

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING  
HELD BY THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
LINCOLN CENTER HEARING ROOM  
MARCH 29, 2023**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

In Person: James R. Stevenson, Chair  
Robert Haley, Vice Chair  
Edward Slegeski  
Sandra DeCampos

**ALTERNATES PRESENT:**

In Person: Kevin Hood  
Electronically: Linda Harris, Sitting

**ABSENT:** Keshet Spadaccini, Secretary  
Harun Ahmed

**STAFF PRESENT:**

In Person: Megan Pilla, Principal Development Planner  
Electronically: James Davis, Zoning Enforcement Officer  
Nancy Martel, Recording Secretary

The Chair opened the Public Hearing at 7:00 P.M. The Secretary read the legal notice for the application when the call was made.

**JESSE FERNANDEZ** – Application #ZSE-0001-2022 – Request a special exception under Art. II, Sec. 26.04 to allow a child day care center at 346 Middle Turnpike West, Form-Based zone.

Mr. Jesse Fernandez, 350 Hartford Road, introduced himself. Mr. Fernandez stated that the business intends to move the location to 346 Middle Turnpike West.

He explained that their business is a local, family-owned day care operated by himself and his wife, Julissa. The business has operated since 2015; prior to that, Ms. Fernandez operated a home day care. They provide services to low-income families. The current property was recently sold, and the new owner is raising the rent, prompting them to look for a new location. Mr. Fernandez reported that they sought to stay in Manchester because they serve 24 families, but the proposed location is not zoned for day care.

Mr. Fernandez remarked that he has been working with Ms. Pilla, the Planning Department, and the Fire Marshal. Their business has been in good standing with all the inspections, both State and local.

Hours of operation will be from 7:30 A.M. to 5:45 P.M. There are a total of six employees and Mr. Fernandez. Additional staff will be added if they are able to open at the new location. There are currently 24 children enrolled and they could bring their capacity to 30 in the new site.

Mr. Fernandez stated that they do not expect any traffic impact. They hope to stay within a reasonable proximity to a bus line for those who utilize buses. In addition, there will be no impact on utilities and there is a surveillance system and fire system.

The landlord of this location will allow the installation of a playground, which will not obstruct traffic or parking. The playground will be enclosed by a 4 ft. tall fence with barrier protectors around the fencing. Mr. Fernandez detailed the drop-off and pick-up plan.

Mr. Fernandez explained the confusion about the floor plans. The Health Department did an initial review of the floor plans and stated that they needed a separate mop closet for cleaning and chemical storage. Based on the Fire Marshal's recommendations, fire barrier walls will be constructed inside.

Mr. Haley asked where the rear entrance leads into. Mr. Fernandez responded that the rear entrance will be a vacant area. They will take the front side in hopes of expanding into the back area. The landlord will add an additional rear egress.

Mr. Haley asked for clarification on the doors. He understood that there will be two doors in the front. According to Mr. Fernandez, a rear door will be constructed for the rear egress.

Mr. Stevenson interjected that the Board is looking for greater detail on the exit. He inquired whether the children would be led out through office space. Mr. Fernandez explained that the rear is now fully open.

Mr. Haley asked if there is a timeline for the installation of the door. Mr. Fernandez noted that door must be in place when the State does an inspection.

Referring to the playground, Mr. Haley inquired about the material to be used. Mr. Fernandez reported that it will be rubber mulch on top of the asphalt, which is certified by the State. He reiterated that there will be fencing around the playground.

Mr. Haley requested detail on how the children will be moved to the playground and how many adults will be escorting them. Mr. Fernandez pointed to the drawing and explained the procedure. For every four children, there must be a teacher or assistant when the children are being led out. He also explained that there will be no parking in that area.

Pointing out the dumpster, Mr. Haley noted that there are no gates on the front. Mr. Fernandez explained that the children will be unable to leave the playground area. They intend to install vinyl fencing which will prevent the children from climbing. There will also be bollards for protection.

Mr. Stevenson asked whether the Board needs more detail of the play area, with which Ms. Pilla agreed. Mr. Fernandez stated that he will provide more detail.

Mr. Slegeski referred to the back page, Staff review. He acknowledged the child play area, the back doorway, and two comments about the kitchen and the utility closet. Staff mentioned that, as of that writing, the plan had not been submitted.

Ms. Pilla reported that the Planning Department received new plans yesterday and this morning, which is why they are not in the packet. Staff has not had a chance to fully review the new plans, since they were just received.

Mr. Stevenson speculated that it may be in the Board's best interest to continue the application.

Ms. Pilla replied that, if the Board is inclined to keep the Public Hearing open until the next meeting, that would give Staff time to review the documents recently received. She noted that Staff is still awaiting a more detailed plan of the playground area itself, and this will give the applicant time to submit that as well.

Mr. Stevenson referred to the rear portion of the space, which the applicant is not leasing, and speculated whether someone could rent it. He asked how that would affect the rear egress. Mr. Fernandez stated that, in the lease, the landlord will not be able to rent that space.

Mr. Stevenson requested more detail about the rear space. He additionally requested the reason for the special exception, what other locations were investigated, and how they settled on this particular location.

Mr. Fernandez remarked that they had scoured the entire town themselves and with a realtor. None of the vacant spots were workable, due to lack of parking and area for a playground, and they cannot afford to build a new building.

Mr. Hood asked whether the playground material is loose or solid. Mr. Fernandez responded that it is loose. He explained how they currently handle loose material being kicked around.

Mr. Hood informed the applicant that the egress must be lit. Mr. Fernandez reported that he met with the Fire Marshal and the Building Department; they explained what will be required.

Mr. Slegeski stated that, in fairness to the Board and the applicant, he determined it would be appropriate to continue this application.

**MOTION:** Mr. Slegeski moved to continue the public hearing on this application. Ms. DeCampos seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**DR. WILLIAM SPECTOR** – Application #VAR-0043-2023 - Request a variance of Art. II, Sec. 3.01.01 to allow a generator approximately 11 feet from the side property line (15 feet required) at 81 Grissom Road, Residence AA zone.

Ms. Danielle Chartier, representing Dr. Spector, introduced herself. Ms. Chartier reported that regulations changed from a 15 ft. setback and she, unfortunately, was not aware of that change. She noted that they submitted an application for the permit and the gas company submitted for their permit. The gas company received approval. She stated that her company set the generator, and the gas company hooked up the generator and got a passing permit. According to Ms. Chartier, when they called to have the final inspection, they were told that the permit now must go through Zoning.

When inquiring why they need to go through Zoning, Ms. Chartier stated that they were told it must meet a 15 ft. setback. According to the Town's online mapping, if drawing a line from the side of the house to the property line, it appears to come up at approximately 17 ft. from the side of the house. They allotted approximately 2 ft. for the chimney and 2 ft. required in clearance from the chimney to the back side of the generator. The generator is approximately 2 ft. and the distance to the property line is 11 ft. They did not retain a land surveyor because of the cost already expended.

Ms. Chartier reported that the placement of the generator is the best location due to safety. Factors that need to be checked include carbon monoxide intake concerns, allowable distance to combustibles, window clearances, and sources of ignition. They must meet NEC code, as well as the installation requirements for the generators. The distance to the neighbors' homes is more than 40 ft., the generator is not obtrusive from the street, and the exhaust direction was taken into consideration. They are asking for the generator to remain in place, as the alternate locations are not in the best interest of the homeowner for safety reasons.

Mr. Haley sought confirmation that Ms. Chartier is testifying that this is the safest place for the generator, which Ms. Chartier confirmed.

Mr. Slegeski asked why the generator was not placed on the other side of the house. He speculated that it could have been placed on the left or rear of the house.

Ms. Chartier reported that the other side of the house is not an economical setting. The driveway and garage are on that side, and the availability to access the electrical service and getting it to the other side of the house along with gas was an exponential cost and not a good fit for meeting the variances for the NEC code in terms of window variances, openings, and combustibles.

Ms. DeCampos observed that, when reviewing the hardship, additional cost to the homeowner is not relevant, but the safety issue is.

**ORFORD VILLAGE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION** – Application #VAR-0044-2023 – Request a use variance of Art. II, Sec. 4.01 to construct 4 senior multi-family units at 190 North Elm Street, Residence A zone.

Mr. Alan Lamson, Architect, FLB Architecture and Planning, introduced himself. Mr. Lamson reported that they are the architects for Orford Village Housing Development Corporation, which owns the property at 190 North Elm Street.

The site was approved in 1985, noted Mr. Lamson, by the Planning & Zoning Commission when it was owned by the Town of Manchester. This particular property belonged to one of the Crockett families, who donated it to the Town of Manchester with the explicit instructions that it be used for the construction of elderly housing. If, within a certain period of time, it was not constructed for elderly housing, it was to revert to a park. The Town of Manchester went before the Planning & Zoning Commission and received approval for the site plan before the Board, which included 24 elderly housing units and retained the existing house.

At the time of the approval, the property was zoned Residence A, which it remains. Mr. Lamson explained that, at that time, there was a provision in the Residence A regulations that allowed the approval by the Planning & Zoning Commission of multi-family by special exception. The approval was for the 24 units shown on the plan, retaining the house. Since that time, stated Mr. Lamson, the regulations have changed multiple times, with new multi-family and elderly housing zones being created. As that occurred, the special exception provision in the Residence A zone was removed.

When the Town actually constructed the project, they only constructed 20 units. The four units not constructed were pointed out on the site plan. The current situation is that the area toward the west side of the property is used by the tenants now as an open green space. Mr. Lamson reported that the reason the four units were not put there is that the Town wanted to retain the house for the caretaker; they did not want the house removed and all four units could not be placed, leaving two in the middle.

When Orford Village Housing Development Corporation purchased the property with all the rights to the property, stated Mr. Lamson, they purchased it to operate and maintain it. He reported that Orford Village has done a tremendous job renovating the units. They would like to construct the other four units on the property, but do not want to put the two units on the west side and destroy the green space. Prior to Orford Village purchasing the property, the existing house was demolished by the Town.

Mr. Lamson reported that, after reviewing all the options with the Planning Department, to apply for a zone change to either elderly housing or one of the other zones, in every single instance, the units currently there would violate the provisions of those zoning regulations and create nonconformities. Therefore, the decision was made to remain Residence A; they would construct the new building on North Elm Street and observe the front yard 25 ft. setback that has been in place since 1985. However, currently four units cannot be built in the Residence A zone, though it meets all requirements.

Mr. Lamson referred to the site plan and detailed the four units and parking areas. New sidewalks will be constructed that will not only connect the parking to the units, but also across the front of the new building on North Elm Street, connecting the existing sidewalk.

Mr. Stevenson asked if the four units could be built based on the original plan without coming before the Board. Mr. Lamson replied that they could not, because the site plan approval that went with the special exception, by statute, has expired.

Mr. Andrew Bushnell, Professional Engineer and Licensed Land Surveyor with Bushnell Associates, introduced himself. Mr. Bushnell reported that they prepared the site plan displayed in this meeting.

Mr. Bushnell detailed the site plan regarding utilities, parking, catch basin and parking regulations. He reported on gas onsite, water, sewer, electrical, telephone and cable.

Mr. Lamson offered that this is the only property in the neighborhood with elderly housing and a previous approval for four more units. This may be the only Residence A piece of property in the town of Manchester that has approval for four more units on it. The existing buildings on the site are small scale residential, Cape Cod appearance, simple structures. The new building will be similar in design, though slightly larger for handicap accessibility. As these buildings will be smaller than those in the neighborhood, they do not believe they will change the character of the neighborhood. When Orford Village purchased the property, they had every expectation that they could build the four units, only to be informed the approvals had expired. Mr. Lamson reported that the four units to be constructed will help with the management of the property.

Mr. Haley sought confirmation that this is strictly elderly housing, which Mr. Lamson confirmed. Mr. Haley asked whether Orford Village is for profit and Mr. Lamson reported it is non-profit. Mr. Haley asked who makes the decision on who is accepted as tenants and Mr. Lamson responded it is the management.

Mr. Michael Grant, with the management company, introduced himself. He explained that there is an application process followed by screening of the applicant, picture ID, and Social Security cards for identification. They will go through a credit and background check. Reasons for rejection would be prior evictions, unfavorable credit, unfavorable landlord verification and criminal history. There is an income to rent ratio of 40% income/rent minimum. Mr. Grant reported that they do allow pets, with a 50 lb. maximum on dogs, and cats are restricted to indoor cats. He added that they require updated vaccination records from veterinarians as well as licenses.

Mr. Haley asked whether this qualifies as affordable housing. Mr. Grant responded that, when Orford Village purchased the property from the Town of Manchester, they were required to keep their rents at 85% of the published HUD fair market rents on an annual basis.

After a question from Mr. Haley about the State standard, Mr. Grant responded that he was not familiar with State requirements.

Mr. Stevenson assumed that would be comparable with the Manchester Housing Authority in terms of rents. Mr. Grant responded that some Manchester Housing Authority rents are subsidized. He stated that they have some residents that receive housing choice vouchers, but they are mobile vouchers and nothing project based.

Mr. Stevenson asked whether it would be comparable to the Housing Authority in terms of operation. Mr. Grant responded that there are many different programs, some of which require

tax credits and below-market rents, but they are restricted by the deed restriction signed upon purchase.

Mr. Haley speculated why two bedrooms are needed in elderly only housing. He was concerned about long-term visitors.

Mr. Grant stated that there may be a medical issue with a married couple that necessitates a two bedroom. In addition, there may be visitors. It is really a personal choice.

Ms. DeCampos related her personal experience with the Housing Authority.

Mr. Stevenson sought clarification of what was approved in 1985 vs. today. He assumed that the parking lot would be where the house was, which Mr. Lamson confirmed. The footprint of the two units is obviously an expansion of where the four units will be built.

Mr. Lamson reported that the units proposed are slightly larger than the previous units because they need the space to meet ADA requirements. Generally, he said, they are the same size, and they are putting those four units in front of the building that has four units.

Ms. Pilla reported one outstanding comment from Staff review, which the applicant is aware of. It relates to relocating a retaining wall to maintain a proper clearance from a nearby water line. That is the only outstanding comment that requires a revision to the plan, and if the Board was so inclined, that could be a modification to an approval.

Ms. Jennifer Wright, 214 North Elm Street, introduced herself. Ms. Wright stated that she owns and lives at 214 North Elm Street and objects to the commercial construction on the Residence A zoned lot adjoining her property. She commented on environmental issues: There was previously a single-family home on the site at 208 North Elm Street, built well before the 1950s, which was demolished. Her concern is that, when the site is excavated, the residual asbestos, lead paint, etc. will become airborne. The Town allows the demolition contractors to crush and leave a portion of the demolition in place and her concern is the airborne contaminants and what guarantees will be provided to the neighborhood.

Ms. Wright noted that the plans are calling for 10 ft. of side yard from a proposed parking lot, which will be 10 ft. from her property line. It will be directly outside her dining room window with cars and headlights into her dining room. Currently, the parking lots are well lit at night and the new parking lot will provide constant light, which is a privacy issue. She also noted the gas fumes from residents' vehicles and emergency vehicles. Fire, Ambulance, and Greater Hartford Transit Authority vans will be running 20 ft. from her kitchen and dining room. It will encroach on her home and will diminish the quality of life. If the proposed commercial project on a Residence A lot is built, it will impact her quality of life on a daily basis. One of her decisions that factored into the purchase of her home was the residential lot open space and the buffer provided from the apartments, which maintains a certain level of distance and privacy. Currently, the first building is toward the back of her house and not invasive to her property.

Ms. Wright reported that the Ansaldo Company was on the property recently, digging and testing soil. She was surprised to see that was allowed prior to this hearing. When she inquired why they were digging, she was told she had no choice in the matter.

Although the housing is zoned for elderly housing, Ms. Wright noted that there are children onsite, apparently to be watched by grandparents during the day during the school year and more frequently during summer breaks.

Ms. Wright reported that the Notice of Hearing signage has been laying on the ground since it was delivered. It was never put into the ground, resulting in no one reading the sign. She stated that she has pictures with times and dates and that the neighborhood was never correctly given notice, which seems to be an attempt to keep the hearing under wraps.

Regarding quality of life, according to Ms. Wright, vehicles entering the proposed parking lot 10 ft. from her property will result in headlights shining directly into the house through the dining room, living room and kitchen windows. Sidewalk and parking area lighting currently goes on at dusk and remains on all night. Building this 10 ft. from her home will create light pollution. Increasing the volume of renters in the proposed complex by an additional 20% will increase the inherent problems, directly affecting their right to quiet enjoyment of their home and quality of life. Additionally, ice melt and other residual parking lot residue from cars and trucks will be plowed and/or snowblown off the parking lots and piled onto the property from the landscape service. The grade of the yard is lower to the south and the west than the proposed parking area. With a 10 ft. side yard, the landscape company will pile the snow, ice melt and other debris onto the 10 ft. wide area between the parking lot and the yards. The landscape company already snowblows this type of material in the yards from the sidewalk.

Ms. Wright commented that the longest open side of the proposed parking lot is against her property line. The landscape company pushes and piles the snow where there are no buildings present. This will create runoff from this proposed commercial complex expansion onto and across the yards of all the lower-lying properties going downhill. There is no consideration as to how the snow removal will be undertaken and has been historically handled on the property line between 214 North Elm Street and the former 208 North Elm Street property.

Regarding noise pollution, Ms. Wright stated that the Greater Hartford Transit District buses with a weight capacity of more than 10,000 lbs. pick up and drop off between the hours of 5:30 A.M. to as late as 10:00 P.M. The vans are equipped with back-up warning devices. The volume of these devices is a minimum of 97-112 dB, which can be heard through the walls of their house clearly, even at well over 100 ft. away from the current parking area.

The Manchester Fire Department and the Eighth District Fire Department, according to Ms. Wright, sometimes send two different fire trucks for one call, and have probably made more than 75 visits with full-sized fire trucks and supervisory vehicles in the last year to the complex providing paramedic support. Again, with lights on and diesel engines running for the duration, the calls are most likely 911 and always seem to be on site with ambulances. The ambulances also back into the complex with the previously mentioned high dB backup warning alarms.



Ms. Wright concluded that putting the proposed complex 10 ft. from her home would certainly disrupt their right to privacy and quiet enjoyment of their home, negatively affecting their ability to sleep and their quality of life. Though she has heard many comments about the benefits to the residents of the Orford Village community, she feels not much consideration has been taken for the residents in the surrounding area, especially with the parking lot 10 ft. from her property line.

Mr. Haley asked Ms. Wright, if this was reversed, with the house behind her and the parking lot further away, if would that be acceptable.

Ms. Wright stated that, if it was behind her and the parking lot was not 10 ft., in a different area, it might be a different story.

Mr. Haley asked if Ms. Wright would be satisfied if the houses were where the parking lot is and the parking lot were where the houses were.

Ms. Wright remarked that she would not want the houses that close to her either.

Mr. Haley stated that, in the Residence A zone, a regular house could go in there.

Ms. Wright commented that it could, but it would be a house, not four more units with a parking lot next to a house.

Mr. Haley assumed the parking lot is Ms. Wright's biggest concern, which Ms. Wright confirmed.

Mr. Stevenson requested that Mr. Davis speak to the concern from the neighbor regarding the demolition, the signage, and the soil testing that is already being performed before approval.

Mr. Davis responded that, regarding the demolition, he will check with the chief building official, but he believes the health code allows for clean fill to be buried onsite from a demolition.

Mr. Stevenson clarified his question.

Mr. Davis acknowledged that not all dust can be contained. He went on to describe the various methods that should be employed during the process. Soil testing is permitted without a permit.

Ms. Pilla stated that the sign was posted, and they have a photo from the day it was posted. However, it is not routinely checked, so if the sign fell, she cannot speak to that. She confirmed that it was posted, letters were sent to abutters, and the notice was published online and in the newspaper.

Mr. Lamson reported that, when the house was filled in, it was filled with earthen material. It is his understanding that the material from the house itself was hauled away. The foundation is still there, and they recognize that they will have to remove all or a part of it. When reviewing the site plan on this particular property, the entire site flows away to the northwest, away from 214 North

Elm Street. When the project is complete, all the drainage in the parking lot flows to the northwest, away from North Elm Street and away from the adjacent property. The flow will be captured in a catch basin at that corner, so anything on the parking lot would flow into that catch basin, which would flow into a subsurface system to absorb the water.

Mr. Lamson explained that, when the parking was laid out, all the parking spaces faced away from the abutting property.

Mr. Stevenson observed that the lighting is currently on all night, which was confirmed.

Mr. Lamson stated that, in this parking lot, they can do lower fixtures and cutoff, which could not be done in 1985.

Mr. Stevenson asked whether there will be any high fencing around the area. Mr. Lamson stated that they were not planning to, but they could. He stated that they could put fencing on the side between there and the adjacent property. They would probably add landscaping as well, so if the fence was near the parking lot, the south side of the fence could be landscaped.

Mr. Stevenson inquired about the transit buses.

Mr. Grant explained that many elderly residents use public transit or municipal services. He acknowledged the sound transmitted when the vehicles are in reverse. Additionally, the vehicles are left running when picking up/dropping off people. He was unaware of the hours the transportation vehicles operate.

Mr. Lamson reported that they would be willing to restrict Greater Hartford Transit from using the new parking area. The individuals in the two proposed units can easily go to the sidewalk and walk to the existing parking, which is north of the building.

Mr. Haley asked whether any consideration was given to relocating the parking lot. Mr. Lamson stated there was, but the grading made it difficult to access the parking and meet all the accessibility requirements with the sloping of the sidewalks.

Mr. Stevenson speculated about putting the units where the original two units were, in the open space. Mr. Lamson explained the difficulty with that possibility.

Mr. Haley asked whether there was a demand that led to this increase. Mr. Lamson reported that there is a long list waiting for this property.

Mr. Steve Garofalo spoke on behalf of Jen Wright, 214 North Elm Street. He noted that the properties to the south and west are lower than the proposed parking lot. There is nowhere to pile snow except to the south. He acknowledged that Mr. Lamson addressed rainwater, but they are speaking about debris from the parking lot, ice melt and snow piled into the 10 ft. very small area between the curb of the parking area and the property line. The house at 214 North Elm Street is 10 ft. from the property line.

**BDC INVESTMENTS LLC** – Application #VAR-0045-2023 – Request a use variance from Art. II, Sec. 15.01.01(m) to convert the existing dentist office into a residential unit at 12 Myrtle Street (a.k.a. 12B Myrtle Street), Central Business District zone.

Mr. Kyle French introduced himself. Mr. French stated that he is speaking about the previously used dental space at 12 Myrtle Street, a property he co-owns and manages. He stated that they feel the best use for this unit is as a residential unit and not as a commercial unit. It is currently in a business district zone and has traditionally been used as a mixed-use property with three residential units and one commercial unit. However, on the Assessor's database, it is listed as a four-unit residential multi-family building, with no reference to a commercial space in that building. He noted that it is not the typical commercial space, as it is not located on Main Street. It is located on Myrtle Street, which is a road that leads into a residential neighborhood across from a park. On the outside, no one would assume it is a commercial space.

Mr. French stated that this building has been vacant for some time. In addition, the demand for residential space is very high and the supply is very low. With the recent shift to individuals opting to work from home, there has been less need for commercial space. Many commercial spaces have been having trouble filling their buildings, with tenants leaving for smaller places or moving to work from home.

There is also an issue with the Fire Marshal regulations. The building does not currently comply. If it was to be used as a commercial space, the entire building would need to be sprinklered, which would be a financial burden and would also disturb and displace the current residential tenants who reside in the building. Additionally, there is not ample parking space to service a commercial unit. There are three parking spaces for employees and customers, making it unfriendly for that type of use. In addition, there is not a separate entrance; a common entrance would be used that the residential tenants would use.

In addition, Mr. French noted that the plans would not require any site work. All work would be contained inside the current boundaries of the unit. He added that they would have to remove partition walls. There are already two rooms that could be converted to bedrooms. Other modifications to the space were explained in detail.

After a question from Mr. Stevenson, Mr. French replied that there are currently three residential units, two of which are occupied. All plans to convert the unit into a residential unit would not require any site work. All work would be contained inside the current bounds of the unit and there is a fully finished bathroom in the prior dentist's office.

Mr. Haley asked whether the four units all have a bathroom, which Mr. French confirmed. Mr. Haley asked whether they all have a kitchen. Mr. French pointed out one unit which will be part of the plans.

Mr. French explained that the plans are for just the one unit. It does not include the other three residential units. He stated that the plans are just for Unit 2, on the west side of the first floor.

Mr. Haley asked for confirmation that this will be a single-family unit, which Mr. French confirmed.

Mr. Haley sought information about the parking. Mr. French explained the parking in detail.

Ms. Pilla reported no comments from Town Staff that require any changes on the application. She did clarify that the applicant mentioned the discrepancy in the Assessor's information. Her understanding is that this was originally a four-family house and, at one point, one of the first-floor units was converted to a dentist's office. Ms. Pilla suspects it may have been converted without being properly permitted, which would require significant code upgrades per the Fire Marshal, and that may be why the Assessor's information does not reflect the office.

Mr. Haley sought confirmation that this was built as a four-unit house before the CBD zone was established, which Ms. Pilla confirmed.

Mr. Stevenson asked if any member of the public wished to comment either in favor of or in opposition to this application. No member of the public came forward at this time.

The Public Hearing was closed at 8:45 P.M.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

April 26, 2023

Date

James Stevenson, Chair

**NOTICE: A DIGITAL RECORDING OF THIS PUBLIC HEARING CAN BE HEARD IN THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT.**