

**CITY OF NORWALK
PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 12, 2009**

PRESENT: James White, Chair; Bob Hard; Jackie Lightfield; Adam Blank; Larry Bentley; Andrea Light;

STAFF: Mike Greene; Adam Carsen; John Hayducky

OTHERS: Atty. Liz Suchy; Ray Sullivan; Ron Kellogg; Brian Hardin; Alan Smardin; Matthew Pock; Don Straight; Mike Moore; Larry Bourque

I. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF APPROVAL TIME

- a) #2-08SPR/#2-08CAM - 95/7 Ventures LLC - 105-141 West Av/3-11 Reed St/1-41 & 62-64 Putnam Av – North of Reed St – ±605,000 square foot mixed use development (Phase 1) – Request for 1 year extension of approval time

The applicant agreed to hear this item together with item b.

- b) #3-08SPR/#3-08CAM - 95/7 Ventures LLC – 51-63 West Av/15-25 Putnam Av – South of Reed St - District 95/7 ±106,500 square foot mixed use development (Phase 1) - Request for 1 year extension of approval time

Mr. Carsen explained that work was still being done on the overpass and that the applicant was requesting an extension. The Committee agreed to send the item to full Commission.

- c) #3-07SPR – American Cancer Society NE Division – 38 Richards Av – Office bldg w/ parking under - Request for 1 year extension of approval time

The Committee agreed to send the request to full Commission.

- d) #2-07SP – Stuart Avenue Town Houses, LLC – 42-46 Stuart Avenue – 12 unit multifamily development – Request for 1 year extension of approval time

Ms. Lightfield asked if the item were being considered under the new regulations. The Committee agreed to send the item to full Commission.

- e) #2-03SP/#6-03CAM City of Norwalk - Calf Pasture Beach Road – Restaurant at Calf Pasture Beach – Request for one year extension of approval time

The committee agreed to send the item to full Commission.

II. SPECIAL PERMITS & COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEWS

- a) #5-01SP/#10-01CAM – Weeburn Beach Club – Anchor Rd – Construct outdoor bar area – Determination if minor change

Mr. Carsen showed the site on a map. He said that the new use was considered an accessory use and would not affect parking.

- b) #9-94SP – Golf Training Center – 145 Main St – Conversion to children's commercial recreation "Pump it Up"– Determination if minor change

Mr. Carsen showed the site on a map and described both the old and the new use as commercial recreation.

Atty. Suchy addressed traffic concerns at the site, indicating that there were 92 parking total between the front and the back parking areas. She said that the peak traffic times would be altered, but that it seemed close to an even exchange of traffic from the old use to the new use. She added that a traffic report had been submitted.

Ms. Lightfield expressed concern with the traffic study, stating the child-oriented nature of the new use would probably involve two trips—a drop-off and a pick-up—for every visitor. She added that the new use would be open one more day each week than the old use. Mr. Hard noted that the site would involve “counter-cycle” traffic.

The proprietor discussed the expected number of visitors to the site, indicating that the fire marshal would have information about the maximum numbers. She added that a sign would indicate that the main entrance was in the rear of the property, thereby directing people away from the front loop.

The Committee discussed adding such signage as a condition of approval.

III. SITE PLAN REVIEWS & COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEWS

- a) #14-08CAM – West Pine Place – 1 West Av/Pine St – Mixed use development – Request to modify approved plans

Mr. Carsen showed the site plan, stating that the units would be slightly larger and the rear façade would be altered. He said that the front façade would remain the same.

Mr. Sullivan showed photographs, describing the scale and elevation of the development.

Ms. Lightfield asked about the possibility of balancing out the roof, which seemed out of proportion with the rest of the building.

The Committee agreed that this appeared to be a minor change.

- b) #3-09CAM – Shiverick – 29 Shorehaven Road – Additions to SFR – Preliminary review

Mr. Carsen described the site, indicating that the proposal would reduce two non-conformities.

The Committee agreed to waive a public hearing.

- c) #2-09CAM – Gromley – 170 Woodward Av – Legalize 2 family residence – Preliminary review

Mr. Hayducky showed the plan, stating that it was a legalization of an existing two-family residence. He said that there were no additions or renovations proposed.

Mr. White asked why the property was not legal now. Mr. Hayducky said that it was approved as a one-family lot and that parking remained the only issue.

- d) #30-08CAM - Jackson – 10 Goldstein Place – Contractor’s storage yard – Further review

Mr. Greene showed the property on a map and discussed the traffic study and levels of service.

Mr. Kellogg added that traffic was the only remaining issue concerning the site.

The Committee agreed to send the item to public hearing.

- e) #12-06SPR – CVS – 6 Willard Rd – Retail pharmacy – Request to add changeable copy (automatic) sign – Preliminary review

The Committee discussed changeable copy signage. Mr. Bourque clarified that the sign was not a flashing sign, but rather a sign that faded in and out. He addressed the concern regarding the frequency of the changeable sign.

Mr. White stated that changeable copy signs were an eyesore and a distraction, adding that the City needed to come up with a system of approving the signs that was not merely piecemeal.

Ms. Lightfield said that the signs should be considered depending on their location. She asked if the signs used LED technology. Mr. Bourque said yes.

Mr. Hard asked about the frequency and duration of the sign changes. He asked whether the signs actually seemed to generate business. Mr. Hardin discussed the impact of the signs on business.

Ms. Lightfield said that the concerns remained only with regard to frequency of sign changes, not with sign placement. Mr. White objected to the sign on the basis of its use to advertise products. Mr. Blank agreed with Mr. White's concern about the signs, adding that the approval of one changeable copy sign would likely lead to many more requests for the signs.

f) #X-09SPR – 166 Glover Ave LLC (c/o Bldg & Land Technology) – 166 Glover Av – Application amendment to remove previously approved parking structure – Preliminary review

Mr. Greene explained that the proposal involved a 50-space parking lot instead of the parking garage originally proposed. He added that this was a new, separate application and that a special meeting would be held concerning the proposal.

g) #11-08SPR/#29-08CAM – Crystal LLC – 314 Wilson Ave (Grasso Construction) - Contractor's storage yard – Addition of structures and reconfiguration of property – Final review prior to public hearing

Mr. Carsen said that the applicant was proposing several improvements to the site. He added that a letter from neighbors and a traffic study were included in the packets.

Mr. Greene agreed to check with Mike Wrinn with regard to photographs of the site.

Mr. Kellogg stated that the doors and the color of the building were concerns. He discussed the traffic study and said that all sign-offs were in.

Ms. Lightfield asked what would be done to mitigate the noise from the site.

Mr. Smardin said that the noisy area would be moved back 260 feet from the proposed berm and that there would also be an 18 foot wall and about 179 trees added to the site.

Ms. Lightfield asked about the echo factor with relation to the rock ledges. Mr. Smardin said that the echo would be minimized now that the noisy area would be moved back 260 feet.

Mr. White asked about a restriction of dumpster pickup hours. Ms. Lightfield stated that the proximity to the water should be taken into account, because water was an acoustic amplifier.

Mr. Smardin said that he was judging the noise based on what was compliant with the City's noise ordinance.

Ms. Lightfield asked if the applicant had reviewed neighbors' concerns. Mr. Kellogg said yes and detailed some of the concerns.

Ms. Lightfield asked about a mitigation plan for flooding, particularly with regard to keeping the berm intact. Mr. Pock said that it would be unlikely to erode unless it was next to moving water.

Ms. Lightfield asked what the height was at which the flood mitigation system would fail. Mr. Straight said that it would be at about 7 to 7.5 feet. He added that the plant, when established, would help control flooding without relying only on temporary controls.

Respectfully submitted by Charlene Smith