

**CITY OF NORWALK  
PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE  
October 13, 2016**

**PRESENT:** Rod Johnson, acting as Chair; Joe Passero; Mike Witherspoon; Blank; Richard Roina; Nate Sumpter; Galen Wright Wells

**STAFF:** Mike Wrinn; Dori Wilson; Frank Strauch

**OTHERS:** Atty. Liz Suchy; Bill Andriopoulos; Bennett Brooks; Atty. Frank Zullo; Atty. Larry Cafero; Mike Stein; Mike Dougherty

Mr. Johnson called the meeting to order at 7 p.m.

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

**a) #5-16SPR/#19-16CAM – Seaman Construction Inc. – 149 Woodward Ave – Proposed contractor’s storage yard – Final review prior to public hearing**

Mr. Strauch began the presentation by showing the commissioners the site plan. He discussed second revision which he would send to them. It would also have to be approved by the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (“D.E.E.P.”).

Atty. Suchy oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property as well as describing the surrounding businesses. She then discussed the application and how the applicant would like to use the property. There was a discussion of the shared driveway. Mr. Sumpter asked about a newspaper distribution business in the area. Mr. Wrinn said that he believed that would be leaving the area. The application would be on the Zoning Commission agenda later in the month.

**b) #28-16CAM – Richard Wood – 9 Cudlipp St – Addition to single family residence - Preliminary review**

Mr. Strauch began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property. He explained the project which would be a 2 story addition and that it had no impact on coastal resources. He explained the drainage system. The application was referred to the Five Mile River Commission which the commissioners would have to wait for their comments. The committee decided that a public hearing was not necessary, unless the Five Mile River Commission recommended it.

**c) #X-16CAM – Capital Equities – 50 Washington St – Proposed roof decks - Determine if minor change**

Mr. Blank recused himself and left the room. Mr. Strauch then oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He also showed them the site plans to show them the locations of the roof decks. These decks would only be used by the businesses that had offices in the building and not the public. Mr. Passero said that he looked at the building every day and thought it should be a minor change. The commissioners decided it was a minor change.

**d) #10-94SPR – Wendy’s Restaurant – 500 CT. Ave – Changes to building façade – Determine if minor change**

Mr. Blank returned to the room. Mr. Strauch began the presentation by explaining the new design that Wendy’s was proposing. The only significant change was to add a vestibule and make it ADA compliant. He also oriented the commissioners as to the location of the

property. Although the Wendy's representative, Ken Shaw, was available to answer questions, the commissioners decided this was a minor change and had none.

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

### **a) #10-16SP – Metropolitan Realty Assoc., LLC - 1 Bates Court – 40 residential units – Further review**

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation with a brief overview of the application from the previous month. He oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property which was adjacent to the Metro-North South Norwalk station.

Atty. Suchy continued the presentation with a further description of the property and the surrounding area. There is no structure on the property at the present time. She then described the proposed structure as well as a sound barrier between the railroad and the property. She also showed the commissioners the elevations and pictures of what the building would look like. She discussed the changes that had been made to the plans from the prior month.

Bill Andriopoulos, the architect on the project, continued the presentation. He discussed the floor plans, the private driveway, the parking spaces and garage, amenities and garbage.

Mr. Blank made a suggestion about using the parking lot at the train station because commuters would use the parking spaces during the day and the residents could use the spaces at night when the commuters are gone. The applicant would attempt to see if this could be a feasible plan. There was then a discussion about visitor parking which Atty Suchy reminded the commissioners the applicant did not have to provide.

Mr. Andriopoulos continued the presentation by explaining the number of units on each floor. He spoke of their target market as well as then discussing the exterior materials of the building. The building also will include some handicap units and some that can be converted to ADA compliant. There was a discussion about the workforce housing units as well as how they would be marketed to those who would be eligible.

Bennett Brooks, the acoustical engineer, continued the presentation by showing them the sample materials that would be used to make the sound wall. He showed the commissioners where the wall would be erected. There was also a discussion about the ledge that the applicant would have to build through. There was also a discussion of the data which Mr. Brooks used which he said was the "worst case" data. Mr. Blank suggested that the commissioners go to the site.

The commissioners decided to have the traffic engineer and landscape architect speak at the public hearing.

### **b) #11-16SP – Side by Side Charter School – 85 & 97 South Main St – New 2story school bldg - Preliminary review**

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation with a brief overview of the Side by Side Charter School and their application.

Atty. Zullo began the presentation with an introduction of the project team as well as orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He then gave brief history of the Side by Side Charter School. He then said that the school has received a grant from the state to build a permanent structure to replace the portable classrooms that they currently have. It would be 6,000 sq. ft. and would be built on the same footprint which was non-conforming.

Atty. Larry Cafero explained the history of the state statute which allowed this public charter school. These were schools funded by the state and not the local municipality. However the legislation did not fund facilities so they found St. Joseph's which had empty facilities as well

as using portable classrooms. Now that the classrooms are beyond their useful life, they were able to receive a grant from the state to help build the permanent structure. This school is not funded by corporations but rather was started by 7 teachers.

There was a discussion of who would own the building which would be Side by Side and the land would be leased from St. Joseph. Mr. Stein continued the presentation by explaining the current structures that are on the property including the portable classrooms. He discussed the current parking spaces as well as the drop-off for the children. There was a discussion on a better drop-off pattern for the buses. There was then a discussion as to whether the applicant could waive a traffic report; however, it seemed to make sense to get input from one. Mr. Stein said that they were working on how to protect the kids while construction was happening. He also described the playground. He said the parking lot would be repaved. He then showed them renderings of what the new structure would look like as well as the floor plans. He discussed the uses for all of the classrooms. There was a discussion of how long the project would take and when it would be completed. Mr. Stein said they hoped to open in the fall of 2018. There was a discussion about the setbacks.

Mike Dougherty, the landscape architect, spoke briefly to correct information in the commissioners' memo as well noting that the impervious surfaces would be decreased. He would make a full presentation at the public hearing.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Diana Palmentiero