

**CITY OF BRIDGEPORT  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
REGULAR MEETING  
JANUARY 12, 2016**

**ATTENDANCE:** Linda Grace, Acting Chair; John J. Carolan; Maria Alves; Leticia Colon

**STAFF:** Dennis Buckley, Zoning Official; Paul Boucher, Assistant Zoning Official; Diego Guevara, City Design Review Coordinator

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:20 PM. A quorum was present. The Chair explained that as there were only four members seated, the applicants were within their rights to defer in the interest of having a fully seated board.

Atty. Raymond Rizio came forward and asked to defer 3245 Fairfield Avenue (#2) and 2149 Seaview Avenue (#10). Steve McKenzie asked to defer 47-53 Crescent Avenue (#1).

The Chair announced that items #1, #2 and #10 would not be heard.

**CT CONTINUED ITEM**

**C-1 645 Pine St. – Petition of 645 Pine Street, LLC – Appealing of Sec. 14-10 of the Zoning Regulations of the City of Bridgeport and Sec. 8-7 of the CT General Statutes, whereby is alleged that the Zoning Enforcement Officer erred in his issuance of an Order to Comply regarding the erection of an on-premises roof sign without a special permit for the building housing the advertized use in an I-L zone.**

Atty. Rizio came forward and stated that as the consolidation of lots is moving forward and the City is not enforcing the ordinance, the petitioner wishes to withdraw the appeal and take it through compliance.

Mr. Buckley confirmed Atty. Rizio's assertion.

**NEW ITEMS**

**#3 199 & 201 Granfield Ave. – Petition of Habitat for Humanity of Coastal Fairfield County – Seeking a variance of the minimum lot area requirement of 9,000 sq. ft. of Sec. 5-1-3 to permit the construction of a 2-family dwelling on a 6,002 sq. ft. lot in an R-C zone.**

Kevin Wharton, Director of Construction for Habitat for Humanity came forward. He stated that he is appearing for a parcel to be divided into 3 lots, in which side by side single family homes will be built. Mr. Wharton stated that the lot has appeared before the commission before as a proposed 13 unit apartment building. He stated that it is an oddly shaped lot.

The Chair asked about the distribution of the dwellings. Mr. Wharton stated that each 2-family home will be a condo association, a typical practice for Habitat for Humanity. He further stated that a single family will inhabit the single family property.

The Chair asked if the inhabitants are on the board, and Mr. Wharton stated that the homeowners become the board.

Commissioner Alves asked for a clarification on the size of the units. Mr. Wharton stated that each unit is 3 bedrooms, 2 ½ baths. He stated that each unit has a minimum of two stacked parking spaces alongside each of the buildings.

The Chair asked if anyone would like to speak in favor of the application. No one came forward. She then asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition. Hearing none, the Chair closed the public hearing on 199 & 201 Granfield Avenue.

**#4 211 & 215 Granfield Ave. – Petition of Habitat for Humanity of Coastal Fairfield County – Seeking a variance of the minimum lot area requirement of 9,000 sq. ft. of Sec. 5-1-3 to permit the construction of a 2-family dwelling on a 6,016 sq. ft. lot in an R-C zone.**

Mr. Wharton stated that the proposal for item #4 is largely the same as the previous item and asked that the same testimony be utilized.

The Chair asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of the application. She then asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition. Hearing none, the Chair closed the public hearing on 211 & 215 Granfield Avenue.

**#5 225 & 227 Granfield Ave. – Petition of Habitat for Humanity of Coastal Fairfield County – Seeking a variance of the minimum lot area requirement of 9,000 sq. ft. of Sec. 5-1-3 to permit the construction of a 2-family dwelling on a 5,633 sq. ft. lot in an R-C zone.**

Mr. Wharton stated that the proposal for item #5 is largely the same as items #3 and #4, and asked that the same testimony be utilized.

The Chair asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of the application. She then asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition. Hearing none, the Chair closed the public hearing on 225 & 227 Granfield Avenue.

**#6 237 Granfield Ave. – Petition of Habitat for Humanity of Coastal Fairfield County – Seeking a variance of the minimum lot area requirement of 9,000 sq. ft. and front setback requirement of Sec. 5-1-3 to permit the construction of a single-family dwelling on a 4,649 sq. ft. lot in an R-C zone.**

Mr. Wharton stated that the item refers to a single family home on the same parcel, and asked that the testimony from the previous items (#3, #4, #5) be incorporated.

The Chair asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of the application. She then asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition. Hearing none, the Chair closed the public hearing on 237 Granfield Avenue.

**#7 194 East Ave. – Petition of Habitat for Humanity of Coastal Fairfield County – Seeking a variance of the minimum distance to the rear lot line requirement of Sec. 5-1-3 to permit the construction of a single-family dwelling on a non-conforming lot in an R-BB zone.**

The Chair stated that the house is already constructed, while it was advertised as per the application to construct. She stated that it needs to be a legalization rather than an application for new construction.

Mr. Buckley stated that it was noted improperly in the paper, and that the applicant will have to wait until next month to present.

**#8 2475 Fairfield Ave. – Petition of Monaco Motorsports, LLC – Seeking a use variance of Sec. 6-1-2 and also seeking variances of the minimum landscaping and maximum site coverage requirements of Sec. 6-1-3; the interior landscaping; perimeter landscaping and**

**parking setback requirements of Sec. 11-1-13 and a variance omitting 10 of the required 61 on-site parking space of Sec. 11-1-2 to permit an automotive repair, restoration and sales business in the existing commercial building in an OR zone.**

Atty. Tom Sergeant came forward with his client, Colton Amster. Atty. Sergeant stated that application is intended to allow the existing Redline Restorations to move slightly down the road to the 2475 Fairfield Avenue location.

Atty. Sergeant stated that the business has been in place since 2008 and received a use variance for its function as a classic and antique car restoration and repair shop. He stated that the business is more of a craftsmanship than a mechanic, and that the business has outgrown its current space. He stated that the new location is ideal for this use, as it was historically a car dealership in the 60s, and it still maintains the original structure with high ceilings and floor drainage. Atty. Sergeant stated that Mr. Amster will not make any exterior changes other than beautification, and that are present there are various non-conforming aspects of the property. Atty. Sergeant stated that the property has been vacant for 2-3 years. Atty. Sergeant stated that Mr. Amster intends on putting the windows back in the property, and restoring it to more of a display area rather than a showroom. He stated that the hardship lies in the fact that the reconstruction of the building would be exceedingly difficult, as they would have to tear it down and start from scratch.

The Chair asked for clarification on the specificity of the business' practices and Mr. Amster stated that they exclusively restore classic cars. He further stated that what they do is more along the lines of remanufacturing, as a lot of the cars are rare, as are their parts which often have to be built in house. Mr. Amster stated that they also host the Wheels & Shields memorial event and have generated \$20-30,000 in donations.

The Chair asked if she could bring an average car in for repairs, and Mr. Amster stated that they exclusively cater to antique restoration, and that they are not outfitted to repair non-classic vehicles.

Mr. Amster stated that he intends to spruce up the location and restore it to an appearance similar to that of the Ford dealer that this property existed as in the 1950s.

The Chair asked if Mr. Amster had seen the landscaping recommendations from Mr. Guevara, and Mr. Amster stated that he intended to restore the landscaping. Atty. Sergeant stated that they would be amenable to a condition regarding the landscaping.

Atty. Sergeant stated that while they applied for a use variance, the companion non-conformities are brought to the forefront as a result. He stated, in regard to the parking requirements, that Redline sees next to no foot traffic, and that the front parking is more than adequate.

The Chair asked for Mr. Guevara's input on the reconfiguration of parking to add landscaping in the front of the property facing Fairfield Avenue. Mr. Guevara stated, in regards to the suggestions, that if the property complies with 25 feet for 2 way circulation, there will be plenty of space to provide parking along one side of the property while keeping the same number of spaces. Mr. Amster stated that he was wholly amenable to the suggestions, and that this was their plan as the former Stevenson's Ford also had front landscaping. Mr. Buckley stated that an L-2 standard on the landscaping would be adequate.

Mr. Amster stated that he intends to collaborate with the community center across the street to help develop some enriching after school programs for their children.

The Chair asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of the application.

David Barber came forward to offer his support of the application. He stated that it is a good proposal in line with the Village Overlay improvement plans. As an architect, he suggested that they open up the front of the buildings with windows to allow the classic cars to be seen from the street.

Stuart Sachs came forward to offer his support of the application. He stated that he often drives by Redline and admires their cars, and can offer a basic endorsement that they generate very low traffic for a high end service as a taxpaying business.

Margaret Spurgulino came forward to offer her support. Ms. Spurgulino stated that she lives behind the currently vacant lot and has for 65 years. She stated that she would like to see the building restored and any favorable changes that can be made would be to the neighborhood's benefit.

The Chairs asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition.

James White came forward to offer his opposition. He cited a letter from Jerry Manning, President of the Black Rock NRZ, that contends the application opposes the goals of the Village Overlay District as a pedestrian oriented area with secure places for foot traffic, retail and residential locations.

The Chair noted the application's intention to improve the lot, in particular the landscaping and facade.

Frank Guyer came forward to offer his opposition. He stated that he does not believe the application adheres to the goals of the Village Overlay District, and expressed his concern over the lack of landscaping.

The Chair noted the applicant's amenability to a landscaping condition.

Mr. Guyer expressed his concern about the lot's proximity to the Boy's Sports Club and Historic Boroughs Building and suggested a dissonance between the amounts of green and constructed space. He requested that the community see that exact plans.

The Chair asked if the applicant would like to offer a rebuttal.

Atty. Sergeant stated that the arguments stated were unfounded, as they don't intend on turning the property in the parking lot. Mr. Amster stated that he is restoring the property back to its original configuration from the 1950s and improving the landscaping, thus there should be no opposition. He further stated that, as the property as they intend to restore it already existed, the community would be able to easily access what the new property will look like. Atty. Sergeant stated that he saw no conflict with the Overlay zone, and in fact Mr. Amster's business would help advance the aims of the zone.

The Chair closed the public hearing on 2475 Fairfield Avenue.

**#9 3030 Park Ave. – Petition of Watermark 3030 Park, LLC – Seeking a variance of the prohibition of enlarging a nonconforming structure under Sec. 4-12-4a and also seeking variances of the maximum density requirement of 2,700 sq. ft. of property per residential unit and the maximum height requirement of 45 feet of Sec. 5-1-3 to permit the construction of a 39-residential unit addition and four 2-side-by-side family dwellings to the existing senior residential facility in an R-A and an R-C zone.**

Atty. Rizio came forward to speak on the application. He stated that this is an adult care center, and that part of the proposed project is already built. Atty. Rizio stated that they intend to add 4 more cottages to the property, which requires a variance due to the RC zone requirement of 1 unit per 2700 square feet. In this situation, the ratio is 1 unit per 2651 square feet. Atty. Rizio stated that the property currently has 180 units, and they want to have the plans for a 3-story, 39 unit independent living facility reapproved. He stated that the units will be a mix of 1 and 2 bedroom from 700 to 1400 square feet. He further stated that there are over 200 parking spaces on site, but that their site does not have the typical parking demand due to the nature of the facility.

Mr. Boucher informed Mr. Rizio that the second variance on his application regarding the 640 square feet maximum size has been long since retired.

Commissioner Alves asked for clarification on the number of stories in the building, and Atty. Rizio stated that it is 3 stories, but would technically be 4 including the subterranean garage.

The Chair asked if the plans for the 3-story building are identical to those approved in 2006 & 2008, and Atty. Rizio answered in the affirmative.

The Chair asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of the application.

Tom McCarthy, City Council President, came forward to express his and Council Member Herron's support for the application. He stated that the independent living facility has been the heart of the community, and that the applicants have proceeded in good faith. He further stated his appreciation for the applicant's commitment to quality construction that serves the needs of the residents while being considerate of the community.

The Chair asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition. Hearing none, she closed the application on 3030 Park Avenue.

**#11 937 State St. – Petition of Ahmadullah Tokhi – Seeking a variance of the maximum allowable setback required of Sec. 8-3-3, as well as a variance of the prohibition of parking between the building and street of Sec. 11-1-6, and also seeking variances of the interior landscaping; perimeter landscaping and minimum parking area setback of Sec. 11-1-13 to permit the construction of a 1-story, 7,114 sq. ft. retail building in an MU-LI zone.**

Atty. Rizio came forward to speak on the application. He stated that over the years, the property has been home to several fast food restaurants. He stated that as State Street is one way, it gives rise to several issues, and that the property itself is a sea of boarded up concrete. Atty. Rizio stated that Mr. Barber designed the new project and Mr. Sachs provided the landscaping plans. He stated that the new plans necessitate a few variances, the most paramount being the requirement in the MU-LI zone that requires parking in the back of the building and a setback requirement. Atty. Rizio stated that in this location, those requirements create a safety issue.

Atty. Rizio stated that the setback requirement does not accommodate the lot's presence on a one-way street. He stated that the plans are in complete compliance with site coverage. Atty. Rizio stated, in regards to the parking requirement, that in a challenged retail area two important aspects are an attractive storefront and safe frontal parking. He stated that they spoke with the

abutting residential lot and car repair business, and both stated they would rather have a well-lit, frontal parking area that provides security to customers. Atty. Rizio stated that the landscape plan is unique, and by pushing the building back it allows them to soften the front and landscaping parking.

Mr. Sachs stated that they have copies of both the Engineer's stormwater management study and a response letter to the engineer's review letter. He stated that their management system is comprised of all catch basins, with sheet drained onto the pavers so water will go through filtration via the bricks, into a subsurface chamber, and be gathered in underground chambers. Mr. Sachs stated that this provides a long-term, sustainable solution for an urban area that has not been used before.

Mr. Barber stated that the new building plan envisions a 1 story building with 6 tenants, one of which will be a small takeout restaurant. He stated there will be a signage board with graphics and unique, backlit Roman canopies above the entries. Mr. Barber stated that there will be a full basement for storage, with stairways to access it from each potential tenant space. The back is simple, with service entrances and blocked refuse areas.

Atty. Rizio stated that these plans will increase the security on site, introduce better traffic flow, a better facade and help revitalize the area.

Mr. Barber stated that they did a series of studies creating building plans in full compliance with the City's regulations, but that even with the compliance, tenants would find the behind the building parking undesirable due to customer safety. He stated, as an architect, he loves the idea of an urban street wall coming up to the sidewalk, but in this transitional area it proves problematic and introduces reasonable concerns.

Atty. Rizio asked Mr. Sachs to address the back drain, per the neighboring auto mechanic's request. Mr. Sachs stated that the building sits on a small plateau, and that the neighbor's property maintains a right of development in the southwest corner of the property that houses the catch basin on their site. He stated, rather than cause confusion, they are offering to put a new catch basin on the adjacent property owner's site in accordance with WPCA and City Engineering recommendations. He stated that this offers a better solution than what is currently on-site.

Mr. Barber stated that the building will be completely flush with the sidewalk, and thus will be handicap and elderly friendly. He further stated that the hardship is driven by the needs of the area.



Commissioner Colon expressed her concern about flooding, and asked how the plan addresses that. Mr. Sachs stated that the site adheres to all engineering standards, and that the redundancy built in is that they will hold 253% of stone water generated, and that everything that pours off the roof will be held in the chambers.

Commissioner Alves asked about the percentage of landscaping. Mr. Sachs stated that the required amount is 15% and their property is at just over 15.1%.

The Chair asked about the lot's parking spaces, and Mr. Sachs stated that there are 26 spaces, including ADA compliant spaces.

The Chair asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of the application.

Edward Schwanier came forward and stated that the back of the property will cover his building's old drainage spot, and he has no problem moving it. He stated that he would like to confer with the City Engineer in terms of placement, and that he is looking forward to having new neighbors.

Mr. Sachs stated that Mr. Schwanier has a right by easement, and that the position can be adjusted to their liking. Atty. Rizio suggested a condition of the drainage being installed as per plans and per the suggestions of the City's Engineer.

### **DECISION SESSION**

**C-1 RE: 645 PINE STREET – APPEALING UNDER SEC. 14-10 OF THE ZONING REGULATIONS OF THE CITY OF BRIDGEPORT AND SEC. 8-7 OF THE CT GENERAL STATUTES, WHEREBY IS ALLEGED THAT THE ZONING ENFORCEMENT OFFICER ERRED IN HIS ISSUANCE OF AN ORDER TO COMPLY REGARDING THE ERECTION OF AN ON-PREMISES ROOF SIGN WITHOUT A SPECIAL PERMIT FOR THE BUILDING HOUSING THE ADVERTIZED USE IN AN I-L ZONE.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER CAROLAN MOVED TO ACCEPT THE WITHDRAWAL OF ITEM C-1 RE: 645 PINE STREET – APPEALING UNDER SEC. 14-10 OF THE ZONING REGULATIONS OF THE CITY OF BRIDGEPORT AND SEC. 8-7 OF THE CT GENERAL STATUTES, WHEREBY IS ALLEGED THAT THE ZONING ENFORCEMENT OFFICER ERRED IN HIS ISSUANCE OF AN ORDER TO COMPLY REGARDING THE ERECTION OF AN ON-PREMISES ROOF SIGN WITHOUT A**

**SPECIAL PERMIT FOR THE BUILDING HOUSING THE ADVERTIZED USE IN AN I-L ZONE.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER ALVES SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**D-1 RE: 113 – 117 WASHINGTON TERRACE – SEEKING A USE VARIANCE OF SEC. 5-1-2, AND ALSO SEEKING VARIANCES OF THREE (3) OF THE REQUIRED SIX (6) OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES OF SEC.11-1-2; THE MINIMUM PARKING SETBACK AND PERIMETER LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS OF SEC. 11-1-13, AND ALSO THE PROHIBITION OF STACKED PARKING OF SEC. 11-1-7 TO PERMIT THE CONVERSION OF THE ILLEGAL 3-FAMILY DWELLING INTO A SHORT TERM TRANSITIONAL GROUP HOME IN AN R-B ZONE.**

**Due to the lack of a quorum, the decision for this item has been deferred until February 9, 2016 to give the Commissioners an opportunity to consider all options related to this application.**

**#1 RE: 47 – 53 CRESCENT AVENUE – REQUESTING A REHEARING ON A PETITION WHICH WAS DENIED BY THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS ON 12/8/15 WHICH SOUGHT VARIANCES TO ENABLED THE PETITIONER TO ESTABLISH A BANQUET FACILITY IN AN OR-G ZONE AND COASTAL AREA.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER ALVES MOVED TO ACCEPT THE DEFERRAL OF ITEM #1 RE: 47 – 53 CRESCENT AVENUE – REQUESTING A REHEARING ON A PETITION WHICH WAS DENIED BY THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS ON 12/8/15 WHICH SOUGHT VARIANCES TO ENABLED THE PETITIONER TO ESTABLISH A BANQUET FACILITY IN AN OR-G ZONE AND COASTAL AREA.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER CAROLAN SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**Item #1 was deferred to February 9, 2016.**

**#2 RE: 3425 FAIRFIELD AVENUE – SEEKING A VARIANCE OMITTING SEVEN (7) OF THE 30 REQUIRED OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES OF SEC. 11-1-2 AND ALSO SEEKING TO ESTABLISH AN OUTDOOR DINING PATIO ALONG THE FAIRFIELD**

**AVENUE FRONTAGE OF THE EXISTING CAFÉ RESTAURANT AND THE ISSUANCE OF A PATIO LIQUOR PERMIT OF SEC. 12-10C IN AN OR ZONE.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER ALVES MOVED TO ACCEPT THE DEFERRAL OF ITEM #2 RE: 3425 FAIRFIELD AVENUE – SEEKING A VARIANCE OMITTING SEVEN (7) OF THE 30 REQUIRED OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES OF SEC. 11-1-2 AND ALSO SEEKING TO ESTABLISH AN OUTDOOR DINING PATIO ALONG THE FAIRFIELD AVENUE FRONTAGE OF THE EXISTING CAFÉ RESTAURANT AND THE ISSUANCE OF A PATIO LIQUOR PERMIT OF SEC. 12-10C IN AN OR ZONE.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER CAROLAN SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**Item #2 was deferred to February 9, 2016.**

**#3 RE: 199 & 201 GRANFIELD AVENUE – SEEKING A VARIANCE OF THE MINIMUM LOT AREA REQUIREMENT OF 9,000 SQ. FT. OF SEC. 5-1-3 TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 2-FAMILY DWELLING ON A 6,002 SQ. FT. LOT IN AN R-C ZONE.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER CAROLAN MOVED TO GRANT ITEM #3 RE: 199 & 201 GRANFIELD AVENUE – SEEKING A VARIANCE OF THE MINIMUM LOT AREA REQUIREMENT OF 9,000 SQ. FT. OF SEC. 5-1-3 TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 2-FAMILY DWELLING ON A 6,002 SQ. FT. LOT IN AN R-C ZONE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- 1. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SUBJECT PREMISES SHALL BE IN STRICT ACCORD WITH THE PLAN SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED BY THE BOARD.**
- 2. THE PETITIONER SHALL FILE PLANS AND APPLICATIONS FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE AND A BUILDING PERMIT.**
- 3. THE FRONT PORTION OF THE SUBJECT PREMISES SHALL BE LANDSCAPED WITH SHRUBBERY AND PROPERLY MAINTAINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SEC. 11-4-3.**

**FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:**

- 1. THE PROPOSED LOT DIMENSIONS ARE IN KEEPING WITH THE MAJORITY OF THE LOTS IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA.**

- 2. THIS APPROVED DEVELOPMENT PROVIDES A NEW MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING IN AN OLD NEIGHBORHOOD AND SHALL HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER COLON SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**#4 RE: 211 & 215 GRANFIELD AVENUE – SEEKING A VARIANCE OF THE MINIMUM LOT AREA REQUIREMENT OF 9,000 SQ. FT. OF SEC. 5-1-3 TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 2-FAMILY DWELLING ON A 6,016 SQ. FT. LOT IN AN R-C ZONE.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER CAROLAN MOVED TO GRANT ITEM #4 RE: 211 & 215 GRANFIELD AVENUE – SEEKING A VARIANCE OF THE MINIMUM LOT AREA REQUIREMENT OF 9,000 SQ. FT. OF SEC. 5-1-3 TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 2-FAMILY DWELLING ON A 6,016 SQ. FT. LOT IN AN R-C ZONE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- 1. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SUBJECT PREMISES SHALL BE IN STRICT ACCORD WITH THE PLAN SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED BY THE BOARD.**
- 2. THE PETITIONER SHALL FILE PLANS AND APPLICATIONS FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE AND A BUILDING PERMIT.**
- 3. THE FRONT PORTION OF THE SUBJECT PREMISES SHALL BE LANDSCAPED WITH SHRUBBERY AND PROPERLY MAINTAINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SEC 11-4-3.**

**FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:**

- 1. THE PROPOSED LOT DIMENSIONS ARE IN KEEPING WITH THE MAJORITY OF THE LOTS IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA.**
- 2. THIS APPROVED DEVELOPMENT PROVIDES A NEW MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING IN AN OLD NEIGHBORHOOD AND SHALL HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER ALVES SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**#5 RE: 225 & 227 GRANFIELD AVENUE – SEEKING A VARIANCE OF THE MINIMUM LOT AREA REQUIREMENT OF 9,000 SQ. FT. OF SEC. 5-1-3 TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 2-FAMILY DWELLING ON A 5,633 SQ. FT. LOT IN AN R-C ZONE.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER ALVES MOVED TO GRANT ITEM #5 RE: 225 & 227 GRANFIELD AVENUE – SEEKING A VARIANCE OF THE MINIMUM LOT AREA REQUIREMENT OF 9,000 SQ. FT. OF SEC. 5-1-3 TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 2-FAMILY DWELLING ON A 5,633 SQ. FT. LOT IN AN R-C ZONE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- 1. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SUBJECT PREMISES SHALL BE IN STRICT ACCORD WITH THE PLAN SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED BY THE BOARD.**
- 2. THE PETITIONER SHALL FILE PLANS AND APPLICATIONS FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE AND A BUILDING PERMIT.**
- 3. THE FRONT PORTION OF THE SUBJECT PREMISES SHALL BE LANDSCAPED WITH SHRUBBERY AND PROPERLY MAINTAINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH 11-4-3.**

**FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:**

- 1. THE PROPOSED LOT DIMENSIONS ARE IN KEEPING WITH THE MAJORITY OF THE LOTS IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA.**
- 2. THIS APPROVED DEVELOPMENT PROVIDES A NEW MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING IN AN OLD NEIGHBORHOOD AND SHALL HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT ON THE IMMEDIATE AREA.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER CAROLAN SECONDED THE MOTION.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**#6 RE: 237 GRANFIELD AVENUE – SEEKING A VARIANCE OF THE MINIMUM LOT AREA REQUIREMENT OF 9,000 SQ. FT. AND FRONT SETBACK REQUIREMENT OF SEC. 5-1-3 TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING ON A 4,649 SQ. FT. LOT IN AN R-C ZONE.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER ALVES MOVED TO GRANT ITEM #6 RE: 237 GRANFIELD AVENUE – SEEKING A VARIANCE OF THE MINIMUM LOT AREA REQUIREMENT OF 9,000 SQ. FT. AND FRONT SETBACK REQUIREMENT OF SEC.**

City of Bridgeport

Page

13

Zoning Board of Appeals

Regular Meeting

January 12, 2016

**5-1-3 TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING ON A 4,649 SQ. FT. LOT IN AN R-C ZONE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- 1. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SUBJECT PREMISES SHALL BE IN STRICT ACCORD WITH THE PLAN SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED BY THE BOARD.**
- 2. THE PETITIONER SHALL FILE PLANS AND APPLICATIONS FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE AND A BUILDING PERMIT.**
- 3. THE FRONT PORTION OF THE SUBJECT PREMISES SHALL BE LANDSCAPED WITH SHRUBBERY AND PROPERLY MAINTAINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SEC. 11-4-3.**

**FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:**

- 1. THE PROPOSED LOT DIMENSIONS ARE IN KEEPING WITH THE MAJORITY OF THE LOTS IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA.**
- 2. THIS APPROVED DEVELOPMENT PROVIDES A NEW MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING IN AN OLD NEIGHBORHOOD AND SHALL HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER CAROLAN SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**#7 RE: 194 EAST AVENUE – SEEKING A VARIANCE OF THE MINIMUM DISTANCE TO THE REAR LOT LINE REQUIREMENT OF SEC. 5-1-3 TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING ON A NON-CONFORMING LOT IN AN R-BB ZONE**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER ALVES MOVED TO GRANT THE DEFERRAL OF ITEM #7 RE: 194 EAST AVENUE – SEEKING A VARIANCE OF THE MINIMUM DISTANCE TO THE REAR LOT LINE REQUIREMENT OF SEC. 5-1-3 TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING ON A NON-CONFORMING LOT IN AN R-BB ZONE FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON:**

- 1. TO ALLOW FOR ADEQUATE ADVERTISEMENT OF THE CORRECTED REQUEST.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER COLON SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**Item #7 was deferred to February 9, 2016.**

City of Bridgeport

14

Zoning Board of Appeals

Regular Meeting

January 12, 2016

Page

**#8 RE: 2475 FAIRFIELD AVENUE – SEEKING A USE VARIANCE OF SEC. 6-1-2 AND ALSO SEEKING VARIANCES OF THE MINIMUM LANDSCAPING AND MAXIMUM SITE COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS OF SEC. 6-1-3; THE INTERIOR LANDSCAPING; PERIMETER LANDSCAPING AND PARKING SETBACK REQUIREMENTS OF SEC. 11-1-13 AND A VARIANCE OMITTING 10 OF THE REQUIRED 61 ON-SITE PARKING SPACE OF SEC. 11-1-2 TO PERMIT AN AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR, RESTORATION AND SALES BUSINESS IN THE EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING IN AN OR ZONE.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER CAROLAN MOVED TO GRANT ITEM #8 RE: 2475 FAIRFIELD AVENUE – SEEKING A USE VARIANCE OF SEC. 6-1-2 AND ALSO SEEKING VARIANCES OF THE MINIMUM LANDSCAPING AND MAXIMUM SITE COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS OF SEC. 6-1-3; THE INTERIOR LANDSCAPING; PERIMETER LANDSCAPING AND PARKING SETBACK REQUIREMENTS OF SEC. 11-1-13 AND A VARIANCE OMITTING 10 OF THE REQUIRED 61 ON-SITE PARKING SPACE OF SEC. 11-1-2 TO PERMIT AN AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR, RESTORATION AND SALES BUSINESS IN THE EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING IN AN OR ZONE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- 1. THE PETITIONER SHALL INCORPORATE ALL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COORDINATOR’S RECOMMENDATIONS IN HIS LETTER DATED 12/10/15.**
- 2. THE ASPHALT AREA IN FRONT OF THE BUILDING SHALL BE REMOVED AND REPLACED WITH GRASS AND LOW LYING SHRUBS.**
- 3. THE CONCRETE WALKWAY SHALL BE ESTABLISHED TO ACCESS THE FRONT OF THE BUILDING FACING FAIRFIELD AVENUE.**
- 4. THE FRONT PLATE GLASS WINDOWS SHALL BE RE-INSTALLED TO COMPLY WITH THE COMMERCIAL VILLAGE OVERLAY DISTRICT (CVOD) REGULATIONS.**

**FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:**

- 1. WILL GENERATE THE GROWTH AND EXPANSION OF THE LOCAL BUSINESS.**
- 2. THE BUILDING WAS DESIGNED AND APPROVED TO BE AN AUTOMOBILE SALES AND SERVICE CENTER AND A VINTAGE CLASSIC CAR RESTORATION FACILITY IS IN KEEPING WITH AND A STEP ABOVE THE ORIGINAL USE.**

**3. THE PROJECT AS APPROVED WILL BE A VAST IMPROVEMENT TO THIS PORTION OF THE BLACK ROCK SECTION OF BRIDGEPORT.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER COLON SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**#9 RE: 3030 PARK AVENUE – SEEKING A VARIANCE OF THE PROHIBITION OF ENLARGING A NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE UNDER SEC. 4-12-4A AND ALSO SEEKING VARIANCES OF THE MAXIMUM DENSITY REQUIREMENT OF 2,700 SQ. FT. OF PROPERTY PER RESIDENTIAL UNIT AND THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT REQUIREMENT OF 45 FEET OF SEC. 5-1-3 TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 39-RESIDENTIAL UNIT ADDITION AND FOUR SIDE-BY-SIDE 2-FAMILY DWELLINGS TO THE EXISTING SENIOR RESIDENTIAL FACILITY IN AN R-A AND AN R-C ZONE**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER CAROLAN MOVED TO GRANT ITEM #9 RE: 3030 PARK AVENUE – SEEKING A VARIANCE OF THE PROHIBITION OF ENLARGING A NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE UNDER SEC. 4-12-4A AND ALSO SEEKING VARIANCES OF THE MAXIMUM DENSITY REQUIREMENT OF 2,700 SQ. FT. OF PROPERTY PER RESIDENTIAL UNIT AND THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT REQUIREMENT OF 45 FEET OF SEC. 5-1-3 TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 39-RESIDENTIAL UNIT ADDITION AND FOUR SIDE-BY-SIDE 2-FAMILY DWELLINGS TO THE EXISTING SENIOR RESIDENTIAL FACILITY IN AN R-A AND AN R-C ZONE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- 1. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SUBJECT PREMISES SHALL BE IN STRICT ACCORD WITH THE PLANS SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED BY THE BOARD.**
- 2. THE PETITIONER SHALL FILE PLANS AND APPLICATIONS FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE AND A BUILDING PERMIT.**
- 3. ALL CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE IN FULL COMPLIANCE WITH THE BASIC BUILDING CODE OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT.**

**FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:**

- 1. THE ADDITION, AS WELL AS THE FOUR SIDE-BY-SIDE 2-FAMILY DWELLINGS WILL PROVIDE SEVERAL UNSUPERVISED RESIDENTIAL OPTIONS TO AN AGING POPULATION.**
- 2. THIS PROJECT WAS PREVIOUSLY APPROVED IN 2006.**



**\*\* COMMISSIONER COLON SECONDED THE MOTION.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**#10 RE: 2149 SEAVIEW AVENUE – SEEKING A USE-VARIANCE OF SEC. 6-1-2 AND ALSO SEEKING A VARIANCE OF ALL OF THE REQUIRED LANDSCAPING OF SEC. 6-1-3 TO PERMIT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INDUSTRIAL SERVICE STORAGE YARD OF VEHICLES, BOATS AND HEAVY MACHINERY IN AN OR ZONE.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER ALVES MOVED TO DEFER ITEM #10 RE: 2149 SEAVIEW AVENUE – SEEKING A USE-VARIANCE OF SEC. 6-1-2 AND ALSO SEEKING A VARIANCE OF ALL OF THE REQUIRED LANDSCAPING OF SEC. 6-1-3 TO PERMIT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INDUSTRIAL SERVICE STORAGE YARD OF VEHICLES, BOATS AND HEAVY MACHINERY IN AN OR ZONE.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER COLON SECONDED THE MOTION.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**Item #10 was deferred to February 9, 2016.**

**#11 RE: 937 STATE STREET – SEEKING A VARIANCE OF THE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE SETBACK REQUIRED OF SEC. 8-3-3, AS WELL AS A VARIANCE OF THE PROHIBITION OF PARKING BETWEEN THE BUILDING AND STREET OF SEC. 11-1-6, AND ALSO SEEKING VARIANCES OF THE INTERIOR LANDSCAPING; PERIMETER LANDSCAPING AND MINIMUM PARKING AREA SETBACK OF SEC. 11-1-13 TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 1-STORY, 7,114 SQ. FT. RETAIL BUILDING IN AN MU-LI ZONE.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER CAROLAN MOVED TO GRANT ITEM #11 RE: 937 STATE STREET – SEEKING A VARIANCE OF THE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE SETBACK REQUIRED OF SEC. 8-3-3, AS WELL AS A VARIANCE OF THE PROHIBITION OF PARKING BETWEEN THE BUILDING AND STREET OF SEC. 11-1-6, AND ALSO SEEKING VARIANCES OF THE INTERIOR LANDSCAPING; PERIMETER LANDSCAPING AND MINIMUM PARKING AREA SETBACK OF SEC. 11-1-13 TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 1-STORY, 7,114 SQ. FT. RETAIL BUILDING IN AN MU-LI ZONE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- 1. THE DUMPSTERS/ROLL-OFF CONTAINERS ARE TO BE LOCATED TO THE WESTERN PORTION OF THE PROPERTY AND ENCLOSED WITH A 6' HIGH PRIVACY FENCE WITH A SUITABLE, LOCKABLE GATE.**
- 2. THE DESIGN AND ARRANGEMENT OF THE PROPOSED DRY WELL AND DRAINAGE PLAN MUST BE APPROVED BY THE CITY ENGINEER, WPCA WITH INPUT FROM THE ABUTTING NEIGHBORS ON STATE STREET.**
- 3. ALL LANDSCAPING SHALL BE INSTALLED IN STRICT ACCORD WITH THE APPROVED PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT.**

**FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:**

- 1. THE LOCATION OF THE PROPERTY AND AND ONE-WAY TRAFFIC PATTERN IMPOSES THE NEED FOR A LOCATION VARIANCE.**
- 2. PARKING BEHIND THE BUILDING WOULD PROMOTE SAFETY ISSUES FOR PATRONS OF THE PROPOSED FACILITY.**
- 3. THE PROPOSED FACILITY WILL BE A VAST IMPROVEMENT OVER THE EXISTING CONDITIONS, AS WELL AS PROVIDING ADDITIONAL RETAIL OUTLETS IN THIS OLDER AREA OF THE CITY.**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER ALVES SECONDED THE MOTION.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**MINUTES**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER COLON MOVED TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 8, 2015.  
\*\* COMMISSIONER CAROLAN SECONDED THE MOTION.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**\*\* COMMISSIONER CAROLAN MOVED TO ADJOURN.  
\*\* COMMISSIONER COLON SECONDED THE MOTION.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Ramos  
Telesco Secretarial Services