

EAST HAVEN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting

The East Haven Planning and Zoning Commission held its Regular Scheduled Meeting Wednesday, March 6, 2013, immediately following a certain public hearing at the East Haven Community Center, 91 Taylor Avenue, East Haven, CT

Chairman Cianelli called the meeting to order at 7:42 p.m.

Roll call: Present 5(Ruocco, Raymond, Cianelli, Colangelo, and Fiorillo)

Staff Present: Alfred Zullo, Assistant Town Attorney, Kevin White, PE, Town Engineer, and Frank Biancur, Zoning Official

Item #1

Administrative Actions/Accept minutes February 6, 2012 meeting.

Commissioner Raymond moved to accept the minutes.

Vice Chairman Ruocco second the motion.

Voice vote- all in favor. None opposed. No abstentions.

Approved

Item # 2

Old Business – None

Item #3

Accept Autumn View Housing Proposal; site plan, text change, and zone change (Revisions) for review, discussion, and possible decision.

Attorney Zullo stated that for clarification there will be three separate motions.

Vice Chairman Ruocco moved to deny the application for public health and safety as well as quality of life reasons, as well as failure to comply with CGS 8-30G.

1. The project is simply too dense and almost quadruples the allowable development in this zone from when it was a R-3 Zone and almost double the units that were previously approved from when the R-3 Zone was changed. This density is not consistent with the Town's Plan of Development as well as the development of the surrounding neighborhoods, and is not conducive to public health and safety.
2. The application is not consistent with the neighborhoods in the surrounding area.
3. The application fails to comply with the Town's standard relative to roads and sidewalks. This is a community that will have children and the Town standards as to 30 ft. roads and 4.5 ft. sidewalks are necessary to ensure their health and safety, as well as, to ensure the health and safety of the homeowners in the event of a fire or police emergency.
4. The plan has insufficient drainage and the applicant has no agreement in place relative to drainage of ground water into Grannis Lake.
5. The application, because of its density would put a severe strain on public services including but not limited to education.

6. There are other larger sites in Town that would more readily accommodate a development with this number of units.
7. The proposed application as an 8;30g proposal fails to provide an adequate affordability plan in that they have failed present an accurate calculation of sales price for both 60% and 80%, median income units an they have failed to designate an affordable manager that would manage the plan throughout the 40 years of its life.

The commissioner further moved that the application be denied without prejudice to the applicant reapplying for a site plan approval in the future accompanied by a zone change and text change application with recommended changes suggested by the Board as reflected on the recorded on the applicants request for text change and zone change approval this same day. Said re-application should provide for the following:

- A. No more than 60 units;
- B. Thirty (30) ft. roadways and 4.5 ft. sidewalks;
- C. Minimum road frontage of sixty (60) feet;
- D. Minimum sidelines of fifteen (15) feet;
- E. Minimum front yard setbacks of twenty-five (25) feet;
- F. Minimum rear yard setbacks of thirty (30) feet from the retention basin and twenty-five (25) feet otherwise;
- G. The location of the retention basins in the middle of the development;
- H. A legitimate pricing calculation that provides 60% and 80% median income purchasers with the appropriate affordable pricing of the affordable units;
- I. An agreement with an administrator such as a Town of State Agency that would be available after completion of the project to administer the program throughout the 40 years of its term.

Commissioner Colangelo second the motion.

Roll call vote - All in favor. None Opposed. No abstentions.

Motion carried unanimously.

Site Plan Approval Request – DENIED

Commissioner Raymond moved to deny the application for public health and safety as well as quality of life reasons, as well as failure to comply with CGS 8-30G.

1. The Development is too dense and will put a drain on Town resources and services and is simply incompatible with surrounding neighborhoods.
2. The application is not compliant with the minimum Town standards as to the width of streets and sidewalks. Sidewalks and streets need to be 30 ft. wide with 4.5 ft. sidewalks on each side of the roadway. This development will contain numerous children and sidewalks of full size are necessary for their health and safety. In addition, in light of the State regulation estimates that each household will have 4.5 people, there will be significant traffic and parking issues that would further impact the health and safety of its residents.
3. The principal building standards are simply insufficient for a parcel of this size. Minimum street frontage should be not less that 60 ft. Sidelines should be 15 ft., front setbacks 25 ft., rear setbacks should be 30 ft. for the basins and 25 ft. from the remaining properties. There should also be at least 30% open space to address quality of life to make the development consistent with other developments in the area.
4. The allowable zone definition gives rise to abuse as other larger parcels in other parts of Town can be converted to a PEFD and then to mixed income housing development in contravention of the Town's Plan of Development.

5. The proposed application as an 8-30g proposal fails to provide an adequate affordability plan in that they have failed to present an accurate calculation of sales price for both 60% and 80% median income units and they have failed to designate an affordable manager to manage the plan throughout the 40 years of its life.

The commissioner further moved that the application be denied without prejudice to the applicant re-applying for a site plan approval in the future accompanied by a site plan change and text change application with the recommended changes suggested by the Board as reflected on the record at the applicants request for zone change and site plan approval this same day. Said application should provide for the following:

- A. No more than 60 units;
- B. Thirty (30) ft. roadways and 4.5 ft. sidewalks;
- C. Minimum road frontage of sixty (60) feet;
- D. Minimum sidelines of fifteen (15) feet;
- E. Minimum front yard setbacks of twenty-five (25) feet;
- F. Minimum rear yard setbacks of thirty (30) feet from the retention basin and twenty-five (25) feet otherwise;
- G. The location of the retention basins in the middle of the development;
- H. A legitimate pricing calculation that provides 60% and 80% median income purchasers with the appropriate affordable pricing of the affordable units;
- I. Amended dimensional standards, which would accommodate the amended principal building standards and site plan standards;
- J. Sufficient off street overflow and visitor parking;
- K. An agreement with an administrator such as a Town or State Agency that would be available after completion of the project to administer the program throughout the 40 years of its term.

Commissioner Colangelo second the motion.

Roll call vote - All in favor. None Opposed. No abstentions.

Motion carried unanimously.

Text Change Request– DENIED

Commissioner Colangelo moved to deny the application for a zone change on the grounds of public health and safety and quality of life reasons, as well as, failure to satisfy Connecticut General Statutes 8-30g. The Applicant has failed to present an appropriate text change, site plan, and affordable housing plan, which satisfies municipal concerns, as well as, the requirements of Connecticut General Statutes 8-30g. Both the application for the text change and site approval by the Applicant has been denied. In light of the denial, changing the zone would be a moot point as there are no standards available to control development in the area.

The commissioner further moved that the Application be denied without prejudice to a re-application by the Applicant for a zone change in the future accompanied by a text change and site plan application with the recommended changes suggest by the Board as reflected in this record at he Applicant's request for text change and site plan approval this same day.

Commissioner Raymond second the motion.

Roll call vote - All in favor. None Opposed. No abstentions.

Motion carried unanimously.

Zone Change Request – DENIED

Frank Biancur stated that there is no other business.

Commissioner Fiorillo moved to adjourn.
Commissioner Colangelo second the motion.
Voice vote- all in favor. None opposed. No abstentions.
Meeting adjourned at 8:37p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Roberta A. DeLuca
Commission Clerk