

**CITY OF NORWALK**  
**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**April 8, 2026**

**PRESENT:** Chapin Bryce, Chair; Diana Lenkowsky; Tammy Langalis; John Hubers; Harvey Jones; Galen Wells; Jacquen Jordan-Byron (left the meeting at 8:20 pm)

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

**OTHERS:** Tom Ellis; Ben Yeung; Tom Ryder; Bob Vance; John Mallozzi; Kurt and Patty Schlegel; Kayla Hanocka; Jacob Hanocka; Richard Cohen; Diane Cece; Kathleen Lesko; Christopher Kaolian; Karen Murray; Atty Emma Dignati; Doug Adams; Andy Soumelidis; Colin Grotheer; Elan McDowell; Diane Lauricella; Deborah Corby; Cheryl Coppola; Richard Bonenfant; Adam Blank; Todd Ackert

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Bryce called the meeting to order at 6 p.m. It should be noted that this meeting was held at 125 East Avenue, Council Chambers as well as on Zoom.com with participants calling in, separately.

**II. ROLL CALL & SEATING OF ALTERNATES**

Mr. Kleppin called the roll. Mr. Bryce said that Ms. Lenkowsky would be seated for the entire meeting.

**III. REVIEW AND ACTION ON APPLICATIONS**

**A. #2026-26 SA - City of Norwalk - Special appropriation request to authorize Mayor Barbara Smyth to execute a sole source purchase order on behalf of the Norwalk Police Department for the purchase of one (1) armored rescue vehicle for a total amount not to exceed \$361,000 Account #(092-63010-5777-C0858) - Report & recommended action and B. #2026-28 SA - City of Norwalk - Authorize a special capital appropriation in the amount of \$361,000 to be transferred from the Communications Upgrade Project (account # 092-13610-5777-C0638) to the City's Police Department for the purchase of a new Police Rescue Vehicle (account # 092-63010-5777-C0858) - Report & recommended action**

Tom Ellis, from the City's Finance Department, explained that he was addressing a technical correction. For this project, there was a new account number for which had the funding in it. He also addressed the next item on the agenda. He said that was not an additional request for funding. There had been a previous project, the 911 Communications upgrade, that was under budget. These funds were being used for this project with the new account number. Mr. Ellis then explained how they had been to other boards before this one and that this was step two of a four step process.

**\*\* MR. JONES MOVED to APPROVE to correct the account number for Special appropriation request to authorize Mayor Barbara Smyth to execute a sole source purchase order on behalf of the Norwalk Police Department for the purchase of one (1) armored rescue vehicle for a total amount not to exceed \$361,000 Account #(092-63010-5777-C0858)**

Ms. Langalis seconded.

Chapin Bryce; Diana Lenkowsky; Tammy Langalis; John Hubers; Harvey Jones; Galen Wells; Jacquen Jordan-Byron approved.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

**\*\* MR. JONES MOVED to APPROVE to authorize a special capital appropriation in the amount of \$361,000 to be transferred from the Communications Upgrade Project (account # 092-13610-5777-C0638) to the City's Police Department for the purchase of a new Police Rescue Vehicle (account # 092-63010-5777-C0858) - Report & recommended action**

Ms. Langalis seconded.

Chapin Bryce; Diana Lenkowsky; Tammy Langalis; John Hubers; Harvey Jones; Galen Wells; Jacquen Jordan-Byron approved.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

**C. #2026-27 R - City of Norwalk - Zoning regulation text amendment to Article 4 and the EVTZ Village District Design Guidelines to modify the crosswalk standards as recommended by the Transportation, Mobility & Parking Department - Preliminary review**

Ben Yeung, Sr. Traffic Engineer, Transportation, Mobility and Parking (TMP) began the presentation by explaining the minor design revision to the East Norwalk Transit Oriented Development (TOD) design guidelines. He asked them to review the existing and proposed guidelines for crosswalks which were in their packets. He said the

proposed crosswalk would be legally compliant and safer. He then showed the commissioners the crosswalk that had been accepted into the guidelines and what was being proposed. He explained what was necessary for them to be in legal compliance, as well. He also discussed the color of the bricks which would make things safer. He said that the asphalt would lighten over time. He said they would like two different colors to create a contrast to distinguish where the crosswalk is. He also discussed the materials for the crosswalk. The crosswalk pattern would be directly imprinted onto the pavement. It would be easy to maintain and cost effective.

The commission would vote on this application at their next meeting.

**D. #2026-18 CSPR – LandTech – 20 Old Wharf Road – Expand an existing Shoreline Flood and Erosion Control Structure (SFECS) - Report & recommended action**

Tom Ryder, senior ecologist, began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. The owners of the property would like to extend their riprap. They have received permits from the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) as well as the Army Corp of Engineers. He explained that the riprap would be the same width and extended out to the same height that is currently there.

There was a discussion about the intent of the project. Mr. Ryder said it was to protect the wall which was not currently protected. There was also a discussion about whether the neighbors were notified. Mr. Ryder said that they had been notified during the DEEP process. The beach where the riprap would be going was the applicant's own beach.

**\*\* MR. HUBERS MOVED: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that application #2026-18 CSPR – LandTech – 20 Old Wharf Road – Expand an existing Shoreline Flood and Erosion Control Structure (SFECS) be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. That the building and site will be occupied in accordance with the following plans:
  1. Per plan set dated 9/22/2025 and revised 1/5/2026 prepared by LandTech, Westport, CT; and
2. That any modifications to the approved plan be reviewed and approved by City Staff prior to implementing; and
3. That all required soil sedimentation and erosion controls (such as turbidity curtains) are in place prior to the start of any construction; and

4. That any additional needed soil sedimentation and erosion controls be installed at the direction of the Staff; and
5. 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 sections of the Zoning Regulations for the City of Norwalk; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that these preceding conditions and modifications of this application are integral to the Commission's approval because, if not for those conditions and modifications, the Commission would have denied this application.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the effective date of this approval shall be April 17<sup>th</sup>, 2026.

You must obtain a zoning approval prior to any work on the site.

**Mr. Jones seconded.**

Ms. Williams said that the staff had no issues and that it was consistent with the Connecticut Coastal Management Act.

**Chapin Bryce; Diana Lenkowsky; Tammy Langalis; John Hubers; Harvey Jones; Galen Wells; Jacquen Jordan-Byron approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

#### **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Before the public hearings began, Mr. Bryce explained the rules for them at this meeting.

**A. #2026-21 SP – Robert and Chunling Vance – 8 Timothy Road (District 5, Block 55, Lot 122) – Special permit application for after-the-fact soil disturbance and/or clear-cutting of approximately 2/3 of an acre - Public hearing, report & recommended action**

Mr. Bryce opened the public hearing. Bob Vance began the presentation by saying that he had bought the property last year. He had asked something to cut  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the yard for the planting of fruit trees. He explained that this would not be a farm, he was the only one doing the labor. The fruits would either be given away or sold at farmers' markets. He said that he had a drainage report which showed it should not pose a drainage problem. He also had a survey and is in the process of constructing a fence.

There was a discussion about the use of pesticides. Mr. Vance said that some of the trees would need pesticides but only used a small, handheld pump sprayer or one that he would wear on his back. There was also a discussion about irrigation. He said he would during the first couple of years but after that he would not. He would only irrigate if there were a couple of weeks in the summer without rain. There was also a discussion about fruit falling on the ground and attracting other animals. Mr. Vance said he would try not to let that happen.

There was a discussion about the drainage. John Mallozzi explained that they used the CN numbers that the United States Department of Agriculture had published. He said that what Mr. Vance is doing is better for drainage and runoff than what was there before.

There was a discussion about the size of the trees that were removed and how long would it take for the trees that were planted to reach the same size as the ones removed. Mr. Vance said that the apple trees would not be as large as the ones that were there. He said that the sizes varied. If a tree died, he would plant something else. He said that in his previous space he had the same number of trees but he would now be doubling his space. He said he would bring in bees, only if he thought it was necessary. Mr. Vance also said that there were no more trees on the property except one in the front yard. He would need as much sun as possible for the fruit trees. There was a discussion about the number of trees that were taken down. There are still trees on the south and east parts of the property.

There was also a discussion about the relocation of the wood chip and compost piles. There was a discussion about the use of equipment and fuel tanks and noise.

There was then a discussion about a special permit for clearing the trees. Mr. Kleppin explained that it was new to the 2024 zoning regulations update. He said that for this application, the applicant would have needed a special permit based on the size. He noted that there would be a press release from the Mayor's office to prevent this from happening again. The staff would have looked at any negative impacts on surrounding properties. Mr. Kleppin said that the Department of Public Works was satisfied with the

drainage report. There was a discussion about the old regulations still being online which Mr. Vance had seen when he did a search.

At this point, Mr. Bryce explained how members of the public could make a statement, for both those in person and online.

Kurt and Patty Schlegel, 19 Douglas Drive, said that they were neighbors. He said he was disappointed that the trees were cut down. He had concerns about the drainage, the pesticides and the noise. He would like to replace some of the privacy that they had with the other trees.

Kayla Hanocka, 17 Douglas Drive, shared her screen with the commissioners which showed a Google map of the location of the property on an aerial map. She said that she was concerned about runoff into her property. She and her husband said that she had spoken with some people at City Hall. She also explained that the tree cutters had cut some trees on her property as well which was more than  $\frac{2}{3}$  of an acre. She also had reviewed the drainage report which she believed was inadequate. She had concerns about the planting plan which was not done by a professional. She then gave a brief family history of how she had grown up. She had concerns and asked for a buffer around the property.

Jacob Hanocka, 17 Douglas Drive, explained how Mr. Vance had come to his house to tell him about the fruit trees. Mr. Hanocka asked him to go to City Hall for permits. He continued to explain his conversations with Mr. Vance.

Richard Cohen, 10 Timothy, said that Mr. Vance had asked for permission to take down a few trees on his property. He also had concerns about the pesticides Mr. Vance would be using, because he had a little farm with animals including chickens.

Diane CeCe, said she was speaking as a resident and thanked the other neighbors who had spoken as well. She believed this would be a commercial business. She was surprised that this was happening. She asked that this application be denied and referred to either DPW or Conservation.

Kathleen Lesko, 24 Douglas Drive, said that she had concerns about the number of trees that were going to be planted. She noted that she understood there would be 200 trees planted. She also explained that she had 2 apple trees which were a lot of work. She had concerns about the pesticides, as well as this being a business. She also had concerns about the effects on the neighborhood.

Christopher Kaolian, 15 Douglas Drive, shared the concerns of previous speakers about the runoff. He said that the drainage report did not take into account what had been done at 6 Timothy Road, since trees had been removed there.

Karen Murray, 9 Douglas Drive, said that she had concerns about this becoming a commercial property. If it was, she was concerned about where the workers would be. She thought it did not seem like a residential property at the moment. She was concerned about the hand-held sprayer to be used for the pesticides.

At this point, the public portion of the meeting was ended by Mr. Bryce.

Mr. Mallozzi addressed comments from the public concerning the drainage. He explained that there would be more runoff if the applicant only had grass. He also discussed the CN numbers. There was a discussion about how long it would take for the trees to become established. Mr. Mallozzi said the roots have no impact on the drainage. He said that grass will help with the absorption of water in a drainage situation. There was a discussion about the analysis of the lot prior to removal of the trees including the average CN number. There was also a discussion as to how a berm could help with erosion or runoff. Mr. Mallozzi said that a berm would keep the water above ground, creating a pond, which would then be absorbed into the ground.

There was also a discussion about the water pressure and whether it was city water. Mr. Vance did not think that his watering of the trees would affect the neighborhood. There was also a discussion about the cutting of trees on other properties and whether they would plant new ones for them. Mr. Vance explained which trees had been cut. He said that he would prefer not to plant trees that would grow too tall and cause shade. There was also a discussion about the cutting of trees without a permit. Mr. Vance said that he did not think he needed a permit to cut them. There was also a discussion about whether this would be a commercial operation, as well as the fencing for this operation. He also discussed spraying the fruit trees and what he did and did not do.

There was a discussion about how the fruits would be taken to farmer's markets. Mr. Vance confirmed that there would not be big trucks on his property to take the fruit to these markets. There was a discussion about the yield from Mr. Vance's orchard. If the yields become large, he would thin the orchard so that the fruit would be better quality.

There was a discussion about the location of the compost pile and a request for a berm or retaining wall. Mr. Vance said that he thought the compost pile was in a good place and had boulders moved to that area for it. He thought it would be good on the

downhill side. He said that if it had to be moved within the 30 ft. strip he could do that. He said he could also put in a berm along the fence which would help keep the deer out.

There was a discussion about whether the berm would need a permit and whether this could be a condition in the proposed resolution. Mr. Kleppin clarified what was in the purview of the commission to require of the applicant.

**\*\* MS. WELLS MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission that application #2026-21 SP – Robert and Chunling Vance – 8 Timothy Road (District 5, Block 55, Lot 122) – Special permit application for after-the-fact soil disturbance and/or clear-cutting of approximately 2/3 of an acre be **APPROVED** with the following conditions:

1. That the site shall be developed in accordance with the following plans:
  - a. Per landscaping site plan submitted as part of this application and that was received by the Planning & Zoning Department on March 3, 2026 and as modified further within these conditions; and
2. That any changes to the approved plans shall be submitted to the Planning & Zoning Staff for review and approval prior to implementation, and 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
3. That the property shall not be used for commercial purposes; and
4. That the applicant shall work with Staff to install a landscaped and/or grassed berm inside the southern fence; and
5. That the applicant shall plant ground cover within 45 days of the effective date of this approval; and
6. That the applicant shall work with the neighbors within 30 days of the effective date of this approval, who had trees had been removed without their permission, on a plan to replace what had been removed with similar landscaping; and
7. That the applicant shall provide an erosion and sedimentation control plan to Staff prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and
8. That prior to the issuance of a zoning permit, the applicant shall submit an erosion and sedimentation control surety bond in an amount to be determined by Staff; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that this application complies with all applicable sections of the Norwalk Zoning Regulations; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the effective date of this approval shall be April 17, 2026.

**Mr. Jones seconded.**

At this point, the commissioners reviewed the proposed resolution and discussed changes.

**Chapin Bryce; Diana Lenkowsky; Tammy Langalis; John Hubers; Harvey Jones; Galen Wells; Jacquen Jordan-Byron approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

At this point, Mr. Bryce announced that the commissioners would take a break and return to the meeting at 8:30 pm. Ms. Jordan-Byron left the meeting.

**B. #2026-16 SP – 204 Flax Hill LLC c/o Edward Gormbley – 204 Flax Hill Road (District 2, Block 48, Lot 44) – Special permit application for a historic preservation development for a property currently used as multifamily per Section 4.3.20 of the zoning regulations to renovate an existing historic structure, construct a 4-story addition, and demolish two separate existing structures for a total of 53 dwelling units - Public hearing, report & recommended action**

Mr. Bryce opened the public hearing and explained the rules for public comment.

Atty Emma Dignati, the attorney for the applicant, began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. She also noted that the sign had been posted that notified neighbors of the public hearing as well as provided the certified, return receipt cards evidencing notice to the neighbors. She noted that there had been a previous approval on this property but a new architect had been hired since then. The applicant had revised the plans and there would still be the same number of units. The same plans for the mansion house were still in place. She also introduced the project team.

Doug Adams, who said that he was with Workforce Housing, which purchases dilapidated buildings, rehabilitates them and then rents them to those who can't afford luxury units. He noted other properties that they had worked on.

Atty Dignati continued the presentation and explained the plans for the buildings on the property which included 53 units. There would be 2 additional workforce housing units. She also discussed the modifications that the applicant was requesting. She showed them the proposed renderings. They would renovate the mansion. She also discussed the traffic impact study, as well as the parking requirements. She then referred to the site plan and discussed the proposed construction plan.

Andy Soumelidis, the engineer on the project, continued the presentation, by showing the existing conditions of the site. He said that the mansion would be restored with some parking areas being removed. He also discussed the reduction of the impervious surfaces and drainage patterns. He then discussed the utility infrastructure which included the connections to water and sewer lines. He also discussed the sediment control plan and silt fencing around the property during construction. He also discussed comments that they had received from an adjacent property owner. The proposed building would have a separate entrance. He said that parking would be handled on site. Since they are close to the train, there would be a reduction in parking. He noted that there would not be a retail or restaurant component to this project. He also said that there would be more parking that would have been approved for the previous application.

Colin Grotheer, the architect on the project, continued the presentation by giving a brief background of the firm and his time with it. He then oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. He then showed them the proposed renderings of the buildings. He discussed the materials being used. He discussed the parking and carports, as well as the residential amenity space. He also said that three season porches would be added.

Atty Dignati continued the presentation by noting that the application met all the requirements, that they were preserving the mansion, and this project would contribute positively to the community. She also said that the application was compliant with the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) which was noted in the application. She reminded them that they had approved a similar application last year which was compliant with the POCD and special permit criteria.

There was a discussion about the height of the building and whether it would be taller than the mansion. There was also a discussion about the color of the mansion. There was a discussion about the easement and whether it would be retained. Atty Dignati said that there would be another driveway as well. There was also a discussion about the entrances to the mansion which would be locked and opened only by those living there. There was a discussion about the parking spaces under the building and whether they would be assigned. Mr. Adams said that they were not sure at this point.

Some of the ground floor units would have patio space.

There was a discussion about the retaining wall. It was noted that there were retaining walls in the previous application that had been approved. Mr. Soumelidis said that the retaining wall would raise the grade and flatten out the parking lot. There was also a discussion about an easement on the property. There was a request for more landscaping which could enhance their property and a neighboring property. There was also a discussion about making these moderately priced condominiums.

At this point, the public was given the opportunity to make comments on the application.

Elan McDowell, 208 Flax Hill Road, said that she was on the board of the property for several years. They had sent a letter to the commission. She said that she liked historical properties as well as affordable units for working people. She also had concerns about the retaining wall, as well as the easement. They would like this closed since vehicles drive down quickly. Another reason was because the vehicles from 204 Flax Hill would use their driveway but they were the ones that had to pay the special assessment for a new driveway. She also had concerns about the sewer line because sewage comes onto their property. She asked if there could be monthly meetings with the applicant. She also asked that snow not be dumped on their property.

Diane Lauricella, 60 Gregory Boulevard, said she appreciated the developer constructing affordable and middle housing. She noted the water quality improvements and asked if there would be renewable energy included such as rooftop solar on the new building in the back.

Deborah Corby, 208 Flax Hill Road, asked for clarification on the driveway. She said there had been many accidents there. She also asked for clarification of the sewer system which gets backed up.

Diane Cece, Olmstead Place, said she was impressed with the design of the mansion. She had comments on the new building including whether the three season porch was included as living space which would be taxed. She also asked them to clarify whether there would be a parking fee for additional parking for residents. She also asked them about where the mechanicals would be as well as when trash pickup would be. She had not seen them in the plans.

Cheryl Coppola, 208 Flax Hill Road, said that they had issues with the parking because they pay for their parking spaces. She would like it blocked off.

Atty Dignati continued the presentation by addressing the public comments including those about the retaining wall, and closing the easement. For the easement she suggested that the neighbors could work with Mr. Adams in monthly meetings to address their concerns. Mr. Soumelidis said that one of the buildings would be demolished and would help the sewage concerns by redirecting the sewage lines to another point. Mr. Bryce noted that the easement was not in their purview but that snow removal issues should be addressed. There was a discussion about traffic calming measures on the applicant's side of the easement. Mr. Grotheer discussed hiding the mechanicals as well as the trash pickup. He also said they would comply with the solar requirements. The comment about the 3 season porch, which would be added to the existing building, was addressed.

**\*\* MS. LENKOWSKY MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission that application #2026-16 SP – 204 Flax Hill LLC c/o Edward Gormbley – 204 Flax Hill Road (District 2, Block 48, Lot 44) – Special permit application for a historic preservation development for a property currently used as multifamily per Section 4.3.20 of the zoning regulations to renovate an existing historic structure, construct a 4 story addition, and demolish two separate existing structures for a total of 53 dwelling units be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. That the site shall be developed in accordance with the following plans:
  - a. Per the Site Plans entitled "Site Improvements for a Proposed Multi-Family Residential Building," prepared for "204 Flax Hill, LLC," prepared by LandTech, and dated 2/17/26 and as revised per the plans presented at the 4/8/26 public hearing; and
  - b. Per Architectural Plans entitled "204 Flax Hill Rd," prepared by Beinfield Architecture, dated 2/12/26 and as revised per the plans presented at the 4/8/26 public hearing; and
  - c. Per Architectural Plans entitled "Ferris Mansion, 204 Flax Hill Road," prepared by Crosskey Architects, dated 5/21/25; and
2. That the site plans and architectural drawings shall be modified as follows:
  - a. That a landscaping streetscreen shall be provided to screen the parking as much as possible; and
3. That a certificate of special permit and mylar map of the approved site (as revised by any conditions of approval) shall be filed on the Norwalk Land Records prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and

4. 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
5. That all erosion and sediment controls shall be installed and maintained prior to the start of any construction or site work and that additional controls shall be installed at the direction of the Commission's Staff (Staff), if necessary; and
6. That a final Workforce Housing Plan showing a total of two new workforce housing unit(s), and a total of five workforce housing unit equivalents on-site, shall be submitted for Staff review and approval and shall include deed restriction documents, architectural floor plans, and a list of the number of studio, one-bedroom, two-bedroom and three-bedroom workforce housing units, prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Zoning Compliance; and
  - a. Further provided that such workforce housing units shall be deed restricted in perpetuity and meet all requirements of Section 6.12 of the Norwalk Zoning Regulations; and
  - b. That the Workforce Housing Plan shall be filed on the Norwalk Land Records; and
7. That all mechanical equipment shall be adequately screened from the Front Lot or Building Site Line and from adjacent and abutting property(s); and
8. That a Connecticut licensed engineer shall certify that all of the required improvements were installed to all applicable City standards prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Zoning Compliance; and
9. That a surety shall be submitted, in an amount to be determined by Staff, to guarantee the completion and maintenance of the site plan and all modifications to the plan as well as all work required as a condition of approval under this special permit prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Zoning Compliance; and
10. That all conditions as required by the Norwalk Water Pollution Control Authority (WPCA) shall be applicable to this approval; and
11. That all conditions as required by the Norwalk Department of Public Works (DPW) shall be applicable to this approval; and
12. That all conditions as required by the Norwalk Department of Transportation, Mobility, and Parking (TMP) shall be applicable to this approval; and

13. That all conditions as required by the Norwalk Fire Marshal shall be applicable to this approval; and

14. That any revisions to the approved plans shall be submitted to Staff for review and approval prior to implementation, and that should any revisions be determined to be substantive by Staff, shall be submitted to the Commission for review and approval prior to implementation; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that this application complies with all applicable sections of the Norwalk Zoning Regulations; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the effective date of this action is April 17, 2026.

**Ms. Wells seconded.**

At this point, the commissioners reviewed the proposed resolution.

**Chapin Bryce; Diana Lenkowsky; Tammy Langalis; John Hubers; Harvey Jones; Galen Wells approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

**C. #2026-02 R – Planning & Zoning Commission – Zoning regulation text amendment to Article 4 and Article 9 regarding Accessory Dwelling Units - Public hearing, report & recommended action**

Mr. Bryce opened the public hearing. Mr. Baker began the presentation by explaining that this revision was mainly for detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs). He discussed the proposed changes which included the application process. He said that they were proposing for some to be over the counter permits, under certain guidelines.

At this point, the hearing was opened to the public for comments. Mr. Bryce explained the rules.

Richard Bonenfant, 17 Park Avenue, said that he understood the removal of the parking requirements. He explained what he liked and did not like about the proposed regulations.

Diane Lauricella spoke in support of increasing the number of attached and detached ADUs in the city. She was pleased that the original amendments were continuing to be modified. She wanted seniors to be able to rent out their larger homes but stay in their neighborhood. She suggested some ideas for public outreach for ADUs.

She said she had also forwarded a guidebook from the AARP to Mr. Kleppin which she hoped the commissioners had received. She also made other suggestions to the proposed language, including having the permits be over the counter and not site plan review.

Adam Blank, 49 Bartlett Avenue, said that he agreed with the previous speaker. He explained that it was a good goal for more ADUs in the city. He made suggestions as to how to revise the language for accessory buildings, like garages, etc.

Diane Cece, 37 Olmstead Place, said that she would speak as a resident as well as for East Norwalk Neighborhood Association (ENNA). She had concerns about properties where there are situations that need a variance. She also had concerns about ADUs added over a garage. She was in favor of attached and detached ones. She said she was a proponent of tiny houses. She also spoke on behalf of ENNA which included support for public notification, including legal notices on the city's website. She also said that there were concerns about parking and suggested that the commission work with TMP on the residential parking permit study. She had questions about the notice of legal decision. She was in support of the owner remaining on the property when there is an ADU.

Todd Ackert, 22 Sylvan Lane, said he was speaking on behalf of his dad. He moved back in with his parents. His parents decided to add an ADU to the property instead of moving to a retirement community. He hoped their application would be approved.

Mr. Baker then responded to the comments from the public, including pre-approved plans in the future. He discussed adding Mr. Blank's comments to the regulations. He addressed comments about the legal notices as well. There was also a lengthy discussion about the language on the field cards which refer to square footage in two different ways, total living space and gross area.

**\*\* MR. JONES MOVED: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission that application #2022-30 R – Planning & Zoning Commission – Zoning regulations text amendment to Article 10 and Article 42 to revise Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) regulations be **APPROVED**.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the approved language is the following:

1. General requirements:

a. The ADU is located on the same Lot as a Single-Family Detached Dwelling;

- b. The Lot shall be limited to one (1) ADU;
- c. The ADU may be within and/or attached to a Principal Building or Accessory Building;
- d. The owner of the Lot must reside on the Lot;
- e. The minimum rental duration of the ADU shall be no less than six (6) months;
- f. Lots utilizing public sewer and/or water shall be subject to approval by the Norwalk WPCA and the local water authority. Lots utilizing private water and/or septic systems shall be subject to approval by the Norwalk Health Department;
- g. The ADU shall be designed to generally maintain the architectural design, style, and appearance similar to a Cottage Principal Building Type;
- h. Recreational Vehicles, travel trailers, and any other wheeled or transportable Structures shall not be used as an ADU;
- i. The ADU is subject to Section 4.3.4.C.3.a which states that the Footprint of a detached Accessory Building shall not exceed 60% of the Principal Building.

2. Height, bulk, and location standards:

a. Attached ADUs:

- i. Shall comply with Principal Building Setback requirements;
- ii. Shall comply with the Height, as to Building or Structure and Total Height, as to Building or Structure for Principal Buildings permitted within the Zoning District, not to exceed 2 ½ Stories;
- iii. Shall not exceed 1,000 square feet in Floor Area;
- iv. Existing Principal Building(s) that are Nonconforming in respect to Setback or Setback Area and/or Height, as to Building or Structure and/or Total Height, as to Building or Structure may convert the portion of the Building that is Nonconforming into an ADU provided that all other requirements under this section are met;

b. Detached ADUs:

- i. Shall comply with Accessory Building Setback requirements, except that the Principal Building Front Setback(s) may be used provided that the ADU is not located between the Front Lot or Building Site Line and the Single-Family Detached Dwelling;

ii. Shall comply with the Height, as to Building or Structure and Total Height, as to Building or Structure for Accessory Buildings permitted within the Zoning District, not to exceed 1 ½ Stories;

iii. Shall not exceed 1,000 square feet in Floor Area;

iv. A legally conforming or legally non-conforming Accessory Building in existence as of the effective date of this amendment may be converted into an ADU and need not comply with Section 2(b)(i), 2(b)(ii) or 2(b)(iii) above, provided that said Accessory Building shall not be made anymore non-conforming

3. Permitting procedures:

a. Permitted by Zoning Permit in accordance with Section 8.4.10:

i. All ADUs that comply with Principal Building Setback requirements;

ii. Attached ADUs in accordance with 2.a.iv of this section;

iii. Notice of the decision shall be published in a newspaper having a substantial circulation in the City. Legal notice fees shall be the responsibility of the Applicant, who will be billed for the payment of legal notice fees directly by the publisher of such notice.

b. Permitted by Site Plan Review in accordance with Section 8.4.5:

i. Detached ADUs that comply only with Accessory Building Setback requirements;

ii. Detached ADUs in accordance with 2.b.iv of this section;

c. For all ADU applications, mailed notice shall be sent by the Applicant using U.S.P.S. Mail, with a Certificate of Mailing-Firm, to all owners of Lots that are within one hundred (100) feet of the subject Lot, as indicated on the Assessor's records. When a Residential condominium is located within one

hundred (100) feet of the subject Lot, mailed notice may be sent to the Residential condominium association in lieu of the individual unit owners. This section shall supersede Section 8.4.4.D.6.f.

d. A certificate in the form of an affidavit which verifies that the owner continues to reside on the Lot, the minimum rental duration, and all other conditions met at the time of the original application remain unchanged shall be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Director by January 31 of each year.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the reasons for this action are:

1. To achieve Plan of Conservation and Development Goal 1 listed in Chapter 4: Housing Choice & Healthy Lifestyles: “Norwalk has a neighborhood and housing strategy that maintains a variety of neighborhood types and housing choices through a variety of mechanisms,” by:

a. Enacting a policy to “Support housing policies that provide housing for Norwalk’s households across a range of preferences and household incomes,” and the policy to “Maintain the predominately single-family character of established single-family neighborhoods;” and

b. Enacting a policy to “Promote diverse housing types, such as townhouses, condos, live-work units and rental apartments in Norwalk’s urban core, at transit-oriented locations and in mixed-use clusters on major corridors, in village districts where appropriate and through redevelopment;” by:

i. The action to “Encourage redevelopment in mixed-use clusters, including housing, of suburban-style commercial land uses along major corridors such as Route 1...The City should take a proactive approach to the redevelopment that will happen over the next ten years with new zoning and design standards, and support for alternative transportation and mixed-income housing;” and

ii. The action to “Identify potential markets for downsizing by empty-nesters and aging seniors who want to stay in Norwalk and encourage housing for that market;” and

iii. The action to “As part of the zoning re-write, explore innovative housing types such as cottage communities and create zoning and design standards;” and

2. To achieve the Plan of Conservation and Development strategy to “Seek solutions to provide sufficient safe and affordable housing for low-income and very low-income residents;” and

3. To achieve Plan of Conservation and Development Goal 2 listed in Chapter 4: Housing Choice & Healthy Lifestyles: “Incorporate healthy lifestyles in city design and improvements,” by:

a. Enacting a policy to “Prepare an Aging in Norwalk report to identify future needs to provide a supportive city environment for seniors to help them age in place;” and

4. To achieve Plan of Conservation and Development Goal 3 listed in Chapter 12: Future Land Use, Urban Design & Zoning: “The user-friendly zoning ordinance is consistent with the future land use map and achievement of the vision and goals of the POCD,” by:

a. Enacting a policy to “Modernize the Zoning Ordinance and the development approval process to achieve the goals of the POCD,” by:

i. The action to “Rewrite the Zoning Ordinance to reflect contemporary best practices in administration and user-friendliness and to be consistent with the POCD...including [an] analysis of how well the regulations implement established City Policy, and how well the regulations integrate with other ordinances and initiatives to meet public expectations [and a] summary of ‘best practices’ for key issues;” and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the effective date of this action is April 24, 2026.

**Mr. Hubers seconded.**

**Chapin Bryce; Diana Lenkowsky; Tammy Langalis; John Hubers; Harvey Jones; Galen Wells approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

**D. #2026-03 R – Planning & Zoning Commission – Zoning regulation text amendment to Article 4, 6, 7 and 9 regarding fee in-lieu of public realm requirements; workforce housing requirements; village district review standards and procedures; encroachment allowances for steps; creation of “landscape nursery” use; band sign locations; and revisions and/or new definitions of the following terms: “dormer,” “earth processing and contractor’s materials storage yard,” “landscape nursery,” “patio,” “porch,” “stoop,” and “wetbar” - Public hearing, report & recommended action**

Due to the late hour, Mr. Kleppin suggested that this item be continued to the next agenda. Mr. Bryce opened the public hearing.

**\*\* MR. JONES MOVED to continue this application to the next Planning & Zoning Commission meeting on April 22, 2026.**

**Mr. Hubers seconded.**

**Chapin Bryce; Diana Lenkowsky; Tammy Langalis; John Hubers; Harvey Jones; Galen Wells approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

## **V. DISCUSSION**

### **A. Commercial Vacancy Tax Bill**

Planning & Zoning Commission - Minutes

April 8, 2026

Page 19 of 20

Mr. Bryce asked if staff could draft a memo in support of the bill. Mr. Kleppin said it would be on the agenda for the next meeting.

**VI. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES**

**A. Regular Meeting: March 18, 2026**

**\*\* MS. LANGALIS MOVED to approve the March 18, 2026 minutes.**

**Galen Wells seconded.**

**Chapin Bryce; Diana Lenkowsky; Tammy Langalis; John Hubers; Harvey Jones; Galen Wells approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

**VII. COMMENTS OF DIRECTOR**

There were no comments from Mr. Kleppin.

**VIII. COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS**

Mr. Jones said that he appreciated the public comments which he thought were productive.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

**Mr. Jones made a Motion to Adjourn.**

**Ms. Langalis seconded.**

**Chapin Bryce; Diana Lenkowsky; Tammy Langalis; John Hubers; Harvey Jones; Galen Wells approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Palmentiero