



**CITY OF BRIDGEPORT
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
OCTOBER 11, 2022**

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

ATTENDANCE: Mel Riley, Chair; Robert Filotei, Acting Secretary; Brendan Bish, Johanna Dorgan, Kyle LaBuff, Jacqueline Martoral, Robert Morton, Soledad Nunez

STAFF: Paul Boucher, Zoning Department; Atty. Russ Liskov; Jackson Strong, Design Coordinator

CALL TO ORDER

Commissioner Riley called the meeting to order at 6:50 p.m. He then introduced the Commissioners seated. A quorum was present.

Commissioner Riley announced that they would be deviating from the public agenda in order to handle the 8-24 referrals first.

CITY BUSINESS

(23-30) 8-24 Referral – Petition of the Office of Planning & Economic Development (OPED) – Requesting under Sec. 8-24 of the Connecticut General Statute, a favorable recommendation to the City Council for the acquisition of certain chronically vacant and blighted properties in the “Hollow” Neighborhood Revitalization Zone (NRZ), generally located across from Nanny Goat Park and across from St. Raphael’s Elementary School.

Mr. Vincent Mobile came forward to request a favorable recommendation to the City Council for the acquisition of certain chronically vacant and blighted properties in the “Hollow” Neighborhood Revitalization Zone (NRZ) which are in close proximity to St. Raphael’s Elementary School and Nanny Goat Park. The properties have been vacant for years and have been condemned by the Condemnation Board.

(23-31) 8-24 Referral – Petition of the Office of Planning & Economic Development (OPED) – Requesting under Sec. 8-24 of the Connecticut General Statute, a favorable recommendation to the City Council for the acquisition of certain chronically vacant and blighted property located within the “South End” Neighborhood Revitalization Zone (NRZ), located generally proximate to the University of Bridgeport campus and the new Bassick High School campus.

Mr. Vincent Mobile came forward to request a favorable recommendation to the City Council for the acquisition of certain chronically vacant and blighted property located within the “South End” Neighborhood Revitalization Zone (NRZ), located generally proximate to the University of Bridgeport campus and the new Bassick High School campus. This property has been vacant and chronically blighted for over 20 years. A brief discussion about the actual address of the property in question followed.

(23-40) 8-24 Referral – Petition of the Department of Public Facilities – Requesting under Sec. 8-24 of the Connecticut General Statute, a favorable recommendation to the City Council for the installation of cellular antennas on a light tower and a 10’ x 15’, fenced equipment area at Kennedy Stadium.

Mr. Vincent Mobile came forward to request a favorable recommendation to the City Council for the installation of cellular antennas on a light tower and a 10’ x 15’, fenced equipment area at Kennedy Stadium. He explained that the City Attorneys have reviewed this and this installation would be similar to the T-Mobile towers already there.

(23-41) 8-24 Referral – Petition of the Department of Public Facilities – Requesting under Sec. 8-24 of the Connecticut General Statute, a favorable recommendation to the City Council for the installation of a water pumping station on 9.640-sq. ft. on the Fairchild Wheeler Golf course along Jefferson Street.

Mr. Vincent Mobile came forward to request a favorable recommendation to the City Council for the installation of a water pumping station on 9.640-sq. ft. on the Fairchild Wheeler Golf course along Jefferson Street. He said that the City was looking for a lease to allow this improvement to happen.

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON MOVED TO APPROVE THE FOLLOWING 8-24 REFERRALS:**

(23-30) 8-24 REFERRAL – PETITION OF THE OFFICE OF PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (OPED) – REQUESTING UNDER SEC. 8-24 OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTE, A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THE ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN CHRONICALLY VACANT AND BLIGHTED PROPERTIES IN THE “HOLLOW” NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION ZONE (NRZ), GENERALLY LOCATED ACROSS FROM NANNY GOAT PARK AND ACROSS FROM ST. RAPHAEL’S ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.

(23-31) 8-24 REFERRAL – PETITION OF THE OFFICE OF PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (OPED) – REQUESTING UNDER SEC. 8-24 OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTE, A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THE ACQUISITION OF

CERTAIN CHRONICALLY VACANT AND BLIGHTED PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN THE “SOUTH END” NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION ZONE (NRZ), LOCATED GENERALLY PROXIMATE TO THE UNIVERSITY OF BRIDGEPORT CAMPUS AND THE NEW BASSICK HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS.

(23-40) 8-24 REFERRAL – PETITION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC FACILITIES – REQUESTING UNDER SEC. 8-24 OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTE, A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THE INSTALLATION OF CELLULAR ANTENNAS ON A LIGHT TOWER AND A 10’ X 15’, FENCED EQUIPMENT AREA AT KENNEDY STADIUM.

(23-41) 8-24 REFERRAL – PETITION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC FACILITIES – REQUESTING UNDER SEC. 8-24 OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTE, A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THE INSTALLATION OF A WATER PUMPING STATION ON 9.640-SQ. FT. ON THE FAIRCHILD WHEELER GOLF COURSE ALONG JEFFERSON STREET.

**** COMMISSIONER LABUFF SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

(23-39) 377 Woodlawn Ave. – Petition of FG New Home Construction, LLC – Seeking an approval for a 3-lot subdivision and a site plan review in the N2 zone.

Commissioner Filotei stated that the applicant for Agenda Item (23-39) 377 Woodlawn Ave. – Petition of FG New Home Construction, LLC – Seeking an approval for a 3-lot subdivision and a site plan review in the N2 zone requested a deferral to October 30, 2023.

DEFERRED BUSINESS

D-1 (23-25) 3369 & 3375 Fairfield Ave. – Petition of Nutmeg Southwest JV, LLC – Seeking a certificate of location approval for a cannabis sales retail establishment in the MX1 zone.

Atty. Christopher Russo of Russo and Rizio, LLC in Fairfield, came forward and greeted the Commissioners. He said that he was present to represent the applicant. The property is located in the MX-1 zone and formerly known as the Philbin Nursery. He displayed the site plan and noted that Fairfield Avenue has a median along this portion. He said that they would be adding as much parking as possible. Along the rear of the property, there is a significant grade change. Beechwood Avenue runs along the rear of the property, but the residences are located significantly higher.

Atty. Russo said that they wished to shift the driveway in order to have 24 parking spaces. The building will remain and they wish to add a single story, 535 sq foot addition to the rear for the vault. If the building was removed, it would have a substantially larger commercial building.

The area for the customers will be relatively small, with the remainder being break rooms for the employees and storage. The center island will be landscaped and the exit will be a right turn only. He indicated where the dumpster would be and displayed the landscaping plan. A number of windows will be added and they have held a meeting with the NRZ. One of the NRZ suggestions was to add awnings. The side entrance will be removed and replaced by an entrance facing Fairfield. There will be a separate entrance for deliveries.

There was a question regarding the licensing. Mr. Patrick Johnson came forward and said that he represents the applicant from the Operations perspective. He said that the group had opened up their first store last week and would be opening a store the coming week-end. The group will be opening 20 plus stores around the country. They have provisional licenses for the retail sites and will receive the final licenses with full approval pending the completion of some paperwork and a waiting period.

Atty. Russo said that the neighbor to the rear had expressed concern about the lighting. All the exterior lights are directed downward and there is no light spillage beyond the property lines. There are security cameras and a security office. The regulations forbid smoking the product on the property and the security officer will insure that no one does this. The vault will be very secure.

He then displayed the map for the protected uses and the dispensary is not near any of the protected groups.

Atty. Russo then reviewed the details of the floor plans with the Commissioners.

Mr. Johnson said that they would be encouraging pre-orders via online. No product is kept out on the floor during non-business hours. He explained that they would only carry product that was grown and approved in the State of Connecticut. There are currently four providers. There will be edibles, pre-rolls and vape cartridges and concentrates available. He gave a brief overview of the seed to sale system. The dispensary will be open 9 a.m. to 8 p.m. Monday thru Saturdays and 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Sundays.

Mr. Johnson stated they would only have 25 employees in total, some part time and others full time based on customer volume. He then distributed some handouts and photos of the site.

Mr. Johnson then address the concerns about the traffic management plan and noted that there were other dispensaries that were opening. They are working with the Police Department to arrange off duty officers. There will also be additional off site parking for the employees

approximately 900 feet from the site. A traffic evaluation was submitted even though it was not required.

The application is in conformity with the criteria, including the 750 foot buffer. He reviewed the key requirements that were necessary and noted how the application fulfilled all of them.

There were concerns about the amount of parking available for a facility that would have a high volume of sales in an area that was already heavily trafficked.

Mr. Johnson said that when the store opens, they expect a peak of 300 customers a day and then it will drop down to about 200 per day, spread out across the entire day. The traffic management plan projects overuse and this is why they secured additional parking in the area. For the opening, there will be an off duty police officer on site to direct customers to additional parking.

Discussion followed about the details and the location of the dispensaries in other towns.

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

Ms. Diane Vulcano of Beachview Avenue in Bridgeport came forward. She said that their property abuts 3369 & 3375 Fairfield Ave. They have lived there for 24 years. In 2014, the Fairfield Avenue property was purchased as a Garden Center. The owner used the property as a staging site for his landscaping business, which had a negative impact on their quality of life. The City Zoning Department limited the owner from using the site for commercial landscaping. The City also stopped him from using the barn as an apartment because it was not up to code. The owner blamed Ms. Vulcano for his bad decisions and did obnoxious things like shining spotlights on their home, which required the Vulcanos to put in black out shades.

She said that because of this, she is welcoming new and responsible ownership of the property. She has nothing against a dispensary since cannabis is legal and the City should benefit from the taxes associated with the new industry.

Ms. Vulcano asked what the City's strategy was for the dispensaries and whether they have come up with a plan to designate how many dispensaries will be allowed and in which zones. On July 12th, the NRZ held a meeting with the developer and their lawyer. A number of residents participated in that meeting and the collective residents were concerned about the additional traffic this business could create on Fairfield Avenue. The amount of traffic is already a challenge for many of the residents who live on the side streets. She said that she had expressed her concern about lighting, paving and removing the invasive plants along the back of the property. The property is separated from theirs by a stone wall and a fence.

Ms. Vulcano said that her patio is located less than 50 feet from the parking lot. There must be proper enforcement to control customers from congregating or loitering on the property before or

after they purchase their cannabis. Since the NRZ meeting, Ms. Vulcano has been in touch with the representatives from Higher Collective. She said that she believes they understand her concerns. She is not naïve but these are smart business people who realize that it is important to make this new business acceptable as possible. She believes they will do the right thing. Since her meeting with them, the penitentiary spot lights have been turned off.

Originally she stood in opposition to the application due to the quality of life and property values are a consideration for cannabis retail. However, if the applicant follows through with the suggested modifications and the updated plans, she will be satisfied. If not, she will become a disappointed home owner without any real recourse except to sell her property.

Mr. Joe Shepard of 366 Fairfield Avenue came forward and said that he had no objections.

Mr. Greg Simon representing the Black Rock NRZ came forward and said that this was a new type of retailer for the City and the neighborhood, it brings new concerns and expectations. He believes that this is proper for the zone. The team has been responsive to the community input and design suggested. He added that the team has been professional to date follows through on all their light mitigation plans for the rear lot and provides appropriate and safe traffic planning for peak periods. He hopes they follow through on being responsive and a responsible neighbor.

Commissioner Riley asked if anyone present wished to speak in opposition.

Mr. Carter Gemp of Beachview Avenue came forward. He said that he has four children and was at the NRZ meeting. There was some opposition to the dispensary. Ms. Vulcano was correct in saying the biggest concern was traffic. He said that this dispensary would be less of a bar and more of a grocery store, so felt that it would attract a large number of customers from Fairfield. The peak of the sales will be during rush hour and those who are coming to the store from the east will likely do a “U” turn at the end of the island, which will add to the traffic. There are untested quality of life issues with this. He said that the City of Bridgeport is only allocated four of these dispensaries by the State. The Black Rock site is the only one that is up for approval.

Commissioner Riley said that he believed that the City could have five dispensaries.

Mr. Gemp said that he hoped that the City would thoroughly investigate this application given the news. The store in Bristol now handles 65 cars now. The location of these dispensaries in states such as Colorado, have them situated in industrial zones.

His own personal concern is that because it will be like a grocery store, is that the retailers won't patrol the sidewalk. There have been issues in Holland due to the quality of life issues. He said that he had witnessed first-hand that there is loitering at these places. Customers pick up their orders and then go to a dead end street or someplace nearby. He repeated his request that the application receive a thorough review.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak in opposition. Hearing no response, he called for rebuttal.

Mr. Johnson came forward and reminded everyone that there were State controls in place. He said that they had provided Ms. Vulcano with a lighting plan, but there are also State statutes and requirements. The State statutes do not allow the customers to loiter by the dispensary, so it is not the word of the developers that matter. They can only control what happens on site. Not having on street parking will eliminate loitering in front of the building. Once the customers complete their purchases, they are not allowed to loiter on site.

This is a commercial corridor that is very popular area. A fast food store or a gas station would generate much more traffic. There is a lot of parking on site and some parking available for overflow. They don't expect overflow, but there is contingency plan for it.

There are many successful businesses on this commercial corridor. He said for the record that they would be happy to remove the invasives along the property line for Ms. Vulcano as a condition of approval.

The application satisfies all the criteria for certificate of location approval in the appropriate zone, it conforms with the regulations and the Master Plan of Conservation and Development. The Commission worked very hard on the regulations and uses. The regulations offer protections. He said that he would be happy to answer questions.

The applicant was asked if there was any type of agenda for giving back to the community. Mr. Ken Henry came forward and said that he was in charge of the Social Equity Plan. The State requires the organization to submit a Social Equity Plan as part of the application process. The plan is to go out to the community and talk about their views, not the owner's needs. They will ask what the community wants or needs and from that input, they will develop their goals. The Social Equity Applicant is present and they will be part of the community. They started with the NRZ and local organizations and work from there.

Mr. Jackson Strong, the City Design Review Coordinator, came forward and greeted the Commissioners. He said that the application was submitted and the applicant made the changes requested by the City. Now it complies with the use and development standards. There were some requests for windows for transparency. He reviewed the details that were addressed in the Master Plan of Conservation and Development, including the 3% tax revenue that will go to the City of Bridgeport.

NEW BUSINESS

(23-28) 19 Infield St. – Petition of Pro Tech Home, LLC – Seeking a special permit and a site plan review approval to construct a 2-family dwelling in the N2 zone.

Atty. Diane Lord of Willinger, Willinger and Bucci, came forward and introduced herself to the Commission. She said that she was representing the property owner, Pro Tech Home, and Tiago Silva, the principle.

She displayed the plans for the residence. She noted that the item was before the Commission in January and Mr. Silva was not represented at that time. The individual who presented the application did not understand the nuances needed for the application. The denial stated that this would be out of character with the neighborhood. She explained that there was a similar application in the area and indicated where it was on an overview of the neighborhood.

Atty. Lord stated that the August approval stated it conformed to the Special Permit standards, consistent with the Master Plan, complied with the Zoning regulations, and in character with the neighborhood with no adverse impact, which is what the applicant is proposing.

She displayed the site plan and reviewed the details with the Commissioners. There was a favorable report from Mr. Strong, that indicates it complies with the flood regulations, meets the criteria for a Special Permit, consistent with the Plan Bridgeport, and not impair future development along with adequate safeguards to protect property values with no detrimental impact.

Atty. Lord then reviewed the legal standards, which the application meets. She requested that they approve the application.

Commissioner Filotei said that Infield Street was all single family homes and the application was for a two family home. The nearby street was not mentioned when the original application was presented. The Commission tried to maintain the integrity of the neighborhood.

Atty. Lord pointed out that there were two family homes on either side of that street. It is consistent with what already exists in the neighborhood.

Mr. Jackson Strong, the City Design Review Coordinator, came forward and greeted the Commissioners. Mr. Strong proposed an additional condition regarding thoroughfares which do not include sidewalks. On Infield Street, there are no sidewalks on that side of the street. He recommended that if the neighbors on either side install a sidewalk, that the owner be required to extend that sidewalk along the frontage of their property.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone present to speak in favor of the application. No one came forward. Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone present to speak in opposition to the application. Hearing none, Commissioner Riley closed the public hearing on 19 Infield Street.

Atty. Lord came back and informed the Commission that Mr. Strong's recommendation was acceptable to the applicant.

(23-29) 280 Trumbull Ave. – Petition of Michael Oh – Seeking a special permit and a site plan review approval to allow a home business for an attorney’s office on the first floor in the N2 zone.

Atty. Oh came forward and greeted the Commissioners. He said that he is the owner and lives on the second floor of a two family residence. He would like to use the first floor as an office instead of renting it out. He is the only occupant in the building at this time. He said that the rule 4.70 (h)3(h) addresses home businesses. He explained there were two options, a home office or a home business. He is requesting a home business, which allows for a certain number of clients on site. His application has been submitted with all the requirements, which his location meets. It is a sole practice. The rules allow for eight (8) business client visits a day. He practices mainly civil litigation focused on personal injury. This requires a Special Permit.

Mr. Jackson Strong, the City Design Review Coordinator, came forward and greeted the Commissioners. Mr. Strong said that this petition was reviewed to verify it was in compliance with the requirements. He noted that the petition had a finding that was made for the Special Criteria. The Design Review will not continue to do that in order to leave that decision solely to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Atty. Oh came back to explain that there would not be any changes to the building.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone present to speak in favor of the application. No one came forward. Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone present to speak in opposition to the application. Hearing none, Commissioner Riley closed the public hearing on 280 Trumbull Avenue.

(23-32) 152 Princeton St. – Petition of T&N Properties, LLC – Seeking a site plan review and a coastal site plan review approval for a 6-unit residential apartment building in the NX1 zone and coastal area.

Atty. Patricia Sullivan of Cohen and Wolf came forward and greeted the Commissioners. She stated that she was representing T&N Properties, the owners of the 152 Princeton Street parcel. This is for a Coastal Site Plan Review. The last time that Atty. Sullivan was present, they were waiting for comments from the DEEP and for new plans to be presented.

The Coastal Site Plan Review is for activities that are either fully or partially within the coastal boundaries. The property at 152 Princeton Street is within the boundary but is not on the water or suitable for a water dependent use. She said that the property currently has a vacant single family house on it. The application proposes a two and a half story, six unit apartment building, which is an allowed use in the zone. It fits in the character of the neighborhood and each unit has a separate entrance. They anticipate about 24 months from construction. The neighborhood is a mix of single family and multi-family uses.

The storm water run off will be treated on site subgrade. Comments from DEEP were addressed in the revised storm water management plan which were submitted to the Commission. The CAM permit is because of the location, not because of a water dependent use. It will promote economic growth without environmental impact. No adverse impact off site or to adjoining properties. She reviewed the details of the NRZ meeting. The units will be rentals.

Commissioner Riley asked if they had the letter from the Office of Long Island Sound Management. The letter stated that the storm water system was inadequate. Atty. Sullivan explained that this was the original letter. Commissioner Riley said that they need the letter from Mr. Gaucher in order to continue.

**** COMMISSIONER MARTORAL MOVED TO CONTINUE THE APPLICATION FOR (23-32) 152 PRINCETON ST. – PETITION OF T&N PROPERTIES, LLC – SEEKING A SITE PLAN REVIEW AND A COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR A 6-UNIT RESIDENTIAL APARTMENT BUILDING IN THE NX1 ZONE AND COASTAL AREA TO THE OCTOBER 30 MEETING.**

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

(23-33) 815 Lafayette Blvd. – Petition of Outfront Media, LLC – Seeking a special permit and site plan review approval for the replacement of a static outdoor advertisement sign with an electronic message display at a 69-foot height and 672-sq. ft. per face at an 18-degree angle in the DX2 zone.

Atty. Christopher Russo of Russo and Rizio, LLC in Fairfield, came forward and greeted the Commissioners. This is a replacement of an existing sign. The sign will be the same size, but updated to conform to the new wind load codes and converted to an electronic message display.

He then submitted some photos of the sign and the area around it. He reviewed the details of the installation. The new sign will be the same height as the existing sign with the message display the same as the existing one. They will be separating the sign by 18 degrees as allowed by the regulations. It is compliant with the regulations as it is a replacement.

He reviewed the details with the Commissioners and explained that the electronic signs do not need exterior catwalks and eliminates the problems of snow loads. The catwalk are now inside the sign and have a better support structure. The pole will have more structural integrity and there is an auto dimming technology that reduces the lumen field. It is connected to the Public Alert System which will immediately display items like Amber Alerts or other similar messages.

Atty. Russo reviewed the various requirements and confirmed that the project conformed and met all the requirements.

Mr. Jackson Strong, the City Design Review Coordinator, had no comments at this time.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone present to speak in favor of the application. No one came forward. Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone present to speak in opposition to the application. Hearing none, Commissioner Riley closed the public hearing on 815 Lafayette Blvd.

#2 (23-36) 108 & 114 Evergreen St. – Petition of Tarantino’s Landscaping, LLC – Seeking an approval for a zone change of the 2 parcels from the CX zone to the I zone. Parcel One (108 Evergreen Street) Schedule “A” property description: bounded Northeasterly: by land formerly of Sanita Capasso, 110 feet; Southeasterly: by land now or formerly of Partrizio Gentile, 33.4 feet; Southeasterly by land now or formerly of Theodore Samolick, 110 feet; Northwesterly: by Evergreen Street, 33.4 feet. Parcel Two (114 Evergreen Street) Schedule “A” property description: bounded Northeasterly: by land now or formerly Joseph and Jack Bergen, 109.4 feet; Southeasterly: by land now or formerly of Carmine and Franchina Bruno, in part, and in part by land now or formerly of Patrizio Gentile, in all 33-1/3 feet; Southwesterly: by land now or formerly of Sanita Capasso, 109.6 feet, more or less; Northwesterly: by Evergreen Street, 33-1/3 feet.

Atty. Christopher Russo of Russo and Rizio, LLC in Fairfield, came forward and greeted the Commissioners. He explained that there was a new zoning code that came into effect and a new zoning map in the Zone Bridgeport project. He said that Atty. Rizio had presented some of the specific smaller properties that were not properly zoned. He explained that there were three properties that were located in this enterprise zone.

Atty. Russo said that this area was very active during the day. There has been an established industrial use there and this was rendered non-conforming when the zone changes went into effect. They are requesting it be changed to an I zone since it was an IL piece previously. Island Brook, which is nearby, is in an I zone. Any changes to the property will require a variance. There are standards in the new regulations that protect residential zones that abut industrial properties.

Atty. Russo then gave an overview of the difference between the I zone and the CX zone. The I zone allows outdoor site uses, and there are different type of buildings to consider. A workshop building or outdoor use is not allowed in the CX. The current tenants are a security company and a tile business. Discussion followed.

Atty. Russo explained that both the Roosevelt Street (23-35) and the River Street (23-37) were similar applications. He said that they would not consider it spot zoning because he felt that the CX and the I zones were closely related and this would be a simple shift within the same category.

Mr. Jackson Strong, the City Design Review Coordinator, came forward and greeted the Commissioners. Mr. Strong said that the CX and the I zones were similar but somewhat

different. The different type of buildings are allowed: general building, workshop building or an outdoor site in both the CX and I zone. The CX zone does not allow for heavy industry, which the I zone does with a special permit. He went on to give the definition from Zone Bridgeport. The CX zone only allows for low impact industrial. The I zone allows for moderate impact manufacturing, warehousing and distribution. He went on to review the requirements for general buildings and the open outdoor sites.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone present to speak in favor of the application. No one came forward. Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone present to speak in opposition to the application.

Mr. Bill Coleman, the Deputy Director of OPED, came forward and greeted the Commissioners. He said that he was present to argue against the zone change. The code said that when the Commissioners are asked to consider zone changes, they have discretion. They need to consider if the proposed amendment is in conformity with the Comprehensive Plan. He said that he did not think it was egregiously against the Master Plan. The Commissioner must also consider whether this correct an error or an inconsistency or will help meet the challenge of a change or changing condition. He believes that the answer to those questions is no. The approval of the Zoning map was a deliberate process and carries the legitimacy of the process. This was deliberately created as a CX zone. The controls were not created in error, but deliberately. The consistency shows on the map. He said that the changes that he has seen in the area shows the consistency.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone else present to speak in opposition to the application. Hearing none, he called for rebuttal.

Atty. Russo said that the goal of the zoning was to eliminate inconsistency, but the zone change created one. Originally this was an IL zone but was change to the CX zone. That's a heavy commercial zone and it does not allow moderate impact manufacturing and warehousing and distribution, which are uses that are prevalent in this area. The heavy industry requires a special permit as does the outdoor storage. This property was purchased as an industrial property and used as an industrial parcel in an industrial zone. The zone change cut out a number of uses that should remain available for the area. This is appropriately placing the property in the correct zone because of the uses that are already existing in the area continue.

#3 (23-35) 10 Roosevelt St. – Petition of Roosevelt Properties, LLC – Seeking an approval for a zone change from the NX2 zone to the I zone. Schedule “A” property description: bounded as per map being known and designated as lot no. 30 on a map dated May 31, 1899, and on file on the land records of Bridgeport: Northerly: by Roosevelt Street, 55 ft, more or less; Easterly: on land now or formerly of Louis J. Krause, being lot no. 20 on said map, 100 ft.; Southerly: on land now or formerly on the estate of Nathaniel Wheeler and the estate of William H. Perry, 35 ft., more or less; Westerly: on Berkshire Mill Pond by an irregular line as per said map.

Atty. Christopher Russo of Russo and Rizio, LLC in Fairfield, came forward and greeted the Commissioners. Atty. Russo said that he was present on behalf of the applicant. This application is similar to the previous application. The parcel was sold to the owner by the City as a location where he could have his industrial use business there. Now the parcel is placed in the NX2 zone. The business is an outdoor contractor storage yard which was located in an industrial zone. The NX2 made this use and property non-conforming. This hampers the development and use of the property. This is in close proximity to the I zone and across the street is another industrial use that was placed into the NX2 zone.

One of the Commissioners noted that there was illegal razor wire on the property. Atty. Russo said that he had told the owner that it had to come down immediately.

Mr. Jackson Strong, the City Design Review Coordinator, came forward and greeted the Commissioners. He gave an overview of the differences between the NX2 zone, which is a neighborhood mix zone and allows for a mix of A or AA residences or small general buildings. It does not permit any other type of use other than residential. It is not to be confused with mixed use.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone present to speak in favor of the application. No one came forward. Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone present to speak in opposition to the application.

Mr. Bill Coleman, the Deputy Director of OPED, came forward and greeted the Commissioners. He said that the approach to the property was intentional. It is important to note that the property borders the Pequonnock River. It was a deliberate public process. There are statements that allow for buffer zones and resiliency. All of the neighboring houses are residential. He requested that the Commission endorse the code.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone else present to speak in opposition to the application. Hearing none, he called for rebuttal.

Atty. Russo said when he submits an application, he is asked to conform to the code. This zone made the property non-conforming. In this instance, the zoning change made it none conforming. This was a property sold by the City for the property owner to be used as an IL industrial use. Now the City is saying that there is a waterfront there, it's not industrial anymore, even though it is zoned industrial on the opposite bank. Other than the razor wire, there have been no violations reported on the site. It's not even in the CX zone but the NX zone. He indicated where the I zones were located in proximity to the parcel.

#4 (23-34) 1755 Stratford Ave. & 24 Waterman St. – Petition of Eighteen Forty-One Stratford Ave, LLC – Seeking an approval to change the parcel with the accessory parking for the apartment building from NX2 to RX1 and combine the two lots into one lot in the

RX1 zone. Beginning at a point on the easterly street line of Waterman Street being a distance of one hundred fifty and fifty hundredths feet (150.50') northerly from the intersection of Stratford Avenue. Said point also being the southwesterly corner of subject parcel as depicted on aforementioned map; thence running N 03°54'02" W; a distance of eighty-eight and fifty hundredths feet (88.50') to a point. Said course abutting the easterly street line of Waterman Street; thence running; N 86°38'50" E, a distance of ninety-nine and ninety-six hundredths feet (99.96') to a point. Said course abutting land, now or formerly, of Larry N. Rudd and Jackie R. Rudd; thence running S 03°54'36" E; a distance of twenty and fifty-six hundredths feet (20.56') to a point. Said course abutting land, now or formerly, of Free Hope, LLC and Maria G. Rangel, each in part; thence running S 52°16'33" W; a distance of one hundred twenty and thirty-two hundredths feet (120.32') to the true point and place of beginning. Said course abutting land, now or formerly, of Maria G. Rangel, land, now or formerly, of James Patrick and other land of Eighteen Forty-One Stratford Ave, LLC, each in part. The above described parcel of land contains an area of five thousand four hundred fifty plus or minus square feet (5,450± SF) or one hundred twenty-five thousandths plus or minus acres (0.125± Ac).

Atty. Christopher Russo of Russo and Rizio, LLC in Fairfield, came forward and greeted the Commissioners. Atty. Russo said that he was present on behalf of the applicant. He explained that Bridgeport Neighborhood Trust was approved for 1755 Stratford for a multi-family dwelling that would contain 8 residential units. A TCO was issued. The work started pre-Zone Bridgeport. When Zone Bridgeport was implemented, the property became an RX1 zone and the Waterman Street property became an NX2 zone. 24 Waterman supplies the parking for the 1755 Stratford Avenue residential units. The new zoning regulations do not allow for a split zone parcel. In order to get the full CO, the two parcels will have to be combined into one parcel. However the new regulations do not allow this because it is a split zone. They wish to change the zoning to match the parcel on Stratford Avenue. This is a technicality in order to combine the two parcels into one.

Mr. Jackson Strong, the City Design Review Coordinator, came forward and greeted the Commissioners. He then explained the differences between the two zones and noted that there was overlap between the two zones. RX1 does not allow for retail, but does allow for indoor consumer services and low impact manufacturing. There are some residential uses included but they are limited to a six units or eight with a special permit.

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

Mr. Bill Coleman, the Deputy Director of OPED, came forward and greeted the Commissioners. He said that he was present to speak in favor of this change because it was an error.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone else present to speak in opposition to the application. Hearing none, he closed the hearing on 1755 Stratford Ave. & 24 Waterman St.

#5 (23-37) 142 River St. – Petition of MGT, LLC – Seeking an approval for a zone change from the CX zone to the I zone. Schedule “A” property description: northeasterly: on land now or formerly of Mark IV, 78.18 feet; Easterly: on land now or formerly of Mark IV, 39.28 feet by the arc of a curve having a radius of 25 feet; Southwesterly: on land River Street, 103.18 feet; Northwesterly: 150.97 feet on Parcel B1 on map filed in the Office of the Bridgeport Town Clerk on May 5, 1988.

Atty. Christopher Russo of Russo and Rizio, LLC in Fairfield, came forward and greeted the Commissioners. Atty. Russo said that he was present on behalf of the applicant. The parcel is located in the Enterprise Zone and was in an Industrial area. This location was former Holcon Gas Company and later purchased by Airgas, a national brand in fuel storage. Fuel storage is heavy industry. The change of zone makes the property non-conforming. They can't expand without a variance or grow their national business. Across the street is another fuel storage facility. It is an industrial neighborhood and an industrial property.

Atty. Russo requested that the Commissioners return the parcel to the original zoning of Industrial Zone.

Commissioner Riley asked why they did not request that fuel storage be included in the CX zone. Atty. Russo replied that having fuel storage added to the CX zone, that would include every CX zone throughout the City. He felt that this was a much more controlled use of the zone.

Mr. Jackson Strong, the City Design Review Coordinator, came forward and greeted the Commissioners. He said that this was the same type of zone change that the Commissioners had been presented with on the first application between CX and I. Other than that, he had no comment.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone present to speak in favor of the application. No one came forward. Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone present to speak in opposition to the application.

Mr. Bill Coleman, the Deputy Director of OPED, came forward and greeted the Commissioners. He said that he would note that the zone change would create an island and look like spot zoning. He said that while the company could expand, it could also close. He said that they can't be too enticed by specific scenarios. They have to consider the community values, also.

Commissioner Riley asked if there was anyone else present to speak in opposition to the application. Hearing none, he called for rebuttal.

Atty. Russo came forward and pointed out that Airgas was not likely to shut down because they are a national brand and well-established. Anyone else who came in with a heavy industry use would have to come to the Commission for a Special Use Permit. Workshop types of uses like

breweries or lumber or metal work are allowed in Industrial, but not CX zone. The uses in the neighborhood were industrial uses that were rendered non-conforming. He said that he did not feel this was spot zoning.

RECESS

Commissioner Riley announced a recess. He reconvened the meeting a few minutes later.

(23-38) Text Amendments & Corrections – Petition of the Office of Planning & Economic Development (OPED) – Seeking 24 miscellaneous corrections and amendments to correct inconsistencies and provide clarity to the current City of Bridgeport Zoning Regulations.

This item was deferred to October 30, 2023.

DECISION SESSION

D-1 (23-25) RE: 3369 & 3375 FAIRFIELD AVENUE – Seeking a certificate of location approval for a cannabis sales retail establishment in the MX1 zone.

**** COMMISSIONER DORGAN MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM D-1 (23-25) RE: 3369 & 3375 FAIRFIELD AVENUE – SEEKING A CERTIFICATE OF LOCATION APPROVAL FOR A CANNABIS SALES RETAIL ESTABLISHMENT IN THE MX1 ZONE FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:**

- 1. THE PROPOSAL COMPLIES WITH THE MASTER PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT.**
- 2. THERE ARE NO ADVERSE IMPACTS ON THE NEIGHBORHOOD.**
- 3. THE SITE IS A SUITABLE LOCATION FOR THE PROPOSED USE.**
- 4. THE SUBMITTED TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN SHOWED NO ADVERSE IMPACTS TO EXISTING TRAFFIC FLOW.**

**** COMMISSIONER MARTORAL SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

23-28. RE: 19 INFIELD STREET – SEEKING A SPECIAL PERMIT AND A SITE PLAN REVIEW APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A 2-FAMILY DWELLING IN THE N2 ZONE.

**** COMMISSIONER MARTORAL MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM. 23-28. RE: 19 INFIELD STREET – SEEKING A SPECIAL PERMIT AND A SITE PLAN REVIEW APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A 2-FAMILY DWELLING IN THE N2 ZONE FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:**

- 1. SINGLE FAMILY HOMES ARE THE PREDOMINATE USE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD.**

2. **A TWO-FAMILY HOME WOULD NEGATIVELY IMPACT THE NEIGHBORHOOD.**
3. **THE APPLICATION DOES NOT MEET THE SPECIAL PERMIT REVIEW CRITERIA OF SECTIONS 11.50.6(A)(5&6) AND 11.50.6B(1).**

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION TO APPROVE FAILED TO PASS WITH FOUR (4) IN FAVOR AND THREE (3) OPPOSED.**

23-29 RE: 280 TRUMBULL AVENUE – Seeking a *special permit and a site plan review approval to construct a 2-family dwelling in the N2 zone.

**** COMMISSIONER FILOTEI MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM 23-29 RE: 280 TRUMBULL AVENUE – SEEKING A *SPECIAL PERMIT AND A SITE PLAN REVIEW APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A 2-FAMILY DWELLING IN THE N2 ZONE for the following REASONS:**

1. **THE USE MEETS THE SPECIAL PERMIT CRITERIA OF SECTION 11.50.6.**
2. **THERE WILL BE NO PHYSICAL CHANGES TO THE HOME’S APPEARANCE.**
3. **THE ARE NO ADVERSE IMPACTS ON THE NEIGHBORHOOD.**

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

D-1 (23-32) RE: 152 PRINCETON STREET – Seeking a site plan review and a coastal site plan review approval for a 6-unit residential apartment building in the NX1 zone and coastal area.

This item was continued to October 30, 2023.

23-33 RE: 815 LAFAYETTE BOULEVARD – Seeking a *special permit and site plan review approval for the replacement of a static outdoor advertisement sign with an electronic message display at a 69-foot height and 672-sq. ft. per face at an 18-degree angle in the DX2 zone.

**** COMMISSIONER DORGAN MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM 23-33 RE: 815 LAFAYETTE BOULEVARD – SEEKING A *SPECIAL PERMIT AND SITE PLAN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR THE REPLACEMENT OF A STATIC OUTDOOR ADVERTISEMENT SIGN WITH AN ELECTRONIC MESSAGE DISPLAY AT A 69- FEET HEIGHT AND 672-SQ. FT. PER FACE AT AN 18-DEGREE ANGLE IN THE DX2 ZONE FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:**

- 1. THE USE MEETS THE SPECIAL PERMIT CRITERIA OF SECTION 11.50.6.**
- 2. THE CHANGE REDUCES THE NON-CONFORMITY OF THE EXISTING SIGN.**

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

#1 (23-39) RE: 377 WOODLAWN AVENUE – Seeking approval for a 3-lot subdivision and a site plan review in the N2 zone.

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON MOVED TO DEFER AGENDA ITEM 23-39 RE: 377 WOODLAWN AVENUE – SEEKING APPROVAL FOR A 3-LOT SUBDIVISION AND A SITE PLAN REVIEW IN THE N2 ZONE TO OCTOBER 30, 2023.**

**** COMMISSIONER MARTORAL SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

#2 (23-36) RE: 108 & 114 EVERGREEN STREET – Seeking an approval for a zone change of the 2 parcels from the CX zone to the I zone.

**** COMMISSIONER MARTORAL MOVED TO DENY AGENDA ITEM #2 (23-36) RE: 108 & 114 EVERGREEN STREET – SEEKING AN APPROVAL FOR A ZONE CHANGE OF THE 2 PARCELS FROM THE CX ZONE TO THE I ZONE FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:**

- 1. THE PROPOSAL DOES NOT COMPLY WITH THE MASTER PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT.**
- 2. THE ZONE CHANGE WOULD BE SPOT ZONING.**

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

#3 (23-35) RE: 10 ROOSEVELT STREET – Seeking approval for a zone change from the NX2 zone to the I zone.

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON MOVED TO DENY AGENDA ITEM #3 (23-35) RE: 10 ROOSEVELT STREET – SEEKING APPROVAL FOR A ZONE CHANGE FROM THE NX2 ZONE TO THE I ZONE FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:**

- 1. THE PROPOSAL DOES NOT COMPLY WITH THE MASTER PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT.**
- 2. THE ZONE CHANGE WOULD BE SPOT ZONING.**

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

#4 (23-34) RE: 1755 STRATFORD AVENUE & 24 WATERMAN STREET – Seeking an approval to change the parcel with the accessory parking for the apartment building from NX2 to RX1 and combine the two lots into one lot in the RX1 zone.

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM 4 (23-34) RE: 1755 STRATFORD AVENUE & 24 WATERMAN STREET – SEEKING AN APPROVAL TO CHANGE THE PARCEL WITH THE ACCESSORY PARKING FOR THE APARTMENT BUILDING FROM NX2 TO RX1 AND COMBINE THE TWO LOTS INTO ONE LOT IN THE RX1 ZONE EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 16, 2023 FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:**

- 1. THE PROPOSAL COMPLIES WITH THE MASTER PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT.**
- 2. THE ZONE CHANGE CORRECTS AN ERROR OF MAPPING.**

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

#5 (23-37) RE: 142 RIVER STREET – Seeking approval for a zone change from the CX zone to the I zone.

**** COMMISSIONER MARTORAL MOVED TO DENY AGENDA ITEM #5 (23-37) RE: 142 RIVER STREET – SEEKING APPROVAL FOR A ZONE CHANGE FROM THE CX ZONE TO THE I ZONE FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:**

- 1. THE PROPOSAL DOES NOT COMPLY WITH THE MASTER PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT.**
- 2. THE ZONE CHANGE WOULD BE SPOT ZONING.**

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

(23-38) RE: TEXT AMENDMENTS & CORRECTIONS: Seeking 24 miscellaneous corrections and amendments to correct inconsistencies and provide clarity to the current City of Bridgeport Zoning Regulations.

This item was deferred to October 30, 2023.

23-30 RE: 8-24 REFERRAL – Requesting under Sec. 8-24 of the Connecticut General Statute, a favorable recommendation to the City Council for the acquisition of certain chronically vacant and blighted properties in the “Hollow” Neighborhood Revitalization Zone (NRZ), generally located across from Nanny Goat Park and across from St. Raphael’s Elementary School.

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON MOVED TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR AGENDA ITEM 23-30 RE: 8-24 REFERRAL – REQUESTING UNDER SEC. 8-24 OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTE, A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THE ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN CHRONICALLY VACANT AND BLIGHTED PROPERTIES IN THE “HOLLOW” NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION ZONE (NRZ), GENERALLY LOCATED ACROSS FROM NANNY GOAT PARK AND ACROSS FROM ST. RAPHAEL’S ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.**

**** COMMISSIONER LABUFF SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

23-31 RE: 8-24 REFERRAL – Requesting under Sec. 8-24 of the Connecticut General Statute, a favorable recommendation to the City Council for the acquisition of certain chronically vacant and blighted property located within the “South End” Neighborhood Revitalization Zone (NRZ), located generally proximate to the University of Bridgeport campus and the new Bassick High School campus.

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON MOVED TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR AGENDA ITEM 23-31 RE: 8-24 REFERRAL – REQUESTING UNDER SEC. 8-24 OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTE, A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THE ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN CHRONICALLY VACANT AND BLIGHTED PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN THE “SOUTH END” NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION ZONE (NRZ), LOCATED GENERALLY PROXIMATE TO THE UNIVERSITY OF BRIDGEPORT CAMPUS AND THE NEW BASSICK HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS.**

**** COMMISSIONER LABUFF SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

23-40 RE: 8-24 REFERRAL – Requesting under Sec. 8-24 of the Connecticut General Statute, a favorable recommendation to the City Council for the installation of cellular antennas on a light tower and a 10’ x 15’, fenced equipment area at Kennedy Stadium.

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON MOVED TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR AGENDA ITEM 23-40 RE: 8-24 REFERRAL – REQUESTING UNDER SEC. 8-24 OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTE, A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY**

COUNCIL FOR THE INSTALLATION OF CELLULAR ANTENNAS ON A LIGHT TOWER AND A 10' X 15', FENCED EQUIPMENT AREA AT KENNEDY STADIUM.

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

23-41 RE: 8-24 REFERRAL – Requesting under Sec. 8-24 of the Connecticut General Statute, a favorable recommendation to the City Council for the installation of a water pumping station on 9.640-sq. ft. on the Fairchild Wheeler Golf course along Jefferson Street.

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON MOVED TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL for Agenda Item 23-41 RE: 8-24 REFERRAL – REQUESTING UNDER SEC. 8-24 OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTE, A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THE INSTALLATION OF A WATER PUMPING STATION ON 9.640-SQ. FT. ON THE FAIRCHILD WHEELER GOLF COURSE ALONG JEFFERSON STREET.
** COMMISSIONER LABUFF SECONDED.
** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

OTHER BUSINESS

There were no additional items to consider at this time.

CONSENT AGENDA

There were no additional items to consider at this time.

OTHER MATTERS THAT MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION

There were no additional items to consider at this time.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **Minutes of June 26, 2023 – Present: Acting Chairman, Melville Riley.
Commissioners: Cesar Cordero, Johanna Dorgan, Robert Filotei, Jacqueline Martoral, Robert Morton; PZC Clerk: Paul Boucher**

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 26, 2023 MEETING.
** COMMISSIONER MARTORAL SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 26, 2023 MEETING PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

ADJOURNMENT

**** COMMISSIONER MORTON MOVED TO ADJOURN**

**** COMMISSIONER LABUFF SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

S. L. Soltes

Telesco Secretarial Services