2 lots: Lot1), 181 Meadow Street (Map 137, Lot 16) R-1 District.

Ms. Anthony presented revised plans to address the conservation issues raised for the stone wall preservation. (Conservation letter dated 12/30/16 was read into the record – attached) Further, Ms. Anthony indicated that a conservation easement will be reviewed with the City’s Corporation Counsel. Ms. Anthony stated that her surveyor reviewed the existing access easement from Sinsabaugh Heights and indicated that there was no viable use without obtaining additional easements from the property owner. This easement appeared to provide access to the barn and is not a city street.

Upon review of the revised plans, it was questioned whether the width of the opening for the driveway access to Meadow Street was short. Ms. Anthony indicated that if needed, the wall opening could be enlarged and the wall would be remediated with the columns restored if they needed to be moved. The driveway will have to meet zoning requirements as per the city engineering review. In lieu of the open space provision, it was determined that the conservation easement will satisfy the requirements. Further, all needed variances have been obtained.

On motion made by Virginia Harger and second by Elaine Matto it was unanimously moved to close the public hearing on application 16-33. Motion carried unanimously.

Application #16-28 Dominick Thomas on behalf of Ricar, LLC and Mianus Holding, LLC for Modification of PDD#66 including Initial Concept Development Plans and Statement of Uses and Standards (164 unit multi-family, clubhouse, maintenance building and marina), 704, 712 and 722 River Road, (Map 22, Lot 1 and map 32, Lots 16 and 17) (continued from 11/16/16)

Planning and Zoning Commission - 1/19/17
Dominick Thomas was present and requested a continuation of the public hearing consenting to a 41 day extension effective 1/19/17 which would extend the consent to 2/28/17.

On motion made by Virginia Harger and second by Jimmy Tickey it was unanimously moved to accept the request to continue the hearing to February 22, 2017 on application 16-28.

Old Business:
Applications for Certificate of Zoning Compliance
#0866 Rose Tiso, 405 Bridgeport Ave and #0964 Sign Lite, Inc., 395 Bridgeport Ave – master sign design
– Patrick Rose of Rose Tiso presented drawings from SignLite, Inc. of 6 Corporate Drive, North Haven, CT – Project Title: Channel Letters on a raceway with dates 11/3/16 and 1/5/17. The Chairman noted as this is a visual presentation, alternate Ned Miller will sit in for Anthony Pogoda. Mr. Rose stated that the signage will be on each tenant establishment. For continuity of visual design the letters will be placed on a cornice raceway located on each unit and the lettering will be halo lit (back lit). The limitations of the structure will drive the letter size as will the number of letters within the sign itself. Some of the units will have signage panels. All signage will be compliant with zoning regulations.

On motion made by Jimmy Tickey and second by Virginia Harger it was unanimously voted to approve application for Certificate of Zoning Compliance #0866 and #0964.

#0937 John Paoletti, 405 Bridgeport Ave – business use – Anthony Dorn of 123 Riding Ridge Rd, Monroe stated that he plans to open a full service restaurant with approximately 40 full time and part time employees. Hours of operation would be from 11:30 am to closing as per liquor permit regulations. He is seeking approval for occupancy this evening and will return with his sign design at a later date. He will be negotiating with the landlord for designated parking spaces for take-out patrons.

On motion made by Virginia Harger and second by Jimmy Tickey it was unanimously voted to approve application for Certificate of Zoning Compliance #937.

#0960 John Gaida, 405 Long Hill Ave – tree cutting and fill

On motion made by Anthony Pogoda and second by Jimmy Tickey it was unanimously voted to table action on application for Certificate of Zoning Compliance #0960.

#0945 Patricia Wells, 109 Old Mill Rd – professional office

On motion made by Virginia Harger and second by Jimmy Tickey it was unanimously voted to approve application for Certificate of Zoning Compliance #0945.

#0958 – Robin Lynch, 84 Platt Rd – sign and business – ARL Electronics & Supply will be leasing 2,000 sq ft in the ABCO Manufacturing Corp building for manufacturing of electronic components.

On motion made by Virginia Harger and second by Jimmy Tickey it was unanimously voted to approve application for Certificate of Zoning Compliance #0958.

#0933 Paul T. McNamara, 95 Indian Well Rd – 6 month temporary storage – the owner is seeking to have a temporary plastic shelter for 6 months and the unit will be removed by May 1st.

On motion made by Virginia Harger and second by Elaine Matto it was unanimously voted to approve application for Certificate of Zoning Compliance #0933.
On motion made by Jimmy Tickey and second by Virginia Harger it was unanimously voted to approve application for Certificate of Zoning Compliance #0967.

Application #16-11 Soundview Crossing Re-subdivision: request for 90 day extension to file record map. The map has been received and no extension is needed.

On motion made by Virginia Harger and second by Elaine Matto it was unanimously voted to accept the withdrawal of 90 day extension to file record map for Soundview Crossing Re-subdivision.

Application #16-33 Paula Anthony for Re-subdivision Approval (2 lots: Lot1), 181 Meadow Street (Map 137, Lot 16) R-1 District

On motion made by Charles Kelly and second by Virginia Harger it was unanimously voted to approve with conditions for application #16-33.

Application 16-23 Wendy Montanaro, LLC and 60-64 Huntington Street, LLC for Initial Development Concept Plan and PDD Zone change approval, 60-66 Huntington street (Map 74, Lots 27 and 28) (public hearing closed on 11/16/16). This is the first discussion since the closure of the public hearing. Plans do satisfy all parking requirements. Consultant Anthony Panico indicated concern for the steepness of the driveway, the current design has a 15-16% grade. This could be lessened with some fill and regrading as the plans are in the initial concept stage. It was decided to hold a staff meeting with the applicant to further review the plans.

Application #16-8 Dominick Thomas for Initial Development Concept Plans and PDD Zone Change (Shelter Ridge: mix use development) for Bridgeport Ave (Map 50, Lot 9, LIP and R-1 Districts (public hearing closed on 9/21/16)

Consultant Panico reviewed the timeline of this application. This evening he sought further direction from the commissioners. He stressed that the traffic design will fall under the State’s jurisdiction once the plans intent are formalized. He reviewed square footage of each use – retail, medical, food service and residential (note – the assisted living use has been removed). Calculating the minimum parking spaces required – retail would need 675, medical/office would need 256, outlet area would need 880, mixed use would need 1037 and residential would need 700 for a minimum total of 3,548. He indicated that the commissioners could consider deferring some of the spaces to reduce the overall numbers.

Commissioner Tickey felt it unfortunate that DOT could not render an opinion at this stage. Further, he noted that Bridgeport Avenue is significantly congested now and there are many approved projects yet to generate their projected traffic impacts. Members concurred.

Mr. Schultz read the response document from Milone & MacBroom, Inc. dated September 20, 2016 reference “Response to Comments of Traffic Peer Review” (attached)

Commissioners requested further accident review data and further clarification on permissive or protected code as mentioned in section A3 regarding the Synchro analysis of traffic movements as it affects the capacity of an intersection. Comment from the Shelton Police Department will be explored. Members discussed the current traffic conditions. The transitions from single lane, multi-lane and turn lanes cause confusion in the flow now. While decisions on the flow are dependent on DOT reviews from
the traffic experts, the overall impacts of development need to be addressed in a broader sense as Bridgeport Avenue continues to be developed.

Commissioners discussed the upper road. Mr. Panico indicated that the Commission has a right to find the upper road unacceptable and the applicant would have to provide an alternative solution. It appears that alternatives are viable. Members were clear there should be no connection to Buddington Road.

Discussion continued. It was felt that parameters should be set so that a revised design could be prepared. On parcel C members discussed buffer recommendations and suggested that the design be more conservative than shown on the plans. Parcels D & E should also be reexamined. The restaurant use should have a significant buffer. On parcels A, B & C the statement of use for the retail use is very vague as to the likely tenants. Members noted trends going toward on-line retail and the fact that many established stores are projecting closures. They questioned whether the design can be developed sufficiently with the retail industry projections. It was mentioned that it may be better to define exclusions of use rather than trying to describe the intended retail use. Speaking to the residential use, parameters describing the maximum height, maximum number of units and the distribution of units should be clarified. Members concurred that they would like to see a reduction in the number of units. Currently, 411 are proposed but the commission felt a lesser number was appropriate.

Mr. Tickey indicated that he was not convinced that this lifestyle trend will hold and is uncertain as to the marketability of this “high-end” lifestyle, which, in its self he felt the definition was vague. Members noted the developer’s fiscal analysis shows optimistic projections to the success of the parcel. Bridgeport Avenue is the corridor for economic development but questions arose if this was beyond balanced development. Members weighed whether the current LIP designation could have a bigger impact on the area if it is developed. Conversely, would a LIP development consume this parcel or possibly the impact would more likely extend not too deeply from the road into the land. It was stated that the City has expressed no interest in purchasing this land for open space.

Members raised the fact that under the current LIP zoning, zoning allows for more significant development of the land, no dedication of open space and forty foot high buildings. A developer can present plans to excavate and regrade and would be allowed to strip the entire parcel. Mining of the rock is permitted under the current zone designation although the work does have regulations as to the methods and actions of said process. This mining excavation could be done for a very extended period of time.

Members weighed the economic benefits of the presented uses in this proposal. This expansive design concept seemed to steer the residential use to a higher end being that the project cost investment is to a higher end. The residential units provide parking within the building thus reducing pavement requirements. Further, the Commission could review the number of overall units thus reducing the development footprint.

The next regular meeting is February 14th and public hearings will be heard on February 22nd. It was decided that the application be continued to the next regular meeting. As this is a zone change, there is no time requirement on a decision. With that said, Mr. Shultz will still request an extension from the applicant. He and the consultant will seek answers to the commissioner’s questions on the traffic report as well as work on the parameters as discussed this evening and they were charged with developing a favorable resolution with conditions for this application.

New Business

Application # 17-1. Dominick Thomas for Initial Development concept Plans and PDD zone change (six (6) single family dwelling on fee simple lots), 405 Long Hill Ave. (Map 78, Lot 5), IA-2/R-1 Districts.
On a motion made by Virginia Harger and seconded by Jimmy Tickey it was unanimously voted to accept and schedule the public hearing on 3/22/17 for Application # 17-1.

Application #17-2 R.D. Scinto, Inc. for Initial Development Concept Plans and PDD Zone Change (light industrial building), Waterview Drive (Map 79, Lot 13), LIP District.

On a motion made by Jimmy Tickey and seconded by Elaine Matto it was unanimously voted to accept and schedule the public hearing on 3/22/17 for Application # 17-2.

Public Portion:
Tom Harbinson of 16 Soundcrest Drive stated that as a city there has been balanced development but he wondered as residential development continues how the city is planning for future recreational needs. As the Plan for Conservation and Development moves forward he felt that projections for these quality of life issues should be considered.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger and seconded by Elaine Matto to close the public portion.

Other Business:
On a motion made by Virginia Harger and seconded by Jimmy Tickey it was unanimously voted to approve payment to bills.

Staff Report (attached) - Under zoning matters – 405 Long Hill Avenue, Mr. Shultz reported that the property owners are seeking a warehouse type use and are seeking a variance to create driveway access through an R-1 residential zone. The front of the parcel is residential and the rear is IA-2 industrial/commercial. The ZBA public hearing will discuss the matter of filling. Further, there are wetlands areas that will need to be discussed.

Zoning Enforcement – 2 Cloverdale – illegal filling of property. Mr. Schultz indicated that a cease and desist order has been delivered to the property owner. This issue remains outstanding.

On a motion made by Elaine Matto, and seconded by Virginia Harger it was unanimously voted to authorize legal action for zoning enforcement action against 2 Cloverdale Avenue.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger and seconded by Charles Kelly it was unanimously voted to approve the release of the site bond for Soundview Crossing Subdivision Parcel A and B.

The Market Place Shopping Center requested to bond releases. First the cash bond which was for site stabilization. That portion has been finished. The second is for site completion. They seek to have it reduced in half and this details the parcels landscaping, curbs, retaining wall, etc. That work is progressing but not yet complete.

On a motion made by Jimmy Tickey and seconded by Virginia Harger it was unanimously voted to release the Cash Bond and to reduce the Site Bond to $35,000 for the Market Place Shopping Center, Bridgeport Avenue.

On motion made by Virginia Harger and second by Jimmy Tickey it was unanimously voted to adjourn this special meeting at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted;
Karen M. Kemmesies
Karen M. Kemmesies
MEMORANDUM

To: Shelton Planning and Zoning Commission

From: Richard D. Schultz, Planning and Zoning Administrator

Date: January 19, 2017

Re: P & Z Application #16-33
   2 Lot Re-Subdivision
   181 meadow Street

I have reviewed the subject proposal on plans titled “Resubdivision Map of lot 1, Paula Anthony” prepared by NOK Civil Engineering and Land Surveying dated 2/24/16 and revised to 12/28/16.

Based on this review, I offer the following comments:

1. The applicant is seeking final resubdivision approval for the creation of 2 lots identified as Parcels A and B. The property contains a total area of 2.01 acres. Proposed Parcel A has an existing single family dwelling with direct access to Meadow Street. Proposed Parcel B, contains a barn, is to be removed or converted into a single family dwelling. Parcel B will be accessed from a proposed driveway from Meadow Street. All lots will be served by sanitary sewers and public water supply. The property is located within the Residence R-1 District.

2. The application was referred to the City Engineer, Fire Chief and Conservation Commission.

3. The IWC Agent determined that there are no regulated activities associated with this subdivision.

4. The applicant received a variance for parcel B from ZBA for the reduction of lot frontage and location of square on lot.

5. The applicant has provided an acceptable sediment and erosion control plan. The subject property is not located within a Watershed Area or Special Flood Hazard Area. A Certificate of Sediment and Erosion Control Permit will be issued for the construction of a single family dwelling on Parcel B.

6. Staff has inspected the subject property and have determined that sidewalks are non-existing for this neighborhood.
September 20, 2016

Mr. Richard Schultz, Planning and Zoning Administrator
City of Shelton
54 Hill Street
Shelton, CT 06484

RE: Response to Comments of Traffic Peer Review
Proposed Town Center at Shelter Ridge
Bridgeport Avenue
Shelton, Connecticut
MMI #2472-15-01

Dear Mr. Schultz:

Please see the applicant’s responses in **bold text** to the Traffic Peer Review dated July 8, 2016 issued by Milone & MacBroom, Inc. (MMI) for the proposed mixed-use development located along Bridgeport Avenue. New comments from MMI are provided in **bold red text** where applicable.

**Traffic Study Review**

**T1.** We reviewed the trip generation estimations that have been calculated based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation* publication. Most of the trip generation was calculated satisfactorily. However, we have the following comments regarding the trip generation methodology:

- Trips for "Parcel C – Office" and "Parcel D – Medical Office" appear to have been generated using the rates for employees, not using the rates for square footage. The applicant should revise the trip generation for the office space in Parcel C and for the medical office space in Parcel D.

  The trip generation summary has been revised to depict the correct rates for the mentioned parcels. The trip generation summary has also been revised to incorporate site plan changes which included eliminating the assisted living use, increasing the medical office space, and reducing number of the residential units.

  **Comment satisfied.**

- Trips for "Parcel D – Assisted Living/Skilled Nursing" appear to have been generated using LUC 254 by the number of beds, while the traffic study states the size of the assisted living facility in units. The applicant should base their site traffic estimates on the number of beds in the proposed assisted living facility.

  The assisted living use has been removed from the most recent site development plan. The analysis has been revised accordingly.

  **Comment satisfied.**
T2. We reviewed the distribution of traffic entering the site, exiting the site, and traveling through the adjacent road roadway network and have the following comments. We noticed several errors in the distribution at the Route 8 ramps:

- Nearly all vehicles to/from the south will use exit 12 (Old Stratford Road), not split between exit 12 and exit 13 as assumed in the report.

- Nearly all vehicles to/from the north will use exit 13 (Constitution Blvd), not split between exit 12 and exit 13 as assumed in the report.

- The directional assignment is incorrect. For example on Figure 4.6, the 7% entering via the northbound off ramp should be the same 7% exiting via the southbound on ramp. This should be corrected for all of the Route 8 ramp assignments. The applicant shows 7% arriving from the south and departing to the north.

The Route 8 ramp distributions have been revised as requested. Is remains the opinion of Solli Engineering that an "all or nothing" approach to distribution is not realistic of actual driver patterns. It is more realistic that drivers will utilize both interchanges although possibly to a lesser extent than initially analyzed. Ultimately, the Connecticut Department of Transportation Office of Policy and Planning and the Office of the State Traffic Administration will have the opportunity to review and comment on the distributions prior to issuing a MTG certificate.

To be clear, we did not indicate that there would not be a directional split between interchanges, just not the nearly 50/50 split originally shown. To/from the south, the all-or-nothing approach is more than reasonable and is shown by the applicant. To/from the north, the applicant still shows most traffic passing interchange 13 and exiting Interchange 12 to double back. We would expect a smaller percentage to use the second, slightly longer route to avoid potentially one or two traffic lights. The lingering difference of opinion in our estimation is not significant in relation to our mitigation review.

The more pertinent part of this comment is the third bullet, which the applicant has addressed satisfactorily.

T3. We reviewed the background traffic, which includes a normal traffic growth of two percent and additional traffic volumes from nearby projects. We note that there is potential for a mixed use development project on the northeast corner of Long Hill Cross Road and Bridgeport Avenue. However, the timing of this project is such that it does not need to be included at this point.

Acknowledged.

Comment satisfied.

T4. The applicant should include an accident history analysis for the last three years of available data for Bridgeport Avenue.
An accident analysis summary for the three most recent years of available data has been included as part of this submission.

Comment satisfied.

Analysis Review

A1. The site plan shows a site driveway intersection with Buddington Road. However, it appears from the traffic flow diagrams that this will not be an active access. If it is active, it should be included on the traffic flow diagrams, and should be fully analyzed from both a traffic impact and safety perspective. The applicant should confirm whether or not this is proposed as an active access driveway.

The access depicted on the site plan from Buddington Road will not be an active access. The access is exclusively for emergency vehicle use and will not be used as a patron access.

Comment satisfied.

A2. We understand the following signalized intersections are in closed loop coordination systems:

**Group 1**
Bridgeport Avenue & Constitution Blvd S
Constitution Blvd S & Route 8 Northbound Ramps (Exit 13)
Constitution Blvd S & Long Hill Cross Ave (not analyzed by applicant)

**Group 2**
Bridgeport Avenue & Nells Rock Road / Platt Road
Bridgeport Avenue & Big Y Access
Bridgeport Avenue & Wal-Mart Driveway
Bridgeport Avenue & Woodland Park / Shopping Plaza Drive

**Group 3**
Bridgeport Avenue & Site Driveway North (proposed)
Bridgeport Avenue & Site Driveway South / Long Hill Cross Road
Bridgeport Avenue & Mill Street / Beard Sawmill Road

**Group 4**
Bridgeport Avenue & ShopRite / Shelton Square Driveway
Bridgeport Avenue & Shelton Square South Driveway (not analyzed by the applicant)

- We agree with the proposed system wide signal cycle length and timing optimization for the study intersections in coordinated systems. In each individual system, for each time period, the cycle length should be the same. However, this is not the case for the intersection of Bridgeport Avenue & Nells Rock Road / Platt Road for the morning peak hour under the Build with Improvements Condition.
The indicated intersection has been revised to match the morning peak hour cycle length to the other intersections in the group.

Comment satisfied.

- If the coordination between intersections in any of the groups will be modified, all of the intersections within the group need to be included in their analysis. This is not the case in Group 1 and Group 4.

The other coordinated intersections in Group 1 and Group 4 shall be included in the proposed cycle length modifications.

Comment satisfied.

A3. We reviewed the Synchro analysis and found that some of the movements are coded as permissive, where they should be instead coded as protected. It is important to correctly code these movements as it may affect the capacity of the intersection. The applicant should recode these turning movements from permissive to protected. Attached are copies of the Synchro worksheets with the movements in question pointed out.

The indicated intersection movements have been revised in the Synchro analysis to be coded as protected.

Comment satisfied.

Mitigation Review

M1. We reviewed the impact of the traffic generated by the proposed mixed-use development on the capacity of the study intersections and the proposed mitigation. In general the proposed mitigation either improves operations at the signalized intersections to level of service (LOS) D or better or maintains the LOS of background conditions. The two unsignalized intersections operate at LOS F during most peak hours. Note that these findings may change once the comments above are addressed. The applicant should provide signal warrant analysis worksheets for the intersection of Huntington Street & Commerce Drive. We expect that no signal warrant analysis will be needed for the intersection of Bridgeport Avenue & Access Road / Todd Road.

The unsignalized intersection of Huntington Street & Commerce Drive is not proposed to be signalized as part of the recommended improvements of this project. The LOS F operations are experienced in the existing condition. We agree that a signal warrant analysis is not needed at Access Road/Todd Road.

The city should be aware that signalization at this intersection is needed. We agree that this need is not predicated on traffic from this development, but poor operations are exacerbated.
Mr. Richard Schultz  
September 20, 2016  
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M2. Regarding the roadway improvements on Bridgeport Avenue, we cannot accurately comment until the applicant provides a roadway plan illustrating the proposed geometric changes and roadway widening along Bridgeport Avenue. This plan is critical in understanding key elements such as:

- The side of the road where widening is being proposed  
- Lane continuity between widened areas  
- Transitions  
- Merges/lane drops  
- Properties that could be impacted  
- Utility impacts  
- Signal equipment impacts  
- R.O.W. impacts

The plan can be provided on aerial mapping showing dimensions for lane widths, transitions, merge areas and turn lane lengths. It is important that the approximate R.O.W. limits are shown.

A conceptual corridor roadway plan has been prepared which illustrates the recommended the geometric improvements and widening along Bridgeport Avenue.

We reviewed the conceptual corridor roadway plan and offer the following comments:

1. **Bridgeport Avenue and Route 8 Southbound Ramps (Exit 13)**

   - The park and ride exit driveway is in the transition area of the proposed northbound right-turn lane. Also, the northbound through queues of 362 feet will block it some of the time. The transition area should be moved away from this driveway. One option is to extend it to the south to accommodate the 362-foot through queue blockage. Alternatively, shorten the turn lane to about 50 feet by moving the transition north.

   - There appears to be a steep change in grade where the right-turn lane is proposed.

   - The traffic signal will need to be upgraded as a result of this lane addition.

2. **Bridgeport Avenue, Nells Rock Road, and Platt Road**

   - The length of the northbound and southbound left-turn lanes on Bridgeport Avenue should match the latest plan prepared as part of the Big Y project.

   - Review of the analysis results shows significant impact to left turns into and out of Nells Rock Road and out of Platt Road. Additionally, northbound left and southbound through queues increase substantially. A second southbound through lane should be evaluated.
Mr. Richard Schultz  
September 20, 2016  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection/Approach</th>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Combined w/ Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>95th Percentile Queue (ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport Avenue/Nells Rock Road/Platt Road</td>
<td>B (C) [C]</td>
<td>48 (161) [145]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound Left</td>
<td>B (C) [B]</td>
<td>121 (555) [386]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound Through/Right</td>
<td>C (D) [C]</td>
<td>489 (481) [487]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound Through</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound Right</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastbound Left (Nells Rock Road)</td>
<td>C (E) [C]</td>
<td>82 (101) [75]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastbound Through (Nells Rock Road)</td>
<td>C (C) [C]</td>
<td>81 (49) [48]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastbound Right (Nells Rock Road)</td>
<td>A (A) [A]</td>
<td>38 (36) [36]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestbound Left (Platt Road)</td>
<td>C (C) [D]</td>
<td>61 (81) [105]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestbound Through/Right (Platt Road)</td>
<td>B (C) [B]</td>
<td>52 (120) [62]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>B (C) [C]</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It appears that the property on the northwest corner of the intersection will be impacted by the widening on the west side of Bridgeport Avenue for the proposed right-turn lane.

3. **Bridgeport Avenue and Big Y Driveway**

- Review of the analysis results shows significant increases in queue lengths out of the Big Y driveway as well as the queue lengths of northbound through traffic. As shown, the northbound through movement operates at LOS C, but the northbound through queue length is not expected to be as long as 982 feet. The applicant should be prepared to rationalize the flow of northbound through traffic through this intersection. Similar to the Nells Rock Road intersection, a second through lane should be evaluated here.
4. **Bridgeport Avenue and Mill Street/Beard Sawmill Road**

- There appears to be enough space to provide short northbound and southbound left-turn lanes on Bridgeport Avenue. Consider adding these turn lanes.

5. **Bridgeport Avenue and Commerce Drive/Old Stratford Road**

- Because the southbound lane will be revised with a second left-turn lane, please ensure that the existing northbound lanes align with the proposed northbound acceptance lanes.

- It is also recommended that a width of at least 30 feet be available to accept the southbound double-left traffic.

- Review of the analysis results shows a significant increase to northbound right-turn queue lengths from Old Stratford Road onto Bridgeport Avenue. Consider any timing improvements to alleviate these queues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection/Approach</th>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Combined w/ Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>95th Percentile Queue (ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport Avenue/Old Stratford Road/Commerce Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastbound Left (Commerce Drive)</td>
<td>D (F)</td>
<td>[376] [69]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastbound Through (Commerce Drive)</td>
<td>C (F)</td>
<td>[722] [100]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastbound Right (Commerce Drive)</td>
<td>A (A)</td>
<td>[52] [43]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestbound Left (Old Stratford Road)</td>
<td>D (E)</td>
<td>[194] [94]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestbound Through (Old Stratford Road)</td>
<td>F (C)</td>
<td>[146] [58]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestbound Right (Old Stratford Road)</td>
<td>A (B)</td>
<td>[199] [67]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastbound Left</td>
<td>F (F)</td>
<td>[262] [87]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastbound Through</td>
<td>C (D)</td>
<td>[235] [166]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastbound Right</td>
<td>A (C)</td>
<td>[262] [87]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestbound Left</td>
<td>E (F)</td>
<td>[167] [152]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestbound Through/Right</td>
<td>B (C)</td>
<td>[167] [152]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL</strong></td>
<td>E (F)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Bridgeport Avenue at Site Driveways**

We reviewed the analysis results at the site driveway intersections with Bridgeport Avenue and have no concerns with the LOS or queue length findings. It appears that without significantly more widening there is enough right-of-way on Bridgeport Avenue along the site frontage to accommodate a five-lane section between the two driveways, which should be considered.
7. **Remaining Two-Lane Sections of Bridgeport Avenue**

The following segments of Bridgeport Avenue are to remain with one lane of travel in each direction.

- Bridgeport Avenue between the Route 8 southbound ramps and Nells Rock Road
- Bridgeport Avenue between the Big Y driveway and the northerly site driveway

Bridgeport Avenue through Shelton is classified by the Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) Functional Classification Map as a minor arterial through an urbanized area. Per the *Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM), Bridgeport Avenue has a LOS E service volume of between 890 and 1,140 vehicles per hour (veh/h) in each direction (depending on the arterial classification). There are sections along Bridgeport Avenue where peak-hour volumes approach the upper threshold, and CTDOT may require additional improvements.

**Site Plan Review**

S1. According to the site plan, the North Site Driveway approach to Bridgeport Avenue appears to have a left/right and a right turn lane. However, according to the Synchro analysis, this approach was analyzed as having a left turn and a right turn lane. The applicant should clarify which lane configuration is correct and revise either the site plan or the analysis of this driveway accordingly.

The Synchro analysis and recommended improvements stated in the traffic impact study are correct. The north site driveway is proposed to include a left turn and a right turn lane. The site engineer should update the site plan to reflect the proposed geometry.

**Comment satisfied.**

S2. Other than the Paugussett Trail, it appears there are not many on site accommodations for bicyclists and pedestrians. The applicant should rationalize the need for pedestrian and bicycle accommodations or lack thereof. Because the proposed relocated Paugussett Trail will come close to many of the parcels, the applicant should also consider adding connections between the developed parcels and the trail.

The revised site layout plan prepared by James Swift, PE illustrates the proposed pedestrian accommodations internal to the site.

**Comment satisfied.**

S3. The applicant should confirm that the Shelton Fire Department and other emergency responders have reviewed the site plan.

The local authorities have been included in the permit application process thus far and have been afforded the opportunity to review the site plan.

**Comment satisfied.**
S4. The applicant should display Intersection Sight Distances (ISDs), calculated based on 85th percentile speeds, on the site plan for all access driveways. Any areas where clearing of vegetation is needed within the sight line triangles should be shown on the site plan.

Agreed. The site plan, prepared by Jim R. Swift, will be modified to illustrate the driveway intersection sight distance as a condition of approval.

We agree that a condition of approval would be acceptable.

S5. The applicant should demonstrate through AutoTURN or similar vehicle tracking analysis that a WB-67 vehicle can access the site with no encroachment over the curb or lane line of the major street. The applicant should demonstrate that an SU-30 vehicle can access the site with no encroachment over the curb or lane line of the major and minor street.

Truck turning movement figures demonstrating WB-67 and SU-30 movements at the site driveways are included as part of this submission.

Comment satisfied.

S6. The applicant should identify loading and trash service maneuvers for each building on the site as applicable.

The site engineer, Jim R. Swift, has designed the internal site access to accommodate loading and trash service for each parcel. Providing internal circulation for loading and trash service may be included as a condition of approval.

We agree that a condition of approval would be acceptable.

We hope this review is useful in moving forward with the proposed mixed-use development. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Very truly yours,

MILONE & MACBROOM, INC.

David G. Sullivan, P.E., Associate
Manager of Traffic Engineering
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