

**CITY OF BRIDGEPORT
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
APRIL 26, 2020**

ATTENDANCE: Mel Riley, Chairman; Cesar Cordero; Carlos Moreno; Robert Morton; Reggie Walker; Robert Filotei

STAFF Dennis Buckley, Zoning Official; Nicholas Sampieri, Zoning Inspector; Russell Liskov City Attorney.

OTHER: Jon Urquidi, City Engineer; Alfredo Castillo, Council Member; Barbara; Bill Coleman, Deputy Director OPED; Chintan; Christopher Kriegner; Christopher Russo; Councilman McCarthy; Devendra Shah; Essence Boyd; Franca Derosa; Francis; Fredrick Hall; IBRAHIM; Jack Hennessy, State Representative; James Young; Jim Gilroy; John Cooper; Coseph Messina; Justin Ballotte; Kiumarz Geula; Lawrence; Leonardo Reodrigues Cross; Tom Livingston; Maria Pereira, Council Member; Martin Masterson; Mildred Rodriguez; Neil DeLuca; Patricia Sullivan; Lt. Paul Grech; Attorney Ray Rizio; Raymond Ganim; Rosalina; Sarhanna Smith; Simone; Tim Whiting; Tom Regan; Vincent Fiumidinisi; Wanda Judkins; Helen Olga Losak; Pastor Kenneth Moles Junior; Chris Caruso, Former State Representative; Eneida Martinez, City Council; Don Cooper; Keith Williams.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Riley called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. There was a quorum present. He performed a roll call of those present.

Chairman Riley read the following statement: This meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission complies with Governor Lamont's Executive Order 7b as it relates to a web-based meeting. Therefore, the in-person requirement is eliminated as long as a person can participate by phone or video in real time. Also, the sign posting requirement and the return receipt of notification to property owners has also been eliminated as long as the Planning & Zoning Commission agenda has been online complying with the statute's normal earliest publication date in the Connecticut Post.

Two letters were provided to be read into the record.

The first letter concerns case 21-12 which was a request for the item to be continued.

The second letter concerned item 21-13 and was a request to have that item deferred to the next regularly scheduled meeting.

**** COMMISSIONER WALKER MOTIONED TO DEFER ITEM C-2 AND D-1 TO NEXT MONTH.**

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

CITY BUSINESS

(21-22)

BLOCK 507 (PORTION OF ALLEN ST.) – PETITION OF THE OFFICE OF PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (OPED) – REQUESTING UNDER SEC. 8-24 OF THE CT GENERAL STATUTES A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION FOR A GROUND LEASE AGREEMENT FOR A PORTION OF ALLEN STREET FOR THE INSTALLATION OF AN ELECTRONIC BILLBOARD FOR THE HARBOR YARD AMPHITHEATER.

Mr. Coleman came forward to present this item. He is with the Office of Planning and Economic Development. He provided images for the Commission. This is an 8-24 request. The proposed lease is for South Frontage Road and is across from the arena and Harbor Yard Amphitheater project. He said he desired for the Commission to make a favorable report to the City Council relevant to their consideration of the issue. The area is in a special zone set up to allow for greater use of electronic signage and more ample signage for advertising purposes. The sign would be owned by the Harbor Yard Amphitheater. The City would continue to own the land and there would be a ground lease of the pedestal spot.

Commissioner Filotei asked if there was something in the bylaws already regarding ramp usage. Mr. Coleman responded that he didn't know the answer but whatever was constructed would need to go through a review process by the State Department of Transportation and the City's own regulatory process.

Chairman Riley pointed out that there were regulations on how close billboards can be located and how close to highways they can be.

Mr. Coleman pointed to two examples on Main Street and on Broad Street where similar examples could be found. He went further into detail on the potential design issues of the site. He does not see the billboard as a fatal flaw with one being able to design a good project on that site.

Commissioner Filotei asked if the City Council could misconstrue their approval as advocating for approval.

Mr. Coleman clarified that it would be a good thing to have the report of the P&Z Commission prior to voting but there was a provision in place where they could still vote without it. The decision is still the City Council's and their vote today is strictly advisory.

No one wished to speak in favor of this application.

City Councilwoman Maria Pereria came forward in opposition to this application. She said that there already were restrictions on the height in this zone. Section 8-24 specifically says that no municipal body or agency shall lease any municipally owned property until the proposal to take such action has been referred to the Commission for a report. The City Council has not done this. She said that the billboard would generate significant profits for Howard Saffan who is the tenant of the amphitheater. The city council has never referred this item to P&Z for the required report. There has been no report available on the agency's website which is required under Governor Lamont's executive order 7-B. As such this

item was referred in violation of section 8-24 as the City Council needs to refer it not Mr. Coleman as a member of a municipal agency.

State Representative Jack Hennessy came forward to speak in opposition to this application. He said that the city was already congested with visual distractions and billboards. It wasn't going to make Bridgeport to be viewed pleasantly. They have been working to get rid of blighted areas and he did not like placing up large signs in their place. They are unpleasing aesthetically and can be a public safety hazard due to their distracting nature.

Pastor Kenneth Moles Junior came forward in opposition to this application. He agreed with Councilwoman Maria Pereria and Senator Hennessy and said there was already signage at the site. He felt it would not be conducive to the City in the long run either and would negatively impact the people there.

Ms. Helen Losak came forward in opposition to this application. She said she agreed with all the reasons stated by Councilwoman Pereria and State Representative Jack Hennessy. She feels that there is enough signage in that area and they don't need another sign. It should also follow the proper procedures in filing a report and be submitted in a correct way to the City Council.

Mr. Coleman came forward to rebut. He said he didn't want to weigh in on people's opinion of the aesthetics of the billboard but wished to categorically rebut the assertion that the 8-24 item was incorrectly presented. He said that it wasn't just the City Council that referred 8-24 items to Planning & Zoning and municipal agencies do that.

Atty. Liskov said that they had every right to decide one way or the other based on precedent.

**** COMMISSIONER MORTION MOTIONED NOT TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL.**

**** COMMISSIONER CORDERO SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

(21-23)

TEXT AMENDMENT – PETITION OF THE OFFICE OF PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (OPED) – SEEKING TO AMEND SEC. 11-7-3, SEC. 11-7-3(E), AND SEC. 11-7-7 REGARDING SIGNAGE OF THE ZONING REGULATIONS OF THE CITY OF BRIDGEPORT TO INCLUDE THE MU-EM ZONES.

Mr. Coleman came forward to speak on this item. He wished to clarify some inaccurate information in the previous item. There is no relationship between this text amendment and anything related to the amphitheater, arena, or the billboard signs. They are different items. He pointed out that, even though they were in the middle of a zoning re-write, petitioners still try to make things happen and they still need to respond appropriately. They have received a query from Hartford Healthcare who bought the St. Vincent's Medical Complex and are interested in putting up signage. The current regulations are inflexible regarding signage and do not allow variances. Mr. Buckley had talked with the staff and suggested a text amendment limited to the medical zones. He reviewed the desired locations on a provided map. The text amendment would allow for flexibility relative to signage.

Chairman Riley asked if, theoretically, this would allow for a sign on top of the 10-story Dorm at Sacred Heart.

Mr. Coleman denied this. Discussion followed regarding locations on the map for potential signage. This was done in response to a petition. The text amendment is a non-intrusive way to accommodate what they desire.

There were no further questions from the Commission.

No one wished to speak in favor of this petition.

Councilwoman Maria Pereria came forward to speak against this item. She pointed out that the amendment allowed for people to place 3-story tall signs on top of their buildings. She wondered how people would have trouble finding the hospitals. She claimed that Harvard Healthcare had signed a contract with Howard Saffan to put their name on the amphitheater. This is not about finding hospitals but about shameless self-promotion. She also pointed out that the vast majority of employees are not Bridgeport residents. She also pointed out that they do not pay property taxes. They take large swaths of buildings for offices and don't pay taxes.

State Representative Jack Hennessy came forward to speak against this item. He pointed out that the buildings had been massively transformed but were not garnished. He said that it would lead to a decrease in the quality of life to people who had to frequently drive up and down the road with the signs every day. Passing this would be intrusive and decrease quality of life for the residents of Bridgeport.

Ms. Helen Losak came forward to speak against this item. She is in agreement with Councilwoman Pereria and State Representative Jack Hennessy. She felt the signs would be intrusive and a monstrosity. She did not feel there was an issue finding the hospital. She felt it would blight the area.

City Councilwoman Michelle Lyons came forward to speak in opposition to this item. She is not in favor of the signs because she felt the area already had many distractions. She felt adding signs would be very dangerous and provide additional distractions for drivers. She felt it would affect the residents of the neighborhood in a negative manner. She wished for the area to remain clean and wanted it to look classy.

Mr. Coleman came forward to rebut. He pointed out that there were no changes for Park Ave. other than for one area with a garage that serves the Cancer Center. In response to the comments about signage being garish and visually unappealing he did not feel were to the point when discussing medical signage. He pulled up images of other medical signs for viewing. These signs presented are similar to what will be built. This will not be a large billboard but signage appropriate for medical facilities.

Commissioner Coredro asked if there would be nothing above the buildings.

Mr. Coleman said that, with one exception, this would be the case. Only the main building itself would have a sign on top of its roof.

Chairman Riley intervened and said that Mr. Coleman, as a presenter, could not present anymore.

It was clarified that these would be wall signs and only one would be positioned on the roof. Additionally, any roof sign, by regulation, has to come to the Commission for approval.

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON MOTIONED TO APPROVE ITEM 21-23 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- 1. THIS APPROVAL DOES NOT INCLUDE ANY TYPE OF ROOF SIGNS.**
- 2. ANY USE OF ELECTRONIC MESSAGING; MOVING TEXT OR IMAGES; INTERMITTENT/MOVING LIGHTS AND STROBE LIGHTS, ALL ARE STRICTLY PROHIBITED.**

**** COMMISSIONER WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

CONTINUED & DEFERRED BUSINESS

C-1 (21-03)

225 BOSTON AVE. – PETITION OF HAN CAPITAL – SEEKING TO AMEND TABLE 2.A OF THE ZONE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS OF THE ZONING REGULATIONS TO PERMIT SELF-STORAGE FACILITIES IN OR-G ZONES.

Ms. Patricia Sullivan came forward to discuss this item. The Commission has heard this matter previously. The petition is from HAN Capital to allow the development of self-storage facilities in an OR-G zone. She had provided images the prior time of the building HAN Capital is interested in. Each application under this amendment would allow the Commission the digression to overlook each application as a permit use and not use as a right. They didn't want the residents of Bridgeport thinking that they wanted self-storage facilities popping up all over the place or having the Commission unable to have the ability to go through the special permit process.

It was asked if they were still waiting on a report from Mr. Coleman regarding the potential impact of the amendment on OR-G zones and the neighborhood.

Chairman Riley said that he had not received it.

Mr. Coleman came forward. He said he had submitted to the Zoning Office and it had been forwarded for further analysis. He mentioned that, previously, he had displayed a series of buildings designed to give images from nearby of the area. He said that, in a memo, he had mentioned that they had moved out of the industrial areas where they used to be though there are remnants. They have move into retail areas. He further reviewed the details. He also said that it has become a retail service. They desire to be in retail areas to provide better service to female customers. There is some synergy with other retail areas. Residents who don't have access to self-storage are heading to Stratford to find storage. He further mentioned that, in some cities such as New York City have moved to exclude self-storage from industrial areas. This is because they feel that the buildings have less value in industrial areas and more value in retail.

Dennis Buckley stated that Mr. Colemans report had been included in the previous month's materials.

Commissioner Filotei commented that he had been to the site and seen a lot of box trucks in the area and said that he felt that the area couldn't handle that amount of box trucks.

Council Member Alfredo Castille came forward in support of this item. He lives close to the building location. He had visited it and talked to the owner. The owner is willing to fix the building and clear up the graffiti at the location. He had mentioned that the owner would need to do a lot of renovations and beautification. He felt it was a good economic investment for the City of Bridgeport.

There was no one else in favor of this item.

Mr. Raymond Ganim came forward to speak in opposition to this item. He represents a number of property owners in Bridgeport as well as his own property. They are not comfortable with a change that would allow late-industrial use in a retail zone. As a result, he is opposing the proposed amendment.

Ms. Wanda Judkins came forward to speak. She opposes the request because Boston Ave is always full of traffic and is congested. It will be detrimental to the area.

City Councilwoman Maria Pereria came forward to speak in opposition. She says she worked in retail management for 25 years. She feels retailers will look at the area around them to see how much traffic they can procure. The entire length of Stratford Ave. is an OR-G zone except the final two blocks. She listed several other streets that were mainly OR-G zones. The text amendment will affect potentially every OR-G zone. Storage facilities don't generate jobs or a significant increase in storage tax revenue. This petition will allow potentially every OR-G zone to have storage facilities which generate little income. She also felt offended by the remarks about how they wished to be in an area to better service female customers.

State Representative Jack Hennessy came forward to speak in opposition to this item. He pointed out that most of Main Street would be affected by this change. He wished to associate his remarks with City Councilwoman Pereria in that this opens them to inappropriate development and residential areas need to be protected.

Former State Representative Chris Caruso came forward to speak in opposition to this item. He wishes to oppose the proliferation of storage units in the City of Bridgeport. Land use should not be decided on financial use for a city. He listed historical examples of when regulations were waved to allow for a storage facility to be placed. He pointed out that space was limited. Milford is slowing down its placement of storage units and he believes other cities are doing the same thing. He felt it was critically important to inform developers through their Master Plan what Bridgeport offers them. The board has no idea about storage units other than what is being presented this evening. This may result in issues in the future. He pointed out how this originally only applied to Boston Ave. but was now being applied to all OR-G zones. This is much more weakening to the Master Plan than just changing zoning in Boston Ave. This can also lead to a chain effect in which multiple unplanned businesses are placed in residential zones.

Council Member Ernie Newton came forward to speak against this item. He warned that, once they make a change for Boston Ave., they may end up doing so for other locations. He wished the

Commission would think about the communities. He is concerned that they may adopt a mindset in which they have to approve self-storage because OR-G will be zoned for it.

Mr. Ralph Ford came forward to speak against this item. It is rare that he agrees with Councilwoman Pereria and State Representative Hennessy but he agrees with their stance regarding the zoning. Without making further comment he wishes the Commission would vote no on the proposal.

Ms. Helen Losak came forward to speak in opposition to this item. She agrees 100% with Former State Representative Chris Caruso. She is opposed to the zoning special permit. She feels the location is prime retail location and that the self-storage is not needed.

City Councilwoman Eneida Martinez came forward to speak in opposition to this item. She is totally against this proposed amendment for the same reasons as Council Member Pereria, Council Member Newton, and Mr. Ford.

City Councilwoman Michelle Lyons came forward to speak in opposition to this item. She is in total agreement and has seen similar things happen in the past. She hopes they will vote against this item.

Mr. Neil DeLuca came forward to rebut. He has been a property owner in Bridgeport for almost 16 years. He owns and operates Budget Self Storage and owns the business next to it which has been a furniture store. He has been operating as self-storage for 16 years. He pointed out that, in 2018, the Commission had voted them into an OR-G zone. They had been Residential B and C for as long as he could remember. They had been consistent with usage and the Master Plan previously. He has no desire to open up Bridgeport to unintended consequences and have self-storage popping up because there is an OR-G zone. He provided images of his property as well. He has no desire to put Bridgeport in any kind of jeopardy due to the text amendment.

Mr. Don Cooper came forward to rebut. He said he didn't have much to add and felt most of the points given were valid. He is not looking to allow storage into every nook and cranny of the city. He pointed out that storage does not generate a lot of traffic and it would increase the value of the property.

Ms. Sullivan came forward to rebut. She has been practicing law in Bridgeport for 30 years. She desires to see these kinds of improvements made to help Bridgeport along.

Chairman Riley noted that the special permit would allow for the Commission to review every application including this one. So, if the Commission does not like it they can refuse the application.

Commissioner Filotei said no one wanted to address the parking situation or the presence of the box trucks that he had seen.

**** COMMISSIONER FILOTEI MOTIONED TO DENY APPLICATION 21-13.**

There was no second. The motion failed.

Commissioner Cordero said he agreed with Commissioner Filotei in that there seemed to be multiple businesses at the location that were not organized properly. Discussion as to what options were possible for a motion followed.

Commissioner Morton asked if they could wait till the zoning rewrite to see what they would have to say about this application.

Chairman Riley said it could be tabled but it would need to be tabled for months for that to happen.

**** COMMISSIONER WALKER MOTIONED TO TABLE THIS ITEM TILL TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 2021 FOR DECISION ONLY.**

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

C-2 (21-12)

4531 MAIN ST. – PETITION OF BROOKSIDE (E&A) LLC – SEEKING A SPECIAL PERMIT AND A SITE PLAN REVIEW TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A FAST-FOOD RESTAURANT WITH A DRIVE-THRU FACILITY IN AN OR-R ZONE.

This item was deferred to Tuesday, June 1, 2021.

D-1 (21-02)

70 HAWLEY AVE. & 95 EZRA ST. – PETITION OF HAWLEY AVENUE ASSOCIATES, LLC – SEEKING A SPECIAL PERMIT AND A SITE PLAN REVIEW TO LEGALIZE A VEHICLE REPAIR FACILITY IN THE EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING IN AN OR-G ZONE.

Chairman Riley noted that this item had a lot of opposition the prior time it had been brought up.

Atty. Russo came forward to address the Commission. He wished to submit a request for a deferral. They were hoping to have a plan for the meeting but it wasn't completed on time.

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON MOTIONED TO DEFERR THIS ITEM TO TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 2021.**

**** COMMISSIONER CORDERO SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

D-2 (21-13)

600 (598) IRANISTAN AVE. – PETITION OF NEW POWER BRIDGEPORT, LLC – SEEKING A SITE PLAN REVIEW AND A COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEW TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A FUEL CELL DISTRIBUTION FACILITY IN AN MU-LI ZONE AND COASTAL AREA.

This item was deferred to Tuesday, June 1, 2021.

NEW BUSINESS

(21-16)

451 & 567-589 SEAVIEW AVE. – PETITION OF BARNUM LANDING, LLC AND BARNUM

LANDING II, LLC – SEEKING A COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEW TO PERMIT THE REMEDIATION OF THE EXISTING VACANT COMMERCIAL PARCEL OF PROPERTY TO COMPLY WITH D.E.E.P. REQUIREMENTS IN AN I-L ZONE AND COASTAL AREA.

Mr. Tim Whiting came forward to speak. He is a licensed environmental professional. The site location is just east of the Bridgeport Water Pollution Control Authority Facility. He provided images for the Commission. The site is an 18-acre parcel. The site was filled with material of questionable quality that the D.E.E.P. has formally recognized as widespread polluted filth. Their approach would allow the site to have potential future use in redevelopment. Their ask is to remediate the site by allowed them to render these soils inaccessible at the site to prevent exposure and direct contact that's consistent with D.E.E.P. requirements. There is one building that remains standing that is scheduled for demolition with the permit having been approved. In other, lighter, areas previously contaminated soil has been removed from the site. He reviewed the proposed site plans for soil removal for the Commission. Their obligation to render soils inaccessible and prevent exposure extends to the property lines. This includes coastal areas. He reviewed the processes to render the soil inaccessible for each area. This includes installing large obstacles to break up waves. They are looking for City approval so they can meet their deadlines.

Mr. Christopher Kriegner came forward to speak on this item. There are three primary approvals he wished to bring to the Commission's attention. The first is a recently issued Truckers Dredging and Fill permit issues by the D.E.E.P. Land and Water Resource division on April 7th, 2021. That permit includes the bulkhead notch that had been outlined as well as the eastern parcel. The second is a Certificate of Permission that's in its final stage of review by D.E.E.P. This is the approval that will facilitate work along the Western Shoreline.

There were technical problems and Mr. Whiting resumed speaking. The third permit is a U.S. Army Corps permit pre-construction notification. This is expected by May 25th. There has been no opposition from the Army Corps at all. The vast majority of the site does not require D.E.E.P. approval.

Commissioner Filotei if this was the site of the Former Connecticut Coastline Terminal.

Mr. Whiting confirmed that it was.

There was no one who wished to speak in favor of this application.

Council Member Newton came forward to speak against this application. He asked if this was where the ferry was supposed to be arriving.

Chairman Riley confirmed that it was.

Council Member Newton said that they hadn't heard anything from the ferry people in regards to what they planned to do in the community. He felt it was sad that, when they needed the NRZ, to support them in bringing the ferry, they included them. However, this time they weren't included at all. He is opposed because he fees that they cannot allow people to develop the waterfront without the community being a part of that. He wished that they'd allow the ferry boat people to meet with them. Currently they have no idea what their plans are.

Mr. Ralph Ward came forward to speak in opposition. He is in agreement with Mr. Newton. While there are many properties in need of remediation, he feels that Bridgeport Ferry should have contacted them previously. They have not said one word or given one presentation since they moved regarding their plans. He suggests that they table the request until a presentation can be made to the NRZ.

Council Member Eneida Martinez came forward to speak in opposition. She is opposed because they have not come over to the East End to have conversations with the NRZ or elected officials. She said that she is in favor of remediation but against them moving forward until they present more details. There is not sufficient time to present enough detail to them. She requested the matter be tabled until they meet with the NRZ and members of the community.

Ms. Debbie Simms came forward to speak against this item. She said she was not against remediation but was upset with the lack of communication. She said that the plan needed to be shared with the community. At this point they do not know what is going on at the site. It needs to be halted until they get a full understanding of what is going on.

Mr. Keith Williams came forward to speak against this project. He agrees with Council Member Martinez, Council Member Newton, and Mr. Ward. The community does not know what is going on at the location. He desired more information before the project proceeds.

Pastor Kenneth Moles Junior came forward to speak against this project. He has been an East End resident for over 25 years. He is opposed to the project as they have not reached out to anyone in the community. There are 18-wheelers outside on Union Ave. He listed his issues with the project including issues with parking. The property was supposed to be offered to them first, legally, if they were looking to sell. They are not talking to the community yet. He wants them to be required to go through the community. The signs were up for only one day and all were removed except one.

Chairman Riley clarified that, due to the executive order, those were no longer required.

Pastor Kenneth Moles Junior apologized. He realized he was discussing the wrong item and said he'd return for the proper item.

Mr. Whiting came forward to rebut. The application is strictly for remediation and not for redevelopment. This is because it has been a struggle from a permitting and approval standpoint to combine the remediation and redevelopment efforts. This is strictly for site remediation. Completion of site remediation opens the possibility for redevelopment. The redevelopment plans have been limited by the inability to couple remediation and redevelopment. They will take the concerns to heart. The redevelopment plans will crystalize once they are confident that they will be able to meet remediation deadlines. He recognizes that there is a second part and they fully intend to involve the community and NRZ in redevelopment. What they are looking at now is strictly remediation.

Mr. Justin Ballotte came forward to rebut. He asked about the comment Pastor Kenneth Moles Junior had made about the 18-wheeler. This was clarified as having been regarding the wrong item.

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON MOVED TO APPROVE THE REMEDIATION FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:**

- 1) IT COMPLIES WITH THE MASTER PLAN
- 2) IT IS REQUIRED FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT.

**** COMMISSIONER CORDERO SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Commissioner Morton gave the reason that it complies with the Master Plan. Also, it is required for redevelopment.

(21-17)

541 BROADBRIDGE RD. – PETITION OF CHINTAN PATEL – SEEKING AN APPROVAL OF LOCATION FOR A PACKAGE STORE AND THE ISSUANCE OF A PACKAGE STORE LIQUOR PERMIT IN THE EXISTING SHOPPING CENTER IN AN OR ZONE

Mr. Chitan Patel came forward to speak on this item. He wishes to open a family owned and operated wine maker/store. He will spend the money to improve the site and hire local employees. He has been a retailer in liquor stores for the past 10 years. He operates mainly in Stamford. In the past 10 years he has not sold liquor to minors and runs a reputable business.

Chairman Riley noted that he was missing a lot of the requirements for a liquor store.

Mr. Patel said that he had submitted the survey.

Chairman Riley said he had to provide more information.

Mr. Patel asked what information was needed.

Chairman Riley said that he had to comply with the Special Permit Standards.

Mr. Patel said he had submitted an aerial survey of the site as was required by the standards.

Chairman Riley said that he needed to hear about the other parts of the business. He reviewed the things which needed more info. He suggested that they continue this item so Mr. Patel could become more familiar with the regulations. Did the site meet the distance requirement from locations, such as schools?

Mr. Patel requested that it be continued.

**** COMMISSIONER CORDERO MOTIONED TO CONTINUE THIS ITEM TO TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 2021.**

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

(21-18)

1 ATLANTIC ST. – PETITION OF PSEG POWER CONNECTICUT, LLC – SEEKING A RESUBDIVISION OF AN EXISTING 61-ACRE OF PROPERTY INTO TWO (2) SEPARATE PARCELS: A 22.85 ACRE PARCEL AND A 38.17 ACRE PARCEL IN A I-H AND DVD-WF ZONES AND COASTAL AREA

Mr. Tom Regan came forward to speak on this item. There is a typo in the agenda. The parcel is 56 acres and the sub-divided parcels are 22.85 and 33.17 acres. The request is to divide the current parcel into two separate parcels by way of background. He reviewed the circumstances that have led to the desire for the sub-division for the Commission. This request is in conjunction with the decommissioning of CC operations in units 1 through 4 and eventual redevelopment of this section. Units 1 through 4 will be on one parcel and the new facility will be on its own, separate, parcel. There are no improvements being contemplated or undertaken at this time. He provided images of the site for the Commission.

Commissioner Filotei asked a question regarding the lot features.

Mr. Regan confirmed the question. At the moment they have a decommissioning plan.

Commissioner Filotei asked if the decommissioning would be permanent.

Mr. Regan confirmed that the plant would be decommissioned as would units 1 through 4.

Mr. Bill Coleman came forward to speak in favor of this application. He said that this was a very important project along the harbor and requested the support of the Commission.

There was no one who wished to speak in opposition to this application.

**** COMMISSIONER CORDERO MOTIONED TO APPROVE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- 1. AN A-2 SURVEY MAP FOR EACH PARCEL SHALL BE FILED ON THE LAND RECORDS OF THE CITY OF BRIDGEPORT.**

**** COMMISSIONER MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

(21-19)

785 & 800 UNION AVE. – PETITION OF 800 UNION AVE REALTY, LLC – SEEKING A SPECIAL PERMIT AND A SITE PLAN REVIEW TO RENOVATE THE EXISTING INDUSTRIAL BUILDING TO BECOME A MULTI-PURPOSE AND EVENT FACILITY IN AN I-L AND R-C ZONES.

Mr. Kiumaraz Geula came forward to speak on this item. He is the managing member of 800 Union Ave. Realty. They purchased the property several years ago and have leased back a portion of the property. He reviewed the property for the Commission. He is also working with another tenet; the Center for Food, Equity, and Economic Development, to create a production kitchen for their use. The purpose of the special permit that they are requesting is so that their tenet can have their educational training and shared space for events. He reviewed the possible events that could take place.

Commissioner Filotei asked for a clarification on the number of spaces that would be present.

Mr. Geula clarified that only one space was subject to the special permit being requested tonight. He provided images of the site for the Commission. He also reviewed the information that had been submitted in the application for the Commission.

Chairman Riley pointed out that they were requesting a special permit which would give them an exemption to the regulations of that area. He needed Mr. Geula to show how he met the standards that the exemption requires.

Mr. Leo Rodriguez, Architect, came forward to speak on this item. They were told by the Zoning Office that they needed a Special Permit and Site Plan Review to have the event space within the Light Industrial Zone. He asked which conditions needed to be met.

Chairman Riley said he may have been told he needed a special permit, but he was not prepared. The Chairman suggested that the meeting be continued so that they could find out the requirements and fulfill them properly.

- ** COMMISSIONER MORTON MOTIONED TO CONTINUE THIS ITEM TO TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 2021.**
- ** COMMISSIONER MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.**
- ** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

(21-20)

220 & 230 FIFTH ST. – PETITION OF JJK CONSTRUCTION, LLC – SEEKING A SITE PLAN REVIEW TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 1-STORY, 8,400-SQ-FT. WAREHOUSE ADDITION TO THE EXISTING WOODWORK MANUFACTURING AND PROCESSING BUSINESS IN AN R-C ZONE

Atty. Raymond Rizio came forward to present this item. The building in question has, historically, been an industrial building but sits in an R-Z zone. He provided the site plan for the Commission. Anything done to expand the building needs approval from the ZBA. They have received waivers from the ZBA to expand this building. They have no impact to public safety. They are not requesting a special permit. They are here for site plan review purposes only. They are going to remove the storage trailer that has been there for years. They will also add 7 legal parking spaces and all exterior storage will be placed in this 1-story warehouse. He reviewed the further changes such as the removal of barbed/razor wire in the area for the Commission.

Commissioner Morton asked if they had gone before the Design Review.

Atty. Rizio confirmed that they had and gone through variances as well. Mr. Coleman had appeared at the ZBA hearing and made suggestions about the front of the building and removal of the barbed wire, fencing, and installing a wrought-iron fence upfront.

Mr. Bill Coleman came forward to speak in favor of this application. He wished to confirm that there had been review of the project and a staff report offered at the ZBA. The petitioner has responded to almost all of those kinds of concerns. He did add that the sidewalk needs to be reconstructed.

City Council Member Ernest Newton came forward to speak in favor of this application. He would just ask Mr. Rizio that the fence that has been erected be one that cannot be seen through. He does feel it is an improvement over what is there now.

City Council Member Eneida Martinez came forward to speak in favor of this application. The property has been uplifted since these individuals took over. She has no problem with the presentation given this evening.

Mr. Keith Williams came forward to speak in favor of this application. NIZ is in favor of this application.

**** COMMISSIONER MORENO MOTIONED TO APPROVE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- 1. THE PETITIONER SHALL FILE PLANS AND APPLICATIONS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE AND A BUILDING PERMIT.**

FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

- 1. THE PROJECT AS APPROVED COMPLIES WITH THE SITE PLAN REVIEW STANDARDS OF SEC. 14-2-5.**

**** COMMISSIONER CORDERO SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

(21-21)

155 POND ST. (REAR) – PETITION OF GIACOBBE CONSTRUCTION, LLC – SEEKING A SUBDIVISION OF AN EXISTING 1.506-ACRE LOT INTO FIVE (5) CONFORMING BUILDING LOTS IN AN R-A ZONE.

Atty. Raymond Rizio came forward to speak on this item. This is not a special permit or site plan review. It is a sub-division application where the Commission acts in the Administerial capacity. As long as the sub-division satisfies all the development standards the Commission shall approve this application. It is not a discretionary application. It is one in which the Commission gets to issues its stamp of approval if the lots conform to current zoning regulations. This application was previously before the Commission for a zone change to go to R-C. They desired to install a 20-unit apartment building that had received resistance. They are dedicating open space in the event that the City needs it to help with the flooding of Island Brook. He reviewed the details of the property for the Commission. All the proposed lots exceed the minimum size needed. The subdivision meets all the standards in regards to the lots size, with regard to lot square, and accessways. He is aware that the new construction has been disruptive towards the neighbors. The new houses in the neighborhood will add to the value of the neighborhood and clean the property up.

Ms. Marie Resto came forward to speak in favor of this application. She is pleased to hear that it has been changed from an apartment unit to a five-house plot of land. She was concerned about where the houses would be located on the plot.

It was clarified that they were not that far ahead yet.

She opposed having houses built on the land and felt it was unsettling. However, she preferred the homes and asked that they build the homes far enough away from the running water back there.

State Representative Chris Caruso came forward to speak in favor of this application. He reviewed a history of prior proposals for the area. He supports the residential houses that are being proposed. He suspects part of the issue is people's confusion due to the property being listed as part of Pond Street. He hoped that they would put it into the conditions that some of the land be set aside for helping with flooding.

Ms. Wanda Judkins came forward to speak in opposition to this application. She pointed out that the street is a dead-end street with very limited parking. Traffic getting in and out has always been an issue. With just four homes there has already been an issue with traffic and parking. She asks that there be consideration to having either a cul-de-sac or some type of situation that will alleviate some of the problem.

Ms. Ortiz came forward in opposition to this application. She said the amount of heavy equipment coming in and out of the street was causing disruptions. She wished there would be some sort of survey regarding the amount of disruption being done to the residents.

A member of the public came forward in opposition to the application. He felt this would be disruptive to the environment of the area.

Chairman Riley clarified that they were not discussing development; simply dividing the land up.

He replied that he felt they would eventually build houses which would lead to deforestation which he was against. He felt there were other places in the city that houses could be built without causing so much environmental disruption.

Another member of the public came forward to oppose the application. She feels the construction of homes on a dead-end street would be very chaotic and disruptive. She said they couldn't be outside with all the construction work going on.

Mr. Anthony Judkins came forward in opposition to this application. He agrees with his neighbors and believes that there is a huge safety issue. Children will be in danger from the construction equipment. He questioned where there wasn't an outlet on Pond St. to relieve some pressure.

Atty. Rizio came forward to rebut. He pointed out that this was not a special permit application or site plan review and was strictly about the size of the lots and if they met standards; which they did. There will be area left open according to the plans. Not all the homes will exit onto Infield Street. They will not be adding a cul-de-sac and will be adding a private access way that the city won't need to take care of. Most of the lots will have two parking spaces per lot.

Chairman Riley pointed out that all they were deciding is if they were conforming lots or not.

**** COMMISSIONER MORENO MOTIONED TO APPROVE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. AN A-2 SURVEY MAP FOR EACH PARCEL SHALL BE FILED ON THE LAND RECORDS OF THE CITY OF BRIDGEPORT.

FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

1. THE PROJECT AS APPROVED COMPLIES WITH THE MASTER PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT.

** COMMISSIONER MORTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

CONSENT AGENDA

There were no items on the consent agenda at this time.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business at this time.

OTHER MATTERS THAT MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE BOARD

There were no other matters that may properly come before the Board at this time.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MINUTES OF APRIL 26, 2021

** COMMISSIONER CORDERO MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 26, 2021 AS SUBMITTED.

** COMMISSIONER MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT

** COMMISSIONER MORTON MOTIONED TO ADJOURN.

** COMMISSIONER CORDERO SECONDED THE MOTION.

** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at 10:42 P.M.

Respectfully submitted.

Ian A. Soltes

Telesco Secretarial Services