

**CITY OF NORWALK
ZONING COMMISSION
January 6, 2022**

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

STAFF: Steve Kleppin; Bryan Baker

OTHERS: Atty Adam Blank; Atty David Waters; Katherine Eberly; Broderick Sawyer; Janet Evelyn; Ranjit Samra; Truman Curtis; Victoria Tiefenthaler; Harry Chopra; John Seibert; Sloan Schickler; Mohinder Kalsi; Michael Killingsworth; Randall Weeks; Katherine Sherwin; Kelly Danziger; Jason Aponte; Satjeet Gore; Mergim Elezi; William Wrenn; Minti Kaur; Dr. Sarbjeet Rayat; Kathleen Weller; Jeff Danziger; Maureen Grandin; George _____; David Davidson; Jaspreet K; Gregory Staples; Kathryn Jones; Tyler Deieso; Jose Andriago; Karl Kaferle; Paula Napoletano; Atty Liz Suchy; Chris DeAngelis; Aris Stalis

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Schulman called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. It should be noted that this meeting was held on Zoom.com with 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 & BOND RELEASES

a. #5-13 CAM – 280 Wilson Avenue – Request for one-year extension of time for a CAM approval to construct a new single-family residence – Report & recommended action

Atty Adam Blank began the presentation with a brief history of the application. He noted that this would be the last extension. The applicant, Bruce Beinfeld, will have to build or re-apply for the application. He showed them an aerial photo of the lot on Wilson Avenue. He noted that another lot became available in a different area of Norwalk which diverted his attention. However, he is now focused on building on this lot and hoping to get through the process in Spring of 2022.

**Whereas the Zoning Commission approved the Coastal Site Plan Review application effective March 28, 2013;*

**Whereas the Zoning Commission approved multiple extension of time requests for the applicant to secure a building permit;*

**Whereas per Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-3 (i), the total amount of time that a Commission may grant for the completion of all or part of the work in connection with a site plan shall not exceed ten years from the date such site plan was approved;*

*** MR. MANCINI MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Zoning Commission that the one-year extension of time request for application #5-13 CAM – 280 Wilson Avenue – Request for one-year extension of time for a CAM approval to construct a new single-family residence 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 March 28, 2023; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this action is January 14, 2022.

Mr. Witherspoon seconded.

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

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

b. #14-15 SP – 150 Glover Avenue – 150 Glover LLC – Bond release request for Grist Mill Village Building A – Report & recommended action

Atty David Waters began the presentation with an explanation of the original bond which was later reduced to a maintenance bond. They are asking for release of the bond. Mr. Baker noted that a Certificate of Occupancy had been issued so there was no reason to hold the bond.

**Whereas a Certificate of Zoning Compliance was issued for Building A of Grist Mill Village on 7/10/20;*

*** MR. WITHERSPOON MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Zoning Commission that the bond release request for application #14-15 SP – 150 Glover Avenue – 150 Glover LLC – Bond release request for Grist Mill Village Building A be **APPROVED**.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this action is January 14, 2022.

Mr. Roina seconded.

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

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

c. #15-15 SP – 166 Glover Avenue – 166 Glover LLC – Erosion & sedimentation control bond reduction request for Grist Mill Village Building B – Report & recommended action

Atty David Waters began the presentation by noting that the sedimentation control bond was requested for the second bond. The Certificate of Occupancy had been issued so there was no reason to hold the bond.

**Whereas a Certificate of Zoning Compliance was issued for Building B of Grist Mill Village on 12/22/2021;*

*** MR. MANCINI MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Zoning Commission that the bond release request for application #15-15 SP – 166 (aka 200) Glover Avenue – 166 Glover LLC – Erosion & sedimentation control bond release request for Grist Mill Village Building B be **APPROVED**.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this action is January 14, 2022.

Mr. Witherspoon seconded.

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

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

d. #15-15 SP – 166 Glover Avenue – 166 Glover LLC – Bond release request for performance bond for Grist Mill Village Building B – Report & recommended action

Atty David Waters began the presentaiton with a description of the bond. He said that the Certificate of Occupancy had been issued. There was a discussion about the status of all the buildings. Two of the buildings were almost completely rented and the last building was almost completely built.

***Whereas a Certificate of Zoning Compliance was issued for Building B of Grist Mill Village on 12/22/2021;**

*** MR. MANCINI MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Zoning Commission that the bond release request for application #15-15 SP – 166 (aka 200) Glover

Avenue – 166 Glover LLC – Bond release request for performance bond for Grist Mill Village Building B be **APPROVED**.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this action is January 14, 2022.

Mr. Witherspoon seconded.

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

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

IV. REVIEW AND ACTION ON APPLICATIONS

a. #2021-40 CAM – 8 Farm Creek LLC – 8 Farm Creek Road – Demolition of existing and construction of new single-family residence – Report & recommended action

Mr. Schulman read a portion of a letter into the record from the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) in which they noted that this construction was larger than the previous building and there were concerns about that. Based on that information, he would vote against the application to build this residence. He asked the owner to pull the application and to have further conversations with DEEP to get to a size that would be amenable to them. He then asked for comments from the other commissioners. The rest of the commissioners agreed with Mr. Schulman.

Katherine Eberly, an owner and the architect on the project, agreed to withdraw and noted that she had been surprised with DEEP's response. Mr. Schulman said that he had been surprised by the letter as well. There was a discussion about when this item could be rescheduled on the agenda.

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 – Continuation of public hearing originally opened on December 8, 2021

Mr. Schulman noted that this was the continuation of the public hearing on December 8, 2021. He said that members of the public that had spoken at that meeting could not speak again. This meeting was for those who had not had an opportunity to speak. He then discussed the rules of the public hearing.

Mr. Kleppin continued the presentation by noting that the Fire Marshall would address concerns about occupancy and parking calculations. Atty Suchy asked why this would be addressed at this point when an approval had been issued by the Fire Department.

Broderick Sawyer, the Fire Marshall, then continued the presentation to explain how the occupancy was calculated. He noted that there were 240 fixed seats. He then discussed the outer rooms and the total space. There was a discussion about whether it was 240 people total or does that include people standing. There was a discussion about whether it could be changed. Mr. Sawyer noted that it could not be changed unless new plans were submitted.

Janet Evelyn, 20 Elwood Avenue, read a letter she wrote for the Sikh community in Norwalk and addressed to Mr. Schulman, in support of the application.

Mr. Schulman noted that the Planning & Zoning staff had shared the large number of letters and emails with the Zoning Commission.

Ranjit Samra, who lived in Stamford, spoke in support of the application and wanted to address the concerns from some commenters. He spoke about the multi-purpose space and not the worship space. He also discussed the traffic patterns and that it was a more fluid service. There are daily services which would be the head priest and 1-2 other members. He also noted that there is not a large population of Sikhs in Fairfield County. It has not grown in 2 decades. It will not become a headquarters. He then addressed concerns about high holy days.

Truman Curtis, 14 Priscilla Road, said that he welcomed all races and religions. However, he did have concerns about the traffic in the area. He noted that the previous speakers did not live in the area.

Mr. Sawyer addressed a comment from Mr. Curtis about his comment about "policing" He noted that the Fire Department could not police the amount of people in the building and had nothing to do with traffic.

Victoria Tiefenthaler, 287 Richards Avenue, said that she understood the goal of the application but had concerns about the size of the building on the lot. She began sharing a slide presentation. She had concerns about the removal of the screening and asked for evergreens for year round screening. She had concerns about the allowance exceeding the maximum occupancy several times a year. She said she spoke in opposition to the application.

Harry Chopra, 27 Cat Drive Road, Weston, said that he had been part of the Sikh community since he had moved to the area. He noted that there was only one day of worship and that the plans were set up to code.

John Seibert, 10 Hunters Lane, said that he objected to the building because of the density of it. It does not attempt to be low density and that the applicant had not made any attempts to make it low density. He then addressed concerns of the occupancy. He noted that it was a commercial building. He also had concerns about the design of the building which he described as a “big, white box.” He wondered why he should continue to live in Norwalk.

Sloan Schickler, 6 Fox Run Road, spoke in opposition to the application. She had concerns about the traffic. She compared this building to other local houses of worship. She also discussed the definition of “family.” She had concerns about the number of members who would be worshipping in the space. She asked for the application to be denied due to F.A.R., insufficient parking and destroying the harmony of the neighborhood.

Mohinder Kalsi, the applicant, asked to speak but Mr. Schulman said it was not appropriate at this time. Mr. Kalsi said he would wait.

Michael Killingsworth, 5 Ridge Farms Road, had concerns about the hours of operation which were 24/7, which made it different from other houses of worship in the area. It would increase the traffic. With regards to parking, he noted that other houses of worship had parking on site and overflow parking. He discussed the traffic study. He also discussed the community lunch which would be open to the public at large.

Randall Weeks, 279 Richards Avenue, directly abutting the property and the husband of Katherine Sherwin, said he would make a statement first and then his wife would. He said that he agreed with Mr. Curtis. He also had concerns about the size of the house of worship and thought the scale was wrong. He said he had worked with an appraiser and that it could negatively affect his property values, up to 15%.

Katherine Sherwin, Mr. Weeks’ wife, gave a brief history of the property next to her house. She said that the owner of the property had originally told her the property would be a home for his son when it was purchased in 2020. She didn’t believe that the membership wouldn’t grow and that the building was too big for the property.

Kelly Danziger, 282 Richards Avenue, spoke in opposition to the application. She noted that there were many other considerations under the code. She addressed corrections from the public hearing on December 8, 2021 about several points of the architect. She then began sharing her screen as well. She had concerns about the seating. She noted that the Sikh community currently sits on the floor and that this is not fixed seating. She showed them a chart with the F.A.R. comparing houses of worship and noted that this application exceeds the others.

Mr. Schulman asked to take a break for 10 minutes and return to the meeting at 8:15 pm.

Mr. Sawyer addressed the 240 fixed seating. He said if they are not there, the Fire Department would not sign off on the Certificate of Occupancy.

Jason Aponte, 45 Fox Run Road, spoke in opposition to the application with regards to parking, traffic and density.

Satjeet Gore did not feel comfortable sharing her address. She said that she understood the bias that was being said by some of the commenters. She wanted the decision to be made on zoning laws and not bias. She noted that her and her family were also Norwalk taxpayers and would not want to be made to feel as outsiders.

Mergim Elezi, 14 Betmarlea Road, spoke in opposition to the application. He asked whether it would have well water, or would it be city water and sewer. He had concerns about the number of occupants in the building and about the water supply being contaminated. He also had concerns about the size of the building.

William Wrenn, 67 Weed Avenue, spoke in opposition to the application because the property was too small to support the size of the building. He showed them a flyer which included a rendering of the building. He asked the commissioners whether they would like to live in a neighborhood with a building of that size.

Minti Kaur, 129 _____ Road, addressed the concerns about lowered property values, and traffic. She also addressed the landscaping plan. She noted that all regulations had been followed and that the process was seamless. She addressed the fear of the unknown and hoped that Norwalk would be an open and inclusive community.

Dr. Sarbjeet Rayat, 100 Richards Avenue, spoke in support of the application. He addressed the traffic concerns. He also noted that so many issues had been raised by the opposition in the hopes that they would listen to them. He believed that the neighbors were good people. He also thought it was impressive for the city to have a Sikh house of community in the same neighborhood as a synagogue, Catholic Church and UCC Church. He did not envy the position of the commissioners. He noted that the Sikh community would work with the neighbors, if approved.

Kathleen Weller, 26 Red Coat Road, spoke in opposition to the application because it did not fit the size of the property.

Jeff Danziger, husband of Kelly Danziger, shared a slide presentation, by addressing some definitions in the city code, specifically Article 10, including "dwelling" and "family." He then compared the Parkway Assembly of God on New Canaan Avenue. He noted that there would be weddings which he believed had not been addressed before.

Maureen Grandin, 286 Richards Avenue, spoke in opposition to the application. She believed RLUIPA did not apply in this case. She shared a video. She was concerned about how quickly it would grow post-COVID. She also discussed reasons for denial of the special permit application.

George _____, 8 _____, said that Richards Avenue was not suited for additional traffic. He had concerns about the size of the building on the property. He noted that there were other areas in Norwalk that could accommodate the structure, such as along Main Avenue.

Will Harris, 24 Weed Avenue, spoke in opposition to the application because it was too large for the property. His wife, Stephanie Harris, also noted that the property was only 1 acre and trying to put this on the property was unnecessary.

David Davidson, 24 Betmarlea Avenue, spoke in opposition to the application. He said there were many reasons to reject the application.

Jaspreet K, 21 Fairview Avenue, said that she had the letters in opposition to the application and was appalled at the aggression. She addressed the questions about why the Sikh community needed a bigger house of worship. She also addressed the concerns about it being open 24/7.

Gregory Staples, spoke in opposition to the application because of the size of the structure on the property. He did not think it was framed in religious intolerance.

Kathryn Jones spoke in opposition to the application because of the size of the building on the property. It was also out of context for the neighborhood.

Tyler Deieso, 50 Princess Pine Road, spoke in opposition to the application because of the traffic. However, he also had issues with Atty Suchy's comments at the prior meeting which he felt were bullying tactics and were threats of future litigation. He noted that he was also an attorney.

Avneet Singh, who lived on West Norwalk Road, spoke about the size of the building. He also addressed the residential nature of Richards Avenue which he noted was not all residential. He hoped that they could all come together after this was over.

Jose Andriago, 15 Fireside Court, spoke in opposition to the application because of the decrease in the market value of their homes. It did not fit the neighborhood.

Mohinder Kalsi, 519 Flax Hill Road, spoke in support of the application. He noted that it complied with the regulations. He also noted that the city had opportunities to change the regulations if they were not adequate. The design is consistent with the Sikh tradition. He said

that the Sikhs do pray in seats. He said there is no factual evidence that property values will go down. He also discussed regulations on the city, state and Federal levels which support diversity. He asked that the Zoning Commission would vote for the approval of the application.

Karl Kaferle, 14 Bonnybrook, spoke in opposition to the application and whether it was safe if there was a fire at the building.

Mr. Sawyer responded about the fire safety and explained that the building would have sprinklers. He also said that anyone could speak with him.

Paula Napoletano, 5 Red Coat Road, spoke in opposition to the application.

Atty Suchy then began her rebuttal and asked the commissioners to consider Dr. Rayat's comments. She noted that the public's concerns were in 4 areas. The first area was traffic. She noted that the traffic study was completed and reviewed by the city. Neil Olinski, the traffic engineer, continued the presentation by noting that the structure would not add traffic during weekday hours. It would add traffic on Sundays which were generally low traffic times. He also spoke about the levels of service and noted that anyone could look at their report. He addressed when the traffic counts were done, in June 2021. She then addressed concerns about why the property was picked. She said that it was near 2 other houses of worship. It is allowed in the AAA zone. She also addressed the issues with F.A.R. and that it could not be applied in this application. She addressed concerns about weddings and funerals which she noted were private events. The whole congregation was not invited. It would not be rented out for private events, especially since the Sikh community does not allow alcohol. She then explained about the parking issues. She addressed a document supplied by an assessor. She then discussed sales of houses in the neighborhood in 2021. She also addressed what happens if there are violations.

There was a discussion about whether there would be other special holidays during the year when parking would be an issue. Atty Suchy noted that the date they would expect to be overcrowded was April 14 but if another date was expected to be crowded they would find a way to handle that.

Atty Suchy addressed comments made about her interaction with Commissioner Roina at the December 8 meeting. The property would be served by a well and septic system. She then addressed many of the comments of the public, including signage, and landscape plans.

There was a discussion about the retaining walls. Chris DeAngelis, the engineer on the project, noted that it had been moved 3 ft. off the property line. Aris Stalis, the landscape architect, discussed the plantings. There was then a discussion about the parking lot not having enough spaces on a given Sunday. Atty Suchy said they were working on an agreement with Fox Run Elementary School. There was a discussion about the amount of

special events. There was also a discussion about dates when there are a large number of members.

Mr. Kleppin read several emails into the record. One was from Andrew Grandin and Claire Delessio. Atty Suchy objected to the characterization that her clients were not truthful.

Mr. Schulman closed the public hearing at this time.

VI. REVIEW AND ACTION ON PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

The commissioners began to discuss how to move forward with this application. Ms. Wells said she would propose to approve the application. She said that she lived near the property and she believed there would be traffic on Sundays and Fridays only, when services were being held. She also noted that these were not typically high traffic days or times. Mr. Mancini said that he had grown up near a house of worship and was in an identical situation to this one. For him, it was a good experience and he strongly supported the application. He believed that the congregation would park nearby if there was no parking. Mr. Mancini said that he had watched the video since he had not attended the public hearing on December 8, 2021.

a. Action on items V. a.

**Whereas the application was officially received by the Norwalk Zoning Commission (the Commission) on August 18, 2021.*

**Whereas the application was presented to the Commission for a preliminary review on October 7, 2021.*

**Whereas the Commission opted to have a peer review traffic study conducted by the City's on-call traffic peer-reviewer at their October 7, 2021, meeting.*

**Whereas the applicant submitted a 47-day extension of time to open the public hearing.*

**Whereas the public hearing was opened on December 8, 2021.*

**Whereas the public hearing was continued to January 6, 2022.*

**Whereas the public hearing was closed on January 6, 2022.*

**Whereas the applicant has set forth on the record that it would accept a condition of approval that would limit the total number of worshippers within the worship hall to 240 people for services except for services on certain limited high holy days.*

**Whereas the applicant confirmed that it anticipates that it may need to exceed a total of 240 worshippers for services on certain high holy days which it estimates to take place on one day(s) in any given calendar year.*

**Whereas the applicant confirmed that it anticipates that it would need to exceed a total of 265 people in the building for a limited number of special events during the calendar year.*

**Whereas the applicant has demonstrated that the proposed number of parking spaces complies with the minimum number of parking spaces required under Section 118-1220 C.(7), based on a maximum seating capacity of 240 fixed seats.*

**Whereas the City's traffic peer reviewer has indicated that an additional 32 parking spaces may be necessary based on vehicular site-generated traffic.*

**Whereas the Commission acknowledges that on-street parking is not allowed on Richards Avenue or Fallow Street.*

**Whereas the Commission acknowledges that regulating on-street parking is not within its jurisdiction, however, should the on-site parking spaces provided be inadequate, that the applicant must make arrangements to ensure that congregants can safely access the property and that any vehicles parking off-site, do so in accordance with all applicable regulations, codes, laws and ordinances.*

*** MS. WELLS MOVED: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Zoning Commission that application #2021-32 SP – The Guru Tegh Bahadur Ji Foundation, Inc. – 283 Richards Avenue – Construction of a two (2) story Sikh Religious Center 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 (C-0) through (C-8) entitled Sikh Religious Center - Gurudwara, prepared by Cabezas DeAngelis Engineers & Surveyors dated 7/21/21 and revised to 12/3/21; and
 - b. Per Landscaping and Lighting Plans (L-1) and (L-2) entitled Planting Plan and Lighting Plan, prepared by Aris Land Studio, dated 7/21/21 and revised to 11/24/21; and
 - c. Per architectural plans (A-1) through (A-6) entitled Sikh Gurudwara Religious Center, prepared by Guedes Associates, Inc., dated 7/20/21 and revised to 9/8/21; and
2. The maximum capacity for the worship hall shall not exceed 240 people as stated by the applicant and the maximum capacity for the entire building shall not exceed 265 people, which is the maximum allowable capacity that is permitted in the building where the applicant has provided 53 on-site parking spaces; and

3. That the applicant has confirmed that the seating capacity in the worship hall will be fixed at 240 worshippers except for on certain religious services that will take place on a limited number of high holy days and special events; and
4. That prior to any high holy day or special event in which over 265 people will be gathering on the property, at least two (2) business days or more before the scheduled high holy day or special event the applicant must provide the City Staff with a written and fully executed off-site parking agreement, in a form that is acceptable to City Staff such as a letter signed by the property owner granting permission of temporary off-site parking, which confirms that additional parking will be provided at an alternate property for the entirety of the religious service or special event and that an additional parking space will be provided on the alternate property for every five (5) additional people beyond the 265 person maximum capacity that will attend the religious service or special event; and
5. That additional off-site parking shall only be used to accommodate an exceedance of 240 people in the worship hall and 265 people in the building for high holy days and special events and not for regular prayer services; and
6. That the applicant shall hire a police officer to direct vehicular traffic for the high holy days and special events in which an off-site parking agreement is required; and
7. Each special event shall not take place for more than one (1) day or twenty-four (24) hour period; and
8. That should the applicant be unable to attain an off-site parking agreement for the required additional parking spaces, that the maximum capacity of the building shall for any religious service or special event shall remain at 240 people in the worship hall and 265 people in the building; and
9. That the hours of regular prayer services and religious instruction be generally limited to the hours proposed in the applicant's Narrative (Schedule B); and
10. That the building is not to be rented to other groups or organizations; and
11. That no more than three people may reside within the property; and
12. That any changes to the parking layout or how vehicles are proposed to park on-site must be approved by the Commission prior to implementation; and
13. That all accessory structures and signage shall comply with applicable setbacks as required in the Norwalk Building Zone Regulations; and

14. 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

15. 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

16. 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

17. 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

18. That all conditions as required in a memo dated 12/6/21 by the Norwalk Health Department shall apply to this approval; and

19. That all conditions as required in a memo dated 12/1/21 by Norwalk DPW shall apply to this approval; and

20. That all CEAC signoffs are submitted prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and

21. 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 all applicable sections of the Norwalk Building Zone Regulations; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this action shall be January 14, 2022.

Mr. Mancini seconded.

Mr. Schulman noted that the applicant had met all of the requirements. He believed he had heard many comments of misinformation including those about the times of traffic. He said that he believed that many people were fearful and that they could not make decisions on perceived fears, but rather, on what is best for the city. He would support the resolution. He also suggested adding another couple of conditions to the resolution.

Louis Schulman; Michael Witherspoon; Galen Wells; Nick Kantor; Frank Mancini approved.

Richard Roina opposed.
No one abstained.

VII. REVIEW AND ACTION ON OTHER ITEMS

a. #2021-43 – Zoning Commission – Revisions to Planning & Zoning Schedule of Fees – Report & recommended action

Mr. Kleppin noted that it had been 4 years since fees had been raised. The fees were in the mid-range of fees as compared to neighboring towns. He had not calculated the amount of revenue this increase would generate.

**** MR. WITHERSPOON MOVED to approve the new Planning and Zoning Schedule of Fees.**

Mr. Mancini seconded.

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

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

VIII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: December 15, 2021

**** MR. MANCINI MOVED to approve the December 15, 2021 meeting minutes.**

Mr. Witherspoon seconded.

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

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

IX. COMMENTS OF DIRECTOR

Mr. Kleppin noted that the first meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission would be held on January 12, 2022.

X. COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS

Mr. Schulman noted that three Zoning commissioners would no longer be on the new Planning and Zoning Commission, Mr. Mancini, Ms. Sapone and Mr. Witherspoon. He said he would miss them. He also noted that they had never had to cancel a meeting due to not having a quorum which he appreciated.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Wells made a Motion to Adjourn.

Mr. Mancini seconded.

Louis Schulman; Michael Witherspoon; Galen Wells; Nick Kantor; Richard Roina;

Frank Mancini approved.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Palmentiero