

CITY OF NORWALK
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES
September 20, 2023

PRESENT: Louis Schulman, Chair; Nick Kantor; Darius Williams; Mike Mushak; Chapin Bryce; Hector Pachas; Richard Roina; Ana Tabachneck; Tammy Langalis

STAFF: Steve Kleppin; Bryan Baker

OTHERS: Scott Raissis; Atty Jay Klein; John Plante; Steve Leaty; Elsa Peter Obuchowski; Richard Bonenfant; Lynnelle Jones; Donna Smirniotopoulos; Katherine Price; Chris MacDonnell; Diane Lauricella; Scott Goodwin; John Paladino; Diane Cece; Atty David Waters

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Schulman called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. It should be noted that this meeting was held on Zoom.com with participants calling in, separately.

II. ROLL CALL

Mr. Baker called the roll.

III. SEATING OF MEMBERS

There was no discussion about seating members.

IV. REVIEW & ACTION ON APPLICATIONS

a. #2023-42 CAM – 36 Shorefront Park LLC – 36 Shorefront Park (District 2, Block 85, Lot 21) – Demolish an existing home and build a new single-family residence to be made flood compliant – Report & recommended action

This application has been withdrawn.

b. #2023-43 SPR – Bjorn & Catherine Bergabo – 3 Admiral Lane (District 5, Block 31, Lot 20) – Construction of a detached accessory dwelling unit – Report & recommended action

Scott Raissis, the architect for the project, said he worked with Mr. Baker and the Planning and Zoning staff since this is a new regulation in Norwalk. He described the project which conforms to the farmhouse design. He noted that this is a large property and does not conflict with neighborhood views. There is buffering on the property. There is only one other structure on the project.

There was a discussion about the compliance for the 1st stand-alone ADU in the city. Mr. Raissis said again that the staff was very responsive. The square footage was for the living space.

**** MS. LANGALIS MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission that application # be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. That the site shall be developed in accordance with the following plans:
 - a. Per civil site plans and landscaping plans provided by McChord Engineering Associates, Inc., originally dated 6/2/2023 and revised to 7/17/23; and
 - b. Per architectural drawings prepared by Thompson Raissis Architects, dated 7/24/2023; and
2. That any changes to the approved plans shall be submitted to the Commission's Staff (Staff) for review and approval prior to implementation. If any proposed changes are determined to be substantive, Staff shall refer the changes to the Commission for their review and approval prior to implementation; and
3. That all erosion and sediment controls be installed and maintained prior to the start of any construction or site work and that additional controls be installed at the direction Staff; and
4. That prior to the issuance of a zoning permit, the Applicant shall submit a certificate in the form of an affidavit which verifies that the owner resides on the premises and that the minimum rental duration of the accessory dwelling unit is a minimum of six (6) continuous months; and
5. That any and all conditions required by Norwalk Health Department are applicable to this approval; and
6. That any and all conditions required by Norwalk WPCA are applicable to this approval; and

7. That any and all conditions required by Norwalk DPW are applicable to this approval; and

8. That a Connecticut licensed engineer shall certify that all the required improvements, including any required off-site improvements, were installed to City standards prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Zoning Compliance (COZC); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this application complies with all applicable sections of the Norwalk Building Zone Regulations; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this action shall be September 29, 2023.

There was a discussion about the rental period and a condition in the resolution. Every commissioner was seated for this application.

Mr. Williams seconded.

Louis Schulman; Nick Kantor; Darius Williams; Mike Mushak; Chapin Bryce; Hector Pachas; Richard Roina; Ana Tabachneck; Tammy Langalis approved.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

c. #2023-53 LM – El Tequilazo – 99 Washington Street – Live music request for El Tequilazo restaurant – Report & recommended action

Mr. Baker said that the sound report had complied with the noise ordinance. Staff recommended that the resolution be approved as long as they continue to comply with the noise ordinance. There was a discussion about the enforcement which Mr. Baker said was handled by the police, but that applicants had to get a permit from the Planning & Zoning Commission. It was a two step process. Mr. Mushak told a story of a business on Washington Street that was in violation of the noise ordinance and that they should call the police. He noted that the windows should be closed and is a violation of their permit. There was a discussion about the fact that their permit could be revoked. Mr. Baker said there is communication between the police department and the Planning & Zoning Department.

**** MR. WILLIAMS MOVED: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission that application #2023-53 LM – El Tequilazo – 99 Washington Street – Live music request for El Tequilazo restaurant be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. That the maximum sound levels that may be played shall not exceed the levels indicated in the Noise Report for El Tequilazo, dated August 6, 2023, provided by Creative Acoustics, LLC; and
2. That all windows and doors shall remain closed while the entertainment is underway, except for the normal passage of people into and out of the premises; and
3. That this approval is subject to compliance with Norwalk City Ordinance Chapter 68: Noise; and
4. That this approval is subject to Section 118-1460 of the Norwalk Building Zone Regulations; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this action is September 29, 2023.

Mr. Kantor seconded.

Louis Schulman; Nick Kantor; Darius Williams; Mike Mushak; Chapin Bryce; Hector Pachas; Richard Roina; Ana Tabachneck; Tammy Langalis approved.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

a. #2023-41 R/SP – Wegmans Food Markets, Inc. – 47 Richards Avenue and 677, 667 and 651 Connecticut Avenue – Zoning regulation text amendment to allow for additional signage in the Business No. 1 Zone and special permit application for signage for Wegmans

Mr. Schulman opened the public hearing and explained how the process would work.

Jay Klein, the attorney for the applicant, introduced the project team and then explained the application for signage. He then oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He then noted that Wegman's has purchased the property which gave the project access to Connecticut Avenue. He then showed them the signage, starting with ground and directional signs. He also discussed the wall signage. He noted that the building is 250 feet from Keeler Avenue so the proposed language would allow for appropriately sized signage. He then discussed the signage for the parking garage. He showed them a site plan which showed where all of the signs were located. He also discussed the height of the signs and showed them the

designs for those signs. They were willing to reduce the height of them if requested by the commissioners. He also discussed the Wells Fargo sign which could not be removed.

There was a discussion about a left hand turn onto the property which would not be allowed. Mr. Schulman thought it would be less likely if the signs were shorter. Mr. Baker said that the staff had spoken with TMP and they had the same concerns about the height.

John Plante, the traffic engineer on the project, continued the presentation and explained that the multiple locations for ingress and egress would help the management of traffic. He also reiterated that the sign should be visible and substantial enough.

Atty Klein showed them pictures of Connecticut Avenue which included a mockup of the sign. Mr. Schulman explained his concern about having a higher sign which may encourage drivers to make an illegal left turn into the parking lot from Connecticut Avenue. There was also a discussion about having printing on both sides of the signage which might stop people from making the illegal left turn. Mr. Plante explained that it was important to tenants for business recognition. Atty Klein thought that the controls that Mr. Plante had discussed deterred people from making a left turn. It was noted that if drivers missed the turn there was another entrance that they could make. He said that he would agree with the other commissioners if they wanted a 10 foot sign. Atty Klein noted that it would be a bit strange not to allow Wegman's to have their name on both sides. Steve Leaty, a representative of Wegmans, spoke about the left turn down Richards Avenue.

Atty Klein discussed the text amendment and the comments they had received from the commission.

At this point, the public was allowed to make comments with Mr. Baker explaining the process.

Elsa Peter Obuchowski, 41 East Avenue, said she thought it would be confusing to have a large sign with only their name on one side.

Rich Bonenfant, 17 Park Hill Avenue, noted that by changing the sign regulations, all the businesses in that area would be allowed the same.

At this point, Atty Klein made his rebuttal remarks. Mr. Baker noted that the text amendment was restricted to the Business 1 zone. Mr. Roina discussed the height of the signs.

Mr. Schulman closed the public hearing.

i. Action on #2023-41 R/SP

Mr. Baker said that the application had been referred to WestCog and the Town of Darien. There was a discussion about the changes in the draft resolution.

**** MR. MUSHAK MOVED: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission that application #2023-41 R – Wegmans Food Markets, Inc. – 47 Richards Avenue and 677, 667 and 651 Connecticut Avenue – Zoning regulation text amendment to allow for additional signage in the Business No. 1 Zone and special permit application for signage for Wegmans be **APPROVED** as modified.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the approved language is the following:

§ 118-521.E. Sign regulations.

(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 121 of these regulations, signage in accordance with this subsection shall be permitted subject to Special Permit Review and Approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission for uses located on an assemblage of adjacent Lots where such lots are accessible via integrated curb cuts and drive aisles.

(2) Prior to approving any signage permitted under this subsection, the Planning and Zoning Commission must find that the proposed signage will facilitate safe and efficient vehicular and/or pedestrian movements within the assemblage.

(3) Signage shall be permitted under this subsection subject to the following standards:

(a) Wall Signage

(i) Area: For buildings set back 250' or less from the centerline of a street on which said building enfronts, the total area of all wall signage on each building façade shall not exceed 1.5 square feet of area for each linear foot of building length facing a street, or parking area.

The total area of all wall signage on any building façade set back more than 250' from the centerline of a street on which said building enfronts (excluding interstate highways), with a floor area of 50,000 sf or more, shall not exceed 2 square feet of area for each linear foot of building length. Wall signage on the façade of

such a building enfronting an interstate highway shall not exceed 1.5 square feet of area for each linear foot of building length.

(ii) Letter Height: Lettering on Wall Signage shall be no larger than twenty-four (24) inches in height.

Lettering on wall signage on any building façade set back more than 250' from the centerline of a street on which said building enfronts (excluding interstate highways), or signage that fronts on an interstate highway, shall be permitted to exceed twenty-four (24) inches in height where such signage is in keeping with the architectural design and scale of the building upon which it is located.

(iii) Location: Wall Signage shall not project above the roofline of a building.

(iv) Modifications to approved wall signs shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning & Zoning Department Director or their designee.

(b) Ground Signage

(i) Frontage Requirement: No more than, one (1) Ground Sign shall be permitted on a Lot provided that it has at least seventy-five (75) feet of street frontage on one (1) street. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, one (1) Ground Sign shall be permitted on ~~Flag~~/Rear Lots in existence at the time of the adoption of this regulation.

(ii) Size: Ground Signs shall not exceed seventy-five (75) square feet in area, and no dimension of a Ground Sign shall exceed twenty (20) feet. The maximum height to the top of any ground sign shall not exceed fifteen (15) feet. Ground signs may be located up to zero (0) feet from the property line to ensure optimal visibility. Letter height shall be to scale with the proposed ground sign.

(iii) Off Premises Ground Signage: Ground Signs shall be permitted to contain signage for tenants located on adjacent Lots to facilitate the flow of patrons to buildings set back more than 250' from the centerline of a street on which such a building enfronts (excluding interstate highways). No individual tenant shall be eligible for more

than two (2) off-premises Ground Signs under this subsection, and any such off-premises Ground Sign shall only be located on an adjacent parcel with a curb cut providing direct access to said tenant.

(iv) Modifications to approved ground signage that do not result in an increase in the overall size or number of ground signs shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning & Zoning Department Director or their designee. Other modifications to approved ground signage shall be subject to review and approval by the Commission.

(c) Parking Structure Signage: Wall Signage shall be permitted on Parking Structures located at least 200' from the centerline of a street (excluding interstate highways). Such Wall Signage shall not exceed one (1) square foot for each linear foot of Parking Structure length on which said wall signage is located. There shall be no more than two (2) Wall Signs located on any Parking Structure. Modifications to approved parking structure signs shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning & Zoning Department Director or their designee.

(d) Window Signage: Window signs shall be permitted on any building façade set back more than 250' from the centerline of a street on which said building enfronts (excluding interstate highways). Such window signage shall not exceed 50% of the glass, with the remainder of the window remaining transparent. Approval of window signage shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning & Zoning Department Director or their designee.

(e) Sandwich Board/A-Frame signage: Sandwich Board/A-Frame signage shall be permitted for any building set back more than 250' from the centerline of any street on which said building enfronts (excluding interstate highways). Such portable signs shall not exceed 28"x44". Such signs shall be permitted subject to review and approval by the Planning & Zoning Department Director or their designee.

(f) Directional Signage: For purposes of this subsection, Directional Signage shall include Ground Signs not exceeding eight (8) feet in height and twenty (20) square feet in area. No more than one (1) Ground Signs utilized as Directional Signage shall be permitted on any Lot improved with a commercial building set back at least 250' from the centerline of a street on which said building enfronts (excluding interstate highways). Directional signs may be located up to zero (0) feet from the property line

to ensure optimal visibility. Modifications to approved directional signs shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning & Zoning Department Director or their designee.

(i) Off Premises Directional Signage: Such Directional Signage shall also be permitted on Lots adjacent to a Lot improved with a commercial building(s) set back at least 250' from the centerline of a street on which said building enfronts (excluding interstate highways).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the reasons for this action are:

1. To achieve Plan of Conservation and Development Goal 1 listed in Chapter 3: Prosperity & Opportunity: *"Norwalk has the right policies, infrastructure and leadership for business growth and development."*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this approval shall be October 6, 2023.

Mr. Pachas seconded.

Before the vote, Mr. Mushak asked if they could do a straw poll about the height of the sign but Mr. Baker said they could discuss this for the next resolution.

Louis Schulman; Darius Williams; Mike Mushak; Chapin Bryce; Hector Pachas; Richard Roina; Ana Tabachneck; Tammy Langalis approved.

No one opposed.

Nick Kantor abstained.

**** MS. LANGALIS MOVED: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission that application #2023-41 SP – Wegmans Food Markets, Inc. – 47 Richards Avenue and 677, 667 and 651 Connecticut Avenue – Zoning regulation text amendment to allow for additional signage in the Business No. 1 Zone and special permit application for signage for Wegmans be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. That the approved signage plan is the following:

a. Signage Plan entitled "Wegmans" prepared by Bignell, Watkins & Hasser, originally dated 5/6/2022 and revised to 9/8/2023; and

2. That "Freestanding Sign A" shall be replaced with a sign not to exceed 10 feet in height; and
3. That should any signage fall into disrepair, that the applicant shall be responsible for repairing the signage within 60 days of their receipt of notice from the city; and
4. That any and all conditions as required by Norwalk Department of Public Works (DPW) shall be applicable to this approval; and
5. That any and all conditions as required by Norwalk Transportation, Mobility & Parking (TMP) shall be applicable to this approval; and
6. That any and all conditions as required by the Norwalk Fire Marshal shall be applicable to this approval;
7. That this approval is subject to Section 118-1460C. of the Norwalk Building Zone Regulations, as amended; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this application complies with all applicable sections of the Norwalk Building Zone Regulations; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this action shall be October 7, 2023.

Mr. Roina seconded.

There was discussion about the height of the sign. Mr. Schulman said that since Wegman's indicated that 10 ft. would be adequate, they should leave it at that. Mr. Mushak, Mr. Roina and Ms. Langalis said that they thought it should be 15 ft. Mr. Pachas also indicated that a 15 ft. sign would be safer since this would be a destination for residents of Norwalk and the surrounding communities. Mr. Schulman thought that a larger sign would be a help when Wegman's first opens.

At this point, there was a show of hands for and against a 15 ft. sign. It was a tie amongst the commissioners. Mr. Kantor said he would abstain. After a further discussion, there was another show of hands as to the height. This time it seemed that a 10 ft. sign would be approved in the resolution. Also, before the motion, there was a discussion about condition #3 regarding the Wells Fargo sign which was deleted. Mr. Schulman noted that the applicant would work with Google Maps, etc. to help wayfinding to the store. Mr. Pachas did not think it needed to be added to these apps.

Louis Schulman; Darius Williams; Mike Mushak; Chapin Bryce; Hector Pachas; Richard Roina; Ana Tabachneck; Tammy Langalis approved.
No one opposed.
Nick Kantor abstained.

b. #2023-01 POCD – Planning & Zoning Commission – Amendment to the 2019 Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) to adopt the Norwalk Industrial Waterfront Land Use Plan, dated September 2022, as an addendum to the POCD

Mr. Kleppin began the presentation with some background information about the study, its purpose and intent, the planning process, draft recommendations and changes to the draft. He said he would also focus on areas that residents had the most concern with. There were issues with the land uses in the area as well as different visions for the future. He then discussed the existing character of 19 areas. He then discussed FEMA, the Coastal Management Zone and local zoning. He also discussed the waterfront land use vision. He then explained the land use vision for this area as well as recommendations. First, he discussed the CBD-Industrial Buffer. He then discussed the Mini Industrial-Marina District. He then discussed the Walk Bridge Staging Area. He discussed various options for this area but one option was taken out since the Common Council was not amenable to it. This left two options in the plan. He then discussed the Water Street Recommendations and noted what was in the draft plan, as well as what the preferences were from the Common Council.

Mr. Kleppin noted that this study would become an amendment to the Plan of Conservation and Development. He showed them the draft zoning map from the proposed zoning regulations. Mr. Kleppin then discussed policy linking development to public benefits. He noted that this area floods and how to improve water quality. He also discussed the marine commercial mixed-use concept and showed them what the street could look like.

There was a discussion about the Devine Bros. property and what would happen if it was sold to another company with a similar use. Mr. Kleppin said that as long as they continued the same use, it would be conforming.

He then continued by noting that ground floors of commercial buildings had to be adaptable for possible flooding. There was a discussion about a vegetative buffer, on site drainage and water quality improvements.

Mr. Schulman said that they are waiting for a letter from DEEP but it has not arrived. He would hold the public hearing open until Friday to find out what they think of

the plan. He did not think they would decide on this matter until the next regular Planning & Zoning Commission meeting. He also said that several letters that they had received were all in opposition to the amendment to the POCD. He said that they had received from Diane Lauricella who is on the Water Quality Commission but it was unclear whether she was acting as a member of that commission.

At this point in the meeting, Mr. Baker explained how members of the public could address their comments to the commissioners.

Lynnelle Jones was about to speak but Mr. Schulman reminded her that they had received her letter. She said that she was disappointed it won't be read into the record and asked to read it. Mr. Schulman said that it is on file and would not allow it. She thought it was discriminatory and unfair. He said the commission had not reached a conclusion at what action they would take.

Elsa Obuchowski, 41 East Avenue, said she was disappointed that the previous speaker could not give a summary of her letter. She then described the Taylor Farm Park should remain as pure open space and noted that it periodically floods. She urged them not to build and preserve it in perpetuity as open space. Mill Hill view shed should be preserved as well.

Donna Smirniotopoulos, 18 Shorefront Park, said she was disappointed that the previous speaker was not allowed to read her letter into the record. She also said that she was running for Common Council. She then discussed the Soundview Landing Project. She also noted that Planning & Zoning Commissioners in Westport were elected.

Katherine Price, 14 Haviland, also said she would like to hear Ms. Jones' letter. She asked to see where toxic waste sites were and those were her concern. She said she was running for Sheriff.

Chris MacDonnell, 29 Van Buren, Harbor Management Commission, and noted which studies he had been part of. He said he was speaking as a private resident and noted that he wanted to put on record the Harbor Management Commission objecting to the amendment to the POCD. He discussed the marine services industry that is thriving in this area. He explained the boating economy. He supported marine commercial and that the proposed 5W is not. He asked when they would see the 5W district. Mr. Schulam apologized for not mentioning the Harbor Management Commission but it had been received much earlier than the other letters.

Diane Lauricella, Little Fox Lane, said she was speaking as resident, and asked for the record to be held open due to an illness of the chair of the Water Quality Committee so that they could complete their letter. She then spoke as a private citizen and explained what she would like to see changed. She also spoke about the conversion of Washington Village to Soundview Landing.

Scott Goodwin, 6 Pine Hill Avenue, noted that there was a lot about the plan he liked but did have some concerns. He said some were addressed by Mr. Pinto's letter as well as some of the other speakers. He noted that he could not find the letter of Ms. Jones on the city's website. He asked if they could share the letter with the speakers through email.

John Paladino, 107 Water Street, asked about the thought process about the infrastructure, park space, etc. in this area. He also discussed the Soundview Landing project. He shared his concerns for the development in the area.

Diane Cece, 37 Olmstead Place, addressed the commissioners as a member of ENNA, and noted that she generally spoke at the end of public comments in order to hear other residents. She commented about Ms. Jones not being allowed to read her letter into the record. She also said that many residents may not write letters. She also noted that there were items not posted on the city's website. She asked if public comment could be held open. She then discussed the adoption of the amendment as part of the POCD. She also discussed the CD5W zoning. She discussed poor water quality runoff which was being allowed and why the stormwater management guidelines were not being enforced. She said that the public should review the use tables of the proposed zoning regulations.

Mr. Schulman closed the public portion of the comments. He asked Mr. Kleppin if he would like to respond to the public's comments at this time. Mr. Kleppin addressed comments about Taylor Farm Park, Harbor Management Commission and the brownfields. He said that some properties can be developed without coming before the Planning & Zoning Commission. He explained what would happen if there is contamination on the site. He addressed Mr. MacDonnell's comments and noted that there had been an oversight which would be corrected and reflected. He also explained that the presentation was completed that day and there had been no time to post it. He explained why DEEP's letter had not been completed at the time of the public hearing. He noted that there were areas that had received comments.

Mr. Schulman noted that he did not state that Ms. Jones could not speak but rather, that she could not read her letter. There was a discussion about the public

speaking at the next meeting at which Mr. Schulman said they could speak on new material on October 4.

i. Action on #2023-01 POCD

There would not be any action on this item at this meeting. At this point, Mr. Schulman said they would take a break and reconvene the meeting at 9:27 pm.

VI. DISCUSSION

a. Updates to the North 7 Master Plan

Atty David Waters, the attorney for the applicant, began the presentation by noting that any application for a building would have to be referred to the third party traffic consultant. Atty Waters then showed the commissioners a comparison of the prior site plan and current site plan. He showed them the changes between the two including a larger town square and a dog park. Instead of two separate buildings, there would be one larger building which would have the same number of units. The amount of retail space has been reduced but they added a separate retail space. He described the discussions with the city's consultant, Bob Grzwacz. He then explained the differences in the height of the buildings from the previous site plan. There were additions that tied into the building from the train station across the street.

There was a discussion about Merritt 7's building height being close to the height of these buildings. There was also a discussion about the reduction in retail space. Atty Waters also discussed the outdoor covered area. He then discussed the dog park area and noted that the Tennessee gas pipeline ran through the area. He showed them renderings of the building near the train station. He also discussed nodes of interest. He showed them some parking areas including parallel parking. He noted that the parking at the train station will be used at nights and weekends when events are held at the town square. He showed them how the dog parks and small retail spaces look in Stamford. He said there is a high demand for dog parks. He discussed the activation from the building to areas north. He explained where the Connecticut Department of Transportation (DOT) would have the train parking. There was a discussion about the walkability from the buildings to retail on Main Avenue. Atty Waters discussed the many events at the town square in Stamford which could be brought to the one in Norwalk.

There was also a discussion about talks with DOT about the sidewalk on Grist Mill. He said that they are working on it and it noted it was a condition of approval. He also noted that the NRVt was interested in completing the trail but Mr. Schulman said

they do not have construction funding. There was a discussion about a food truck area. There was a suggestion to change the shape of the sidewalk to a serpentine to be more visually appealing.

There was a discussion on next steps. Mr. Schulman noted that he did not see much in these designs from the city's guidelines. Ms. Langalis asked why there would not be a way to have more retail in the bottom of these buildings. She thought it might create community as residents saw each other in the store. Atty Waters said that it was difficult to keep retail these days. The commissioners voted for AKRF to be the traffic consultants for the city on this project.

VII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 13, 2023; September 6, 2023; August 30, 2023; August 9, 2023

**** MR. BRYCE MOVED to approve the August 9, 2023 minutes.**

Mr. Pachas seconded.

Louis Schulman; Nick Kantor; Mike Mushak; Chapin Bryce; Hector Pachas; Richard Roina; Ana Tabachneck; Tammy Langalis approved.

No one opposed.

Darius Williams abstained.

**** MS. LANGALIS MOVED to approve the August 30, 2023 minutes.**

Mr. Williams seconded.

Louis Schulman; Nick Kantor; Mike Mushak; Chapin Bryce; Hector Pachas; Richard Roina; Ana Tabachneck; Tammy Langalis; Darius Williams approved.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

**** MR. BRYCE MOVED to approve the September 6, 2023 minutes.**

Mr. Williams seconded.

Louis Schulman; Nick Kantor; Chapin Bryce; Hector Pachas; Richard Roina; Ana Tabachneck; Tammy Langalis; Darius Williams approved.

No one opposed.

Mike Mushak abstained.

**** MR. KANTOR MOVED to approve the September 13, 2023 minutes.**

Ms. Langalis seconded.

Louis Schulman; Nick Kantor; Ana Tabachneck; Mike Mushak; Tammy Langalis; Darius Williams approved.

No one opposed.

Hector Pachas; Richard Roina; Chapin Bryce abstained.

VIII. COMMENTS OF DIRECTOR

Mr. Kleppin said that there would be another meeting in the following week but it has specific items.

IX. COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS

Mr. Schulman said that Mr. Kantor would be on the affordable housing study committee. Mr. Kleppin said they would meet on September 28.

Mr. Mushak asked where letters of support would be posted online. Mr. Kleppin said that they would be posted the following day. There was a discussion about what else was posted online and kept in the files.

Mr. Kantor asked about the aquifer case they had recently heard. Mr. Roina said that he had spoken with Ms. Cherichetti and she said that if she needed help she would let him know.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Pachas made a Motion to Adjourn.

Mr. Williams seconded.

Louis Schulman; Nick Kantor; Mike Mushak; Chapin Bryce; Hector Pachas; Richard Roina; Ana Tabachneck; Tammy Langalis; Darius Williams approved.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Palmentiero