

**CITY OF NORWALK  
PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE  
June 11, 2015**

**PRESENT:** Jill Jacobson, Chair; Emily Wilson; Adam Blank; Nora King; Linda Kruk; Nate Sumpter; Joseph Santo; Mike O'Reilly; Jim White

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

**OTHERS:** Atty. Al Vasko; Juan Perides; Steven Cipolla; Atty. Larry Cafero; Luke Mauro; Jerry Kiley; Atty. Liz Suchy; Atty. Dan Panessi;

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

**I. SPECIAL PERMITS**

**a) #5-15SP – Special Properties II, LLC – 78 Cranbury Road/440 Newtown Ave – 15 unit Conservation development – Final review prior to public hearing**

Before the presentation began, Mr. Blank recused himself and left the room.

There was a discussion about whether there would be a public hearing since the Conservation Commission had not acted. The commissioners could hold the public hearing but not act on it.

**b) #6-15SP – RAP II, LLC – 123 & 125 Richards Avenue – 72 unit congregate housing/assisted living – Final review prior to public hearing**

Mr. Strauch began the presentation by asking the commissioners if they had any questions. Since there had been no changes to the application, the commissioners had no questions.

**c) #8-15SP – Miracle Temple Church of God in Christ of Norwalk, Inc. – 1 Trinity PI – Child daycare center – Preliminary review**

Mr. Blank returned to the room. Mr. Strauch began the presentation by introducing Atty. Vasko to continue the presentation. He gave a brief synopsis of the application. He also oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He explained the hours of operation, the number of employees as well as the recreation area and parking spaces.

Juan Perides, the civil engineer for the project, continued the presentation. He discussed the parking lot and how vehicles would be parked. He then passed out some handouts. He also discussed the impervious surfaces and the drainage system. He then discussed the landscaping plan. There was a discussion about safety fencing. Since this is a special permit application, there will be a public hearing.

Steven Cipolla, the traffic engineer, continued the presentation by describing how the traffic analysis was done. He then described the site traffic generation as well as the accidents in the vicinity.

Atty. Vasko continued the presentation with a brief description of what was remaining to do.

**d) #6-13SP/#10-13CAM – Grove Ely – 71-77 Rowayton Av – Request to modify approved plans – Determine if minor change**

Mr. Strauch discussed the site plan that had been approved two years ago. He then described the changes that the applicant would like to make to the plan. There was a discussion about the parking garage, parking spaces and whether they would be assigned.

There was a discussion as to whether the commissioners in Rowayton had seen this change. There was also some clarification of the parking spaces for mixed use and whether the applicant could put a gate on the parking garage. It was agreed this was a minor change.

**e) #8-12SP – Lowe’s – 100 CT. Ave – Retail home improvement store – Discussion of timing of off-site improvements**

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by explaining about the road improvements which would not be completed when Lowe’s has its opening in July. The state is aware of this and would provide a police officer for 3 hours on Saturday.

Atty. Larry Cafero continued the presentation by introducing the project team. He explained the opening dates in July. He then explained why the state Department of Transportation (“DOT”) had not completed its part of the project. He also said that the applicant would be happy to provide a police officer to direct traffic if the local police authority deemed it necessary.

Mr. Mauro continued the presentation by explaining the drainage problems at Clinton and Connecticut Avenues. He also discussed the opening of the bridge and striping of Clinton Avenue/ Connecticut Avenue.

**f) #X-15SP – Van Dyk Baler – Dr. MLK Jr. Drive – Request to modify building façade – Determine if minor change**

Mr. Greene began the presentation by showing the commissioners the site plan and explaining how the applicant wanted to change the façade.

Jerry Kiley continued the presentation by showing the commissioners an aerial map of the building. The building was numbered on the map and he explained what the numbers meant. There was a discussion about what would be done to the building. The commissioners decided the changes were a minor change.

**g) #X-15SP – Norwalk Public Schools – 157 Perry Av – Add portable classroom to Silvermine School – Determine if minor change**

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by explaining that the Board of Education would like to move a portable classroom to Silvermine Elementary School. The commissioners decided the changes were a minor change. There was a discussion about how long the portable classroom would be there. It would be set at 5 years.

**II. SITE PLAN REVIEWS/COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEW**

**a) #X-15CAM – 159-165 Rowayton Avenue, LLC - 159-165 Rowayton Ave – Minor changes to existing building**

Mr. Greene began the presentation explained that since the applicant would not go over the 50% value of the property in the upgrade so they would not have to elevate the building as required under FEMA regulations.

Atty. Suchy continued the presentation by giving a brief history of the building. She then explained when the applicant purchased the property as well as the changes the applicant would like to make to it. She also showed pictures of the current building as well as the site plans and materials board.

There was a discussion about which neighbors had seen the plans for the renovations. There was a concern that the remodel would block views of the water by neighbors. There was also a discussion about the roof that was going to be built and whether it was going to be a living space or used for mechanicals, etc. It would not have a use nor used for living space. The square footage of the building was to remain the same. The commissioners decided the changes were a minor change.

**b) #8-15CAM – Greenwich Flyers, LLC – 21 Rocky Point Road – New single family residence - Preliminary review**

Mr. Strauch began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map.

Atty. Suchy continued the presentation by giving a brief history of the application. She discussed the remodel as well as the fact that the applicant had been before the Zoning Board of Appeals. At that time, there was some opposition to the application but the applicant was close to a resolution with the Bell Island Improvement Association. She explained the parking and noted that 2 parking spaces would now be off the street. Atty. Suchy said that they had notified the neighbors again during this application but that neither she nor the Planning and Zoning Department staff had received any notifications of objection.

Commissioner King said that she knew of neighbors that were in opposition to the project. Atty. Suchy, at this point, asked that Ms. King recuse herself because she had contacted members of the Zoning Board of Appeals as well as the Zoning Commission, prior to this application being filed and may have a pre-disposition to the application. Ms. King said that she would not recuse herself. She also said that the comments she had received were about the park being used for the project. Atty. Suchy said that those objections had been noted at the ZBA hearing and were being worked on between the parties.

There was also a discussion about having a public hearing for this matter. Atty. Suchy noted that there had been a public hearing at the ZBA. It was noted that there had not been any requests by the neighbors for a public hearing. The commissioners agreed that the application did not need a public hearing.

**c) #9-15CAM – Klevian Postol – 19 Emerson St – Conversion of a one-family to a two-family residence – Preliminary review**

Mr. Strauch began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He also showed the commissioners a picture of the property as a single family and the plans for the 2 family. He noted that they would need extra parking spaces. He also explained that if they had been on a nearby property they would not have had to file a CAM application.

A neighbor that lived behind them had questions about the fencing and drainage. The commissioners agreed that the application did not need a public hearing.

**d) #10-15CAM – John & Francis Meehan – 12 Norport Drive – Additions to single family residence - Preliminary review**

Mr. Strauch began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map.

Atty Suchy continued the presentation by showing the commissioners pictures of the existing house. The applicant would like to create an addition to the house. She also showed the commissioners a site plan. They have not received any notification of opposition from the neighbors that were notified. The commissioners agreed that a public hearing was not necessary.

**e) #X-15SPR/#11-15CAM – 587 CT. Ave LLC – 11 Belden Ave – 69 multifamily dwelling units – Preliminary review**

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by stating that this would be postponed until the following month.

**f) #6-13SPR – iPark – 761 Main Ave – Office complex – Discussion of parking**

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by noting that there had been some parking issues.

Atty. Dan Panessi, General Counsel for iPark, introduced himself and his colleague. Mr. Wrinn oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He explained the issues about who is parking where, including along the river. There have been issues with security, and being told where to park.

Mr. Santo explained that cones had been placed in the parking lot to direct traffic, a guard house was placed and valet was brought in. He described it as a "battle between LA Fitness and iPark."

Atty. Panessi continued by explaining how the situation got this bad. Basically everyone wants to park close to the buildings that they were visiting. Many spaces remain available. He then showed pictures of what was being done to prevent people from parking along the river. He has noticed that as the weather has gotten better, people are now walking further.

There was a discussion about how to solve the parking problems.

**g) #X-15SPR – McDonald's – 340 Main Ave – Request to modify approved plans to add dining space – Determine if minor change**

Mr. Greene began the presentation by showing the commissioners a picture of McDonald's without the play area. They had changed it to outdoor dining. The commissioners agreed it was a minor change.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Diana Palmentiero