

**CITY OF NORWALK**  
**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**February 18, 2026**

**PRESENT:** Chapin Bryce, Chair; Diana Lenkowsky; Louis Schulman; Ana Tabachneck; Galen Wells; arriving after the roll call: Harvey Jones; Richard Roina; Jacquen Jordan-Byron

**STAFF:** Steve Kleppin; Michelle Andrzejewski; Amelia Williams

**OTHERS:** David Westmoreland; Doug Hempstead; Keith Cavanagh; Tim DeBartolomeo; Tom Ryder; Peter Cotaling; Jessica Norwick; Sean Sheedy; John Steery; Lisa Feinberg; Jake Granoff; Jeff Scher; Colleene Byrne; Vincent Hynes

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Bryce called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. It should be noted that this meeting was held on Zoom.com with participants calling in, separately.

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

Mr. Kleppin called the roll.

Mr. Bryce seated both Ms. Lenkowsky and Ms. Tabachneck for this meeting.

**III. REVIEW AND ACTION ON APPLICATIONS**

**A. #2026-11 SA - City of Norwalk - Special capital appropriation from the Historical Commission for design work for the Conservatory at the Lockwood Mathews Mansion - Report & recommended action**

David Westmoreland, from the Historical Commission, discussed the special appropriation for the engineering research to rebuild the conservatory of the Lockwood Mathews Mansion. He said that there were pictures in the packets. They had found leaks in the conservatory while doing mechanicals repairs. There is a concern about it collapsing. There is a capital budget request which is available on July 1, but they were hoping they could get advance money to start the repairs before next winter. The request would be reduced by this amount.

Doug Hempstead said that in the 1970s a tree had fallen on the conservatory. The repairs were done in plastic which is now rotting. There are concerns about the amount of snow that has fallen this winter. He noted that the room must be heated to keep the sprinklers from freezing. There was a discussion about the type of materials that would be used for the repairs. They would work with the state Historic Preservation office since it is on the state's register for their approvals.

**\*\* MR. SCHULMAN MOVED to APPROVE #2026-11 SA - City of Norwalk - Special capital appropriation from the Historical Commission for design work for the Conservatory at the Lockwood Mathews Mansion.**

**Ms. Lenkowsky seconded.**

She suggested that everyone should visit the museum.

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

**No one opposed.**

**Harvey Jones abstained.**

**B. #2026-04 CSPR – Keith & Eileen Cavanagh – 4 ½ Seaside Place – Construct a new single-family residence within the Coastal Area Management boundary - Report & recommended action**

Keith Cavanagh, the owner of the property, began the presentation by introducing the project team. He said that the property had been in his family for a long time. He had bought it from another family and then he described the design of the residence. He said that he owned a landscaping company and would also include them as well.

Ms. Williams then oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on a Google map. She also showed them the site plan for the property as well as a survey of it. It was determined that the property was not on the water.

**\*\* MR. JONES MOVED: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that application #2026-04 CSPR – Keith & Eileen Cavanagh – 4 ½ Seaside Place – Construct a new single-family residence within the Coastal Area Management boundary be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

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

- a. Per engineered site plan dated 12/2/2025 prepared by Fairfield County Engineering LLC, Norwalk, CT (received electronically by the Planning and Zoning Office on 2/6/2026)
  - b. Per architectural plans dated 1/20/2026 prepared by Joseph Matto Architects, Shelton, CT
  - c. Per zoning location & topographic survey dated 7/3/2025 and revised 12/1/2025 prepared by Seymour Surveying, Darien, CT
  - d. Per landscape plan dated 1/20/2026 prepared by Joseph Matto Architects, Shelton, 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 the applicant obtains the legal right to connect a sanitary sewer lateral to the existing private sanitary sewer main extension located on a private road known as Seaside Place Service Road; and
  6. That any changes to the plans be reviewed by Staff prior to implementation; and
  7. 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 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 February 27th, 2026.

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

**Ms. Wells seconded.**

At this point, they reviewed the resolution. Ms. Williams noted that this previously had been an application that would have been done over the counter. She also noted that there had been some questions about the sewer that the house would be connected to. Since it was a private sewer, the applicant would have to obtain the right to connect to it.

**Chapin Bryce; Galen Wells; Diana Lenkowsky; Louis Schulman; Ana Tabachneck; Richard Roina; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Harvey Jones approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

**C. #2026-01 CSPR – Norwalk Cove Marina – 48 Calf Pasture Beach Road – Repair an existing Shoreline Flood and Erosion Control Structure (SF ECS) - Report & recommended action**

Tim DeBartolomeo began the presentation and explained that this application is for a boat basin and that a bulkhead has failed and they would replace it. The electrical service is not in FEMA compliance. They would replace the wall, install utilities and add landscaping. There would be a boardwalk as well. He shared pictures of the current corroded wall, as well as the current conditions. Things would be removed and replaced. He then shared the proposed plans which included a new anchor system to be installed and new transformer. He showed them designated work areas. There will not be a barge in the basin and they would like to begin the work immediately. They have their permits from Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) and the Army Corp of Engineers, so they could complete the project before the boating season begins. There would be no change from the original wall to the new one. He then showed them the landscaping plan including pictures of the types of pavers they would use, and the lighting.

There was a discussion about the life span of the new wall. Mr. DeBartolomeo said it could last between 40-50 years. There was also a discussion about public access to the boardwalk. Mr. DeBartolomeo said it would be for anyone using the marina, not the public.

**\*\* MS. LENKOWSKY MOVED: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that application #2026-01 CSPR – Norwalk Cove Marina – 48 Calf Pasture Beach Road –

Repair 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:

a. Per site plan dated 1/2/2026 prepared by Sound Engineering Associates, Fairfield, 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 February 27th, 2026.

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

**Mr. Roina seconded.**

At this point, the commissioners reviewed the resolution. Ms. Williams explained why the application was before the commission.

**Chapin Bryce; Galen Wells; Diana Lenkowsky; Louis Schulman; Ana Tabachneck; Richard Roina; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Harvey Jones approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

**D. #2025-84 CSPR – LandTech – 163 Gregory Boulevard – Retain a Shoreline Flood and Erosion Control Structure that was built without permits and construct a new residential dock - Report & recommended action**

Tom Ryder, the ecologist on the project, began the presentation by orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. There would be a residential dock and a wall would need modifications to be compliant with the zoning regulations. He gave a brief history of the property since the wonders purchased it in 2020. He then showed them the site plan. The owner had received approvals to construct a house, as well as the retaining wall. He also discussed what the as-builts had shown, that the contractor had built it taller. He noted that the application had been submitted to DEEP and the Army Corp of Engineers. They had received approval for the dock and wall from the Army Corp. DEEP has given them a tentative approval. He showed them a cross-section of the wall that had been constructed. He showed them several pictures of the property with the wall that had been constructed.

At this point, Mr. Ryder said that they were trying to have the wall comply with what had been approved. He then described several options, some of which were not practical. They discussed adding more vegetation to the base. However, they didn't want to disturb what was there. Another option would be to move the wall back which would have to be done in sections and a barge brought out to remove boulders. It didn't seem practical to disturb the vegetation to do this. The next option was to remove the wall, although it would still need some type of stabilization.

Mr. Ryder then discussed what was being proposed. He explained how the wall would then be in compliance with the approved plan as well as stabilize the area. They would not need a barge to do the work which would be in the water for a couple of weeks. The wall would be lowered to what had been approved. They would plant some shrubs which would provide a foundation for the soil at the bottom.

There was a discussion about the elevation of the wall. Mr. Ryder explained the reason that the applicant was brought to the Planning & Zoning Commission. He said that DEEP had been on the site, and noticed that the wall was not constructed correctly. They then notified the city to handle the enforcement. They received a letter from Mr. Kleppin that the wall was non-conforming. At this point, there was a discussion of the

commission's options to either approve or deny the application or allow the applicant to leave it as it is. There was also a discussion about the DEEP letter. There was a discussion about the owner's options and the staff's recommendation.

The owners had been notified in 2021 that they would not receive the zoning certificate of compliance because of the situation with the wall, so they would not have been able to receive a certificate of occupancy from the Building Department. Ms. Williams explained why they had not received their zoning certificate of compliance. She did not know whether anyone was living in the house since the certificate of occupancy should not have been issued. There was then a further discussion about the letter from DEEP which said that they could make them take down the wall. Ms. Williams said that the letter indicated that the commission had the authority to enforce however they would like and DEEP would back that up.

At this point, Mr. Ryder was asked whether the family was living in the house. He said that they were although the certificate of occupancy had never been issued. Mr. Ryder did not know why and said that the owners had had trouble logging into the meeting. He also said that they had begun discussing issues to remedy the situation about a year and a half ago when they were going to work on the dock.

There was a discussion about whether the family living in the house was a violation. Mr. Kleppin said that the Building Department could have issued a temporary certificate of occupancy. He also explained how zoning violations were prioritized and that this was not a high priority for enforcement. There was a discussion about postponing the decision on this application. There was also a discussion about whether removing the wall served the public interest.

Peter Cotaling, the owner of 163 Gregory Boulevard, said that he does have a temporary certificate of occupancy so he is allowed to live in the house. He explained how the wall was built and his reaction to the notice of violation. He also said that DEEP had been to the site in November of 2020 and said that the retaining hole was outside the CJL, so there was no violation on his end. He said that he had been to the zoning department about a month later. There was also a discussion about postponing the action on this item, so Mr. Cotaling could bring a detailed timeline to the commission. There was a discussion about whether anyone from Land Tech was at the site when DEEP was. Mr. Ryder said that they were not. The commissioners requested additional documentation for this application as well as an extension of time. Mr. Ryder said that he would authorize an extension of time to the following meeting on March 4.

**\*\* MR. ROINA MOVED to continue the application for #2025-84 CSPR – LandTech – 163 Gregory Boulevard – Retain a Shoreline Flood and Erosion Control Structure that was built without permits and construct a new residential dock.**

**Mr. Schulman seconded.**

**Chapin Bryce; Galen Wells; Diana Lenkowsky; Louis Schulman; Ana Tabachneck; Richard Roina; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Harvey Jones approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

**E. #2026-10 – Norwalk Hospital Association – 34 Maple Street – Modifications to Norwalk Hospital Sign Manual - Report & recommended action**

Jessica Norwick, who was representing Norwalk Hospital, introduced the team and began the presentation which would update existing signage and include 3 new ones. She shared the updated sign package for Northwell. The sign at the top of the building would be replaced so that it could be seen at a greater distance. From feedback from patients, they are adding a sign to help patients locate the emergency room. This sound would be reflective and not illuminated. Sean Sheedy said that they had not heard about any problems for patients getting to the birthing center. John Steery said that most expectant parents had come to the birthing center before for a tour so they knew where it was. Ms. Norwick then showed them the sitemap of where all the new signs would be. She then showed them other new signs as well. Mr. Sheedy said that if the current sign was illuminated, it was carried over, and similarly, if it was not illuminated, then the new sign would not be. She continued the presentation by showing them different examples of the new signs.

There was a discussion about the colors of the signs which would be helpful to wayfinding. There was also a discussion about the totem sign to the emergency room.

**\*\* MR. ROINA MOVED: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the request to revise the sign manual for Norwalk Hospital by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission for application 2026-10 – Norwalk Hospital Association – 34 Maple Street – Modifications to Norwalk Hospital Sign Manual be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. That all exterior signage will be installed in accordance with the following manual:
  - a. Per sign manual developed by American/Interstate Sign Crafters for Norwalk Hospital at 34 Maple Street dated 1/23/26; and

2. That a zoning permit for the installation for the signs is obtained prior to installation; and
3. The applicant shall consult with the Norwalk Department of Public Works, Transportation, Mobility, and Parking and CT DOT regarding the adequacy of Norwalk Hospital wayfinding signage specifically for Interstate 95 and the Route 7 interchange;
4. That any changes to the proposal are required to be reviewed by staff prior to implementation; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the effective date of this action shall be February 27th, 2026.

**Mr. Jones seconded.**

At this point, the commissioners reviewed the resolution. Ms. Andrzejewski said that staff did not have any concerns. There was an addition to the resolution for wayfinding from I-95.

**Chapin Bryce; Galen Wells; Diana Lenkowsky; Louis Schulman; Ana Tabachneck; Richard Roina; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Harvey Jones approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

**F. #2025-79 SPR – Lofts M7 LLC – 101-201 Merritt 7 – Conversion of Office Buildings to Residential – Report & recommended action**

Lisa Feinberg, who was representing the applicant, began the presentation by introducing the project team. She then oriented the commissioners as to the location of the property on an aerial map. The applicant would like to convert two of the Merritt 7 buildings to residential buildings. She shared a report of office statistics which showed how much office space was vacant. She showed them pictures of the current buildings and then the renderings for the residential buildings. She noted the number of units, affordable housing units, parking spaces, and amenity areas. She said that the applicant would explore having solar panels on the roof even though it was not required because this is not new construction.

Jake Granoff, the architect on the building, explained the previous conversions that his firm had done around the state. He showed them the plans for the amenity space which included a pool, playground, outdoor lounge, etc. They are working with the Fire Department to allow access to 101. He noted that they would lose some parking spaces

due to the pool. There would be some restriping of the spots due to the regulations. He discussed the ramp access as well as landscape renderings which would include an outdoor fireplace. He showed them the materials which would be used to soften the look of the buildings to feel more residential.

Jeff Scher, the landscape architect on the project, discussed the new amenity space in the parking lot. He showed them the existing site plans. He then shared the proposed site plan which included new trees, etc. There would be a circular roundabout for dropoff, additional bike spots. There would be an open space, as well as areas where people could sit on a bench surrounded by trees. He also discussed indoor amenities. He then shared images of the trees, shrubs, grasses etc that would be used on the site. He also discussed the lighting plan which included a photometric study to confirm that light was not being obtrusive.

Collene Byrne, the traffic engineer for the project, explained the traffic analysis and focused on the analysis and findings. She explained the study areas. She also explained that the state DOT has construction projects which will bring improvements to the area. She explained the trip generation methodology as well as the site-generated traffic volumes. She shared the traffic study findings.

Vincent Hynes, the engineer on the project, continued the presentation, by discussing the greenery on the existing site which counts as being impervious. There would be no change to the overall drainage infrastructure. They had received an approval on a minor activity application from the Conservation Department. He discussed sign-offs and comments received from various departments. There had been a request to improve the pedestrian ramps at the access points to the site, as well as making them compliant to today's standards.

Mr. Schulman asked to see the affordable housing units which Mr. Granoff shared with the commissioners. He said that he appreciated the financial analysis that was provided. There was a discussion about pedestrian accommodations at the intersections as well as public access to the river. There was a discussion about the demonstration kitchen for classes or dinners. Some windows in the apartments would open and close. In discussions with the fire department, Ms. Feinberg said that they would have to reinforce the parking deck in front of the building, as well as the ramp.

**WHEREAS**, Public Act 25-164 was signed into law on July 8, 2025;

**WHEREAS**, Public Act 25-164 allows the conversion of office to residential provided that:

1. The subject building been vacant, or

2. had an average occupancy rate of less than fifty per cent, over the one-year period immediately preceding the application for such conversion or partial conversion;

**WHEREAS**, the applicant provided sufficient supporting documentation to meet the vacancy requirements of Public Act 25-164;

**WHEREAS**, the application is consistent with applicable Site Plan criteria in Article 8.45.

**\*\* MR. SCHULMAN MOVED: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, by the Norwalk Planning & Zoning Commission, that #2025-79 SPR – Lofts M7 LLC – 101-201 Merritt 7 – Conversion of Office Buildings to Residential, be APPROVED, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Development be built consistent with the following:

a. Architectural plans prepared by Granoff Architects dated 2.6.26 (all pages)

b. Civil plans prepared by Redniss & Mead with the following plan titles:

i. ZSP-1 Zoning Site Plan 1, dated 9.30.25, and revised to 1.22.26

ii. ZSP-2 Zoning Site Plan 2, dated 9.30.25, and revised to 1.22.26

iii. SE-1 Site Utility Plan, dated 9.30.25, and revised to 1.22.26

iv. SE-2 Notes & Details, dated 9.30.25

v. SE-3 Notes & Details, dated 9.30.25

c. Site Engineering Report prepared by Redniss & Mead dated 9.30.25

d. Landscape plans prepared by Granoff Architects with the following plan titles:

i. L01 Existing Conditions, dated 12.17.25

ii. L02 Landscape Improvements, dated 2.6.26

iii. L03 Site Lighting Improvements, dated 12.17.25

iv. L04 Site Lighting Photometrics, dated 2.6.26.

2. The approved Site Plan (as revised by any conditions of approval) be filed on the Norwalk Land Records prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit; and

3. Any outstanding CEAC signoffs shall be submitted to staff prior to the issuance of a zoning permit; and
4. The applicant shall make improvements as agreed to with Transportation, Mobility and Parking; and
5. Approved emergency access locations, circulation and maximum load shall be designed as depicted on certain plans prepared by Granoff Architects titled "Emergency Access Plan, Sheets AS24, AS24.1 & AS24.2" dated January 21, 2026 . Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a structural engineering plan(s) that conform to the Emergency Access Plan and is determined by the City of Norwalk Fire Marshal and Chief Building Official, within their sole discretion, to be acceptable. At the discretion of the Fire Marshal, the applicant may also be required to pay for the City of Norwalk to hire an outside structural engineer of the City's choosing to conduct a peer review of the submitted plan(s) and either verify compliance or recommend changes to submitted plan(s);
6. Two additional Fire Department Connections (FDC) shall be installed as required by the Fire Marshal; and
7. Any modifications to the approved Site Plan be reviewed and approved by City Staff prior to implementing; and
8. All rooftop mechanical equipment associated with the new development shall be screened with an acoustic and visual barrier, to the height of the equipment.
9. Prior to receipt of the Zoning Certificate of Compliance, a Connecticut licensed engineer shall certify that all required improvements, including any required off-site improvements, were installed to City standards; and
10. The Affordability Plan Declaration shall be filed on the Norwalk Land Records prior to the issuance of a final Certificate of Zoning Compliance; and
11. Should any building façade material become damaged or deteriorated, the applicant and future owners shall repair the damage or deterioration within thirty (30) days' notice from the City; and
12. That any and all HVAC units shall be located in conformance with the applicable zoning setbacks and appropriately screened; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the effective date of this action shall be February 27, 2026

**Mr. Roina seconded.**

At this point, the commissioners reviewed the resolution. Mr. Kleppin added a condition which Mr. Schulman and Mr. Roina agreed to.

**Chapin Bryce; Galen Wells; Diana Lenkowsky; Louis Schulman; Ana Tabachneck; Richard Roina; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Harvey Jones approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

#### **IV. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES**

##### **A. Regular Meeting: February 4, 2026 (Regular and Special Meetings)**

**\*\* MR. ROINA MOVED to approve the February 4, 2026 minutes for the Regular and Special meetings.**

**Mr. Schulman seconded.**

**Chapin Bryce; Galen Wells; Diana Lenkowsky; Louis Schulman; Ana Tabachneck; Richard Roina approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**Jacquen Jordan-Byron and Harvey Jones abstained.**

#### **V. COMMENTS OF DIRECTOR**

Mr. Kleppin discussed a proposed amendment to the POCD to include the strategic harbor plan. He said that there would be a combined meeting on Thursday, March 5.

#### **VI. COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS**

There were no comments from commissioners.

#### **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

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

**Mr. Schulman seconded.**

**Chapin Bryce; Galen Wells; Diana Lenkowsky; Louis Schulman; Ana Tabachneck; Richard Roina; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Harvey Jones approved.**

**No one opposed.**

**No one abstained.**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:26 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Palmentiero