

**CITY OF NORWALK  
ORDINANCE COMMITTEE  
SPECIAL MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING  
APRIL 14, 2020  
VIA ZOOM**

**ATTENDANCE:** Lisa Shanahan, Chair; David Heuvelman, Dominique Johnson, Thomas Keegan, Manny Langella, Tom Livingston, Kadeem Roberts

**STAFF:** Brian Candela, Corporation Counsel; Nick Roberts, Parks and Recreation; Anthony Carr, Chief of Operations and Public Works; Jessica Paladino, Waste Programs Manager; Loise King

**OTHERS:** Greg Burnett, Common Counsel

**ROLL CALL**

Ms. Shanahan called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. A quorum was present. Ms. Shanahan read the Executive Order of Governor Lamont regarding virtual meetings.

**PUBLIC HEARING (possible action on)**

- Discuss and vote on ordinance name change to Chapter 94 of the City Code;
- Discuss and vote on Section 94-18: Disposal pass for residents and real property owners who pay vehicle tax to Norwalk;
- Discuss and vote on Section 94-19: Admission for residents and real property owners who do not pay vehicle tax to Norwalk;
- Discuss and vote on Section 94-20: Passes and permits;
- Discuss and vote on Section 94-21: Admission for non-residents and non-permit holders;

Attorney Candela mentioned Chapter 94 is a Name Change. There is no emails or public comment. There were some additions to the wording to make the ordinance easier to read and understand.

**\*\* MR. HEUVELMAN MADE A MOTION TO TAKE THIS TO THE COMMON COUNSEL FOR REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION, AS AMENDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMIOUSLY.**

- Discuss and vote on ordinance name change to Chapter 74, Article 1 of the City Code;
- Discuss and vote on Section 74-1: Free admission for residents and real property owners who pay vehicle tax to Norwalk;
- Discuss and vote on Section 74-2: Admission for residents and real property owners who do not pay vehicle tax to Norwalk;
- Discuss and vote on Section 74-3: Season sticker for residents and property owners of certain towns;
- Discuss and vote on Section 74-4: Parking fees;
- Discuss and vote on Section 74-5: Waterfront parking;

Attorney Candela read the following emails from Carol Salvato into record:

I would like to advocate that non residents who own and pay taxes on Norwalk properties be given a resident beach pass as has always been up to now with no fee attached.

I own 2 middle class properties now in Norwalk and have paid taxes for 60 + years

on properties to Norwalk that supported the infrastructure, common good and beach and parks. I use the resident pass to attend concerts and non profit events with friends and my Norwalk family members. I was born and educated in Norwalk .

Moved to Wilton 52 years ago because of growing family and could not afford Norwalk properties . The price structure of the 2 towns has since reversed.

The recommended rate schedule from Parks and Recreation would have me pay \$325

To attend these concerts, etc.

My deceased husband and I both had our business in Norwalk and volunteered innumerable hours at non profit events for many, many years as can be attested to by Mayor Harry Rilling.

I am well into my senior years and am saddened to see that the town I have supported has little regard for my long time support. Especially since any non resident of Norwalk that works for the city can have a resident pass for \$100.

Please keep the system in place for non resident property tax payers to receive

A resident pass at no cost. How many of us can there be?

City employees are paid wages and as part of their job description to act as first responders. They pay no money to support the city. They can get a pass for \$100 and I a taxpayer for 60 + years have to pay \$325. Most people don't know about the proposed fees. I speak and know many citizens of Norwalk through my various endeavors.

I relate to them the situation I am faced with and how non resident city employees are favored over me a taxpayer. They are incredulous.

These rates were published in the Norwalk Hour once to my knowledge and I have not seen them published anywhere else. Many people do not get the local paper and do not know the rates are being raised on parks etc. They don't know how to access city government in any way.

City of Norwalk  
Ordinance Committee  
April 14, 2020  
Page 2 of 6

All of these past years I have received a resident pass at no cost. Now I am told that the beach is free but the \$325 is for parking. How can I access the beach without parking .  
Attorney Brian Candela is being cc'd on this thread and I wish this to be read into the public record. All the information is on this email.  
I cannot attend the meeting and am not good with technology so this is the information I want read into the record.

There were a few minor changes to make it easier to understand.

**\*\* MR. LIVINGSTON MADE A MOTION TO TAKE THIS TO THE COMMON COUNSEL FOR REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION, AS AMENDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMIOUSLY.**

- Discuss and vote on Section 95-38: Policy and considerations; and
- Discuss and vote on Section 95-39: Procedure

Attorney Candela read the following email from Richard Bonenfant into record:

Dear Ordinance Committee and Council Members,

I would request that you make no changes to Chapter 95 regarding the criteria for a commemorative naming of a street, specifically altering the requirement that if named after a deceased person, a period of one year must pass before a street or roadway can be named after the individual.

At the last Ordinance meeting some of you remarked it was a loophole or an inconsistency that a living individual could have a street named in their honor, but a naming after a deceased individual had a period of a year before the designation could occur.

This wasn't an oversight when the Ordinance was written, it was by design and agreed to by all members of the Common Council in a bipartisan effort. The general agreement was that a street naming should not be based on emotion after someone passed, but rather established on merit after the community's sorrow had subsided.

Conversely, the naming after a living person was also the subject of much discussion and it was understood that if a person had served with distinction in the community and they were of little threat to subsequently embarrass the City, then it would be a meaningful gesture to let them enjoy the honor and commemoration. This wasn't about emotion but rather a way to express appreciation for all the contributions and dedication the person gave to society.

Please don't move the goalposts to make it easier to name a street or roadway by changing the Ordinance for one individual. All this will do is create a large number of requests from family and friends to honor individuals immediately after their death.

Thank You,

There were no changes to language.

**\*\* MR. HEUVELMAN MADE A MOTION TO TAKE THIS TO THE COMMON COUNSEL FOR REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMIOUSLY.**

### **PUBLIC HEARING DISCUSSION**

There was discussion on Section 94 to explain the process and the difference between the passes and permits.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Attorney Candela read the below e-mail from Diane Lauricella, into record.

Brian I could not register to take part because Zoom I'd number was not a hyperlink and could not be copied because Agenda was a pdf and I do not own Word conversion software.

Please include the following comments for the record:

Lisa Shanahan

Chair, Ordinance Committee

Council Members and Staff

I hope this email finds you and your families safe and well. Thank you for your work and dedication during this stressful time.

I noted in the Agenda that the discussion item about the Facilities construction Committee includes the possibility of a vote.

I ask that you consider not abolishing this Committee and instead consider holding meetings on a different day of the month so that fuller detailed discussions can occur related to a harmonization of across-the-board standards for renewable energy implementation, energy efficiency and employment of green Infrastructure in every building and renovation projects.

In addition, I ask that before voting about whether to abolish the NFCC, please speak to former Mayor Alex Knopp. He created this Committee in order to relieve the Council of detail study and review of construction plans utilizing community construction professionals in addition to Council and staff.

If the current Committee has become burdensome, consider a different structure, format and meeting date so that additional attention can be paid to the things I mention in the previous paragraph as well as a fresh approach for public buildings design, renovation and construction.

Sincerely

Diane Lauricella

203-858-1537

### **ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES**

February 18, 2020 – Ordinance Committee Meeting

Page 1 – Change “Todd” to “Tom”

Page 1 – Change “Melendez” to “Shanahan”

Page 1 – Lurichella spelt wrong

Page 3 – Add a \$ sign in front of 10,000

**\*\* MR. LIVINGSTON MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES AS AMENDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

### **OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

### **DISCUSSION ITEM**

Mr. Livingston discussed the Norwalk Construction Commission: Sections 30-15 through 30-17. He just wanted to get it on the radar of the committee members. This committee is just another

City of Norwalk  
Ordinance Committee

April 14, 2020

Page 5 of 6

level of beauracracy. It is hard to pass through. He also mentioned it is not effective. He asked if the committee should be dropped. This topic will be discussed at the next meeting.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**\*\* MS. JOHNSON MOVED TO ADJOURN.**

**\*\* MR. KEEGAN SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**\*\* THE MOTION TO ADJOURN PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Raeann Bromark  
Telesco Secretarial Services