**CITY OF NORWALK**
**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES**
**March 20, 2024**

**PRESENT:** Louis Schulman, Chair; Ana Tabachneck; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Nick Kantor; Richard Roina; Galen Wells; Nick Kantor; Darius Williams; Tammy Langalis

**STAFF:** Steve Kleppin; Bryan Baker; Amelia Williams

**OTHERS:** Atty David Waters; Bob Grzywacz; Mike Mushak; Atty Liz Suchy; Peter Romano; Rick Tomasetti; Harry Rocheville; Bill Andriopoulos; Maria Genovese; Matt Popp; Neil Olinski; Neil Olinski; Gino Mattera

## 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 seated Ms. Tabachneck for the entire meeting.

## III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

**a. #2024-04 R/SPR – Building & Land Technology – 77, 87, 111, 117, 129, 135, 155, 156 and 201 Glover Avenue (District 5, Block 38A, Lots 40, 51, 5A, 22, 29, 19, 36, 35 and 50) (North 7) – Zoning regulations text amendment to revise Article 20 to modify the front setback requirement for Development Parks in the Executive Office zone and a site plan review application to construct a 12-story, 266 dwelling-unit, mixed-use building and other associated site improvements at 77 Glover Avenue in accordance with the approved North 7 Master Plan.**

Mr. Schulman began by noting that the commission had to alter the Master Plan before they took action on the site plan, since it had two buildings but they were reviewing a plan for one building.

Atty David Waters began his presentation with an introduction of the project team. However, Mr. Schulman said that he would like to explain to the public how this hearing would work.

Atty Waters continued that the public hearing had previously been opened on February 21, continued to March 6 and then at this meeting. The applicant had a chance to review the city's third party review consultant. He then addressed items in the resolutions. He began with the conditions for the Master Plan resolution. He showed them a comparison of what had been approved under the Master Plan and then on the bottom was a picture of what was being proposed. He explained the differences from the Master Plan and the proposed site plan.

In order to help activate the street, the applicant has now included a pavilion building between the town square and the dog park. This building would include a small coffee shop for commuters, people in the town square or dog park. Atty Waters explained what would go in the space if it were not a dog park. It was suggested that it could be a gallery or event space but Atty Waters reminded them that this space would be closed at times and not activating the street. There was also a suggestion to construct the dog park behind the building. There was a discussion about the location of the pavilion building to support the dog park. Mr. Schulman did not think it would help commuters, as is intended.

There was a discussion about some of the conditions in the resolution which included a requirement that utilities be underground. Atty Waters said that the applicant agreed that they should be underground. They had invested money on other projects for underground utilities on Glover Avenue. He explained the cost and the length of time it would take to do this. He explained that if this is a condition of approval, it would make the project economically not viable.  He said that the applicant could grant easements to the city at no cost for any other utilities that need to be underground.

Atty Waters also discussed another condition to realign the intersection of Glover Avenue and Oakwood Avenue. He reviewed their analysis and noted that if this were done, the node of interest would be gone. In its place would be retaining walls, instead. He noted that the intersection would not be compliant. He said that there are no documented issues at this intersection. He also explained how the service entrance and parking for tenants worked. There would not be truck traffic turning right onto Oakwood Avenue for this development. There was a concern that if the grade becomes steeper there would be liability issues if someone slips. He suggested that if the city wanted to fix this in the future, the applicant would grant an easement in the future. There was a further discussion about the reason as to why this should be a 90 degree intersection.

Atty Waters also discussed a dropoff area that was suggested in one of the conditions in the resolution. He noted that there was an area across the street which was a dropoff area. He noted that there is a loading area where people could drop off. There will be a 24 hour concierge to let everyone know where the dropoff areas are. Atty Waters said that they are working on a signage package for this building.

Atty Waters discussed the hurricane resistant ethos which they are permitted to have above the ground floor. He said it only adds weight and cost and does not have any other benefits and asked them to reconsider the condition.

He also discussed the use of artificial turf behind the building and noted that it was as pervious as natural turf. He explained why it was important for a heavily trafficked area. He also said that they had submitted the workforce housing affordability plan to staff, which they had used on other similar projects in the city. He did note that they are not on the top floor. Mr. Schulman said he was uncomfortable excluding them from those floors, but would discuss it with the other commissioners upon their review of the resolution.

There was a discussion about the probable savings of constructing one building when the applicant was originally going to construct two buildings. Mr. Kleppin noted how many units were on the top floors of the building.

Bob Grzywacz began his presentation by noting there is a savings since there is only one building with a loss of retail. His discussion of his report included numerous unresolved issues. He discussed the distance that there would be between building 1 and 1.2 since there would not be a building 1.1. Although there would be a dog park, he did not think this would be enough activation of the street. He also discussed the number of pavilions he thought should be constructed. He discussed the parking requirements. Mr. Kleppin further discussed the pavilion but noted that it would be up to the commission to decide what they would like to see in the space. There was a discussion about the previous look of the area and that this proposal did not look like it. There was a discussion about the programming and how it would activate the street. There was a discussion about the neighborhood being cut off from Main Avenue and vice versa. Ms. Jordan-Byron wanted residents from Main Avenue to visit the retail on Glover Avenue and not to feel they were cut off from it.

There was also a discussion about the affordable workforce housing units. Since there would be a premium for the penthouse units, Ms. Jordan-Byron did not think it would be a problem for them not to be available as workforce housing units. Several commissioners agreed with her.

Mr. Roina said he would like to see a dog park as proposed. There was a discussion about whether the Curb buildings had a dog park. Atty Waters said that one of them did. Mr. Grzywacz said that he thought utilities should be underground but was not sure who would pay for it. There was also a discussion about parks for people to which Atty Waters reminded that there was a town square which would be programmed extensively. There would also be a park further north. Under the city's new zoning regulations, parks are not allowed on private land. However, the Master Plan was approved under the old regulations. There was a discussion about materials to be used for the building.

Mr. Schulman opened the hearing to the public but reminded everyone that they could only speak on the new materials that had been brought up at this meeting.

Mike Mushak, 50 Olmwood Avenue, and a former Planning & Zoning Commissioner, has known Atty Waters and the applicant for many years. He spoke in support of the text amendment. He said that opening the town square and the dog park would help balance the area. This area would be residential to the commercial spaces on Main Avenue and not necessarily self-supported. He made suggestions about how to activate the area.

Atty Waters noted that residents could cross over to Main Avenue through the train station access and are beginning to see this happening. He also addressed some of the questions from the commissioners earlier in the meeting.

There was a discussion about activating the area with art installations. There was also a discussion about the updated amenity placements. There was a discussion about the charging stations for electric vehicles and that there would be designated locations. Atty Waters explained that some of the parking would be set up as Level 2 charging stations. If necessary, others could be converted to charging stations. There was also a discussion about sustainable roof materials. There was a discussion about the design standards and what was in them. There seemed to be a discrepancy but Mr. Kleppin suggested that they could deal with it later. He noted that the applicant complied with the zoning regulations.

Mr. Schulman closed the public hearing.

**i. Action on #2024-04 R/SPR**

Mr. Schulman said that there would be two resolutions, one for the Master Plan and the other for the site plan, in that order. The commissioners began the review of the first one. There was a discussion about adding an additional node or second pavilion building. Mr. Roina and Ms. Langalis said they did not think a second pavilion was necessary. Mr. Kantor said that he was torn about it. Mr. Schulman thought that more should be done to activate the area but was not sure the pavilion would do that. There was discussion of an artist studio/gallery. Mr. Bryce also said that he was torn about the 2nd pavilion, but suggested that the first one be expanded. Mr. Schulman reminded them that the Master Plan had to be revised since the site plan would change it from the Master Plan. Ms. Tabachneck believed incremental changes were straying from the original, thought out Master Plan. Ms. Langalis had concerns about having an unoccupied building, if there was to be a second pavilion building.

At this point, the commissioners took a straw poll to see whether to add language about a second pavilion building. Mr. Schulman said all those in favor of requiring the additional building. Two commissioners approved, three were opposed, and there were three abstentions so the commission would not be requiring a second pavilion. There was a discussion as to whether they should expand the pavilion. The Planning & Zoning Department staff would have input into the nodes of activity.

There was then a discussion about having the utilities being buried underground. Mr. Schulman believed that there was substantial savings by constructing one building, rather than two buildings and was less concerned with having the developer bury the utilities underground. He thought it would be best for the project, best for the neighborhood and best for the city. Mr. Kleppin said it would be better for the building during storms, ensuring power for the area. They had made many changes to the zoning regulations as well as revisions to the Master Plan. Several commissioners agreed. At this point, Atty Waters made a point of order and withdrew the applications.

There was a discussion about the developer’s response to the last set of comments from the Planning & Zoning staff, as well as further discussion about burying the utility lines. Mr. Kleppin reminded them that the Master Plan was still in effect and that they could come back with a new application. There was a discussion about whether a new developer could build this portion of the Master Plan. Since the applicant owned the property, they could sell those rights to build. There was also a discussion about which projects around the city required the utilities to be buried underground.

At this point, the commissioners took a break and returned at 8:35 pm.

**b. #2024-08 SP/CAM – Harbor Ventures LLC – 18 Harbor Avenue (District 1, Block 25, Lot 7) – Construction of new building for contractor’s storage yard use.**

Mr. Schulman opened the public hearing and then explained the process.

Atty Liz Suchy began the presentation with an introduction of the project team, including the owner, the architect and the engineer. She noted that the neighbors were notified about the public hearing. She gave a brief description of the property. She oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. The permit for a contractor's yard remains in effect. She discussed the proposed new building, as well as the business operations. She said there would be a new stormwater management system.

Peter Romano, the engineer on the project, discussed the property as it currently is as well as the storm management. He noted that currently it is an impervious site so they are introducing storm drainage. He also discussed the parking spaces as well as the usage which is part warehouse, part office space. He said that they had received comments from the Department of Public Works (DPW) as well as from Traffic, Mobility and Parking (TMP). He explained the garbage collection on site.

There was a discussion about storage of materials outside the building, including volatile gases. Rob Fahey, the owner, said that there were not. Mr. Romano said that they could be stored inside as long as they were stored properly.

Rick Tomasetti, the architect on the project, continued the presentation by showing the commissioners the site plans. He showed them the interior and exterior plans. He noted that the city's regulations require a building taller than they had originally planned.

Atty Suchy made closing remarks before members of the public were allowed to speak.

Amelia Williams discussed staff concerns including increasing the first floor to comply with height standards. She noted that the traffic study had been waived. She requested designs for the dumpster enclosures and whether they would be seen from the street. She noted that the landscaping plans do not comply with the Industrial 1 regulations. There was a discussion about the conditions in the resolution. She said the application was consistent with the Coastal Area Management Act. There was also a discussion about using a fence instead of plantings which Ms. Williams said would be appropriate on some areas of the property. However, it was noted that in the back they would need a variance for a fence since it is stated in the regulations that a buffer is necessary. Ms. Langalis asked to keep as much vegetative buffer as possible.

Mr. Schulman asked that members of the public be allowed to speak. There were no speakers who spoke for or against the project. Atty Suchy made some closing remarks, saying that the application met the zoning regulations. Mr. Schulman closed the public hearing.

**i. Action on #2024-08 SP/CAM**

The commissioners reviewed the resolution with Ms. Williams.

**** MR. KANTOR MOVED: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that application #2024 - 08 SP CAM – Harbor Ventures, LLC and Plumbing Works, LLC – 18 Harbor Avenue – Construct a new building and use the entire property as an Earth Processing and Contractor Materials Storage Yard be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. That the building and site be developed in accordance with the following plans:

a. Per zoning location survey dated 12/22/2023 and revised 2/6/2024 prepared by Arcamone Land Surveyors LLC, Norwalk, CT

b. Per architectural plans dated 2/9/2024 and revised 3/14/2024 prepared by Tomasetti Architects LLC, Wilton, CT

c. Per the site plans dated 2/9/2024 prepared by Landtech, Westport, CT

2. That a certificate of special permit and mylar map of the approved Site Plan (as revised by any conditions of approval) be filed on the Norwalk Land Records prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and

3. That all department sign-offs are obtained prior to issuance of any Zoning Permit; and

4. That any and all conditions listed in a memo dated March 15, 2024, from Norwalk DPW are applicable to this approval including any revisions; and

5. That any and all conditions listed in a memo dated March 19, 2024, from Norwalk WPCA are applicable to this approval including any revisions; and

6. That any and all conditions listed in a memo dated March 19, 2024, from Norwalk TMP are applicable to this approval including any revisions; and

7. That a surety be submitted, in an amount to be determined by staff, to guarantee the installation of the required sedimentation and erosion controls prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and

8. That all required soil sedimentation and erosion controls are in place prior to the start of any construction; and

9. That any additional needed soil sedimentation and erosion controls be installed at the direction of the Staff; and

10. That any changes to the plans be reviewed by Staff prior to implementation; and

11. Any utilities comply with setbacks; and

12. All equipment and material shall be stored in an environmentally safe manner and comply with setbacks; and

13. That no storage of empty refuse containers used exclusively for the collection and disposal of construction debris in the construction trade occurs on this site; and

14. No materials be stored outdoors; and

15. A landscaping plan, prepared by a qualified professional, is submitted to and approved by Staff. The plan shall depict a five (5) foot vegetated buffer where feasible along all property lines, except where the property abuts a residential zone where there shall be a ten (10) foot vegetated buffer. All materials, equipment, and vehicles will be screened from the adjacent properties. The area within required yards, except for required parking, vehicle and pedestrian accessways, shall be landscaped with lawns, native trees and shrubs per §118-700B(4)b.

16. That all plantings be implemented prior to COZC; and

17. That all plantings be maintained, and any dead plantings must be replaced in accordance with the approved planting plan; and

18. Lighting shall not emit onto neighboring properties; and

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

20. Nothing in this permit shall obviate the requirements for the applicant to obtain any other assents, permits or licenses required by law or regulation by the City of Norwalk, State of Connecticut, or the Government of the United States, including any approval required by the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers- obtaining such assents, permits or licenses is the sole responsibility of the applicant; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that this proposal complies with all applicable coastal resource and use policies, section 118-1450 Special Permits, and with all applicable sections of the Building Zone Regulations for the City of Norwalk; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the effective date of this approval shall be March 29th , 2024.

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

**c. #2024-13 SUB – Norden Center LLC/Fortis Property Group LLC – 10 Norden Place (District 3, Block 17, Lot 40) – Proposed three (3) lot subdivision.**

Mr. Schulman opened the public hearing by noting that the regulations for the subdivision are very clear and restrictive. The commissioners were acting in their capacity as the Planning Commission for this application. He explained that comments from the public about the project itself would be allowed during the public hearing for a site plan application.

Atty Suchy continued the presentation with an introduction of the owner of the property. She noted that the application was filed under the old zoning map and neighbors were notified of the public hearing by a letter mailed certified mail, return receipt. The green cards were delivered to the Planning & Zoning Department staff earlier that day. She oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property. She explained the current property and then explained the subdivision of the property. All lots conformed to the regulations and there are wetlands on the property. An application had been submitted to the Inland/Wetlands Agency and decided previously. She discussed the fire hydrants around the building and in the vicinity of the building. She also discussed the sidewalk in the front of the property as well as the planting of street trees in a limited required area. The site plan application would be reviewed in the following weeks. She then noted the sign-offs that had been received by the applicant.

Mr. Schulman invited the public to speak on the subdivision only; however, there were no speakers at that time. Mr. Schulman closed the public hearing.

**i. Action on #2024-13 SUB**

**** MR. ROINA MOVED: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that #2024-13 SUB – Norden Ctr. & Fortis Group – 10 Norden Pl. (3/17/40) – 3 lot re-subdivision be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. That the approval is in accordance with Resubdivision Map of Revised Lot 2, Maps 12681A & 12681B Depicting Parcels 1A, 1B & Lot 2, 10 Norden Place, Norwalk Connecticut, Prepared for Courville Nursery Property, prepared by Seymour Surveying, dated January 16, 2023.

2. That a mylar map of the approved subdivision be filed on the Norwalk Land Records; and

3. That all department signoffs are submitted prior to the mylar map being filed on the Norwalk Land Records; and

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

5. That any and all conditions from Norwalk DPW are applicable to this approval; and

6. That the existing sidewalk, handicap ramps and curb must be maintained; and

7. That the applicant install a native, flowering street tree every 25' along the site frontage. However, shall a more comprehensive landscape plan be approved for the larger 10 Norden parcel, street trees fronting proposed lots Parcels 1A and 1B, shall be incorporated into a larger landscape and screening plan for the sites. Tree species shall be approved by the Tree Warden; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the effective date of this approval shall be March 29th, 2024.

**Mr. Bryce seconded.**

Before the vote, Ms. Langalis asked for confirmation on the fact that the commission was voting on the subdivision and not the future plans for the site. Mr. Kleppin clarified that one parcel received a zoning permit for its use as a nursery. The other two parcels would come before the commission as site plan applications. There was a discussion about whether the future applications would be allowed without the subdivision. There was also a discussion about whether the current owner would maintain ownership after the subdivision. Mr. Kleppin said that they could be sold. There was a discussion about the size of the parcel.

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

## IV. REVIEW & ACTION ON APPLICATIONS

**a. #2024-15 SPR – 3 Color LLC – 175 West Cedar Street (District 5, Block 64, Lots 15 and 423) – Construction of a 12-unit multifamily structure and a two (2) unit mixed-use structure for a total of 14 dwelling units – Report & recommended action**

Atty Suchy began the presentation with an introduction of the project team. She then reviewed the timeline of the site plan. Neighbors have been notified of the application submission. She then discussed the location and size of the property. She reviewed the proposed site plan. She noted which sign-offs they had received.

Harry Rocheville, the engineer on the project, continued the presentation by showing them the drainage plans which conformed to the Norwalk drainage standards. He explained the underground retention system. He also discussed the sewer easement and the coordination with WPCA.

Bill Andriopoulos and Maria Genovese, the architect and project manager on the project, continued the presentation. Mr. Andriopoulos reviewed the two buildings, the parking in the lower level and on grade parking. There would be a mailroom, storage and bike storage in the building. He also discussed the interior plans for each floor including the number of units on each. He also discussed where the workforce housing units would be located. He discussed the recreation area. He showed them the exterior plans and discussed the materials. Ms. Genovese described the retaining wall and landscaping. Mr. Andriopoulos explained the reasons for the fencing. They showed the commissioners the elevations for the building. He then discussed the second building which included a review of the different floors. There would be townhouses in this building. There would not be roof access in this building and share the recreational area with building A. They showed them the exterior of this second building as well. There would be commercial space on the first floor. They then showed the elevations for this building.

There was also a discussion about charging stations on site. Mr. Baker said that it did not meet state requirements due to the number of units.

Matt Popp, the landscape architect, continued the presentation, with a description of the types of trees on their landscape plan which he showed them. He also described the lighting plan and sidewalks.

There was a discussion about the fact that part of the property had been purchased from the city, the required plantings and the parking garage.

Neil Olinski, the traffic engineer, continued the presentation with a description of the traffic study and how it was done. He also described the levels of service and said that this development would not have an impact on the traffic. They had received comments from TMP, to which Mr. Baker had a request. Mr. Olinski said that the applicant could look into it.

Gino Mattera, the owner of the property, read a statement, thanking the commissioners for reviewing his application and explaining the history of his family and himself in Norwalk. He hoped to revitalize the area.

**** MS. WELLS MOVED: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission that application #2024-15 SPR – 3 Color LLC – 175 West Cedar Street (District 5, Block 64, Lots 15 and 423) – Construction of a 12-unit multifamily structure and a two (2) unit mixed-use structure for a total of 14 dwelling units be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. That the site shall be developed in accordance with the following plans:

a. Civil Site Plans entitled “Site Layout and Utility Plan, 175 West Cedar Street, Norwalk, Connecticut,” prepared by McChord Engineering Associates, Inc., dated 2/12/202; and;

b. Architectural Plans entitled “New Mixed-Use Development, 175 West Cedar Street & Scribner Avenue, Norwalk, CT 06850” prepared by Andriopoulos Design Associates, LLC, dated 2/7/2024; and

2. That the applicant shall submit a Workforce Housing Affordability Plan, subject to Staff approval, prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and

3. That all utilities servicing the site shall be installed underground; and

4. 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

5. That should any building façade material become damaged and/or deteriorated, the applicant and any future owner(s) shall repair the damaged and/or deteriorated façade within thirty (30) days upon receiving notice from the City; and

6. That the applicant shall consider the recommendations made by the Transportation, Mobility & Parking Department prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and

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

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

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

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

11. That a surety shall be submitted, in an amount determined by Staff, to guarantee the installation of the required erosion and sediment controls prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and

12. That all erosion and sediment controls shall be installed and maintained prior to the start of any construction or site work, shall be maintained throughout all construction and site work, and that additional controls be installed at the direction of Staff; and

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

14. That a surety shall be submitted, in an amount determined by the applicant and verified by Staff, to guarantee the completion and maintenance of the site plan and any and all modifications to the plan and all work as required as a condition of approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Zoning Compliance; 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 March 29, 2024.

**Mr. Roina seconded.**
Ms. Tabachneck said she was glad to see development in this area.
**Louis Schulman; Ana Tabachneck; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Nick Kantor; Richard Roina; Galen Wells; Nick Kantor; Tammy Langalis Darius Williams approved.**
**No one opposed.**
**No one abstained.**

## V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 6, 2024

**** MS. WELLS MOVED to approve the March 6, 2024 minutes.**
**Mr. Bryce seconded.**
**Louis Schulman; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Ana Tabachneck; Darius Williams; Chapin Bryce approved.**
**No one opposed.**
**Tammy Langalis and Jackie Jordan-Byron abstained.**

## VI. COMMENTS OF DIRECTOR

Mr. Kleppin did not have any comments.

## VII. COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS

Mr. Williams said all good restaurants are closed at this point.

Mr. Schulman said that the action by BLT was unfortunate and asked what would happen going forward. Mr. Kleppin noted that since they had spent a considerable amount of money on this project, they would have to submit a new application. Since the Master Plan had been decided under the old regulations, they would continue to fall under those.

Mr. Kleppin asked for comments from the commissioners on a draft memo to TMP. If there were none, he would send it over and schedule a time for them to meet with the commissioners.

Mr. Kleppin said that their May 1 meeting would have to be rescheduled for May 8. Their next meeting would be April 3.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

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

The meeting was adjourned at 10:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Palmentiero