



CIVIL & TRAFFIC ENGINEERS / LAND SURVEYORS / PLANNERS / LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS
Serving Connecticut, Massachusetts, & Rhode Island

P.O. BOX 1167
21 JEFFREY DRIVE
SOUTH WINDSOR, CT 06074
PHONE: 860.291.8755
FAX: 860.291.8757
www.designprofessionalsinc.com

June 6, 2022

Michele Lipe
Director of Planning
Town of South Windsor
1540 Sullivan Avenue
South Windsor, CT 06074

Re: App 22-17P – Kennedy Road Cul de Sac Resubdivision

Dear Ms. Lipe:

This letter is written to address your review comments dated May 19, 2022 for the above-referenced application. The accompanying plan set incorporates our responses to these comments. For ease of your review, your initial comment is in *italics*, followed by our response in **bold**.

- 1. A resubdivision plan, exclusive of the proposed site plan, shall be submitted. It is difficult to evaluate the compliance of the resubdivision (which must stand on it's own) amongst the site plan proposal. For example – the property resurvey RS-2 does not show a proposed drainage easement for the detention basin easterly of the new cul de sac. It appears that would be required for road drainage – is that an oversight?*

A revised set of plans for the Kennedy Road Cul-de-Sac has been submitted removing information pertaining to the 67 Kennedy Road Site Plan application. The drainage easement in favor of the Town of South Windsor for the detention basin easterly of the proposed cul-de-sac that was previously shown on the 67 Kennedy Road Site Plan has been added to sheet RS-2.

- 2. A zoning data table showing required and provided total acreage, setbacks, frontage, open space requirement, etc. is required. (Checklist item 4). Please address how the combining of the lots (specifically the 10 foot strip and easterly lot) creates a lot that meets the criteria of Section 2.2 – Lot Configuration.*

A Zoning Data Table has been added to sheet C-SP1.

Section 2.2 states that in the design of new lots “awkward lot configurations designed for the purpose of creating additional lots shall be avoided.” The example noted in Section 2.2 is where a rear portion of a lot is connected to a frontage portion of a lot by a narrow unusable strip of property. The purpose of such an awkward lot configuration, which is not allowed, is to create additional lots by gerrymandering the available public street frontage to gain access to rear areas of land. In this application, the parcels in question are not part of a new subdivision, but rather are existing lots that are part of a resubdivision application. The applicant is proposing to do exactly the opposite of creating new, additional lots – the resubdivision proposal includes a consolidation of parcels to reduce the number of lots. This type of lot consolidation should be encouraged since it cleans up outdated and nonconforming parcel lines which are not consistent with the current manner of development of the properties. Moreover, the proposed lot configuration complies with most of the criteria set forth in Section 2.2, as follows:

1. *Is the front portion of the lot useable for primary or accessory uses as permitted in the zone?* Answer: YES, the vast majority of the developable area is in front.
2. *Are there distinguishable setbacks (i.e., do front, side and/or rear setbacks overlap)?* Answer: NO. There is an existing parcel that is only 10 feet wide, and therefore does not have distinguishable setbacks, that is being consolidated with the other parcels.
3. *Is there a useable building area in the front portion of the lot, or is the whole front portion occupied by setback areas?* Answer: YES, the front portion of the lot is buildable as depicted on the site plan application that was filed with the resubdivision application.
4. *At a minimum, does the interconnection between lot "areas" provide a bona fide access between the separate areas?* Answer: Potentially YES, although it is not needed.
5. *Could the lot boundaries be physically separated (e.g., with a fence) from abutting properties and still result in bona fide access between separate areas of the lot?* YES, although it is not needed.

Since the application complies with at least 3 of these criteria, the lot configuration should be considered appropriate pursuant to Section 2.2 of the Regulations.

3. *An easements chart has not been provided -e.g. electrical easement, sanitary sewer, drainage easements (checklist item B5)*

An easement chart has been added to sheet RS-1.

4. *Is there any new street lighting proposed? It appears that the new cul de sac will require the possible relocation of a couple of street pole, however their relocation is not shown.*

No new street lighting is proposed. The utility pole to remain north of the proposed cul-de-sac has an existing street light. One utility pole will need to be relocated to accommodate the new cul-de-sac with the final location to be determined by the utility company.

5. *Are there any trees of significance in the area of the detention area proposed to be removed? These trees should be identified on the plans.*

Several significant trees were identified in the area of the proposed improvements. The approximate location of these trees is depicted on the plans. The detention basin has been shifted north in order to preserve the two most significant trees near the southern property line.

6. *Are any new sidewalk proposed with this resubdivision? With the addition of the large acreage of land and Sullivan Ave frontage being added to the subdivision, staff will be recommending a sidewalk or multi-use path along the frontage on Sullivan Ave.*

No new sidewalks are proposed with this resubdivision. A sidewalk or path along Sullivan Avenue will be considered with the 67 Kennedy Road Site Plan application.

Please contact us with any questions.

Sincerely,
DESIGN PROFESSIONALS, INC.

Peter R. DeMallie
President