



# 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

**November 18, 2013**

**MINUTES: THE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**, Town of Hamden, held a Public Hearing and Regular Meeting on Tuesday, November 12, 2013 at 7:00 pm. in the Thornton Wilder Hall, Miller Memorial Library Complex, 2901 Dixwell Avenue, Hamden with the following results:

Commissioners in attendance:

Brack Poitier, Acting Chair  
 Bob Roscow  
 Michele Mastropetre  
 Myron W. Hul  
 Peter Reynolds  
 Lee Campo  
 Joe McDonagh, sitting for Jen Cutrali

Staff in attendance:

Dan Kops, Assistant Town Planner  
 Tim Lee, arrived at 7:12 p.m.  
 Stacy Shellard, Clerk  
 Genovieve Bertolini, Stenographer

Mr. Poitier opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. The Commission and staff introduced themselves. Mr. Poitier reviewed the meeting procedures.

### **A. Public Hearing**

#### **1. Special Permit & Site Plan 13-1226**

230 Wintergreen Avenue, R-4 zone

Place of Worship

Saint Mary's Unison Church

***Deadline to open Public Hearing 11/28/13***

Mr. Michael Lambert, Civil Engineer, addressed the Commission and reviewed the location of the site. The entrance to the site will be via Wintergreen Avenue. The church will be 14,400 square feet with 134 parking spaces. It will be serviced by public utilities. Mr. Lambert reviewed the stormwater management plan. He stated that he reviewed Mr. Dan Kops' comments and accepts the conditions of approval as stated.

Mr. Scott Hesketh, Traffic Engineer, addressed the Commission and reviewed the traffic study done in February, 2012.

Mr. Dan Kops read his comments which recommend approval with conditions as stated and based on the following plans:

“Saint Mary's Unison Church, 230 Wintergreen Avenue,” Sheets AB1,OD1, SD1, C1, L1, C2, WS1, ES2, D1-D2, DB1-DB2, LP1, A1 and A1.1, engineering plans prepared Harry E. Cole & Son, and architectural plans prepared by Pustola Associates. The engineering plans have a revision date of November 4, 2013. The architectural plans bear no revision date but were received on November 5, 2013.

Mr. Poitier asked for comments in favor of the application:

Mr. Ken Ginsberg, 377 Main Street, West Haven, addressed the Commission and stated that he represents the current bond holder K & H Development. He is not against the application, but would like the applicant to assume responsibility of the existing bond or replace with a new bond and keep it until the project and the road are completed as required as a condition of approval.

Mr. Tim Lee, Assistant Town Attorney, asked if the applicant was willing to adhere to Mr. Ginsberg's request. He explained that Mr. Ginsberg was the owner of the property when the subdivision was approved. The existing bond would remain in place if the Church does not accept ownership or replace the existing bond. Mr. Ginsberg stated that the financial responsibility should follow the project.

Mr. Poitier asked for comments against the application:

Ms. Noreen DeDomenico, 58 Stanley Road, addressed the Commission and stated that her property abuts the site. She is concerned that the proposed building is large and the approximate size of the houses in the area are 1,200 square feet. Compared to the homes the size of the church is overwhelming. She asked if the high steeple is necessary. She is also concerned with the amount of traffic the church will generate. Areas of Wintergreen Avenue are narrow and the additional traffic would impose a traffic danger to the residents, children and the church. Ms. DeDomenico asked if there was any consideration to widening the road where it crosses over the Merritt Parkway up to Joseph Lane. Also, if a sound barrier could be put along the edge of the property at the Merritt Parkway. She feels the size of the building will impact the amount of noise that already comes from the Merritt Parkway. Ms. DeDomenico noted that the residents at the bottom of Stanley Road have wells and there is concern that the water runoff from the site will effect the wells. Another concern is that the lighting on the property will effect the abutting property owners. Ms. DeDomenico she has concerns for the neighborhood and her home. The area has middle class residents who are taxpayers in Hamden. Her family has lived in Hamden for 59 years. She loves her neighborhood and would like it to remain quiet without excess noise and lighting. Ms. DeDomenico asked the Commission to consider the residents in neighborhood who will be directly effected and that they address her concerns.

Ms. Monique Colon, 3 Field View Lane, addressed the Commission and stated that she moved into her house because it was quiet and there was a lot of greenery. She thought that the vacant lots would be for houses and not a church. She is concerned with the amount of traffic that will be generated by an occupancy for the church of 400 people. Ms. Colon's driveway is on Field View Lane and with the increase of traffic it will be difficult to enter onto Wintergreen Avenue. She also has concerns about small children in the neighborhood, the lighting, the construction on the site, and on street parking at the cul-de-sac. Ms. Colon asked if the road will be private or a Town road when completed and if her street address will change.

Mr. Michael Colaiacovo, 155 Mueller Drive, Seventh District Councilman, addressed the Commission and asked that the comments made by the residents be addressed. He asked the Commission to protect the quality of life for the residents. Mr. Colaiacovo asked for clarification regarding lot five and lot one merging, open space and what will be done with the remaining lots. Mr. Colaiacovo submitted a letter (exhibit 1) from David Morin and the clerk read it into the record.

Mr. Mark Savinelli, 123 Jennifer Road, addressed the Commission and questioned the Traffic report done in February, 2012, which was in the middle of the winter when there are less people out on the road. He asked why it was not done in May, June, July and August when children are home from school and out riding bikes and walking.

Ms. Mastropetre asked if there would be testing of the soil because the site had previously been an active farm. She noted that many years back the farmers used pesticides. She asked if when the ground is disturbed what precautions will be taken. Mr. Lambert stated that the soil has not been tested, but during construction and cleanup precautions will be taken. He said that testing of the soil can be added to the construction sequence.

Ms. Mastropetre asked if there will be a bell on the steeple and Mr. Lambert replied no. Ms. Mastropetre asked if the steeple can be lowered. Mr. Lambert stated that the steeple can be lowered, however, with the height of the roof the steeple will not stand out. The steeple can be lowered to 45 feet, but it would take away from the visual effect from the top of the church.

Ms. Mastropetre asked what the intention of the remaining building lots would be. She asked for clarification for where lot five merging is where lot nine which was part of the subdivision for Field View. Mr. Lambert said that lot nine was part of the subdivision of Field View and is currently seven acres known as lot one. Lot 5 is located off the cul-de-sac.

Ms. Mastropetre asked what the intended use of the other building lots would be. Mr. Lambert stated that the remaining lots would be single family approved and sold. Mr. Lambert reviewed the lots that will remain as part of the subdivision and which lots will be used for the church.

Ms. Mastropetre asked who owns the properties where the trees are proposed to be removed to increase the sight line distance. Mr. Lambert said that the trees are located on properties belonging to the applicant and some are in the Town's right of way. He explained that a survey will determine the exact locations.

Ms. Mastropetre asked for clarification of the dumpster location (exhibit 2). Mr. Lambert reviewed the location of the dumpster and said it would be located in the back rear corner.

Ms. Mastropetre asked if the need for a sound barrier should be reviewed by the planning staff. She questioned if the neighboring wells could become contaminated. Also, if there is a public water line on Stanley Road. Mr. Lambert said that there is a sanitary sewer line and water line on Stanley Road that the church will connect into. He addressed possible contamination of wells in the area and stated that sediment and erosion controls and precautions will be taken and is included in the construction sequence. Mr. Lambert reviewed the stormwater management plan.

Ms. Mastropetre asked if the church has plans to allow a telecommunications tower to be located on their property and Mr. Lambert replied that the issue was never been brought to his attention. Ms. Mastropetre asked if the applicant would object to a condition of approval to not allow a telecommunications tower on the property and Mr. Lambert replied that there would be no objection.

Mr. Hul asked Mr. Lambert to identify the locations of the building, parking lot and distances to the current existing homes. Mr. Lambert reviewed page C-1 of the site plan and stated that the closest building to the property line is under 88 feet. The existing buildings on the site will be used for storage and garages. Mr. Lambert said that the surveyor did not note the distance from the proposed church to the houses on abutting properties. Mr. Hul asked if the uses of the existing building will change. Mr. Lambert stated that the buildings are abandoned and will be used as extra storage for equipment and to house the church's two vans.

Mr. Reynolds asked what activities will take place on the site during the week. Mr. Lambert reviewed the statement of use that was submitted as part of the application.

Mr. Roscow advised Mr. Lambert that the zoning regulations require that the plans have the seal of an Architect. Mr. Lambert stated that upon of approval and the final submittal a licensed architect will sign and place his/her seal on the plans. Mr. Roscow feels that for aesthetics the steeple should remain the height proposed. He noted that it is the appropriate height and would be seen from the east as you enter into the driveway.

Mr. Kops addressed the comments made by the neighbors and the Commissioners. The size and massing of the church are appropriate. It will be located on 7 acres of land and will cover only 4.3 percent of the property where 25 percent of building coverage is allowed. The impervious surface coverage will be 16.9 percent where only 30 percent is allowed. The height of the building will be under the 35 feet allowed. There should be no impact to the wells because the site will be served by public water (RWA). The wells are up gradient and any water will discharge to the detention basins. The height of the steeple at 50 feet is allowed by the zoning regulations. There is nothing in the traffic report that would reflect any dangers to the neighborhood. The width of Wintergreen Avenue should be addressed with the Town Engineer. The Commission would exceed their authority to require the construction of sound barriers because of the noise that is coming from somewhere else. Field View Lane is currently a private road and a condition of approval was recommended that until the road is completed to the Town's standards and accepted in the Town system a Certificate of Zoning Compliance and a Certificate of Occupancy would not be issued. The on-street parking is determined by the Traffic Authority. There is an adequate amount of parking on the site meets the requirements of one parking space for every three occupants. A traffic study would not indicate when children are out of school and only counts the vehicles. All Special Permit applications by State Statute and zoning regulations require the notification to property owners that about the property or are across the street and there is no evidence that this was not done. The application had a legal notice published two times and a sign that a public hearing was scheduled was posted as required by the Commission. The concern for light pollution was addressed in Mr. Kops' comments. A photometric study is required to show the lighting on the entire sight and it must drop to 0 foot candles at the property line and should not cause problems for the neighborhood. Additional buffering has been required to buffer the vehicle headlights from the abutting properties.

Mr. Poitier asked if the church is willing to assume the responsibility of the existing bond. Mr. Lambert replied if the application is approved they are willing to accept a replacement bond to complete the road.

Ms. Mastropetre asked if the church will maintain the road if it snows because it has not yet been accepted as a Town Road. Mr. Lambert replied that upon purchase of the property by the church, they will maintain the road until it is accepted by the Town. Ms. Mastropetre questioned what the time frame would be for the removal of snow. Mr. Lambert stated that the snow will be removed within two hours of the first inch of snow. Ms. Mastropetre said that it should be the homeowners association's responsibility, but she is unsure if there is a functioning one. Mr. Lambert said that if there is a large snow event the time frame to remove is questionable. Ms. Mastropetre asked if a contractor would be used. Mr. Lambert replied that a contractor could be used, however, if there is a large snow event like last year it may create a problem.

Mr. Poitier closed the Public Hearing.

## **2. Special Permit & Site Plan 13-1227/CAM**

2664-2666 State Street, T-4 zone  
Place of public assembly/Banquet facility  
Edmor Associates, LLC

***Deadline to open Public Hearing 12/12/13***

Mr. Bernard Pellegrino, Attorney, addressed the Commission and reviewed the site. He stated that the proposed facility space will be 6,500 square feet and will be located in the front of the building. Only interior improvements will be done. The food production will be done off site and the facility will have a small kitchen to heat the food. The events will take place in the evenings and on the weekends when the other businesses on the site are dormant. There is a total of 166 parking spaces on the site, but only 50 parking spaces are required for 150 people. Mr. Pellegrino stated that a CAM application was filed and he believes that all the requirements of the CAM review have been met because no exterior work will be done.

Mr. John Cruet, Architect, addressed the Commission and reviewed the site plan. He said that the traffic to the site will enter and exit through a two way entry. He reviewed the existing parking. He noted that there will be minor

construction on the site for a dumpster which needs to be screened with a fence. Mr. Cruet reviewed the proposed floor plan. He stated that there will be food warming and food maintenance done at the site and that the food preparation will be done off site.

Mr. Dan Kops read his comments which recommend approval with conditions as stated and based on the following plans:

Ed-Mor Park, 2666 State Street Hamden, CT,  
Overall-Site Development Plan and Floor Plans,  
dated September 13, 2013, revised October 11, 2013, prepared by John Cruet,  
Jr., A.I.A.

Mr. Kops noted that the Commissioners may ask why there is a flex cap on the number of people allowed to occupy the space. In a T-4 zone where there is this type of proposed use the Commission has the discretion to determine the amount of people allowed to occupy the space. The Commission does not have this discretion in a residential zone.

Mr. Poitier asked for comments in favor of the application:

Mr. George Giering, Owner of 2665 and 2685 State Street, addressed the Commission and stated that he supports the effort to expand and create jobs at the proposed site. He feels it will benefit all the businesses in the area. Mr. Giering said that site is well maintained. Mr. Giering is concerned that there will be an overflow of parking on to State Street. He stated that traffic on State street moves quickly and when entering the site or walking on State Street it could be dangerous. Mr. Giering asked what sediment & erosion controls will be taken for any construction on the site because of the water runoff that comes from Sebec Street.

Ms. Louise Pilon, 57 Sebec Street, addressed the Commission and stated that her property abuts this site. In the past where there is a wooded area at the top of the site trees have fallen onto her property. She is concerned with noise and lighting at night if the upper part of the site will be used.

Mr. Geoffrey Kanner, 138 Daniel Road, addressed the Commission and stated that EDMOR is a good neighbor and the site is well maintained. He has concerns because his property abuts this property. He is concerned with noise coming from the site, especially at night because the property is located under his bedroom. Mr. Kanner asked that the hours of use be clarified. He feels that allowing 150 people to use the site is extreme because the businesses may be closed when the site is being used, however, homes are not.

Ms. Mastropetre asked if there would be any exterior work and the location of the banquet room. Mr. Pellegrino stated there would be no work done on exterior of the site and he reviewed the location of the banquet room on the site. Ms. Mastropetre asked if the building is soundproof. Mr. Cruet explained that the existing building is constructed of double wide masonry and is insulated. There is not a lot of glass on the building so 90 percent of the noise would be contained within the facility. Ms. Mastropetre asked what types of events will be held. Mr. Pellegrino stated that social events such as weddings, anniversaries, bar mitzvahs and first communions. He said that the events will be held primarily on the weekends, but there could be some after work events.

Mr. Pellegrino stated that condition #3 may not be necessary because of the amount of parking provided and that the events will be held after hours of the businesses on the site.

Mr. Poitier said that there was concerns with regards to the overgrowth of the trees and he asked if they will be trimmed. Mr. Pellegrino stated that they will talk with the owner of the residence and any issues will be resolved.

Mr. Hul asked Mr. Pellegrino what allowed occupancy he would like. Mr. Pellegrino stated he is unsure of the number but questioned if a cap is warranted. Mr. Cruet discussed what is allowed per the fire safety codes and stated that a safe occupancy load is 294 person. He does not feel that events to be held would approach that number.

Mr. Poitier closed the Public Hearing.

Regular Meeting:

**1. Special Permit & Site Plan 13-1226**

230 Wintergreen Avenue, R-4 zone  
Place of Worship  
Saint Mary's Unison Church

***Ms. Mastropetre made the motion to approve Application 13-1226 as recommended by Mr. Dan Kops, Assistant Town Planner, and the following conditions:***

1. Prior to the Issuance of a Zoning Permit, the applicant must:
  - a. File at the Town Clerk's Office a mylar approved by the Town Planner and Town Engineer, merging "Parcel 1" with "Lot 5".
  - b. Provide A written explanation of the components of "Parcel 2" and plans for disposition of any parcels.
  - c. File the easement document requested by the Town Engineer fully explaining what is being granted to the Town, after approval by the Assistant Town Attorney.
  - d. File a document, approved by the Town Attorney, acknowledging responsibility for maintenance of the open space parcel and the island in the cul-de-sac.
  - e. File a document, approved by the Town Attorney, acknowledging responsibility for completing Field View Lane to Town standards so that it may be accepted into the Hamden road system.
  - f. Provide proof that the existing subdivision performance bond remains in place or provide a replacement bond that meets Town requirements.
  - g. Furnish a performance bond in an amount approved by the Town Planner and Town Engineer and in a form that meets Town requirements, covering sedimentation and erosion controls.
  - h. Phase One Environmental test to be completed.**
  - i. Submit a revised site plan for approval by Town Planner and Town Engineer, containing:
    - i. Any changes required by the Inland Wetlands Commission.
    - ii. Identification of trees to be removed to improve the sight line and indication of the resulting sight line distance. Trees to be removed are to be replaced with new trees that will not impede the sight line, because of their type and/or placement further from Wintergreen Avenue.
    - iii. Evergreens placed along the northern edge of the property where it borders the open space parcel, to create a better buffer between the church and the one house constructed in the new subdivision, the northern edge of the property where it borders Lot 6 and on the eastern boundary the length of the parking lot.
    - iv. A bike rack.
    - v. The 20 foot wide drainage easement in favor of the town requested by the Town Engineer removed from the survey of existing conditions and placed instead on the site plan.
    - vi. A photometric study demonstrating compliance with the Zoning Regulations regarding lighting.

- vii. All Conditions of Approval.
2. A Zoning permit, signed by the GNHWPCA, Fire Marshal and QVHD must be obtained prior to the start of any work.
  3. During the site preparation phase the remaining glass shards and other detritus from the greenhouses should be removed and disposed of properly.
  4. During the construction phase:
    - A. All sedimentation and erosion controls should be installed prior to the start of any other construction activity.
    - B. There should be absolutely no discharges of fluids or dry chemicals to the environment;
    - C. Any hazardous materials should be recycled or properly disposed of by a licensed waste hauler.
    - D. Care should be taken to avoid compacting the soil.
    - E. Erosion controls should be inspected regularly and immediately after rainfall, and maintained and modified as necessary to ensure optimum performance. Erosion controls should be installed around the base of all stockpiles of excavated materials and the pile should be temporarily seeded or covered if it will remain at the site for longer than one month.
    - F. All oil, paint, and other hazardous materials should be stored in a secondary container and placed in a locked indoor area with an impervious floor during no-work hours.
    - G. A supply of absorbent spill response material should be available, especially during refueling, to clean up any spills of hazardous material such as gasoline or oil.
    - H. Hours of construction shall be limited to between 7 am and 7 pm Monday through Friday and 7 am and 5 pm Saturday.
  5. All work must be completed by November 12, 2018.
  6. The Certificate of Zoning Compliance, necessary to obtain a Certificate of Occupancy will not be issued until Field View Lane has been accepted into the Town road system by the Legislative Council.
  7. After the completion of the project the Stormwater Maintenance Plan described on sheet ES-1 must be strictly adhered to.
  8. The maximum occupancy is 402 people, based on the available parking.

***Mr. Campo seconded the motion.***

Ms. Mastropetre stated that she is concerned about the use of pesticides on the property and would like a condition that soil testing be done. Mr. Campo said that the applicant would be unable to secure loans without the testing for pesticides. Mr. Roscow that greenhouses would have had a higher concentration of pesticide use. Mr. Poitier explained that a phase one environmental report would be needed for funding.

Ms. Mastropetre would like to amend the motion to include: Phase One Environmental test be completed.

Ms. Mastropetre questioned the existing bond. Mr. Kops said that the Town requires a bond to be in place and if the applicant is willing to substitute a bond for Mr. Ginsberg bond a condition of approval is not needed.

Ms. Mastropetre asked if there should be a condition of approval not allowing the applicant to rent out property for the use of a cell tower. Mr. Kops believes that since a request for a cell tower is not part of the application and if there is no indication to do one then there are no grounds to have as a condition of approval. He explained that the Citing Council handles cell towers and the Commission has no jurisdiction over them.

***Ms. Mastropetre made the motion to amend the original motion to include condition 4.H to read: Phase One Environmental test to be completed. Condition 1.H becomes 1.I. Mr. McDonagh seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.***

Mr. Hul asked if the current bond holder has a relationship to the property. Mr. Kops replied that he is not aware of the specific nature of the financial arrangements. Mr. Hul ask why if the current bond holder is not associated with the property anymore why would he be required to hold the bond. Mr. Kops explained that the concern of the Planning & Zoning Commission is that there be a bond in place. If the applicant is willing to take over the existing

bond it would be handled between the two parties. Mr. McDonagh stated that the current bond cannot be released until another one is in place.

***The motion as amended passed unanimously.***

**2. Special Permit & Site Plan 13-1227/CAM**

2664-2666 State Street, T-4 zone  
Place of public assembly/Banquet facility  
Edmor Associates, LLC

***Mr. Campo made the motion to approve Application 13-1227/CAM as recommended by Mr. Dan Kops, Assistant Town Planner, and the following conditions:***

1. The applicant must obtain a Zoning Permit, signed by QVHD and the GNHWPCA.
2. Prior to obtaining a Zoning Permit the applicant must submit a revised plan containing:
  - a. All Conditions of Approval.
3. The number of patrons attending the banquet facility is limited to 150 unless otherwise determined by the Commission.
4. All work must be completed by November 12, 2018.

***Mr. Reynolds seconded the motion.***

The Commission discussed amending condition 3 to increase the allowed occupancy with Mr. Kops. It was determined if there are no issues in the future the applicant can come back to the Commission with the request to increase the occupancy.

***The motion passed unanimously.***

***Mr. McDonagh made the motion to find the application to be consistent with all applicable goals and policies in accordance with the Connecticut Coastal Management Act. Ms. Mastropetre seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.***

**3. Location Approval 13-034**

28 Gorham Avenue, R-5 zone  
Repairs/Used Car Sales  
Robert Cappella, Applicant

Mr. Dan Kops read his comments which recommend approval with conditions as stated and based on the following plans:

“General Location Survey, Site Plan Showing  
Proposed Cappella Auto Repair,”  
Prepared by A. Mello, Jr., dated 11/1/2013

Mr. Robert Cappella, Owner, addressed the Commission and stated that he agrees with the conditions of approval as stated by Mr. Kops.

***Mr. Roscow made the motion to approve the Application 13-034 as recommended by Mr. Dan Kops, Assistant Town Planner, and the following conditions:***

1. Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit, for approval by the Town Planner and Town Engineer:
  - A. A revised site plan showing:

- i. The dumpster surrounded on three sides by a six inch asphalt curb, and screened from view.
  - ii. All Conditions of Approval.
2. All hazardous materials and waste chemicals should be stored inside the building on an impervious floor with some form of secondary containment.
3. Non-hazardous materials must also be stored inside the building.
4. Any interior floor drains must be capped.
5. Waste material should be disposed of by a licensed waste hauler in accordance with all applicable federal, state and local regulations and all material should be stored inside.
6. Solid waste material should be stored in an appropriately sized, covered, solid waste dumpster inside the building.
7. All vehicle washing should be conducted indoors.
8. All servicing of vehicles should be conducted indoors on an impervious surface.
9. There should be absolutely no discharges of motor vehicle fluids or detergent chemicals to the environment.
10. All vehicles being repaired should be stored inside the garage.
11. Scrap metal or other parts in contact with lubricant should be stored in a watertight container to prevent the accumulation and contamination of stormwater.
12. All Conditions of Approval should be placed on the survey submitted to the Connecticut Department of Motor Vehicles.
13. A Zoning Permit should be obtained prior to any work on the property.

***Mr. Campo seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.***

**4. C.G.S. 8-24 13-347**

432 Evergreen Avenue

Sale of property to the owner of 440 Evergreen Avenue (Matthew Florian)

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 sale of the property to the owner of 440 Evergreen Avenue, issuing a favorable report to the Legislative Council.

Ms. Mastropetre asked who is paying for the merging of the lots. Mr. Kops explained that the owner negotiated with the Town through his attorney and that the contract includes the terms of the sale.

***Mr. McDonagh made the motion to refer the C.G.S. 8-24 13-347 for the sale of the property to the owner of 440 Evergreen Avenue with a favorable report to the Legislative Council. Ms. Mastropetre seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.***

**5. Annual Review of Quinnipiac University enrollment, housing and parking plan**

Mr. Bernard Pellegrino, Attorney, addressed the Commission and stated that parking plan process is to insure that parking is working adequately on the campuses. The parking plan shows more parking spaces than the demand for parking. Mr. Pellegrino said that there is an adequate amount of parking with the construction of the York Hill Campus parking garage. Presently there are parking facilities that are not being used.

Mr. Pellegrino stated that the main topic for discussion is housing, dormitories, off campus housing and student population. He feels it makes sense to roll the discussion in the future to providing the Commission with an annual master plan that addresses student population, on and off campus housing, and that an annual parking plan is no longer necessary. Mr. Pellegrino would like the submission of the housing and enrollment plan to be submitted in September because the numbers would be more reliable. Mr. Pellegrino said that the Commission is concerned with the with the growing population and no new on campus housing. The University has given an internal

approval for drawings and architectural plans for a new dormitory on York Hill Campus. An application should be forthcoming in six to nine months. The original approval was for 2,000 beds and approximately 1,500 were built. The University is analyzing the type of housing that will be desirable to the upperclassman so that a new design for 500 (plus or minus) beds on York Hill Campus. There are currently 400-500 students that are living off campus in Quinnipiac University Housing. The University is looking at various ways to reduce this figure and would like to bring students back on to the campus. The facilities staff has taken on a new internal responsibility by working with the Res Life Department to immediately come up with strategies to fill the empty beds. The University is looking at ways to compete with landlords that offer lower cost housing off campus.

Mr. Pellegrino reviewed the current enrollment numbers and projected numbers through 2016. He said that the growth of the student enrollment is a testimony to the success of the University. He stated that the number of students living off campus is about the same as three years ago. The University recognizes that there are areas off campus with students that create more problems, but the vast majority of students living off campus are not a problem. Mr. Pellegrino stated that the University is committed to constructing additional beds and are working to fill the 400-500 existing empty beds.

Mr. Kops read his comments which review the Quinnipiac University's housing and traffic issues.

Ms. Mastropetre stated that she strongly supports construction of dormitories and just adding student beds. She feels that Quinnipiac University is a lousy neighbor. She noted that over the last several weeks there have been off campus parties involving students and the need for police and fire department involvement which is appalling. Ms. Mastropetre would like the University to have housing on campus that students want to live in. There should be a policy that undergraduate students are required to live on campus. Ms. Mastropetre has heard students complain that the dormitories on York Hill Campus are not air conditioned and that the food is not good vs. the food on the Mt. Carmel campus. The University needs to work with the student government to determine what the students want. Putting three students into a dorm room will not entice them to remain on the campus. Ms. Mastropetre that this is the third time that Quinnipiac University has come before her as a Commissioner and there have been no changes. She is frustrated because the problems with student housing are getting worse and the University needs to change their policies.

Mr. McDonagh reviewed the increase in the amount of students. He asked how many students were commuters and how many were issued parking permits. He reviewed the existing student population vs. the projected population. He asked how the University can continue to increase the population with out any plans to accommodate the students. Mr. McDonagh stated that the Town is bearing the problems of the increased student population.

Mr. Pellegrino stated that the double rooms can be made tripled if necessary. However, this makes them less attractive. There are currently vacant rooms in the older dorms. The University is committed to building additional beds and Mr. Pellino said they university feels comfortable that they can get the upperclassman to fill them.

Mr. Poitier asked why the existing empty dorm rooms are not modernized and made attractive so that the students will want to use them. Mr. Pellegrino stated that the older dorm rooms do not have the same amenities as those on York Hill Campus. The University is looking to make some of the amenities and layouts more attractive to the students. The freshman students are required to live on the campus in the older dorms. About five percent of the freshman live with their parents or have special circumstances.

Ms. Mastropetre stated that the freshman dormitories need to be renovated so that they will want to stay on the campus. Mr. Pellegrino remembered his college days and living in the dormitories.

Mr. Poitier stated that it does not make sense to build new dormitories if the University is unable to fill the existing ones. He feels the University would be showing good faith if they fill the existing empty spaces.

Mr. Pellegrino suggested that the Planning Department increase the fees for the student housing permits. He said it is hard to compete with the off campus homes being rented by students at a lesser cost. Ms. Mastropetre asked Mr.

Kops what would need to be done to increase the student housing permit charge. Mr. Kops said that the Legislative Council approves the increasing of fees. He noted that increasing the fees has its merits but would not solve the problems of student housing. Ms. Mastropetre asked what the university charges for on campus housing. Mr. Pellegrino replied the cost is \$7000.00 a semester. Mr. Poitier stated that Quinnipiac University has created a monster and it became an opportunity for the homeowners to rent to students because of what the University did not do.

Mr. Poitier asked for comments from the public:

Ms. Cindy Civitello, 61 Berkeley Court, addressed the Commission and read a statement addressing residents concerns with regards to student housing.

Ms. Gail Traester, 156 Brooksvale Avenue, addressed the Commission and stated that the University had given a guarantee that there would be a bed for every student when they were approved for the York Hill Campus dormitories. The approval to increase the crescent dormitory and not build the last dormitory for economic reasons. Ms. Traester stated that the University should only accept additional students if there is a bed for them.

Mr. Gary Prestash, 127 Rocky Top Road, addressed the Commission and asked if the landlord was notified when his/her renters were arrested for having a party.

Mr. Kops explained that the Zoning Enforcement Officer does inform the landlord of the property if she is notified of police involvement. Last year as part of the student housing permit the applicant was required to provide the homeowners name, telephone number and email address. The information along with a letter was mailed to the abutting property owners encouraging them to call the property owner if there was a problem.

Mr. Gus Spohn, 4032 Whitney Avenue, addressed the Commission and asked why the University cannot require the sophomores, juniors and seniors to live on the campus.

Ms. Maura McCloskey, 29 Douglas Road, addressed the Commission and stated that her husband is employed by the University. She feels that what was spoken by Mr. Pellegrino to be untrue. Not long ago the seniors were not housed on the campus. The policies that Quinnipiac University created the problems with students in the Community and Ms. McCloskey stated that it is ridiculous that they are asking for the Town's help. She said that the cost to attend and stay on the Campus is very expensive and no one wants to experience staying in older dorms with bunk beds or possibly being tripled up. Ms. McCloskey stated that the Town is now beginning to understand the lack of response from the University as seen by the West Woods Neighborhood Association. The administration needs to attend meetings and address the complaints made by the students. The University is expecting to increase their enrollment with future projects which include the North Haven campus.

Ms. Sarah Clark, 4032 Whitney Avenue, addressed the Commission and complimented the Planning staff for responding to the residents in the neighborhoods. She would like a policy change and measures taken to get students out of the neighborhoods. Ms. Clark stated that the University should further educate their students about being good neighbors and they should police the off campus housing. Ms. Clark said she has students that live across the street from her who do not maintain the property, and she has tried to communicate this to them.

Ms. Mastropetre asked if a copy of the lease can be required to be submitted when a landlord is submitting the student housing permit application.

Ms. Holly Masi, Zoning Enforcement Officer, addressed the Commission and stated that a lease is not required when submitting an application. If there is a question of how many students are living in the home she does request one. However, a lease showing four students in the house, does not mean there may not be more living there.

Ms. Mastropetre asked if the lease says four tenants but more are living in the house or the students are being reported for bad behavior can they be evicted by the town. Ms. Masi said if there is sufficient evidence that more

than four students are living in the house she will send a notice of violation. She would need to speak with the Town Attorney to see if the Town would be able to place language in a lease about evicting students. Ms. Masi explained that bad behavior is handled by the police and a report is not always sent to her.

Mr. Poitier stated that Quinnipiac's student enrollment is increasing and something must be done to control it. He asked that this item be tabled and the University put together a report that includes a solution for housing that would not hurt the neighborhoods. He feels the University has an obligation to the Town and the neighborhoods to not let the students go bonkers throughout the Town. The University needs to think about the residents of the Town when increasing enrollment and must share the responsibility of resolving the issues being raised.

Mr. McDonagh said that the University should provide the following information: Mr. Kops' requests for information stated in his comments. How many beds are available to students. How many commuter parking permits have been issued. If meeting with the neighbors as required when new applications are being submitted.

Mr. Roscow asked if there are graduate students being housed on the campus. Mr. Pellegrino stated there are 56 graduate students housed on the campus.

Mr. Poitier asked Mr. Pellegrino if he has any problems addressing the Commission's and Mr. Kops' request for additional information. Mr. Pellegrino stated that he would provide the additional information requested.

Mr. Salvatore Filardi, Vice President for Facilities and Capitol Planning, addressed the Commission and stated that that the University is committed to building more beds despite beds being empty. It is clear that the University needs to provide different options for housing to increase occupancy. Last year they rolled out additional senior experience programs to try entice seniors into housing. Administrative changes have been made to address the housing issues. Last year the projections for the number of students were off and the University is committed to providing accurate numbers and more beds. They are committed to making students aware of their responsibilities if living in the neighborhoods.

Mr. Poitier said history speaks for itself and the University has asked the Commission and neighbors to forget the past history and move forward. However, Mr. Poitier feels if the University does not address what has happened in the past before expanding the number of students it would be creating more problems. The Commission has not been satisfied with the reports that have been submitted in the past.

Ms. Mastropetre would like submitted the number of students by class, how many students by class are living on campus and off campus. She would like the University to consider requiring freshman and sophomores to live on the campus. The University should make living on campus affordable and provide amenities that would make living on campus more desirable.

Ms. Mastropetre made the motion to table this discussion until the December 10, 2013 meeting. Mr. McDonagh seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

### **C. Old Business/ New Business**

1. Review minutes of October 8, 2013

Mr. Kops stated that the minutes should be amended to reflect that Mr. Campo was in attendance.

***Mr. McDonagh made the motion to approve the minutes of October 8, 2013 as amended by Mr. Kops. Mr. Reynolds seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.***

2. Review minutes of October 22, 2013

Ms. Mastropetre stated that the minutes should be amended as follows: On page one-Commissioners in Attendance should stated that Mr. Joseph McDonagh was the alternate for the vacancy re: Sanford Street and Mr. Maratolli's name should be spelled "Marottoli" and that he sat for Jennifer Cutrali re: Sanford Street. Also, "Mastropietre" should be "Mastropetre". Page 2, third paragraph, remove "Speakers in favor." Page 3, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, in the condition of approval "Condition H" should read "Condition 3.H" in two places. Page 7, Review minutes of October 8, 2013, should included prior to the motion: "Mr. Szczypek's name was spelled wrong in a few places" After the motion remove " Ms. Mastropetre noticed that Mr Szczypek's name was misspelled in a few places. MM made a motion to approve as corrected-Michelle noticed that Mr. Szczypek's name was misspelled in a few".

***Mr. McDonagh made the motion to approve the minutes of October 22, as amended. Mr. Campo seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.***

#### **D. Adjournment**

***Ms. Mastropetre made the motion to adjourn. Mr. McDonagh seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.***

The meeting adjourned at 10:32 p.m.

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Stacy Shellard, Clerk of the Commission