



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

1019 Main Street, PO Box 150, Branford, CT 06405
Tel: (203) 488 - 1255, Fax: (203) 315 - 2188

MINUTES PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MONDAY, APRIL 22, 2019 SPECIAL MEETING 7:00 P.M. BRANFORD FIRE HEADQUARTERS 45 NORTH MAIN STREET

Commissioners Present: J. Lust, J. Vaiuso, F. Russo, P. Higgins, C. Andres,
M. Palluzzi

Commissioners Absent: J. Chadwick, D. Dyer

Staff Present: H. Smith-Town Planner, R. Stoecker- Asst. Town Planner,
Attorney D. Bercury, M. Martin- Clerk

Chairperson Andres introduced the Commission and the Staff.
Secretary M. Palluzzi read the Public Hearing notice into the record.
Chairperson Andres said the Commission will hear Application #19-3.2 first since it will be a fairly quick application and the Applicants for the Public Hearings have agreed to this.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. Danby Gasoline Marketers, Inc. c/o
Kevin Curry- Applicant
Charles J. Pepe, Executor of Estate of Anthony C. Pepe-Owner
165 & 195 Main Street
Special Exception-Modification of Parking Requirements for property with existing Auto Service with Gas, Liquor Store and Office on which is proposed a New Convenience Store.
Application #19-2.7
A/R & PH set for 3/21/19, Time Extension received & continued to 4/22/19

H. Smith said we have an offer of a Time Extension of 40 days from the Applicant and it is noted for the record that the Commission accepted it.

The applicant has to go before the Town Center Revitalization Review Board (TCRRB) on May 15 with professionally prepared building, elevation and drainage information. This item will be continued to the May 16, 2019 Planning & Zoning Meeting to receive the recommendation of the TCRRB.

Chairperson asked if anyone was present to speak about the application. No one came forward.

The Public Hearing was continued to the 5/16/19 meeting.

2. Beacon Communities Development LLC,
c/o Attorney Timothy Hollister-Applicant
Town of Branford Housing Authority-Owner
Application for a Site Plan Modification / Coastal Site Plan) under CGS Section 8-30g
Affordable Housing Land Use Appeals for property located at 115 South Montowese
Street (Parkside Village I) for (1) deletion of Condition #3a of the amended Resolution
adopted on 1/3/2019 approving application #17-9.6 and (2) a revision of the approved
Site Plan to show use of Sliney Road as a supplemental emergency access to the
redeveloped building.

Application #19-2.4

A/R 2/21/19 & PH set for 4/4/19, continued to 4/22/19

Chairperson Andres stated this Public Hearing opened on April 4th and was continued to this meeting. He then stated this is an CGS Section 8-30g (Affordable Housing Appeals Statute) application and explained the impact of that designation on the Commissions review. He said the Applicant made a presentation at the last meeting and has responded to some of the comments. He then reviewed the Public Hearing procedures.

Doug Denes (Branford Housing Authority) spoke first, noting they have worked hard on this redevelopment. They feel a new Parkside is urgently needed and will be a benefit to everyone. He noted the Housing Authority is made up of volunteers and they asked the Commission to put aside the previous 2 years and base their decision on the facts.

Attorney Timothy Hollister spoke next (representing the Applicant). He noted David Sacco was also present as well as Steve Ullman, Mr. Versteeg and Dara Kovel. He reviewed the book dated April 15 "Responses to Staff Reports and Public Comments" that was submitted to the PZ office. He noted Mr. Sacco submitted revised Site plan drawings tonight.

He summarized for the record, and said there are 3 conditions (3d, 3c,3L) that have been satisfied since January of 2019. He then reviewed the conditions that are unchanged from the January 3, 2019 resolution. He noted there are 5 conditions that require minor updates or clarifications. He said they told H. Smith if there are wording changes they will work with staff to do that.

He noted, for the record, he received 2 additional memos from H. Smith this afternoon that were from the Town Engineer. The Town Engineer said the land conveyances were not approved and in an email exchange today with counsel and the Town Engineer it was confirmed that it has been approved but it hasn't been conveyed yet. It is a future action that has been agreed upon.

He wanted to recap the Melrose access because there were comments that did not accurately summarize what happened. The short summary is that the proposal for the Melrose access came from the Parks and Rec. dept. and the First Selectman. It was presented as a conceptual plan on Sept 7, 2017 under Section 8-24 of the general statutes which asks the Commission to give its opinion that the proposal is consistent

with the POCD, which it did. Because of that Beacon and the Housing Authority agreed to incorporate the Melrose access into the Parkside redevelopment Site Plan. They didn't think it was the best plan for Parkside, per se, but they agreed to do it to cooperate with the Town. He noted that during the discussions in the fall of 2017, the widening of Sliney Road was discussed. Mr. Sacco gave a conceptual plan for the widening of Sliney Road at that time. But, the RTM denied the Melrose access in July 2018 so this application is what they said would happen if the Melrose Access was denied. He stated that these are the correct documented facts.

David Sacco, P.E. –Civil Engineer (TPA Design Group) spoke next. He reviewed the revised Site Plans that were distributed to the Commissioners at the meeting and summarized the changes that were made in response to comments that were made.

The Commission asked a few questions.

Steve Ulman, P.E. (Alfred Benesch & Co.) spoke next noting he compiled the original traffic study in September 2017. He reviewed the dates and times of the data collection for that study. He said a supplemental report was given to the Commission in October 2017 that counted and analyzed Sliney Road and South Montowese Street. He also said the original traffic study used the ITE trip generation manual (9th edition) for land use for low rise apartments and this doesn't take age restriction of the population in account. He then responded to H. Smith email dated 4-8-19

Joe Versteeg-(Versteeg Associates) He reviewed the procedures for the removal of rock by blasting. He spoke of the permits necessary and the information that's required for that. He stated the use of explosives for blasting at this site for the potential removal of rock is achievable and can be done with complete safety.

Dara Kovel-(CEO-Beacon Communities) Spoke next and said two weeks ago she listened to public comments and wants to give her prospective about why the application should be approved. She said they build quality housing across the northeast and mid atlantic to low income families, seniors and people with disabilities, and have won national recognition. She invited people to visit the properties and call the mayors of the towns of the projects. She encouraged people to call Mayor Toni Harp in New Haven or the First Selectman in Windsor Locks. In 2015, Beacon responded to the Branford Housing Authority competitive and open request for a proposal for a development partner for Parkside initially, because it is a project that fits their skill set and their mission. Redeveloping distressed public housing thru the creation of new quality homes is a core business of Beacon Communities. They provide programs for people who are chronically homeless. She noted that while this project is smaller and more financially challenging than most of the ones they take on, they responded to the Housing Authority RFP because they understood the need for this project. Parkside has been identified by the state as particularly at risk; meaning it is in need of particular priority and investment above others. So, when the Housing Authority selected Beacon as their partner, they accepted the challenge believing that the resident's deserve a chance at better living conditions. She also noted that the program used to fund this redevelopment is highly regulated. She said the residents of Parkside have no other housing options in Branford and Beacon has a duty to provide

a safe, comfortable, warm accessible and modern place to call home. She also noted there is an agreement in place for the current residents that guarantees them a place in the new building. There is a signed agreement between Beacon, the Housing Authority and the Resident Council of Parkside Village 1 that gives the residents guaranteed return to the property and they have been involved in the design and planning of the project all along. Also, as a good faith effort, they also went thru an exhaustive process to look for other sites in town. She said that also met with resistance from other neighborhoods as one might reasonably expect. She noted as Attorney Hollister indicated, with Melrose access they similarly responded to a town request to create better more rational access and parking for the little league field rather than continuing to use Sliney, a poorly improved road, never intended for that purpose.

They could not have foreseen the RTM vote against the request so they revised their proposal to the design the Fire Marshal initially proposed. She stated the vote to be taken tonight pertains to the change of fire access from Melrose Ave. to Sliney Road. The improved Sliney Road will benefit the entire town. They have done everything the town has asked and have gone above and beyond code requirements to address concerns.

Attorney Hollister stated he wants to confirm that he received two memos from the Town Engineer and he has no objections to any of his concerns.

H. Smith reviewed his staff comments. He noted the Town Engineer's memo on the blasting plan and the traffic info was reviewed already. He noted the Fire Marshall was out last week and has not has time to submit any comments, but will reply next week. He noted to the Commission that they can accept staff comments after the close of the Public Hearing but the applicant could not respond to them. The possibility of the Public Hearing being continued has been discussed by email and a time extension would be advisable so the Commission would have two full meetings subsequent to the Public Hearing closure to deliberate, direct the preparation of a draft resolution and vote on it. He then questioned how traffic to the early learning center, Parkside residents and service traffic, Parkside Village construction traffic as well as the Sliney Field Recreation use traffic will all share the Sliney Field Access Road during construction. It is not clear how this will work. He then asked about dry access – access route located outside of the area that could be flooded during a 100-year storm event. How will it be achieved and can it be?

He then went back to his staff report and the comments that have been made by the applicant in response to it. He stated in general he agreed that possibly some of the conditions of approval from the prior Site Plan and Coastal Site Plan have been met but he will check those further to be certain. He saw no harm in leaving those conditions on the present approval if the Commission decides to approve it. He talked a bit about excavation and had a few questions. He noted that some substitutions of coniferous vegetation for the deciduous plantings proposed would provide a more effective screen for the neighbor to the south of the reserve parking area. He also discussed the area to the south of the Sliney Field Access Road where the excavation is proposed to provide for the widening of the road. He asked if the applicant's intension was to replace the proposed retaining wall with rock slopes where that was feasible. Mr. Sacco stated that that was true.

H. Smith referred to the response to the Town Engineer's original comments (Tab 2) in which it is stated that several of the activities on town property were already approved in 2017. He said that while they were shown on the plans and, yes, the Site Plans were approved; they were also subject to a condition requiring town approval of those activities and possible changes, particularly the ones regarding construction.

He concluded by discussing traffic and asked if he was correct in understanding from Mr. Ullman's comments and the traffic study that, even with the addition of traffic from the redevelopment of Parkside 1, the level of service for recreation traffic coming out of Sliney Field Road on South Montowese will not be affected. Mr. Ullman agreed.

.

PUBLIC INPUT:

1. Ray Ingram- (RTM member 5th district)- He talked of the RTM vote, noting there was much discussion on it. He had comments from Jaime Cosgrove (First Selectman) who is attending another meeting presently. He said he was first approached for the discussion of Sliney Field and the Parkside driveway access. The project would have to identify some way of taking care of that. Regarding the question of who brought up Melrose Road as the access road; he said Beacon approached the Town Engineer and the Parks and Rec Director and asked what their concerns were regarding current circulation and design. Beacon then created a plan that addressed the staff concerns and made an offer to contribute funds in exchange for an Easement. That offer was rejected by the town, and subsequently by the RTM. Last June the residents of Indian Neck Avenue asked for a cross walk at Toole Drive. The Police Commission denied the request due to sight lines. They felt it was too dangerous for people to cross there.
2. Leighton McGee- (Lifelong resident) He is opposed. He asked the Commission to consider the whole neighborhood. He said the road floods in every rainstorm. He noted sea level rise and global warming are happening. He said the project belongs on Route 1.
3. Damien Platosh- He said he was at the ball fields before the meeting and there is 2-3 feet of water there. He will limit his comments to the Sliney Rd. access. He mentioned the traffic study and is familiar with the fatality that occurred on Montowese Street. There is a curve there. The person hit a tree at 133 Montowese Street and noted the road is not straight. He spoke of the traffic study that was done 2 years ago and the 2 hour increments of time that were studied. This is not a representative sample. He talked of the peak times in the summer and also disagrees with the number of accidents that were stated as to have occurred. He spoke of the Sliney Field access and the length of it. When you pull out of the ballfield and are turning left, it takes about 38 feet to fully turn. He explained there is not enough room to turn. He also disagreed with the 24 mph speed that had been noted. The reason why this has been a path all these years is that it's a liability. It is not a town recognized road. He asked the Commission to err on the side of public safety. The reasonable accommodation is to use the Melrose Avenue access.

3. Rita Berkson-(Llinden Ave)- Said she drives by Parkside daily. She is in favor of the new Parkside. She is impressed by the amount of patience and attention the Commission is giving. The attention is also delaying and perhaps missing a window of opportunity for funding new housing that is important. What she hasn't heard is; what is the alternative if we don't rebuild Parkside? What is the alternative to having a building that is deteriorating that houses elderly and disabled people? Also, what does it say about our town that this is where we house elderly and handicapped people? She urged the Commission to move quickly to assure funding.
4. David Nix- (Melrose Ave.) He said at 5pm today, there was a foot of water where the Sliney parking lot will be. It doesn't drain easily. Widening Sliney Road will mean more water running into the field. Regarding the Baseball, the number of kids who play on the field is large; where will the kids go? Parkside has a nice equilibrium now, why mess with it? Bigger and better isn't always the best.
5. Todd Petrowski –Montowese St. –Asked if any of this is on town property. What about staging? You don't get an answer from the applicant. Who will maintain the road? Where is the artifact study? What about a soil test, where is it? He also asked if there will be a radon problem. And how many trees will be taken down or rock excavated? We have no answers yet and it's ridiculous.
6. Tracy Everson-She asked if the Fire Dept. was able to access the ball fields in an emergency. If so, then why widen it? You don't want access to be hampered by the cars parking on the road.
7. Chris Collins -Highland Ave. –She said our town and low income residents deserve high quality housing. She drives on Sliney Rd. often and it's not good now. It needs improvement. This is part of the solution, not the problem. It is taking an awfully long time. We could work together to make it happen quicker. She asked why the Fire Marshal wasn't able to attend the meeting so it doesn't take another month?
8. Carolyn Sires- She said the process is held up, every meeting there are new problems. She spoke of vacancies at Parkside now and read an email. People are getting stressed, they care about the people of Parkside. She doesn't like the fact that words are being misconstrued. She talked of all the money that has been wasted and it could be used to remove the mold on the buildings at Parkside now. She then talked of the crash data and the dates. She noted the crash data gets sent to UConn but it's not complete. She stated there were 19 accidents, not 14 as stated, and 12 of the 19 were intersection related. She submitted a document from the Branford Police Dept. She also said she is happy that the current residents will be placed in the new building. She talked of the access road, and noted whether its Melrose or Sliney, the cost to maintain it will be on the Town. She said last year she met with the Inland Wetlands Dept. about the vernal pools because they are disappearing. She paid for an expert to look into that. The expert found wood frog eggs and salamanders. She talked of DEEP information and how the health of frogs in relation to human health. She read from the ordinance and noted is against the law to move protected animal species. She also asked if there is blasting information from Beacon. Due diligence needs to be done.
9. Steve Mazzacaine- He said he lives around the corner from the project. He knows there are significant variations in traffic when all the businesses are busy. One item that has been missed is to note, this is not a rehab project. This is a new project. By drastically increasing the amount of people, you are increasing pedestrian road traffic. It will double the amount of people walking and biking. He noted for

affordable housing, it doesn't say you have to have sidewalks or grocery stores or transportation. This project is not adding affordable housing for people. We need a better traffic study.

10. Jaime Cavanaugh (Parkside Resident & President of the Tenant Association) He said many of the residents were not able to attend the meeting. He felt that increasing Sliney Road will only benefit the ball fields, not Parkside. The conditions now at Parkside are not ADA compliant. He spoke of one tenant there who uses a wheelchair and has barely has enough room to move in their apartment. The apartments were not built to accommodate wheelchairs. This project will improve the residents health and welfare.

Chairperson Andres announced a 10 minute break at 9:24 pm.

The Commission returned at 9:34 pm.

The Commission asked a few questions.

Chairperson Andres announced that this Public Hearing was being continued to May 2nd and they will try to get staff comments to the applicant as soon as possible.

H. Smith noted, for the record, the applicant granted a 30 day time extension and the commission accepted it.

8. Audra Nuzzo- Applicant

Zoning Regulation Amendment- Addition of a new use category" Farm Event Venue with Liquor & Food service" as a Special Exception use in the BC,BR,BL,MU,IG1,IG2, and CP Zones.

Application #19-3.4

A/R & PH set for 4/22/19

Audra Nuzzo (Nuzzo Farms) spoke first, explaining they want to add a new category to the Regulations. She wants to sell liquor at weddings that they host at their farm.

H. Smith reviewed the Staff Report noting that this would be a new use category. He explained that they had an arrangement established with the prior ZEO to host 4 events per year on their farm as an accessory use but now the owners would like to hold more events. He said that Staff didn't write this application. He said he understood it could be difficult to craft Regulation wording. However, he said, as currently worded the draft regulation poses several concerns ; there is no definition of the use, size of events, parking, and noise issues. This should be spelled out for the protection for neighbors. Currently, they serve liquor thru the caterers liquor license They could operate a full café license, a.k.a. a bar as an "event" under this regulation. It is important to note that this regulation amendment would pertain to other properties as well. This may open the door to issues with these other zones. He said more information is needed before a decision can be made.

The Commission and Chairperson person asked questions.

Chairperson Andres said the Public Hearing will open tonight and will be continued to the May 16 meeting.

PUBLIC INPUT:

1. Jim Budworth (68 Cross Feld Rd, No. Branford) He said during the previous events last summer , the music was very loud. He said the music gets trapped in the valley. They aren't Branford residents but it effects them. He is not adverse to events but it should be controlled. He knows one event was a fundraiser and he didn't; want to complain.
2. Joanne Crosiglioo- (115 Cross Field Rd., No. Branford) She said the outdoor music was horrible. It was till midnight.
3. Robert Dean – (69 Crossfield Rd.) He said he had the same basic experience. The music was so loud he had to wear earplugs in his yard. As the prior neighbor said, he has no issue with the Nuzzo's making a living but the noise should be controlled.
4. Helen (73 Cross Field Rd.) She said the music coming from the farm was blasting, even with her windows closed. She noted she has not heard noise from either VanWilgens and Woodwinds.
5. Janet Reisman-(699 East Main St.) She said she is in the IG zone too. She assumed as a resident she had no right to complain but she is tired from being woken up with the loud noise. She is encouraging farms. She knows what it is like to grow up in farmland. She encouraged the Commission to promote farming.

Tony Nuzzo said he is trying to keep the property a farm. He knows, the factories keep him awake too. He said if he can't keep the property, it will become a factory.

Chairperson Andres said this item will be continued to May 16.

Husband said he is trying to keep the property a farm. Factorys keep him awake too. If he cant keep the property it will be a factory.

Chuck said it will be continued to may 16

MINUTES: 4/04/19

**F. Russo made a motion to approve the meeting minutes as written.
J. Vaiuso seconded the motion which passed unanimously.**

CORRESPONDENCE:

H. Smith noted documentation regarding a dredging permit for property off Pawson's Park has been received.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Nicole Letsinger –Applicant
Ten Properties, LLC- Owner
22A Limewood Avenue
Coastal Site Plan & Site Plan – Single Family FEMA compliant home
Application #19-2.6
A/R 3/7/19 & Tabled to 4/22/19

Mike Bennett-(Bennett & Smilas Associates) spoke and represented the applicant.
Joe Sepot (Architect) was also present.

M. Bennett explained this was a FEMA compliant single family house and they have no issues with the proposed conditions of approval.

Joe Sepot- Highlighted the plans saying it's a 3 bedroom elevated house.

R. Stoecker reviewed the staff report.

Commissioner Lust had some concerns regarding the potential of the R-2 Zoning Regulations to create unintentional levels of development and negative impact on the neighborhood . He said this is a first cut and this is creating a greater density in an area that is already too dense.

The Commission had a brief discussion.
Commissioner Higgins left the meeting at 10:50 pm.

R. Stoecker said letters were submitted to the office pertaining to this application from neighbors.The letters were then distributed to the Commission and they reviewed them.

M. Palluzzi made a motion to approve the application with the finding and condition below:

Finding –

1. The Coastal Site Plan is consistent with the goals and policies of the Coastal Area Management Act (CGS Section 22a-92) and incorporates conditions and modifications necessary to mitigate adverse impacts on coastal resources and any future water dependent activities.

Conditions -

1. Prior to the issuance of a zoning permit or the authorization for the issuance of a building permit. The following Site Plan revisions shall be addressed or other documentation provided to the satisfaction of the Zoning Enforcement Officer or other staff of the Planning and Zoning Commission as may be indicated.

- A) The Zoning Data Table shall show the correct minimum lot size for the R-2 zone which is 4,500 square feet.
 - B) The construction of the anti-tracking pad should be widened to the full width of the wall opening which is 12 feet wide.
 - C) Documentation of approval by the Connecticut Department of Transportation of the proposed driveway opening onto Route 146 (Limewood Avenue)
2. Prior to the start of construction, the sedimentation and erosion control measures shall be installed to the satisfaction of the Zoning Enforcement Officer.

2. Planning & Zoning Commission-Applicant
Zoning Regulation Amendment to modify Section 7.4 (Line 11)
(Accessory Apartment)
Application #19-3.3
A/R & PH set for 5/2/19

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Tidal Basin, LLC.-Applicant & Owner
4-6 Indian Neck Avenue
Site Plan Modification & Coastal Site Plan – for a Hotel
Application #19-3.2
Tabled to 4/22/19

Gregg Burton-(Carmody, Torrance, Sandak, Hennessey) spoke first and represented the applicant. Also present was Ed Crowley (President of Tidal Basin LLC) ,J. Pretti (Criscuolo Engineering) as well as Alfred Lombardi (Michael Horton Associates).

He then gave a brief history of the hotel. He explained that the previous Site Plan that was approved showed the relocation of a drainage pipe. To do that, it was necessary to get permission from Amtrack, which they have been unable to do. The alternative plan is to leave the pipe in its current location, and to support it independently from the building. The building will be on pilings as well.

J. Pretti (Criscuolo Engineering) spoke next, showing the previous approved pipe location.

H. Smith reviewed the Staff Report and proposed two additional conditions (# 's 4 & 5 listed below). The Commission asked a few questions.

M. Palluzzi made a motion to approve the application with the finding and the conditions listed below:

Finding:

1. The Coastal Site Plan is consistent with the goals and policies of the Coastal Area Management Act (CGS Section 22a-92) and incorporates conditions and

modifications necessary to mitigate adverse impacts on coastal resources and any future water dependent activities.

Conditions:

1. All previous approvals shall remain in full force and affect as they may still apply.
2. Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit or the Zoning Authorization for the issuance of a Building Permit the following shall be addressed to the satisfaction of Town Counsel, the Town Planner, and the Town Engineer:
 - a) Submittal of a fully executed Maintenance Agreement, reviewed and approved by Town Counsel and the Town Engineer as to form and content, obligating the owner of the property subject to this application ("Owner) to be responsible for performing all maintenance, repair, and/or replacements necessary to maintain the drainage pipe and related improvements on the property in good operating condition, free of blockages.
 - b) Submittal of a fully executed Right to Drain and Easement to the Town of Branford ("Town") to allow, but not obligate, the Town to perform all maintenance, repair, and/or replacements necessary to maintain the drainage pipe and related improvements on the property in good operating condition, free of blockages should the Owner fail to do so after due notice. Said Easement shall provide for the Town to recover the costs of such work and in the event of a failure to pay after due notice, place a lien on the Owner's property for the payment of the costs of such work.
3. If contaminated soils are encountered during the storm sewer installation, they shall be remediated and a clean corridor provided along the length of the pipe.
4. A structural civil engineer shall be required to submit a design for appropriately supporting the pipe in the soils on site.
5. A licensed professional engineer shall provide inspection services and certification as to the proper construction of said pipe.

H. Smith noted that Commissioner Russo is seated for Commissioner Chadwick who is absent.

J. Lust seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

2. Sherry Purvis Torello & Nick Torello-Applicants & Owners
43 Hotchkiss Grove Road
Special Exception for an Accessory Apartment
Application #19-4.2
A/R & PH set for 5/2/19
3. Joseph Tammaro-Applicant & Owner
Lot between 233 & 249 East Main Street
Special Exception- Multi-Unit Residential Building
Application #19-4.3
A/R & PH set for 5/16/19
4. Daniel & Anita Cecchetto –Applicants & Owners

10 Cocheco Avenue
Lot Determination

R. Stoecker spoke and said the ZEO can't determine if an application is for a free split, the Commission has that authority. This was 2 parcels of land that were approved prior to the adoption of zoning regulations in 1954 and it was always considered 2 parcels. However, In 1992 a quick claim deed described the parcels as one combining them.

This applicant is seeking a free split now to develop 2 conforming lots.

H. Smith said it is Staff's opinion that this does not constitute a Subdivision because it is not a division property into 3 or more lots.

**J. Lust made a motion that finds the proposal does not constitute a Subdivision.
F. Russo seconded the motion which passed unanimously.**

5. Tidal Basin LLC & Branford Land Development, LLC-
Applicants & Owners
2,5,4-6 Indian Neck Avenue
Zoning Map Amendment-to add Food Preparation for on-site consumption as an accessory use.
Application #19-4.4
A/R & PH to be set

The Commission A/R and set a Public Hearing for 6/6/19.

6. Matthew Cassella- Applicant
Larysa Maria Cassella-Owner
11 Prospect Hill Road
Special Exception – Grading for a single family home
Application #19-4.5
A/R & PH to be set

The Commission A/R and set a Public Hearing for 6/6/19.

OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Cash Bond Establishment -19 Parish Farms Rd.-**J. Vaiuso made a motion to establish the cash bond for \$5,665.50. J. Lust seconded the motion.**
2. Cash Bond Establishment -26 Summer Island Rd-**M. Palluzzi made a motion to establish a cash bond for \$2,000.00. J. Lust seconded the motion.**
3. Cash Bond Establishment- 9 Carle Rd. –**J. Vaiuso made a motion to establish a cash bond for \$3,500.00. J. Lust seconded the motion.**
4. Planner's Report
Nothing to discuss.

The meeting adjourned at 11:08 pm.