

**CITY OF NORWALK**  
**SPECIAL MEETING OF THE ZONING COMMISSION**  
**December 8, 2021**

**PRESENT:** Louis Schulman, Chair; Michael Witherspoon; Richard Roina; Galen Wells; Nick Kantor

**STAFF:** Steve Kleppin; Bryan Baker

**OTHERS:** Atty Deborah Brancato; Atty Liz Suchy; Pamma Gulati; Chris DeAngelis; Aris Stalis; Marcos Reinheimer; Michael Beattie; Barbara Garelick; Farhan Memoun; Dr. Bhavna Khandpur; Cate Sanderson; Sheri Brown; Stephanie Kennedy; Frank Bineti; Catherine McGettigan; Ralph Layman; Gregory Dorsey; Harry Arora; Jagjiwan Singh; Imreet Singh; Peter Fratarcangelo; Joe Lacovara; Sundeep Kaur; Layne Evans; Ross Tiefenthaler; Elizabeth Cortright; Butch Quick; Preeti Sethi; Taylor Strubinger; Anthony Segalas; Kulbir Saini; Ken Montanez; John M; Steve Starkman

**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 all participants calling in, separately.

**II. ROLL CALL**

Mr. Kleppin called the roll. Mr. Schulman explained the rules of the public hearing.

**III. EXTENSION OF TIME REQUESTS ON APPROVED APPLICATIONS**

**a. #5-20SPR/#07-20CAM – Wall Street Recap Associates, LLC; Municipal Holdings, LLC; Second Garden Development Limited Partnership – 61 Wall Street (aka Wall Street Place Phase I) – Request for one-year extension of time to complete construction of an existing 6 story frame structure as a mixed use building with 101 dwelling units, 10,233+/- square feet retail - Report & recommended action**

Atty Deborah Brancato explained the reason why the applicant was requesting an extension of time on this approval. She noted that there was an appeal pending on 61 Wall Street and she was not sure how long it would take to proceed.

*\*Whereas the Zoning Commission approved the Coastal Site Plan Review effective January 15, 2021;*

**\* MR. ROINA MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Zoning Commission that the one-year extension of time request for application #5-20SPR/#07-20CAM – Wall Street Recap Associates, LLC; Municipal Holdings, LLC; Second Garden Development Limited Partnership – 61 Wall Street (aka Wall Street Place Phase I) – Request for one-year extension of time to complete construction of an existing 6 story frame structure as a mixed use building with 101 dwelling units, 10,233+/- square feet retail be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. That property taxes be kept current for the duration of the extension period; and
2. That the original conditions of approval remain in effect; and
3. That the new approval deadline for obtaining permits will be January 15, 2023; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the effective date of this action is December 17, 2021.

**Ms. Wells seconded.**

**Louis Schulman; Michael Witherspoon; Richard Roina; Galen Wells; Nick Kantor approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

**b. #6-20SPR/#08-20CAM – Wall Street Recap Associates, LLC; Municipal Holdings, LLC; Second Garden Development Limited Partnership – 17 Isaacs Street (aka Wall Street Place Phase I) – Request for one-year extension of time for construction of new 4 story building with 2 upper residential stories to include 50 units above parking garage levels with 152+/- parking spaces to support both the residential uses for 61 Wall Street and 17 Isaacs Street, together with associated site improvements - Report & recommended action**

Atty Deborah Brancato explained the reason why the applicant was requesting an extension of time on this approval. She said that since this project was a companion to the previous application that the applicant was requesting an extension as well.

*\*Whereas the Zoning Commission approved the Coastal Site Plan Review effective January 15, 2021;*

**\* MR. ROINA MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Zoning Commission that the one-year extension of time request for application #6-20SPR/#08-20CAM – Wall Street Recap Associates, LLC; Municipal Holdings, LLC; Second Garden Development Limited Partnership – 17 Isaacs Street (aka Wall Street Place Phase I) – Request for one-year extension of time for construction of new 4 story building with 2 upper residential stories to include 50 units above parking garage levels with 152+/- parking spaces to support both the

residential uses for 61 Wall Street and 17 Isaacs Street, together with associated site improvements be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. That property taxes be kept current for the duration of the extension period; and
2. That the original conditions of approval remain in effect; and
3. That the new approval deadline for obtaining permits will be January 15, 2023; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the effective date of this action is December 17, 2021.

**Mr. Witherspoon seconded.**

**Louis Schulman; Michael Witherspoon; Richard Roina; Galen Wells; Nick Kantor approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

#### **IV. REVIEW AND ACTION ON PENDING APPLICATIONS**

a. **#2021-18 R/SPR/CAM – 25 Van Zant Street Condominium - 25 Van Zant Street – Building zone text amendment to create a “vocational/trade (workforce training center) school” use and to allow the use as a principal use in the Industrial #1 Zone in conjunction with a proposed vocational/trade school within an existing structure – Report & recommended action**

Ms. Wells recused herself from this application. Mr. Schulman explained that there would be two applications voted on this evening. A public hearing had been held previously and it was being continued to make a determination after that. There had been concerns about the language that would allow this to be used in the industrial zone. Mr. Schulman noted that the vote had to be unanimous since there were only four sitting members at this time.

Before they voted on the text amendment, Mr. Schulman noted that the Zoning Commissioners believed this project was a good idea, but that they had questions on the application of the revised language.

**\* MR. KANTOR MOVED: BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Zoning Commission that the text amendment application #2021-18 R – 25 Van Zant Street Condominium - 25 Van Zant Street – Building zone text amendment to create a “vocational/trade (workforce training center) school” use and to allow the use as a principal use in the Industrial #1 Zone be **APPROVED**.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the reasons for this action are to implement the Plan of Conservation and Development:

1) Chapter 3, Goal 2Aiii. Study industrial zoning and update zoning and land use regulations to allow and encourage a wider set of uses in targeted industrial zones, focused on market opportunities in warehouse/logistics, brewing/distilling, artist/artisan uses and other light industrial uses that do not have detrimental externalities on nearby areas; and

2) Chapter 5, Goal 4A. Attract a higher education presence to downtown Norwalk. Staff comment: while this is not downtown, additional higher education is needed.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the effective date of this action shall be December 23, 2021.

**Mr. Witherspoon seconded.**

**Louis Schulman; Michael Witherspoon; Richard Roina; Nick Kantor approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

Mr. Schulman noted that this resolution would allow the project to move forward. Mr. Roina said that he had concerns about the easement from the state. Mr. Kleppin said that there were new conditions added to the resolution in connection to their concerns about parking and traffic. Mr. Kantor said that he had driven by the property and believed that there was a parking lot for sale. There was a discussion about allowing partial occupancy to confirm that the parking was sufficient. Zoning Department staff would assess any parking spillover issues. He explained the analysis for the commissioners. There was also a discussion about signage. There was a discussion about the possibility of train riders using the parking lot as well.

**\* MR. ROINA MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Zoning Commission that application #2021-18 R/SPR/CAM – 25 Van Zant Street Condominium - 25 Van Zant Street – Building zone text amendment to create a “vocational/trade (workforce training center) school” use and to allow the use as a principal use in the Industrial #1 Zone in conjunction with a proposed vocational/trade school within an existing structure be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

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

a. Per Site Plan (CS-100) and (CD-501) depicting 25 Van Zant Street, prepared by Fuss and O’Neill dated 10/18/21 and revised to 11/1/21; and

b. Per architectural plans (A-1.0 – A-1.4) entitled 25 Van Zant Street, prepared by D Barr Architectural Drafting, LLC, dated 7/21/2020; and

2. That for each zoning permit application for tenant space as a trade/vocational school use, the applicant shall provide Staff with:

Zoning Commission

December 8, 2021

Page 4 of 14

- a. The name of the tenant and contact information.
  - b. The amount of square footage the tenant is renting/leasing appropriately identified on floor plans of the building.
  - c. A description of the general type of educational program the tenant is engaged in.
  - d. The total number of students the tenant is proposing to have/train in this location with a breakdown of how many students will be at the site during morning, afternoon and evening sessions, thus showing the potential parking distribution.
3. That City Staff will maintain a continuing count of the available parking on the site and compare that with the approved parking plans submitted; and
  4. That the applicant is approved for occupancy of 100,000 square feet of space for a trade/vocational school, with the remaining 50,000 square feet to be occupied upon the following:
    - a. A parking occupancy report to be submitted, indicating occupancy of 22, 25 and 28 Van Zant Street at the morning, midday and evening peak periods taken on three separate weekdays, collected after 50,000 square feet of the building is occupied.
    - b. A parking occupancy report to be submitted, indicating occupancy of 22, 25 and 28 Van Zant Street at the morning, midday and evening peak periods taken on three separate weekdays, collected after 100,000 square feet of the building is occupied.
    - c. An updated traffic analysis is submitted, reanalyzing traffic intersection impacts amongst the same intersections that were included as part of the Traffic and Parking Impact Study prepared by Fuss & O'Neill, dated April 12, 2021 after 100,000 square feet of the building is occupied.
  5. That City Staff shall evaluate the traffic and parking reports, as well as monitor the site conditions to ensure there is adequate parking for the remaining 50,000 square feet; and
  6. That until said parking and traffic reports and approved by City Staff, no zoning permit shall be issued for the use and occupancy of any of the remaining 50,000 square feet of vocational/trade school space; and
  7. That the sidewalk along Van Zant Street to the corner of Osborne Avenue shall be increased to a minimum width of five (5) feet by reducing the proposed native pea gravel surface by one (1) foot and that street trees and landscaping be provided and maintained between the street and the sidewalk; and
  8. That the sidewalk and curbing be constructed from material as approved by Norwalk TMP; and

9. That the guardrails proposed along Osborne Avenue, in lieu of the existing curb-cuts be replaced with landscaping and sidewalk as proposed on adjacent areas on Osborne Avenue; and
10. That an easement in favor of the City be provided for public access on the sidewalk along Van Zant Street and that said easement shall be filed on the Norwalk Land Records after having been reviewed and approved by Norwalk Corporation Counsel; and
11. That an off-premises parking easement for the use of the parking lots located at 22 Van Zant Street and 28 Van Zant Street be submitted to Staff for review and filed on the Norwalk Land Records in accordance with Section 118-1220 H. of the Norwalk Building Zone Regulations prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and
12. That site line distances are added to the plans prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and
13. That a wayfinding signage plan, including signage for the off-premises parking lots located at 22 Van Zant Street and 28 Van Zant Street be submitted for Staff review and approval prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and
14. That the off-premises parking lots located at 22 Van Zant Street and 28 Van Zant Street shall be paved in accordance with Section 118-1230 F. of the Norwalk Building Zone Regulations prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Zoning Compliance; and
15. That an amenity strip (separation) to separate the parking lots located at 22 Van Zant Street and 28 Van Zant Street from the back of the sidewalk shall be required, such plans shall be submitted to Staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and
16. That the Connecticut Department of Transportation easement agreement in favor of 25 Van Zant Street showing the parking spaces in favor of 25 Van Zant Street in perpetuity be provided to Staff prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and
17. That as noted in the traffic study provided by Fuss and O'Neill dated August 31, 2021, that the fence at the intersection of Site Driveway 6 at Harvey Street/Route 136 when looking west shall be removed or relocated to increase sight distance prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and
18. That as noted in the traffic study provided by Fuss and O'Neill dated August 31, 2021, that the applicant shall work with relevant City agencies regarding traffic signal optimization at the intersection of Route 136 at Fort Point Street/Private Drive prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Zoning Compliance; and
19. That a surety be submitted, in an amount to be determined by Staff, to guarantee the installation of the required erosion and sediment controls prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and

Zoning Commission

December 8, 2021

Page 6 of 14

20. 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 of the Commission's Staff, as needed; and

21. 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; and

22. That a surety be submitted, in an amount to be determined by Staff, to guarantee the completion and maintenance of the site plan and any and all modifications to the plan and all work required as a condition of approval under this special permit prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Zoning Compliance; and

23. That the applicant shall provide a follow-up traffic study and parking analysis to Staff one (1) year after the 150,000 square feet of trade/vocational school use is entirely occupied; and

24. That should any of the follow-up traffic and/or parking studies indicate that the Level of Service is lower than what the April 4, 2021 and August 31, 2021 traffic studies provided by Fuss and O'Neill had predicted, that the applicant shall work with relevant City agencies to resolve the traffic and parking issues and that such solution be presented to the Zoning Commission for their approval prior to implementation; and

25. That any and all conditions required by Norwalk WPCA shall apply to this approval; and

26. That any and all conditions required by Norwalk DPW shall apply to this approval; and

27. That any and all conditions required by Norwalk TMP shall apply to this approval; and

28. That all CEAC sign-offs are submitted prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and

29. That any revisions to the approved plans be submitted to the Zoning Commission for their review and approval prior to implementation; and

30. That this approval is subject to Section 118-1460 C. of the Norwalk Building Zone Regulations; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that this application complies with applicable coastal land use policies; and

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

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the effective of this action shall be December 24, 2021.

Zoning Commission

December 8, 2021  
Page 7 of 14

**Mr. Witherspoon seconded.**

**Louis Schulman; Michael Witherspoon; Richard Roina; Nick Kantor approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

## **V. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **a. #2021-32 SP – The Guru Tegh Bahadur Ji Foundation, Inc. – 283 Richards Avenue – Construction of a two-story Sikh religious center**

Mr. Schulman opened the public hearing. He explained that there was a program at Ponus School that evening and that the public hearing would be continued sometime in January to accommodate those that could not speak. He also explained the Zoning process to the public attending the meeting. He noted that this is not a political process. The Zoning Commission follows state and local regulations that define what can be approved. Any inappropriate language would not be tolerated and would ban the speaker from the meeting. He also asked everyone to keep comments brief and that they only had one opportunity to speak. He then explained the rules of the public hearing. He also explained that he would poll the Zoning Commission members at 10 pm to see if they should stop the meeting to continue it on January 6, 2022.

Atty Liz Suchy began the presentation with an introduction of the project team and asked that they be recognized as experts for the purposes of the public hearing. She said that she had submitted certificates of mailing to the Zoning Department, notifying neighbors of the public hearing. She also introduced the members of the Foundation. She then oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property. She noted that the property had been purchased in 2020 and had been on the market for 3 years. She also concurred that if the public hearing was continued to January 6, 2022, anyone that had spoken at this public hearing would not be able to speak then.

Atty Suchy then continued with a list of facts of the application that houses of worship are allowed in this zone. She noted that there are 3 others in this zone. She reminded them that the lot size is appropriate in this zone as well as the floor area ratio (FAR). She also discussed the building height. She also addressed parking issues including those about the April holy day. She noted that she had reviewed the files for other houses of worship and that the same 1:5 ratio of parking had been used since 1985. If there were to be any other ratio used, it could violate her client's rights under the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000 (RLUIPA). She also said that the Zoning Commission could have changed the regulations, but that since they had not been, the ratio should be used consistently as in all of the other projects. She discussed the number of members of the Sikh community and background of the services. Congregants arrive at different times and it is a

fluid service. There is a lunch served and prepared by those congregants. A religious school is proposed.

Pamma Gulati introduced himself as the President of the working committee. He also explained his background and lived in Norwalk for 25 years. His children had attended Norwalk Public Schools. He then explained some of the volunteer opportunities that his congregation helped with, including those during the pandemic. He explained why they wanted to build a larger building for their congregation. He noted that there are already 3 houses of worship on Richards Avenue and that their congregation is much smaller than the others. He thanked the project team for working with them on this application.

Chris DeAngelis, the civil engineer on the project, continued the presentation with a discussion of the site plan. He discussed the setbacks which were larger than the ones for residential uses. He explained the traffic pattern on the property as well as the ingress and egress onto the property. He discussed the number of parking spaces as well as the changes from the previous meeting in October. He also discussed the comments from the Department of Public Works (DPW). They had also worked with the Department of Public Health regarding the sewers. The state department of health worked on the application as well.

Aris Stalis, the landscape architect, continued the presentation with the screening plan on the perimeter of the site. He explained the number and types of trees on the site. He described the lighting plan as well. He said that they were LED lights so they could be electronically controlled.

There was a discussion about an irrigation system for the property. Then there was a discussion about screening. Mr. Stalis said there would be quite a lot of property in the front.

Marcos Reinheimer, the architect of the building, continued the presentation with an explanation of the amount of square footage. He described each floor and what they would be used for. He then described the exterior of the building including the decorative domes but using more modern materials. He showed them renderings of what the building would look like from various views with the proposed landscaping/screening. There was a discussion about the materials being used on the exterior, including the stucco board. There was then a discussion about the design of the worship hall's seating chart. Mr. Reinheimer explained the calculation. He also said this would be the maximum seating area.

Neil Olinski, the traffic engineer, continued the presentation with an explanation of the traffic study as well as a response to the City's comments. Also, a peer review was completed. He said that they had not done a parking study. He explained what the traffic study was and how it was done. He also noted that the congregants do not all arrive at the same time on Sunday to services. He explained the levels of service that they observed and predicted. He also discussed the Friday services. There was a discussion about the number of trips in the peak periods which were the beginning and ending of services. There was a concern about the

number of parking spaces on Sundays. There was also a discussion about the rental of parking spaces for their high holiday celebration on April 14 and how parking would be handled, including renting parking lots and shuttling congregants. There was then a discussion of the peer review's study of the parking.

Michael Beattie, the consultant who had done the peer review, continued the presentation. He discussed what would happen at maximum capacity. He explained their concerns with the study. Atty Suchy noted that other houses of worship had not been asked for a parking study. She said that it had met the codes including for parking and was concerned about unequal treatment. Mr. Roina said that they had the obligation to protect the neighbors under the special permit regulations. There was a lengthy discussion about the regulatory process between Mr. Roina and Atty Suchy.

Atty Suchy said that she would like to reserve time for rebuttal after the public comment which would most likely end on January 6, 2022. There was a discussion about the last time that the Zoning Commission would be seated before the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Schulman noted that there were over 150 people who seemed to want to speak. He suggested that speakers do not repeat the same as previous speakers.

Barbara Garelick, 280 Richards Avenue, said that she had concerns about growth and parking. She was concerned about the size of the building because she did not understand why it was 18,000 sq. ft. with 240 people maximum. She also discussed the members who would live in the house of worship. She did not understand why they needed a building which was 3.5 times as large as their current building. She did not understand how they would not grow their membership. She was concerned about the high holidays and how the neighbors could have control. She also had concerns about the parking lot and where would the overflow parking go since parking is not allowed on the streets. She asked how the Fox Run parking lot could be used during school times. She did not think they were being honest.

Farhan Memoun, 15 Pequot Drive, said that he had been involved in the Al Madany Mosque application, a few years prior, which the city had settled previously. He said he was part of a civil rights organization. He spoke in support of this application. He noted that the previous speaker had asked why they needed a larger house of worship. He explained how the experience becomes more meaningful. He also noted that he did not expect the numbers of members to grow since other communities have their own Sikh populations as well as their own houses of worship. He also addressed issues of RLUIPA which he believed would govern in this instance. He also noted that the City could have changed the regulations over the last several years but had not.

Dr. Bhavna Khandpur, 199 West Norwalk Road, said that she was a resident of Norwalk as well as worked in NORwalk. She spoke in support of the application and said the application was within the regulations of the city. She said that she had been a part of the \_\_\_\_\_ for awhile. She asked Norwalk residents to visit the current house of worship.

Zoning Commission

December 8, 2021  
Page 10 of 14

Cate Sanderson, who had asked to share her screen, stated in a slide presentation that there was opposition to the application. She said that the property had not been on the market for several years. She also noted that some of the site plans were not in the correct scale. She spoke about the current location of the house of worship and said it could upgrade it. She said they were not complying with their current permit and that it was not low density. She also said it would not be the same as the other churches in the area. She spoke about the screening at the site. She also noted that other houses of worship were not helping this house of worship with parking. She discussed the calculation without fixed seating and how it was applied to other houses of worship. She then discussed the calculation of seating with fixed seating. She discussed the growth expectations in the current congregation. She said that she had a video which she would not share in the interest of time. She then showed them gurdwaras in other areas of the state. She then showed them an aerial view of the location of the property. She said that many trees had been removed. She then showed them a 3D model of what it would look like. She also said that there would be high density with lowered property values. She asked for them to compromise and lower the size of the project.

Sheri Brown, Riverview Drive, spoke in support of the application. She discussed the contributions of the Sikh community in Norwalk.

Stephanie Kennedy, 24 Weed Avenue, spoke in support of the application. She did wonder if the traffic was looked at pre or post pandemic.

Frank Bineti (sp), 30 Hunters Lane, said he was concerned about the volume of traffic. He asked that the regulations be changed in the future.

Catherine McGettigan, 20 Betmarlea Road, spoke in opposition to the application. Her concerns were the size of the building and the size of the land for parking. She was also concerned about traffic, especially on Betmarlea, as well the lack of screening since the trees won't be full grown for several years.

Ralph Layman, who said that he lived in Riverside, CT, spoke in support of the application since he is a member of the Sikh congregation. He addressed some concerns that he had heard which included traffic. He said that he would attend a service for only 20 minutes at a time. He also said that he would attend at less frequent times. He explained the service component of the Sikh community.

Gregory Dorsey, 6 Weed Avenue, spoke in support of the application and noted that he had submitted comments to the Zoning Commission. He also noted that some neighbors had made discriminatory remarks and fears that al-Qaida was moving in. He hoped everyone would welcome this community.

Harry Arora, a CT state senator, as well as a member of the congregation, spoke in support and to allay the fears of some Norwalk residents.

Jaggiwan Singh, 11 Moore Place, spoke in support of the application. He explained why the current building was inadequate. He said that the worship hall was also used as a dining hall.

Imreet Singh, 153 Prince Avenue, Southport, CT, spoke in support of the application. He had lived in Norwalk in 2016 and he is a member of the congregation. He gave a brief history of the Sikh community and when they came to the United States. He explained why the new building was necessary.

Peter Fratarcangelo noted that he owned several buildings in Norwalk and said he knew the special permits for regulations. He spoke in opposition to the application. He believed that the application went against those regulations. He thought it was destroying the neighborhood.

Joe Lacovara, Fireside Court, spoke in opposition to the application because he thought it was a large building on a small piece of property. He was concerned about property values.

Sundeep Kaur, 32 Eagle Road, spoke in support of the application. She is a member of the congregation. Her children actively participated in Norwalk Public Schools as well as being members of the congregation while they were students.

Layne Evans, Fox Run Road, had questions about whether there would be fixed seating.

Ross Tiefenthaler, 287 Richards Avenue, spoke about the triple A zone and granting the special permit. He had concerns about the outdoor space and the lack of a playground for children. There is also no room to expand. He was concerned about the lack of infrastructure for this large structure in the area.

Elizabeth Cortright spoke in opposition to the application. She had concerns about traffic congestion. She said that people were not opposed because of religious bigotry but rather, the size of the building.

Butch Quick, Fallow Street, spoke in opposition to the application because it was too large. He did not think this was the right spot for this house of worship.

Preeti Sethi, 33 Princess Pine Road, spoke in support of the application.

Taylor Strubinger, Fallow Street, spoke in opposition to the application. He said it was too big and had concerns about signage.

Anthony Segalas, Betmarlea Road, spoke in opposition to the application. He thought it was too large. He also had concerns about property values. He asked the commission to reject the application.

Kulbir Saini spoke in support of the application. He addressed concerns of those that were opposed to the application, specifically why did the Sikh community need a new house of worship.

Ken Montanez, 15 Fireside, had concerns about the scale of the building and asked to see a rendering. He said that this community had done great things in Norwalk and would continue to do so. He thought they should consider the impact on the neighborhood.

John M said he did not want to use up his time so he suggested that they end the public portion of the meeting at this time because everyone was tired. He asked to have a chance to speak at the next meeting on January 6.

Mr. Schulman said that he would like to see if there was anyone who would like to speak who could not make the January 6th meeting.

Steve Starkman, 223 Fallow Street, spoke in opposition to the application. He asked about hours of operation and the events that would be held.

Mr. Schulman said that the public hearing would be continued until January 6.

## **VI. REVIEW AND ACTION ON PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

### **a. Action on item V. a.**

The public hearing was continued until January 6, 2022.

## **VII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 17, 2021**

**\*\* MS. WELLS MOVED to approve the November 17, 2021 meeting minutes.**

**Mr. Kantor seconded.**

**Louis Schulman; Michael Witherspoon; Richard Roina; Galen Wells; Nick Kantor approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

## **VIII. COMMENTS OF DIRECTOR**

Mr. Kleppin reminded the commissioners that they had another meeting on next Wednesday, December 15. Mr. Schulman asked that all commissioners make the next few meetings in order to vote on these applications. He asked Mr. Kleppin to ask Ms. Sapone to attend the next 2 meetings as well.

**IX. COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS**

Ms. Wells asked if the new commissioners had been appointed for the combined Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Schulman said they should know by next Wednesday since the Common Council would meet on December 14.

**X. ADJOURNMENT**

**Ms. Wells made a Motion to Adjourn.**

**Mr. Kantor seconded.**

**Louis Schulman; Michael Witherspoon; Richard Roina; Galen Wells; Nick Kantor approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Palmentiero