CITY OF NORWALK
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES
June 5, 2024

PRESENT: Louis Schulman, Chair; Ana Tabachneck; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Richard Roina (signed off at 6:11 pm and returned at 6:17 pm); Tammy Langalis; Darius Williams; Galen Wells; Chapin Bryce; Diana Lenkowsky

STAFF: Steve Kleppin; Bryan Baker

OTHERS: Mark Conte; Atty Adam Blank; Jason Milligan; Atty Liz Suchy; Matt Bruton; Phil Cerrone; Phil DiGennaro (sp?); Mike Kurker; Marissa Tarallo; Laura Lamorte; Diane Lauricella; Heather Dunn; Joe Balestriere; Eric Lindquist; Laura King; Anamaria Bonilla;

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Schulman called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. It should be noted that this meeting was held on Zoom.com with participants calling in, separately.

II. ROLL CALL & SEATING OF MEMBERS

Mr. Kleppin called the roll. Mr. Schulman said that he would seat Ms. Lenkowsky on the first two items. He then said he would seat Ms. Tabachneck on the first two public hearings and then for #2024-19 SPR/CAM – O&G Industries Inc.

III. REVIEW & ACTION ON NEW AND/OR PENDING APPLICATIONS

a. #2024-38 Special Appropriation – Norwalk Fire Department – Special capital appropriation in the amount of $17,100 for Building Repairs – Report & recommended action

Mr. Schulman introduced Mark Conte from the Fire Department. Mr. Conte explained that the department had completed a roof replacement on a fire house a few years back which was under budget by $17,000. Now they were noticing cracks in the slab at the Broad River Station which were getting larger as well as drainage issues in the floor. He said they spoke with two city officials, Bill Ireland and Alan Lo about the situation. The money they were requesting would cover the initial cost of determining the scope of the work. There was a discussion about the age of the building which Mr. Conte said had been built in 1964. The fire department was requesting authorization for the transfer of the funds from one account to another.

*****	MS. LANGALIS MADE A MOTION FOR THE AUTHORIZATION OF THE TRANSFER OF THE FUNDS FROM ONE ACCOUNT TO ANOTHER FOR THE INITIAL COSTS OF THE PROJECT.**

Mr. Roina seconded.
Louis Schulman; Galen Wells; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis; Diana Lenkowsky; Nick Kantor; Darius Williams approved.
No one opposed.
No one abstained.

b. #2024-37 SPR/CAM – Wall St Opportunity Fund LLC c/o Jason Milligan – 21 & 23 Isaacs Street (District 1, Block 29, Lots 25 & 28) – Construction of a six-story extended stay hotel – Preliminary review & approval of architectural peer review

Before Atty Adam Blank began, Mr. Roina signed off the meeting at 6:11 pm. Atty Blank introduced the project team members and then oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He then described the project and said it was in scale with the Wall Street Place project. He showed them some exterior renderings of the hotel, with a semicircle driveway. He noted that there are many businesses in the area with the hotel residents going out into the neighborhood. He said there would be an increase in pervious surfaces and upgrades in the drainage. He also discussed the traffic report which Atty Blank said he did not think there were any traffic issues created by this project or site access.There would be rooftop solar and the building would be LEED Silver.

Jason Milligan said he owned many of the buildings in the area. He described the theaters, restaurants and theatrical college in the area. He believed there was a need for this extended hotel and live/work rooms. He said that he also would like to see a bike rental place.

There was a discussion about the art in the parking lot which would help people remember where they parked. Mr. Milligan said it would be a part of this project as well. There was also a discussion about the live/work units which were described as a retail store where people could live as well. These units would be targeted to small businesses and start-ups. There was a discussion about driving out of Leonard Street and Isaac Street. There was a discussion about keeping the current tenants.

*****	MS. LANGALIS MADE A MOTION TO HIRE ARCHITECTURAL CONSULTANTS, DECARLO AND DOLL, FOR THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW ON THIS PROJECT.**

Mr. Bryce seconded.
Louis Schulman; Galen Wells; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis; Diana Lenkowsky; Nick Kantor; Darius Williams approved.
No one opposed.
No one abstained.

Mr. Schulman asked if the city had hired new architectural and traffic consultants. Mr. Kleppin said that the process would be completed soon.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

a. #2024-12 SPR – Main Norwalk, LLC – 272-280 Main Avenue (District 5, Block 21, Lots 174 & 97) – Proposed construction of three (3) two-story structures; a +/- 19,000sf retail store with 10 apartments on the second floor; a +/- 2,240sf coffee shop; a +/- 2,200sf restaurant building; and electric vehicle charging

Mr. Schulman opened the public hearing and explained how it would be conducted.

Atty Liz Suchy began the presentation with an introduction of the project team. She then explained that the application had been filed before the new zoning regulations had been placed in effect. She said that the neighbors had been notified of the public hearing and that the certified, return receipt cards had been delivered to the Planning and Zoning Department. One neighbor had spoken with her prior to this meeting about the application. There had been an agreement made under the prior application in 2016. She then oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. She described the history of the current application and a prior, approved application on the property in 2016 which has since lapsed. She reminded the commissioners that since this was a site plan review, they were acting in an administrative capacity, as well as the fact that they should review the application under the old regulations, not the new ones. She then described the project which included 3 2 story buildings, 195 parking spaces, restaurant spaces, the new stormwater and lighting system, and the proposed entrance/exit in the middle of the site. She then said that their traffic study determined the site did not need a signal. She also discussed the various sustainable features, including solar panels on the roof of the largest building, LED lighting, etc. They had received most of their sign-offs, except for the Water Pollution Control Authority (WPCA) and Department of Public Works (DPW). They also received comments from the Transportation, Mobility, and Parking department (TMP) as well as the city's peer review consultant, AKRF.

Matt Bruton, the engineer on the project, continued the presentation by describing the site plan. He noted this was an empty lot with a rudimentary drainage system. He described the storm water management system. He then described the tree line in the rear of the property.

There was a discussion about using trees in boxes. Mr. Bruton said that there was a gas main in the frontage, therefore they did not think they would not survive. There was also a discussion about replacing the sidewalk along the frontage. There was a discussion about a traffic signal in this area. There was also a discussion about how it was too steep of a grade to put in an ADA compliant sidewalk to bring pedestrians into the site. There was also a discussion about the driveway.

Phil Cerrone, the architect on the project, continued the presentation by showing the commissioners the interior floors of the first building. Since there are no tenants yet, the plans are generic. He showed them the exteriors and described the materials. He described the two other buildings as well.

There was a discussion about what types of retail tenants they would be targeting. Phil DiGennaro (sp?), representing the owner, said that they would be looking for restaurants, dental or eye offices, etc. He said they had not been successful in obtaining any yet. It has been challenging. There was a discussion about not having a grocery store or fast food establishment in the space since those traffic counts were not used in the study. Mr. DiGennaro said that they would not stipulate that in the resolution. There was a concern about the traffic study not reflecting counts for a supermarket. There was a discussion about the 6 month follow-up traffic study. Mr. Kleppin said that they were placed in the file, but he said that they could be posted on line as well.

Mike Kurker, the traffic engineer, presented the traffic impact study by explaining the purpose, and the time periods that were studied. He showed them the existing conditions. He discussed other projects that were included in this study. He showed them the trip generation report, as and then discussed the level of service. He also discussed the signal warrant analysis. There was a discussion about using grocery store numbers versus generic retail numbers for the trip counts.

There was a discussion about the encroachment permit process by the state’s Department of Traffic (CONNDOT).

Marissa Tarallo, AKRF, the city’s peer review consultant, said that they had not captured a worst case scenario for the traffic study. She described the discrepancies she found in the traffic study. She discussed fast food sit downs versus those with drive-thrus. She also noted that even if they did think a traffic signal was warranted, CONNDOT may still not approve it. She said she had spoken with Mr. Kurker earlier in the day to reach some compromises on it. Mr. Schulman asked her to recommend language for the resolution. Ms. Tarallo said that the draft resolution did have some language to address their concerns. She discussed the possibility of a traffic study after 6 months of completion of the project. She reminded them that the space might not be occupied and then a year later, a Trader Joe’s comes in. She did not know if the city’s regulations would cover this situation. Mr. Kleppin said that there could be a condition in the resolution that if the space changes to a grocery the applicant would have to come back to the commission with a traffic analysis.

There was a comparison to the Starbucks farther north on Route 7. There was further discussion about adding a signal. There was also a discussion about making the property more pedestrian friendly. Ms. Tarallo discussed a mountable curb. There was a discussion about the applicant returning 6 months after the project was completed with an updated traffic study. There was a discussion about limiting the left turns out of the site.

Phil DiGennaro said that they would add a signal if they had high traffic tenants. He said they could stipulate that if they did get one of those tenants they would redo their traffic study. There was a further discussion about mountable curbs which Mr. Bruton said that they would look at.

At this point, Mr. Baker invited members of the public to comment.

Laura Lamorte, 50 Aiken Street, said that many in the neighborhood had concerns about the traffic as well as limiting left turns out of the property. She said that she appreciated this proposed development and was happy to see it being developed.

Diane Lauricella, 21 Little Fox Lane, said she was familiar with the mitigation on the site. She said she was in favor of the project but suggested conditions to the permit.

Heather Dunn, 117 Perry Avenue, said she is a Common Council representative in this area. She thanked the developer for this iteration of the project.

Joe Balestriere, 130 Fillow Street, said he would like to have local businesses on this property.

Atty Suchy then addressed the comments from the public. Mr. Cerrone and Mr. Bruton also addressed some of the concerns about the site noises. She then summarized her presentation and once again reminded them of the standards they should apply to this application. She also welcomed the newest commissioner, Diana Lenkowsky, and thanked the Planning & Zoning staff and commissioners for their time on this application.

Mr. Schulman closed the public hearing.

i. Action on #2024-12 SPR

Mr. Baker asked if Atty Suchy would agree to an extension of the application deadline if it was necessary to revise the resolution and have it for the next meeting.

At this point, in order to begin review of the resolution, Mr. Williams made a motion to approve the resolution which Mr. Roina seconded. Mr. Bake said he had been updating the resolution during the meeting and highlighted those updates in yellow. If the commissioners were not comfortable with the language in it, they could continue the meeting until June 26th to revise it.

There was a discussion about an updated traffic study. Mr. Kantor had concerns whether a traffic signal would be installed. His concerns were with the traffic and safety aspects of the application. Ms. Jordan-Byron shared his concerns, as well as the possibility of fatal accidents happening. Mr. Bryce had concerns about the site because there were limitations on where things could be placed. He thought it best to add a traffic signal during the planning stages, rather than later on when it was completed. There was a discussion about conditions #5, 7 and 9 which were sidewalks and street trees. There was then a discussion about how the applicant is held accountable with complying with the conditions of the permit. Mr. Kleppin said that the staff person that prepared the memo and resolution for the commission would review the plans to confirm that the conditions had been met when issuing the zoning permit. There was a discussion about a warrant analysis and holding a bond.

As they finished their review, Mr. Williams was asked to make a motion to approve the resolution with the modifications that they had agreed upon.

**** MR. WILLIAMS MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission that application #2024-12 SPR – Main Norwalk LLC – 272-280 Main Avenue (District 5, Block 21, Lots 174 and 97) – Proposed construction of three (3) two-story structures; a +/- 19,000sf retail store with 10 apartments on the second floor; a +/- 2,240sf coffee shop; a +/- 2,200sf restaurant building; and electric vehicle charging be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions and modifications:

1. That the site be developed in accordance with the following plans, as modified per these conditions:

a. Per site plans entitled “Proposed Development Issued for Site Plan Review Application, 272-280 Main Avenue, Norwalk, Connecticut 06851,” prepared by BL Companies, dated April 23, 2024; and

b. Per architectural plans entitled “New Construction: 272-280 Main Avenue, Norwalk, CT” for Building No. A, B and C, respectively, prepared by Philip H. Cerrone III, dated January 25, 2024; and

2. That prior to the issuance of a zoning permit, the applicant shall provide a traffic signal warrant analysis, as specified by the Norwalk Department of Transportation, Mobility and Parking’s (TMP) April 11, 2024, and May 28, 2024, memorandums, and in AKRF’s April 5, 2024, and May 24, 2024, memorandums; and

a. That the traffic signal warrant analysis should be based on likely tenants of all of the buildings on the site, as agreed to by TMP and P&Z, such as Buildings A and B being occupied by fast-food restaurants and Building C being occupied by a grocery store tenant; and

b. That prior to any potential retail store that primarily sells food or food related products, such as a grocery store tenant, occupies the site, the property owner shall submit an updated traffic signal warrant analysis, in coordination with the City and State; and

i. That if the analysis shows that a traffic signal is warranted, that it shall be the responsibility of the applicant to make the necessary improvements; and

c. That the City and State shall coordinate and decide on if a traffic signal is warranted based in part upon the updated data and calculations within the analysis; and

3. That if a traffic signal warrant analysis shows that a traffic signal is not warranted, that the applicant shall provide an additional traffic signal warrant analysis after six months of the site being completely occupied to confirm whether or not a signal is required; and

a. That prior to the issuance of a zoning permit, the applicant shall bond for an amount in consultation with the City, for the traffic signal as well as any additional improvements required for the traffic signal, in an amount determined in coordination with TMP, DPW, Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT); and

b. That the traffic signal warrant analysis should be based on likely tenants of all of the buildings on the site, as agreed to by TMP and P&Z, such as Buildings A and B being occupied by fast-food restaurants and Building C being occupied by a grocery store tenant; and

c. If the analysis shows that a traffic signal is warranted, that it shall be the responsibility of the applicant to make the necessary improvements; and

4. That the curb cut shall be reduced in width, to a width as approved by TMP and the Norwalk Department of Public Works (DPW), to improve pedestrian safety; and

a. That a Delivery Plan outlining the frequency, timing, and types of vehicles making deliveries to the site be provided prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and

b. That coordination with potential tenants on prioritizing off-peak deliveries is recommended, especially for deliveries being made by larger tractor-trailers; and

5. That the drive-through associated with Building B shall be configured to prevent vehicle queuing that would block circulation throughout the entire site, or such reconfiguration is not feasible, that the drive-through shall be removed entirely; and

a. That such reconfigurations shall be presented to and approved by Staff prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit; and

6. That sidewalks that are a minimum of five-feet wide, shall be installed from the public right-of-way, along both sides of the driveway that connect to the sidewalks along the entrances to Buildings A, B, and C, to ensure safe pedestrian access to the site; and

a. Where the parking lot separates the sidewalks, crosswalks shall be installed; and

b. That if such improvements are not feasible in these locations, the applicant shall provide an alternative pedestrian improvement plan to allow for pedestrian access from the public right-of-way into the site; and

c. That a mountable curb along the driveway to the site shall be considered by the applicant and proposed to Staff for review prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and

7. That the internal crosswalk that passes through the drive-through queue lane be reconfigured to provide a safer connection for pedestrians; and

8. That street trees and sidewalks that are a minimum of five-feet wide, be installed in accordance with city standards along the entirety of the frontage of the properties, in coordination with P&Z, TMP, DPW and CTDOT; and

9. That the electric vehicle charging stations be relocated to be integrated with the rest of the parking area that is closer to buildings A, B and C; and

10. That all site lighting shall be dark sky compliant; and

11. That any and all conditions required by the Norwalk Health Department are applicable to this approval; and

12. That any and all conditions required by Norwalk WPCA are applicable to this approval; and

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

14. That any and all conditions required by Norwalk TMP are applicable to this approval; and

15. That any and all conditions required by the Norwalk Fire Marshal are applicable to this approval; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this decision shall be June 14, 2024.

Mr. Roina seconded.

During the voting, there was a discussion about a traffic signal warrant analysis with the potential of a grocery store. A second analysis could be done if a grocer goes into the space 10 years later.

Louis Schulman; Ana Tabachneck; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis; Darius Williams approved.
Chapin Bryce and Nick Kantor opposed.
Jacquen Jordan-Byron and Galen Wells abstained.

Mr. Schulman thanked the commissioners for their time and said they would take a break until 9:00 pm.

b. #2024-14 SPR – Norwalk Center LLC – 10 Norden Pl (District 3, Block 17, Lot 40, Unit A) – Use of +/- 113,500sf of an existing building and +/- 155,000 square feet of the site for a Transportation Maintenance Terminal use

Mr. Schulman opened the continuance of this application by explaining that they had heard from the applicant as well as from the public. He said that at this time the applicant would provide a rebuttal, before the commissioners decided. Atty Suchy thanked the commissioners and the public for their comments. She noted which experts would speak and reminded the commissioners of their purview.

Eric Lindquist, the engineer on the project, continued the presentation with a review of the features of the storm water quality system. He noted that there were underground infiltration chambers. He discussed the screening on the site. He said there was no space for additional screening. Ms. Tabachneck explained that she had driven through and it was not blocked. Mr. Lindquist said there had been clearing done by CONNDOT on the rail right away which was not on their property. Atty Suchy said that some of the land was occupied by the DOT for the Walk Bridge Project.

Laura King, SLR International, gave a review of her background. From an air quality perspective, she said this project had a very small potential impact on its immediate environment. She discussed models that are used to characterize emissions from traffic. Within the Tri State area, the EPA researched traffic emissions, as well as on the state level. She also discussed natural mitigation and which agencies were responsible for studying these matters. Local governments provide information to them and they do the models. She said that after reviewing the applicant’s data, the project would not result in a measurable change in air quality, even in the immediate area. She thought it was important to understand that projects like these are being constantly assessed at their worst case growth and commuter potential as part of this regional planning to ensure compliance with air quality standards. She said that the public had opportunities to make comments to their state agencies as well as the EPA. She also said that this project is extremely small and that they should not doubt the applicant.

Atty Suchy introduced Anamaria Bonilla who continued the presentation by stating that she was an engineer working for Metro-North for 23 years. She said that Metro-North was committed to the communities that they serve and strive to be good neighbors. They are looking for a headquarters in Connecticut. She then explained the shop space which would have indoor and outdoor storage. They are looking to begin their time in Connecticut. There was a discussion about the storage as well as a description of the night and weekend shifts. Ms. Bonilla said that there would only be one daytime shift. If there was a need for work to be done at night or the weekends, crews would report to the site and then report to the job site. She said that it was not a 24 hour operation. She said that this is not a railroad yard so there would not be work done at this location.

Atty Suchy addressed comments about the number and size of trucks that would be on the site. She also addressed comments about sidewalks, crosswalks on Strawberry Hill. The MTA is a tenant of the building and would not pay taxes. She addressed concerns about accidents of the MTA vehicles. She said that they have offered suggestions for traffic mitigation. She also addressed questions about the types of jobs as well as pay rates for these jobs. They would work with the city to generate interest in these jobs. She said they could have a shuttle from the train station if there was interest. She addressed why East Avenue was not included in the traffic study. She said there would not be access directly from I-95 to the site. She said that she had reached out to ENNA but that the response from them was that since the application had been filed, they would not be seeking substantive feedback from ENNA on the proposal. Atty Suchy did say that the applicant had met with ENNA on May 6. She addressed some comments from Dr. Desai on the Air Quality Analysis. She noted that Dr. Desai was a California licensed civil engineer whose focus was on structural engineering and not air quality. Atty Suchy addressed comments if the plan should change. She also addressed the questions about Triangle Street not being included in the study. She said that a tow company had been hired to remove vehicles from the site. She also noted the different uses that could be allowed on the site, besides this one. She discussed the comments about notice being sent to abutting neighbors. Work would be done in the interior of the building, not outside. The exterior would be for employee parking, MTA vehicles and the storage of materials. She said this was a low intensity use of the property since it would only be 20% of the property. She responded to comments about the noise from the property. She also said that the application had been reviewed by the Inland Wetlands Agency but that no permit was required for it. The MTA would self-police idling on the property. There had been comments that there was never manufacturing on the site but Atty Suchy showed them a photo from the 1960s which showed that there had been air traffic control systems. She addressed comments about the private road between Norden Center and I-95. Almost all abandoned vehicles had been removed. There will be screening of the employee vehicles and materials. Additional screening may be implemented after the Walk Bridge project is completed. She also addressed comments about there being a conflict as SLR worked on other projects for the city of Norwalk. She addressed comments about turning this area into a park, Myrtle Street being a cuthrough street and parking on Strawberry Hill. Atty Suchy addressed Ms. Cece’s comments and then Ms. Lauricella. She said that there would not be a fueling station on site. She noted that in the past, there were 3200 employees. Currently the building is mostly vacant. She explained why it met the requirements and should be approved.

There was a discussion about if the material storage was over 20,000 sq. ft. then this application should be a special permit, not a site plan review. For the record, Mr. Bryce said that he had reviewed the video of the prior meeting. There was a discussion about the air quality and the fact that it would not be considered in the review for this application. Ms. Tabachneck noted that there are no crosswalks between the bridge and Roxbury, going across Strawberry Hill. Ms. Jordan-Byron agreed with Ms. Tabachneck's remarks about air quality. Mr. Roina said that he had a reservation about Fitch Street and East Avenue and had concerns about trailer trucks on this route. He asked that the applicant not use these roads until improvements were made on East Avenue, etc.

Mr. Schulman closed the public hearing.

i. Action on #2024-14 SPR

Ms. Jordan-Bryon said she had driven to the site twice and asked why some routes were considered and not others.

At this point, in order to begin review of the resolution, Mr. Roina made a motion to approve the resolution and Ms. Wells seconded the motion.

The commissioners then reviewed the resolution. Ms. Tabachneck said that two weeks prior to this meeting she was stuck behind two large trucks, trying to turn from Strawberry Hill onto the road that went to Norden. She believed that the traffic was getting worse, especially from the Walk Bridge project and could not imagine bringing more truck traffic into the area. There was also a discussion about having more cars come to the site. It was noted that the Walk Bridge was a temporary project and that there would only be two trucks per week coming to the site.

There was a discussion about the "Whereas" statement about air quality. There were numerous changes made to the conditions of the resolution including charging stations, lighting requirements, a shuttle van for employees, changing their start times if Norwalk Public schools change their start times, the number of tractor trailer trucks coming the site, and turning movement counts at Fitch Street

As they finished their review, Mr. Roina was asked to make a motion to approve the resolution with the modifications that they had agreed upon. Ms. Wells again seconded it.

Ms. Wells seconded.

During the voting, there were comments about the fact that since this is a tax paying property, there should be some use of the property. If it was not this application, there could be another use that was more detrimental for the neighborhood. Some commissioners did empathize with the neighbors but wanted to find a use for this site. The commissioners appreciated the neighbors speaking on this application. Ms. Jordan-Byron wanted them to be more aggressive in letting the public know that there would be jobs available at this site. Ms. Tabachneck would have liked to have seen the results of the study for this site to see what could go into it. She did not think it conformed to the regulations so she voted against it. Mr. Williams read an excerpt into the record from the Connecticut Land Use Law and Practice regulation to express why he could not vote in favor of the application. Mr. Schulman did not think he had a choice but to vote in favor of the application, but said that he could empathize with the neighbors.

Louis Schulman; Galen Wells; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis approved.
Ana Tabachneck; Nick Kantor and Darius Williams opposed.
No one abstained.

At this point, the commissioners discussed whether they should continue the meeting or not. Mr. Kleppin said that there would be a special meeting on June 20 and explained why it was important to open the public hearings. He did say that the O&G Industries application did have to be decided by June 30. The commission may need to have an additional meeting after the June 26th meeting. Mr. Schulman asked them to decide on continuing this evening's meeting, which most said they could not continue.

c. #2024-19 SPR/CAM – O&G Industries Inc. – 20, 34, 40, 46, 48 & 50 Smith Street (District 1, Block 59, Lots 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16 & 17) – Reconfiguration and changes to an existing materials yard

Mr. Schulman opened the public hearing.

***** MR. ROINA MADE A MOTION TO HIRE TWO PEER REVIEW CONSULTANTS, ONE FOR THE TRAFFIC STUDY AND THE OTHER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL (LISTEN TO VIDEO)**

Mr. Bryce seconded.
Louis Schulman; Galen Wells; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis; Ana Tabachneck; Nick Kantor; Darius Williams approved.
No one opposed.
No one abstained.

***** MR. BRYCE MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO JUNE 20, 2024.**

Ms. Wells seconded.
Louis Schulman; Galen Wells; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis; Ana Tabachneck; Nick Kantor; Darius Williams approved.
No one opposed.
No one abstained.

i. Applicant presentation only, public comment on June 20, 2024

This item was tabled until the next Planning & Zoning Commission meeting.

d. #2024-27 R – Planning & Zoning Commission – Zoning Regulations text amendment to Article 4 and Article 9 to revise the definition of "Lot or Building Site Width," the location of where Recreational Vehicles are Permitted to be stored in all zones, façade requirements for duplexes in the CD-2 zone, and window and façade requirements for the mixed-use and industrial zones.

Mr. Schulman opened the public hearing.

***** MS. LANGALIS MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO JUNE 20, 2024.**

Mr. Williams seconded.
Louis Schulman; Galen Wells; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis; Ana Tabachneck; Nick Kantor; Darius Williams approved.
No one opposed.
No one abstained.

i. Action on #2024-27 R

e. #2024-33 R – Planning & Zoning Commission – Zoning regulations text amendment to Article 4 to amend the residential building height determinations and modification to frontage/building types permitted in the CD-4 zone.

Mr. Schulman opened the public hearing.

***** MS. LANGALIS MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO JUNE 20, 2024.**

Mr. Bryce seconded.

Louis Schulman; Galen Wells; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis; Ana Tabachneck; Nick Kantor; Darius Williams approved.
No one opposed.
No one abstained.

i. Action on #2024-33 R

This item was tabled onto the next meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission meeting.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 15, 2024; May 22, 2024

**** MS. LANGALIS MOVED to approve the May 15, 2024 minutes.**
Ms. Tabachneck seconded.
Louis Schulman; Galen Wells; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis; Ana Tabachneck; Nick Kantor; Darius Williams approved.
No one opposed.
Diana Lenkowsky abstained.

**** MS. LANGALIS MOVED to approve the May 15, 2024 minutes.**
Mr. Williams seconded.
Louis Schulman; Galen Wells; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis; Ana Tabachneck; Darius Williams approved.
No one opposed.
Chapin Bryce; Nick Kantor and Diana Lenkowsky abstained.

VI. COMMENTS OF DIRECTOR

Mr. Kleppin had no comments.

VII. COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS

There were no comments from the commissioners.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Jordan-Byron made a Motion to Adjourn.
Mr. Roina seconded.

Louis Schulman; Galen Wells; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis; Ana Tabachneck; Nick Kantor; Darius Williams; Diana Lenkowsky approved.
No one opposed.
No one abstained.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Palmentiero