

CITY OF NORWALK
ZONING COMMITTEE
March 9, 2017

PRESENT: Doug Stern, Chair; Michael Witherspoon; Joe Passero; Nate Sumpter; Rich Roina; Roderick Johnson; Louis Schulman; Galen Wells

STAFF: Steve Kleppin; Mike Wrinn; Frank Strauch

OTHERS: Atty. Andy Glickson; Tim Sheehan

The meeting began at 8:07 p.m.

I. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUILDING ZONE REGULATIONS/SITE PLAN REVIEWS

a) Draft amendments to the zoning regulations and changes to the zoning map associated with South Norwalk Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Redevelopment Plan – Status report

Mr. Kleppin began the presentation by introducing staff from the Redevelopment Agency.

Atty. Andy Glickson discussed his previous appearance before the commissioners. He then discussed the South Norwalk Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Redevelopment Plan as they related to the TOD Plan. There would be mixed use areas, many of them would be walkable. It includes design review by the agency. He then discussed what areas would be included in the plan. He explained what would change in the regulations. There was a discussion about affordable housing and workforce housing. There was then a discussion with Mr. Sheehan about affordability for the residents who currently live there. Atty. Glickson said there were no residential projects yet under this plan. There was discussion about the height requirements in the area. There is potential for increasing density in the area. There was a discussion about what areas were included in the TOD plan to help clarify what regulations would be changed. There was a discussion about why the waterfront was not included. Mr. Sheehan said that after discussions with waterfront property owners, it seemed that should be its own district. There was also a discussion of the Lexington Avenue corridor. Although this application is not ready for a public hearing, Mr. Kleppin noted that the Redevelopment Agency is looking for guidance from the commissioners that the plan is going in the right direction so that amendments to the regulations could be drafted. Mr. Kleppin also noted that there was an issue about the traffic. There was a return to the height issues on building. Norwalk did not seem to want the buildings to be as high as the ones in Stamford which were 20 stories high.

Mr. Beinfield, representing Spinnaker Real Estate Partners, continued the presentation by discussing the restoration of several areas. Spinnaker would be building around this project. He discussed the goals of their project which included walkability. He explained that Spinnaker would be getting involved in the project. He discussed

what is currently allowed under the regulations in the area as well as what revisions they would be seeking under the plan. There was a discussion of a public/private partnership for the project. There was a discussion about parking spaces for commuters.

b) #1-17R/#1-17SPR/#1-17CAM – Meadow Street Partners, LLC – 6 & 30 Meadow St – Proposed amendment to Industrial #1 zone to allow storage of empty solid waste containers and refuse collection receptacles associated with an approved solid waste transfer station as a contractor’s storage yard and site plan review/AM for new contractor’s storage yard to store empty containers and refuse collection receptacles within 100 ft of an existing solid waste transfer station – Preliminary review

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

Atty. Hennessey continued the presentation with a detailed history of the property. He explained the use of the transfer station. He reminded the commissioners that the cans were used for the construction industry and are empty until they go to a demolition site. He explained that his client has followed the path of least resistance to get the site properly permitted.

There was a discussion with staff about what can be seen at Village Creek and whether shrubbery would be needed. There was a discussion about when the application should go to a public hearing or back to committee.

c) #9-16R – Zoning Commission – Proposed amendment to Section 118-1110 Coastal Zone regarding vegetated buffers from the Coastal Jurisdiction Line for properties in the Coastal Zone – Status update: Hearing continued

Mr. Kleppin began the presentation with a review of the public hearing which had been continued. He then gave the commissioners a red-lined version of the amendments were sent to the Law Department. He then recommended having another public hearing regarding further changes to the amendment. There was a discussion as what else should be in the amendment such as a definition for “vegetative buffer.” Mr. Strauch discussed the purpose of the walls that would be necessary. There was then a discussion as to the purpose of the amendment and the function of the buffer as well as the walls. There was a discussion about the onus this amendment would put on property owners. Mr. Kleppin said he would provide more information and report back to the commissioners the following month.

d) #10-16R - Zoning Commission – Proposed amendments to Articles 111 and 140 regarding fees for various applications and adoption of new fee schedule – Further review

Mr. Kleppin began the presentation about the revised proposed fees. There was a discussion about whether the proposed fees were lower than other towns. There was then a discussion as to whether to raise them higher now or then end up raising them

twice. Since many commissioners had not reviewed the fees, then it would be put on the next month's agenda.

e) #11-16R - Zoning Commission – Proposed amendments to Article 140 regarding technical review of various applications – Final review prior to public hearing

Mr. Kleppin began the presentation with a review of the proposed amendment. He reminded them that the application would be on the Zoning Commission agenda the following week.

f) #2-17R - Zoning Commission – Amendments to extend the moratorium for one year on licensed medical marijuana producer or dispensary facility as permitted by the State of Connecticut – Preliminary review

Mr. Kleppin began the presentation asking that the commissioners extend the moratorium for another 6 months since one presenter was not available for this meeting. There was a discussion as to how long the moratorium should be. They decided to extend the moratorium for 3 months.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Diana Palmentiero