

**CITY OF NOWALK  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 3, 2009**

ATTENDANCE: Rev. Phyllis Bolden, Chair; Christopher Potts;  
Douglas Hempstead; Carvin Hilliard; Amanda Brown (7:25 p.m.)

STAFF: Timothy Sheehan, Jack Burritt; Monroe Johnson

OTHERS: Anna Duleep, Laurel Lindstrom; Steven Serasis,  
Common Councilmembers

**CALL TO ORDER**

Rev. Bolden called the meeting to order at 7:20 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Rev. Bolden called the Roll.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr. Burgess said that he was here to support the quest to make the property on Day Street allow housing. He spoke in support of the HOPE IV project for the residents of Washington Village.

Ms. Brown joined the meeting at 7:25 p.m.

Ms. G. Duleep said that she was opposed to taking two parcels on Day Street, but needs more information. She requested a list of City owned properties.

There were no other members of the public who wished to speak.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES – JUNE 4, 2009** – REGULAR MEETING

- \*\* MR. HEMPSTEAD MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES AS PRESENTED**
- \*\* MOTION PASSED WITH TWO (2) ABSTENTIONS (MR. POTTS AND MR. HILLIARD)**

## BUSINESS

### WATER STREET INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT NORWALK HOUSING AUTHORITY PRESENTATION OF HOPE VI CONCEPT

Mr. Sheehan reviewed the project. He explained that there is a deed restriction on the site which is inconsistent with the site and is the basis of the Agency's request. He said that the property should be considered for affordable housing.

Mr. Sheehan explained that the Housing Authority has not approved the concept. He added that the Agency does not designate the developer; the Common Council does. He described the process that would be used to select the developer.

Mr. Sheehan explained that this is an information session and that no action will be taken.

Mr. Curtis Law explained that Washington Village is the oldest housing project in the City. He said that HOPE IV will provide an opportunity to develop a mixed income project.

Ms. Gayle Epp, EJP Consulting Group gave a power point presentation describing the HOPE IV project and showing site plans.

Mr. Serasis asked how many of the units would be affordable housing. Ms. Epps said that the criteria has not yet been decided. Ms. Epps said that there had been a big discussion about this question with the Housing Authority. Mr. Serasis asked if there are currently 135 deeply subsidized units, will they be replaced with 135 deeply subsidized units. Ms. Epps said that they tried to push one for one; however, people will get Section 8 vouchers. She said that anyone who is relocated off site, will be given first preference to return.

Mr. Hilliard asked who determines the number of units and their designation. Ms. Epps said that there are a variety of factors used, such as local public policy, the market and financing. That is part of the planning process.

Ms. Epps said that when they began putting this program together, they had Webster Street which would have provided a total of 260 units. Mr. Sheehan said that all of the information would be included in the development process. The intent is that this would follow the normal process to solicit RFPs from developers.

Ms. Duleep asked for an explanation of how homeownership would work and the criteria for tax credits. Ms. Epps said that she did not know exactly the criteria for home ownership; all affordable units would be financed with tax credits.

Ms. Brown asked Ms. Epps to explain the relocation process and asked if the City has that kind of capacity. Ms. Epps said that she did not know the Housing Authority's

monthly turnover. If it is slow, it may take longer. Under the program, they have to help residents find housing. In addition the vouchers are portable. Ms. Brown asked if this Committee and the Common Council could get a copy of the feasibility study.

Ms. Brown asked what steps the Housing Authority has to take. Mr. Sheehan said that the issue is that they can not do anything with this property because of the deed restriction.

Mr. Hempstead said that this sounds like a great program. He added that communication is important and suggested that informational meetings be held in the evening to allow more people to attend.

Mr. Hempstead asked if they looked into re-incorporating Ryan Park into the project. At Mr. Hempstead's request, Ms. Epps said that she will provide various reports. Ms. Brown asked if there are other parcels that might work better in order to get State funding. Mr. Sheehan said that they were aware there would be problems, because the site is in a flood plain; that is why they looked at Webster Street for housing. He said that the Master Plan calls for housing on Webster Street.

Mr. Sheehan said that Stamford did this type of project successfully; this is not unique to Fairfield County.

Mr. Bruce Morris asked about future development possibilities for Washington Village if Day Street is not available. Ms. Epps said that she would not recommend it.

Mr. Cesar Ramirez encouraged this committee to submit a strong request to the Common Council to support this project.

A recess was called at 8:35 p.m.  
The meeting resumed at 8:43 p.m.

S. MAIN STREET CORRIDOR URBAN RENEWAL PLAN  
PROPOSED PLAN AMENDMENT TO TR SONO PARTNERS – HOTEL

Mr. Burritt reviewed the plan. He said that the revisions are in the packets. He added that there are some very specific objectives that were laid out in the plan and also enclosed in the packet. He said that the concerns are the height of the building, the design of the structure and the desire to see tighter controls on the determination of new construction in lieu of rehabilitation. Mr. Burritt said that the architect made significant effort to address mitigating designs that would allow the eight story building to be perceived as a smaller building.

Mr. Hempstead asked if the Committee could act on each amendment separately. He suggested that the Committee consult with the Historical Commission on this item. He said that he wants to be sure that this does not become a single agency process. Mr.

Burrirt said that there has to be a public hearing and if there is housing, the Housing Authority has to be involved.

**\*\* MR. HEMPSTEAD MOVED TO AMEND THE PROPOSED LANGUAGE  
\*\* MOTION FAILED WITH ONE (1) VOTE IN FAVOR (MR. HEMPSTEAD)  
AND FOUR (4) VOTES IN OPPOSITION (REV. BOLDEN; MS. BROWN;  
MR. HILLIARD AND MR. POTTS)**

**\*\* MR. HILLIAD MOVED AMENDMENT 1B AS PRESENTED**

Mr. Hempstead asked if the language change goes through any other agency. Mr. Burrirt said that this language comes before this Committee as the final arbiter of the plan. The Corporation Council's opinion is that everything is in draft form until it is approved by the Common Council.

**\*\* MOTON PASSEWITH ONE (1) VOTE IN OPPOSITION (MR.  
HEMPTEAD) AND FOUR (4) VOTES IN FAVOR (REV. BOLDEN; MS.  
BROWN; MR. HILLIARD AND MR. POTTS)**

Mr. Hempstead said that normally each amendment is voted on separately. Mr. Burrirt said that number 1 is a clarification. The amendment is in response to a proposal from a hotel developer. The next item refers to the properties to be acquired, potentially by eminent domain and they have to be taken out to make this plan up to date.

Section II, paragraph B, page 7 adds the word "hotel". The Committee discussed the wording in the proposed plan amendment.

Mr. Burrirt said that the last item deals with the duration of the controls. The Redevelopment plan was extended for a period not to exceed five years. The plan was adopted on September 11, 1990 and would have expired on September 10, 2010. The Redevelopment Agency is recommending extending the plan for five years. Mr. Sheehan said that the intent was to have it reviewed every five years by the Redevelopment Agency.

Ms. Brown suggested changing the term to a longer period of time. Mr. Sheehan suggested allowing the Redevelopment Agency to extend the plan for two terms.

**\*\* MS. BROWN MOVED ITEM TWO WITH THE RECOMMENDED TERM  
CHANGE  
\*\* MOTION PASSED WITH ONE (1) ABSTENTION (MR. HEMPSTAD)**

## WALL STREET REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

### TRANSPORTATION GRANT APPLICATION

Mr. Johnson reviewed the project. He said that it relates to the already approved automated parking garage and replaces public parking on the surface parking lot. He said that this grant opportunity recently became available.

Ms. Brown asked why Mayor Moccia has to sign the grant. Mr. Johnson explained that the developer can not apply for the grant. Ms. Brown asked about jobs. Mr. Johnson said that the job component is significant in order to receive funding.

Mr. Potts questioned the financial aspects of the application. Mr. Johnson said that he will make the application clearer. Mr. Sheehan said that it would be helpful to have a breakout of the number of jobs that will be allocated. Mr. Johnson said that he believed that job generation is separate from operations. Ms. Brown asked if this grant requires a match. Mr. Johnson said that it did not.

**\*\* REV. BOLDEN MOVED TO APPROVE THE ITEM  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

### MILL HILL MASTER PLAN PHASE 1A – EXISTING CONDITIONS

Mr. Johnson explained that they are working with the Historical Society and the Historical Commission to create a Master Plan. Mr. Sheehan explained that they are looking out 10 – 20 years. This is before the Committee for their information and to let them now that the process is underway.

### OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

### NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### GLOBE THEATER

**\*\* REV. BOLDEN MOVED TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

The Committee went into Executive Session at 10:05 p.m. and the Secretary was excused.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosemarie Lombardi  
Telesco Secretarial Services

