

**MINUTES FOR ONE (1) PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

Chairman Mark Bender called to order the May 7, 2013 Public Hearing meeting of the Planning and Zoning Board at 7:30 p.m.

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Ben Gettinger, John Grant, Edward Mead (Vice Chairman); Dan Rindos, Michael Casey, Joseph DellaMonica, Jr., Tom Nichol, Mark Bender, Ward Willis (7:32)

Not Present: Jeanne Cervin

Staff: David Sulkis, City Planner; Emmeline Harrigan, Assistant City Planner; Phyllis Leggett, Board Clerk.

C. PUBLIC HEARING – Close by 6/11/2013; expires on 8/15/2013

1. **46 MELBA STREET (ZONE R-5)** Petition of Stanley Washuk for Special Permit and Coastal Area Management Site Plan Review approval to substantially improve a single family residence with construction within 25 feet of the tidal wetlands on Map 29, Block 558, Parcels 19 and 19A, of which Stanly Washuk is the owner.

Rick Raymond, Anthony Giordano Engineering, West Haven, CT. Representing Stanley Washuk who has lived at this address for 36 years. Seeking a CAM approval and Special Permit for this project. The rear deck is approximately 16 feet into the 25-foot tidal line setback. The setback presently goes through the rear portion of the existing house.

Two individual lots are being combined. The lot coverage for the house at 46 Melba Street is at 77 percent. By combining the two lots with the additions, the lot coverage will be 40.5%. There will be over a 30% increase in open space. The additions are on the side of the house; one addition at 132 SF and the other is 272 SF. The rest of the project meets all the setback requirements. The owner also proposes to put a deck at the front of the house and a small portion on the side of the house.

A new driveway will be put in. The house will have a full foundation with vents. There will be rain barrels at all the downspouts. Stockpiling of any soil will be protected from runoff at all times. No structures are being built within DEEP's jurisdiction.

Ms. Harrigan: Reviewed her summary as it concerned the CAM aspect of the construction. As a condition of approval Kristin Bellantuono requested that the three sheds that are located within the tidal wetlands area in the rear of the property be removed prior to any issuance of a Certificate of Zoning Compliance and CO.

Mr. Giordano: Agreed with that condition.

**MINUTES FOR ONE (1) PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

Chairman Bender: There being no questions from the Board, the Chair opened the hearing to the public and indicated the procedure for stating their comments.

The Chair asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of the application.

Robert Stevens, 49 Melba Street. In favor of the application.

No one to speak in opposition to the application.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Mr. Willis: Made a motion to approve the petition of Stanley Washuk for Special Permit and Coastal Area Management Site Plan Review approval to substantially improve a single family residence with construction within 25 feet of the tidal wetlands on Map 29, Block 558, Parcels 19 and 19A, of which Stanly Washuk is the owner, with the condition that three sheds in the flagged tidal wetlands area be removed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

Mr. Gettinger: Second.

All members present voted in favor of approval.

D. NEW BUSINESS

2. **30 JAMES STREET (ZONE R-5)** Petition of Thomas Lynch, Esquire for Coastal Area Management Site Plan Review approval to construct a single family residence on Map 27, Block 456, Parcel 14, of which William and Bernadette Piacitelli are the owners.

Mr. Grant recused himself from participating in this application.

Thomas Lynch, Esq., 63 Cherry Street, Milford, representing Bill Piacitelli and his wife who have owned the property since 2000. The house was destroyed in Storm Sandy and the owners who had used the property as a summer residence are rebuilding it for their year-round use. Prior to 2000 there was a single story bungalow style house that was built in the 1920s that was utilized as beach property for summer use. The intention is to build the new residence as their primary residence.

The prior house was approximately 800 SF. The proposed new house meets all the standards for the flood elevations in that zone, to level 13. It will be a three-story house with an unfinished attic with pull-down stairs for the third level. Approximately 1800 to 1900 SF.

The application was brought before the ZBA in December. Because there was greater than 50% destruction of the residence, the variances were required for setbacks. The house has virtually the same footprint as the old house.

**MINUTES FOR ONE (1) PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

The CAM application was submitted simultaneously. John Gaucher of the DEEP had some comments with regard to the lack of an anti-tracking staging area. The plans were revised to address that. There was also a concern about showing the area of the property where the materials would be removed for the construction of the foundation. Plans were revised accordingly. Engineering comments were addressed. All the department reviews have now been met.

Ms. Harrigan: Identified the DEEP requirement with regard to stockpiling materials. Kristin Bellantuono, the permitting agent wanted the stockpile eliminated from the site. All excavated materials for the foundation will be removed because they are not suitable for use as backfill. It is all peat and unstable materials.

Mr. Lynch: Stated his client was willing to do this.

Ms Harrigan: Indicated the elevations of the finger streets at Silver Sands were discussed. The elevations are not daily influenced by the tides. The DEEP will have to come up with what is to be done under these circumstances. The applications are being reviewed with the State and they are providing guidance. Because this property is below elevation 4 7, there is the possibility that the State has authorization to issue a full permit or issue authorizations.

Mr. Rindos: Made a motion to approve the petition of Thomas Lynch, Esquire for Coastal Area Management Site Plan Review approval to construct a single family residence on Map 27, Block 456, Parcel 14, of which William and Bernadette Piacitelli are the owners, with the condition of no stockpiling on the site and removal of a shed at the rear of the property.

Ms. Harrigan: Reiterated that the State has the opportunity, due to State law, to come in to the property and request a permit at any time.

Mr.Nichol: Second.

Eight members present voted in favor of approval.

(Mr. Grant returned to the meeting at 7:51.)

3. **PROSPECT STREET (ZONE MCDD)** Request by Mr. Richard Platt for an informal discussion regarding a zone change to the above-captioned street in the MCDD zone.

Chairman Bender: Explained that Mr. Platt has put in an unofficial request for a zone change. By State statute the Board can discuss it. It is not a public hearing per se, but the Board will allow some public comments. They will not be binding but the Board can have some discussion and opinions and go from there. It is not an official public hearing.

**MINUTES FOR ONE (1) PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

Richard N. Platt, 132 Platt Lane, Read a statement with regard to his thoughts and the history of Prospect Street and why he thought the street should be returned to its original zone designation. The statement was date stamped into the record.

Linda Stevenson, 67 Prospect Street. She has lived in the Peter Prudden House for 18 years. There is a national stone marker in front of her house that says, "100 feet east of the marker is the first burial ground of the borough of Milford. " It means there are ancestors buried on this property. Part of Mr. Prudden's plan was to give back part of the property to the DAR back in the early '50's, perhaps earlier.

She stated she is speaking before the Board tonight because she has lived for 18 years in this family home. It is the largest piece of property on Prospect Street at .99 acres, most of it backyard and all of it flat. She is approaching foreclosure on the property because she lost her job. Due to this situation developers have been swarming her house and have even measured the side of her yard that abuts the DAR property is. They have asked her if the house is historic; could the garage be torn down so that access could be made to the backyard for a parking lot. One person said he wanted to turn the backyard into a parking lot and make the home into a restaurant. Her house is on the National Registry. The property is historic. One developer said he would remove the pool that is not historic and make an entrance to the backyard on that side. She noted other ideas that developers had presented to her for the use of her property. Her house has been a family home for hundreds of years and would like it to stay that way within the historic district. Even though she might not be in the home in a few years, she hopes the Board will consider putting the house back to its previous zone.

Steve Rathbun, 44 Prospect Street.. Described the area known as "Jefferson Park" that leads to Prospect Street. Prospect Street has beautiful old homes as well as the DAR building. There is a big development on Prospect Street that got snuck in. The Lilypad B & B is a beautiful old home. Ask that Prospect Street be put back into any residential neighborhood other than the MCDD. The residents need that protection. Otherwise, someday people will drive into a CVS on the street and remember how it used to be. One of the best things about Milford is living downtown and be able to walk to everything downtown and still be able to live in a residential area.

Barbara Genovese, 19 Belmont Street. Vice President of Milford Preservation Trust. She cares about the historic homes and anything dealing with the history of the City of Milford. She asks the Board to seriously consider returning the street back to its original zone so as to protect the history of Milford. The decision to change the zone because someone wants to build something to their liking is wrong. The City is losing the Milford history with the development of condos and apartment complexes being built all over.

Ann Mayer, 50 Prospect St. Pointed that the Board and Staff know Prospect Street. The street has been in the news for several years. The neighbors across the street are now the neighbors across the street. It is what it is, but it does not have to continue to be that way. She referred to recent history when Lafayette Street was pulled out of the MCDD. There was a situation of spot zoning according to the memo that was circulating at that time and it did not prove to be a problem.

**MINUTES FOR ONE (1) PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

She reiterated that Milford has a gem of a downtown, which was created for everyone in Milford. She referred to the park that was mentioned previously that everyone enjoys so much. That whole neighborhood is everyone's downtown. Those who care about it and take that stewardship seriously are here tonight. She asked the Board do something and use Lafayette Street as an example and offered her assistance in any way the Board would need.

Tim Chaucer, 104 Hawley Avenue. Echoed everything that had been said. Prospect Street is probably the most historic street in the City because Peter Prudden lived there and the first settlers of Milford were buried there. It has been a residential street for over 300 years and surprisingly it was changed to the Milford Center Design District without the residents being notified. Asked the Board to give serious consideration to changing it back to its original zone designation.

Mr. Platt: Had neglected to mention there is a bed and breakfast on the street. This was established before the MCDD was established by a Special Exception. If there is one type of business or commercial use that is valid and acceptable for a residential area, it is a bed and breakfast. This is what people want who go to them. People do not want to go to an ordinary motel. They want to go to an old house on a residential street and that is the charm of these places. He has heard that the Lily Pad is a commercial use and that is a good reason to make it an MCDD. It is not a good reason to keep it the MCDD.

Esther Lusterboss, 458 Welch's Point Road. She is a DAR member at 55 Prospect Street. She brought some photos of half of Peter Prudden's well that was found on the DAR property. The Boy Scouts did some clearing of the property and found the lid to Peter Prudden's well. It is very historic. She agrees with what the other people have said about bringing the street back to its original residential zone.

Mr. Rindos: Asked what the process for changing the zone would be.

Chairman Bender: An official application would have to be submitted. The fee would be paid and it would go to a public hearing.

Asked Staff for comments.

Mr. Sulkis: Had no opinion other than the land use analysis that he had submitted.

Mr. DellaMonica: Asked if the zone was changed would that preclude the establishment of any other bed and breakfasts from opening?

Chairman Bender: Yes, that would require a Special Permit or Exception. That is one of his concerns, but you cannot have a zone that just allows bed and breakfasts.

**MINUTES FOR ONE (1) PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

Unfortunately, it could allow other things. That is what happens when you think you are protecting an area and someone finds a loophole to do something else. The next thing you know there is an argument about a business that technically fits into the regulations but does not fit into the neighborhood.

Mr. Willis: Stated he would like to see this go back to residential. Asked if the existing bed and breakfast was approved before the street became MCDD zoned.

Mr. Sulkis: Stated he did not know. That would have to be researched.

Chairman Bender: Believes it is a consensus of the people attending tonight's informal hearing, the answer is yes, but it would have to be researched to verify.

Mr. Casey to Staff: Read from Mr. Sulkis' memo and asked if a house or property is designated as historic that it cannot be touched regardless of its designation?

Mr. Sulkis: The amount of protection that a property has as a single family zone vs. the MCDD or any commercial zone is not any different. The MCDD does include design standards that residential zones do not have. Also, residential zones allow more than just plain residences. You can do a lot of other things that are commercial in nature in a residential zone. It is not strictly for residences.

Also, the point of a land use analysis is that for the most part, other than four properties, the horse has left the barn. The properties do not qualify to go back to a residential zone. They do not meet the qualifications. They would all be nonconforming and the Board, by its own regulations, cannot create nonconformities.

Chairman Bender: One of the concerns of the people who would like to go back ---

(The Chair deferred to Mr. Platt)

Mr. Platt: If there is no difference between a residential area and the MCDD as far as what can be built there, he still wonders why it was that when this apartment complex was proposed, told the Prospect Street group spoke to some of the members of the zoning board who were sympathetic to the group, but said their hands were tied. This is the way it is zoned. The Board cannot do anything about it. If it was residential, could they have done something about it?

Chairman Bender: There are differences in the two zones.

Mr. Sulkis: There are use differences. Mr. Platt is correct that if it was an R-12.5, the kind of development that took place there could not take place. But under an R-12.5 or an R-5, or another residential zone, you can put in hospitals, libraries, or different types of commercial businesses in that zone that are not residential.

Chairman Bender: Stated he did not think it will solve everything by going over to the MCDD or back to the residential. He thinks the concerns that were stated will not clear the issue.

**MINUTES FOR ONE (1) PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

The concerns he is hearing are: "How did it happen before?"; "If it was the other way it would not have happened." Not having been on the Board at that time he cannot go back and know that answer, but he does not know that right now changing it back is going to solve the serious concerns that the group has.

This is an informal hearing and he would like to make sure that if the Board were to do something, it would truly be addressing the concerns and solve the problem. Not just go to another zone and think the problem was solved and then open the door for another problem and not solve the groups.

Mr. Chaucer: Stated Milford has existed for several hundred years without zoning, so people could end up with a pig farm next to their home, etc. But at a certain point in time, around 1930, the thought was it would be nice to keep the commercial in one area and the residential in another area. Prospect Street was a residential zone. As far as the bed and breakfast, a Special Permit could allow another bed and breakfast. The idea that residential zones allowing all kinds of things, if he heard correctly, negates the whole concept of zoning. There is a zoning board, so make the zones stand for what they were intended to stand for.

Ms. Harrigan: Added, in terms of historic preservation, a designation as a National Trust property is intended to be a celebration of whatever deems that particular structure historic. It is not a penalty to the property owner in terms of never being able to tear down that house. That should be very clear to the Board. There are opportunities when you have a National Trust designation where you can get tax credits for rehab. But there is nothing that prevents the demolition of a National Trust property unless it is in a district. That is something the Board should understand. If somebody owns the structure and wants to preserve it that is the best protection of all

Mr. Platt: Mr. Platt agreed with what Ms. Harrigan said. The National Register designation does nothing to protect the property. However, the State of Connecticut has an Environmental Protection Act which protects the State's resources and they specifically include National Register properties in the designation of protected properties. Any person in Connecticut has the standing to bring suit to prevent the destruction of the State's resources and that includes National Register properties.

Chairman Bender: Asked what the difference was between National Trust and National Register.

Ms. Harrigan: It is National Register.

Ms. Stevenson: She is one of the co-founders of the Preservation Trust. One of the reasons they were able to save the John Downs house is because the State of Connecticut and the City chipped in and helped them save it because they could not destroy that piece of property because it was on the National Register and it is an historic home. That is why the State of Connecticut has laws to protect homes and some of the property. The ground might be able to be used for something else, but the standing facility, the home itself, cannot be destroyed. That is in the State regulations.

**MINUTES FOR ONE (1) PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

Barbara Genovese: Mr. Sulkis mentioned that if Prospect Street were to be transferred back to the prior zoning, that there would be nonconforming lots. Stated those properties could be grandfathered back to the original zoning.

Chairman Bender: The Board understands the feelings of those who spoke tonight. More research has to be done in order to understand what happened. We will get back to Mr. Platt as to the next move, if any.

He thanked those persons who came in to speak and express their concerns.

3. **1201 BOSTON POST ROAD (ZONE SCD)** Petition of John Knuff, Esq. for an Amendment to a Special Permit and Site Plan Review Revision approval of tenant signage on Map 78, 79, 89; Blocks 811 and 812; Parcels 40A/A, 32, 40C, 13A, of which The Connecticut Post Limited Partnership is the owner.

John Knuff, Esq., 147 Broad Street, Milford, representing Connecticut Post Limited Partnership and Connecticut Post Mall. This is a very straightforward site plan amendment application to amend the approval that the Board gave the Mall for the Buy-Buy Baby retail store last October. The purpose is to add a 135 SF sign to the Post Road parking deck. The sign will be facing the Post Road and the exterior entrance to the store is located at the rear of the Mall to act as direction into the proper Mall entrance to reach Buy-Buy Baby, as well as letting the world know that this new tenant is in the Mall.

He described Buy-Buy Baby as an upscale children's accessory store. Approximately 30,000 SF. This will be their first store in Connecticut and the first store located in a mall. All others are stand alone or part of a strip center. It is a coup for the Mall to obtain them as a tenant. This store will energize the other end of the Mall where LA Fitness is located. This is only the second time since the expansion of the Mall in 2004 that a request such as this is being made.

He explained the advantage to the customers wanting to visit the store and the sign acts as a direction for them. He reviewed the signage of other Boston Post Road properties and shopping centers that have multiple signage for each tenant. They have individual wall signs and signs on the front pylons. Milford Marketplace is such an example. Except for anchor stores the smaller stores in the mall are not listed and do not have signage. The Mall is the most undersigned retail development in the City. There is no pylon sign that lists all the tenants. The Mall is between 3-4% of the mall wall area with signage, far below the permitted 10%. He named all the stores on the Post Road that have multiple signage for tenants. The small stores at the mall do not have wall signage. The anchors do.

Asking for 138 SF for signage on the Post Road deck, where there is more traffic than any other mall entrance areas.

He noted that Mr. Sulkis did not like the idea of this wall signage and stated there was a policy that you could only place a sign on a wall that is contiguous with the tenant.

**MINUTES FOR ONE (1) PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

That is an unwritten policy that the Mall has embraced, but the Board has demonstrated that it does not have a rigid adherence to that policy where it makes sense not to do so. There have been cases where the board has approved wall signage not contiguous with a tenant. The Borders sign is gone. It has been 7 years since there has been a request for wall signage.

Chairman Bender: Asked why there are Buy Buy Baby signs at the mall now?

Mr. Knuff: He believes Buy Buy Baby or its sign people decided to hang temporary banners to tell the public about the store's arrival. He understands it is not permitted.

Mr. Sulkis: Had no comment. He stood by his report on the application.

Mr. Bender: Asked why the Mall does not have a pylon sign like the other shopping centers.

Mr. Sulkis: They actually have multiple pylon signs but they like to advertise Westfield and that is what is on the pylons.

Mr. Knuff explained the reasoning behind the location of the sign and the way people enter the Mall to locate a store in the Mall. In 2006 the Board allowed Borders, Target and Dick's and it is appropriate here.

Chairmen Bender: Said he would like to see a written policy on this but there does not appear to be one, other than a gentlemen's agreement that has on occasion been altered.

Mr. DellaMonica: Thought the store signage at the front of the mall was contrary to the reasoning that people will be directed to Buy-Buy Bay when the store is located at the rear of the mall. Thought the sign would be better served at the rear of the mall facing where I-95 traffic would see it.

Mr. Knuff: The sign is being placed at the Boston Post Road because it will lead directly to the Mall entrance which is directly across from the interior entrance to Buy-Buy Baby. It does provide direction to the store.

Ms. Harrigan: Asked about cart return on that side for parking at the structure. Items purchased in the store could be very large and heavy.

Mr. Knuff: Assumes the store will have staff to monitor front and rear parking lots.

Mr. Nichol: Asked about the location of the store in proximity to parking areas in the front and rear of the mall.

Mr. Knuff: The store is located at the back portion of the Mall. Once people know where the store is located, they will know where to park upon their return to the store.

**MINUTES FOR ONE (1) PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

Mr. Rindos: Asked how the size of Buy-Buy Baby compared to the smaller stores in the mall.

Mr. Knuff: The store is considered the next level down after the anchor stores.

Mr. Rindos: Will there be a sign on the wall where the entrance to the store is?

Mr. Knuff: Yes. It will have its own entrance with a sign. This was approved by the Board last October.

Chairman Bender: Do other stores ask to have the same sign privilege?

Mr. Knuff: Yes, but Westfield rejects the vast majority of the tenants that request signage.

Mr. Gettinger: Asked if there were any known safety issues?

Mr. Knuff: No. Thinks it would be a safety benefit as people will know where they are going.

Mr. Mead: Asked how large the signs were that were put up in violation of the regulations.

Mr. Knuff: Did not know the exact size, but they exceed what is permitted.

Chairman Bender: The Board does not like when things are done without permission.

George Gianquinto, Vice President, Westfield Mall. LA Fitness asked to have another sign but was rejected. Buy-Buy Baby is owned by Bed Bath and Beyond across the street, which has enormous signage at their property. They wanted even more signage at the Mall and were told it was against policy. People coming through the main entrance will see Panera, Ulta, Target, etc. This is the first shopping center store for Buy-Buy Baby. Their signage is very important to their customers.

Chairman Bender: Asked why this signage was not requested at the time the application for the store came before the Board.

Mr. Gianquinto: Negotiations were still ongoing and the lease had not been completed.

Chairman Bender: Asked if LA Fitness would come back to ask for more signage.

Mr. Gianquinto: The signage agreements are in the lease.

Mr. Gettinger: Made a motion to approve the petition of John Knuff, Esq. for an Amendment to a Special Permit and Site Plan Review Revision approval of tenant signage on Map 78, 79, 89; Blocks 811 and 812; Parcels 40A/A, 32, 40C, 13A, of which

**MINUTES FOR ONE (1) PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

The Connecticut Post Limited Partnership is the owner with the condition the two illegal signs be removed one day from tonight.

Mr. Mead: Second.

Eight Board members voted in favor. Joseph DellaMonica: Voted against.

E. PUBLIC HEARING – Closed 4/16/2013; expires on 7/11/201

4. **143 HILLSIDE AVENUE (ZONE R-5)** – Petition of Edward Jones for Special Exception and Site Plan Review approval to raise a two-family dwelling out of the flood plain on Map 49, Block 795, Parcel 82, of which Edward Jones is the owner.

Chairman Bender: Discussion on this application to allow a two family house in a one family district.

Mr. Rindos: Said he saw both sides of the situation and was confused as to which way to go.

Mr. Mead: Also has mixed feelings on this. If the house was not damaged before the hurricane and they decided to raise it for preventive maintenance, they could have done it and it would still be a two-family. Now that it is substantially damaged more than 50% it is supposed to be changed from a two-family to a one family. It's confusing.

Mr. Casey: The property has been a two family since the 1920's. It is a pre-existing nonconforming use. It has not been abandoned. It was damaged and taken down. He looks at the law concerning preexisting nonconforming as allowing the homeowner with the vested right to repair that. It is not consistent with the regulations but he thinks some of the case law lease has within the spirit of that gives them a vested right to do that. The homeowner did not violate its own regulations when it was rented as a two-family. He thinks they should have the right to rebuild and rent it as a two-family.

Chairman Bender: There are people on the street who will be coming back based on what is being done tonight.

Mr. Casey: Responded that there are already a lot of two-family homes in the area. This house does not stick out as being uniquely different from other houses in that area. He does not disrupt the comprehensive scheme of the area.

Chairman Bender: Asked how many two families are currently on the street.

Attorney Smith: To his knowledge four houses.

Mr. Sulkis: There will be other properties throughout the city that face the same situation that will be coming to the Board.

Chairman Bender: Noted there had been prior discussions around the time of Storm Irene

**MINUTES FOR ONE (1) PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

regarding approval of pre-existing conditions if the house was rebuilt on the same footprint and the house was nonconforming, it had to come into conformance. Not sure that anything was ever done on this.

Mr. Sulkis: The regulations say that the applicant has to come before the Board with a Special Exception because it is a new two-family house. It's up to the Board.

Mr. Mead: As a Special Exception the Board has a right to review each application on its own merits.

Also noted, if the house was totally destroyed as a two-family and they were going to rebuild it then they would definitely have to make it a one-family, but at this time it is still workable as a two-family.

Ms. Harrigan: Verified that was true because they would lose the nonconformity.

Mr. DellaMonica: In favor of letting the applicant rebuild because the rebuilding is due to the storm. The Board just completed the Plan of Conservation and Development. which stated the City is looking for housing that is affordable. If this is made a one family home on the beach it will not be a rental property that someone can afford and will be bumped up to a high mortgage payment. He believes some of the properties in that area should be kept affordable.

Chairman Bender: Had a similar thought along with minimizing density. He does not think he would want to live next to a rental which is usually not kept as well as a single family owner.

Mr. Sulkis: Suggested the front façade could be modified to look like a single family and inside lead to two apartments.

Mr. Jones' son: Due to raising of the property the house will not look like a two-family house. There will be two doors on the side.

The Board looked at the plans.

Mr. Gettinger: Made a motion to approve the application for 143-145 Hillside Avenue, petition of Edward Jones for Special Exception and Site Plan Review approval to raise a two-family dwelling out of the flood plain on Map 49, Block 795, Parcel 82, of which Edward Jones is the owner

Mr. Casey: Second.

All members voted in favor of approval.

F. REGULATION CHANGES – Parking, Rear Lots, Variance – Discussion

Chairman Bender: Noted he cancelled the meeting due to attendance issues. Postponed it to the next meeting on May 21st. Plan to have information to bring to the

**MINUTES FOR ONE (1) PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

full board. The parking regulations are scheduled for public hearing at the next meeting as well.

G. LIAISON REPORTS

Mr. Casey: The Board of Aldermen passed all the 8-24s the Planning and Zoning Board had approved: the sidewalk easement, Junior Major League fence and equipment storage for the sewer project.

Chairman Bender: Asked if the BOA had discussed the lease and contracts for the Junior League fence.

Mr. Casey: They did. It was clarified that the Junior Major League was in control of the fence and had the obligation and the liability. There is an exclusion for the Oyster Festival for three days.

H. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – (4/16/2013)

Mr. Grant: Made a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting.

Mr. DellaMonica: Second.

All members voted in favor of approving the Minutes.

I. CHAIR'S REPORT

The Chair signed three lot line adjustments: 1) 1519 Second Avenue; 2) 10 Wildwood Avenue and 3) 139 North Street / 849 Boston Post Road (Downs House)

The POCD books are being printed.

J. STAFF REPORT - None

Mr. Gettinger: Made a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Rindos: Second.

All members voted to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

Phyllis Leggett
Phyllis Leggett, Board Clerk