

**CITY OF NORWALK
PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
September 10, 2015**

PRESENT: Jill Jacobson, Chair; Adam Blank; Emily Wilson; Mike O'Reilly; Rod Johnson; Nathan Sumpter; Douglas Stern; Linda Kruk;

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

OTHERS: Pam Hinton; Neil Richardson; Thomas Petracca; Atty Liz Suchy; Will Thomas; Ray Sullivan; Wayne D'Avanzo; Nico Nakos;

Ms. Jacobson called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. Mr. O'Reilly was appointed to the Plan Review Committee for the meeting.

I. SPECIAL PERMITS

a) #5-15SP – Special Properties II, LLC – 78 Cranbury Rd/440 Newtown Av – 15 unit Conservation development – Review of public hearing

Before Mr. Wrinn began the presentation, Mr. Blank recused himself and left the room. He explained to the commissioners the various documents that had been in their packets which included all the handouts from the public hearing. He then read from the statute that would govern their decision making. First, the commissioners had to make a decision about the intervenor's petition. Mr. Wrinn then went over the site plan. There was a discussion of the storm water mitigation plan and impervious surfaces. There was also a discussion about the Conservation Commission's hearing. Mr. Wrinn then explained how the density calculation was arrived at, along with advice from Corporation Counsel. The maximum units permitted is 15. There was then a discussion of setbacks. Some of the commissioners felt that the applicant had done a good job in setting out their plan. Mr. Wrinn also showed the commissioners one of the site plans which set forth the conservation areas. The commissioners considered the fact that a lot of land was being conserved. There was a discussion about the run-off from this proposed development. There were concerns about clear cutting.

Ms. Jacobson made a motion to make a recommendation to the Zoning Commission that the project is not likely to unreasonably pollute the surrounding area and that there is no validity to the intervenor's petition. Mr. O'Reilly agreed.

At this point they began to review the Special Permit application. They discussed the concerns addressed by the public, including the noise, proximity to the pond, and how they were to the wetlands. Some of the commissioners thought that the project exceeded the Zoning requirements. The public had also expressed concerns about lighting which the commissioners discussed. There was also a discussion about the parking lots being turned into meadows and the utility easements.

There was then a discussion as to the next steps and when this application had to be decided upon.

b) #4-15SP – Rackson Corp. – 380 Main Avenue – 6,558 sq ft, 2-story freestanding restaurant (Burger King) in existing shopping center – Final review prior to public hearing

Mr. Blank returned to the room while Mr. Strauch began the presentation. He oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. There were some concerns about the walk between Briggs High School and Burger King. There was the suggestion about putting a crosswalk. It would be on the Zoning Commission agenda next week.

c) #11-15SP/#18-15CAM – Pam Hinton – 17 Park St – New daycare facility – Preliminary review

Mr. Strauch began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He then showed them current pictures of the premises and then the site plans of the proposed daycare facility. The site plan included parking and a play area. He then discussed the ages of the children, hours of drop-off and pick-up and a discussion of traffic. The drainage system was being reviewed by the Department of Public Works. An architect was also reviewing the project to see if it is in keeping with the East Avenue Village District guidelines. There was a discussion about the parking lot's ingress and egress.

Pam Hinton, the applicant, continued the presentation by addressing the concerns of the commissioners about drop-off. She explained that parents would be required to park in the rear and bring their kids into the facility. Her staff does not go out to the vehicles to get children.

Neil Richardson, the architect on the project, continued the presentation. He explained the site plans that he showed to the commissioners. He also explained that there would be bollards around the playground area and the traffic flow. This application would be on the Zoning Commission agenda for a public hearing in October.

d) #27-86SP – Orchard Lakes Conservation Development – 230 New Canaan Ave – Emergency generator for pump station – Determine if minor change

Mr. Strauch began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He explained that this was a conservation development that was constructed in the 1980s. He explained that the generator was at the end of its useful life. It was currently in a pump house but now it had to be located outside of the pump house because regulations do not allow it to be inside. The commissioners thought it was a minor change.

II. SITE PLAN REVIEWS/COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEW

a) #17-15CAM – Pentecostal Church John 3:16 – 8 Woodward Ave – Replacement church – Final review prior to public hearing

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by explaining why the church was being replaced.

Mr. Thomas Petracca continued the presentation by explaining that the church would be slightly larger than the current. The new one will be above the base flood elevation. He described the inside and outside of the building on the site plans. This application was scheduled for a public hearing for the following week. There was a discussion about the parking.

b) #16-15CAM – B. Beinfield – 2 Nearwater Rd. – New single family residence, convert existing dwelling to accessory use – Final review prior to public hearing

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by explaining that the DEEP had sent their comments about the application that day. He passed them out to the commissioners at this time. Atty Suchy said that she had received them as well so that she would address them at the public hearing which was on the Zoning Commission agenda the following week.

c) #14-15CAM – Petro Heating – 24 Woodward Ave – 2,154 sf general office – Preliminary review

Mr. Strauch began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He explained that they would like to convert storage

space to office space. He also discussed the parking. They have received their sign-offs and would have buffer plantings to hide the parking.

Mr. Thomas, the architect, continued the presentation by explaining why they explaining that the storage was being converted to office because another office had been flooded. The commissioners decided that this application did not have to go to a public hearing. It would be on the Zoning Commission agenda in the following week.

d) **#4-15SPR/#11-15CAM – 587 CT. Ave LLC – 11 Belden Ave – 69 residential units – Preliminary review**

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by explaining to the commissioners that they have seen this application previously. He then showed them the site plan and explained the parking.

Atty Suchy continued the presentation by explaining how the project was initially presented in July but didn't meet some Zoning requirements. This is the revised application. She then described the project which included affordable housing. She discussed how the parking would work. There would be agreements for parking by the end of September. The affordable housing would be disbursed throughout the building. She also described the recreation space. There was further discussion about the parking which the library patrons and staff would be using.

Ray Sullivan continued the presentation by discussing the screening for the parking underneath the building as well as the actual parking garage. Mr. Sullivan said that he would revise the site plans so that they could see it from different angles. There was a discussion of the lighting in the parking lot as well as the sidewalks. Mr. Sullivan said that he got inspiration from the library and the post office.

e) **#19-15 CAM – R&M Counihan – 1 Cudlipp Street – Additions to residence – Preliminary Review**

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He explained that the applicant wanted to construct additions on the residence. They were still working through some issues.

Wayne D'Avanzo, the engineer on the project, continued the presentation to discuss the pervious surfaces.

Nico Nakos, the architect, continued the presentation by explaining about the easement. They do realize that they have to leave the easement open for access. The application would be on the Zoning Commission agenda in the following week.

f) **#9-13SPR/#25-13CAM – CP IV Waypointe BP, LLC – 515 West Ave./29 Orchard St. – Waypointe Midblock – Request to modify approved plans to revise façade for Sedona Taphouse & Colony Grill – Determine if minor change**

Dori Wilson began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. She explained there were currently tenants, the Sedona Taphouse and Colony Grill, in these spaces which had changed windows to doors on the buildings. They had gone through Redevelopment for these changes but Zoning staff felt it was necessary to show it to the Zoning commissioners since they had not seen them. There was a discussion about the signs.

Ella Lagasse, a representative of the developer, continued the presentation by explaining how the tenants had wanted the door to be on the inside courtyard and not facing the outside streets. There were concerns about other tenants that may want access through the courtyard, instead of the street. It would not create an active streetscape. She also explained how the parking garage has been the main entrance. It was suggested that the display

windows be spruced up and that the applicant consider adding a canopy over the West Ave entry door to make it more visible. The commissioners asked that the West Ave frontage remain active with entry doors and transparent windows to see into the tenant space. The Committee agreed that these were minor changes.

III. REQUEST FOR RELEASE OF SURETY

a) #X-05SPR – Starbucks – 555 Main Avenue – Request for release of surety

Mr. Wrinn began the presentation by explaining that the bond had been taken out over 10 years ago, although all the improvements had been made. This matter would be on the Zoning Commission agenda in the following week.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Diana Palmentiero