



Town of Hamden

Planning and Zoning Department

Hamden Government Center
 2750 Dixwell Avenue
 Hamden, CT 06518
 Tel: (203) 287-7070
 Fax: (203) 287-7075
 www.hamden.com

October 3, 2011, revised 10-7-11

MINUTES: THE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION, Town of Hamden, held a Public Hearing and Regular Meeting on Tuesday, September 27, 2011 at 7:00 p.m. in the Thornton Wilder Hall, Miller Memorial Library Complex, 2901 Dixwell Avenue, Hamden and the following items were reviewed:

Commissioners in attendance:

Joe McDonagh, Chairman
 Lee Campo
 Jon Cesare
 Ed Grant
 Ann Altman
 Ryszard Szczypek
 Bob Roscow
 Peter Reynolds

Staff in attendance:

Leslie Creane, Town Planner
 Dan Kops, Assistant Town Planner
 Tim Lee, Assistant Town Attorney
 Stacy Shellard, Clerk
 Lisa Raccio, Stenographer

Mr. McDonagh called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The clerk read the Public Hearing items into the record. Mr. McDonagh introduced the panel and reviewed the Public Hearing procedures.

A. Public Hearing

Mr. McDonagh stated that item 1 and item 2 would be combined and heard together because the applications involve the same properties.

1. Re-Subdivision 11-1361

2560 Dixwell Avenue/50 & 64 Sanford St, T-4/R-4 Zone
 Hamden Professional Center, LLC, Applicant

2. Major Amendment to Special Permit & Site Plan 06-1082/WS

2560 Dixwell Avenue/50 & 64 Sanford St, T-4/R-4 Zone
 Division of property
 Hamden Professional Center, LLC, Applicant

Mr. Bernard Pellegrino, Attorney, addressed the Commission and stated that a Special Permit application had been approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission with a condition of approval that the three properties involved be combined as one parcel. This application is a paper sub-division being requested that would divide the property into two parcels, but not affect usage of the site. Mr. Pellegrino reviewed the re-subdivision map that had been submitted which shows the buildings and parking that were previously approved, and he said that nothing that is

shown would change if a new approval is received. He said a variance was granted for one lot by the ZBA and both lots would now meet the zoning criteria. The sub-division map shows how the land would be divided and there would be a mutual easement for the exit only onto Sanford Street. Mr. Pellegrino stated that if the approvals were received the separate parcels would still continue to work as one. He said that Dr. Doug Rollins, current owner of the property, has been approached by a company that would like to purchase one property and it would still be used as a medical building. Mr. Pellegrino said if an approval was granted it would allow for the transfer of title because the amendment to the Special Permit would create two lots. There would be no detrimental impact to the neighboring properties and it would meet the sub-division regulations.

Ms. Altman asked if the reciprocal easement would be permanent and Mr. Pellegrino replied yes.

Mr., Dan Kops, Assistant Town Planner read his comments and noted that they refer to application 11-1161 and should read 64 Sanford Street and recommends approval based on the conditions as stated and the following plans:

“Subdivision Map, Hamden Professional Center, Sanford Street Medical Building, Sanford Street & Dixwell Ave., Hamden Connecticut,” dated 8/17/2011, page 1 of 1;
 “Zoning Data Map, Hamden Professional Center, Sanford Street Medical Building, Sanford Street & Dixwell Ave., Hamden Connecticut,” dated 8/17/2011, page 1 of 1

Mr. Kops read his comments that refer to application 06-1082 which recommend approval with the conditions as stated and based the following plans:

“Subdivision Map, Hamden Professional Center, Sanford Street Medical Building, Sanford Street & Dixwell Ave., Hamden Connecticut,” dated 8/17/2011, page 1 of 1;
 “Zoning Data Map, Hamden Professional Center, Sanford Street Medical Building, Sanford Street & Dixwell Ave., Hamden Connecticut,” dated 8/17/2011, page 1 of 1

Mr. Szczypek asked if it was necessary for the right of way easement if the lots were to act separately. Mr. Pellegrino replied no but explained that there is currently only one entrance/exit on Dixwell Avenue that will be used for both parcels because the driveway going to Sanford Street was approved to be used as an exit only. Mr. Szczypek asked if exit only onto Sanford Street were to be used as an entrance/exit would an easement be necessary and Mr. Pellegrino replied that the previous approval was for it to be used as an exit only.

Mr. Pellegrino referred to Mr. Kops’ comments and referred to condition 1.b. and the need for reciprocal easements governing access and parking. He said that the locations of the proposed lot lines were done so that both parcels would have the required parking for either building and he does not feel that an easement is needed for both parking areas. Mr. Kops said that the Commission could remove the condition if they feel it is not necessary. Mr. Kops stated that the building that already exists has a large parking area and the north end of the lot will be used be for the proposed smaller building. He said that there could be days where someone may need to access both buildings. Mr. Pellegrino explained that he would prefer not have the easement but would do it if the Commission requires it. He feels that where the lots meet it would be cleaner for his client without the easement.

Mr. McDonagh feels there is no need for a parking easement and but means that parking would not be reciprocal except for access to the properties. Mr. Pellegrino said that there is already an easement for the egress and ingress and that there is the required amount of parking for both parcels.

Mr. McDonagh asked if there were comments for or against the application. There were none.

Mr. McDonagh closed the Public Hearing.

B. Regular Meeting:

Mr. McDonagh opened the regular meeting and explained that item 1 and 2 would be discussed together.

1. Re-Subdivision 11-1361

2560 Dixwell Avenue/50 & 64 Sanford St, T-4/R-4 Zone
Hamden Professional Center, LLC, Applicant

2. Major Amendment to Special Permit & Site Plan 06-1082/WS

2560 Dixwell Avenue/50 & 64 Sanford St, T-4/R-4 Zone
Division of property
Hamden Professional Center, LLC, Applicant

Ms. Altman made the motion to approve Application 11-1361 as recommended by Mr. Kops with the following conditions:

1. Prior to filing the re-subdivision map the applicant must:
 - a) Submit a revised map containing all conditions of approval
 - b) Submit a copy of the reciprocal easements governing access and parking, for approval by the Assistant Town Attorney.
2. *The applicant must ensure that the approved, signed, re-subdivision map as well as easement are filed at the Town Clerk's Office in accordance with State Statutes.*

Mr. Roscow seconded the motion.

Mr. McDonagh asked if the condition 1.b should be removed. Mr. Roscow said there will be shared parking but only one exit which would be for the new parcel. Mr. McDonagh explained that the existing parcel has an existing enter/exit onto Dixwell. Mr. Roscow feels that the condition should be included. Mr. McDonagh stated that he is not convinced that there is a need for a parking easement, because both parcels meet the parking requirements in the zoning regulations and Mr. Roscow agreed. However, Mr. Roscow is concerned if there were to be a new owner of the larger building's property and the small parcel would need the existing enter/exit that is currently part of the parking scheme.

Mr. McDonagh asked for a consensus from the Commission if they feel the parking easement is necessary.

Mr. Reynolds asked Mr. Kops what the parking easement represents and if there is no parking easement could there be a dispute between the owners.

Mr. Kops said that if one of the proposed lots did not have the required amount of parking there would be a need for the parking easement. He stated that both lots have adequate parking, and that he added the condition because it would make it clear. Mr. Pellegrino feels that an easement would make it more complicated because people could park on the wrong property without knowing. Mr. Grant asked if the owners will know which parking spaces are theirs and Mr. Kops replied yes.

Mr. Campo asked if there must be an easement for the exit or enter and Mr. McDonagh said yes. Mr. Kops explained that the easement is for circulation only. Mr. McDonagh said that there is an easement for the enter/exit and an easement for the exit only. The parking easement would be to cover if someone is going from building to the other and not moving their vehicle.

Mr. Szczypek stated that the fewer amount of easements the simpler it is. He said he understands the easement for the driveways but another easement would be added burden onto the two lots. If one lot changes use and requires additional parking it would need to comeback before the Commission. He feels that the owners will have a separate agreement for maintenance of the lots.

Ms. Altman said that the maintenance of the parking lots could be separate for each individual property owner, and if it became a problem in the future the property owners could separate the parking with something such as a wall. She feels that an easement is necessary for the parking lot.

Ms. Altman withdrew her motion.

Mr. Szczypek made the motion to approve Application 11-1361 as recommended by Mr. Kops and remove the wording "and parking" from condition 1.b and the following conditions:

1. Prior to filing the re-subdivision map the applicant must:
 - a. Submit a revised map containing all conditions of approval
 - b. Submit a copy of the reciprocal easements governing access, for approval by the Assistant Town Attorney.
2. The applicant must ensure that the approved, signed, re-subdivision map as well as easement are filed at the Town Clerk's Office in accordance with State Statutes.

Mr. Grant seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Szczypek made the motion to approve the major amendment to Application 06-1082 as recommended by Mr. Kops and remove the wording "and parking" from condition 1.b and the following conditions:

1. Prior to obtaining a Zoning Permit the applicant must:
 - a. Submit a revised map containing all conditions of approval
 - b. Submit a copy of the reciprocal easements governing access, for approval by the Assistant Town Attorney.
2. Ensure that the approved, signed, re-subdivision map as well as easement are filed at the Town Clerk's Office in accordance with State Statutes.

Mr. Grant seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. C.G.S. 8-24 11-318

Tuttle Avenue Bridge Replacement
Town of Hamden, Application

Mr. Dan Kops, Assistant Town Planner, reviewed his comments and recommended that the Planning & Zoning Commission vote in favor of the Tuttle Avenue Bridge Replacement, and issue a favorable report to the Legislative Council.

Mr. Grant asked if this project was have supposed to have started several years back., and if so, what was the cost going to be. Mr. Bob Brinton, Town Engineer, addressed the Commission and stated that it was the same project and the approximate cost estimate had been approximately \$400,000.00-\$500,000.00.

Mr. Szczypek asked if this was in the public right of the right of way. Mr. Brinton said that it is a Town Road. Mr. Szczypek asked if what is before the Commission within their jurisdiction. Mr. Kops reviewed the procedure for municipal improvements per C.G.S. 8-24s and what the requirements are. He also noted that it is within the jurisdiction of the Planning & Zoning Commission because it is a municipal improvement. Ms. Creane explained that per State Statute the Legislative Council must get a review from the Commission.

Ms. Altman made the motion to refer the C.G.S. 8-24 11-318 for the Tuttle Avenue Bridge Replacement with a favorable report and the recommendation that the proposed road closing be referred to the Traffic Authority for approval prior to the Council making a decision Roscow seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. 2011 Parking Plan-Quinnipiac University: Annual Review

Mr. Dan Kops, Assistant Town Planner, read his comments that are an analysis of the Quinnipiac Housing and Parking Data. He explained that the plan shows ample parking is being provided. However, he noted that a recent

complaint by a student and a student web-site suggests there is a problem that needs to be addressed. He also concluded that the housing data is complicated by the fact that the University has provided two different sets of figures.

Mr. McDonagh reviewed a letter from Mr. George Mudry, Hamden Resident, and the web-site articles that refer to on-campus students that are driving to commuter lots, and additional parking that was added to the carpool lot. He noted that if the parking areas are being increased in size it must come before the Commission.

Mr. Bernard Pellegrino, Attorney, addressed the Commission and reviewed the Housing Plan vs. Parking Plans that were submitted. He noted that the 1815 number as well as the 1913 from the previous year is for the total non-resident data population. This includes undergraduate students and the graduate students and the University has carried 600 to 800 commuter number on top of the undergraduate students. This number is always different between the non-resident undergraduates and the total non-resident day number who come to the campus, and this figure includes both the undergraduate students and the law students. Mr. Kops requested an amended set of figures and in the future it must be specified.

Ms. Altman stated that this meeting is pointless because the Commission listens to the University and questions are asked. But then a letter is received from Mr. Mudrey who is a Hamden resident and Ms. Altman feels that the letter is shameful with respect to the way Quinnipiac deals with its students. Ms. Altman said that every year citizens have complaints about the students. She understands that Quinnipiac University cannot control student behavior and the Commission has made requests for additional information, but that it does no good to the neighborhoods where the students live. Ms. Altman stated that the University needs a dedicated staff to go out immediately when a complaint is made and remove the students and bring them in front of the authorities and remove them from the University. Ms. Altman stated that the meetings to discuss the student parking and housing plan is a polite interchange where the Commission has no power or the suggestions make no difference. She supports the many things that Quinnipiac University does and is in favor of the academic programs, but the parking issue that brings up the number of students on and off campus has not improved and the University is completely neglecting its responsibility to the citizens of Hamden by not taking care of the issue. She also feels that should be taken care of immediately and with a heavy hand, and that the Commission does not have the power to take care of the problem with the students.

Mr. George Mudry, 21 Austen Road, addressed the Commission and stated that there have been a lot of problems with the students who live off campus. He stated that two years ago Mr. Don Weinback who was the Vice President of Development at Quinnipiac University made a comment that he could not help if the zoning regulations do not address the issue.

Mr. Roscow asked if the realignment of West Woods Road reduced the amount of parking that was on West Woods Road parking lot. Mr. McDonagh said the road alignment only affected the driveway down to West Woods Road. Mr. Pellegrino stated that it did not impact the amount of parking available.

Ms. Leslie Creane, Town Planner clarified that zoning regulations cannot regulate behavior and that bad behavior falls under criminal law. She further explained that the zoning regulations are as strict as they can be. When Ms. Altman talks about the Commission having no power, there are certain powers that the Commission does not have under State Statutes. The power to regulate behavior is not a zoning issue, but is a police and university issue.

Mr. Pellegrino stated that he somewhat disagrees with Ms. Creane because there have been discussions over the last four or five years regarding behavior. He said that the changes that were made was the off-campus hotline, the hiring of two Hamden Police Officers on the weekends who are paid for by the University. Mr. Pellegrino said that the officers did respond and investigate the incident that took place in Mr. Mudry's neighborhood which resulted in five students being arrested and follow up citations issued. Mr. Pellegrino feels that the key issue is getting the students who have done something wrong into the judicial system. There had been an earlier issue occur which resulted in five dismissals from Quinnipiac University had resulted because of complaints. He is hopeful that what occurred with Mr. Mudry's incident would result in a judiciary process in which the persons who allegedly caused

the problems would get the treatment they deserve. Mr. Pellegrino further feels that the discussions and interplay between the Quinnipiac Security Department, the Hamden Police Department and with the Commissions suggestions has lead to a reduction of the problems and achieved the desired results. He understands that the behavior cannot be regulated.

Mr. Mudry said that he is at this meeting because Quinnipiac University has changed a great deal since he started having problems with the students. He said that three years ago Quinnipiac would not come out to a non University owned house for security issues. Mr. Mudry stated that Quinnipiac did come out when the last issue occurred. Mr. Mudry reviewed what had happened and the outcome of the incident. The University has been in contact with him and explained the disciplinary process.

Mr. Mudry stated that his issue before the Commission this evening is that there are students living in an unpermitted house. This started three or four years ago with six students living in the house. Mr. Mudry said that he had a meeting with Mayor Henrici, and that Mr. Kops was in attendance. The outcome of the meeting was that fines were imposed and still to date the situation has not been rectified. Over time \$45,000.00 of fines have accrued with interest, and now approaches \$55,000.00. He asked why the students are still living in the house and this is a zoning interest.

Mr. Kops said that students who are living in a house that does not have a permit is a zoning issue. The fines that have been imposed are approximately \$45,000 and Mr. Kops' understanding is that Mr. Lagner who owns the property or his attorney was to come in today to pay the fines. Mr. Kops was unsure if that did happen today. Mr. Kops explained that the Zoning Enforcement Officer did take action against the property owner. A notice of violation was received by the property owner, subsequently a citation was issued and fines started to accrue and the property owner has not paid the fine. When the property owner came in for renewal of the student housing permit and he was told it could not be done because the fine was not paid. Another notice of violation was sent out and if the fines are not paid or the students removed by Thursday, another citation will be issued and additional fines will be added. Mr. Kops said that zoning enforcement is not the most efficient enforcement because it does not have police power. The goal is to remove the students or get the property properly permitted. He explained that a student housing permit last year had been inadvertently renewed because it had been overlooked that the fines were not paid. The Planning Office will continue to follow-up and take action.

Mr. McDonagh said that the Planning Office has to abide by the State Statutes and the process they are required to follow. When action is being taken within the court system, some offenders continue to break the law while they awaiting a decision. Mr. McDonagh said that while \$45,000.00 in fines is nice for the Town and a dent to the land owner, it does not resolve the issues that Mr. Mudry is having.

Mr. Mudry stated that he was told that the Mayor has dropped the fines from the \$55,000.00 to \$45,000.00 and it still has not been paid. His understanding was that through conversations with the Mayor and email and because he had not paid the \$45,000.00 fine, it is back up to \$55,000.00 and ask if there is away to clarify this.

Mr. McDonagh said that his understanding is that the existing fines will continue to accrue and the process must start again to issue a new violation because it is a new student housing permit that he does not have.

Mr. Mudry said that two new rooms have been built without any permits and he is not following the proper process at his other properties in Hamden.

There was further discussion with regard to the fines that were to be paid today and the uncertainty of whether they were paid.

Ms. Altman stated that Mr. Mudry was given a chance to express his concerns to the Commission and she was relieved that Quinnipiac has improved with its responses to residents of Hamden. She said that this discussion this evening shows how long the legal process can take for action to be taken and that it is unfortunate what a resident must deal with where bad behavior is involved, but the State Statutes must be followed.

Mr. Mudrey said if the process is not working there should be an amendment to the zoning regulations to put college students into residential neighborhoods. He has read the Town Charter and Zoning Regulations and a resident should not have to wait three years for the process to be completed. He feels that student tenants should be evicted or fined to get them out of the house. Mr. McDonagh said that the Commission cannot fine tenants who violate the zoning regulations.

Mr. Kops stated that notice of violations and citations can be imposed on tenants. The Planning Office will go after tenants if necessary but they cannot go after tenants for bad behavior. There was further discussion regarding the zoning regulations, the Town Charter and imposed fines.

Mr. McDonagh asked the Planning Office to provide a report to the Commission that may increase the effectiveness of the student housing regulations.

Mr. Pellegrino stated that at a meeting this summer the University authorized him to do research nationwide to see what other universities did to regulate student behavior. He said that one thing he thought may work is to amend the zoning regulations is if there is a targeted house that has repeated violations of the student housing regulations would be not to renew the permit in the future.

Mr. Kops said that another issue raised at this meeting is the parking permits being that are being issued by the University is to York Hill students for commuter parking lots on campus and the accuracy of the figures presented. Mr. Kops said that the information provided shows 1,215 non-resident undergraduate students. He asked if this number includes the 1925 in the first column under year 08-09 include the graduate students and if it needs to be adjusted. Also, if that is adjusted would it mean that the number of off campus students is less than projected. Mr. Kops said that regardless of which figures are used the intent of when the Special Permit was approved by the Commission for the York Hill dormitories was that there would be a significant decrease in the off campus housing. Because of the economy there were 1400 units built instead of the 2,000 units that were originally planned, but only 700 rooms appear to be used by students that were used by off campus students. The remainder are being used by new students and the population has increased and the impact of the new on campus housing has been diminished.

Mr. Pellegrino stated that the parking plan figures are correct and include all the students parking on the campus on a regular basis. The total campus population has included graduate and undergraduate students. He said that the undergraduate students 1,815 day students include 600 graduate students who use the commuter lots during the day, and some are graduate students for both day and evening students and this is why the figures differ from the housing data which only includes the undergraduates.

Mr. McDonagh clarified that in the school year 08/09 the 1925 figure includes 600 graduate students. Mr. McDonagh reviewed the charts provided by Mr. Kops and said that the undergraduate population is 1,100 students higher than three years ago. Mr. Pellegrino stated that he did not have the data with him. Mr. McDonagh asked Mr. Pellegrino to submit the information to the Planning Office and make an appointment with Mr. Kops to review the information and it would be reviewed at the next meeting of the Commission. Mr. Pellegrino replied that this could be done.

Mr. Pellegrino referred to the submitted article that relates to the on campus parking and said that the busiest days at the campus are Tuesday and Thursday. He stated that the because of the work being done by the State project on the Mt. Carmel Avenue bridge it has impacted the traffic which resulted in issues within the surrounding neighborhoods and the buses being delayed. Mr. Pellegrino feels that the delay with the bus issues has been resolved.

Mr. McDonagh asked if the on campus students living at York Hill being given parking permits to park anywhere on campus. Mr. Pellegrino said that as part of the marketing efforts to have the seniors move back to on campus housing were given expanded rights to come on to campus. He explained that all other on campus students with a resident parking sticker are not allowed to come on to the main campus until after 3:00 p.m. The seniors who have

the privilege to park on the main campus has resulted in more students utilizing the commuter lot and is not creating additional issues due to demand.

Mr. McDonagh asked what the percentage is for students living on the York Hill that have been given the privilege to park on the main campus. Also, Mr. McDonagh would like to see the parking permit sticker used by the seniors that allows them to use the lots on the main campus. Mr. McDonagh said he is frustrated and asked if freshman are allowed stickers. Mr. Pellegrino stated that freshman living on campus are not allowed a car. Mr. McDonagh said that there are additional students now being put onto Town roads at difficult times of the day. Mr. Pellegrino disagreed, and he said that the Seniors are not being put on to the roads during peak periods. Mr. McDonagh said that there is no more a peak time of day on Whitney Avenue and he has had difficulty exiting his driveway on it at different times of the day.

Ms. Altman said that students have many resources to determine when the buses will be coming and if the students know they can rely on the buses they would use them more.

Mr. McDonagh said that the University should abide by what the Commission was told, which was that the students living on the York Hill Campus would be using the buses. The Commission and Mr. Pellegrino further discussed the students parking on the main campus vs. using the bus. Mr. Pellegrino stated that the undergraduate student on campus housing has increased from 68 percent to 82 percent and he reviewed what the University incentives were offered to the seniors who stay in housing on campus. Mr. McDonagh stated that the Planning & Zoning Commission should have been advised prior to any changes in the permitted parking in commuter lots by on campus students. Mr. Grant stated that lack of staff on the campus would make it difficult to enforce students using non permitted areas.

Mr. Pellegrino reviewed what is considered a normal schedule for students staying on campus and the additional time it would take to access their cars to drive to the main campus vs. using the bus service. He feels that many of the problems with regards to traffic was the work being done on the Mt. Carmel Bridge.

Ms. Creane reviewed the approval for the York Hill Campus and said that the parking permit stickers shown that convinced the Commission that the stickers made it clear who would be allowed and not allowed to park at the main campus. Mr. Pellegrino stated that they are still using the stickers. Ms. Creane would like to see the stickers with explanations for their use.

Mr. McDonagh asked for public comments:

Ms. Cindy Civitello, 61 Berkley Court, asked Quinnipiac if on the map for lot 15 for residential student use will be reopened because it is listed on the parking plan. Also the colors on the lots need to be made clearer to distinguish the York Hill Dorm parking with commuter lot parking. Ms. Civitello also stated that the Security Department has been more responsive to unruly students when there is a problem occurring off campus and on one occasion sent a bus to pick up the students to return them to campus. Ms. Civitello stated that Mr. David Barger, Chief of Security will be making a presentation at the next West Woods Civic Association Meeting.

Mr. Jeremy Stull, Quinnipiac Student, 67 New Road, addressed the Commission and stated that 100 percent of the students living on the York Hill Campus are given parking stickers as commuters. He described the stickers for on campus and commuter students and stated that the only difference is that bottom half, off campus commuters are green and York Hill students are red. He said that as a junior he lived on York Hill last year and would drive down to park and never had any problem. There are issues with demand during the University day and the bus schedule has not been ironed out. The senior housing experience has improved with the incentives, but designated parking for the seniors has not improved. Mr. Stull said the time to walk to his car and drive when he was on campus was similar to the waiting time for a bus.

Mr. Pellegrino said that it is his understanding that lot 15 will not be used this year and is not needed because of the parking spaces on York Hill. He also noted that the color coding on the parking map will be corrected. Mr. Pellegrino stated that his understanding is that only seniors can use the commuter parking on campus.

Mr. David Barger, Chief of Security, addressed the Commission and stated that there are different color decals for every single parking lot and where students live. The student regulations state that juniors should not park in commuter lots on campus and is only a privilege to on campus seniors.

Mr. McDonagh stated that it was suggested by Mr. Stull that the security personnel is not reading the parking regulations. Mr. Barger will discuss with his staff to make sure that they are enforcing the parking regulations.

The Commission and Mr. Barger further discussed the parking and suggestions to help enforce the parking regulations and different ways that the lots could be accessed to help enforce them. Also discussed were ways to make improvements to the bus schedules and bus routes to help increase the amount of students that use them. Mr. Barger stated that at the Universities expense off duty police officers were hired to direct traffic near the bridge to improve the flow of traffic.

5. Special Permit & Site Plan 00-909

79 Bowen Street

Request to release bond in the amount of \$99,300.00

Ralph Mauro, Applicant

Mr. McDonagh reviewed the request to release the bond in the amount of \$99,300.00. He advised the Commission that Ms. Holly Masi, Zoning Enforcement Officer, recommends that the request be approved.

Ms. Altman made the motion to release the bond by the amount of \$99,300.00. Mr. Roscow seconded the motion the motion passed unanimously.

6. C.G.S. 8-24 11-319

Bassett Park

Irrigation Project

Town of Hamden, Applicant

Mr. Dan Kops, Assistant Town Planner, reviewed his comments and recommended that the Planning & Zoning Commission vote in favor of the irrigation project, and issue a favorable report to the Legislative Council.

Mr. Roscow made the motion to refer the C.G.S. 8-24 11-319 for the Irrigation Project at Bassett Park with a favorable report. Mr. Szczypek seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Altman said that there is a deed restriction that states there is to be no construction on the property. Mr. Kops stated that he was unaware of any restrictions on the deed and the request is for a continuation of the irrigation system already in place. She asked Mr. Kops to check the deed because this irrigation project would be considered construction.

C. Old Business/ New Business

1. Review minutes of September 13, 2011

Mr. Reynolds made the motion to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Roscow seconded the motion. Mr. McDonagh, Mr. Campo, Mr. Cesare, Ms. Altman, Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Roscow voted in favor of the motion. Therefor, the motion passed.

2. Minor Amendment-2380 Dixwell Avenue

Mr. McDonagh advised the Commission that Ms. Leslie Creane, Town Planner had approved and signed the Minor Amendment.

3. Minor Amendment-3697 Whitney Avenue

Mr. McDonagh advised the Commission that Ms. Leslie Creane, Town Planner had approved and signed the Minor Amendment.

D. Adjournment

Ms. Altman made the motion to adjourn. Mr. Grant seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m

Submitted by: _____
Stacy Shellard, Clerk of the Commission