



**CITY OF DANBURY**  
155 DEER HILL AVENUE  
DANBURY, CONNECTICUT 06810

**ZONING COMMISSION**  
www.danbury-ct.gov

(203) 797-4525  
(203) 797-4586 (FAX)

RECEIVED FOR RECORD  
DANBURY TOWN CLERK

2023 MAY 10 P 2: 08

BY: *[Signature]*

**MINUTES**  
**APRIL 11, 2023**

The IN PERSON meeting was called to order by Chairman Theodore Haddad Jr. at 7:38 PM.

Present were Milan David, Ryan Hawley, Rick P. Jowdy, Robert Melillo, Joseph Raya, Theodore Haddad Jr., and Alternate Olga Mejia. Also present were Planning Director Sharon Calitro, and Assistant Corporation Counsels Daniel Casagrande and Robin Edwards.

Absent were Michael Coelho, Candace Fay, Angela Hylenski, and Alternates Bruce Bennett and Edwin Duran.

Chairman Haddad asked Ms. Mejia to take Mrs. Hylenski's place for the items on this evening's agenda.

Mr. Melillo led the Commission in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Haddad said the March 28, 2023 minutes were not ready yet so acceptance of them will be on the April 25, 2023 agenda.

Chairman Haddad announced that there were not enough eligible members present to vote on the Pembroke Road Zone Change petition listed under Old Business so there would be no action taken on it this evening.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

Draft Stipulated Agreement to settle 3 Lake Avenue Extension, LLC v City of Danbury Zoning Commission, Docket No. DBD-CV-226041619S, to amend Sections 2.B. , 5.B.2.b. and 5.B.5.g. of the Zoning Regulations to define and regulate a Supportive Housing Facility in the CA-80 Zoning District.

Chairman Haddad read the legal notice. He then explained the public hearing process to the audience saying that those in favor would speak first, then the opposition would speak, and finally, the attorney for 3 Lake Avenue would have the chance to rebut the opposition's comments.

Attorney Dan Casagrande, Assistant Corporation Counsel for the City of Danbury, said the purpose of this hearing is to solicit public comment on the proposed stipulated settlement. He said neither the Planning Director nor his office are making any recommendations on this. He said the stipulation proposes regulations for a new use "supportive housing" which would be allowed in the CA-80 zone as a special exception use. It would allow a maximum of 132 residents and job training and social services would be provided to these residents. He said this specifically is what they are here to discuss. He added that although the 98 Elm Street project is mentioned in the stipulation, that is not under this Commission's jurisdiction and should not be discussed.

Speaking in favor of this was Attorney David DeBassio, Hinckley, Allen & Snyder LLP, said he is here for his partner, Attorney Timothy Hollister, who represented Pacific House during the public hearing process. Attorney DeBassio said what they have proposed is an attempt to respond to the neighborhood concerns and hopefully reach a compromise instead of litigating this in court. He stated several times during his comments that this would not a homeless shelter, it would be affordable housing with supportive services. He said this will not be transient housing, it will be like renting an apartment. He said there would be two occupants per unit, they would sign a lease, and the state would cover the rent. He said they would much rather resolve the lawsuit by a compromise rather than taking it to court. He said the stipulation is not to approve this, it would give Pacific House the opportunity to go the Planning Commission for a special exception to conduct this use on the Lake Avenue site. He said there would not be any walk-in clients and the supportive services would only be available for the residents. Mr. David asked if the residents would still be permitted to loiter around the highway ramp as they have been doing. Mr. Melillo stated that this would be an amendment to the CA-80 regulations and that would mean it could be put on any property located in that zone. Chairman Haddad asked for a definition of a room and would they be one bedroom or efficiencies. Attorney DeBassio said he is not sure yet because there would have to be major renovation work done to convert the hotel rooms into apartments. He then asked Mr. Pagan to speak.

Rafael Pagan, from Pacific House, said this is a new kind of housing, and they are specific about limiting this to 66 units with two people per unit. He said they have not yet actually planned how the space will be renovated. The offices for the supportive services will also be located in the building. He said the average length of stay in a place like this is three years. There is not supposed to be a constant turnover, when a person leaves, it will be to go into their own housing.

Chairman Haddad then read three letters in support of this proposal. The first one was from Danbury's Task force on homelessness which was established last year. The second letter was from Rabbi Ari Rosenberg from ARC (Association of Religious Communities), and the third letter was signed by Myles DuBay, Center for Human Development (no location identified). These three letters were labeled Exhibit A.

Chairman Haddad asked if there were others to speak in favor of this and several people came forward.

Dr. Scott Bialik, Wilderswood Way at Rivington. He asked how much Pacific House earned on past projects.

Jeanne Carr, 28 Country View Road in Rivington, said she wanted to encourage the Commission to approve this settlement. She mentioned that the Crowne Plaza was also identified as a possible site as it meets the requirements in the proposed language. Mr. Jowdy asked her if she thought putting this housing in the Crowne Plaza was a good idea. Ms. Carr said she would be okay with that.

Bob Friedman, 167 Brentwood Circle at Rivington, asked if they are asking to rezone three parcels. Chairman Haddad explained that the proposed stipulation contains an amendment to the Zoning Regulations for the proposed use of transitional housing. He continued saying that there is specific criteria, which must be met and aside from this parcel there are only three other parcels that would be eligible. But tonight's hearing is about the 3 Lake Avenue Extension site.

Dan Bertram, from BRT, said he has heard people say that the Crowne Plaza will also be converted to this use and he wanted to set the record straight. He said he owns that site and already has different plans for it as profiled in the News-Times. He said his goal is to have the first three floors available to the Danbury Hackerspace and the upper floors converted to apartments and micro-studios. He said he just wanted to assure the crowd that he owns the Crowne Plaza site and it will not be used for the purpose being discussed this evening.

Pastor Meredith Payton, 96 Elm Street, said he is not opposed to this idea of supportive housing, but he is concerned about the City's plans for the former shelter at 98 Elm Street. Mr. Melillo asked for a point of order, since Attorney Casagrande had specifically said that the proposal for 98 Elm Street is not part of this stipulation and will not be discussed this evening. It is a City Council matter and under their jurisdiction. Chairman Haddad asked Attorney Casagrande to explain. Attorney Casagrande said the City Council has approved the City's purchase of a single-room occupancy shelter that was owned by the Danbury Housing Authority. It is noted in the stipulation that if Pacific House can obtain funding from the state, they will purchase it from the City and run it as a twenty-bed shelter. He added that it is not up for discussion this evening because the City purchasing it has already been approved by the City Council. And this Commission has no say over the purchase or how it will be used in the future.

Jennifer Broadbin, Business Development Manager from Pacific House, said she wanted to clarify what they do for people and how they help the homeless. They have been around for forty years and have helped thousands of people.

Wanda Payton, 96 Elm Street, said this is about people and how they are treated. She said it sounds like Elm Street is already a done-deal, so she asked the Commission to consider the culture of an already distressed neighborhood.

Jessica Kabicki, said she is with the (*CT Coalition to end Homelessness*) Housing Collective based in Bridgeport, but they work in Danbury also. She spoke about how difficult it is to find housing that is affordable and stated that rental costs have gone up 23% since COVID. She said there are many people who have been approved for Section

8 housing but they cannot find any place to rent. She said that it takes almost one full year to find housing for people. In closing, she said housing is a basic need and everyone deserves to have some place to live.

Maura Newall Juan, 66 Deer Hill Ave., said she lives in Danbury and operates her business here because she loves the diversity that Danbury has to offer. She said the homeless are part of the community and this proposal could help a lot of people.

Kimberly Galba, identified herself as a Probation Officer, said transitional and affordable are very good incentives for people. She said stopped at 3 Lake Avenue to offer her services and found people drinking and doing drugs with no one there in a supervisory or supportive capacity. She said if this proposal is to work, it will only work if the supportive services are provided. She said they really need structure and someone needs to be made accountable for what goes on there and they need to make the residents respect the rules. She added that no one wants drugs and alcohol in their back yard. If they approve this, they need to be sure that these supportive services will be provided. Mr. Raya asked if she is in favor or opposed to this proposal. Ms. Galba said she is only in favor of it if it comes with the supportive services, it will not work without them.

Mr. Melillo asked Attorney DeBassio if right now the motel is still operating as a shelter under the Governors Executive Order. Attorney DeBassio said it is. Mr., Melillo asked if they will be moved out of the shelter if this is approved. Attorney DeBassio said that is the plan.

The next speaker, Christopher Westfall, said he currently lives at the 3 Lake Avenue Extension shelter. He said he has received a voucher from Pacific House meaning they will help him relocate once they find a place. He said Pacific House has done everything in their power to help him because that is what they do. Mr. Hawley thanked Mr. Westfall for speaking.

James Maloney, 15 Wooster Heights Road, said the neighborhood around the hotel was valid in opposing the use of the hotel as a homeless shelter. He said a shelter belongs in the center of the city, but this is not about a homeless shelter. This is about affordable housing, the previous proposal is gone. He said Danbury needs affordable housing and in this situation it all comes down to the supportive services. He said it is reasonable for them to accept this settlement offer because it will take a problematic hotel and turn it into affordable housing units. This is advantageous for the city because we are perilously close to the minimum percentage under 8-30g.

Tom Carr, 28 Country View Road at Rivington, said he is in favor of this because Danbury needs the affordable housing and it is man's moral obligation to help those less fortunate than themselves. He said the homeless need help not fear or disdain.

Bob Botelho, 3 Ridgewood Street, said he has been working on the Mayor's Task Force on Homelessness since the denial of Pacific Houses previous petition. He distributed a booklet (designated Exhibit B) showing the renovations he made to the shelter on 41 New Street. He then spoke extensively about how much these people need our help and how we should do everything we can to find them places to live. He said being homeless

is not always their fault and we as a society should be doing everything we can to help them out. He said there are three reasons why this should be approved. He said the City just keeps getting bigger and that means more homeless people, the new Plan of Conservation & Development states that we need to ensure that the housing needs of these vulnerable people are met, and lastly, because he believes it is the right thing to do and there is no plan B.

Tiera Lofton said she has worked for Pacific House as a program manager for six years. She explained that she oversees services and programs for the residents.

Chairman Haddad asked three times if there was anyone else to speak in favor and there was no one. He then asked for the people who want to speak in opposition, saying that they could line up at one of the two podiums on either side of the room.

City Councilman Paul Rotello, 13 Linden Place, said represents the sixth ward which includes the subject property, all of the area surrounding it, and the 98 Elm Street property. He said he was on the subcommittees for new Plan of Conservation & Development and the Affordable Housing Plan. He said this is about a stipulated agreement brokered through the courts that includes a proposed change of use. They are saying that even if this gets approved, it then has to go for a public hearing before the Planning Commission. He said it is disingenuous for them to say that because right now it is not allowed, so there would be no public hearing without approval of this settlement. He said the proposed changes to the regulations should not come from Pacific House, it should come from staff. In order for this settlement to work, the public has to be heard and if the Commission limits what the public can speak about, it isn't right. He said this could happen at the former Hilton or the other two locations within the Reserve. There is no actual need to have affordable housing located next to a highway ramp. It was just a way to limit the availability of sites for this use. He said they need to allow everybody to have the chance to speak. Mr. Melillo and Mr. Rotello debated for several minutes regarding Mr. Rotello's statements.

Attorney Neil Marcus, 158 Deer Hill Avenue, said he is here representing Ed Batista, who owns several Dunkin Donut restaurants. He said this is not a referendum about Pacific House. He said he is in favor of affordable housing but this proposal is too confusing. He said the proposed language needs to be seriously looked at because it will not achieve what they say it will. He said his client has been very patient about the shelter residents hanging around on his property drinking and doing other undesirable behaviors. He said he also is concerned about the sincerity of this proposal since it is being done in an attempt to settle a lawsuit. He added that his client wants to see the neighborhood cleaned up but this is not the way to do it. He said the language is not specific as to what supportive housing will be. Lastly, he said what is missing from this is a real commitment that they will actually do what they are saying they will and that is to operate actual supportive housing in this zone.

Clay Pierce, Long Ridge Road, said we all have empathy for the homeless, but that is not what this is about. We all feel for these people but we also don't want our quality of life to deteriorate. He continued saying that unfortunately drugs, alcohol, and other addictions cause people to become homeless and we need to figure out how to do the

right thing without hurting any other people. There is no easy way to solve this, but the solution should not affect other people's quality of life.

Frank DeStefano, also a resident at Rivington, said he is vehemently opposed to any settlement or amendment that would allow a hotel to be used as a homeless shelter. He said he also is opposed to any development of the land on Old Ridgebury Road as a shelter. He continued saying mental illness and drug addiction are horrible and we all wish they did not exist. He said if this is approved, crime will go up and the businesses on Mill Plain Road will be negatively impacted.

Michael Levine, 34 Country View Road at Rivington, said he is opposed to this because they are not explaining how they will change the hotel into apartments and they are not talking about the supportive services. He said he doubts they will be able to do interior renovations and they will probably have to upward or outward to expand. Chairman Haddad said the stipulation says the maximum number of proposed units is 66. Mr. Levine said that it is highly unlikely they will get that many units without expanding.

City Councilman Emil Buzaid, 7 Wilderswood Way at Rivington, said he learned a lot this evening. He said whether we call it a homeless shelter, supportive housing, or even affordable housing, it all comes down to helping people. He said he understands the zoning part of this, but they have not said much about how they will manage it. He said when you see how something is going to be managed, you can tell if it is going to work, and they have not shown much. He said also it appears that titles are not important to them because the rendering of the supportive housing that Attorney DeBassio placed on the easel as an exhibit, is titled homeless shelter.

Gabrielle Orquizen, Elm Street, said she is grateful to live in affordable housing. She said the kids in her neighborhood have seen things they never should see and she is afraid to let her kids wait for the school bus by themselves. She said it seems like these people don't respect people's homes or properties. She said she understands that shelters are necessary but they need to have rules and this place does not seem to have any rules. She said it is hard to be afraid of your own environment.

Jeff Berlant, 18 Fairlawn Avenue, said he is here for the community and mentioned the website the neighbors started to get the word out. He said he is opposed to further use of the Super 8 as a shelter. He said throughout all the public hearings, all they kept hearing was assurances from Pacific House about how they would run the place if they get approval. He said none of their promises have been kept, and now they have tents erected behind the building and in the woods. He said the pandemic put a tremendous strain on the community. He said he cares about the safety of the other residents in this area. Pacific House made all kinds of promises and you can see their track record in keeping them over the past two years. They have shown total disregard for the residents in this area. Despite what they say, there is zero vetting done before someone is allowed into this shelter. Pacific House may have done wonderful things in other parts of the state but they have nothing to brag about with this location. He said there are drug dealers operating there and during the initial public hearing, there was a registered sex offender living there. He asked that the Commission does not place this in a residential neighborhood because this is a safety issue. He said the number of police and emergency service calls to this location has not changed despite the fact that there

are less people living there now. He said you can put a bow on a pig, but it is still a pig. Mr. David asked him to repeat where the tents are located. Mr. Berlant said behind the hotel structure and along the exit ramp. He said he had some documentation regarding the number of police and emergency services calls since Pacific House took over the location.

Juliette Wilkins, 6 Flint Ridge Road, said she owns the property at 29-31 Spring Street, which is a rental property. She said she heard the attorney say it is going to be affordable housing but when you look at the rendering, it says homeless shelter. She said the residents of Spring Street have had to endure enough already. The people who will be affected by the location of a shelter should matter as much as the people who are allowed to stay in the shelter. She said she has seen prostitution, stabbing, drug deals, and people passed out on the sidewalk. She said we all want to help the homeless but at what cost. And we would hope that these people want to help themselves but it does not seem that way. She said Ernesto Rodriguez, a resident of Spring Street has records of the countless number of emergency calls to this neighborhood throughout the Dorothy Day years. She said all of the people who spoke in favor of this proposal leave Danbury at night and go to their homes in another town. She said this is difficult because all of these other surrounding towns put their homeless on buses and send them to Danbury because there are no homeless shelters in the towns they live in. The people who live around a shelter pay the price because the majority of the people who reside in the shelter have no respect for anyone's property. She said the kids that live in these neighborhoods can't even play outside because they are not safe. She continued saying that the Pledge of Allegiance promises liberty and justice for all but it seems like all Pacific House cares about is the homeless. There is no concern for anyone who lives in the vicinity of their shelter. She said ideally, we should be able to see that the homeless are benefitting from the help that they receive, but instead their presence is detrimental to the people who live in these neighborhoods.

Sarah Passell, 25 Ridge Road, said most of the important points have been made already. She said the fact that there is a lawsuit pending should not affect the Commission's decision on this. She continued saying that their argument holds no water and no one has the right to question their decision. It was wisely made after many hours of testimony. She said the residents in this area do not feel they can trust Pacific House because they have not done anything to prove that they will do what they say. She said that they should consider this offer because if it goes to court the Commission's decision will be upheld and they will lose.

Ernesto Rodriguez, said he has lived on Spring Street since he was seven years old, which is over forty-five years. He said he has lived with the homeless issue since at least 1981 when Dorothy Day came into their neighborhood. He said it seems like the homeless population just continues to grow in Danbury while the surrounding towns do nothing to carry their share of the burden. He continued saying that when Dorothy Day was operating there were people urinating and defecating in the streets, as well as all kinds of sexual acts going on. He said when COVID hit and Dorothy Day was closed, the neighbors had peace for the first time in years. He said he has substantial police call records that he wants to submit for the record. Mr. Berlant came forward and added his documents to the ones Mr. Rodriguez is submitting. There were designated Exhibit C. He said he could go on but there are others waiting to speak.

Eileen Curran, 18 Fairlawn Avenue, said during COVID the City took Pacific House because it was the only option at the time. She said it is not right that the City Council did not allow any public comment on the Elm Street purchase. She added that not enough studies have been done to determine if this proposal is the City's best option. She said Pacific House has shown a total lack of respect for the citizens of Danbury. She asked that the Commission not accept or approve this settlement because Pacific House has no ties to Danbury and they have demonstrated it by their behavior since the denial of their petition. Nothing has been done to improve any of the issues that the residents in this area have had to endure since Pacific House took over the Super 8.

Sean Marcus, 22 South King Street, said for the past eight years, he has driven Lake Avenue Extension and Mill Plain Road several times each day. Since Pacific House took over the Super 8, he has seen an increase in prostitution, drugs being dealt and abused, and alcohol abuse. He added that this increase has resulted in a need for more police and emergency service interventions. He said there are all types of housing located behind this Lake Avenue Extension/Mill Plain Road corridor including e Housing Authority project at Mill Ridge. He said both Mill Ridge and High Ridge have been cleaned up and rebuilt, but if Pacific House continues as it has been operating, it will create another High Ridge situation. He said the residents in this area do not deserve this, it is not the right location, and it is not fair to the community. In closing, he said he has read his fair share of settlement agreements and this is not a good deal for the City. This settlement offer should be denied and let the court make the decision.

Benjamin Doto, 17 Ridge Road, said he is opposed to this settlement and he believes that the Commission's denial was the correct decision. He reminded everyone that at the public hearing, they threatened to sue if their petition was denied. He said the original petition was for a homeless shelter, but now they are proponents of affordable housing. He said this is about fixing the mistake Pacific House made by purchasing the hotel with state funds. They are offering to buy 98 Elm Street and run it as a shelter if all of their approvals for 3 Lake Avenue Extension are granted. He said this is just a homeless shelter by another name. He said this sounds like a dormitory, and asked if they will have a cafeteria to feed these residents. He said they bought this property knowing that shelters were not permitted in the CA-80 zone. They tried to add the use to the zone, but they were denied, so they sued the Commission. He said the amendments to the Zoning Regulations were written with this site in mind; they just added the language about being located near a highway ramp so it limited the number of sites that would meet the requirements. He said being located near a highway ramp only serves the drug dealers. Danbury is over the 10% minimum for affordable housing whereas none of the surrounding towns are meeting the minimum. He said 98 Elm Street was approved in the 1990's as a single room occupancy shelter so they are not doing anything for Danbury by offering to buy it if this Commission gives them what they want. He said more than half of the members of the homelessness task force do not live in Danbury, so what are they doing in their own communities to provide affordable housing or shelters for the homeless. He said the problem with the Super 8 site is that there is nothing for the residents to do because there is no green space available, so the residents wander about the surrounding neighborhoods. In closing he said that there still seems to be some discrepancy as to when Pacific House actually took over the shelter operation at the Super 8. He then submitted a packet of information containing



photos that were previously submitted, some statistics from the National Alliance to End Homelessness, a case incident report summary from the Danbury Police Department, and a newspaper article about a stabbing that took place at a Pacific House location in Stamford. This was designated Exhibit D.

City Councilman Ben Chianese, 5 Briar Ridge Road, said he is opposed to the proposed settlement. He said this is the first chance anyone from the public has had to review this potential settlement is at tonight's meeting. He said Zoning is designed to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of the residents and this proposal does not do that. He said there are inconsistencies here because this proposal does not address the existing safety issues that have arisen since Pacific House took over. He said this Commission should stand by its original decision. He continued saying that Pacific House did not have to sue the Commission, they could have just brought in this proposal as a new petition without the lawsuit. The carrot they dangled was the purchase of 98 Elm Street as part of this settlement. He said Pacific House did not even show up at the City Council meeting where the City's purchase of 98 Elm Street was considered. And since they were not there, no questions could be asked of them as to how they would run this place. He then submitted a copy of the minutes from the September 28, 2021 Zoning Commission meeting. He had highlighted the area where Attorney Hollister stated that an appeal of a denial would be highly unlikely to succeed. This was designated Exhibit E. He said it is not this Commission's responsibility to change the City. He asked whose problem this will become after tonight, the Planning Commission, and then the Police and Fire Departments. He suggested the Commission deny this and then we can regroup as a city and come up with a better plan than this proposal.

Dr. James Nolan, 16 Southern Boulevard, said everyone has a story about Danburians being generous and it is wrong to say that the opposition does not care. That is not true, it is just that this proposal is not the answer. He said all of the same conditions still exist at the Super 8, it just that there are less people staying there. He said the surrounding communities should be matching what is done in Danbury with respect to affordable housing. He spoke about the "situation" on Spring Street and what it did to that neighborhood. He then said that this proposal does not accomplish its goals.

Mark Nolan, 114 Long Ridge Road said he and his brothers are partners in a real estate business that his parents started in 1955. He said that he is a licensed real estate broker, an affordable housing administrator who manages all of the 8-30g projects in Danbury and many of the surrounding communities in addition to the units that his family owns. He also is a Section 8 Administrator so he knows about affordable housing in this area and what is available. He said the Pandemic created an unfortunate situation by allowing this property owner to get close to six million dollars to purchase and administer the structure at 3 Lake Ave. Ext. He said that he is often contacted when people are transitioned out of the shelter, because they know he will know what is available. Unfortunately the supportive services do not always follow once a tenant leaves the shelter. He spoke about how difficult it is to get funding from the State and Federal governments. The requirements imposed on the towns by 8-30g, make all of this even more confusing. He said a constant inventory is kept of the affordable housing in Danbury and it is over the required 10%. He said the six million dollars they used to purchase the Super 6 would build a lot of affordable housing units and also help places like Amos House, Harmony House, Sunrise Terrace and other transitional housing. He

said in they cannot discriminate, their doors must be open to everyone. He said Pacific House has not offered any supportive services to the people who stay there. He then mentioned that all of the members of the Homelessness Task Force with the exception of Bob Botelho, are non-profits and service providers, instead of people who have the ability to construct affordable housing units. In closing, he asked that the Commission stand by their previous decision and deny the proposed settlement.

A woman came forward and said she was the president of one the homeowner's associations at Rivington. She said her name was "Sharpay" Day\*, it was mumbled and not clear. She said she grew up in Danbury and moved back here me back here from New York City to raise her children. She said she has faced adversity in her life and found the way to overcome it. She said we all want to help the homeless, but there are some limits as to how much help we should have to give. She said it is time for us to take back control of our town. (*\*Shqipe Day, 139 Brentwood Circle, President, the Woodlands at Rivington Homeowners Association*)

Since there was no one else to speak in opposition, Chairman Haddad offered Attorney DeBassio the chance to rebut the opposition's comments.

Attorney DeBassio asked if they could continue the hearing so he could come back with a prepared rebuttal. He said if he goes forward tonight, it may sound erratic. Chairman Haddad told him that he could go forward tonight with whatever he has to say. He said some of the opposition said that it was disingenuous of Pacific House to propose this settlement. He said they do not agree with that, because they wanted to explore the possibility of a compromise. IF that does not work, they will have no choice but to go forward with the Court case. He then stated that Pacific House is run as a non-profit; rents and subsidies that they receive go back into the business. All of this is tracked by the government because they have to submit disclosures to them. He said some of the questions and comments from the opposition cannot be answered until they go before the Planning Commission with a specific plan. He said they already own 3 Lake Ave. Ext. and there is no contingency plan if the settlement offer is not approved. He said a lot of the history that was included in the settlement offer was included to show how they got to this point and to be completely transparent. He said this originally was about a shelter, but now it is about providing housing for the homeless. He also said they cannot cater to only Danbury's homeless because they get money from the State. He said he cannot address the emergency call logs because they don't provide enough information. He added that Pacific House has had success with their operation in Stamford, and they want to that in Danbury. He acknowledged that the rendering he presented was from another project, he was hoping to show the kind of structures they build and run. In closing he said Pacific House recognizes that there is a problem that needs a solution. They are proposing a compromise with this amendment that they think will be a solution.

Mr. David made a motion to close this public hearing. Mr. Raya seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously by voice vote with seven ayes (from Mr. David, Mr. Hawley, Mr. Jowdy, Mr. Melillo, Mr. Raya, Ms. Mejia, and Chairman Haddad).

---

OLD BUSINESS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:

Petition of 3775 LLC (as Applicant), 1, 3, & unnumbered lot Pembroke Road (G08029 [owned by Robert Morsey], G08030 & G08098, [owned by 3775 LLC]) for Change of Zone from RA-40 to RA-20.

Chairman Haddad said he had announced at the beginning of the meeting that there are not enough eligible members present to vote on this petition so there would be no action taken on it tonight.

---

NEW BUSINESS:

Petition of American Polish Citizens Club (property owner)/Raquel Diaz & Yenny Lopez (applicants) for Expansion of the Special Permit for Café Liquor for Copacabana Café, 12 Ives Street (I14244) in the C-CBD zone. Public hearing scheduled for May 9, 2023.

Petition of Melther 78 LLC (property owner)/Rosa Munoz (applicant) for Special Permit for Restaurant Beer & Wine Permit for Gastronomía Paty Paty LLC, 78 Lake Avenue (G15126) in the CN-5 zone. Public hearing scheduled for May 9, 2023.

Petition of Germantown Plaza Associates LLC (property owner)/Jason LaReau (applicant) for Special Permit for Restaurant Liquor License for J. Law Restaurant & Craft Bar, 30 Germantown Road (J11361) in the CG-20 zone. Public hearing scheduled for May 9, 2023.

Chairman Haddad said that this type of petition does not need any referrals, but they are all on file in the Planning & Zoning Office.

---

Petition of Bright Ravens IS Danbury, LLC to Amend Sections. 5.B.2.a, 5.B.4., & 8.C.4.f. of the Zoning Regulations. (Add “Hotel Conversion” as a Permitted Use with Specific Use Requirements to the CA-80 zone and add parking calculation to the Off Street Parking Table.) The official date of receipt for this petition is March 27, 2023. Public hearing scheduled for May 23, 2023.

Petition of South Park Properties LLC, 130, 132-134, & 136 South Street (J15059, J15058, & J15056) for Change of Zone from CN-5 to C-CBD. Public hearing scheduled for May 23, 2023.

Mr. Melillo made a motion to accept both of these petitions, refer them to the Planning Commission for a recommendation, put them on file in the Town Clerk’s office, and forward to any other agencies as may be required. Mr. Hawley seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously by voice vote with seven ayes (from Mr. David, Mr. Hawley, Mr. Jowdy, Mr. Melillo, Mr. Raya, Ms. Mejia, and Chairman Haddad).

---

Chairman Haddad said there was nothing listed under Correspondence and under For Reference Only, there were three petitions scheduled for public hearing on April 25, 2023. He asked if anyone has anything to discuss under Other Matters and there was nothing.

At 12:55 AM, Mr. Raya made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Jowdy seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously by voice vote with seven ayes (from Mr. David, Mr. Hawley, Mr. Jowdy, Mr. Melillo, Mr. Raya, Ms. Mejia, and Chairman Haddad).

Respectfully submitted,



JoAnne V. Read  
Planning Assistant