



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
NOVEMBER 24, 2014
MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF BRIDGEPORT

45 Lyon Terrace, Room
210
Bridgeport, CT 06604
(203) 576-7217 Phone
(203) 576-7213 Fax

ATTENDANCE: Mel Riley, Acting Chair; Barbara Freddino, Acting Secretary; Tom Fedele, Anne Pappas Phillips, Bob Filotei, Robert Morton, Edgar Rodríguez, Carlos Moreno

STAFF: Dennis Buckley, Zoning Officer; Diego Guerrero, Design Review Coordinator; Atty. Ed Schmidt, City Attorney's Office

CALL TO ORDER

Commissioner Riley called the meeting to order at 6:57 p.m. A quorum was present.

CITY BUSINESS.

(14-70) Text Amendment – Petition of the City of Bridgeport Office of Planning & Economic Development (OPED) – Seeking to amend the maximum height of buildings in the R-A zone to add a footnote to Table 3, exchanging the 28' mid-point requirement to 2 ½ stories.

Commissioner Freddino called the item. Commissioner Riley explained for the public that this was a housekeeping issue. The basic amendment had been approved at the previous meeting and one small item had accidentally been omitted. Mr. Kooris came forward and explained that this change had been previously approved for two other tables.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak in favor of this application. No one came forward. Commissioner Riley then asked if there was anyone present who wished to oppose this application. Hearing none, Commissioner Riley closed the public hearing on the proposed text amendment to add a footnote to Table 3.

DEFERRED BUSINESS.

D-1 (14-66) 2155 Commerce Drive – Petition of One Commerce Drive, LLC – Seeking a site plan review, a coastal site plan review, and an approval of location for a new car dealership license to permit the construction of an 18,752sq. ft. 2-story commercial building in an I-L zone and coastal area.

Atty. Quatrella came forward and introduced himself to the Commissioners. He then stated for the record that he had the mailing receipts to the neighbors, and photos of the notice signs and submitted these to Mr. Buckley. He then gave an overview of the property and said that there was a contract purchaser for the parcel. He explained that the parcel was unique in that 75% was located in Bridgeport with the remaining 25% in Fairfield, including the mailing address.

Commissioner Phillips asked if there was a letter from the Regional Planning Council document stating that this parcel was located in two towns. Atty. Quatrella responded staff had received this. Commissioner Phillips asked if this item had been on the agenda last month. Atty. Quatrella said it was. Commissioner Phillips pointed out that the response from the original Council should have been included in last month's information. Commissioner Phillips then asked Mr. Buckley if there had been a response from the Regional Council on this application. Atty. Quatrella pointed out that as part of the approval process, the applicant would need to have approvals from both Bridgeport and Fairfield. Commissioner Phillips said that the applicant would need the comments from the Regional Planning Council by State statute. Atty. Quatrella said that the forms had been submitted but he did not know if Mr. Buckley received them. He reminded everyone that this application has been deferred last month. Commissioner Phillips asked if notice had been given to the Regional Planning Council that this application would be submitted. Discussion followed.

Commissioner Riley said that the City's attorney had informed him that this application would have to be delayed until the Commission receives the letter from the Regional Planning Council. Because this involves two different municipalities, it is critical. Atty. Quatrella asked if the public hearing would be kept open. Commissioner Phillips said that the hearing would have to remain open. Commissioner Phillips stated that the State requires the commentary from the Regional Council to be part of the record. Atty. Quatrella said that there was no meeting in December. Commissioner Riley confirmed this. Atty. Quatrella then pointed out that the case would be deferred to January. Commissioner Phillips suggested that Atty. Quatrella confirm that the letter was received by Fairfield Zoning before opening the public hearing there. Discussion followed.

Atty. Quatrella went on to explain that the property is unique not only because the property bridge two towns, but that the proposed building would also be located in both towns. He then added that the Rooster River had been the dividing line between Bridgeport and Trumbull and how this had been changed by the Army Corps of Engineers. Both the town lines and the old Rooster River bed are indicated on the plans. He add that there had been an application before the Planning and Zoning Commission that included a self-storage facility and a restaurant/retail building that had not been constructed yet. The applicant would be purchasing everything west of that previously approved parcel. He went on to describe the various other neighboring parcels.

The site is approximately 2.03 acres, with 3/4ths in Bridgeport and 1/4th in Fairfield. The site is fully developed has a current building, which will be demolished as part of the project. The paving will also be demolished and replaced. Approximately 84% of the site is impervious and the paving will be reduced to approximately 78%. This will increase the landscaping area on the site.

Atty. Quatrella then reviewed the details about the new Land Rover and Jaguar dealership building for with the Commissioners. He then explained that the dealership was being relocated in Bridgeport from Milford. Atty. Quatrella then informed the Commissioners that there would be 23 jobs coming with the relocation.

Atty. Quatrella then distributed copies of photos showing what the facility looks like. He then introduced the project architect.

Atty. Quatrella said that Commerce Drive has become “Automobile Row” in Fairfield and this would extend it into Bridgeport. The architect then went on to describe the proposed project and spoke about how it was in the coastal area.

Commissioner Phillips asked who the dealership would be owned by. She was told that the owner would be a franchisee of Jaguar and Land Rover. The owner presently owns a business in Milford. Atty. Quatrella then gave an overview of the details of the two businesses.

Commissioner Freddino asked about the present dealership that was located in Milford. She was told that the entire operation would be moved to Bridgeport.

Another question was asked about whether the Land Rover rock walls would be included in the landscaping. Atty. Quatrella then indicated where this would be located on the site plan. Another question was asked about the number of parking spaces, which the staff reviewed with the Commission. It was estimated that there would not be more than 50 vehicles on site at any time. There are 99 parking spaces presently on the site.

Commissioner Phillips asked if the 99 parking spaces would be shared by both dealerships or just used by one. She was told that both would be sharing because there is only one building and the two dealerships would be sharing the facility with two distinct showrooms. Discussion followed.

Atty. Quatrella then reminded everyone that the design coordinator had approved the plans. The Fire Marshal had no comments, and OLISP had no comments.

Commissioner Riley asked what would happen if Fairfield made changes in the design. Atty. Quatrella said that the applicant would have to come back to Bridgeport for the design modifications. Commissioner Riley said that this would be another reason to keep the hearing open. Atty. Quatrella said that there needed to be a discussion with police and

fire about first responders. There will also be discussions about who will be responsible for site inspections and other similar duties.

The architect came forward and reviewed the details of the site plan with the Commissioners. He indicated where the town line was located on the plan. The building will be concrete. He pointed out that presently, all the storm drainage goes directly into the Rooster River, which is a tidal river. This new project will improve the water quality since the run off will be treated before it reaches the river. The river is located along the eastern side of the property.

The architect then went on to speak about the location of the shoreline and the conditions that applied to the application. An underground storm water storage system will allow the particles to separate out. Commissioner Riley informed the architect that the Planning and Zoning Commissioners also serve as the Inland Wetlands Committee. The architect pointed out that since the parcel is also located in Fairfield, the Fairfield Conservation Committee would be reviewing the application and the proposed water treatment system as well.

The architect then gave a brief overview of how the tractor trailers would enter the site, offload and then exit the parcel, along with how the fire or emergency vehicles would have access. He concluded his presentation by saying that other than these issues, the application was fairly straight forward.

The Commission wished to know if there would be a full service department at the location. The architect said that there would be. He then reviewed the details and the location of the service area.

Commissioner Phillips asked whether the building would be located in both towns. She was told that this was so. Discussion followed about the details.

The presentation continued with a review of the floor plan. Commissioner Riley asked how many models each of the brands would have. He was told that there would be between 8 vehicles inside the building but the plans show a ninth space, which is actually a delivery bay.

The discussion then moved back to the details of the service bay area, including the drop off station, the wash station and the actual repair bays.

The second floor of the building will be office space and a section for parts. This area will be for employees only. The offices and storages areas will not be over where the vehicles are being serviced.

Commissioner Phillips wished to know how the soap and water would be disposed of in the wash bays. She was told that the water would drain into a recycling system and be reused.

Commissioner Phillips then wished to know how the oil and other fluids would be handled in the oil and lube center. She also wished to know if the wash recycling system was a closed water system. She was told that it was. The water will be held in an underground tank and the particulate will settle out. Then the holding tank will be pumped out. The fluids from the vehicles will also be held in underground storage tanks and pumped out once a year. The used oil goes into a separate tank from the other fluids. These are then pumped out by a company that handled these types of waste fluids. Commissioner Phillips asked where the tanks would be located. She was told that the tanks had not been included in the drawings yet, however the oil separator was a standard utility. There is a metal grating on the floor and the fluids drain that way.

Drawings of the exterior were displayed next with a narrative of how the building would be situated on the site and where various item such as driveways, drop off point, and the showrooms were located.

The traffic engineer came forward to present the traffic evaluation. He indicated where Interstate 95 was located in relation to the building. The traffic count was done during a week day and a separate one was also done on a Saturday at 2 p.m. He then reviewed the information contained in a table that was compiled from two traffic locations on Commerce Drive including peak periods with the Commission. He said that there would be no noticeable impact on the traffic.

Commissioner Riley asked if this would generate less traffic than Connecticut Limousine did during its normal operating period. The engineer said that this was so. Commissioner Riley commented that Connecticut Limousine actually transported people. It was pointed out that during Connecticut Limousine's normal operating period, the vehicles were continually coming in and out of the site around the clock. This traffic study focused on the rush hours in the morning and in the evening.

Commissioner Freddino asked if any landscaping was included. She was told that there would be landscaping. She asked if there would be anything located in front of the property. Atty. Quatrella said that there was a 15% landscaping requirement in the I-L zone and that there was 18.6% under the existing conditions. The new facility will have 21.2%.

Commissioner Morton wished to know how the inventory would be handled between Bridgeport and Fairfield, since Fairfield's taxes on inventory are probably lower than Bridgeport's. Atty. Quatrella said that there had been some discussion regarding all taxation, the first responders, and other similar issues. There will be a inter-municipal agreement between Fairfield and Bridgeport. This agreement will cover the issue of taxes

since both the building and the land will be located in both towns. The applicant is very excited about this location since his parcel probably has the best visibility of any of the dealerships.

Commissioner Phillips asked about the sidewalks on the street. She was told that there would be sidewalks across the front of the property. Commissioner Phillips wished to know how many curb cuts there would be. She was told that there would be two. These were indicated on the site plan. One of the cuts will be an entrance/exit and the second one, which will be by the service bay, will be exit only.

Commissioner Phillips wished to know where the turning point for the tractor trailers was located. Atty. Quatrella indicated where this was located on the site plan.

It was asked if there would be older vehicles located on the site as well. It was pointed out that the allocation of parking spaces that were based on employees, owner cars and clients does not leave many other parking places. The architect explained that the owner vehicles would be there for service, so they would be moved to the back for the service and the wash.

Atty. Quatrella came forward and said that this project would be in harmony with the existing businesses. The traffic issues will actually reduce the number of vehicles. The plan conforms to the Bridgeport site plan review standards and those in Fairfield. Atty. Quatrella then requested that the Planning and Zoning Commission consider granting this application.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak in favor of the application.

Council Member Susan Brannelly, one of the Council representatives for the district, came forward to speak in favor of the application. She listed the reasons why she was in support of the application. She said that this would enhance Bridgeport and was in full favor of it.

Mr. David Kooris, the Director of the Office of Planning and Economic Development (OPED), came forward to speak in favor. He said that the use was consistent with the zone and that the site plan effectively manages the type of traffic. His office supports this application. This business will be located at one of the gateways into Bridgeport.

Commissioner Freddino stated that she had a letter from Mr. John Gaucher of the Office of Long Island Sound Program, dated October 20, 2014 regarding this application. Mr. Gaucher said that he had done an onsite inspection in coordination with the Fairfield Coastal Management Liaison due to the fact that the site is located in two towns. Mr. Gaucher noted the following:

- Regarding the site conditions: The property is located in both Bridgeport and Fairfield along Ash Creek. The banks of the creek are steeply sloped along the subject parcel. Vegetation along the creek is primarily limited to the immediate embankment except near the entrance to the property where there is a fairly flat area of grass adjacent to the top of the embankment. The edge of the existing parking lot edge of the parcel, which is bordered by curbing, extends into many areas close to the top of the bank of the creek.

- Potential areas of inconsistency with CAM policy:

- 1) The proposed conditions to maintain the parking areas close to the area of the steep bank in most cases, but areas of wider buffer exist, encroachment will exist closer to the creek. If bank encroachment occurs, which could threaten to undermine the proposed parking area, corrective action could likely include structural solutions, particularly given the steep slopes along the creek. Such solutions would typically be disallowed in accordance with the current CAM policies. Therefore, the proposed development designs for this site should reflect the potential condition to insure that structural erosion control measures would not become necessary and unavoidable during the life of the proposed uses and structures. Accordingly, we recommend that an additional creek buffer be designed into the project to minimize the potential need for the erosion control structure at this site.

- 2) The proposed storm water treatment, EMP, the rain garden and subsurface erosion control galleries are located close to the creek. Construction of the proposed rain garden appears to require manipulation of the creek's embankment to install the reinforced turf mat. The discharge overflow from the proposed subsurface infiltration galleries system is to be located above midway up the creek bank. Construction and disturbance of the bank should be avoided if possible. Any overflow should be discharged to the existing municipal storm water system so that the discharge would be added to an existing outlet. We are also concerned about exfiltration from the gallery system saturating and destabilizing the lower creek bank over time or even just discharging to the bank's surface. Is there any technical reason why the gallery system cannot be located significantly further from the creek?

- 3) The chief flow from the parking lot on to the adjacent grass area located at the western end of the property is appropriate but should be directed away from the creek bank towards the flattest area. We appreciate the constraints to managing and treating storm water run off due to the property's proximity to Ash Creek, but prior development has already significantly impact this sensitive area adjacent to the creek. We recommend that the alternative design approaches to treating storm water run off generated on the site be explored, that at a minimum, cause no further degradation of the area along the creek or its bank and potentially restore some of the natural buffer.

Let me know if you would like to discuss a proposal for any potential alternatives.

John Gaucher, Environmental Analyst, Office of Long Island Sound Program.

Atty. Quatrella said that the applicant would be incorporating those comments into the design. He gave the details of the changes. He spoke about how the previous development had discharged all their run off directly into the Rooster River and how this proposal would significantly improve the situation. The plans were revised with Mr. Gaucher's comments included. Commissioner Freddino asked for confirmation that the applicant had indeed revised the plans accordingly. Atty. Quatrella said that the applicant had responded to him both verbally and in written form. Commissioner Riley said that the hearing would remain open and that another letter from Mr. Gaucher affirming that the changes had been made would be needed for the record.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in opposition to the application. No one else came forward.

Atty. Quatrella came forward to request a continuance of the application for the purposed of obtaining the letter from the Planning agency and an updated letter from Mr. Gaucher. Commissioner Riley then announced that the public hearing portion of this application was closed but the application would be continued.

RECESS.

Commissioner Riley announced a recess. He reconvened the meeting a short time later.

D-2 (14-68) 3115-3129, 3135 Fairfield Avenue & 704 Courtland Avenue – Petition of 3115 Fairfield Avenue, LLC – Seeking a site plan review and a coastal site plan review to permit the construction of a 4-story, 43-unit apartment building in an OR zone and coastal area.

Atty. Raymond Rizio came forward and introduced himself to the Commission. He said that he was representing the applicant regarding this significant project on Fairfield Avenue. He explained that this project had been before the Commissioner earlier but significant changes had been made to the project such as a reduction of the height, a change from a five story building to a four story building and additional parking being included on site. This application had been presented to the ZBA. He noted that even though the property was primarily located in an OR zone, a small portion was in an RC zone. Because of this, the project had to be reviewed with an RC standard. This was why the changes were made. The RC requires 30% landscaping on the property and a reduction of density along major corridors. The ZBA approved the application at their September meeting and it was recorded in the land records.

The parking is now compliant. The applicant had to request a variance because the parking needs to be stacked in the garage underneath the building. Atty. Rizio then indicated where the parking was on the site plan. The five stacked parking spaces will be

assigned to the two bedroom units. The regulations required 65 parking spaces and the project now has 66.

In the previous plan, Engineering had requested that the two spaces on Courtland, which would have required the drivers to back out onto Courtland, be eliminated. These two spaces were moved into the garage area and additional landscaping was added.

Atty. Rizio explained that the reason that the applicant was before the Commission was because the project was located in a coastal zone. He said that a letter from Mr. Gaucher should have been included in the Commission's information packets. The letter states that the project is consistent with the Connecticut Coastal Management policies.

The letter is dated November 20th. Commissioner Phillips said that her letter was dated October 14th. Commissioner Freddino said that the most recent letter was dated November 20th. She then read the following letter into the record.

From John Gaucher,
Thursday, November 20, 2014
To Dennis Buckley.

Dear Dennis,

We have received the above reference proposal for consistency with the Connecticut Coastal Management Act policy. The covered parking below the proposed units must be equipped with an oil and water separator connected to the municipal sewer system. Otherwise, we have no comments for the applicant or for the Commission's consideration. Please let me know if you have any questions or if you need any additional information.

John Gaucher, Environmental Analyst 3, Office of Long Island Sound Program.

Atty. Rizio stated that the applicant was willing to accept the addition of the oil and water separator as a condition of approval.

He then reviewed the application with the Commission. The parking will be underneath the building since the grade of the parcel permits this. There is no variance required for height and the project is consistent with the construction practices. The site plan review standards require entrances to the building on the main street. He indicated where these would be and also pointed out the entrance that is located off the side roads. Atty. Rizio then reviewed where the curb cuts would be located on the property. There will be 11 units on the first three floors and 10 units on the fourth floor serviced by an elevator. There will be handicapped units and parking. The handicapped spaces will be located next to the elevator. There will be no labeled visitor parking spaces. Approximately 29 spaces will be under the building and the remaining spaces will be outside.

Atty. Rizio said that the project has received all the variance approvals needed and complied with all the site plan review standards. The City Engineer is requiring No Parking signs on one of the streets at the developer's expense. The applicant has no problem with this as a condition of approval. Atty. Rizio said that the Building Department could require this anyway when the developer goes to apply for the building permit.

Atty. Rizio reminded everyone that there are 66 parking spaces for 65 bedrooms and that the landscaping exceeds the OR standards and basically exceeds anything along the Fairfield Avenue corridor. The only reason that the application was before the Commission was for coastal site plan approval.

A question was asked regarding the building number cited on the address listed on a letter from John McCready. Atty. Rizio said that on the original application it was listed as 331-35 Fairfield Avenue. Mr. Buckley said that the Engineer had already gone ahead and assigned an address to the project.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak in favor of the application.

Mr. David Kooris, the Office of Planning and Economic Development Director, came forward and said that this was a great project and is a project that the department would like to see along the major transit corridor. His office was supportive of the variances and there will be some adjustments on the zoning regulations in the future. This is located on a gateway to the City.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in opposition to the application. Hearing no opposition, Commissioner Riley closed the public hearing on 3115-3129, 3135 Fairfield Avenue & 704 Courtland Avenue.

NEW BUSINESS.

(14-72) 210 Washington Avenue. – Petition of Laurels II Limited Partnership – Seeking a special permit and site plan review to construct a 4-story, 9-unit addition to the existing 81-unit apartment building in an R-C zone.

Atty. Raymond Rizio came forward and introduced himself to the Commission. He stated that he was present to represent the applicant. This special project will replace the former L'Ambiance Plaza, where there was a tragic collapse of the partially constructed building and a large loss of lives. Following this, Judge Santano managed to settle the claims and redesign a project for the site that allowed the families of the victims to share

the profits from the new construction, which is called Renaissance Plaza. Now the building is 23 years old and needs renovations.

The application is for nine additional units located in the rear of the property and all the funds will be used to refurbish the existing units. He then reviewed the details of the site plan and explained that the roof of the garage would be redone to provide a courtyard which is contained by the nine new units.

Commissioner Riley asked about the right of first refusal. Atty. Rizio said that there would be an evaluation of the requests. Commissioner Riley said that the issue was not a zoning matter.

This project will add more subsidized housing, Atty. Rizio said. He pointed out that while there would be an increase in units, the number of parking spaces would remain the same. At the present time, there is adequate parking and the manager of the facility submitted a letter stating that there have never been more than 30 or 40 vehicles parked in the spaces. Atty. Rizio said that he had visited the site numerous times at various times and the garage has always been half empty. He reminded everyone that this parcel is located on public transportation routes and is deed restricted. This will prevent the building from being converted into another type of use with an increase in vehicles.

Commissioner Freddino asked if anyone had checked the structure of the garage roof. Atty. Rizio said that this had been done and the engineer was present to answer questions.

Atty. Rizio said that there had been discussions with the residents and submitted a petition signed by almost all of the residents in favor of this project.

Atty. Rizio then reviewed the details of the site with the Commissioners. He pointed out that the flat roof would be turned into courtyard for the residents and this would increase the landscaping. Everything else will be constructed within the confines of the existing footprint. The building is located in an RC zone and across the street from mid rise apartments and by a shopping center. While this is underway, the structure will be renovated and all the financing is in place.

Engineering had no problems but the Fire Marshal had a few issues. These have resolved. The letter from the Fire Marshal in the information packet addresses travel distances to the various exits. The applicant responded to that on November 12th with the code and other references. Atty. Rizio said that the applicant believes he has satisfied all the Fire Marshal's concerns and any further discussion will take place when the building permit is applied for.

Atty. Rizio said that there was an October 22nd letter regarding the drainage tying into the existing City sewers.

There will not be any additional traffic, the financing is already in place and the site plan standards have been met.

Commissioner Freddino asked about a roof sign or advertising sign mentioned in Mr. Guerrero's design review letter. Atty. Rizio said that this was included because the project includes adding an additional story to the building. There are no plans to have a roof or advertising sign.

Atty. Rizio was asked why the back apartments were not included when the original structure was built. He explained that the original L' Ambiance plan was for 216 units but after the tragedy, the plan was significantly downsized. Since then, things have changed. Atty. Rizio was asked if the units would receive enough natural light. He responded that he believed they would have plenty of light and also would have an external patio for the residents. The architect then came forward to discuss the design with the Commission. He pointed out that by using the existing footprint and adding the units, it will provide the financing to renovate the existing units, and also add the courtyard. The new courtyard will be a green space.

Commissioner Freddino asked about the structure's integrity. The architect explained that structural integrity will be examined closely in the next phase of the project, which is the application for a Building permit. He went on to give the details of the various considerations that will be reviewed.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak in favor of the application. No one came forward. Commissioner Riley asked Atty. Rizio how many signatures were on the petition in support of the project. Atty. Rizio said that there were just over 40 signatures on that document.

Commissioner Riley then asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in opposition to the application. Hearing no opposition, Commissioner Riley closed the public hearing on 210 Washington Avenue.

(14-73) – 1407 Fairfield Avenue – Seeking a special permit and a site plan review to permit the establishment of a full service restaurant with live entertainment in an OR-G zone.

Atty. Diane Lord of Willinger, Willinger and Bucci came forward and turned in the mailings for the project. She introduced herself to the Commission and said that she was representing the client. She indicated the space where the take out and delivery restaurant occupied on a site plan and stated that the owners wanted to expand to a full service restaurant. The customers have also indicated they would support a full service restaurant. The current take out has been at that location since 2011 and is approximately 1,600 square feet. Their other site is located in Norwalk.

Atty. Lord reviewed the proposed hours of operation with the Commissioners. The building was formerly a commercial bakery. There would be no changes to the existing building if the full service restaurant was approved.

Commissioner Riley said that the WPCA had requested to see the storm water management plan, the recharge system and the fat, oil and grease separator system included on the plan. Atty. Lord indicated where it was on the plan. Commissioner Riley asked if there would be a problem with included these items as conditions of approval. Atty. Lord said that there would be no problem with that. A brief discussion followed.

Atty. Lord then reviewed the plans for the full service restaurant. Commissioner Riley asked why the applicant needed a stage. He pointed out that a stage could be used for adult entertainment and that whatever is granted stays with the property even after the business is sold.

Commissioner Phillips asked if there were apartments above the restaurant. Atty. Lord said that there was no second floor over that section.

Atty. Lord said that the request was to share parking, which are used by the warehouse, the pharmacy and the restaurant. The restaurant requires 40, the pharmacy requires 16 and the warehouse requires 3. The peak hours of the restaurant will occur when both the warehouse and the pharmacy are closed. She then submitted two statements: one from the owner of the pharmacy and one from the organization that owns the warehouse regarding their hours of operation and the parking.

The Hancock Pharmacy is a delivery pharmacy. Commissioner Riley asked how many vehicles the Hancock Pharmacy had because he frequently sees the vehicles in town. It was explained that there were six vehicles and they are not parked on the lot after hours.

Atty. Lord then submitted copies of a sample menu to the Commissioners.

She then said that she had received the Engineer's report earlier in the day and that there were no significant issues contained in it. The WPCA issues will be addressed.

Commissioner Freddino wished to know what would be served in the bar area. Atty. Lord said that it would be a full bar with seating available. She explained that it would be fairly small and would be separated from the dining area as required by law.

Commissioner Freddino asked if the applicant already had a liquor license. Atty. Lord said that the applicant did not have one, but will be applying for one.

Commissioner Phillips asked about the storm water drainage being connected to the combined sanitary storm water system. She said that the recommendation was that the drainage be connected to the storm water system for the site drainage. Atty. Lord pointed out that the statement was that "if the system was connected to the combined system, it

should be disconnected.” Commissioner Phillips asked if Atty. Lord knew which system the building was connected to. Atty. Lord said that she did not know, but she would look into it. Commissioner Freddino said that if the building was connected to the combined system, it would be one of the conditions. It was then noted that the requirement for the combined system was for another application.

Commissioner Freddino asked if the letters that had been submitted were sufficient or if there would be a shared parking agreement. Atty. Lord said that the area was all one address. Commissioner Riley asked if the owner of the property was present. Atty. Lord said that the owner of the Hancock Pharmacy was present and he would also be a partner in the proposed restaurant.

Atty. Lord then addressed the landscaping requirements and said that it was currently at slightly over 13% for the entire parcel. She also reviewed the various requirements for the application and noted that the existing building was not being changed. Commissioner Riley noted that Mr. Guerrero stated in his letter that the proposed application would not depreciate property values of the adjoining properties and the change of use would not be disruptive to the existing businesses.

Commissioner Freddino asked if the restaurant would be open until 2 a.m. on Friday and Saturday. Atty. Lord said that it would. Commissioner Freddino said that the application said it would also be open until 2 a.m. on Thursday also. Atty. Lord said that it would only be Friday and Saturday. Commissioner Freddino asked about the noise on those nights. Atty. Lord said that it would be inside the building. Commissioner Freddino said that if a window was opened, the noise would be heard outside. She said that she lives behind a building that is rented out for weddings and the windows are often opened during the summer, which allows the music to blast out into the neighborhood. Commissioner Freddino wished to know if the building was air conditioned. Atty. Lord indicated where the residences were on the site plan. Atty. Lord said that the area where the music would be is buffered.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone present who would like to speak in favor of the application.

One of the residents came forward and said that he was the President of the Spanish American Club in Bridgeport and was present in support of the application.

Commissioner Riley then asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in opposition to the application. Hearing no opposition, Commissioner Riley closed the public hearing on 1407 Fairfield Avenue.

(14-74) 251 North Avenue – Seeking a special permit and a site plan review to permit the establishment of a school for barbering, as well as, a barber shop in an I-L zone.

Mr. Steve McKenzie came forward to present the application for the applicant. He said that there was a small parking lot on the property. He explained that the owner was not changing anything other than the use. There will be some internal renovations to open up the space for more barber chairs.

Commissioner Riley asked what the requirements were for operating a barbering school in the State of Connecticut. He pointed out that there would be a difference in licensing between a barbershop and a hair dressers, which the application will be doing both. Mr. McKenzie said that the applicant has both types of licenses. Discussion followed.

The business will be in a storefront, so that the operations can be seen. He reviewed the details. Commissioner Freddino asked if the applicant will be occupying both floors of the entire building. Mr. McKenzie said that this was so. Commissioner Freddino asked for confirmation that the applicant had a license for both a beauty school and a barbering school. Mr. McKenzie said that this was so. Commissioner Freddino asked if the applicant was currently operating a beauty school. Mr. McKenzie said that he was running a beauty salon for women and a barber shop for men. Commissioner Freddino asked for confirmation that the applicant wanted to begin a school to teach the techniques. Mr. McKenzie said that he already runs both. Commissioner Freddino asked if the applicant was looking for a new location for his four businesses, the hair salon, the barber shop and the two schools. Mr. McKenzie said that this was so.

Commissioner Freddino said that if the application is approved, the applicant will not change the footprint of the building, but will be renovating the interior. These renovations will include an HVAC system because of the chemicals needed. When Mr. McKenzie confirmed this, the Commissioner wished to know what other changes would be made to the interior. Mr. McKenzie said some of the walls would be removed to open up the space. Commissioner Riley asked for a copy of the proposed floor plan. However this would be finalized at the permitting stage. Commissioner Freddino pointed out that the regulations require an A-1 survey. The one that was included in the information packet was not a certified floor plan. She said that the application did not mention a beauty salon. Commissioner Riley noted that if this was not correct, it had not been posted properly in the paper. Discussion followed.

Mr. McKenzie was told that he needed to correct the wording on the application to include the beauty salon portion, and have certified floor plans available.

Commissioner Freddino asked if there was an easement for the driveway. Mr. McKenzie reviewed the details. Commissioner Freddino pointed out that there were some spaces on the site plan that would require backing into the State right of way and this is not acceptable to the State. A number of spaces are not useable without maneuvering onto the neighboring property. That is from the Engineering Department. Mr. McKenzie said that he had a set easement in writing.

The discussion moved back to the A-1 survey. Mr. Buckley pointed out that the building permits would require the survey and address the parking issues. Commissioner Freddino pointed out that the application only had two of the businesses listed, not the four that the applicant wanted to have on site.

The owner came forward and spoke about the barbering school and the cosmetology school and explained that both schools were combined, which is allowed. Commissioner Riley pointed out that the barbering license is less than the hair dressing license.

Mr. McKenzie requested a continuation of the application and waived the 65 days rule due to the fact that there would be no meeting in December.

RECESS.

Commissioner Riley declared a recess at 9:15 p.m. He reconvened the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

DECISION SESSION.

(14-70) Text Amendment – Petition of the City of Bridgeport Office of Planning & Economic Development (OPED) – Seeking to amend the maximum height of buildings in the R-A zone to add a footnote to Table 3, exchanging the 28’ mid-point requirement to 2 ½ stories.

**** COMMISSIONER FREDDINO MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM 14-70 – TEXT AMENDMENT – PETITION OF THE CITY OF BRIDGEPORT (OPED) – SEEKING TO AMEND THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS IN THE R-A ZONE TO ADD A FOOTNOTE TO TABLE 3, EXCHANGING THE 28’ MID-POINT REQUIREMENT TO 2 ½ STORIES. WITH THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF DECEMBER 1, 2014. FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON: ☐ ☐**

CLEARs UP AN OVERSIGHT/OMISSION FROM THE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED AMENDMENT RELATING TO 2 ½ STORIES OF HEIGHT FOR A RESIDENTIAL BUILDING IN RESIDENTIAL ZONES.

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON SECONDED.
** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

D-1 (14-66) 2155 Commerce Drive – Petition of One Commerce Drive, LLC – Seeking a site plan review, a coastal site plan review, and an approval of location for a new car dealership license to permit the construction of an 18,752 sq. ft. 2-story commercial building in an I-L zone and coastal area.

**** COMMISSIONER FREDDINO MOVED TO CONTINUE AGENDA ITEM D-1 (14-66) 2155 COMMERCE DRIVE – PETITION OF ONE COMMERCE DRIVE, LLC – SEEKING A SITE PLAN REVIEW, A COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEW, AND AN APPROVAL OF LOCATION FOR A NEW CAR DEALERSHIP LICENSE TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN 18,752 SQ. FT. 2-STORY COMMERCIAL BUILDING IN AN I-L ZONE AND COASTAL AREA TO JANUARY 26, 2015 AT 6:45PM FOR DECISION ONLY, AS INPUT FROM THE GREATER BRIDGEPORT REGIONAL COUNCIL (GBRC) IS NOT REQUIRED.**

**** COMMISSIONER RODRÍGUEZ SECONDED.
** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

D-2 (14-68) 3115-3129, 3135 Fairfield Avenue & 704 Courtland Avenue – Petition of 3115 Fairfield Avenue, LLC - Seeking a site plan review and a coastal site plan review to permit the construction of a 4-story, 43-unit apartment building in an OR zone and coastal area.

**** COMMISSIONER FREDDINO MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM D-2 (14-68) 3115-3129, 3135 FAIRFIELD AVENUE & 704 COURTLAND AVENUE - SEEKING A SITE PLAN REVIEW AND A COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEW TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 4-STORY, 43-UNIT APARTMENT BUILDING IN AN OR ZONE AND COASTAL AREA FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON:**

THE PROJECT, AS APPROVED, COMPLIES WITH THE SITE PLAN REVIEW STANDARDS OF SEC. 14-2-5, AND AS TO THE COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEW, THIS PROJECT WILL HAVE NO ADVERSE IMPACT ON THE COASTAL AREA.

THE EXPIRATION DATE OF THE COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEW, AS REQUIRED UNDER SEC. 14-3-4 OF THE ZONING REGULATIONS OF THE CITY OF BRIDGEPORT, CT HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED AS DECEMBER 1, 2015.

**** COMMISSIONER FEDELE SECONDED.
** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

(14-72) 210 Washington Avenue. – Petition of Laurels II Limited Partnership – Seeking a special permit and site plan review to construct a 4-story, 9-unit addition to the existing 81-unit apartment building in an R-C zone.

**** COMMISSIONER FILOTEI MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM (14-72) 210 WASHINGTON AVENUE – PETITION OF LAURELS II LIMITED PARTNERSHIP – SEEKING A SPECIAL PERMIT AND SITE PLAN REVIEW TO CONSTRUCT A 4-STORY, 9-UNIT ADDITION TO THE EXISTING 81-UNIT APARTMENT BUILDING IN AN R-C ZONE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- 1. THE PROJECT, AS APPROVED, SHALL BE IN STRICT ACCORD TO THE PLANS SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION.**
- 2. THE PETITIONER IS TO ADHERE TO ALL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CITY ENGINEER IN HIS LETTER DATED 11/21/14.**
- 3. ALL CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE BASIC BUILDING CODE OF THE STATE OF CT.**

FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

- 1. PROVIDES NEW LOW-INCOME HOUSING FOR THE BRIDGEPORT RESIDENTS.**
- 2. THE PROJECT IS IN KEEPING WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MASTER PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT.**
- 3. THE PROJECT, AS APPROVED, COMPLIES WITH THE SITE PLAN REVIEW STANDARDS OF SEC. 14-2-5, AS WELL AS THE SPECIAL PERMIT REQUIREMENTS OF SEC. 14-4-4 OF THE ZONING REGULATION OF THE CITY OF BRIDGEPORT.**

THE EXPIRATION DATE OF THE SPECIAL PERMIT APPROVAL, AS REQUIRED UNDER SEC. 14-4-5 OF THE ZONING REGULATIONS OF THE CITY OF BRIDGEPORT, CT HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED AS DECEMBER 1, 2015.

**** COMMISSIONER MORENO SECONDED.
** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

(14-73) – 1407 Fairfield Avenue – Petition of La Mexicana 2, LLC - Seeking a special permit and a site plan review to permit the establishment of a full service restaurant with live entertainment in an OR-G zone.

**** COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM (14-73) – 1407 FAIRFIELD AVENUE SEEKING A SPECIAL PERMIT AND A SITE PLAN REVIEW TO PERMIT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A FULL SERVICE RESTAURANT WITH LIVE ENTERTAINMENT IN AN OR-G ZONE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. THE RAISED PLATFORM/STAGE TO BE REMOVED.
2. GREASE AND OIL SEPARATOR SHALL BE INSTALLED AS REQUIRED BY THE W.P.C.A. MANAGER IN HIS MEMO DATED 11/6/14.
3. THE APPLICANT IS TO ADHERE TO ALL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CITY ENGINEER IN HIS LETTER DATED 11/21/14.
4. ENTERTAINMENT IS LIMITED TO THE INSIDE OF THE SUBJECT PREMISES AND SHALL ONLY CONSIST OF SMALL BANDS, DJ'S, AND ACOUSTICAL MUSICIANS.

FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

1. PROVIDES A FAMILY TYPE RESTAURANT AND PLACE OF ENTERTAINMENT FOR A GROWING POPULATION IN THE CITY OF BRIDGEPORT.
2. THE APPROVAL OF THIS PETITION WILL HAVE NO UNACCEPTABLE IMPACT ON THE IMMEDIATE AREA.

THE EXPIRATION DATE OF THE SPECIAL PERMIT APPROVAL, AS REQUIRED UNDER SEC. 14-4-5 OF THE ZONING REGULATIONS OF THE CITY OF BRIDGEPORT, CT HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED AS DECEMBER 1, 2015.

**** COMMISSIONER FEDELE SECONDED.
** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

(14-74) 251 North Avenue – Petition of Al's Millennium Cuts, LLC - Seeking a special permit and a site plan review to permit the establishment of a school for barbering, as well as, a barber shop in an I-L zone.

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON MOVED TO CONTINUE THE APPLICATION TO JANUARY 26, 2015 AT 6:45PM FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND MODIFICATION OF THE LEGAL AD IN THE CT POST.
** COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS SECONDED.
** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

CONSENT AGENDA.

(CA-1) 15 Hemlock St - Petition of Shoreline Collision – Seeking under Sec. 14-54 of the CT. General Statutes an amended certificate of approval of location for a DMV general repairer's license under new ownership in an I-L zone.

**** COMMISSIONER RODRÍGUEZ MOVED TO APPROVE (CA-1) 15 HEMLOCK ST - PETITION OF SHORELINE COLLISION – SEEKING UNDER SEC. 14-54 OF THE CT. GENERAL STATUTES AN AMENDED CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL OF LOCATION FOR A DMV GENERAL REPAIRER’S LICENSE UNDER NEW OWNERSHIP IN AN I-L ZONE WITH CONDITIONS “D”.**

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON
** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Minutes of September 29, 2014 –

**** COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS MOVED THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 29, 2014.**

**** COMMISSIONER RODRÍGUEZ SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 29, 2014 AS SUBMITTED PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Minutes of October 27, 2014 –

**** COMMISSIONER FEDELE MOVED THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 27, 2014.**

**** COMMISSIONER RODRÍGUEZ SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 27, 2014 AS SUBMITTED PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

ADJOURNMENT.

**** COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS MOVED TO ADJOURN.**

**** COMMISSIONER FILOTEI SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

S. L. Soltes
Telesco Secretarial Services