

**CITY OF NORWALK
PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
September 7, 2017**

PRESENT: Lou Schulman, Chair; Doug Stern; Galen Wright; Nathan Sumpter; Joe Passero; Richard Rowena

STAFF: Steve Kleppin; Mike Wrinn; Dori Wilson; Frank Strauch

OTHERS: Atty Liz Suchy; Bill Andriopoulos; Tom Nelson; Michael Galante; Casey Fitzpatrick; Michael Lazano; Kendra Halliwell; Frank D'Arno; Patricia Gill

Mr. Schulman called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

I. REQUEST FOR RELEASE OF SURETY

a) #7-14SP – 587 Connecticut Storage LLC – 587 CT. Ave – Request for return of maintenance surety

Mr. Strauch began the presentation by noting that the improvements have been completed. Staff believed that the maintenance bond should be returned.

II. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF APPROVAL TIME

a) #10-16SP – Metropolitan Realty Assoc., LLC - 1 Bates Court – New multifamily development with 40 units – Request for one year extension of approval time

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by orienting the commission as to the location of the property. He noted that this was the first request by the applicant for an extension.

III. SITE PLAN REVIEWS & COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEWS

a) #4-17SPR – ServPro – 173 Main Street – Indoor contractors parking facility – Preliminary review

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by handing out aerial maps showing the location of the property. He then explained the different types of uses as well as passing out other photos of it.

Atty. Suchy continued the presentation with an introduction of the applicant's project team. She oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. The company is currently located in Stamford but it would be better for it be centrally located in Norwalk. She explained the ventilation system in the current building. The applicant would use almost the whole building. It is not a retail site. There is no servicing of vehicles on the site; it is only for storage of the vehicles as well as office staff. They have received most of the sign-offs from various departments. There were no plans for site improvements. There was a discussion on how vehicles would come out of the site. There was a discussion about the appearance of the building. She requested of the commissioners that they consider not holding a public hearing.

Bill Andriopoulos, the architect of the project, continued the presentation who explained the layout of the interior of the building. He also explained where the vehicles and equipment would be stored. He then was asked to explain how the applicant's vehicles would back into the vehicle storage. There was a concern about the chemicals used by the applicant. Tom Nelson

discussed the clean-up of chemicals, which did not go into the drainage system. Mr. Andriopoulos explained that drainage is not an issue. There was also a discussion about the ventilation. There was also a discussion about the vehicles idling inside the building. There was also a discussion about the applicant's services and whether it included hazardous materials such as lead paint.

Mr. Galante continued the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property. He then explained the analysis of the traffic report including the peak times of the traffic. He also explained that the size of the vehicles were not that large. He also discussed the driveways on the street. He then passed out a letter that his company had prepared and would become a part of the record.

The commissioners discussed whether to hold a public hearing. Mr. Schulman asked the audience members whether they thought there should be a public hearing. This is an indoor storage application. There was also a discussion of the previous use by a paint store. Mr. Sumpter asked the commissioners for their opinion as to whether there should be a public hearing. There was also a discussion about how many employees there would be at the site. The commissioners thought that they should wait until the next Plan Review meeting to decide whether they would require a public hearing or not.

b) #24-95CAM – Crystal LLC (Grasso) 314 Wilson Avenue – Landscape berm along Village Creek – Determine if minor change

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by handing out aerial photos of the location as well as explaining what the applicant was proposing.

Atty. Suchy continued the presentation by explaining that the building had been there since the late 1980s. She gave a brief history of the property as well as why the applicant was requesting a berm. This would be a vegetative buffer which would then hide the property from Village Creek. There was a discussion about the neighbors' reaction to this application which seemed to be positive. There was a discussion about possible landscape plans. Mr. Wrinn noted that the landscape plan had to be maintained for the life of the tenant on that property. The applicant has also filed plans with the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection ("D.E.E.P.") This item was placed on the Zoning Commission agenda for later in the month.

c) #16-17CAM – 197 Rowayton Ave, LLC – 197 Rowayton Av – New single family residence – Prelim review

Mr. Strauch began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He explained the requirements for the application as well as the size of the lot. He noted that the applicant was also going to get variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals this month. Referrals had been sent to the Five Mile River Commission which had no objection. There were no adverse impacts to coastal resources. A public hearing was at the Zoning Commission's discretion. There was a discussion as to the footprint of the property and why it had to request a variance. This item was placed on the Zoning Commission agenda for later in the month.

d) #20-17CAM – Troupe 429 – 3 Wall Street – Live music request – Preliminary review

Mr. Strauch began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. The restaurant is not open at this time because it is still being constructed. He also presented a plan of the interior to show where the live music would take

place. He said that the live music would not be loud music. There were no residents above the restaurant. Casey Fitzpatrick, the owner, said that the music would be mostly acoustical and not a large band. The sound report would have to be updated if that were to happen.

IV. SPECIAL PERMITS & COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEWS

a) #15-13SP/#21-13CAM – Trinity Washington Village Ltd Prtnrs/City of Norwalk – Raymond, Water & Day Sts - 193 unit multifamily development – Proposed modifications to approved plans to add new driveway on Water St; shorten Building C; remove bridges between bldgs; add compact car pkg spaces & related changes – Determine if minor change

Ms. Wilson began the presentation began by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map and explaining what was currently happening at the site.

Michael Lazano explained the minor site plan modifications. He also said that they had spoken with D.E.E.P. who had approved them as minor modifications.

Kendra Halliwell explained further the modifications which included removal of some bridges as well as the parking spaces, which were remaining the same. Some of the parking spaces would now be compact which would allow them to have more grass, rather than paved. Units have been reconfigured inside Building C. Some of the interior space was no longer needed. She then showed them some new materials for the stoops because there were concerns about flooding. The landscaping would remain the same. Ms. Wilson said that the applicant would also have to go before the Traffic Authority to obtain permission to remove on-street parking spaces.

b) #X-17SP – Garavel Motor Group – 300 Westport Ave – Transfer sidewalk requirement to State DOT – Preliminary review

There was a quick review of a question that the commissioners had regarding the property.

c) #5-17SP/#21-17CAM – Dimitrogou – 198-200 East Ave – 14 unit multifamily development – Preliminary review

Mr. Strauch began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He gave a brief review of the current use of the property. He explained how the application was a special permit. He also discussed the requirements of the regulations for this project. If the commissioners were going to hold a public hearing, it would be in October. There was a discussion of the square footage of the units which Frank D'Arno, the architect, explained further. Mr. Strauch showed them the site plans and materials board. The units would be toward the back of the property. There was a discussion about the blandness of the architecture and what could be done to enhance it and give it more character.

d) #7-17SP/#22-17CAM – Third Taxing District – 16 & 18 Rowan St – Construction of storage building for public utility supply & storage facility – Preliminary review

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map which he handed out to them. He gave a brief overview of the project.

Patricia Gill continued the presentation by showing the site plans of the proposed storage facility. She explained the use of the building and how it would be accessed. There is a fence around the separate sub-station. It would require a public hearing.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Diana Palmentiero