

**CITY OF NORWALK  
PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE  
MAY 14, 2009**

**PRESENT:** James White, Chair; Jackie Lightfield; Andrea Light; Karen Spencer; Bob Keyes; Larry Bentley; John Tobin; Michael Mushak

**STAFF:** Mike Wrinn; Frank Strauch; Dori Wilson

**OTHERS:** Atty. Glenn Major; Bill Achilles; Don Straight; Atty. Liz Suchy; Alan Matthis; Ron Kellogg; Henry Ditman; Lisa Burns; Hal Alvord; Mike Doyle

**I. SPECIAL USE:** Transit District – Burnell Blvd – Bus shelter

Mr. Wrinn clarified that the use involved only the bus shelter itself. He added that Redevelopment had no issues with the item and that DPW had also signed off on it. The Committee agreed to move the item to full Commission.

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

a) #3-09SP/#7-09CAM – SIR East Ave, LLC – 124 East Av – 12,000 sq ft mixed use development – Further review

Mr. Strauch said that a traffic report had been done since the preliminary review last month.

Atty. Glenn Major discussed the redesign of the building, as well as the applicant's intention to retain the tree on the property. He emphasized that the plan was virtually the same as the previous building, as far as the footprint, the parking and the driveways.

Mr. Bill Achilles discussed the details of the building, particularly its entrance.

Ms. Lightfield addressed the ingress and egress of the site. Mr. Don Straight discussed parking at the site, as well as topographical issues with regard to the two-way exit on Daskams Lane.

Mr. Achilles described the building's interior, showing a floor plan of what he called the "Second Empire Design."

There was a discussion of the tree on the property. Mr. Wrinn suggested that the Committee request an arborist to examine the tree and make recommendations for its care.

Ms. Lightfield pointed out that the sign was next to, rather than in front of the building, due to sign regulations. She emphasized that the regulations needed to be adjusted.

Mr. Mushak asked about a condition requiring the applicant to replace the tree with a similar one, in the event that the tree died. Ms. Lightfield requested that such a condition be addressed in the arborist's report.

The Committee agreed to send the item to public hearing.

b) #X-09SP –Bd of Ed – Naramake Elementary– 16 King St– Two classroom modular– Determination if minor change

The Committee agreed to consider the item together with Item C.

c) #X-09SP – Bd of Ed– Rowayton Elementary– 1 Roton Av –Two classroom modular – Determination if minor change

Mr. Wrinn stated that questions had been raised regarding softball near the building and also regarding the retaining walls.

Ms. Lightfield pointed out that the packet was very large and the Committee had not had time to review it.

Ms. Light stated that the report had not mentioned the need for portable classrooms.

Ms. Lightfield added that requests for transfers into the two schools had increased, due to the before-school and after-school programs. Mr. White added that economic circumstances had influenced the move from private to public schools.

The Committee agreed to address these items at its next meeting.

d) #4-08SP – Clover Hill School – 2 Emerson St – Kindergarten & day care facility in church – Request release of surety

Mr. Strauch said that proposal involved re-striping the parking area and adding two parking spaces.

Ms. Lightfield asked if there were traffic issues on the site. The Committee agreed that there were not.

e) #10-92SP – Alcohol & Drug Abuse Center – 4 Elmcrest Terrace - Modification of use - Determination if minor change

Mr. Wrinn described the location of the site, explaining that a 45-bed facility had originally been approved, along with 25 parking spaces.

Atty. Liz Suchy described the structure and gave background concerning its use. She emphasized that only the staff would have vehicles on the premises. She added that the apartments on the property would be available only for people who had completed the treatment program.

Mr. Alan Matthis clarified that the apartments were targeted for people who had completed Phase 1 of the program.

Atty. Suchy discussed car allowances, as well as the three staff shifts at the facility.

Ms. Light asked about a similar facility in Stamford. Mr. Matthis gave details about the facility.

Ms. Spencer asked if the site expected visitors. Mr. Matthis said no.

f) #4-09SP/9-09CAM – Crystal LLC – 314 Wilson Avenue – 10,300 sq ft indoor commercial recreation facility in existing building (indoor soccer and lacrosse) – Preliminary review

Mr. Wrinn showed the property on a map, explaining that it involved a new, independent application.

There was a discussion of the DEP requirement, as far as the berm.

Mr. Ron Kellogg described the facility, its hours of operations, and its security system. He discussed the number of players and spectators expected with relation to the number of parking spaces.

Mr. Henry Ditman discussed traffic at the site, comparing it to The SportZone in Trumbull.

Ms. Light pointed out that the facility bordered a residential neighborhood and would need to address the issue of loitering and noise.

Ms. Spencer asked if there would be locker rooms at the facility. Mr. Kellogg said no.

There was a discussion of loitering and enforcement.

g) #13-84SP/#157CAM – Thomas Properties Conservation Development– Bluff/ Wilson Avenue – Request to modify conservation land to add a deck to unit #12– Preliminary review

Mr. Wrinn discussed the conservation area with relation to the location of the deck.

Ms. Lightfield commented that the modification would present a “net zero” change.

h) #24-06CAM / SPR#2-06- Guinta – 30 Sheehan Ave – Proposed contractor’s storage yard – Revocation of permits

Mr. Strauch said that the issue at the site involved the intensity of use. He pointed out that the applicant had received two Cease and Desist orders. He added that the ZBA had stated that Zoning’s decision on the item would stand.

May 14, 2009

Plan Review Committee

Page 2

### III. SITE PLAN REVIEWS & COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEWS

a) #X-09CAM – Soybel Properties – 159-165 Rowayton Avenue – Proposed façade improvements for existing retail building – Determination if minor change

Ms. Wilson described the property, saying that it was on the waterfront and had once been the Rowayton Pharmacy. She said the plan would involve new retail tenants to replace the prior use. She added that the item involved a façade improvement only, with the addition of signage.

The Committee agreed that the item was a minor change.

b) #14-09CAM/#6-09SPR – Fessler Stebbins R.E. LLC – 116 East Avenue – 1,200 sq ft addition to dental office – Preliminary review

Mr. Wrinn said that the item was a small addition to the existing building and that the unattractive ramp would be replaced, as well. He said that he would meet with a building consultant next week and also that a Village District architect was working on the project.

c) #X-09SPR – Publicis Modem - 1 Selleck Street – Office Cornice Sign – (replaces existing Bear Naked sign)

Mr. Strauch said that the item involved the replacement of a sign.

d) #5-09SPR/#12-09CAM – City of Norwalk – 5 South Smith St – Expansion of wastewater treatment plant – Preliminary review

Ms. Lightfield recused herself.

Mr. Strauch said that the project involved Phase 1 upgrades and would be in environmental compliance.

Ms. Lisa Burns explained that the proposed wet-weather facility was in the center of the site. She added that the WPCA was getting a grant from the State of Connecticut Clean Water Fund. Ms. Burns discussed the heating of the facility and its façade.

Ms. Light asked if the new facility would be considered a regional facility. Ms. Burns said no, pointing out that the project did not involve an expansion of the plant's capacity.

Mr. Strauch said that the item needed to go to public hearing, due to the size of the project.

Mr. Mushak asked about where Phase 2 of the project would take place. Ms. Burns described Phase 2 briefly, adding that there would be much better odor control.

Mr. Hal Alvord addressed the idea of tours of the facility and also discussed the timeline of the project.

Mr. Bentley asked if the project were fully funded. Ms. Burns gave details, emphasizing that the project had been given high priority.

Ms. Lightfield returned to the meeting.

e) #8-88SPR – M&M Deli – 430 Main Av –Modify to allow additional dining -Determination if minor change

Mr. Wrinn described the site, explaining that the applicant wanted to put outdoor seating in.

Ms. Light asked if it were subject to the same regulations. Mr. Mike Doyle described the site.

The Committee agreed that the item was a minor change.

f) #28-87CAM – Miegas – 10 Wall St – Add restaurant space - Determination if minor change

Mr. Wrinn described the Old Trolley Barn restaurant. He said that no new parking was required. The Committee agreed that the item was a minor change.

g) #15-86SPR – Tuscan Oven – 712 Main Ave – Modification to add music- Determination if minor change

Mr. Wrinn described the site, next to the DMV. He said that a sound report had not been conducted, because of its location. The Committee agreed that the item was a minor change.

#### **IV. MOTOR VEHICLE LICENSE**

a) #1-09MV/#13-09CAM–Hollywood Restorations 115 Woodward Av –Auto Body Repair– Preliminary review

Mr. Strauch gave background about the property, with regard to parking variances. He said that the item needed to go to public hearing.

Mr. White asked if there would be towing. Mr. Strauch said no.

Ms. Lightfield asked if there were a lot of cars on the street. Ms. Light said no, but added that there were a lot of cars on the site.

#### **V. REFERRALS**

a) DEP/USACE Referral – 71-73 Osborne Avenue – Construct a public access walkway

Mr. Wrinn described the project, explaining that it would involve connecting two boardwalks.

b) DEP/USACE Referral – 63 Bluff Avenue – Construction of a new dock

This item was considered together with Item C.

c) DEP/USACE Referral – 12 Nathan Hale Drive – Construction of a new dock

Mr. Wrinn said that the project involved a dock and a float and was a water-dependent use. He added that the DEP approved the projects.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Charlene Smith.