



**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 16, 2020, Revised June 23, 2020 and June 24, 2020

**MINUTES: THE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**, Town of Hamden, held a Public Hearing and Regular Meeting via Zoom teleconferencing technology on Tuesday, June 9, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. with the following results:

Commissioners in attendance:

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

Staff in attendance:

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

Mr. Poitier opened the meeting at 7:02 p.m. The clerk read the Regular Meeting items into the record. The Commission and staff introduced themselves. Mr. Poitier reviewed the meeting procedures.

Mr. Roscow mentioned his concerns about the electronic meeting procedures. Attorney Lee explained because of the Governor’s Executive order, documents or comments need to get posted 24 hours prior to the meeting. Attorney Lee then added that any documents that come into the office after that must be posted within 24 hours after the meeting. Attorney Lee recommended that the Commission vote on all items at the next meeting. Mr. Roscow repeated his concerns. Attorney Lee said that the applicant makes the proposal tonight, and then at the June 23, 2020 meeting, the applicant will come in and do the rebuttal and close the public hearing. Mr. Poitier said that there has to be a cut off. Attorney Lee answered that the Town is trying to accommodate everyone’s interests.

**A. Public Hearing**

1. Zoning Regulation Amendment #20-0975  
Application to Amend the Zoning Regulations COVID-19 Business Recovery Amendment for outdoor cafes and temporary signage  
Hamden Planning and Zoning Commission, Applicant

Mr. Kops addressed the Commission by reading his report recommending approval.

Mr. Roscow said that he drove around Hamden and looked at a bunch of restaurants in town, and while he sympathizes with businesses, it seemed that the only places that restaurants can put a table would be on a

main road such as Whitney Avenue and Dixwell Avenue. Mr. Roscow then mentioned concerns about maintaining the proper social distancing procedures, as well as protocols on what do during rain.

Mr. McDonagh said this amendment provides with more outdoor dining options and is a temporary measure, seeing that outdoor dining isn't a 12-month experience for New England, and this is potentially helpful to restaurants. Mr. McDonagh added that all of those places face the same problem if it's not passed.

Mr. Roscow said that he doesn't see how it would be helpful due to the health effects.

Mr. McDonagh said that for a restaurant to be open, it had to pass through the state requirements

Mr. Cocchiaro asked how do the restaurant operate and fall under the Commission's jurisdiction.

Mr. Kops said that the restaurants were allowed to have outdoor dining under the governor's order starting on May 20<sup>th</sup>. Attorney Lee explained the order to the Commission.

Mr. Begemann asked if you would need a zoning permit for any of COVID-19 signage since the timing to get the permit can take a while. Mr. Kops said that the advantage would be how long someone would have the signage up, and added that he recommended allowing the business to have it on their own and have 90 days to use it. Mr. Kops said that for a zoning permit, there is a fee, and while the Commission does not have the authority to waive the fee, the Commission does have the authority to waive the need for a permit.

Mr. Mastroanni and Mr. Begemann both agreed that this amendment is a good idea.

Mr. Stevens asked about the land that is not owned by restaurant owners. Mr. Stevens said in the example of the Brownstone, would the Town of Hamden, who owned the parking lot next to it, agree to allow them to put tables on the parking lot. Attorney Lee said he attended a seminar that encouraged property owners to work together for that purpose. Mr. Kops even suggested in the case of the Brownstone, it might be a possibility to put some tables on the sidewalks as well.

Mr. Roscow asked about buffets. Attorney Lee said under the current executive order, buffets are prohibited.

Mr. Kops then asked if there were any comments speaking in favor of the application.

Mr. Kops then read a letter from Nancy Dudchik, President of the Hamden Regional Chamber of Commerce, supporting the approval of the application.

Mr. Kops then asked if there were any comments speaking against the application. There were none

***Mr. McDonagh made a motion to continue the public hearing on June 23, 2020. It was seconded by Mr. Roscow and unanimous in favor. This item will be continued to the June 23, 2020 public hearing.***

**2. Zoning Map Amendment # 20-0976**

233 Skiff Street, T-1 Zone

Change from a T-1 zone to a T-5 zone

South Central Regional Water Authority, Applicant

John Triana, Real Estate Manager of Regional Water Authority, addressed the Commission. Mr. Triana said that they are requesting a zone change. The property is a former rental house, and the Preservation

Connecticut is trying to sell these houses. Mr. Triana said that he was trying to carve out the least amount of land required because the land is very important to watershed protection. Mr. Triana went onto to say that this will require a conveyance of 1.3 acres to make a conforming lot at this location, and conveying less class 1 land. Mr. Triana added that one property on one side is a T-4 Zone, and the one on the other is a T-5 Zone. Mr. Triana said that the Regional Water Authority chose the T-5 designation because it would result an extra acre of land for the protection of the CT Water Supply.

Kari Olsen, attorney at Murtha Cullina, addressed the Commission. Attorney Olsen said that it is a historic house. The property faces the Mill River, where it's not conducive to water uses, and to maintain these houses. Attorney Olsen added that the RWA recognized the house has historic value, and with certain uses, and the owner has agreed to keep the current use. Attorney Olsen added that she was concerned about how to give up a minimal amount of the land break, and to maintain as much as the class one land as possible, and the property sits on acres of watershed. Attorney Olsen said that the house sits right on Skiff Street, near a school, and the house sits close to the road in a primarily commercial area. Attorney Olsen stated that the objective is to preserve as much of the historical aspects as possible. Attorney Olsen then said that a T-5 zone will allow them to convey 3/10 of an acre.

Attorney Olsen added that it's an insignificant loss of watershed, and can't tear it down due to it being a historic home nor could it be developed in a significant way due to that restriction. Attorney Olsen said that this will finally be facilitated with the state as well.

Mr. Kops went above and beyond and this is the only way to preserve as much class one land as possible.

Mr. Roscow asked if the house was determined to be eligible for the historic register. Mr. Triana said that nothing has been done. Attorney Olsen added that this was not the first house in Hamden, and the other house was 95 Ives Street. Mr. Triana said that this is preparation work, and the process to get approved is a lengthy one. Mr. Triana said that in order for the approval for Ives Street to happen, Skiff Street needs to get approved as well. Mr. Triana added they are required to hold a public hearing. Attorney Olsen pointed out that it was a blighted property and this will facilitate the rehab of this property.

Mr. Banks asked if this was easier to do with a zone change versus a series of variances. Attorney Olsen said that variances don't help with that property, and therefore, you create a conforming lot. Attorney Olsen said that once the zone changes, a variance may be needed to accommodate the front yard setback, pre-existing, and a de minimus variance for that purpose.

Mr. Kops read his report, recommending approval of this application.

Mr. Stevens asked what the market value of the house is, and whether or not it would be best to demolish it. Mr. Triana said that the Regional Water Authority purchased nine acquisition properties, including houses that are in worse condition than this one. Mr. Triana added it's important to find the right buyer who recognizes that the property requires a lot of work, and the cost of the work will exceed the property value. Mr. Triana explained the selling process of the home.

Mr. Stevens commented that the house is in a tough spot. Mr. Triana said that the company hasn't previously sold a house like this in Hamden, but have sold one on Route 34 in Orange. Mr. Stevens asked about demolishing it. Mr. Triana said that the Regional Water Authority would work with Hamden Historic Properties Commission, and added that the amendment requires that the property is preserved, and try to find the right buyer so it persists.

Mr. Kops then asked if there were any comments speaking in favor of the application. There were none.

Mr. Kops then asked if there were any comments speaking against the application. There were none

***Mr. McDonagh made a motion to continue this into the June 23, 2020, Mr. Cocchiaro seconded, and unanimous in favor.***

3. Special Permit # 96-0788  
109 Sanford Street, T-4 Zone  
Major amendment to allow public assembly  
Devonshire LLC, Applicant  
*Continued from the May 26, 2020 Public Hearing*

Attorney Bernard Pellegrino, Pellegrino Law Firm, addressed the Commission. This is a continuation of the public hearing two weeks ago. Attorney Pellegrino summarized the family has the property and are actively on the site daily. Attorney Pellegrino added there are also long term tenants on the property. Attorney Pellegrino said that the applicant is seeking approval to use a portion of the site as a place for public assembly, and there appears to be that need.

Attorney Pellegrino then said that since the last meeting, there have been modifications of the proposal, such as changing the hours of operation to close at 10:00 p.m. on Thursdays, and midnight on weekends. Attorney Pellegrino stated that staff will be present during events, and after discussing this with Mr. Kops and Mr. Masotta, an off duty police officer will be there for events with over 100 guests. Attorney Pellegrino also added that Mr. Masotta checked sound levels on the surrounding streets, and found that other than a few feet behind the building, and you can't hear the sound levels on surround levels.

Mr. Kops read his report recommending approval of the application, subject to 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 a staff representative present until the event has ended and the participants have left the premises.
  - (c) For events with over 100 people, in addition to the staff representative an off-duty police officer must be present until the event has ended and the participants have left the premises.
  - (d) The applicant must have sufficient staff present throughout each event.
  - (e) The applicant may not provide any food or beverages.
  - (f) Any food offered must be provided by a licensed, catering food service establishment.
  - (g) 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.
  - (h) The hours of operation will be from 7:00 pm to 10:00 pm Thursday evenings, from 7:00 pm to 12:00 am Friday and Saturday evenings and 10:00 am to 5:00 pm on Saturdays and Sundays.

- (i) 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.
  - (j) All events must occur inside the building.
4. All work must be completed by June 9, 2025.

Mr. McDonagh said he is not sure what the distinction is between live music and concerts. Mr. Kops answered that live or recorded music would be allowed as part of other events. There will be no concerts. Mr. Begemann asked about the limits on the hours and wanted clarification on why Monday through Wednesday were not listed. Attorney Pellegrino said the applicant is not proposing to use it Monday through Wednesday.

Mr. Cocchiaro asked what would the staff consist of, and what their duties will be. Attorney Pellegrino said that the applicant is anticipating that one staff member will be on site, and depending on the event, there would be someone to provide access to the building for the event, oversee the event, troubleshooting if there are any issues, ensure that attendees are behaving in an orderly fashion, and assist with cleanup. Attorney Pellegrino then added that the applicant is anticipating at least one staff person for events. Mr. Cocchiaro asked if this is someone who is going to be there at all times. Attorney Pellegrino answered is the applicant is expecting that the person will be on site at all times, unless in emergencies.

Chairman Poitier asked if the 100 person count includes staff. Mr. Kops answered it was just guests, and doesn't include the catering staff. Mr. Kops added he doesn't think that there will be a huge staff.

Mr. Roscow asked if there was any residential near the building. Attorney Pellegrino said that there was an apartment building near Sanford Street, as well as the Farmington Canal Trail and Dorrance Street.

Mr. Roscow asked if it was a block building. Attorney Pellegrino said it is next to the trail and that it was a metal building. This provides a buffer between the Dorrance Street properties who are probably the closest. Mr. Roscow asked if the building is air conditioned. Attorney Pellegrino said yes. Mr. Roscow asked about the windows. Attorney Pellegrino said that they are operable, and had fixed two windows. Mr. Roscow added that he mentioned that he was concerned about the noise.

Mr. Stevens said that off duty police officer is overkill, and said that he would be in favor of striking that out. Chairman Poitier said that he will make that recommendation in the regular meeting.

Mr. Kops then asked if there were any comments speaking in favor of the application. There were none.

Mr. Kops then asked if there were any comments speaking against the application. There were none.

Tim Onderko, 72 Dorrance Street, said that he was not in opposition and appreciates the modification to reduce any weekend hours, and said that he was concerned about weekday nights because of the proximity of the neighborhood, and appreciates the work Attorney Pellegrino did.

Mr. Kops read a letter submitted by Mr. Onderko.

Mr. McDonagh asked if the public hearing can be closed Mr. Kops reminded him that the report wasn't written in enough time to comply with the guidelines in the Governor's executive order.

***Mr. McDonagh made a motion to continue the application to the public hearing on June 23, 2020, Mr.***

***Cocchiaro seconded, and the vote was unanimous in favor. The public hearing was continued to the June 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting.***

4. Zoning Regulation Amendment # 20-0974  
Amendment to zoning regulations to allow multi-family housing on a portion of Connolly Parkway,  
T4 Zone  
Ancar, Inc., Applicant  
*Rescission of Approval due to technical difficulties providing public access to the meeting*

Mr. McDonagh asked if this is something that he could vote on, seeing as he was not present at the previous meeting and if this is something that could be voted on tonight.

Attorney Lee said yes, because the vote will be on an issue that there was a problem with the procedure and the Town recommends that the Commission redid the Public Hearing. Mr. Roscow asked what the difficulty was. Attorney Lee said that there was a problem with the posted link, in addition to complaints that the link was not functioning properly.

Hunter Smith, addressed the Commission and requested to add that a letter from Attorney Levinson against the rescission of approval to be added to the record.

***Mr. McDonagh moved to continue until the June 23, 2020 public hearing. It was seconded by Mr. Banks and unanimous in favor.***

5. Zoning Regulation Amendment # 20-0974  
Amendment to zoning regulations to allow multi-family housing on a portion of Connolly Parkway,  
T4 Zone  
Ancar, Inc., Applicant  
*Re-hearing of Public Hearing due to technical difficulties providing public access to the meeting*

Hunter Smith addressed the Commission. Mr. Smith said the applications was submitted to amend regulations, and specifically section 652.1.a, table 6.3. Mr. Smith said the purpose was to add Connolly Parkway so multi-family housing can be developed, and clarified that they are not looking for zone change. Mr. Smith added that this is not the first time this has been used, as this one on Mather Street to create Canal Crossing, which was not done using the affordable housing regulations. Mr. Smith said that the property is presently used for industrial purposes. It is a long, narrow parcel of land, where the Mill River empties into Lake Whitney. Mr. Smith added by using it for multi-family purposes, it will have easy walking distance for tenants to public transportation and the Farmington Canal Trail.

Mr. Smith said the developer's intention will be to have no more than 32 tenants on the property. Mr. Smith specified that this is only to add a portion of Connolly Parkway as an allowed area. Mr. Smith also brought up the Plan of Conservation and Development and stated that this plan meets five out of the 10 items as well. Mr. Smith noted Mr. Kops mentioned two more items that Mr. Smith didn't have. Mr. Smith also added that the property contributes \$1,800 tax revenues, which translates of \$210,000 in property taxes so the application supports increase of revenue. Mr. Smith added that this also supports local businesses, water, seek development and redevelop existing sites, in transit, and we also need to continue to encourage housing types to create a walkable sense of community. Mr. Smith said that the view will be a part of the ambiance when it becomes a residential use.

Mr. Smith said one of the things he would like to mention is that he wrote to everyone who submitted a letter to the previous public hearing for a site inspection, which had 20 attendees. Mr. Smith mentioned the communications he had with the Regional Water Authority, which were in favor of the application.

Mr. Smith mentioned that the main topic is affordable housing, and 20 percent of the units will fall under the town and state requirements, and also went over the impact on the watershed. Mr. Smith addressed the concerns about traffic, and when the special permit application is being done, a traffic study will be conducted. Mr. Smith added if there are 28- 32 extra cars, it would not add significantly to Connolly Parkway. Mr. Smith said that those cars wouldn't be going onto Spring Glen, they would be going on the Meritt Parkway. Mr. Smith pointed out that this project will also help get people from the trail to Connolly Parkway, and part of the application would include allowing people to come down in a way that will be linked to down the road.

Mr. Smith added it stated in the email that this is going to be multi-family housing. Mr. Smith said that the application that it will be extending down from Dixwell Avenue, and be on the northeast corner of Connolly Parkway. Mr. Smith stated this amendment does not impact property across the street, and it does not accurately state the application and what it was about. Mr. Smith added he thought that approval of this request to add onto table 6.3, to add onto the northeast corner, will definitely add to the tax base, will transform what the visually ugly and do a lot to add housing stock and will have an affordable housing stock. Mr. Smith also stated that the applicant's request that the commission at least to the level that they did last time, and vote to accept the amendment.

Mr. Kops read his report recommending approval of the application, and corrected that it concerns a portion of Connolly Parkway, specifically extending 600 feet on the south side of Connolly Parkway.

Mr. Roscow asked if the 660 feet is the corner of the property that is owned by the applicant and it happens to be where the road is. Mr. Smith replied that they using the information on the GIS Map, and 660 feet covers the northeast corner. Mr. Smith added that this is indicating the northeast corner, and the applicant could limit it coming down so they can have access to the property.

Mr. Roscow said that both properties on both sides of the street were owned by the Regional Water Authority. Mr. Roscow referenced information that was sent out, and asked if the Spring Glen Civic had a meeting. Mr. Smith said that when the association came to them, they had false information, and that email was forwarded to him. Mr. Roscow said that he gets offended when people put out false information, and Elaine Dove has the capability of finding where property lines are.

Mr. McDonagh wanted to clarify if the T-4 section extends a bit east of the property. Mr. Mastroanni added that the GIS mapping is confusing to him, and couldn't even see the T-4 zone because the highway and the Farmington canal. Mr. Mastroanni stated that he would recommend that the Commission establish the measure from Dixwell to clarify. Mr. Smith said that the applicant would be happy to have a survey of the property. Mr. Mastroanni said it needs to be done before the next meeting.

Mr. Cocchairo asked if the area the applicant looking to convert to multi-family housing is 2.7 acres. Mr. Smith said yes. Mr. Cocchairo asked if each unit is proposing to have a garage. Mr. Cocchairo asked about the area that is between the two parts of the Wilbur Cross Parkway, and asked if this the proper width.

Mr. Kops said no because the application is not a special permit and the fire marshal didn't say it was an issue.

Mr. Smith replied that this is a design issue that has to be delved into, and the engineering aspects need to get worked out. Mr. Smith added that getting this approval is the first step, as the applicant will have to go through the Inland Wetlands Commission as well. Mr. Smith said a lot of work will be done in the next phase of this project.

Ms. Draughn said that as a multi-family real estate developer, she has the same concerns for site layout, and added that it is a challenging site. Ms. Draughn added that it goes against the prerequisites in the community, and said that she thought that it is challenging that residents have to travel under an underpass to get to their home and to have families living behind that is concern. Ms. Draughn asked if this is the best site for multi-family housing, and how would first responders be able to come onto the site if need be safely.

Mr. Kops reminded the Commission that it's not up to the Commission to decide what the best use of this property is. Mr. Kops then stated that the Department had received several email comments speaking to the application, and that he sent them out to the Commission prior to the meeting for review, and mentioned that Kristin Anderson sent a comment with a petition signed by 50 people – 44 of the signatures were from residents of Spring Glen, and 6 names were outside of Spring Glen.

Mr. Kops then asked if there were any comments speaking in favor of the application.

William Kurtz, 109 Wakefield Street, addressed the Commission to say he was in favor of the application. Mr. Kurtz said that he heard valid concerns, and at this point, it's up to the developer to make a plan that will work. Mr. Kurtz expressed the needs for multi-family housing in the neighborhood, and added that he doesn't think that the traffic concerns could go forward.

Dalton King, 114 Wakefield, addressed the Commission. Mr. King said that he is a 30 year resident of spring glen and is an avid user of the trail. Mr. King also noted that he is a member of the Farmington Canal Commission, but wasn't representing the Commission tonight. Mr. King wanted to address the number of units, and added that he thought that the project provided a significant upgrade to the trail, and Mr. Smith was detailed in his presentation. Mr. King said that traffic already needs significant traffic calming as noted with entry and exit of the trail, and this is an excellent opportunity to improve access to the trail.

Kristin Anderson, 103 Thornton Street, asked a question about the letter that she wrote. Ms. Anderson stated that isn't posted online. Mr. Kops said that it will be posted tomorrow. Ms. Anderson added that she is in favor of the zoning environment, and feels that the opportunity of multi-family housing should get explored.

Mr. Kops then asked if there were any comments speaking against the application.

Elaine Dove, Santa Fe Avenue, addressed the Commission. Ms. Dove said that what Mr. Smith did tonight is exactly what he did at the site walk on Saturday, and noted that she didn't represent the Spring Glen Civic Association. Ms. Dove added that this sets a precedent on the properties, and there doesn't need to be a reason that they seek relief from the regulation, which is a problem in her opinion. Ms. Dove stated that the POCD supports applicants request and she found items that doesn't support the request. Ms. Dove said that a lot of time was spent on this exception on why this particular property is an exception. Ms. Dove added that she doesn't think that this will be growing the tax base, as taxes will be increasing. Ms. Dove concluded by stating that she doesn't think that this an application that the Commission should support.

Scott Green, 85 Hobson Avenue, read his letter that he submitted to the Commission in opposition of the application.

Tom Parlapiano, 27 Ardmore Street, read his letter that he submitted to the Commission in opposition of the application.

Michelle Zacks, 316 Thornton Street, addressed the Commission and said that she agreed with all of the points made by Mr. Parlapiano had mentioned. Ms. Zacks said that she is in support of multi-family housing in Hamden, but the problem she has with the application is with traffic and the volume of traffic which the development would increase.

Ron Zacks, 316 Thornton Street, addressed the Commission. Mr. Zack said that he lived at his property since 1971. Mr. Zacks stated that his house is so close to the Meritt Parkway that the noise goes until 2 a.m. Mr. Zack said he imagines the noise that these people will have to endure and this will be unbearable to them. Mr. Zacks wanted to know more about the open space. Mr. Zacks said that there are more or less cars, and that the property needs improvement. Mr. Zacks suggested that some thought should be given before turning the property into an ugly development. Mr. Zacks stated the danger will increase in regards to the student walking. Mr. Zacks added that this will increase the traffic on Dixwell Avenue and referenced a traffic accident he witness. Mr. Zacks concluded by saying for that reason, he is opposed to the application.

Karlen Meinsien, 80 Santa Fe Avenue, addressed the Commission. Ms. Meinsien read her letter in opposition of the application.

Denise Laframboise, 12 Waite Street, addressed the Commission. Ms. Laframboise is the president of the Spring Glen Association, and stated that she found about this too late. Ms. Laframboise said that the Association has significant concerns. Ms. Laframboise clarified that the Spring Glen Civic Association is not officially opposing it, and the petition was started to gage the feelings of the neighborhood on the project. Ms. Laframboise stated that the original wording did not specify a portion of Connolly Parkway. Ms. Laframboise said that this did not exclude the property across the street, and added that if you look at the Zoning laws, the original intent was multi-family housing. Ms. Laframboise stated that she agreed with Ms. Meinsien's comments, and added that she thought Ms. Meinsien did a great job expressing why this doesn't make sense. Ms. Laframboise said that her second concern was that this would set a precedent, and stated that since this would apply to one land owner, therefore, how a similar application could be denied. Ms. Laframboise said that her final point was about traffic volume, which was really well expressed. Ms. Laframboise added that the site is yards away from the Mill River where it empties into Lake Whitney, and added that she doesn't see any reason to take the first step towards this. Ms. Laframboise added that it's important to proceed with caution with development on wildlife environment issues. Ms. Laframboise mentioned that she submitted a letter to the Commission, and added that she does understand that the Regional Water Authority is not opposed to this application, and can benefit from the specifics. Ms. Laframboise stated that this could be giving the greenlight to any multi-family housing, which can be up to 44 units. Ms. Laframboise added that this would have to go through other stages of approval, and what the RWA is commenting on is the 28 units that is currently proposed. Ms. Laframboise continued by stated that Lake Whitney is a valuable resource, and added that this opens the door for the proposals in the future for other multi-family housing projects, which could impact the valuable ecosystem.

Halina Wagner, 44 Elgin Street, addressed the Commission. Ms. Wagner said that she has been a resident of Spring Glen for 19 years, and is raising two children who attend Hamden High School. Ms. Wagner said that her biggest concern is traffic stacking up, and mentioned that there is significant traffic. Ms. Wagner added that none of those processes have been addressed, and that doesn't allow pedestrians to feel as though they are safe. Ms. Wagner added that she sees cars speeding by as she walks, and this application has no consideration to those who live in the area. Ms. Wagner said that she thinks that by approving the

application, this will set a precedent multi-family housing going onto the other side of Connolly Parkway and she would like to see it stopped

Mr. Smith addressed the concerns. Mr. Smith said that he would like to point out to page one of the application, as the proposed language for the table 6.3 in a T zone – east on the parkway, approx. 660 feet – and stated the limitation on how far it was going to go. Mr. Smith mentioned that the number of units was subject to a site plan. Mr. Smith added that none of them will be beneath the highway. Mr. Smith said that many people bought up considerations of ponds and water retention, and one of the things that the applicant has talked about is directly south of our site where they have a very large area of sedimentation pond and is a collective basin. Mr. Smith said the water then goes to the west of Dixwell Avenue, goes through sedimentation pond, which is taken to the site, and goes into the Mill River. Mr. Smith added that it is a beautiful visual setting, and will be a great setting for a residence. Same view of people who are unable to take advantage of. Mr. Smith reminded the Commission that this particular amendment is already used on Mather Street, which has led to housing developments on Connolly Parkway. Mr. Smith clarified this zone change would not pertain to 60 Connolly Parkway or Hamden Hall School. Mr. Smith concluded by stating that he believes he has a very well scaled project, and the applicant is looking to have buildings with landscaping in between.

Mr. Roscow asked if other businesses were able to relocate, as one of the letters submitted was from the owner of Tech Auto, who will be relocating. Mr. Roscow stated that he was happy to hear that the owner was able to relocate. Mr. Smith responded that he has not heard of that, but had heard that it was getting relocated due to towing concerns

Mr. Roscow asked if the petition, containing signatures from citizens who lived outside Hamden. Attorney Lee said that it's up to the Commission to give them weight.

Mr. McDonagh made a motion to continue on the public hearing on June 23, 2020. Mr. Banks seconded, and the vote was unanimous in favor. The public hearing was continued to June 23, 2020.

## **B. Regular Meeting**

1. Zoning Regulation Amendment # 20-0975  
Application to Amend the Zoning Regulations COVID-19 Business Recovery Amendment for outdoor cafes and temporary signage  
Hamden Planning and Zoning Commission Applicant

*This was continued to the June 23<sup>rd</sup> public hearing.*

2. Zoning Map Amendment # 20-0976  
233 Skiff Street, T-1 Zone  
Change from a T-1 zone to a T-5 zone  
South Central Regional Water Authority, Applicant  
*This was continued to the June 23<sup>rd</sup> public hearing.*

3. Special Permit 96-0788  
109 Sanford Street, T-4 Zone  
Major amendment to allow public assembly

Devonshire LLC, Applicant  
*Continued from the May 26, 2020 Public Hearing*  
***This was continued to the June 23<sup>rd</sup> public hearing.***

4. Zoning Regulation Amendment # 20-0974  
Amendment to zoning regulations to allow multi-family housing on a portion of Connolly Parkway,  
T4 Zone  
Ancar, Inc., Applicant  
*Rescission of Approval due to technical difficulties providing public access to the meeting*  
***This was continued to the June 23<sup>rd</sup> public hearing.***
  
5. Zoning Regulation Amendment # 20-0974  
Amendment to zoning regulations to allow multi-family housing on a portion of Connolly Parkway,  
T4 Zone  
Ancar, Inc., Applicant  
*Re-hearing of Public Hearing due to technical difficulties providing public access to the meeting*  
***This was continued to the June 23<sup>rd</sup> public hearing.***

**C. Old Business/ New Business**

1. Review minutes of the May 26, 2020 Meeting

Mr. Roscow made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 26, 2020 meeting. It was seconded by Mr. Cocchairo. The minutes were approved, with one abstention from Mr. McDonagh. The minutes were approved.

**D. Adjournment**

Mr. McDonagh made a motion to adjourn. It was seconded by Mr. Roscow, and the vote was unanimous in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 10:42 p.m.

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Natalie Barletta, Clerk of the Commission