

RECEIVED FOR FILING
East Haven
DATE 04/14/2023 TIME 8:38 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, JUNE 1, 2022
HELD IN PERSON AT EAST HAVEN SENIOR CENTER, 91 TAYLOR AVENUE AND
VIA ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE AND CONFERENCE CALL
FOR COMMISSION MEMBERS ONLY**

Chairman William DeMayo called the regular meeting to order at 7:15 p.m.

I. Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by those present.

Mr. DeMayo indicated that Ms. Asid and Mr. Tarducci would be participating via Zoom videoconference, and Mr. Cubellotti was excused.

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

- William DeMayo - Present
- Marlene Asid (via videoconference) - Present
- John Tarducci (via videoconference) - Present
- Louis Fusco - Alternate, Present, sitting

There was a quorum.

Mr. DeMayo gave preliminary instructions to those in attendance.

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.
2. Minutes of April 6, 2022 Special Meeting.
3. Minutes of April 13, 2022 Special Meeting
4. Minutes of May 4, 2022 Regular Meeting
5. Minutes of May 10, 2022 Special Meeting
6. Minutes of May 24, 2022 Special Meeting

Mr. DeMayo indicated that the March 2, 2022 Regular meeting had been approved.

Attorney Coppola added that the minutes of the April 6, 2022 had been distributed and tabled. The minutes for April 13, 2022 had been distributed as well. The minutes for May 4, 2022 were submitted and evidently not distributed. The minutes for May 10, 2022 and May 24, 2022 had not been distributed.

Mr. DeMayo indicated the minutes of the March 2, 2022 meeting had been submitted, reviewed and accepted and would come off of this list moving forward. The other minutes would be tabled until the July 6, 2022 Regular Meeting.

III. Public Hearings

1. **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.

Mr. Jonathan McNeil, 4 McArthur Avenue, Devens, Massachusetts, indicated that he was before the Commission on May 4, 2022 to discuss installing antennas at 65 Messina Drive. Dish Wireless is proposing to install three antennas not to exceed the height of the existing structure on three sides of the building. There are existing carriers up there with existing antennas. Dish Wireless is proposing to paint to match the antennas that would be installed. The other related equipment would be within a penthouse and not visible from the public way. There would be no equipment on the ground or ground disturbance at all.

Mr. DeMayo asked about Dish Wireless's timetable. Mr. McNeil responded by saying that the expectation is that installation would begin within the next couple of months.

Mr. DeMayo asked how long it would take. Mr. McNeil replied that the good thing is that Dish Wireless is trying to use existing structures from Sprint. Sprint had removed their equipment when they integrated with T Mobile. He anticipated three to four weeks of work.

Mr. DeMayo asked about disturbance to the residents. Mr. McNeil said other than the use of elevators most of the installation involves utilizing existing structure. So, disturbance would be kept to a minimum.

Mr. DeMayo asked how long it would take. Mr. McNeil explained that when he had previously indicated three to four weeks, he did not mean work would ensue for eight hours a day.

Mr. DeMayo asked about the frequency of inspections. Mr. McNeil said that typically it would be once a month.

Ms. Asid indicated that the public hearing was required. It seemed as though everything was in order for the Commission.

Mr. Tarducci said he was good with all he had heard so far.

Mr. DeMayo asked for public comment for and against this application. Hearing no response, Mr. DeMayo asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

Ms. Asid motioned to close the public hearing for Application No. 22-05 for Dish Wireless, L.L.C., at 65 Messina Drive. Said motion was seconded by Mr. Fusco. The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

2. **Application No. 22-08 – on behalf of the East Haven Planning and Zoning Commission.** A petition for a Text Amendment to the East Haven Zoning Regulations to extend the six-month Moratorium on receiving any land use applications related to all Connecticut-licensed uses involving cannabis, which Moratorium was approved at the Planning and Zoning Commission regular meeting held on December 1, 2021, for an additional three months.

Mr. Budrow indicated the moratorium regarding cannabis would expire on June 6, 2022. There were two meetings with the Town Council, and they got some great feedback. The three-month extension would give the Commission much needed time to discuss the feedback from the Town Council and to get a feel amongst themselves regarding the different uses and perhaps discussions of where in town, if at all, uses would be permitted.

Mr. DeMayo commented that the Commission had had two very intense meetings with the Town Council. Under the direction of Attorney Coppola, they had had very good discussions. There is a lot of work to be done. They would like to start working on some type of a draft regarding whatever direction the Commission is going. However, it does take time. The Commission is working with the Town Council as this is something that would affect the Town. The Commission wants to work with them and needs plenty of time. Some towns have not even started. The deadline for all of this is fast approaching.

Ms. Asid added that there would be a public hearing to discuss whatever the Commission decides to do.

Attorney Coppola indicated that there is a public hearing on the extension of the Moratorium again until September, a three-month extension. As Mr. Budrow indicated, it does expire on June 6, 2022.

Attorney Coppola further commented that there was a public hearing item on regarding RERACA (Responsible and Equitable Regulation of Adult-Use Cannabis Act) as amended on the agenda for this meeting under “Other Business.” So, there will be a discussion. She asked Mr. DeMayo to ask those in attendance if anyone had comments specifically regarding the three-month extension of the moratorium which had been noticed for a public hearing.

Mr. DeMayo asked for public comment regarding the three-month extension as proposed by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Hearing no response, Mr. DeMayo indicated that the Commission should proceed.

Ms. Asid motioned to close the public hearing for Application No. 22-08. Said motion was seconded by Mr. Tarducci. The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

IV. New Application

1. **Application No. 22-09 – East Haven Real Estate, LLC, 95 Frontage Road.** An application of a Site Plan Review to locate a new 2,100 square-foot Taco Bell restaurant with accessory site development at 95 Frontage Road.

Attorney John Knuff, 147 Broad Street, spoke on behalf of the applicant. Attorney Knuff indicated that the property consists of just under three-quarters of an acre located in a commercial district. Significant improvements are being proposed in every respect, particularly environmentally. It will be a very attractive 2,100 square-foot Taco Bell restaurant. This is a permitted use pursuant to Section 24 Schedule A, line 37. While the site is small, the proposed improvements are important since there are wetlands along the western property line and the Tuttle Brook along the eastern property line. These resources have been negatively impacted by prior land uses. This application is an opportunity to reverse the adverse impact of those prior uses and install proper storm water measurements as well as adding significant landscaping throughout the site.

Wetlands approval was received several weeks prior. The Inland Wetlands Commission was extremely pleased with the application.

They have received no responses or comments from the East Haven Building and Fire Departments. They have complied with bulk requirements. Mr. Bodwell and Mr. Budrow have been exceedingly helpful and generous with their time and comments, which is appreciated.

Traffic would be primarily pass-by traffic. More than 18,000 cars go by the site a day. It would be less than a drop in a bucket in terms of cars pulling into Taco Bell's site, about 50 at most during the lunchtime hour. Most of these cars are going to be pass-by trips meaning they are already on the road and just happen to stop at Taco Bell. Deliveries would be scheduled during the off hours.

Mr. Budrow mentioned that Fire Marshal Charlie Miller had no issues with the site plans that he assessed. Mr. Bodwell did submit a memo that he had no issue with the plans before the Commission.

Mr. Kevin Hixson, of BL Companies, 355 Research Parkway, Meriden, Connecticut, introduced himself. As the engineer, he went through the plan in detail. He was asked questions.

It was indicated that no public hearing was necessary as this was a site plan permitted use.

Mr. Budrow indicated he would contact Mr. Bodwell to inquire about the performance bond.

Mr. Tarducci stated that the applicant had to apply with the Department of Transportation for an Encroachment Permit. He asked if it was a long process. He further asked that in the event this application is approved, what would be the start date and ready-for-business date.

Attorney Knuff indicated that the Department of Transportation would not fully consider their application for the Encroachment Permit until the applicant gets all its local approvals. If the Commission were to approve the site plan, they could submit it to the Department of Transportation conceivably. It takes about three months to get the Encroachment Permit. During that time, the applicant could be working on its construction drawings, submitting those drawings to get its building permit. There is some site work that needs to be done and utility work. The hope is to get going as soon as they possibly can. The goal is to be open by this fall.

Mr. DeMayo commented that this is a marked improvement from what it was previously. It has improved that part of East Haven. He thanked the applicant for entertaining this project.

V. Deliberation Session.

1. Discussion and possible decision 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.

Mr. DeMayo indicated that Dish Wireless had met the requirements. There would be no disruption to the residents.

Mr. Fusco indicated he has no issues with the application.

Mr. Tarducci indicated that the last presentation was pretty thorough. It is encouraging that Dish Wireless would be using some transmitters that are already there.

Ms. Asid indicated that what they heard the last time was very informative. The graphics made it clear that it is a good application.

Ms. Asid motioned to Approve Application No. 22-05, Dish Wireless, for 65 Messina Drive. Said motion was seconded by Mr. Tarducci. The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

2. Discussion and possible decision on **Application No. 22-08- on behalf of the East Haven Planning and Zoning Commission**. A petition for a text amendment to the East Haven Zoning Regulations to extend the six-month Moratorium on receiving any land use applications related to all Connecticut licensed uses involving cannabis, which Moratorium was approved at the Planning and Zoning Commission regular meeting held on December 1, 2021, for an additional three months.

Attorney Coppola asked that the Commission use September 6, 2022 as that Monday is Labor Day.

Ms. Asid motioned to approve Application No. 22-08 on behalf of the East Haven Planning and Zoning Commission to Extend the Moratorium for three months which would bring that to September 6, 2022. Said motion was seconded by Mr. Fusco. The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

3. Discussion and possible decision on **Application No. 22-09 – East Haven Real Estate, LLC, 95 Frontage Road**. An application of a Site Plan Review to locate a new 2,100 square-foot Taco Bell restaurant with accessory site development at 95 Frontage Road.

Mr. Fusco indicated that it would be a positive addition for that area of Town.

Mr. DeMayo indicated that if this is approved, East Haven would welcome the business, welcome the employment it will potentially add to East Haven. It would definitely clean up an unsightly parcel in East Haven.

Ms. Asid commented by saying that she knew this application had gone through the Inland Wetlands Commission, and the East Haven Town Engineer, Mr. Bodwell, signed off on this. She asked Mr. Budrow if there needed to be any stipulations if approved.

Mr. Tarducci concurred with all that was said. It is a dirty and ugly site. The end result is going to be a vast improvement. He was encouraged to learn that this would open in the third or fourth quarter of 2022 and not the spring of 2023. His only concern is deliveries. He wanted assurances that deliveries would not occur at noon. Ms. Asid responded by saying that Mr. Hixson indicated it would be off-peak hours.

Mr. DeMayo added that the performance bond should be added.

Mr. Budrow indicated that two conditions could be levied tonight if approved, that a performance bond would be set by the town engineer based on the landscaping list within the plan set. The performance bond is to be returned to the applicant upon installation and approval. The second condition should be that prior to a zoning permit application being submitted, that a site plan will be submitted to the Town showing a conforming unloading space for a truck to offload during the hours that the restaurant is not open, and to be set to the north parking area where the truck turn-around is shown.

Mr. DeMayo indicated that is key. There are no problems with these conditions.

Ms. Asid motioned to approve Application No. 22-09, East Haven Real Estate, L.L.C., at 95 Frontage Road for the Taco Bell restaurant which will include the three conditions that Mr. Budrow had outlined. Said motion was seconded by Mr. Fusco. The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

VI. Other Business

1. **Zoning Regulations Section 51.8.4 Referral** – Discussion on a proposed Modified use variance to be heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals. Request is to allow an existing mixed-use building at 164 Foxon Road, within an R-3 District, to be allowed to have four apartments and two commercial spaces.

Mr. Budrow indicated that East Haven has a regulation whereby if a person applies for a use variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals, the Planning and Zoning Commission has to give a favorable report to the Zoning Board of Appeals about it.

In 1990, Frank Capone, the owner of 164 Foxon Road had an empty parcel which was zoned residential. So, he did a three-lot subdivision. Then he has one where the Zoning Board of Appeals, via a use variance, allowed a commercial building to be built on a R-3 zone property with a number of conditions. The main conditions were as follows: He was allowed two apartments above and two offices below. It was granted.

When he built the building, it was a little off. He needed a setback variance later that was approved.

The property file is full of things that came and went. However, that is not how it is today. Today, it is four apartments and two commercial spaces. One is a fortune teller/Tarot card reader/psychic reader. The other is a hair salon. Things went on and approvals were granted for a third apartment. Then the fourth one arrived. After he met Mr. Capone, he was told what was in there.

This all came about because he asked the Town if a veterinarian could go in the space. Upon research, Mr. Budrow indicated he informed Mr. Capone "no," and that there could only be two offices with two apartments. He gave Mr. Capone the two options, go back to the original variance or seek modification. Mr. Capone chose the latter, to request a variance to modify what he now has, four apartments, and two commercial spaces.

The question here is: Does the Commission feel the use of the building is okay and leave it to the Zoning Board of Appeals or does the Commission think Mr. Capone went way beyond what he was allowed? Mr. Budrow admitted that Mr. Capone sought and received approval for the hair salon. The third apartment on top was allowed. Mr. Budrow further indicated that he did not see a zoning permit for the psychic reader. All in all, the Town did not hold Mr. Capone to the original variance. It is up to this Commission to give a favorable report.

Mr. Tarducci indicated that Mr. Capone was now seeking approval after the fact with four apartments and two commercial spaces.

Mr. Budrow reiterated that the original variance allowed two apartments over two offices. He now has four apartments. The town did allow the third apartment.

Mr. DeMayo asked if this approval was through the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Budrow indicated that Mr. Capone had a lawyer and that it went through the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. DeMayo asked if the Zoning Board of Appeals approved the third apartment. Mr. Budrow replied by saying that no one knew of the third apartment.

Mr. Fusco asked if Mr. Capone did all this and is still doing it and now wants this Commission's blessing.

Mr. Tarducci asked if Mr. Capone had four apartments. Mr. Budrow replied by saying there are three above. There is also an efficiency apartment between the two commercial spaces.

The Commission wondered where the veterinarian would go.

Attorney Coppola indicated that in the use table, page 24-14, veterinary hospitals are only allowed by special permit in CB1, CB2 and CC. This is R-3. She noted the property owner was not present. There needs to be no miscommunication that the process required to open a veterinary hospital is a special permit process.

Ms. Asid asked where the veterinarian would go.

Attorney Coppola stated that the owner should not go to ZBA on a use variance when what is required for veterinary use is a special permit. She cautioned that the Commission has to be very careful because the town might end up with unintended uses.

Recording(s) on land records, etc. were discussed.

Mr. DeMayo indicated that Mr. Capone ought to appear before the Commission.

Attorney Coppola indicated that he had stated previously he wanted a variance for a travel agency and apartment for his elderly parents.

Mr. Tarducci indicated he had driven past the property earlier and did not see signage for a travel agency. Mr. Budrow indicated the travel agency was in 1990.

Mr. Fusco indicated the travel agency used to be in business.

Mr. Budrow indicated there had been various variances over 30 years. The hair salon has a zoning permit. The third apartment has an approval. There

were businesses during this time span that got approved. Somehow, commercial businesses got approved despite what the variance stated.

Ms. Asid and Mr. Tarducci expressed concerns about uses going in without approval.

Attorney Coppola indicated that through all these approvals, the question is whether he followed the required procedures and appeared before the Planning and Zoning Commission. For example, a salon would require more parking than a travel agency. So, parking would have been raised.

Mr. Budrow spoke about the prior history.

Attorney Coppola reiterated that if the proposal is for a veterinarian to occupy the space, the proposal should be to change the zone and to proceed as a special permit. This should not proceed as a proposal for use variance.

Ms. Asid agreed and said the owner needs to understand the process.

Mr. Budrow indicated he wanted to mention to the Commission what the potential use could be.

The Commission indicated that they would like the property owner to appear before them. They would not give any report to the East Haven Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. DeMayo said they would like to know the owner's intentions.

Mr. Tarducci indicated he would like details with respect to what this property owner applied for in the past and what approvals he got from the town.

Mr. DeMayo also reiterated they would like to see all approvals regarding this property.

2. Discussion of short-term rentals and vacation stays.

Attorney Coppola indicated that she and staff had discussed that they would like to have a separate special meeting to address this line item in terms of suggested content for the regulation. The preference would be to have all either on Zoom or fully in person. This is somewhat involved topic.

Mr. DeMayo indicated he would like a face-to-face meeting.

A meeting was scheduled for June 21, 2022 at 7:00 p.m. and will be only a discussion among the Commission members, not a public hearing. The meeting will be noticed.

3. 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.*) and as subsequently amended.

Attorney Coppola stated that when members of the public share information with the Commission members, the information should be sent to town staff so that way the information is appropriately disseminated. This may be a way for the members of the public to engage the Commissions members which is not appropriate. Information put into the record, through the town staff, will ensure that the information is publicly shared. These sorts of communications could lead to claims being made.

Attorney Coppola indicated that the Commission ideally should have a clear understanding of what it wants with regard to content. There are eleven new cannabis establishment uses. She asked what the Commission’s desire was in terms of permitted uses. She asked the Commission if only retail use would be allowed.

Mr. Fusco talked about the dispensary and delivery services. He indicated that these two-go hand in hand. He was unsure about the cultivation aspect of the cannabis industry.

Attorney Coppola indicated that dispensaries still meant palliative. The hybrid establishments may encompass dispensary and retail sales. She wanted to confirm that cultivation is not something the town wants to pursue at this time.

Mr. Fusco concurred with Attorney Coppola about not pursuing cultivation at this time. The question is whether it fits in the town. He wondered if there was a location for this.

Ms. Asid indicated she thought Mr. Budrow said there was limited space for cultivation.

Mr. Budrow indicated that when one looks at the square footage of a cultivator, the buildings that are equal to the size are all on Commerce Street. They are in the 20,000- to 30,000-square feet range.

Mr. Budrow stated that if micro cultivator was permitted as an allowed use, the Commission would zone use on Commerce Street. It would open those property owners for that use down the road.

Mr. Fusco indicated that at the Commission's last meeting, someone proposed a second location. He was of the understanding that only one was allowed due to the population of the Town of East Haven.

Attorney Coppola replied by saying that the legislature did away with the density cap. At this last session, the legislature removed subsections E and F that dealt with the density cap.

Mr. Fusco indicated there could potentially be a second location.

Mr. DeMayo indicated that the Commission would speak about cultivation some more.

Attorney Coppola indicated there were other parameters to consider regarding cultivation.

Mr. DeMayo asked what the downside would be if cultivation was allowed.

Mr. Fusco indicated it would be indoor cultivation.

Attorney Coppola suggested that she would do a memo for the Commission pointing out those portions of the law that address retail versus cultivation. The Commission could look at the actual language. For a cultivator, the space could not be less than 15,000 square feet; and for a micro cultivator, 2,000 to 10,000 square feet.

Ms. Asid indicated the town regulations have to be very specific, especially as it relates to a micro cultivator, that regulating cultivators is easier.

Mr. DeMayo asked about what other towns are doing with regard to cultivation. Attorney Coppola replied by indicating that she had a lot of information and that they had not talked about all the uses, mentioning the food and beverage manufacturer use.

Mr. Fusco asked if this could be limited to a particular street. Attorney Coppola indicated cultivation could be limited to a particular geographical location.

Mr. DeMayo asked if the Commission could subtract. Attorney Coppola indicated that the thing with subtraction is that the Commission could create issues.

Mr. DeMayo indicated that it is imperative that the Commission protect this town and the neighborhoods.

Attorney Coppola asked if there was agreement that there are some establishment uses that the Commission supports.

Mr. Fusco said yes.

Ms. Asid said yes, but that the permitted uses would be well regulated.

Mr. Tarducci expressed his apprehension and indicated that he wondered about the costs/benefits. There have been a lot of rosy pictures painted. He wondered if there were any horror stories the Commission had not heard yet. Mr. Tarducci further indicated that law enforcement should be involved for more than the first thirty days of an establishment's opening. He wondered who would pick up the tab.

Mr. DeMayo and Ms. Asid indicated that the establishment would pick up the tab. Mr. DeMayo indicated that thirty days would be insufficient. Ms. Asid indicated that the first thirty days was for traffic. She said security should be in the parking lot.

Mr. DeMayo indicated he would also like to have Bob Cubellotti's input.

Attorney Coppola indicated some decisions have to be made regarding cannabis as the Commission had just extended the moratorium for another three months.

Attorney Coppola indicated that she had information regarding regulations that have been passed. She could reshare the links to the most recent Public Acts as well as the regulations because that is where the security provisions and what not come from.

Mr. DeMayo wondered if this process could be narrowed down. In addition, there should be some language regarding what the Commission will do or not do now and in the future. The whole point is to obviate a problem that is not reversible.

4. Discussion of provisions of Public Act No. 21-29 "An Act Concerning the Zoning Enabling Act, Accessory Apartment, 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.

Attorney Coppola indicated there is a path that has been defined regarding this as discussed at the combined meeting with the Town Council. It is the intention of the Commission to proceed with the drafting of a regulation to permit accessory apartments or accessory dwelling units. We did not get

into what the specific contents of that would be. There were discussions about owner occupancy. A member of the Town Council expressed discontent with the idea of requiring owner occupancy of the primary or the secondary residence. They did not get into whether or not they want to put any limitation on the number of occupants, in the same footprint, attached or detached, location within basements, attics, garages, outside access. There is restriction in the statute about not prohibiting frontage on a public street for access purposes. There is a restriction on not requiring internal doorway connection if you are going to allow it within the same footprint or as an attached. There are architectural style questions such as exterior stairs or not, limitations on the number of bedrooms, the number of parking space requirements, etc.

Attorney Coppola further indicated that there have been discussions regarding the landlord registration ordinance that needs to really get back up and running. Then the Commission will get into the procedural matters about how the apartments go about being approved. So, the Commission's opinions are important to know about these issues.

Ms. Asid indicated she was not in favor of detached buildings.

Mr. DeMayo asked if the town could opt out.

Attorney Coppola indicated that the issue is that the option to opt out might not be supported by some of the members of the Town Council. It was specifically discussed that a draft regulation would be pursued on the accessory apartment and accessory dwelling units and put forth.

Mr. Fusco asked if a decision had to be made before the Commission could come up with a draft. He wondered if there was a check list.

Mr. DeMayo added that that would be helpful.

Ms. Asid indicated she was not in favor of detached units.

Mr. DeMayo indicated they would like information in a bullet-point format to facilitate discussions the next time they meet.

Ms. Asid indicated a big item the Commission will have to decide is owner occupancy.

Mr. Fusco added the Town Council member was adamant she was not in favor of owner occupancy.

Attorney Coppola asked if the Commission would like a special meeting regarding this. She was becoming increasingly more concerned. They have

been discussing this matter since last year. She worries about the necessity of following the process.

5. Discussion of provisions of Public Act No. 21-29 “An Act Concerning the Zoning Enabling Act, Accessory Apartment, 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 dwelling units parking limitations.

Attorney Coppola says this is a different issue. She tried to make the point in the combined meetings of the Town of East Haven Town Council and Planning and Zoning Commission that this is an entirely separate issue with separate considerations. She wondered if this should be heard separately or heard together.

Mr. Fusco suggested that Items 4 and 5 could be heard together.

Attorney Coppola indicated that they could but there would be two separate public hearings.

VII. Adjournment

Ms. Fusco motioned to adjourn. Said motion was seconded by Mr. Tarducci. The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

The next regular meeting is on July 6, 2022.

The Commission adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sotonye Otunba-Payne