



## REGULAR MEETING – AD HOC HOUSING COMMITTEE AGENDA

MARCH 26, 2026, 6:00 PM  
BY ZOOM VIRTUAL MEETING

To allow public access, anyone may access a meeting by telephone and/or Zoom, or a recording in the City of Norwalk YouTube channel. Specific instructions and links can be found at [norwalkct.gov/meetings](https://norwalkct.gov/meetings).



Members of the public may call in to participate. Callers will not be able to see the meeting participants. All participants will be muted upon entering the meeting. To speak, dial \*9 on the phone and you will be called on by the host of the meeting during the public comment section. All speakers must state their name and address. Comments must be on a topic on the agenda, and are limited to three minutes. Anyone disrupting the orderly conduct of the meeting, including by using threatening, hateful, or sexually-explicit language, will be removed. Please find the information using the link above.



Members of the public who wish to provide "live comments" may also use the Zoom meeting platform. All participants will be muted upon entering the meeting. To speak, click the "raise your hand indicator" and you will be called by the host of the meeting during the public comment section. All speakers must state their name and address. Comments must be on a topic on the agenda, and are limited to three minutes. Anyone disrupting the orderly conduct of the meeting, including by using threatening, hateful, or sexually-explicit language, will be removed. Please find the information using the link above.



Members of the public who wish to provide public comment are encouraged to submit those via email in advance of the meeting. For these comments to be included into the record, they must be submitted by 12:00 p.m. the day of the meeting. Please email Michelle Andrzejewski at [mandrzejewski@norwalkct.gov](mailto:mandrzejewski@norwalkct.gov) with the subject line "Public Comment" to provide written public comment prior to the meeting.

- I. **CALL TO ORDER**
- II. **ROLL CALL**
- III. **ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES**
  - A. **Regular Meeting: February 19th, 2026**
- IV. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**
- V. **OLD BUSINESS**
  - A. **Affordable Housing Account Ordinance**
- VI. **NEW BUSINESS**
- VII. **DISCUSSION**
- VIII. **ADJOURNMENT**



**CITY OF NORWALK  
AD HOC HOUSING COMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES - FEBRUARY 19, 2026  
ZOOM VIRTUAL MEETING**

**ATTENDEES:** Nicole Eaddy (Chair), Jan Degenshein, Jalen Sead, Colin Hosten, Darlene Young.

**STAFF:** Michelle Andrzejewski.

**OTHERS:** Steve Kleppin, Sterling Young.

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Ad Hoc Housing Committee was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Ms. Eaddy.

**II. ROLL CALL**

Ms. Eaddy conducted roll call and a quorum was present.

**III. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES**

**A. Regular Meeting: November 20th, 2025**

Ms. Eaddy presented the minutes of the regular meeting held on November 20, 2025.

**\*\* MR. SEAD MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 20, 2025.**

**\*\*THE MOTION PASSED WITH ONE ABSTENTION – MR. DEGENSHEIN**

There were no omissions, deletions, or corrections.

**IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

No public participation.

**V. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. Affordable Housing Account Ordinance discussion continued**

Ms. Eaddy introduced the continued discussion of the Affordable Housing Account Ordinance. She invited Mr. Kleppin and Ms. Andrzejewski to provide an overview, particularly for newer members.

Mr. Kleppin provided background on the ordinance and the Affordable Housing Account. He explained that the account receives funds from fees on multifamily developments (workforce

housing requirements) and, more recently, certain commercial projects. The funds, approaching approximately \$2.5 million, must be used per state statute for the rehabilitation or new construction of affordable housing, generally targeting households at or below 60% of state median income. He noted that the ordinance requires the committee to establish criteria and a mechanism for disbursing these funds.

Mr. Kleppin described prior committee work on developing a matrix of criteria to evaluate funding requests, including considerations such as project scale, maximum funding caps per project, focus on smaller-scale or missing-middle housing, and other eligibility factors. He emphasized the need to carefully allocate the limited funds, as a single large project could exhaust a significant portion. He apologized for an agenda error regarding attached documentation and indicated he would review the draft criteria but did not expect final decisions at this meeting. He suggested scheduling a future meeting to continue the discussion and move toward a more formal document, with subsequent review by Corporation Counsel and the full City Council.

Mr. Kleppin also addressed committee membership requirements under the ordinance, noting that outreach has been conducted to identify resident members (including those living in income-assisted housing), with approximately eight potential respondents identified previously. Final appointments would involve vetting through the Mayor's office and City Council.

Ms. Young asked about the balance in the fund (approximately \$2 to \$2.5 million) and how frequently it is replenished. Mr. Kleppin explained that funds are collected at permitting, with larger projects contributing significantly more (e.g., one recent project contributed over \$1 million) and smaller projects contributing less (e.g., \$10,000). The fund is replenished with each qualifying project of three or more units or certain commercial projects, though large contributions are infrequent.

Ms. Young inquired about the timeframe represented by the current balance and its relation to specific developments. Mr. Kleppin estimated about five years of collections, noting the program initially applied only to South Norwalk before becoming citywide.

Mr. Degenshein asked for confirmation that commercial projects are now included in the fee requirement. Mr. Kleppin confirmed this change occurred within the last 18 months and applies to new construction only.

Ms. Eaddy asked about the Wegmans project and the effective date of the commercial fee requirement. Mr. Kleppin and Ms. Andrzejewski confirmed the requirement became effective on or about February 19, 2024, and Wegmans predated that date. Ms. Eaddy noted that newer commercial developments (post-February 2024) would contribute to the fund.

Ms. Eaddy reviewed the ordinance's required committee composition: two City Council members, one Planning and Zoning representative (director or designee), one Chief of Community Services or designee, and three residents (one owner, one renter, and one either owner or renter).

Discussion turned to the process for appointing resident members. Ms. Eaddy confirmed the Mayor appoints, with vetting support from the Mayor's office and Council. Ms. Andrzejewski asked whether political party balance or minority representation requirements apply; no such requirement was identified in the ordinance for this committee.

Ms. Eaddy proposed exploring a pilot program to incentivize Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) as a way to create affordable units, given limited city-owned land. She suggested offering tax incentives for property owners to construct deed-restricted ADUs (attached or detached) for affordable rental, potentially as a starter home or for small households.

Mr. Kleppin noted that Planning and Zoning regulations would not be a barrier to ADUs, but any tax incentive program would require City Council action. He stated that deed restrictions would apply only to the ADU portion, not the entire property. He cautioned about enforcement challenges (tracking compliance across many individual properties), potential clawback provisions if tax benefits are not maintained, and the high construction cost of new detached ADUs, which may result in higher rents unless built for family members.

Ms. Young expressed interest in the concept but noted size limitations as a challenge. Ms. Eaddy referenced ongoing discussions about increasing size limits (particularly for detached units).

Mr. Degenshein emphasized that deed restrictions on ADUs would encumber the property and could affect resale value or buyer interest if future owners prefer no ADU. She suggested reviewing average ADU rents in Norwalk to determine if many are already serving as de facto affordable units.

Mr. Sead raised concerns that deed restrictions on an ADU could reduce the property's market value or resale appeal, particularly if buyers seek unrestricted properties, and could hinder homeowners from realizing full equity gains.

Mr. Kleppin reiterated that restrictions limited to the ADU should preserve the main home's market value, but acknowledged enforcement and long-term compliance issues. Ms. Eaddy suggested possible buyout options or penalties for removing the affordable use after receiving benefits.

The committee discussed the concept further but reached no formal decisions or motions on the ADU proposal or the funding criteria matrix.

## **VI. NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

## **VII. DISCUSSION**

No additional discussion occurred beyond the items addressed under Old Business.

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**\*\* MS. YOUNG MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.  
\*\*THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:35 p.m.  
Respectfully submitted,  
Courtney Baldwin

## Norwalk Inclusionary Zoning Fee Grant Process

### Distribution Amount

- For eligible projects greater than 20 units, the maximum distribution is \$1,000,000.
- For eligible projects less than 20 units, the maximum distribution is \$500,000.
  - Cap the amount or project size?
  - Minimum distribution?

### Application Eligibility Requirements

1. Developments over 20 units provided that:
  - at least 50% of the units are permanently deed restricted
  - at least 35% of the units are permanently deed restricted to not exceed 60% SMI
  - at least 15% of the units are permanently deed restricted to not exceed 30% SMI
2. Developments 20 or less units provided that:
  - at least 35% of the units are permanently deed restricted
  - at least 25% of the units are permanently deed restricted to not exceed 60% SMI
  - at least 10% of the units are permanently deed restricted to not exceed 30% SMI
3. Developments that contain existing deed restricted units that do not currently comply with requirements 1 or 2 above and are seeking funds to rehabilitate the structure(s) or add additional dwelling units are not required to comply with Requirements 1 or 2.
4. Accessory Dwelling Units are also eligible to pursue funding under this program provided that the Accessory Dwelling Unit is permanently deed restricted at or below 80% of SMI.
5. Projects must score at least 80% based on the Scoring Criteria contained in §?????
6. Development not located within a flood zone or the coastal area management (CAM) boundary.
7. Properties currently not in violation of the Health Code, Zoning Regulations or Blight Regulations.
8. Project does not require zoning variances, zoning amendments or zoning map changes.
9. Property(s) is not delinquent on their property taxes.
10. Projects are compliant with 6.12 of the Zoning Regulations (WFH).
11. Projects wherein the designated units are deed restricted in perpetuity.

### Scoring Criteria (110 points possible)

1. Percent Affordability (30 points possible)

- The overall % of affordable units within the project. More weight should be given to projects that contain a higher % of affordability.
  - The level of affordability within the project. More weight should be given to projects that demonstrate a deeper level of affordability.
  - Projects contain a dedicated percentage of units set aside for seniors.
2. Project Location (15 points possible)
    - Project located within 0.5-mile radius to a train station (5 points)
    - Project located within 0.5-mile radius to a dedicated Norwalk Transit line (5 points)
    - Project located within 0.5-mile radius to the **CD-3**, CD-3C, CD-4 or Hospital Zones (5 points)
  3. Sustainability Measures Proposed (15 points possible)
    - 5 points for demonstration to achieve LEED Silver or equivalent
    - 10 points for demonstration to achieve LEED Gold or equivalent
    - 15 points for demonstration to achieve LEED Platinum or equivalent
  4. Shovel Readiness (10 points possible)
    - Verification that financial stack is viable
    - Zoning approval received
    - Commitment to begin construction within 180 days of receipt of funding approval
  5. Applicant's demonstrated ability to complete project (10 points possible)
    - Based on track record of completing similar projects
    - Financial competence demonstrated through application submittal
  6. Robustness & viability of additional funding sources (5 points possible)
  7. Projects consistency with the Citywide Plan (5 points possible)
  8. Projects consistency with the Affordable Housing Action Plan (5 points possible)
  9. For-sale deed restricted units included within development (5 points possible)
  10. Inclusion of family-sized units (5 points possible)
  11. Cleanup of Brownfield site (5 points possible)

### Application Process

Staff is proposing that applicants submit the required materials to staff for a completeness review. If determined complete, the application will be forwarded to a third-party reviewer to analyze the pro-forma economic analysis to determine whether the proposal is viable or not. The intent would be for each analysis to cost no more than \$5,000 and if the proposal is deemed viable, the application fee would be refunded. Another option is dedicating City funds to pay for the on-call economic analysis. Assuming the economic analysis verifies project viability, the application would be forwarded to the committee for consideration.



Application Submittal Requirements

1. Complete Application Form
2. Detailed narrative on how funds will be used
3. Financial analysis demonstrating the applicant’s ability to complete the project
4. Floorplan indicating the unit distribution and makeup consistent with 6.12 of the Zoning Regulations (WFH)
5. Breakdown of how funds will be utilized and indicating compliance with eligible expense categories
6. Disclosure of all other funding sources and financial analysis of how funding will be achieved
7. Project timeline