

RECEIVED FOR FILING
East Haven
DATE 03/27/2023 TIME 10:17 AM
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
EAST HAVEN, CONN

Lisa Butler
TOWN CLERK

**TOWN OF EAST HAVEN
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 2022
HELD IN PERSON AT EAST HAVEN SENIOR CENTER, 91 TAYLOR AVENUE**

Chairman William DeMayo called the regular meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

I. Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance.

Sotonye Otunba-Payne, Clerk, called the roll for the Commission as follows:

Marlene Asid - Present

William DeMayo - Present

John Tarducci - Present

Louis Fusco – Alternate, Present, sitting

There was a quorum.

The following were in attendance:

Joseph Budrow - Zoning Enforcement Officer

Attorney Jennifer Coppola - Counsel to the Commission

II. Review and Action on Prior Meeting Minutes

1. Minutes of the March 2, 2022 Regular Meeting.

Mr. Tarducci motioned to accept the March 2, 2022 Regular Meeting Minutes. Said motion was seconded by Ms. Asid. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Minutes of April 6, 2022 Special Meeting.

Ms. Asid motioned to table the approval of the April 6, 2022 Special Meeting Minutes until the Commission's June 1, 2022 meeting. Said motion was seconded by Mr. Fusco. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Public Hearings

1. **Application No. 22-02 - Paul Stoecker.** A petition for a Text Amendment to the East Haven Zoning Regulations proposing to add definitions for “Membership Club” and “Lounge,” and to add “Membership club, lodge and community houses” as an allowed use in LI-3 District.

Mr. Paul Stoecker read his statement into the record. He indicated he was present before the Commission to pursue text amendments for definitions of “Membership Club” and “Lounge” and to add “Membership club, lodge and community houses” as an allowed use in LI-3 District Zone. The entity known as Collection, LLC had selected a location at 260 Dodge Avenue to open a social club where all individuals can meet, relax, work, learn and enjoy cannabis in a clean, stigma-free, and most importantly safe environment.

Mr. DeMayo indicated that this has not been initially part of the application. It was never mentioned before.

Mr. Stoecker indicated it was his opening statement for the hearing.

Attorney Coppola indicated that the Town of East Haven had a moratorium in place.

Mr. DeMayo indicated that at the April 6, 2022 meeting, he had indicated that the Commission wanted the complete application. There is a moratorium in East Haven regarding cannabis.

Mr. Budrow indicated that Mr. Stoecker was still seeking a text amendment to add “Membership Club” and “Lounge” “Membership club, lodge and community houses” as an allowed use in LI-3 District. He should not have been proposing a use at this presentation.

Attorney Coppola indicated that Mr. Stoecker had just indicated that cannabis would be sold on the premises. There is a moratorium. This was the first time she heard about any of this. Had she known, she would have advised him at the last meeting that the Town had a moratorium in place.

Mr. Budrow indicated up until that evening he had no idea about cannabis. He knew that Mr. Stoecker had an interest in the cannabis business, however. Up until tonight, it had not been something he was aware of as part of this application.

Mr. DeMayo reiterated that there was a moratorium in place.

Mr. Stoecker said he wanted to continue with his statement.

Mr. DeMayo said he could continue.

Mr. Stoecker finished reading his statement.

Ms. Asid said cannabis had never been mentioned before. There is a moratorium. Even if the use of cannabis is approved in the Town of East Haven, the Commission still has to come up with regulations for that. Decisions would still have to be made whether to allow cannabis use in a club such as Mr. Stoecker was proposing.

Mr. Budrow indicated that Mr. Stoecker came in for a text amendment and is now putting cannabis before the text amendment.

Mr. Stoecker indicated he would like to turn it over to his counsel, Mr. Phil Silverman just to address the legalities and to explain why he is being so direct. He wanted to ensure that they had it all laid out for the commission.

Attorney Coppola recommended that the Commission not proceed with the public hearing given there is a moratorium in place. Had she known, she would have advised Mr. Stoecker that this was inappropriate.

Mr. DeMayo indicated he didn't think this hearing should proceed. However, he gave the lawyer the opportunity to speak.

Attorney Phil Silverman addressed the Commission briefly. He asked the Commission to consider the text amendment which is not cannabis related.

Mr. DeMayo indicated that that was not what Mr. Stoecker said. Mr. Stoecker's statement cannot be amended.

Attorney Silverman indicated that the actual filing is asking for a text amendment which does not deal with cannabis. It would be helpful to proceed with that and push the cannabis aside until a later time when regulations, if at all, are in place.

Mr. DeMayo added that his client wanted approvals piecemeal including for somethings that the Commission may not grant approval for.

Attorney Silverman indicated he understood. The actual amendment is not about cannabis. He wanted Mr. Brian Miller to address the Commission.

Mr. Brian Miller, of the Miller Group in Wallingford, Connecticut, indicated that he was the planning consultant. The amendment sought does not mention any particular use. The use was mentioned by the applicant in an effort to be above board. The application is to allow the establishment of a membership club. In the Town of East Haven it is permitted in the commercial zone. He presented the thoughts and concepts that the

commission might want to consider. Regardless of what the Commission does on cannabis, flexibility regarding uses is allowed in all commercial zones. It is also important to the enhancement of the town's economic development.

Ms. Asid asked if the Commission was proceeding with the public hearing. Attorney Coppola indicated that the application had not been withdrawn. The Commission had taken information on it. So, the hearing should proceed.

Mr. DeMayo called for public comments.

Ms. Cynthia Sparago spoke in opposition to the application.

Mr. John Wobensmith spoke in opposition to the application.

Ms. Lorena Venegas asked questions and commented.

After public comment, Mr. Stoecker withdrew his application.

IV. New Applications

1. **Application No. 22-03 - Fatou Sarr, 36 Thompson Street.** An application for a Site Plan Review to locate a beauty salon within the first floor of the commercial building at 36 Thompson Street.

Ms. Sarr indicated that she wanted to submit her plan to open a beauty salon at 36 Thompson Street.

Mr. DeMayo asked Ms. Fatou for more details about the operation of the business.

Ms. Sarr said she would be specializing in extensions, make-up, and natural hair care. It would be herself and one stylist. The patrons would be by appointment only. She has a hair salon in Stamford, Connecticut for the past 11 years. She has a lot of plans to move to East Haven.

Ms. Asid spoke about parking being an issue. She asked about off-street parking. Ms. Sarr replied that there are about four parking spaces in front.

Ms. Asid asked how many people would be in the salon at once. Ms. Sarr replied by saying that she would not expect to have more than three clients at once.

Ms. Budrow indicated that there are plenty of parking there. The Town is very forgiving regarding barbershops and salons where it is basically one

space per chair. There are at least 14 spaces on site. Ms. Budrow asked Ms. Sarr about licensing requirements since this would be a second salon.

Ms. Sarr said she just needs a license.

2. **Application No. 22-04 - Robert Mangino on behalf of Gurukrupa Investments L.L.C, 85 Hemingway Avenue.** An application for a Site Plan Modification to amend a previous approval, proposing to combine Buildings A and B, to add a recreational area for dogs, and to amend the landscaping plan.

Mr. Budrow stated that two years ago, three building were approved by the Commission by special exception for 85 Hemingway -- elderly apartments with an office building in the front and retail store. The two buildings in the front somehow had to be connected to the use, the apartments. He thought it was supposed to be a medical office. He thought the retail store encompassed a convenience store use to benefit the residents of the elderly apartments. Since then, the property has come in for changes as site plan modifications. He explained a prior application that was withdrawn.

This is a new application brought in April 22, 2022. This is also a site plan modification. It was always at the back of his mind that this was a mistake on his part. After consulting with Attorney Coppola and Mr. DeMayo he called Mr. Mangino at 5:45 p.m. to no avail. Mr. Mangino is here. He is cognizant that the two buildings going together is too major to be a site plan modification. He understands that. Mr. Mangino wanted to propose the Commission take this application as a site plan modification and consider the landscape change and the doggy park.

Mr. Budrow thought there should be one application instead of modifying it on the fly.

Mr. DeMayo indicated he agreed with Mr. Budrow. This should come as a correct application. He will not vote on something that is not correct and is not presented to the Commission correctly.

Ms. Asid concurred by saying that this application had been up and down and all around for so long. It is hard to keep track. She asked what Mr. Mangino was showing the Commission tonight.

Mr. Robert Mangino indicated that he indeed had been before the Commission more than once regarding this application.

Mr. Budrow indicated that the application was not open but the Commission was seeking information.

Ms. Asid said the Commission's opinion is that Mr. Mangino return after proper filings.

Mr. Fusco indicated he would also like to see a whole package rather than piecemeal.

Mr. Mangino indicated this was a three-part application, landscape plan, the doggy park, and the building change which is the main question. They want to start planting because this is the right season to do so.

Mr. Budrow indicated that there was an approved landscaping plan. Mr. Mangino indicated the last one was done five, six years ago. There is a site change necessitating a landscape change. They submitted a bond to Mr. Bodwell for this plan.

Mr. DeMayo asked when. Mr. Mangino indicated they paid a 35,000-dollar bond two weeks previously. If they have to wait until the Commission's June meeting, they will wait. He showed the new landscaping plan.

Mr. DeMayo indicated he would defer this application to the Commission's June meeting. Mr. Mangino was directed to contact Mr. Budrow if there is some urgency regarding the application. Mr. Budrow would contact the Commission to see what they can do.

Mr. Mangino stated that he understood where Mr. DeMayo was coming from.

Mr. DeMayo implored Mr. Mangino to get in a new application. Mr. Mangino would work with the town staff to accomplish this.

Mr. Budrow said this was officially withdrawn. He would get the applicant to put it in writing.

3. **Application No. 22-05 - Dish Wireless, L.L.C., 65 Messina Drive.** An application for a Special Exception to add three new antennas, radio heads, and accessory equipment on top of 65 Messina Drive. (Public hearing to be scheduled.)

Mr. Jonathan McNeil, 4 McArthur Avenue, Devens, Massachusetts, was presenting on behalf of Dish Wireless. This is cell phone service similar to AT&T, Verizon, and T Mobile.

Mr. DeMayo asked if it was 5G.

Mr. McNeil indicated it would be 5G. Dish Wireless was proposing to install antennas at the 65 Messina Drive. It is a 90-foot building, an

independent elderly housing structure. There are three other carriers on there. They are proposing to install three antennas on the top of the building.

Mr. DeMayo asked if would be the same height. Mr. McNeil replied yes.

Mr. DeMayo asked if Dish Wireless was currently a carrier on the building. Mr. McNeil indicated that Dish Wireless was not on the building. This is a new installation. There would be no equipment on the ground. They would be on the rooftop and in the building itself. The antennas would be visible but they would be painted to match the building as the rest of the antennas are up there.

Mr. DeMayo asked if it was the responsibility of Dish Wireless to maintain and service the installation. Mr. McNeil replied, yes.

Mr. Budrow indicated that the reason this is a special exception is because it is a telecommunication facility in a residential district. He did refer the application to Tweed because of the 5G. He had not heard from them as it had only been a week since the referral.

Mr. DeMayo indicated it was mandatory to notify Tweed.

Mr. McNeil indicated that it was part of the licensing.

Mr. Budrow indicated there would be three antennas that look like dishes with apparatus attached to them with a bunch of conduits going all around the top.

Mr. McNeil indicated that antennas would look similar to what is up there presently. They are not circular in nature. They are rectangular. They will look like the existing antennas.

Mr. Fusco asked if Dish Wireless had a lease and how long the lease was for. Mr. McNeil replied by saying that they had a five-year lease for with two five-year renewals.

Mr. DeMayo asked who owned the properties. Mr. Tarducci responded by saying Vigliotti owned the property.

Mr. DeMayo said then this had nothing to do with the Town as such. The lease is with a private owner. All the liabilities are shared between Dish Wireless and the landlord.

Mr. McNeil replied by saying the lease was structured in such a way that Dish Wireless would bear the brunt of any liability. Additional questions were asked by the Commission and answered by Mr. McNeil.

Ms. Asid motioned regarding Application No. 22-05, Dish Wireless, LLC, 65 Messina Drive, to schedule a public hearing for the Commission's June 1st meeting regarding the special exception to add three new antennas, radio heads, and accessory equipment. Said motion was seconded by Mr. Fusco. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Application No. 22-06 - Neal Angelini, 320 Main Street.** An application for a Site Plan Modification requesting to add a third tenant space within a commercial building.

Neal Angelini, 65 Winchester Drive, North Haven, indicated that the building was built in 2002. It was originally a three-tenant building. When Dunkin' Donuts did a remodeling in 2013, they wanted extra seating. So, the center unit was eliminated to accommodate Dunkin' Donuts. This past March, Dunkin' Donuts reduced its seating area by going back to its original square footage. So, the 1,350-square foot center unit is a separate tenant space with separate utilities, etc.

Mr. DeMayo asked what type of tenant would move in. Mr. Angelini indicated none was planned. It is limited in the space at 1,350 square feet.

Mr. DeMayo asked if there was a parking situation at the site. Mr. Angelini replied no.

Mr. Budrow stated that this property had been before the Commission quite a few times. One such time was when Mr. Angelini wanted to expand. He had a great site survey, site plans. The Commission had opinions about traffic concerns. Their site plan was modified and was approved for the expanded restaurant. The tobacco shop is still there.

Mr. Budrow further indicated he counted the parking spaces at the site before this application came in. When Dunkin' Donut expanded, the parking spaces were not enough. Now, that Dunkin' Donut has reduced its square footage, there are 20 available spaces for a use in the middle.

There were discussions regarding Dunkin' Donuts busiest hours and parking problems.

5. **Application No. 22-07 - East Haven Planning and Zoning Commission.** A petition for a Text Amendment to the East Haven Zoning Regulations to complete the draft revision from 2019 and adding new proposals. (Public hearing to be scheduled.)

Mr. Budrow indicated that was a proposed new layout of the East Haven Zoning Regulations, new sections. The current Schedule A use table has

been reformatted by district. The Commission members would see all the numbers which correlate to a note chart which is in the package given to the Commission. He could not do the reformatting of the uses without relocating some other items.

One of the big changes he is proposing is residential animal agriculture, the regulations for how people can own animals on certain sized lots. He defined animals, small, medium and large. Right now, the Town of East Haven regulates poultry, rabbits, etc. Right now under two acres, you get 20. The coop has to be so many feet from the line. Over two acres, there is no cap, The coop has to be 50 feet from the line. He took that exact language. It is in Section 24.

The change is regarding those who want a horse, donkey, a goat, etc. Currently, the Town of East Haven only allows people to own one. So, he is proposing on properties 40,000 square feet to an acre, there can be one animal. Every acre beyond that, the property owner gets one more animal. They are giving larger properties the opportunity to own a few animals.

A property owner can get two medium animals with 40,000 square feet and two per acre. For example, goats, lamb or other animals that the zoning enforcement officer might deem medium.

This is to allow those with larger properties to have a few more animals and to bring folks into conformity.

The other change is regarding rooming and boarding houses. There are nine to 10 standards in East Haven but they are under the use table. Rooming and boarding houses would be kept in the town's uses. He felt this should be in a section that is called "certain standards for site plans and special exceptions" which itemizes use types. This is in the Commission's package.

Mr. DeMayo asked how soon the Commission could vote on the changes. Mr. Budrow replied by saying he had to do municipal referrals to East Haven's neighbors, to SCROG, and to other departments. He would request two months. The hearings could be on July 6, 2022. It is not unusual to request two months for referrals. He anticipates three public hearings regarding these changes.

Mr. DeMayo indicated the Commission could say a maximum of three public hearings would be needed. Mr. Budrow had done a good job.

Mr. Budrow indicated the Commission should vote to schedule this matter on July 6, 2022 for a hearing.

Ms. Asid motioned regarding Application No. 22-07, East Haven Planning and Zoning Commission, the text amendments and zoning regulations, that the first hearing be scheduled for July 6, 2022. Said motion was seconded by Mr. Tarducci. The motion passed unanimously.

V. Deliberation Session

1. Discussion and possible vote on **Application No. 22-02 - Paul Stoecker**. A petition for a Text Amendment to the East Haven Zoning Regulations proposing to add definitions for “Membership Club” and “Lounge,” and to add “Membership club, lodge and community houses” as an allowed use in LI-3 District.

This was withdrawn.

2. Discussion and possible vote on **Application No. 22-03 - Fatou Sarr, 36 Thompson Street**. An application for a Site Plan Review to locate a beauty salon within the first floor of the commercial building at 36 Thompson Street.

Ms. Asid motioned to Approve Application No. 22-03 for Fatou Sarr for her beauty salon at 36 Thompson Street. Said motion was seconded by Mr. Fusco. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Discussion and possible vote on **Application No. 22-04 - Robert Mangino on behalf of Gurukrupa Investments L.L.C., 85 Hemingway Avenue**. An application for a Site Plan Modification to amend a previous approval, proposing to combine Buildings A and B, to add a recreational area for dogs, and to amend the landscaping plan.

This is withdrawn. The applicant will reapply for an amendment for a special exception.

4. Discussion and possible vote on **Application No. 22-05 - Dish Wireless, L.L.C. 65 Messina Drive**. An application for a Special Exception to add three new antennas, radio heads, and accessory equipment on top of 65 Messina Drive. (Public hearing to be scheduled.)

The public hearing was scheduled for June 1, 2022.

5. Discussion and possible vote on **Application No. 22-06 - Neal Angelini, 320 Main Street**. An application for a Site Plan Modification requesting to add a third tenant space within a commercial building.

Ms. Asid motioned to approve Application No. 22-06 for 320 Main Street, Neil Angelini, for a site plan modification requesting a third tenant space. Said motion was seconded by Mr. Tarducci. The motion passed unanimously.

VI. Other Business

1. -Discussion of Public Act No. 21-1 “An Act Concerning Responsible and Equitable Regulation of Adult-Use Cannabis” (codified at Connecticut General Statutes Section 21a-420, *et seq.*)

Attorney Coppola indicated the Commission had to decide where it was going with cannabis. There had been meetings including a combined meeting with the East Haven Town Council. There were discussions about scheduling another meeting that the Commission felt would be helpful. Dates should be proposed to accomplish this.

Mr. Fusco added that he found the special meeting informative. From his perspective, the East Haven Town Council and the East Haven Planning and Zoning Commission anticipated meeting one more time to iron out some of the information heard at the presentation.

Attorney Coppola indicated that one council member had mentioned contacting the Board of Education.

Mr. Tarducci indicated that input from the East Haven Police Department Chief was needed. Attorney Coppola indicated she communicated with the Chief. Th Police and Fire Departments have indicated they will comment on any proposed text amendment. They are of the position that if the Town adopts regulations permitting cannabis in town that there will be an impact on the provision of services.

Mr. DeMayo thought the meeting with the East Haven Town Council was very informative. He thanked Attorney Coppola for having the presenters at the meeting. He added that Attorney Coppola had briefed all this stuff. He did not think he wanted to go through all this stuff again. He asked if they would be getting close to finalizing their decision. The next special meeting should be scheduled with some direction.

Attorney Coppola indicated that the Commission could have discussions with the East Haven Town Council regarding the direction it is leaning. Public hearing would ensue. If the Commission wished to hear from community leaders or other organizations regarding this topic, she would be happy to extend an invitation. She asked for the Commission’s thoughts.

Mr. DeMayo indicated this should be moved to the next level as the Commission is working on a timeline.

Attorney Coppola indicated the moratorium would expire on June 6, 2022. Whatever decision the Commission makes whether to allow establishing uses or extend the moratorium for a short period of time to allow for drafting of same, it is fine to do that. It is good for the Commission to let folks who wish to establish a business in town know what direction it is heading. We do not want to go out too far with this. Information regarding the licensing application submissions to the Department of Consumer Protection are on the Department's website showing what types of licensing submissions it is dealing with right now.

Mr. Fusco indicated that it was up to 3,600 lottery applications at this point. It is \$500 per application. Attorney Coppola indicated she had not looked at the website that week.

Ms. Asid asked when to schedule the public hearing as she would be away in June.

Attorney Coppola indicated it would be a public hearing regarding a potential regulation. The Commission will decide what establishments would be allowed or prohibited. The Commission will give counsel instruction on same and that will be by text amendment. Regardless of what the Commission decides, it would be a text amendment. Public hearings will necessarily have to be scheduled. July would be the goal.

Ms. Asid asked how long to extend the moratorium.

Mr. DeMayo said this should be done, yea or nay, and with the provisions by August and hopefully not going into September. There is a lot to do in order to meet this timeline. Mr. Budrow had suggested two or three public hearings.

Attorney Coppola suggested that cannabis could be done another night, take it as a separate issue from the regulation rewrite. It is a very important issue.

Mr. Tarducci agreed that the meeting with the East Haven Town Council was very informative. The Council was in favor of a second meeting. Unfortunately, the presentations were very rosy and upbeat. The states in the northeast have not had any experience with sales of cannabis. Out west, they have. He will do his research to see what the downside of this issue is because there is a downside. It would be great to hear the other side of the story.

Attorney Coppola asked what Mr. Tarducci was asking of her in terms of the types of information he was seeking. Mr. Tarducci replied by saying that he would like to see cost-benefit analysis, are the revenue streams worth it considering the social impact, police impact, etc.

Ms. Asid wondered who would be watching what happens after the purchase of cannabis on the premises of the establishments.

Attorney Coppola asked if Ms. Asid was speaking about security. Ms. Asid replied that she was talking about security because none of the presenters spoke about parking lot security.

Attorney Coppola indicated that the provision in the statute is meant to address what had been experienced in other communities that have new retail establishments in other states. There is significant traffic initially when a cannabis establishment opens as a result of there being a rollout of the licenses. She participated in a webinar during which a person from the Governor's office represented in a very preliminary fashion that the State was anticipating or may be desiring to have as much 150 to 200 retail establishments in the State. This will not all happen at once. The issues other states have had are parking issues and traffic issues when the establishments initially open.

Attorney Coppola further reiterated that the Commission wanted information about the impact of cannabis sale on emergency services. The question from Mr. Tarducci was whether the revenue stream would be worth it. She would get some information regarding these issues including security. The Commission has the link to the draft regulations that were prepared by the Department of Consumer Protection. There is information with regard to security around the various establishments in the draft regulations. She asked the Commission members if they would like her to draft anything at this point and in what direction.

Mr. Fusco asked if the Commission decided to proceed on a positive note, allow cannabis use, could the Commission restrict districts and location. Attorney Coppola answered yes. Mr. Fusco said this to him, sealed the deal.

Mr. DeMayo concurred and said it was very important to him as well regarding where the traffic would be regarding people coming into the Town to purchase cannabis if the Commission allows cannabis sale in town. He would not like to disturb residents of the Town or the center of Town. Attorney Coppola could start drafting something. He liked the idea of limiting where the establishments would be located.

Ms. Asid spoke of having bullet points of regarding the types of regulations the Commission might consider. She said Attorney Coppola could expand on those.

Mr. DeMayo indicated that an explanation is required if the Commission were to ban cannabis. However, the explanation for approving cannabis in town would be more in depth.

Ms. Asid asked if the Commission could be sued if they disallow cannabis. Attorney Coppola responded by saying there is no mechanism by which she could prevent a lawsuit against the Commission. Attorney Coppola indicated she had a good sense of what the Commission wanted.

Ms. Asid wondered if they should vote to extend the moratorium. Attorney Coppola indicated that it had to be noticed first that the Commission intended to extend the moratorium.

Ms. Asid asked if there was something there for Airbnb. Mr. Budrow replied by saying that he would like to have something separate for that.

Mr. DeMayo indicated he attended the May 3, 2022 Council meeting. The Commission wants to do this right. No one would be 100 percent satisfied with the Commission's decision. Between the P & Z and the handful of people who are deeply involved in this, he would like to sit down and work this out and come up with some recommendations on where the Commission is going with this issue. He reiterated that no one would be 100 percent satisfied. Whatever they come up with will protect the Town, its residents, the area, etc.

Attorney Coppola did some research regarding short-term rentals. She is prepared to lead discussions regarding this issue in the near future.

The Commission scheduled a special meeting on Tuesday, May 10, 2022 at 7:00 p.m.

2. Discussion of provisions of Public Act No.21-29 "An Act Concerning the Zoning Enabling Act, Accessory Apartments, Training for Certain Land Use Officials, Municipal Affordable Housing Plans and A Commission on Connecticut's Development and Future" (codified at Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-2o) pertaining to accessory apartments or accessory dwelling units.
3. Discussion of provisions of Public Act No. 21-29 "An Act Concerning the Zoning Enabling Act, Accessory Apartments, Training for Certain Land Use Officials, Municipal Affordable Housing Plans and A Commission on

Connecticut's Development and Future" (codified at Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-2(d)(9) and 8-2p) pertaining to parking.

Attorney Coppola indicated that she assumed the commission would want discussions at the council level regarding Item Nos 2 and 3 to continue. The Commission said yes.

Ms. Asid indicated that the deadline for these two items was January 1, 2023.

Attorney Coppola indicated that the Commission had to keep in mind, again, that not only does this body have to act, but the Council has to act as the legislative body as well. So, the discussions would continue.

After discussions, Attorney Coppola indicated that the Affordable Housing Committee also wanted to submit their comments regarding "accessory dwellings." Affordability means something different for the Town of East Haven. The Town is at 8.4 percent regarding affordable housing.

Mr. DeMayo asked how accurate this figure was. Attorney Coppola indicated that naturally occurring affordable housing was not being counted.

Mr. DeMayo asked if the Town could argue this. Attorney Coppola indicated she had argued this point in another matter and the court sided with her. So, yes.

4. Discussion of current zoning on High Street.

Mr. Budrow indicated that he had met with Mr. DeMayo late last week to view High Street which is currently zoned RA-1. The area has some commercial and residential uses. And currently High Street on the east side is all office. And all those offices are a nonconforming use. They are not just allowed in RA-1. He wanted to go see it with a commission member regarding options for the commission to address, leaving this as is or adding offices to RA-1. He is not going to say that it is a good way to go. The third option is to maybe leave them to a different zone that encompasses commercial and residential. The Commission is not ready to address High Street.

VII. Adjournment

Mr. Tarducci motioned to adjourn. Said motion was seconded by Ms. Asid. The motion passed unanimously.

The next special meeting is scheduled on May 10, 2022.

The next regular meeting is scheduled on June 1, 2022.

The Board adjourned at 9:09 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sotonye Otunba-Payne