

**CITY OF NORWALK**  
**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**July 16, 2025**

**PRESENT:** Galen Wells, Chair; Diana Lenkowsky; Louis Schulman; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Darius Williams (arrived at 6:14 pm); Richard Roina (arrived at 6:22 pm); Tammy Langalis (arrived at 7:01 pm)

**STAFF:** Bryan Baker; Amelia Williams

**OTHERS:** Atty Llz Suchy; Vince Hynes; Caitlin Drury; Atty Adam Blank; Seelan Pather; Brian Dempsey; Henry Conroy; Andy Soumelidis; Jeff Byington; Mella Kernanl Bill Andriopoulos; Maria Genovese; Ryan Murphy; Laurie Mira; Mark Fischl; Diane Lauricella; Chia West

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Wells called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m. It should be noted that this meeting was held on Zoom.com with participants calling in, separately.

**II. ROLL CALL**

Mr. Baker called the roll. Ms. Wells seated Ms. Lenkowsky for the entire meeting. She said that she would have to recuse herself from the Shoreham Country Club application since Ms. Lenkowsky is a member and a neighbor.

**III. REVIEW AND ACTION ON APPLICATIONS**

**A. #2025-45 CAM - 38 SD, LLC - 38 South Beach Drive (District 6, Block 36, Lot 64) - Coastal site plan review to raise an existing single-family residence to be FEMA flood compliant and construct minor additions - Report & recommended action**

Atty Llz Suchy began the presentation with an introduction of the applicant and the project team. She gave a brief overview of the application process as well as the application before the zoning board of Appeals (ZBA). She noted that there was a public hearing held during the ZBA process and did not think another was necessary. She explained the zoning regulations as well as which zone the property was located. She explained the variances that were necessary and granted by ZBA. She believed that application met all of the zoning regulations. They had received all necessary approvals from city departments, as well as from the Harbor Management Commission.

There was a discussion about the swimming pool between two properties. Atty Suchy said that they were separate entities and there would be another application from the other property in August or September.

There was a discussion about the comments from neighbors. Atty Suchy said that the neighbors did not share any objections to this project.

Vince Hines, the engineer on the project, continued the presentation with an explanation of the Coltech system being used on the property. There was also a discussion about a retaining wall that is being removed.

Caitlin Drury discussed grading on the property.

At this time, there were no other comments from the Planning & Zoning Dept. staff.

**\*\* MS. JORDAN-BYRON MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that application #2025 - 45 CAM – 38SBD, LLC – 38 South Beach Drive – Raise an existing single family residence to be FEMA flood compliant and construct minor additions be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

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

a. Per site plans dated 3/11/2025 and revised 5/27/2025 prepared by Redniss & Mead, Stamford, CT

b. Per architectural plans dated 3/11/2025 and revised 6/10/2025 prepared by Oliver Cope • Architect, New York, NY

c. Per landscape plans dated 3/11/2025 and revised 6/10/2025 prepared by Hollander Design, New York, NY

d. Per zoning location survey dated 5/27/2025 and revised 5/29/2025 prepared by James A Dennison, L.S., Stratford, CT

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

3. That all required soil sedimentation and erosion controls 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 Staff; and

Planning & Zoning Commission - Minutes

July 16, 2025

Page 2 of 17

5. That any changes to the plans be reviewed by Staff prior to implementation; and
6. That any utilities comply with setbacks and flood regulations; and
7. That flood certifications be submitted prior to issuance of a zoning permit and prior to obtaining a Certificate of Zoning Compliance (COZC), prepared by a CT licensed engineer or architect; and
8. That flood compliance be achieved and demonstrated with a FEMA elevation certificate prior to COZC; and 9. That all plantings be implemented prior to COZC; and
10. That all plantings be maintained, and any dead plantings must be replaced in accordance with the approved planting plan; and
11. That no changes to the seawall are permitted without City review and DEEP approval; and
12. Nothing in this permit shall obviate the requirements for the applicant to obtain any other assents, permits or licenses required by law or regulation by the City of Norwalk, State of Connecticut, or the Government of the United States, including any approval required by the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers- obtaining such assents, permits or licenses is the sole responsibility of the applicant; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that this proposal complies with all applicable coastal resource and use policies and with all applicable sections of the Zoning Regulations for the City of Norwalk; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that this the 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 July 25th, 2025.

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

**Mr. Bryce seconded.**

The commissioners then reviewed the draft resolution. There was a discussion about whether a public hearing should be held. Mr. Baker explained how the staff would determine whether to recommend a public hearing. They generally do not have public hearings for single family residences.

Galen Wells; Diana Lenkowsky; Louis Schulman; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron approved.

No one opposed.

Darius Williams and Richard Roina abstained.

**B.#2025-50 SPR - Craig Hyland and Nancy Zindell - 315 Rowayton Avenue (District 6, Block 27, Lot 5) - Site plan review application for the construction of a detached accessory dwelling unit - Report & recommended action**

Atty Liz Suchy began the presentation with a background of the application. She gave a description of the property and introduced the project team. She described the current property. She believed it met all the zoning requirements. She showed them the proposed site plan. There was also a discussion about an easement to be recorded on the land records. There were 2 separate parcels.

**\*\* MR. SCHULMAN MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission that application #2025-50 SPR – Craig Hyland and Nancy Zindell – 315 Rowayton Avenue (District 6, Block 27, Lot 5) – Site plan review application for the construction of a detached accessory dwelling unit be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. That the site shall be developed in accordance with the following plans:
  - a. Per architectural drawings entitled “Accessory Dwelling Unit located at 315 Rowayton Avenue Norwalk, CT,” prepared by Nicholas A. Sajda, dated 2/10/25; and
  - b. Per site plans entitled “Drainage Plan,” prepared by Fairfield County Engineering LLC, dated 5/1/25; and
  - c. Per the site survey entitled, “Zoning Location & Topographic Survey depicting proposed conditions 315 Rowayton Avenue Norwalk, Connecticut,” prepared by Seymour Surveying, dated 6/10/25; and
2. That any changes to the approved plans shall be submitted to the Commission’s Staff (Staff) for review and approval prior to implementation. If any proposed changes are determined to be substantive, Staff shall refer the changes to the Commission for their review and approval prior to implementation; and
3. 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 Staff; and

4. That prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Zoning Compliance, the Applicant shall submit a certificate in the form of an affidavit which verifies that the owner resides on the premises and that the minimum rental duration of the accessory dwelling unit is a minimum of six (6) continuous months; and
5. That any and all conditions required by Norwalk Health Department are applicable to this approval; and
6. That any and all conditions required by Norwalk WPCA are applicable to this approval; and
7. That any and all conditions required by Norwalk DPW are applicable to this approval; and
8. 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 (COZC); 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 shall be July 25, 2025.

**Mr. Bryce seconded.**

At this time they reviewed the motion.

**Galen Wells; Diana Lenkowsky; Louis Schulman; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Darius Williams; Richard Roina approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

**C.#2025-51 SPR/CAM - Spinnaker Acquisitions LLC - 108 Water Street (District 2, Block 84, Lot 18) - Coastal site plan review application for the construction of a 4.5-story mixed-use development - Preliminary review**

Atty Adam Blank began the presentation by introducing the project team. He then showed them a slide presentation which included a map of where the project would be constructed. He also showed them the aerial photograph of the current property. There would be a publicly accessible park and boardwalk with increased waterfront access. Currently there is no public access to the property.

There was a discussion about whether there would be a public hearing. Mr. Baker said that because of the size of the project, he expected that the commission would hold a public hearing. Atty Blank said that the application would also go before the Harbor Commission. Since it was not in the redevelopment area, there would not be a design review.

Atty Blank discussed the number of parking spaces and that the traffic analysis showed that there would be more parking than needed at peak hours. The residential housing units are larger than typical ones, including 2, 3 and 4 bedroom units. Atty Blank said that there would be affordable units with a couple of them being larger units.

Atty Blank gave a brief history of the property, noting that it had been a material storage yard as well as a boat storage yard. He explained that they were seeking permits for boat slips from the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP). He also described the current conditions of the lot which lacked a drainage system and had no green area. The proposed plan would improve the water quality from the site.

The project would incorporate residential as well as retail and office uses. It was the hope that employees would live in the development, thus creating a walkable environment. They would restore a bulkhead and add a grand staircase down to the water, so that the public would have access to the water. There would also be a boardwalk and restaurant.

Atty Blank noted that in the marine commercial zone, where this project is located, public realm is not required. The applicant was proposing that over an acre of land become part of the public realm area. They would be creating connectivity between the harbor and Water Street.

Atty Blank then discussed the flood elevations and that the structures would be above base flood elevations so that it would be unlikely that there would be flooding in these living areas. However, they have submitted a flood preparedness plan.

There was also office space as part of the project, although it is a tough market for office space. If they could not lease space, they would return to the commission for alternate uses of the space. He suggested that by adding the office space it would help restaurants on Washington Street.

Vincent Hynes continued the presentation with a description of the site which did not include any formal drainage system. He showed them a top-down view of the site. There would be a decrease in impervious surfaces which included the addition of

permeable surface walkways. He also said that they were adding a green roof area to the top of a building, which would be a green element for storm water management and sustainability. He also discussed the infiltration systems. He also discussed the erosion controls to minimize construction impacts on the neighborhood.

He then discussed the flood zone in which the building is proposed and the drainage on Water Street. He also noted that the lobbies could be elevated in the future, to elevation 9. There was a discussion about building to a 9 ft. height, instead of doing it in the future. It was explained that Water Street may be elevated in the future. To do it now, would mean that they would need an ADA ramp that is 4 ft. higher as well as stairs.

There was a discussion about the possible implementation of a backflow preventer, similar to the one at 130 Water Street. Mr. Bryce asked if this was something that they could look into before the next meeting in September. Mr. Hynes said that they would have to work with DPW and DEEP as well.

Seelan Pather, the architect on the project, continued the presentation by showing them an aerial view of the current lot. He noted that there is no connection from Water St. to the water across the site. He discussed the permeability of the project, of which there are three ways. There is a walkway down and across. There will be another walkway to the south. The last one would be a grand staircase which would give access to several levels. There would also be a spot where pedestrians could literally touch the water. He showed them the proposed plans which included an ADA lobby which was lower to the ground. There were some lobbies that were higher. He then described the parking levels. He also described the amenity level which included a pool. The office building would also have a roof deck. There would also be a restaurant and retail spaces. He showed them the exterior designs, influenced by maritime architecture and included water related uses.

There was a discussion about traffic leaving the site. At this point, Brian Dempsey, the traffic engineer, continued the presentation. There would be a one way entrance and there would be another one way out of the property. TMP had made a suggestion about the traffic flow which they were analyzing. There was also a discussion about a pedestrian walkway as well as the traffic signal nearby. There was also a discussion about parking on Water St.

Atty Blank reminded the commissioners that since this was a site plan review application traffic is not a consideration for the commission. Traffic is only considered

for the points on ingress and egress, and not for the traffic on the roadways. He did say that the applicant was working with TMP.

Ms. Langalis said that she had joined the meeting at 7:01 pm. She then asked questions about who owns the docks and how they would be leased. Henry Conroy, from Spinnaker Real Estate Partners, said that his company would own the dock slips and would accommodate tenants, whether it be from the office space, restaurant or residential. There would be 14 dock slips. It would not be appropriate for rowing clubs.

There was a discussion about the location of the office and residential buildings, being closer to the water, which was looked at both ways by the project team. Mr. Conroy said that they were feeling positive about leasing the office space from the feedback that they have already received, especially for Class A office space. There was a discussion about the parking which can be shared by the residential and office tenants and would be sufficient for this property. There was also a discussion about the landscape which would be plants that could tolerate the salt water.

**\*\* MR. SCHULMAN MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission that a public hearing be held for application #2025-51 SPR/CAM - Spinnaker Acquisitions LLC - 108 Water Street (District 2, Block 84, Lot 18).

**Mr. Bryce seconded.**

**Galen Wells; Diana Lenkowsky; Louis Schulman; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Darius Williams; Richard Roina approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

Mr. Baker said that the public hearing would be either September 3 or 17. There was a discussion about whether there should be an architectural review of this project. Mr. Baker explained that they could do it but that the regulations have less requirements in the marine zone.

**D.#2025-53 CAM/SPR - BPC Capital Management VI, LLC c/o Bradford P. Craighead - 7 Park Street (District 1, Block 68, Lot 1) - Coastal site plan review for the construction of two additions to the existing historic structure for a total of 11 dwelling units - Approval of Village District Peer Review Expenditure (fee paid by applicant)**

Mr. Baker explained that the commission would have to approve the expenditure for the village district peer review since the project was in the East Avenue Village District.

**\*\* MR. SCHULMAN MOVED: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission that a Village District Peer Review Expenditure (fee paid by applicant) for application #2025-53 CAM/SPR - BPC Capital Management VI, LLC c/o Bradford P. Craighead - 7 Park Street (District 1, Block 68, Lot 1) be **APPROVED.**

**Mr. Bryce seconded.**

**Galen Wells; Diana Lenkowsky; Louis Schulman; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Darius Williams; Richard Roina approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

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

**A.#2025-43 SP CAM – The Norwalk Country Club Company and Shore & Country Club, Inc. – 220 Gregory Boulevard (District 3, Block 73, Lot 2) – New pro shop and associated site improvements - Public hearing, report & recommended action**

Ms Wells opened the public hearing and explained that Ms. Lenkowsky would be recused from this application.

Atty Suchy then began the presentation with an introduction of the project team. She also explained the application process. She gave a brief overview of the property which included the zone. At this time, the site plan was shared. She gave a brief history of the Shore & Country Club as well as the current structures on the property. She also explained the club's yearly schedule and how many employees they had at different times of the year. She explained that there is a master plan which would modernize the property. This application would be the first phase of it. She described the new structures, some of which would be FEMA compliant. A parking lot would be reconfigured and tennis courts moved. She said that the project was consistent with the Harbor Management Plan. They have also received sign-offs from the various city departments.

Andy Soumelidis, the engineer on the project, continued the presentation with the proposed site plan. He showed them where new tennis courts would be placed as well as new parking. He described how they were going to upgrade the storm water drainage. He also explained the utilities on the property. He showed them pictures of fences that would deaden the sound of pickleball.

There was a discussion about adding solar panels over the new parking area. Mr. Soumelidis suggested that they install solar panels on the roof of the clubhouse when they do that phase of the project. There was also a discussion about using permeable pavers. There was a discussion about additional green spaces in the parking areas. There was also a discussion about sustainability requirements.

Jeff Byington addressed the comment about solar panels over the parking area. He explained it was a bit early in the process. Atty Suchy said they would keep it in mind for the next phase of the project. Mr. Bryce noted that other projects had used solar covered parking which had worked well for them.

Mella Kernan discussed the lawn that would be in place for runoff from the tennis courts. She said that the club was not in the high velocity zone. She noted that the pro shop is not FEMA compliant or ADA compliant which they would now be able to provide. She noted that the tennis pro would be able to see all 10 of the tennis courts from one vantage point. There would be a small retail store, as well as ADA compliant bathroom facilities. She also discussed a transformer that is below the base flood line which would be moved to plus 2 over the base flood line. She described how water would be allowed to flow through flood vents since it is a flood area. She said they were not in a velocity zone. She described the roof plan. She showed them the elevations of the exterior of the building, as well as other views of the building. She noted that they did try to maintain the residential nature of the neighborhood with the materials being used. She showed them views from the tennis courts and clubhouse. She discussed the privet hedge, along with other plantings, for screening. She said they would look into the impervious pavers. She explained the parking for the clubhouse. There would be shade trees. She also explained the lighting design. William Rutherford, the landscape architect, noted the privet's height.

At this point, the hearing was opened for the public to make comments. However, no one spoke for or against the project.

Ms. Williams said that the only issue was the screening along the northern border. She had recommended continuing the vinyl fence while the applicant proposed landscaping. She wanted to hear the decision that the commission would make on this proposal.

Atty Suchy ended the presentation and requested that the commission act on the application that evening.

**\*\* MR. BRYCE MOVED: BE IT RESOLVED** that application #2025 - 43 SP CAM – The Norwalk Country Club Company and Shore & Country Club, Inc. – 220

Gregory Boulevard – New pro shop and associated site improvements be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. That the building and site be developed in accordance with the following plans:
  - a. Per site plan set dated 6/12/2024 and revised 6/26/2025 prepared by LANDTECH, Westport, CT, provided that the parking chart be updated to reflect the current calculation for Waterfront Clubs of 1 space per 4 members
  - b. Per architectural and landscape plans dated 5/15/2025 prepared by Rogers McCagg, Norwalk, CT
  - c. Per revised lighting plans dated 5/15/2025 prepared by Rogers McCagg, Norwalk, CT
  - d. Per zoning location survey dated 9/7/2023 and revised 5/20/2025 prepared by Arcamone Land Surveyors, LLC, Norwalk, CT
2. That all department sign-offs are obtained prior to issuance of any Zoning Permit; and
3. That all required soil sedimentation and erosion controls 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 Staff; and
5. That any changes to the plans be reviewed by Staff prior to implementation; and
6. That vegetative screening, approved by Staff, be provided along the Northern property boundary to comply with section 4.3.9.G.cp.1.d of the regulations; and
7. That any utilities comply with setbacks and flood regulations; and
8. That flood certifications be submitted prior to issuance of a zoning permit and prior to obtaining a Certificate of Zoning Compliance (COZC), prepared by a CT licensed engineer or architect; and
9. That flood compliance be achieved and demonstrated with a FEMA elevation certificate prior to COZC; and
10. That all plantings be implemented prior to COZC; and

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

12. That the feasibility of installing as much permeable paving as possible in the new parking area be considered; and

13. That no changes to the seawall are permitted without City review and DEEP approval; and

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

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that this proposal complies with all applicable coastal resource and use policies and with all applicable sections of the Zoning Regulations for the City of Norwalk; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the 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 July 25th, 2025.

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

**Mr. Schulman seconded.**

They began their review of the resolution. There was discussion about a chain link fence. There was a discussion about using permeable paving on the site. There was also a discussion about the parking area. Mr. Bryce said that he would agree to the changes in the resolution.

**Galen Wells; Louis Schulman; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Darius Williams; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

At this point, the commissioners decided to take a break, as there were still two more public hearings. They returned to the meeting at 8:50 pm.

**B.#2025-46 SP CAM – Lajoie Auto Wrecking Company, Inc. – 40 Meadow Street (District 2, Block 91, Lot 51) – Redevelopment of a recycling facility - Public hearing**

Ms. Wells opened the public hearing. Atty Liz Suchy began the presentation by introducing the project team. She then gave a brief history of the application and noted that the green cards, evidencing notice of the public hearing, had been delivered to the Planning & Zoning Department staff. A sign notifying the public of the hearing had also been placed on the property and remained there during the meeting. She had not received any calls in opposition to the application and had received a letter of support. She explained about the zone that the property is located in. She also gave a brief history of the business which had been in the city for over 100 years. Multiple generations of the family had worked in the business and one member of the family would speak about the recycling process. Atty Suchy described the business in detail. By working with the P&Z staff, they had developed a recycling definition for use in the revised zoning regulations. She began to discuss the proposed building which would now be FEMA compliant. She said that the applicant had received all necessary sign-offs and would reply to all comments that they had received.

Andy Soumelidis, the engineer on the project, continued the presentation by showing them an aerial view of the property. He explained the current drainage system which did not include any treatment. He discussed the proposed site plan which included a new building, receiving/shipping area, and garage bays. The parking would be reorganized with more landscaping, street trees and curbing. He discussed the proposed drainage system. He also said that currently the site is 100% buildings and asphalt but that they are now adding landscaped areas. He also discussed the landscaping plan. He said that trees would be scattered throughout the site.

Bill Andriopoulos, the architect on the project, introduced his colleague, Maria Genovese. He then showed them the proposed plans, beginning on the first floor, which included lobby, employee break room, and even a museum space for Mr. Lajoie's racing memorabilia. He explained how materials would be received and moved to the processing area. There would be an area for equipment maintenance. He then described the second floor which included a conference room and open office area.

There was a discussion about the use of the garage space. There was also a discussion about the mitigation practices for any toxic fumes coming from the site. There were concerns about debris in the air. Mr. Andriopoulos said that the work is

done in the building. They also shared a picture of the front of the current building. Mr. Andriopoulos then showed the proposed plans for the exterior of the building. Maria Genovese shared the elevations as well as other exteriors. Mr. Andriopoulos discussed the materials that would be used. Ms. Genovese shared the simulated wood that was made of aluminum which would be recyclable. Much of the operation would be hidden in the building from the street. There was also a discussion about the landscaping around the building.

Ryan Murphy continued the presentation by explaining what the business does, who they work with. He explained how the materials were collected, how they were melted to become new products. They do not take plastics at this time but they are looking into it. He addressed concerns about dust and noises. There was also a discussion about the number of employees that are employed. There was a discussion about signage for the property. Mr. Murphy said that the drainage does not go into the city's drainage system. The system is tested during the year.

At this point, the meeting was opened to the public for comments.

Laurie Mira, 25 Split Rock Road, said she was on the Norwalk River Watershed Associates. She said that there would be a microforest built across the street. She had concerns about the landscaping in the front which seemed minimal. She asked if the owner could work with her organization to landscape with native plants. She wanted to add more trees. She also had concerns about the filtration system.

Mark Fischl, 129 Woodward Avenue, at the Sports House, said that he was at the building behind this property. He was in support of the project.

Diane Lauricella, 21 Little Fox Lane, had concerns about the water quality coming off the site. She said that she is in favor of recycling but wondered what they did with the residue from it.

Chia West asked about the auto crushing equipment.

Ms. Williams said that the application does not respond fully to regulations and recommended keeping the public hearing open to receive further materials. The public will have an opportunity to speak on the new materials.

Atty Suchy made some closing remarks about the parking which was legally non-conforming. She wanted to address other comments but understood if the commission decided to wait two weeks until the next meeting. Ms. Wells asked her to wait until the next meeting for the rebuttal.

**\*\* MR. SCHULMAN MOVED** to continue the public hearing for application #2025-46 SP CAM – Lajoie Auto Wrecking Company, Inc. – 40 Meadow Street (District 2, Block 91, Lot 51) until August 6, 2025.

**Mr. Bryce seconded.**

**Galen Wells; Louis Schulman; Chapin Bryce; Diana Lenkowsky; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Darius Williams; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

**C.#2025-41 R – Planning & Zoning Commission – Zoning regulation text amendment(s) to Articles 1 and 4 regarding the location of nonconforming parking, Commercial Recreation Establishment uses, and the permitting process for clustered Single-Family Dwellings in the Silvermine Tavern District - Public hearing, report & recommended action**

Ms. Wells opened the public hearing. Mr. Baker began the presentation by noting that these are changes that the staff recommended. He addressed the first one which was for non-conforming parking locations. He also discussed the changes to a use table for Commercial Recreation Establishments. Another change was for clustered single-family dwellings in the Silvermine Tavern Village District. He noted the referrals.

At this point, Ms. Wells opened the hearing to the public for comments.

Diane Lauricella, 21 Little Fox Lane, had comments on the commercial recreational establishments. She asked that instead of bouncy house businesses being placed in the industrial zone, there should be clean industries being placed in this zone, to provide jobs for residents.

Ms. Wells closed the public hearing. Mr. Baker explained that commercial recreational establishments were no longer allowed in the industrial zone, as of 2022.

**\*\* MR. SCHULMAN MOVED: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission that application #2025-41 R – Planning & Zoning Commission – Zoning regulation text amendment(s) to Articles 1 and 4 regarding the location of nonconforming parking, Commercial Recreation Establishment uses, and the permitting process for clustered Single-Family Dwellings in the Silvermine Tavern District be **APPROVED** to implement the following goals, strategies, and actions of the Norwalk Plan of Conservation and Development:

1. Chapter 12, Goal 1: “General guidelines guide land use decision making.”

a. Policy: “Promote urban design guidelines for walkability for development in urbanized parts of Norwalk.”

b. Policy: “Implement transit-oriented design (TOD) guidelines promoting density, walkability, and mix of uses for development near transit stations (rail and high-frequency bus).

2. Chapter 12, Goal 2: “Neighborhood and corridor activity centers have urban design standards that promote walkability.”

a. Policy: “Support mixed-use redevelopment along commercial corridors.”

3. Chapter 12, Goal 3: “The user-friendly zoning ordinance is consistent with the future land use map and achievement of the vision and goals of the POCD.”

a. Policy: “Support revision of the zoning ordinance to promote desired development and design patterns.”

b. Policy: “Support permit streamlining for projects with desired characteristics.”

i. Strategy A: “Modernize the zoning ordinance and the development approval process to achieve the goals of the POCD.”

1. Action i: “Rewrite the zoning ordinance to reflect contemporary best practices in administration and user-friendliness and to be consistent with the POCD.”

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the effective date of this action shall be July 25, 2025.

**Mr. Bryce seconded.**

**Galen Wells; Louis Schulman; Chapin Bryce; Diana Lenkowsky; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Darius Williams; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

## **V. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES**

### **A.Regular Meeting: July 2, 2025**

**\*\* MS. LANGALIS MOVED to approve the July 2, 2025 minutes.**

**Mr. Willians seconded.**

**Galen Wells; Diana Lenkowsky; Louis Schulman; Tammy Langalis; Darius Williams approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**Richard Roina; Chapin Bryce and Jacquen Jordan-Byron abstained.**

## **VI. DISCUSSION**

### **A.Staff's Draft Legislative Changes per the Affordable Housing Plan's Recommendations**

This item was moved to the commission's next meeting.

## **VII. COMMENTS OF DIRECTOR**

There were no comments from Mr. Baker.

## **VIII. COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS**

Mr. Schulman said that the fountain at the Pearl was still not working. Mr. Baker said he would look into it. Mr. Schulman would also like to start a discussion about architectural review for any areas of the city that don't require it when they are over a certain size.

## **IX. ADJOURNMENT**

**Ms. Jordan-Byron made a Motion to Adjourn.** Check this -video

**Ms. Langalis seconded.**

**Galen Wells; Louis Schulman; Chapin Bryce; Diana Lenkowsky; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Darius Williams; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Palmentiero