

**CITY OF NORWALK
ZONING COMMISSION
April 18, 2018**

PRESENT: Nathan Sumpter; Michael Witherspoon; Rod Johnson; Louis Schulman; Galen Wells; Joseph Passero; Richard Roina

STAFF: Steve Kleppin; Mike Wrinn

OTHERS: Atty. Al Vasko; Pete Romano; Keith Simpson; Seelan Pather; Chris Jones; Michael Federer; Keith Brown; Al Pascarelli; Dan Conroy

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sumpter called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Mr. Kleppin called the roll.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

a. #10-17SP – Yew St Partners – Brierwood Road – 5 unit conservation development

Mr. Sumpter opened the public hearing. Atty Vasco began the presentation with an introduction of the project team and handed in the certified return receipt cards, evidencing notice of the public hearing to the abutting neighbors. He also handed in the approvals received from various city departments. He described the project which included that it would be in a conservation development which would include walking trails.

Mr. Romano continued the presentation by handing out a packet of maps for the commissioners' review. He then explained that this was the Silvermine Golf Course off Yew Street and explained the proposal. He explained that the structures conformed to the city's regulations and that the project was straightforward. There was a discussion about the source of the water in the wetlands on the property.

Keith Simpson, the landscape architect, continued the presentation by showing the commissioners the landscape plan for the project. He described the trees that would be used as screening. He said that they would not need to do a lot of planting on the inside of the property but would need to do it on the Route 7 side. There would be walking trails and shrubbery as well. He thought this zoning worked well for this property. There was a discussion about the grade change and what type of shrubbery would be used. There is no public access to the property and there was none previously. Atty. Vasko explained that the property had been previously owned by a developer who had then not developed it. There was a discussion about an access way that was a connecting driveway but not part of the project.

Seelan Pather, the architect on the property, showed the commissioners renderings of the homes that would be constructed. He described the bedrooms, elevations, basements, materials used, etc. They were typical New England homes. The commissioners did not review the floor plans.

Atty. Vasko briefly explained the traffic flow but said that Mr. Galante was in attendance if they wanted to speak with him about the traffic report. They did not. He also asked that the commissioners look favorably on the applicant. There was a question about the average size of the trees that would be planted near the homes. Mr. Simpson said they would be 15 – 20 ft. high. There was also a discussion about the roots of the trees being so close to the homes.

Chris Jones, 17 Yew Street, a neighbor across the street, asked how much blasting there would be during construction. He said there was ledge on the property. He also had a concern about septic tanks.

Michael Federer, 4 Briarwood Road, asked to pull the aerial map again which he referenced his home on. He also said he was representing some senior citizen neighbors, as well. He asked whether the application would happen tonight. He also had questions about the walking trails and whether they would be accessible to the neighbors. He had questions about the wetlands which would collect during rain storms. He asked whether there was a drainage plan. He noted that trees had been cut down and whether more would be cut down. There was also a question about the roads that would be created for this project. He also had a question about the heating of the homes and whether power lines would be above ground or below.

No one else spoke for or against the project. Atty. Vasko then began the rebuttal. He said that the only access to the property would be from Yew Street. Some trees that were cut down had been done by the prior developer. They would work with the Department of Public Works (“DPW”) to name the road. There does seem to be some confusion which they would have to work through with DPW and the police and fire departments. There was a discussion of conditions for the applicant in connection with access to the property.

Mr. Romano also said that he did not think that city agencies would allow the road to be called Briarwood. He then said there would be very little blasting done. He said that they would also do a survey of the nearby homes, for their protection as well as the developer. He said that the removal of ledge is more controlled now.

He then discussed the storm drainage and how it would be collected and where it would flow. Utilities would be underground. The homes would be heated with propane gas. Keith Simpson, the landscape architect, said that there were not trees between the property and the other neighbors. He would meet with the neighbors to talk about screening.

The developer is open to having neighbors access the walking trails. Neighbors would probably have to contact the home owners’ association. Atty. Vasko said the developer was amenable to meeting with the neighbors. Mr. Federer noted the numbers of the homes for the senior neighbors that he was representing.

Mr. Sumpter closed the public hearing.

b. #2-18R - Norwalk Zoning Commission – Proposed amendments to Section 118-700 Industrial Zone No. 1 B2(I) to remove the following text from the regulations “Designated Properties for Transit Oriented Development at South Norwalk Railroad Station”

Mr. Sumpter opened the public hearing and Mr. Passero recused himself as a property owner in this area.

Mr. Kleppin began the presentation by explaining that he had provided the commissioners with a memo at the previous meeting. He also explained that this item has been discussed for a long time. He noted what was removed from the bounds. He also noted that there were changes to both the north and south bounds.

Mr. Roina asked whether Mr. Kleppin could show them the bounds on a map which he did. He gave a brief history of the process of writing this proposed amendment. He showed them another map with the boundary streets which had been changed from what was originally suggested.

Keith Brown, 252 East Avenue, asked some questions about properties becoming non-conforming. He asked that the Zoning Commission try to maintain consistency with the regulations. Mr. Kleppin explained that there would be some properties and uses that would become legally non-conforming. It may need to be tweaked later. There was a discussion about the boundary of this zone on Chestnut Street. Mr. Roina said it might mean he would have to recuse himself as well. Mr. Kleppin showed them a map which helped to explain what they would vote on in Item IV. d. There was a discussion about the homeless shelter. Mr. Brown also made some additional comments about it and Mr. Kleppin agreed with them. At this point in the discussion, Mr. Roina recused himself.

Atty. Vasko, 134 East Avenue, asked for clarification about the text amendment about allowing contractor yards'. Mr. Kleppin said they would remain and that only multi-5families had been removed.

Al Pascarelli noted that he was representing other companies, and asked whether this auto body shop would be affected especially when he went to sell it. Then he noted that how this would affect his properties as well. He believed this was an imminent domain take. His family had lived in the city for decades. He also had concerns about 57 Chestnut Street whether it would be within the new zone. He explained it was a large factory within the I1 zone now.

No one else spoke on this item.

There was a discussion about how to handle this matter. There was a discussion about notification which was only legal notice and not individually notified. Since there were a number of questions, Mr. Schulman believed that it should remain open to give the public an opportunity to comment. The commissioners decided to keep it open.

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ON PENDING APPLICATIONS

a. Action on Items III. a. and, b. –

i.. #10-17SP – Yew St Partners – Brierwood Road – 5 unit conservation development

Before the commissioners voted on this item, Mr. Schulman suggested conditions which the commissioners discussed. He also read the current conditions into the record.

***** MR. SCHULMAN MOVED: BE IT RESOLVED** that application #10-17 SP submitted by

Yew Street Partners, LLC for a 5 unit conservation development on Brierwood Road as shown on various plans by LandTech, Westport, CT dated 12/14/17, amended to 4/3/18 and by Beinfield Architecture PC, dated 3/12/18 be approved with the following conditions:

1. That all required CEAC signoffs are submitted; and
2. That all required soil and sedimentation controls be installed prior to the start of construction and maintained until the project is completed and stabilized; and
3. That any additional needed soil and sedimentation controls be installed at the direction of the staff; and
4. That a surety (in an amount to be determined by staff) be submitted to guarantee the installation and continued maintenance of the soil and sedimentation controls; and
5. That any change to the plan will require Zoning Commission approval; and
6. That any graffiti on the site, now or in the future, be removed immediately; and
7. That a storm water facility maintenance plan be submitted;
8. That the conservation area be clearly marked along all edges , both where it meets the interior of the project itself and the adjacent neighbors; suggested markings are 1' tall pressure treated 4"x4" posts at regular intervals;
9. That a permanent land conservation agreement approved by Corporation Council be filed in the land records, preserving the conservation area; and
10. That the trail in the conservation area remain open to the adjoining neighbors; and
11. That additional landscaping/fencing be added to screen/buffer the project from # 4 Brierwood Road; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the reason for this approval is that the proposed project complies with the Norwalk Building Zone Regulations, 118-410 Conservation developments and section 118-1450, Special Permits; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this approval shall be April 27, 2018.

Mr. Passero seconded.

Nathan Sumpter; Michael Witherspoon; Rod Johnson; Louis Schulman; Galen Wells; Joseph Passero; Richard Roina voted in favor.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

ii. #2-18R - Norwalk Zoning Commission – Proposed amendments to Section 118-700 Industrial Zone No. 1 B2(I) to remove the following text from the regulations “Designated Properties for Transit Oriented Development at South Norwalk Railroad Station”

The commissioners realized they were not ready to vote on this item, so that it was continued.

b. #4-12SP – Windover Farm – 329-335 Chestnut Hill Road – 9 units conservation development – Request to modify approved plan regarding new fence along state ROW – Determine if minor change – Report and recommended action

Charles Willinger began the presentation who gave a brief history of the application. He explained that they were requesting a minor change from a stone wall to a fence. He showed them a rendering of the wall with the plantings. The neighbors signed a letter that

said that all of the neighbors were now in agreement.

***** MR. PASSERO MOVED: BE IT RESOLVED** that the minor change request for application #4-12SP - 329-335 Chestnut Hill Road – 9 units conservation development – Request to modify approved plan regarding new fence along state ROW – Determine if minor change be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. That any graffiti on the site, now or in the future, be removed immediately; and
2. That any further applications of paint/stain/preservative/sealer/etc. to the fence will be accomplished with rollers and brushes, and not with spray guns or other spray methods; and
3. That all plantings be installed prior to the issuance of the last certificate of zoning compliance
4. That any changes to the site plan be reviewed by the zoning staff; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that an updated Special Permit map be placed on the Norwalk Land Records; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this approval shall be April 27, 2018.

Mr. Witherspoon seconded.

Nathan Sumpter; Michael Witherspoon; Rod Johnson; Louis Schulman; Galen Wells; Joseph Passero; Richard Roina voted in favor.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

- a. **#2-18SPR – Bright Beginnings Early Childhood Program – 517 Westport Ave – 11,000 sf child day care center – Report and recommended action**

Atty Suchy began the presentation by showing them plans and explained the meeting that happened on April 9 with other city agencies. The plan was modified after this meeting which she considered a safe plan for the parents and children. There would be one way in to the property and there would be one way out. This plan was approved by CT DOT and the city's DPW. She reminded them of the project. Mr. Gupta thanked the commissioners for their time on this project. Most of the commissioners were grateful that the new plan looked much better than previous plans. Mr. Schulman did still have reservations and thought it was the wrong location for the facility. Ms. Wells noted that parents would get used to the circulation so that it would be safer than a normal retail store. There was also a discussion about signage.

Doug DeVesta answered questions about a ramped area for strollers and the landscape plan. Mr. Roina explained why he was voting for the new plan. They all thought the new plan would help calm traffic. Atty Suchy closed her presentation.

***** MR. PASSERO MOVED: BE IT RESOLVED** that application #2-18 SPR submitted by Bright Beginnings Early Childhood Program, LLC for a childcare center at 517 Westport Avenue as shown on various plans by DiVesta Civil Engineering Associates, Inc, Roxbury, CT amended to 4/12/18 and architectural plans by Geitz Design Associates, LLC, Architects, dated 1/11/18 be **APPROVED** with the following conditions:

1. That all required CEAC signoffs are submitted; and
2. That approvals be received from the State of Connecticut DOT for work in the state ROW; and
3. That all required soil and sedimentation controls be installed prior to the start of construction and maintained until the project is completed and stabilized; and
4. That any change to the plan will require Zoning Commission approval; and
5. That any graffiti on the site, now or in the future, be removed immediately; and
6. That the 3 parking spaces along Westport Avenue served by the separate entrance be reserved for staff only, so as to prevent any traffic conflicts and it be signed as such and communicated to the users of the facility; and
7. That a full sized plan showing specific location of off site parking spaces be submitted; and
8. That a long term access and parking agreement be approved by the Corporation Counsel's office and filed on the land records;
9. That a "slow children" sign be placed as you enter the property from the rear; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the reason for this approval is that the proposed project complies with the Norwalk Building Zone Regulations, 118- 522 Business #2 and section 118-1451, Site Plan Review; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this approval shall be April 27, 2018.

Mr. Johnson seconded.

Nathan Sumpter; Michael Witherspoon; Rod Johnson; Galen Wells; Joseph Passero; Richard Roina voted in favor.

No one opposed.

Louis Schulman abstained.

d. #2-18M – Norwalk Zoning Commission – Monroe Street/South Main Street/Day Street/Hanford Place & vicinity - Proposed change to the Building Zone Map from D Residence, Neighborhood Business, Industrial #1 and SoNo Station Design District (in part) to entirely SoNo Station Design District (SSDD) - Review of public hearing – Report and recommended action

Mr. Kleppin reminded them that they have already discussed this item, several times.

WHEREAS, the Commission discussed and considered the amendments to the Building Zone Regulations on June 7 and November 9, 2016, and February 9, March 9, April 12, May 11 and December 18, 2017 in response to the South Norwalk TOD Redevelopment Plan, dated September, 2016;

WHEREAS, staff submitted Certificates of Mailing in accordance with the zoning regulations and the applications were advertised in the Norwalk Hour on December 4 and 11, 2017;

WHEREAS, the Commission conducted a joint public hearing with the Planning Commission on December 18, 2017;

WHEREAS, the proposal was further considered by the Commission on February 1 and 21, 2018;

WHEREAS, the Commission referred the modified proposal to the Planning Commission, who unanimously concluded at their March 20,, 2018 regular meeting, that the proposed amendment to the Building Zone Map was consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development;

WHEREAS, staff submitted Certificates of Mailing in accordance with the zoning regulations and the applications were advertised in the Norwalk Hour on March 15 and 29, 2018;

WHEREAS, the Commission conducted a public hearing on April 2, 2018 at which time the hearing was closed;

WHEREAS, the Commission conducted deliberations on the closed application on April 5, April 18, 2018;

WHEREAS, the Commission made the following findings:

1. The area proposed for rezoning is an appropriate area for increased development and residential density, considering its proximity to the South Norwalk Railroad Station. In addition, TOD development, immediately adjacent to an existing rail station, is appropriate and will help to revitalize the area.

2. The original plan area was approximately 145 acres but was reduced to approximately 54 acres. The plan area has been reduced to:

a. remove the area to the east of Water Street, and

b. remove the area north of Monroe Street, which will be looked at separately, and

c. remove the area south of Concord Street and Henry Street due to the large concentration of industrial zoned properties containing viable businesses.

3. A traffic impact analysis prepared by Fitzgerald and Halliday indicated that the existing roadway system should be able to sustain acceptable levels of service if development patterns follow the potential buildout being contemplated. Individual site plans will address traffic impacts on a project by project basis. Staff and the Zoning Commission must be diligent as development occurs to monitor traffic and ensure through peer review that development is not having a negative effect on traffic.

4. The intent of the rezoning is to provide an atmosphere that is conducive to alternate modes of transportation such as the use of buses, shuttle services, trains, rideshare, walking and biking.

5. The Commission has consulted with South Norwalk Electric and Water to confirm that there is sufficient water capacity to accommodate a potential full build-out of the plan area.

6. There is sufficient capacity in the wastewater treatment plant to accommodate for the proposed rezoning. According to the Water Pollution Control Authority (WPCA) the treatment plant has a permit limit of 18 million gallons/day, a 180 day rolling average of 13.8 million gallons/day and when the average exceeds 16.2 million gallons/day an expansion plan must be prepared. In looking at recent developments, a typical 100-unit mixed-use development generates approximately 10,000 gallons per day of effluent in 2016. If 2,000 additional units were added in the new SSDD bounds (which is likely much higher than will be realized), that will result in only an additional 200,000 gallons per day.

7. According to information provided by the Norwalk Redevelopment Agency, there appears to be adequate electric service to accommodate the proposed rezoning of this area.

8. According to a report prepared by the Redevelopment Agency, based on data obtained from the Board of Education regarding school impacts, it appears that, city-wide, smaller developments, which include single-family and developments not required to provide workforce housing, generate 1 student for every 3 units created; whereas, more recent developments within the subject census tract the have generated no more than 1 student for every 33 units created.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission finds that the proposed amendment is consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development. Specifically, the proposed amendment is consistent with the following sections within the plan:

a. Introduction, p. 4: "With proper planning dense mixed-use development in existing Transportation corridors and improved public transit can effectively accommodate new population growth without adversely impacting existing neighborhoods and natural resources;

b. §A, Balanced Economic Growth, p. 8: "A commitment to housing affordability means embracing compact neighborhood-conscious transit-based development.";

c. §A.1.2.3, p. 10: to "Encourage the expansion of the number of affordable housing units through innovative methods such as incentive programs";

d. §A.2.1.1, p. 11: to "Encourage quality housing for a variety of tenures, family sizes, incomes, the senior population, and persons with special needs";

e. A.2.1.5, p. 11: to "Require a minimum of ten percent (10%) affordable units in all developments over 20 units, as per Workforce Housing ordinance";

f. §A.2.2.6, p.12: to "Allow a wide range of housing opportunities to ensure that the housing needs of all segments of the labor force are met

g. §A.5.1.1, p.13: to "Update Restricted Industrial Zones, Industrial 1 Zones, and Industrial 2 Zones, to allow on a case-by-case basis certain types of office and multifamily residential uses, to reflect current economic trends in Norwalk provided they are compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods";

h. §B.1.1.2, p. 16: to "Encourage new development around transit access and allow new development which does not exceed the capacity of infrastructure systems (roads, sewers, water, etc.)";

i. §E, Transportation, p. 34: "The dependence on the automobile can only be reduced by a combination of improved public transit and pedestrian friendly redevelopment based on transportation hubs.";

j. §E.2.2.5, p. 37: "Consider designating a redevelopment area at the South Norwalk Station to help achieve goals for transit enhancements and transit-oriented development here"; and

k. §F.1.1.6, p. 40: to "Allow for the future needs of Norwalk to be met as identified in this Plan (i.e. housing, economic growth, community facilities, etc.)";

l. §F.4.2.1. p.42: to "Enhance pedestrian experience to support related economic revitalization and encourage transit use";

m. §F.4.1 p. 43: to "Strengthen the character of neighborhoods and commercial areas and improve the quality of architectural design";

n. §F.4.2, p. 44: to "Design streets for people as well as vehicles"; and

o. §F.4.2.1, p.44: to "Enhance pedestrian experience to support related economic revitalization and encourage transit use".

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT upon a motion made by Ms. Wells and seconded by Mr. Witherspoon, the Commission voted unanimously to approve the proposed amendment, #2-18M – Norwalk Zoning Commission – Monroe Street/South Main Street/Day Street/Hanford Place & vicinity - Proposed change to the Building Zone Map from D Residence, Neighborhood Business, Industrial #1 and SoNo Station Design District (in part) to entirely SoNo Station Design District (SSDD).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this action be April 27, 2018.

**Nathan Sumpter; Michael Witherspoon; Rod Johnson; Louis Schulman;
Galen Wells; Joseph Passero; Richard Roina voted in favor.**

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

e. **#1-18R – Norwalk Zoning Commission – Proposed amendments to Section 118-506 SoNo Station Design District to increase the permitted density from 43 units/acre to 87 units/acre; to increase the permitted height of buildings from 4 stories/45 ft to 6 stories/72 ft provided that all stories above 4th flr be setback at least 10 ft from 4th floor facade; to reduce required open space from 30% to 15%; to encourage the preservation of historic buildings; to require that all multifamily developments of 12 units or more provide a minimum of ten percent (10%) as workforce housing units with maximum monthly rents not to exceed sixty percent (60%) of the State Median Income & related technical amendments - Review of public hearing – Report and recommended action**

Mr. Kleppin reminded them that they have already discussed this item, several times and had updated the commissioners with it. He discussed several changes that they had made to the proposed amendments.

WHEREAS, the Commission discussed and considered the amendments to the Building Zone Regulations on June 7 and November 9, 2016, and February 9, March 9, April 12, May 11 and December 18, 2017 in response to the South Norwalk TOD Redevelopment Plan, dated September, 2016;

WHEREAS, the Commission instructed staff to work with the Redevelopment Agency to modify the draft regulations;

WHEREAS, the applications were advertised in the Norwalk Hour on December 4 and 11, 2017;

WHEREAS, the Commission conducted a joint public hearing with the Planning Commission on December 18, 2017 at which time the hearing was closed and both commission's instructed staff to modify the proposal;

WHEREAS, the modified proposal was considered by the Commission on February 1 and 21, 2018;

WHEREAS, the Commission referred the modified proposal to the Planning Commission, who unanimously concluded at their March 20,, 2018 regular meeting, that the proposed amendments were consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development, provided certain modifications were made to the amendments;

WHEREAS, staff submitted Certificates of Mailing in accordance with the zoning regulations and the applications were advertised in the Norwalk Hour on March 8 and 15, 2018;

WHEREAS, the Commission conducted a public hearing on April 2, 2018 at which time the hearing was closed;

WHEREAS, the Commission conducted deliberations on the closed application on April 5 and April 18, 2018;

WHEREAS, the Commission made the following findings:

1. The area proposed for rezoning is an appropriate area for increased development and residential density, considering its proximity to the South Norwalk Railroad Station. In addition, TOD development, immediately adjacent to an existing rail station, is appropriate and will help to revitalize the area.

2. A traffic impact analysis prepared by Fitzgerald and Halliday indicated that the existing roadway system should be able to sustain acceptable levels of service if development patterns follow the potential buildout being contemplated. Individual site plans will address traffic impacts on a project by project basis. Staff and the Zoning Commission must be diligent as development occurs to monitor traffic and ensure through peer review that

development is not having a negative effect on traffic.

3. The intent of the rezoning is to provide an atmosphere that is conducive to alternate modes of transportation such as the use of buses, shuttle services, trains, rideshare, walking and biking.

4. There is sufficient capacity in the wastewater treatment plant to accommodate for the proposed rezoning. According to the Water Pollution Control Authority (WPCA) the treatment plant has a permit limit of 18 million gallons/day, a 180 day rolling average of 13.8 million gallons/day and when the average exceeds 16.2 million gallons/day an expansion plan must be prepared. In looking at recent developments, a typical 100-unit mixed-use development generates approximately 10,000 gallons per day of effluent in 2016. If 2,000 additional units were added in the new SSDD bounds (which is likely much higher than will be realized), that will result in only an additional 200,000 gallons per day.

5. The Commission has consulted with South Norwalk Electric and Water to confirm that there is sufficient water capacity to accommodate a potential full build-out of the plan area.

6. According to information provided by the Norwalk Redevelopment Agency, there appears to be adequate electric service to accommodate the proposed rezoning of this area.

7. According to a report prepared by the Redevelopment Agency based on data obtained from the Board of Education regarding school impacts, it appears that, city-wide, smaller developments, which include single-family and developments not required to provide workforce housing, generate 1 student for every 3 units created; whereas, more recent developments within the subject census tract the have generated no more than 1 student for every 33 units created.

8. The proposed bulk and height modifications to the SSDD Zone are appropriate to facilitate Transit Oriented Development in and around the South Norwalk Railroad Station.

9. The modifications to the Workforce Housing Regulations proposed for the SSDD Zone are consistent with the goals of providing affordable to individuals of moderate income.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission finds that the proposed amendment is consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development. Specifically, the proposed amendment is consistent with the following sections within the plan:

a. Introduction, p. 4: "With proper planning dense mixed-use development in existing Transportation corridors and improved public transit can effectively accommodate new population growth without adversely impacting existing neighborhoods and natural resources;

b. §A, Balanced Economic Growth, p. 8: "A commitment to housing affordability means embracing compact neighborhood-conscious transit-based development.";

c. §A.1.2.3, p. 10: to "Encourage the expansion of the number of affordable housing units through innovative methods such as incentive programs";

d. §A.2.1.1, p. 11: to "Encourage quality housing for a variety of tenures, family sizes, incomes, the senior population, and persons with special needs";

e. A.2.1.5, p. 11: to "Require a minimum of ten percent (10%) affordable units in all developments over 20 units, as per Workforce Housing ordinance";

f. §A.2.2.6, p.12: to "Allow a wide range of housing opportunities to ensure that the housing needs of all segments of the labor force are met

g. §A.5.1.1, p.13: to "Update Restricted Industrial Zones, Industrial 1 Zones, and Industrial 2 Zones, to allow on a case-by-case basis certain types of office and multifamily residential uses, to reflect current economic trends in Norwalk provided they are compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods";

h. §B.1.1.2, p. 16: to "Encourage new development around transit access and allow new development which does not exceed the capacity of infrastructure systems (roads, sewers, water, etc.)";

i. §E, Transportation, p. 34: “The dependence on the automobile can only be reduced by a combination of improved public transit and pedestrian friendly redevelopment based on transportation hubs.”;

j. §E.2.2.5, p. 37: "Consider designating a redevelopment area at the South Norwalk Station to help achieve goals for transit enhancements and transit-oriented development here"; and

k. §F.1.1.6, p. 40: to “Allow for the future needs of Norwalk to be met as identified in this Plan (i.e. housing, economic growth, community facilities, etc.)”;

l. §F.4.2.1. p.42: to "Enhance pedestrian experience to support related economic revitalization and encourage transit use”;

m. §F.4.1 p. 43: to “Strengthen the character of neighborhoods and commercial areas and improve the quality of architectural design”;

n. §F.4.2, p. 44: to “Design streets for people as well as vehicles”;

o. §F.4.2.1, p.44: to “Enhance pedestrian experience to support related economic revitalization and encourage transit use”.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT upon a motion made by Mr. Schulman and seconded by Mr. Witherspoon, the Commission voted unanimously to approve the proposed amendment, #1-18R, to Section 118-506 of the Building Zone Regulations as modified to April 18, 2018.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this action be April 27, 2018.

**Nathan Sumpter; Michael Witherspoon; Rod Johnson; Louis Schulman;
Galen Wells; Joseph Passero; Richard Roina voted in favor.
No one opposed.
No one abstained.**

V. RECEIPT/REVIEW AND ACTION ON NEW APPLICATIONS

a. #4-18CAM – Robert Mitchell – 20 Shorehaven Rd – New single family residence – Report & recommendation

Mr. Wrinn noted that this was a new application. Dan Conroy explained that this was a new structure on a current lot. He also explained that there was no activity in the V zone. He explained that they would meet with all zoning requirements. There was a discussion about the crawl space. There was also a discussion about where this was property was located. He also noted that there would be a pool on the property as well. They have also been reviewed by several of the city’s departments and agencies. There was also a discussion about the size of the lot. The staff had nothing further to add to the presentation.

***** MR. PASSERO MOVED: BE IT RESOLVED** that application #4-18CAM, construct additions to an existing single-family residence for the property 20 Shorehaven Road and as shown on the zoning location survey dated 11/9/2017 and revised to 3/14/2018 by Dennis A. Deilus, Land Surveyor, Norwalk, CT., Lic. No. 6396 and on the engineering plans dated 3/10/2018 and revised to 4/2/2018 by Peak Engineers, LLC, Redding, CT, and on the architectural drawings dated 3/5/2018 by Daniel Conlon Architects, Georgetown, CT be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. That all CEAC sign-offs be submitted; and
2. That all City storm-water management requirements are met; and
3. That a permit is obtained from the Department of Public Works in regards to City storm-water management requirements; and

4. That all required soil sedimentation and erosion controls are in place prior to the start of any construction; and

5. That any additional needed soil sedimentation and erosion controls be installed at the direction of the Staff; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this proposal complies with all applicable coastal resource and use policies; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this approval shall be April 27, 2018.

Mr. Witherspoon seconded.

Nathan Sumpter; Michael Witherspoon; Rod Johnson; Louis Schulman; Galen Wells; Joseph Passero; Richard Roina voted in favor.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 2, 2018 Special Meeting as revised and April 5, 2018

**** MR. SCHULMAN MOVED** to approve the April 2, 2018 Special Meeting as revised.

Mr. Witherspoon seconded.

Nathan Sumpter; Michael Witherspoon; Rod Johnson; Louis Schulman; Galen Wells; Joseph Passero; Richard Roina voted in favor.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

**** MR. SCHULMAN MOVED** to approve the April 5, 2018 Zoning Commission minutes.

Mr. Witherspoon seconded.

Nathan Sumpter; Michael Witherspoon; Rod Johnson; Louis Schulman; Galen Wells; Joseph Passero; Richard Roina voted in favor.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

VII. COMMENTS OF DIRECTOR

There was a discussion about a new application and the definition of "family." Neighbors were notified the prior Friday. Mr. Kleppin has met with several of them. He noted that several Zoning staff members were not in favor of it but were advised by Corporation Counsel that it should be approved. Ms. Wells thought that it was a good idea for older citizens to become a part of, rather than being in an institution. There was a discussion about whether this was a desirable or undesirable use. The developers said that there were not under any regulations because they were not administering managed health care. Mr. Kleppin explained that it was similar to having roommates. There are no restrictions on parking. It was in West Norwalk. Some of the neighbors were not pleased and claimed that the property would decrease their property values. If the Zoning Commission wanted to fix the problem, then they could change the definition of "family"

VIII. COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS

There was a conversation about whether they should further discuss Item #2-18R. Mr. Schulman said that he had concerns about building housing on Chestnut Street. There was a discussion about language to be kept in and what should be removed. Mr. Kleppin explained that they could leave the boundaries.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Roina made a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Witherspoon seconded.

Nathan Sumpter; Michael Witherspoon; Rod Johnson; Louis Schulman; Galen Wells; Joseph Passero; Richard Roina voted in favor.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Palmentiero