

**CITY OF NORWALK  
LAND USE COMMITTEE  
DECEMBER 8, 2009  
\*\*\*DRAFT MINUTES\*\*\***

**PRESENT:** Fran DiMeglio, Chair; Torgny Astrom; Victor Cavallo; Don Nelson; Michael Chieffalo; Walter McLaughlin; Steve Ferguson; Joel Zaremby

**STAFF:** Mike Greene; Frank Strauch

**OTHERS:** Tom Hamilton; Peter DeLeo; Michael Stefan; Balis Sabel; Joe Iannacone; Marie Couchea; Jackie Liljejun

**I. REFERRALS**

**a. Mayor's Office – Special Capital Appropriation by the Parking Authority in the amount of \$500,000 for the Webster Street Parking Lot**

Mr. Strauch explained that a pay-by-space system would be implemented. He said that the revised system would improve ingress and egress and would also generate a decrease in labor costs compared to the manned booth system currently in place.

Mr. Tom Hamilton said that the Board of Estimates had considered the item and was concerned about the financial implication. He described the details of the two systems and reiterated that the labor cost would decrease with the new system. He added that the cost for equipment for the new system would be \$500,000, which would be bonded over a five-year period. Mr. Hamilton explained that the projected violation revenue was about \$150,000. He also described the plan for personnel in the lot during the transition period between the two systems. He reiterated that the plan would involve 10 or more pay stations.

Mr. Nelson asked about the continuation of the free fifteen-minute policy. Mr. Hamilton said that questions about that policy could be directed to Katharine Hebert.

Mr. Ferguson asked how violations at the site would be addressed. Mr. Hamilton described the "ambassadors" that were planned for the lot. He added that the hours of the lot would remain the same.

Mr. Ferguson pointed out that a memo in the packets indicated that the free fifteen-minute allowance would not remain. Mr. Strauch read a memo concerning the issue.

Ms. DiMeglio asked why the item was on the agenda but lacking important information in the packets. She said that a representative from the Parking Authority should have been present at the meeting.

Mr. Greene stated that the item had been brought to staff late the day before.

Mr. Hamilton said that the Parking Authority had approved the item and that it could be withdrawn and taken up at a later date.

Mr. Greene reiterated that the Commission needed to decide whether to vote on the item tonight.

Ms. DiMeglio asked when the project would be completed. Mr. Astrom said that the memo indicated it would be three to four months.

**b. Zoning Commission referral - #10-09R - Zoning Commission – Proposed amendments to establish a new Golden Hill Village District**

The Committee agreed to hear items b) and c) together.

**c. Zoning Commission referral - #1-09M - Zoning Commission – 59 – 87 Cedar Street/100 Fairfield Avenue - Proposed changes to the Building Zone Map from Neighborhood Business to Golden Hill Village District**

Mr. Greene described the proposal and reiterated that the Plan of Conservation & Development recognized village districts. He said that the character of the area would help to create a village feel and pull the neighborhood together. He emphasized that a village district was not an historic district and also that the designation would not prevent teardowns. He described the form of architectural review.

Mr. Ferguson asked if this village district would mirror the other ones.

Mr. Greene showed the area on a map and explained that it was in an existing Neighborhood Business District. He said that gas stations and taverns were not permitted in the district. He explained how that residential and office use on the second floor of buildings would be encouraged. Mr. Greene said that residential density and lot coverage would remain the same and also that 2 ½ story buildings would continue to be permitted. He also described the head-in parking, as controlled by DPW. Mr. Greene discussed design review, pointing out that it involved a significant incentive to keep a building. He added that sidewalk cafes would be encouraged and also that the applicant would like village district signs to be permitted.

Mr. Chieffalo asked about how much latitude would be available if something obviously out-of-character were proposed in the district. Mr. Greene described the role of the Zoning Commission's architect and addressed the issue of design compatibility. He also discussed the advantages and disadvantages of architectural review.

Mr. Zaremby asked about the cost to the City. Mr. Greene said there would be none.

Mr. Astrom asked how the architectural review would be done. Mr. Greene said that the Zoning Commission would hire an architect, which would be paid for by the applicant.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that it was a positive sign that the proposal was supported by property owners. He asked how the rest of the residents of the Golden Hill area felt about it. Mr. Greene described the opinions voiced by neighbors at the last meeting.

There was a discussion of the details of the public hearing.