

**CITY OF NORWALK  
PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE**

September 8, 2016

**PRESENT:** Adam Blank; Nate Sumpter; Doug Stern; Mike Witherspoon; Galen Wright-Wells; Mike O'Reilly; Rod Johnson

**STAFF:** Mike Wrinn; Dori Wilson

**OTHERS:** Atty. Liz Suchy; Alan Webber; Ray Sullivan; Atty. Chris Smith; Eva Erlich; Kendra Halliwell; Tom Ivers; Atty. Liz Suchy; Brandon Handfield; Bill Andriopoulos

Adam Blank called the meeting to order at 7 p.m. and appointed Mr. Sumpter as Chair of the Plan Review Committee, as well as Mr. Stern and Mr. Witherspoon as committee members.

**I. SITE PLAN REVIEWS & COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEWS**

**a) #25-16CAM – 1800 Real Estate Assoc. – 8 Adamson Ave - New 2 family residence - Preliminary review and b) #26-16CAM – 1800 Real Estate Assoc. – 10 Adamson Ave - New 2 family residence - Preliminary review**

Mr. Wrinn asked that these two applications be heard together. He then oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. The buildings would be demolished and the applicant would construct two (2) new 2 family residences. He showed them the site plans. Since it was in the coastal area, it was brought to the attention of the commission. A public hearing was not required, nor did the commissioners request one.

**c) #27-16CAM – Jennie Bedusa – 17 Washington St – Proposed tavern – Preliminary review**

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He said the use was being changed from retail to a restaurant and bar. There was a discussion about the parking. They have all of their sign-offs. There would be no live music at this time.

**d) #5-16SPR/#19-16CAM – Seaman Construction Inc. – 149 Woodward Ave – Proposed contractor's storage yard – Preliminary review**

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He explained that this was a contractor's yard that the applicant would like to legalize. He also explained the surrounding area as well as the nearest residences. Mr. Sumpter asked how to get to the property which Mr. Wrinn explained.

Atty. Suchy explained further how to get to the contractor's yard. There is a building in front of the lot at which the contractor's yard is located. She explained that there would not be any rock crushing at the site, and that it was only for the storage of materials. The building on the property would stay as is, and there would be no new construction. Appropriate buffers would be planted. The application had been referred to the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection ("DEEP") as well. They had received some sign-offs but not all of them. The owner of Seaman Construction answered questions about the business that was being conducted at the site. The Zoning Department had received a complaint about the site which prompted the application to legitimize it. The applicant requested to waive the public

hearing. However, the commissioners decided that a public hearing should be held. There was then a discussion of the types of trucks that come in and out of the property.

**e) #8-13SPR – FM Investments LLC – 587 CT. Ave – Proposed site changes including new generator at residential; building – Determine if minor change**

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map as well as the proposed modification.

Ray Sullivan, the architect on the project continued the presentation by explaining why the project needed a generator. He also explained the second modification to the site plan. He then said that a dog park had been added to the plans as well which many tenants were pleased about. There was also a change to the door. The commissioners decided it was a minor change.

**f) #X-16SPR/#X-16CAM – Head of Harbor North – High & Wall Sts – ±70 residential units – Informal review**

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map as well as explaining the application.

Alan Webber continued the presentation by introducing himself as well as others on the project team. He then discussed the parking spaces. He also noted where the applicant's offices would be.

Mr. Sullivan continued the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property as well as the parking spaces. There was also a discussion of the different levels in the parking garage as well as signage at the building. He described the building in contrast to the parking deck.

There was a discussion as to whether there had been any neighborhood meetings. There was also a discussion of the size of the sidewalks. The commissioners thought it should be similar to High Street.

## **II. SPECIAL PERMITS & COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEWS**

**a) #1-13SPR/#1-13CAM – TR SoNo Partners LLC – 99 Washington St – 5 story, 66 unit multifamily bldg in a mixed use development with 154 sp valet, tandem, compact, stacked parking garage – Request to modify approved plans to add sliding glass doors and decks for units on 2nd floor – Determine if minor change**

Ms. Wilson began the presentation by explaining that the applicant has a conditional Certificate of Zoning Compliance so that they can begin occupying units. Work has begun to add decks and change windows, sliders, etc. so they were requesting permission to do so. Since the units faced the inside courtyards and not the street, the commissioners thought it was a minor change. Mr. Sumpter asked if there would be an open house to see the project closer to completion as well as being able to see other projects closer to completion.

**b) #5-15SP – Special Properties II LLC – 440 Newtown Av/78 Cranbury Rd. – 15 unit conservation development - Request to modify approved plan – Determine if minor change**

Mr. Blank recused himself and left the room. Mr. Wrinn began the presentation and explained that the applicant wanted to sell a piece of the property. He also explained that the project was on hold since there were parties that were interested in purchasing it back to convert it back to the White Barn Theater. The commissioners thought it was a minor change.

**c) #13-13SP/#14-13SP/#15-13SP – Trinity Washington Village Ltd Prtnrs/City of Norwalk – Raymond, Water & Day Sts - 273 unit multifamily development (3 applications) – Request to modify approved plans with architectural changes, TOD parking & revise conditions of approval regarding offsite improvements – Deter if minor change**

Mr. Blank returned to the room. Ms. Wilson explained the project and oriented the commissioners as to the location of the project on an aerial map. She discussed some of the conditions of approval which included improvements to elevate the street. She also described the surety bond which was required under the approval. The applicant was requesting to remove the condition which would require the bond as well as making some other modifications to the project. She also noted that there were several items that she was not able to hand out to the commissioners because the applicant had not yet provided them.

Eva Erlich from Trinity continued the presentation by explaining the delay in the project as well as noting that it is now moving forward.

Kendra Halliwell, the architect, continued the presentation by giving a quick overview of the project because there were new commissioners that were not on the Zoning Commission when the project was approved several years before. She discussed the construction schedule. She noted that some of the current buildings had been flooded in Hurricane Sandy. She discussed the elevations of the streets which explained the flooding. She then discussed the site plans for each of the buildings.

She discussed four areas in which there would be modifications, building heights, building setbacks, open space, and parking. Some of the modifications being made were in connection with changes in FEMA regulations. There was a discussion of some changes to the façade materials that were to be used on the outside of the buildings. There was a further discussion as to how the buildings would be built and where residents would move while the buildings were being constructed. Mr. Ivers of the Housing Authority said that residents will receive Section 8 vouchers to relocate. They would be notified when it was time to move back. There was also a discussion about reducing the parking since the city's TOD parking regulations had changed since the time of the approval. There was a discussion about the improvements proposed for Ryan Park. They would work with the Redevelopment Agency. There was also a discussion about what would be done as there would be less parking. The applicant indicated that some of the asphalt area would be converted to green space.

Atty. Smith continued the presentation by discussing his letter and the surety bond issue. He explained the bonding process as well as the Public Infrastructure Agreement which was not yet available. They explained what they could be responsible for and what they could not be responsible for. Ms. Wilson noted that the applicant must provide them with a draft, Public Infrastructure Agreement and a budget and funding information in order to keep the process moving. The commissioners agreed to send this to the full Commission for action pending receipt of the requested information.

### **III. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF APPROVAL TIME**

**a) #8-15SP – Miracle Temple Church of God – 1 Trinity Place – Child day care center – Request for 1 year extension of approval time**

The commissioners revised the order of the agenda to hear this presentation next. Ms. Wilson said that the extension of time fee had been paid and property taxes were current and this is their first extension request. The commissioners agreed to send this to the full Commission for action.

**d) #X-16SP – Metropolitan Realty Assoc., LLC - 1 Bates Court – 40 residential units – Preliminary review**

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by discussing the application which was a road abandonment in order to allow construction of 40 residential units.

Atty. Suchy continued the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on map. She showed them the view from Martin Luther King Drive and then introduced the project team. There was a discussion of the parking and where it would be provided.

Brandon Handfield continued the presentation by discussing the topography of the site. He also discussed access for the parking as well as how much parking there would be for each unit. He also described the lighting plan.

Atty. Suchy noted that there would be a CEAC meeting on the following Tuesday with the various City departments.

Bill Andriopolus, the architect on the project, continued the presentation by discussing the various units on the different floors and the amenities. He then showed the commissioners photos of the property from the sidewalk of Dr. Martin Luther King Drive. There was a discussion of the workforce housing units and where they were located. There is no rooftop access. There was a discussion of the height of the building because of the topography. There will be a railroad sound wall which will absorb the train sounds, like a sponge. The commissioners reviewed the materials board. He noted that the materials were designed by a millennial since this was who the building would be marketed to. There was a discussion about some green panels that were on the building. They were only on the side that was hidden from the public and not on the MLK Drive side. There was a discussion about the next meeting. The public hearing would be in November.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Diana Palmentiero