



Town of Hamden
Planning and Zoning Department

**Hamden Government
Center
2750 Dixwell Avenue
Hamden, CT 06518
Tel: (203) 287-7070
Fax: (203) 287-7075**

June 2, 2020

MINUTES: THE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION, Town of Hamden, held a Public Hearing and Regular Meeting via Zoom teleconferencing technology on Tuesday, May 26, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. with the following results:

Commissioners in attendance:

Brack Poitier, Chair
Robert Roscow
Joel Mastroianni
Paul Begemann
Robert Cocchiaro
Joseph Banks, Sitting for Michele Mastropetre
Shanae Draughn, Sitting for Joe McDonagh
Ted Stevens, Sitting for Vacancy

Staff in attendance:

Dan Kops, Town Planner
Tim Lee, Assistant Town Attorney
Genevieve Bertolini, Stenographer
Natalie Barletta, Clerk

Mr. Poitier opened the meeting at 7:01 p.m. The clerk read the Regular Meeting items into the record. The Commission and staff introduced themselves. Mr. Poitier reviewed the meeting procedures.

A. Public Hearing

- 1. Zoning Map Amendment Application# 20-0973
3656 Whitney Avenue, T3 Zone
Change from a T3 to a T3.5 Zone
Green Olive Properties, Applicant

Attorney Susan Hayes, representing Green Olive Properties Management, LLC, addressed the Commission. Ms. Hayes said that she is requesting a Zone Change for 3656 Whitney Avenue. The property is 4.35 acres and runs from Whitney Avenue to the Farmington Canal trail. It currently is a single family in the front, and there are four townhouses in the back. When the most recent tenant left, her client had a structural engineer inspect the front building, and was told that it was structurally unsound. Ms. Hayes said the engineer recommended that she demolish the building in the front, and this prompted her client to think of what she needed to do. Ms. Hayes said that her client would like to replace the building with a mixed-use type of building, the front building consisting of office or retail space on the ground floor, and apartments on the upper floor.

Ms. Hayes added that many of the uses that are currently in the zone today, including the antique store and Wentworth’s ice cream, would not be permitted under the current regulations. Ms. Hayes added that the client doesn’t want to change the zoning regulation, because it would impact more properties, and thought it wouldn’t make sense. Ms. Hayes then went onto say that there wouldn’t be any difference in terms of development. Ms. Hayes said that they have received no issues from the Regional Water Authority –

primarily because T-3 and T-3.5 zones are exactly the same in terms of bulk requirements. Ms. Hayes said there is not a huge amount differences between those zones, as permitted uses are user specific, such mentally ill adult group home, sober house, school, churches, etc, and the main difference is the allowance of retail, personal services, and office buildings, which are allowed in T-3 Zones elsewhere in Hamden.

Mr. Kops read his report into the record recommending approval.

Chairman Poitier asked if any Commissioners had any questions. Mr. Stevens asked if the rezoning would cause a problem. Mr. Kops said that there is a doctor's office, as well as wetlands in the area. Ms. Hayes said that there is a property in the southwest, which would be between them, and that would be the condominium complex. Mr. Kops added that property is very developed, as a managed care residence, which is allowed in a T-3 zone.

Ms. Draughn asked if the zone change would affect the wetlands. Mr. Kops said that there are wetlands on the property, as well as a stream, and the wetlands have their own requirements. Ms. Draughn asked if this impacts the zoning, and Mr. Kops said it does not.

Mr. Kops added that Mark Austin, Town Engineer sent a comment regarding the site plan, but had no comments regarding the zone change.

Chairman Poitier asked if there were any comments in favor of the application. There were none.

Chairman Poitier asked if there were any comments against the application. There were none.

The public hearing for this item was closed.

2. Zoning Regulation Amendment # 20-0474
55 Connolly Parkway, T4 Zone
Amendment to zoning regulations to allow multi-family housing on a portion of Connolly Parkway,
T4 Zone
Ancar, Inc., Applicant

Hunter Smith, Architect of Hunter Smith Associates, addressed the Commission. Mr. Smith said that he is acting as an agent for Ancar, LLC. The property is a long narrow piece of land where the Mill River empties into Lake Whitney, and is near the Farmington Canal Trail. Mr. Smith said the reason to convert the property there is because the Farmington Canal Trail is on one side, and a scenic view on the other. Mr. Smith said that the proposed site plan will consist of 28-32 units. Mr. Smith said that tonight's request is to make an amendment to the Zoning Regulations, which will add a portion of Connolly Parkway to the list of approved locations for multi-family housing. Mr. Smith said that this is under 652.1, and provides a residential environment that promotes community. Mr. Smith added that their request will meet several criteria of the Plan of Conservation and Development.

Mr. Smith said that the project will be a series of four-unit buildings, with spaces in between for parking and landscaping. Mr. Smith added that the water that moves down into is a very large retention basin.

Mr. Smith referenced the comments sent in for this project, most of them referencing traffic concerns. Mr. Smith said that there will be a traffic study conducted if the Amendment of the Regulations is approved.

Mr. Banks said that it looks like a challenging property to develop and asked if this falls under Connecticut Environmental Criteria, which has special requirements for auto repairs and dry cleaners. Mr. Smith answered that he believed that the gentleman who may have done a phase one review, and would need to do additional environmental testing. Mr. Smith added that the Regional Water Authority wants to make sure that any contamination issues will be addressed.

Ms. Draughn said that she is concerned about a safety issue regarding the building being under an overpass. Ms. Draughn also commented that as a good neighbor, it is important to engage the community, and the Spring Glen Civic Association was not contacted about the project.

Mr. Smith said that he has contacted Elaine Dove and Bob Patterson and added that the borderline of the Civic Association ends at the Mill River, so the project is outside that line. Mr. Smith said that the overpass continues all across Connolly parkway, and will be working to greatly improve the physical look. Mr. Smith added that we will not be doing anything to affect the massive concrete support on the property, which will send the noise upward.

Chairman Poitier asked how the construction going will affect the neighborhood. Mr. Smith answered that there will be no blasting as far as he knows. Mr. Smith said that he thinks that the plan is to work with a panel system of construction, and the speed and time will be reduced significantly. Mr. Smith added that the plan is to sprinkle these. Mr. Smith said that the units will be very safe to live in and will be energy efficient. Mr. Smith added that the project will be completed fairly quickly. Chairman Poitier said that you don't start with building panels, you start with foundations.

Mr. Roscow said that he doesn't understand why the construction vehicles wouldn't just go through Dixwell Avenue, as Spring Glen has narrow roads.

Mr. Stevens asked what the maximum amount of units would be if approved. Mr. Smith said there will be 28 units, because the property owner wants space in between the units, however, anything up to 44 units would be allowed by right. Mr. Smith addressed the comment about the construction, and said that they would start at the back and work their way out. Mr. Smith added that in regards to whatever needs to be done and because of the height, it acts as a retaining wall, and will be a challenging project to work through due to a tough space to move around in. Chairman Poitier repeated his concern regarding the neighborhood and traffic. Mr. Smith said that he can make it as part of his future site plan application, and can be made a condition. Chairman Poitier stated that there were many letters of the public opposing the public.

Mr. Kops read his report into the record recommending approval of the application.

Mr. Kops then read all of the comments emailed to the Planning and Zoning department in favor of this application.

Bob Pattinson, 21 Barrett Street wrote: Dear Dan, I've been in touch with the Architect Hunter Smith in regards to this new development, as he wanted to bounce ideas off the Spring Glen Civic Association, but as you probably know, I no longer am on the Ex. Board, but still involved as past president. The board did respond to an email of mine to them in this regard and with the exception of Elaine Dove (who will probably voice her concerns directly) did not offer any opposition to the initial plan, understanding that once the full scope of the project is developed that everyone will be able to weigh in. My comments then are mine and not of the SGCA. There have been a few issues raised, one being access to multi-family housing...as I understand an exemption would need to be made in the same way as was done for the apt units on Mather

(canal crossing) for example. I don't have an issue here as this street is a dead end with only one destination, the business or if this goes through, the housing.

So putting through an exemption should be fine. Two: The same street. I worry of single point access should something catastrophic happen...not sure what that would be, but if fire and rescue had to get to the site and the road was block for some reason. I'm not sure if something could be done that might connect the property with Hobson Ave to the west? Three: Water runoff with near proximity to the river and drinking supply. I would hope that the Town be extra tough in this regard and ensure that the RWA has a complete understanding about the impact and water runoff mitigation. Thanks for taking the time.

Kristin Anderson, 103 Thornton Street, wrote: I am submitting public comment to Zoning Regulation Amendment # 20-0474 regarding the proposed zone change to allow for multifamily development on 55 Connolly. I am excited to see even more opportunities for residential development along the Canal Trail. Projects like these (and other recent additions like Canal Crossing, West Woods Place) have the opportunity to provide increased use, stewardship, safety, and appeal of the Farmington Canal Trail, which is a draw and an asset to Hamden.

I don't have any concerns with the application, and am sure that all departments and commissions will review to ensure the development complies with applicable health, safety, and environmental standards.

I would like to suggest some equitable development practices for the planning and zoning board consider as part of zone change approvals for this particular application.

1) Pedestrian and Cycling Improvements/Access-

Currently all users of the trail have to exit this location onto the north side of Connolly - which presents challenges for pedestrians/cyclists who currently have to cross over Connolly Pkwy as cars come off of Dixwell in order to head east - often time at higher speeds through the neighborhood. It would be a great safety benefit to see a direct access point from the path onto the driveway at 55 Connolly, so that pedestrians and cyclists could exit the trail down the driveway, onto the South side of Connolly, and continue east into Spring Glen without having to cross the busy transitional section of Connolly Parkway. Some type of easement would not add costs to any development, but provide a great access point for future residents and the existing path uses.

Further, it would be great to see any additional upgrades to the traffic management and calming measures along Connolly Parkway. In general, signage, lighting, and traffic calming measures along the section where the driveway connects to Connolly would be a great benefit to cars, cyclists, and pedestrians alike. I'm not necessarily concerned about the increased traffic of the proposed multifamily development as it only seems to be 28 units (though a traffic study would and should be used to confirm any issues), but am more doubtful that cars turning from Dixwell to Connolly would be aware of the new development. Thus any visibility and traffic calming measures to ensure the visibility of the now more frequently used driveway would be a safety benefit for all. There are already a number of pedestrians and cyclists traversing Connolly Pkwy, most notably high school students walking to school, so I would hope that there could be opportunities to encourage these types of enhancements as part of changes to zoning and the addition of multifamily development.

2) Affordable Housing -

I would also like to encourage the town to consider ways to leverage development opportunities in the town that meet the needs of a broad range of incomes. It is encouraging to see developments like Canal Crossing and West Woods along the Canal Trail both incorporate mixed-income housing principles that ensure

Hamden can be affordable to all families. Hamden is a wonderful community to live in and raise a family in, and we should work hard to make sure that everyone has access to housing within their means that provides these opportunities.

While it is often difficult to include affordable housing options in smaller multifamily developments given financing challenges, and to my knowledge Hamden does not have specific inclusionary zoning requirements (I could be wrong about this), I hope the planning and zoning board will explore ways to encourage the developer to provide equitable housing options as part of their project review. Despite the smaller multifamily development proposal, Hamden can help incentivize affordable housing through the use of state sponsored funding such as CDBG or HOME, or through tax abatements. This should not all fall to the town, but if there are tools that can be provided to support mixed-income housing (in addition to allowing for zone changes to make multifamily housing easier to develop in underutilized areas) then all options should be explored.

This particular site would lend itself extremely well to a range of incomes, given its proximity to transportation and employment opportunities. Residents could easily utilize the trail for walking/biking to major employment centers, helping to keep the cost burden of housing low for working families.

Thank you for reviewing my comments. I support the notion of allowing for zone changes that would make multifamily housing development possible at 55 Connolly Pkwy, by granting access to the driveway as part of the residential zone. I hope the commission will further encourage pedestrian/cycling friendly design, enhance traffic calming, and seek ways to incorporate affordable housing as part of the approval process.

William Kurtz, 109 Wakefield Street, wrote: Dear Members of the Planning and Zoning Commission: I support the proposed Zoning Regulation Amendment # 20-0474, applied for by Ancar, Inc., to allow access to a proposed multi-family housing project from Connolly Parkway where it would ordinarily only be allowed from Dixwell Avenue. I suggest that the commission approve the request with two caveats:

The first: Ancar Inc. should commit to building and maintaining an access path between the Farmington Canal Trail and the south side of Connolly Parkway. This access path must be open to the public (and not just their residents or tenants). Currently, a pedestrian or cyclist wishing to enter or exit the FCT must choose between the official access path, on the north side of Connolly Parkway, behind CVS or a short muddy and rutted dirt path through an opening in the fence that abuts the building on that site now. Choosing the official path then forces a bicyclist in particular to make a sharp left turn off the ramp and then cross Connolly Parkway (frequently an avenue for high-speed traffic) to proceed into the neighborhoods east of Dixwell, or to ride along a deteriorating sidewalk, interfering with pedestrian traffic. There is no direct route for a bicyclist to enter the roadway from the FCT without either riding off the curb or riding along the sidewalk to a curb cut or driveway. This section should have access on both sides, similar to the section that crosses Dixwell Avenue.

The second: Ancar Inc. should commit to designating an appropriate percentage of the units for affordable housing. This location is within easy walking and bicycling distance to hundreds of jobs in the Dixwell commercial area at major employers such as Stop & Shop, Shop-Rite, Walmart, Kohl's, Aldi, The Edge, L.A. Fitness, Staples, and many others. It's also represents easy access to Spring Glen Elementary School, Hamden Middle and Hamden High School. Retail industry jobs, in particular, typically pay lower wages and require irregular hours. Those wages would go much further for a family freed from the need to buy and maintain a car for routine transportation.

I am not aware of any inclusionary zoning requirements in Hamden, but I support the ability of the Planning and Zoning commission and other town officials to figure out ways to encourage developers to make affordable units available. There are state grants available for this purpose and Hamden could do more with tax abatements and local zoning requirements.

Thank you for considering these remarks.

Mr. Kops then read the comments that were against the application.

Rochelle Stackhouse, 26 Elgin Street, wrote: Mr. Kops: I am a resident of Spring Glen and am strongly opposed to any more construction off of Connolly Parkway along the Canal Trail and near the Water Company property. The potential for pollution continues, and already is exacerbated by the apartments built down the trail from Home Depot. Is there a shortage of housing in Hamden? I cannot attend the zoning board meeting but I hope that this will not be approved.

Elaine Dove, Santa Fe Avenue, wrote: Dear Planning and Zoning Commissioners: I would like to address several issues regarding the agenda items for May 26. First, I'd like to address the inequities in advertising this meeting's agenda during an unprecedented health event. The community abutting this property was not notified through normal channels of communication for Application 20-0474. While your agenda was advertised legally, you seemed to have missed informally letting the Hamden community know through direct emails to civic groups and through social media of such a proposed change to the zoning regulations. The public in Hamden is having many issues with the lack of transparency in town government activities, so public trust is significantly reduced and this oversight does not help. Secondly, you have a new clerk of the commission, who probably does not know of the process Hamden Planning has had in place in the past of notifying key civic leaders and groups as Stacy Shellard had done. In the past, I received notification of all meetings and it allowed me to know what was happening on P&Z. This was a great way to keep local neighborhoods aware of upcoming zoning change requests or other matters before the Commission. Thirdly, it seems to me that amendments to the zoning regulations should not occur during this pandemic/shutdown when "attending" meetings is fraught with technical difficulties. The public should know when amendments of significance are being proposed especially by a developer/owner of a piece of property. Fourthly, the Town has had **significant** problems with its email server. My emails to town employees (including Ms. Barletta) have "failed" to be delivered. This has happened to many other people who have been trying to contact Legislative Council members and others in town government. This is a significant deficiency since the public cannot communicate via written or verbal correspondence to the appropriate departments, or commission. In addition, with government employees not in the building, physical mail is not guaranteed to be opened by anyone in the department.

Regarding my concerns with this application, I will note the following. First, this piece of property is not a short distance from the corner of Dixwell Ave and Connolly Parkway where multi-family housing is allowed. The buildable property is located at least 500 feet from the street making the multi-family housing project considerably further away from a designated multi-family housing street. Second, the property is narrow and has only one egress. There is one way in or out along a narrow strip of land. Third, there is no public water supply at this time on the property and it is unknown what environmental cleanup may be needed. If none is needed because of recent changes to the law, I would suggest that a housing project would have significant difficulty attracting buyers if there is environmental hazardous waste. While it may be said that a "developer can make bad mistakes and that's his problem," changing the regulations to suit a developer's poor decision is OUR problem. Logically, who would buy a condo underneath a highway? We have plenty of other properties for sale in Hamden in much more desirable locations. The noise alone, as well as the dust and dirt, would make this a poor choice of housing unless you were desperate. Fourth, many times Hamden seems to encourage lots of building because officials can request that a developer do certain

improvements to public streets or sidewalks. This sounds great, but in practice it is a never ending problem. And, we also have a problem with projects getting completed (e.g. the Centerville Lumber "hotel," which has not been completed in 3+ years). Fifth, there is no guarantee that this owner will actually develop this property as housing, but instead, will sell the property with the amended/special permit to someone else with completely different ideas about how the multi-family housing will look and whether it is "quality" built or not.

Why would the commission make this change for a developer? Shouldn't you be making changes to our regulations for the GOOD of Hamden, not for the benefit of an individual? I'm asking that you deny this application.

John O'Rourke, 285 Thornton Street, wrote: Hi Dan, My name is John O'Rourke. I live at 285 Thornton Street, Hamden CT, 06517. I was just made aware of an application to the Hamden P&Z Commission to allow multi-family housing to be developed on the small plot of land at 55 Connolly Parkway.

I am writing to you to express my concern of the application. The plot they are looking to develop and populate is very small, and lets out onto Connolly Parkway which already sees too much traffic for its condition. The plot of land also abuts the water company property. I'm concerned that this development will have a huge negative impact on our water supply. Lastly, my property is immediately across that water supply. Being neighbors to this property, I am concerned for my property value.

John-Paul Szcepanski, wrote: Hello Dan, I have a few questions about the variance for 55 Connolly Parkway. They are stating Table 6.3 will need amending. I see that Mather Street has been added to include multi-family housing, but only on the south side. There is an apartment complex with access from the North side. How is this possible? Was there a variance for that complex?

1. Also the site plan submitted looks like they are building out onto the cliff side east of the driveway as you get closer to Connolly Parkway, and a highway piling onto the middle of said driveway is the existing driveway being moved?
2. Do they plan on sidewalks along the driveway leading to the site or do all pedestrians access form the trail or thought Home Depot/Price Rite parking lot?
3. Will they adhere to the proper light pollution standards set in the zoning guidelines if they add streetscape lighting to the driveway for the pedestrians. There are no lights on the canal trail currently.

Cathy Solomon wrote: Dear Dan, I am opposed to this amendment as it will drastically increase the traffic on Connolly Parkway and Dixwell Avenue area and in the Spring Glen Neighborhood. We already have a speeding problem in the neighborhood and with this development, it will only get worse. Spring Glen is a walking neighborhood with many children out riding bikes, parents pushing strollers, etc. More traffic is not conducive to a healthy, active neighborhood. In addition, students walk to Hamden High School from the Spring Glen neighborhood. With more traffic from 55 Connolly Parkway, there is greater risk to those students walking on Connolly Parkway and crossing Dixwell to get to the high school. Please do not approve this plan for multi-family housing on 55 Connolly Parkway.

Suzanne Carroll wrote: Hi Dan, Given the traffic issues on Connolly Parkway that have never been resolved, I think that adding multi-family housing units under the elevated highway would have a significant impact on pedestrian safety, particularly for students walking to and from the high school. Also, at this point, Hamden has plenty of housing stock available for sale.

Lynne Tarvares wrote: I am writing to you with grave concern over this proposed housing at the above address. As a Spring Glen resident and member of the Spring Glen Civic Association, I would like an

explanation as to why we were not notified of this. That area is not suitable for housing of any kind. I request this go before the Planning and Zoning Commissioners.

Jim and Martha Walsh, 191 Worth Avenue, wrote: Hello Dan, Jim and I would appreciate if you would make certain that this letter goes before the planning and zoning commission thank you Sent from my iPhone We are concerned about the application before planning and zoning on May 26 requesting a special permit for building multi-family housing at 55 Connolly Parkway. Traffic at the corner of Connolly Parkway and Dixwell Ave. has never been resolved. This project will increase daily car trips into that intersection. In front of the High School as well as on the narrow streets in Spring Glen for access to Whitney Avenue. If this is approved there is a potential based on the number of units being requested of 60 cars per day exiting and returning through the residential neighborhood of Spring Glen as well as congestion in the intersection in front of our high school. We also question the necessity for this additional housing proposal in light of the considerable amount of multi-family housing recently erected at the corners of Mather Street and Dixwell Avenue which is in very close proximity to this requested project.

Ann and Pat Destito, 61 Autumn Ridge Road, wrote: Dale, We are writing to acknowledge our strong opposition to the 55 Connolly Parkway Multi Family Housing Zone Amendment. It is our firm that no further housing of this type be even considered in Hamden. Ever! When you consider carefully Mix Avenue, Town Walk and Mather Street, these units alone provide a severe drain on the resources of the town without commensurate tax revenue per capita. This is not even mentioning the traffic cause by the recent Mather Street project that the traffic study did not reveal. As you know better than anyone else, economic development in this town needed to be focused in other areas, not in increased apartments and multi-family housing. I would also take this opportunity to draw your attention to the proposed solar farm on Gaylord Mountain Road. This is another example where open spaces should be left as that, open spaces. I'd be happy to discuss this with you at any time to discuss this and any other related matters. Please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thomas Parlapiano, 27 Ardmore Street, wrote: Hi Dan, Without any particulars about the scope of the development itself, I have the following concerns about allowing multi-family development at 55 Connolly Parkway:

- 1) An increase in traffic, particularly cutting from and to Whitney Avenue from Connolly Parkway
- 2) Increased safety risk for students, parents and staff walking to the high school on a daily basis because of an increased number of cars entering and leaving Connolly Parkway. The busiest time of day for walkers will coincide with the busiest time for cars accessing Connolly Parkway. Risk will increase further during the short winter days.
- 3) It will also most likely mean more cars turning onto Dixwell Avenue from Connolly Parkway - creating greater risk for crossing Dixwell Avenue to and from the high school.
- 4) Proximity to Lake Whitney and a public drinking water supply.

Mr. Smith said that he spoke with Elaine Dove over six days ago, and said that he offered to meet citizens at the site with social distancing procedures, such as wearing masks.

The public hearing was then closed.

3. Special Permit # 96-0788
109 Sanford Street, T4 Zone
Major amendment to allow public assembly
Devonshire LLC, Applicant

Bernard Pellegrino, Attorney, addressed the Commission. Mr. Pellegrino said that the Masotta Family has owned and operated the site for over 21 years as a multi-use tenanted property. It has multiple tenants on the site, including commercial recreation, gyms, dance school. Mr. Pellegrino said that the proposal is to utilize one of the spaces that is currently empty. It is in building C, and is a long rectangular building that abuts the Farmington canal trail. The applicant is proposing to use it as a place for public assembly, which is allowed by special permit in this zone. The applicant has an existing permit, so the request is to allow public assembly, providing space for conferences, seminars, athletic/dance schools that have awards ceremonies, birthday parties, anniversary parties, and business meetings. Mr. Pellegrino said that when this space became available, the applicant thought it would be the right size, and wants to have up to 200 guests.

Mr. Pellegrino added that events that involve food and beverage services would require outside catering to be hired, as needed as there is no kitchen space. Mr. Pellegrino said that building will have restrooms, open space, and offices. This would be a good use for the site, and most of these events will be held during off hours. During the week, events will start no sooner than 5 p.m. and end by 10 p.m., and weekends events will be held from 7 p.m. to 1 a.m. Mr. Pellegrino said that there no outdoor speakers, no exterior changes, and is insulated in the interior of the property, and the building is well contained.

Mr. Pellegrino said that sound is controlled, and no music would be played after 12 a.m., and everyone would need to be gone by 1 p.m. The applicant would have management staff present to ensure that is happening.

Mr. Stevens brought up the comments that were brought up in the Q and A feature on Zoom. Mr. Lee suggested to extend the public hearing. Mr. Pellegrino said that he doesn't know what the additional comments were, other than those that were sent to him this afternoon, but wants to make sure that public comments.

Mr. Kops read his report into the record, recommending approval with the following conditions:

1. The applicant must obtain a Zoning Permit, signed by the Fire Marshal, QVHD and the GNHWPCA.
2. Prior to the Issuance of a Zoning Permit, the applicant must submit revised site and floor plans for approval by the Town Engineer and Town Planner, containing
 - (a) A more detailed floor plan that includes an area with a sink for clean-up.
 - (b) Any other changes required by the Fire Marshal, QVHD and/or the GNHWPCA.
 - (c) All conditions of approval.
3. During use of the banquet hall:
 - (a) The number of patrons is limited to 200 unless otherwise approved by the Commission.
 - (b) The applicant must have sufficient staff present throughout each event.
 - (c) The applicant may not provide any food or beverages
 - (d) Any food offered must be provided by a licensed, catering food service establishment.
 - (e) If the space is used for anything other than a private party and food or beverages are served, a Temporary Food Service Permit must be obtained from QVHD
 - (f) The hours of operation will be from 7:00 pm to 1:00 am Thursday through Saturday evenings and 10:00 am to 5:00 pm on Saturdays and Sundays.
 - (g) Live or recorded music may be used only as an accompaniment to the allowable banquet activities. The sound must not be audible outside the building. No concerts are allowed.
 - (h) All events must occur inside the building.
4. All work must be completed by May 26, 2025.

After Mr. Kops read his report, he said that he has concerns about events going to 1 a.m., and suggested that the Commission should ask for more detail on how that would be controlled. Additionally, Mr. Kops said that he is also concerned about parties that have more than people show up than were expected, as those can get out of control very quickly.

Chairman Poitier asked Mr. Pellegrino if he is willing to continue this until the other statements have been read. Mr. Kops added that there are residential properties to the west and the east, and those are things to think about. Mr. Pellegrino added that the site is very self-contained, but agreed to extend the application to the next meeting.

Mr. Stevens made a motion to continue the public hearing until June 9th, Mr. Mastroianni seconded and all were in favor. The public hearing was then continued to the June 9, 2020 meeting.

B. Regular Meeting

1. Zoning Map Amendment Application #20-0973
3656 Whitney Avenue, T3 Zone
Change from a T3 to a T3.5 Zone
Green Olive Properties, Applicant

Mr. Stevens made a motion to move to change 3656 Whitney Avenue to a T-3.5 Zone effective June 5, 2020, as he finds it consistent with the POCD. It was seconded by Mr. Banks, and the vote was unanimous in favor. The application was approved.

2. Zoning Regulation Amendment # 20-0474
Amendment to zoning regulations to allow multi-family housing on a portion of Connolly Parkway,
T4 Zone
Ancar, Inc., Applicant

Mr. Roscow made a motion to approve the Zoning Regulation Amendment for 55 Connolly Parkway effective June 5, 2020 as he finds it consistent with the POCD. It was seconded by Mr. Begeman, and the amendment was approved with two votes in opposition from Mr. Cocchiaro and Ms. Draughn.

3. Special Permit #96-0788
109 Sanford Street, T4 Zone
Major amendment to allow public assembly
Devonshire LLC, Applicant

Continued to the June 9, 2020 meeting.

B. Old Business/ New Business

1. Review minutes of the February 25, 2020 Regular Meeting, February 25, 2020 Special Meeting, and April 24, 2020 Regular Meeting

Mr. Cocchiaro made a motion to approve the February 25, 2020 Regular Meeting. It was seconded by Mr. Begemann, and all were in favor. The minutes from the February 25, 2020 Regular Meeting were approved.

Mr. Begemann made a motion to approve the February 25, 2020 Special Meeting Minutes. It was seconded by Ms. Draughn, and all were in favor. The minutes from the February 25, 2020 Special Meeting were approved.

Mr. Begemann made a motion to approve the minutes from the April 24, 2020 meeting. Mr. Mastroianni seconded the motion and all were in favor. The minutes from the April 24, 2020 meeting were approved.

C. Adjournment

Mr. Stevens made a motion to adjourn. It was seconded by Ms. Draughn, and unanimous in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 8:58 p.m.

Submitted by: _____
Natalie Barletta, Clerk of the Commission