

CITY OF NORWALK  
PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE  
May 11, 2017

**PRESENT:** Rod Johnson, Chair; Joe Passero, Mike Witherspoon; Louis Schulman; Douglas Stern; Richard Roina; Galen Wells (arrived late)

**STAFF:** Steve Kleppin; Mike Wrinn; Dori Wilson

**OTHERS:** Mike Moccaie; Atty. Liz Suchy; Bill Andriopoulos; Matt Edvardsen

Louis Schulman, acting as Chair for Mr. Sumpter, called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. and began by notifying everyone that a couple of the applications had been withdrawn.

**I. REQUESTS FOR EXTENSION OF APPROVAL TIME**

**a) #2-03SP/#6-03CAM - City of Norwalk - Calf Pasture Beach Rd - Renovations and additions to existing concession building at Calf Pasture Beach for full service restaurant – Request for 1 yr extension of app time**

Dori Wilson explained the background of this application and why they were requesting another extension. Mr. Moccaie explained why it had not been built. Restrooms were renovated instead of the concession stand. The rent has increased significantly for the current tenant. Monies have been set aside for renovations but not enough has accumulated yet. He hoped that it would happen within the next few years. The commissioners were pleased with the tenant, Ripka's. He said that the vendor was discussing possibly helping with the renovations. It would be on the Zoning Commission Agenda in May.

**b) #21-15SP/#22-15SP – Norwalk Land Development – The SoNo Collection – 1 Putnam Ave/63 West Ave – Mixed use retail shopping center development (2 parcels) - Request for 1 yr extension of approval time (2 requests)**

Ms. Wilson explained about the request for the 1 yr. extension and said that they would be starting construction shortly. There was a discussion about whether a 1 year extension was necessary. Ms. Wilson explained about the fee for the extension. Ms. Wilson explained that this was their first extension. It would be on the Zoning Commission Agenda in May.

**II. SITE PLAN REVIEWS & COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEWS**

**a) #X-17CAM – K. Conroy – 89 Rowayton Ave – 2nd floor storage room addition – Preliminary review – WITHDRAWN**

**b) #X-17CAM – K. Conroy – 140 Rowayton Av – 2 apartments in existing building with dormer – Prel review**

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by orienting commissioners as to the location of the property on aerial maps that he passed out. He explained the construction that would be completed. There was a discussion about parking.

**c) #X-17CAM – Pentecostal Church John 3:16 – 8 Woodward Ave – Replacement church – Preliminary review –REMOVED  
(Previously approved Sept 2015)**

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

**a) #5-17SP – Paul Garavel – 85 Dr. MLK Jr. Drive – Storage of motor vehicles – Final review prior to public hearing**

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by orienting commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. There was a discussion about a violation on the site and how this would affect the application which is scheduled on the Zoning Commission agenda in May. The landlord is pursuing an application with the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Wrinn said that they could withdraw the application.

**b) #3-14SP/#11-14CAM – Maritime Village I, LLC – 19 Day St – 57 unit mixed use development (2 new bldgs.) & 9,790 sf office (existing bldg) – Request to modify approved plans to revise use of Bldg A to manufacturing (distillery with tasting room) and office (2nd floor) – Determine if minor change**

Ms. Wilson began the presentation by orienting commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. She also showed them the site plans. She noted that it was currently in construction if the commissioners wanted to see it. She explained how they were changing the use because it was in the flood zone. They were changing floors and places for a distillery. Parking increased because of the change in use. It would be on the Zoning Commission Agenda in May. There was a discussion about the distilling process which the owner said was not noisy and only had a yeastlike smell in the distillery.

**c) #X-17SP – United Church of Rowayton – 210 Rowayton Ave - Revise existing lighting – Determine if minor change**

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by orienting commissioners as to the location of the property on aerial maps that he passed out. He also showed them the site plans and explained how the spill from the lights would not leave the property. The lights were more energy efficient. The commissioners agreed it was a minor change.

**d) #2-17SP/#5-17CAM – Web Construction – 34 Meadow Street – Indoor contractor parking for contractor’s storage yard – Preliminary review**

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by orienting commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He explained the other businesses in the area and explained the application.

Atty. Suchy began the presentation with an introduction of the project team. She also said that they were commissioning a noise study because rock crushing was a noisy business. She then showed them the site plans of the project. A new building would be built because it would help with lowering the sound of the rock crushing. There was a further discussion about sound attenuation. Village Creek was nearby. There was a discussion about the applicant's use.

Bill Andriopoulos continued the presentation by explaining how the trucks would come into the property and where the rocks would be taken. There was also a discussion about how the debris would be handled. There was a discussion about the drainage system which did not currently exist. There were no chemicals involved.

There was a discussion of the business hours as well as the neighbors. Atty. Suchy said they were surrounded by other businesses, and not residential. The garage doors would be facing another building. She asked whether they could schedule a public hearing for June. There was some concern about the dust in the building and whether there was proper ventilation. Mr. Wrinn said that there was still research being done about how the rock crushing process worked. Mr. Schulman asked the commissioners to visit the site to see how the building would affect the surrounding area.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Diana Palmentiero