

**CITY OF NORWALK
PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
June 12, 2014**

PRESENT: Jill Jacobson, Chair; Joseph Santo; Mike Mushak; Jim White;
Nathan Sumpter; Emily Wilson

STAFF: Mike Wrinn; Dori Wilson; Frank Strauch

OTHERS: Michael Moccia; Andrew Diejack; Andrew Glazer; Atty Liz Suchy;

Jill Jacobson called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

I. SITE PLAN REVIEWS & COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEWS

a) #1-84SPR – Cablevision – 28 Cross St – Minor modifications to approved plan – Determine if minor change

Mr. Strauch began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of Cablevision on an aerial map. He also informed the commissioners as to the background and history of the property. He then explained that they would like to install 2 generators in the surface parking area. He also explained that there was an authorized generator at the property for which they had paid the fee. They would also meet sound requirements. An underground oil tank had to be removed. He also informed them of the number of parking spaces they had.

There was a discussion about Cablevision's big trucks and where they would be parked. Mr. Strauch said there may be a new location for them in Stamford.

Mr. Strauch explained why Cablevision needed the generators which were to continue to service the area. They now had more data stored there than they did in 1984 when they first opened this location.

There was a discussion regarding the unauthorized installation of a previous generator as well as whether the residential neighborhood nearby would hear the new generators. Mr. Strauch explained that the generators would be tested on Wednesdays, between 11 a.m. – 1 p.m. There was a discussion about the screening of the generators. The three commissioners on the Plan Review Committee, Ms. Jacobson, Mr. White and Mr. Sumpter voted that this was a minor change.

b) #7-14CAM – Beinfield Architecture – 16 Farm Creek Rd – New single family residence – Preliminary review

Mr. Strauch began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of Cablevision on an aerial map. He then showed the commissioners the site plans which would include a single family residence, with a 1 car garage and 1 parking space. He said that the applicant had all sign-offs. There would be on-site drainage and there was no impact to coastal resources.

Mr. Strauch said that the lot previously had structures on it. There would be three new single family homes. This was the first one to be built. Mr. Mushak had concerns about the footprint of the houses and whether it would block views for other houses to the north. Mr. Strauch noted that there were no regulations regarding homes

blocking views. Mr. Mushak thought it would be a good idea to hold a public hearing. There was a discussion about whether to hold the public hearing for this application. The commissioners voted against holding a public hearing.

II. SPECIAL PERMITS

a) #15-14SP - Recreation & Parks Dept – Nathan Hale Middle School – 176 Strawberry Hill Ave – Athletic field lighting – Preliminary review

Mr. Wrinn gave an explanation of the definition of athletic field facility. He then explained that Recreation and Parks would be lighting the two fields that would be turfed.

Mr. Mocciae, Director of Recreation and Parks, gave a background of how they had done lighting at other athletic fields in the past.

Mr. Diejack, Musco Sports Lighting, continued the presentation by describing the Nathan Hale area and what was being proposed for the lighting. He discussed the lighting that would be used. He explained the difference between “spill” and “glare.” Mr. Mushak had questions about the lighting in a parking lot which Mr. Diejack said was different than lighting an athletic field.

There was a discussion about Dairy Farm Road which Mr. Santo believed should have been a part of the scope of the review for the presentation. Mr. Diejack said that they would include that as well.

Mr. Diejack discussed some of the parts of the lighting fixtures, including a visor. There was a discussion about the 25 year guarantee for their products as well as some of the other projects that Mr. Diejacks’ company had done in the area. Staples High School was a similar project which Mr. Santo said he would look at. Mr. Sumpter asked about player reactions to these lights. Mr. Diejack said that the players love it because they can see the ball. He explained how the system scheduled the lights to be on and off. It was all computerized to work on cell phones, laptops, etc.

Mr. Mushak asked about the sports seasons. There was a discussion about the lights at Norwalk H.S. which Mr. Mocciae said should be shut off by the Board of Ed. Electricity is paid for each time a sports team uses them.

There was then a discussion about the date of the public hearing which it was decided to hold in July. Mr. Mocciae said that he would like the project to be completed by November of this year.

Mr. Mushak wondered why his comments about the residents of Farm Creek were dismissed when Mr. Santo was voicing his concerns about the residents of Dairy Farm Road. Mr. Wrinn explained that this application had to go to a public hearing. Mr. Mushak thought it was a double standard.

b) #16-13SP – A. Glazer – 192-194 Perry Av/Silvermine Tavern - Request to modify approved plans for single family residence at Mill building to remove/rebuild logging shed on side of structure – Determine if minor change

Dori Wilson began the presentation by showing the commissioners the site plan for this village district and a picture of the Mill House located next to the dam on the Silvermine River. She explained that the approved plans indicated that the buildings

would be rehabilitated and that the applicant was requesting to modify the approval to remove and rebuild a portion of the building known as the logging shed. They would re-use the beams, rafters and other materials from the shed and rebuild the structure to raise the first floor so that it would comply with the Flood zone at Elevation 120. Emily Wilson asked if the reconstructed shed would be the same size. Dori Wilson said it would. Mr. Glazer continued the presentation with a history of the shed. He explained that no new materials will be used on the shed that the replacement materials will be sourced from other areas and matched to the materials from the shed. The commissioners decided this was a minor change.

III. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF APPROVAL TIME

a) #6-08SPR/#16-08CAM - POKO IWSR Developers – Wall St/Isaacs St - Wall St Place mixed use development – Request for extension of approval time and review of status report submitted May 22, 2014

Dori Wilson began the presentation by explaining that this was the 5th extension since the project was approved in 2008 and after the appeals were settled in December 2010. Although the applicant had obtained a zoning permit and was almost ready to proceed, there were still some issues which Atty Suchy elaborated on.

Atty Suchy explained that the applicant has paid the surety and zoning permit fees and arranged for a company to continue with abatement of the asbestos. She noted that the applicant had done everything that the commissioners had asked, although they were now held up by the abatement which they needed to complete prior to obtaining a building permit. She said they would like to request another 6 month extension. There was a discussion about the posting of the bonds by the applicant as well as the length of the extension.

Mr. Santo said that he had a discussion with Tim Sheehan of the Redevelopment Agency. He noted that the Land Disposition Agreement with the city would expire in September of this year. There were concerns about how long this project was taking to begin. Dori Wilson said that she would work on another schedule with Atty Suchy which would have to be agreed upon.

At this point, there was a discussion as to whether they should have a Zoning Commission the following week. It was decided to cancel the June Commission meeting. There was a vote for a 6 month extension on the application, for which Ms. Jacobson and Mr. Mushak voted for the extension and Mr. White voted against it.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Diana Palmentiero