

**MINUTES OF THE ZONING BOARD PUBLIC  
HEARING & REGULAR MEETING ON MONDAY,  
DECEMBER 10, 2012, 7:00 P.M., 4<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR,  
CAFETERIA, STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT**

Present for the Board: Tom Mills, Chairman, Barry Michelson, Harry Parson, Maria Nakian, Audrey Cosentini, and Kathleen Donahue. Present for staff: Norman F. Cole, Land Use Bureau Chief and David Killeen, Associate Planner

Mr. Mills called the meeting to order at 7:14 p.m.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. **APPL. 212-16 – YALE & TOWNE SPE, LLC, 110 Towne St, Text change**, to Amend Article III, Section 9k(5)(b) to allow hotel FAR and hotel units to be converted to additional residential FAR and/or residential units with Zoning Board approval (*continued from December 3, 2012*).
2. **APPL. 212-17 – YALE & TOWNE, SPE, LLC, Amended GDP, Final Site & Architectural Plan and Coastal Site Plan Review (CSPR)**, Requesting a GDP amendment, Final Site and Architectural Plans and Coastal Site Plan Review to develop a new five-story building with 102 housing units, 17,600 s.f. office space and associated parking and landscaping and which also includes preservation of an existing historic structure. Block Y1 is part of the mixed-use Yale & Towne development at 110 Towne St. and is located in the SRD-N district. (*continued from December 3, 2012*).

Attorney John Freeman explained the GDP amendments.

Mrs. Cosentini asked why Building 35A wasn't shown on the GDP. Attorney Freeman distributed an explanation of GDP note #3. Mr. Mills said if they want to keep Building 35A then it should be on the GDP

Victor Mirontschuk, EDI International Architects, displayed a slide of Y8 showing Building 35A incorporated. Attorney Freeman said this Y8 alternate maintains the same development amounts.

Attorney Freeman said they have no issues with Staff comments.

Mrs. Cosentini asked if the Planning Board has reviewed this new plan for Block Y8 incorporating Building 35A? Mr. Cole said no, but they should be asked to comment.

Attorney Freeman presented and described the plans for Building Y1 and reviewed the changes from the current GDP including changing the hotel to residential and reduction in height.

Mr. Mirontschuk described how the plan protects the historic 7 Market Street building and also vehicle access and parking.

Attorney Freeman stated they aren't asking for sign approval at this time.

Mr. Mirontschuk discussed the Y1 brick color and light banding intended to complement the 7 Market building.

Ms. Donahue asked if 7 Market could withstand the surrounding construction work? Mr. Mirontschuk said yes. Mr. Mirontschuk added that the surface parking will be for visitors and the garage will be key access.

Mr. Michelson asked if they were using real brick? Mr. Mirontschuk said no, they are using EIFS "brick". Mr. Michelson asked how the floor area compares to the hotel floor area on the current GDP? Attorney Freeman said it's smaller.

Mrs. Cosentini asked if they want to transfer the balance of floor area to other blocks? Attorney Freeman said yes, they are transferring the unused retail from Y1 and Y3 to Y8.

Mr. Mills asked if the Board Members had any questions.

Mr. Mills asked if Y8 parking was all in the Y7 garage? Attorney Freeman said yes, at a rate of 2/1000 retail and office. Mr. Cole pointed out that this parking ratio was only available if the Zoning Board grants a reduction. Mr. Mills said Y7 garage should reflect a rate of 4/1000 retail and 3/1000 office.

Ms. Donahue asked if parking for big box retail site wasn't greater than neighborhood retail?

Mr. Parson asked what the BMR count would be at build-out? Attorney Freeman said 10% or 114 units.

Mrs. Nakian noted that ground floor retail was planned in Yale & Towne to integrate the development to the community but now they are taking it all out of Y2, Y1 and Y3. Attorney Freeman said they are having a lot of trouble attracting ground floor retail. They can't rent live-work units but can rent residential units at grade. Mrs. Nakian expressed concern that the scale of the buildings is getting massive and out of scale with the South-end neighborhood.

Mr. Mills said he wants these GDP changes referred to the Planning Board and thinks the sign location on Y1 should be lower because it seems to over- power 7 Market Street (lower the wall height) and that he doesn't want any signs on 7 Market. Mr. Mills asked what restoration work has been done? The site needs landscaping and not parking against 7 Market and they need to use real brick on the landscape wall.

Mr. Mills called for any questions or comments from the Public.

Dr. Diane Monson said her father designed 7 Market Street. She described the history of this manufacturing site and Mr. Towne's total dedication beginning in 1868 to preserving a manufacturing presence in this area. She's visited the site and looked for the plaque established by Mr. Towne to commemorate the site but was unable to locate it. She expressed her dislike for the architecture of the current Yale & Towne site.

Melissa Bunton, Stamford resident, expressed concern that Y7 garage will make the Fairway store dark. People don't want to use a garage for a grocery store.

Mr. Mills asked if BLT would consider recreating the plaque over the door of 7 Market?

Mr. Mills continued the Public Hearing on these applications to the next Zoning Board hearing scheduled for January 7, 2013.

Mr. Mills called a brief recess at 9:00 pm and called the meeting back to order at 9:13 pm.

3. **APPL. 212-10 – FIRST GARDEN DEVELOPMENT, LP, 1032 Hope Street, Special Exception.** Special Exception approvals related to a proposed mixed use, 4-story building containing 88 residential units, 2,222 s.f. ground floor retail and associated parking for a 0.94 acre parcel located in the V-C (Village Commercial District) (*continued from December 10, 2012*).
4. **APPL. 212-11 – FIRST GARDEN DEVELOPMENT, LP, 1032 Hope Street, Site and Architectural Plan Review.** Construction of a new four story mixed-use building consisting of 88 rental apartments, 2,222 s.f. of ground floor retail space and associated amenities, parking and landscaping on 0.94 acres of property located in a V-C (Village Commercial District) (*continued from December 10, 2012*).

Mr. Mills opened the Public Hearing on this matter.

Attorney John Leydon described the application and told the Board this is the first residential application in the Springdale Village Commercial District. Mrs. Nakian read the Planning Board referral into the record.

Attorney Leydon described the applicant's past projects and said there is a strong demand for studio apartments within 3/10 mile to the train station. The Applicant is offering to increase BMR to 15%. Attorney Leydon told the Board that the project complies with all Village Commercial standards. He introduced Andrew Hennessey, Project Architect, who described the building and presented samples of the proposed materials.

Richard Freedman, applicant, said there is no guest parking. Residents will need a parking pass to access the lot. Their research shows parking demand matches the parking ratios of 1/studio; 1.25/one-bedroom and 1.5/two-bedrooms. There will be a superintendent on-site.

Ms. Donahue asked if they are changing the front sidewalk? Mr. Freedman said no, the City is redoing the sidewalks. Mr. Hennessey said the Planning Board wanted a low wall and pavers on the walkways to the buildings and they've added those. Steve Trinkaus presented a landscape plan and noted they've added an arborvitae row along the rear property line. Ms. Donahue asked how the retaining wall affects the adjacent properties? Mr. Trinkaus said it will have no impact. They are planning a keystone modular wall. Mr. Mills asked that specification be provided for the wall.

Mr. Andrew Hennessey described the design of a low wall and planters along the sidewalk.

Mr. Mills called for any questions or comments from the Public.

Beth Conrad asked what is a village and said that she doesn't like tiny studio units. The Springdale Neighborhood Association doesn't represent everyone's views. They're condemning people's property to solve traffic problems. These units should be larger and fewer.

Mr. Mills asked the applicant to submit revised plans specifying the wall heights and to add railing detail to the wall. Mr. Trinkaus agreed. Mr. Mills said the Public Hearing on these applications would be continued to January 7, 2013.

### **REGULAR MEETING**

Mrs. Cosentini moved to change the order of the agenda. Mr. Parson seconded the motion and it passed with the eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Mills, Michelson, Cosentini, Nakian and Parson).

### **OLD BUSINESS**

1. **Application 211-27 – GB New England2, LLC & Nine Sixty Nine Associates – Special Exception**, requests approval pursuant to Section 7.5, Large Scale Development to redevelop an existing commercially zoned property located at 969 High Ridge Road with a new 14,568 s.f. CVS building (*request for time extension*).
2. **Application 211-28 – GB New England2, LLC & Nine Sixty Nine Associates – Approval of Site & Architectural Plans and/or Requested Uses**, request to demolish an existing two-story, 28,800 s.f. building and construct a new 14,568 s.f. retail building for use as a CVS drug store with associated parking and site amenities for a property located at 969 High Ridge Road (*request for time extension*).

After a brief discussion, Mrs. Cosentini moved to approve the request for time extension on the referenced applications. Mr. Parson seconded the motion and it passed with the eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Mills, Michelson, Cosentini, Nakian and Parson).

3. **APPL. 211-29 – Site & Architectural Plan and Coastal Site Plan Review (CSPR), 28 SOUTHFIELD 2011, LLC**, Final Site Plan and CSPR approval to construct four, 4-story residential buildings containing 256 units along with supportive amenities including: 30 boat slips, a ground floor café, flex office space, a public board walk and associated site improvements all on a 5.8 acre site located in the DW-D zone on Southfield Avenue (*request for time extension*).

After a brief discussion, Mr. Michelson moved to approve the request for time extension on the referenced application. Mrs. Nakian seconded the motion and it passed with the eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Mills, Michelson, Cosentini, Nakian and Parson).

4. **APPL. 208-05 ANTARES HARBOR POINT**, General Development Plan, Condition #7, 14 Acre Working Boatyard and Full Service Marina status updates, Cease & Desist Order and requested items.

Mr. Cole provided the Board Members with an update, noting that BLT reported that fuel tanks had been refilled and the gas dock was staffed and open on Friday morning. He reported that BLT was also ready to stake out the remediation areas.

**PENDING APPLICATIONS:**

1. **APPL. 212-25 – BBSF, LLC and Affordable Housing Development Company, LLC**, Text Change
2. **APPL. 212-26 – BBSF, LLC & Affordable Housing Development Company, LLC**, GDP Amendment and Coastal Site Plan Review

Mr. Mills asked the Board Members if they had any comments on these two applications.

Mrs. Cosentini said we need to add visitor parking to our regulations. Discussion ensued regarding parking requirements and pressure on on-street parking. Mr. Cole commented that the Applicant needed a decision on the GDP amendments.

After a brief review of the Motion prepared by Staff, Mr. Michelson moved to approve the GDP amendment. Mrs. Nakian seconded the motion and it passed with the eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Mills, Michelson, Cosentini, Nakian and Parson).

The approved motion to read as follows:

Motion to APPROVE APPL. 212-26 submitted on behalf of BBSF, LLC & Affordable Housing Development Company Requesting a modification to the General Development Plan (Approval of Site Plans/Requested Uses) and Coastal Site Plan Review to increase the total number of residential units from 238 units to 255 units and to divide the remaining units to be developed between two buildings. The proposed modification also includes a reduction in residential parking to a minimum of 277 parking spaces. The motion for approval is made as follows:

**WHEREAS**, the Zoning Board conducted a duly called public hearing on November 19, 2012, November 26, 2012 and December 3, 2012 and has considered the submitted comments of interested City agencies, officials and the general public;

**WHEREAS** said applications were accompanied by detailed Architectural Plans and Renderings, prepared by Perkins Eastman, dated September 18, 2012 and entitled AS101 Site Plan, A101 Building A First Floor Plan, A102 Building A Second & Third Floor Plans, A103 Building A 9<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> Floor and Roof Plans, A104 Building D First Floor Plan, A105 Building D Second Floor Plan, A106 Building D Third Floor Plan, A201 Building A Elevation, A202 Building D Elevations, A301 Building Sections; an Improvement Location Survey, prepared by Redniss & Mead and dated July 11, 2012 (signed August 17, 2012); a General Civil Engineering Plan, prepared by Tighe & Bond, Inc., dated September 18, 2012 and entitled C1.0 Drainage and Utility Plan; a General Landscaping Plan, prepared by Lee Weintraub Associates, dated September 18, 2012 and entitled L-100 Landscape Site Plan and General Parking Garage Plans, prepared by Walker Parking Consultants, dated September 20, 2012 and entitled A-101 Phase 2 Ground Tier Plan, A-102 Phase 2 2<sup>nd</sup> Tier Plan, A-103 Phase 2 3<sup>rd</sup> Tier Plan, A-104 Phase 2 Top

Tier Plan, A-201 Phase 2 Garage Elevations, A-202 Phase 2 Garage Elevations, A-301 Phase 2 Garage Section, A-420 Phase 2 Stair No. 2 Plans and Details and such related materials, reports and exhibits constituting the application file as may be amended to be consistent with representations made during the public hearing on November 19, 2012, November 26, 2012 and December 3, 2012. Together all of these documents are referred to hereinafter as the Building and Site Plans;

**WHEREAS**, the Building and Site Plans conform to the spirit, goals, purposes and objectives of the TCDD Regulation, to Section 7.2 and 7-T of the Stamford Zoning Regulations, to the Stamford Master Plan and to the applicable policies of the CAM Act;

**WHEREAS**, the proposed activity: (1) is consistent with all applicable goals and policies in Connecticut General Statutes section 22a-92 and (2) will not cause an adverse impact on coastal resources and future water-dependent development activities; and

**WHEREAS**, the General Development Plan as herein amended shall be recorded on the City of Stamford Land Records.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Zoning Board approves Appl. 212-26.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**Minutes of October 1, 2012**

After a brief discussion, Mrs. Cosentini moved to approve the minutes as modified. Mr. Michelson seconded the motion and it passed with the eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Mills, Michelson, Cosentini, Nakian and Parson).

**Minutes of October 15, 2012**

After a brief discussion, Mr. Parson moved to approve the minutes as modified. Mrs. Nakian seconded the motion and it passed with the eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Mills, Michelson, Cosentini, Nakian and Parson).

**Minutes of November 19, 2012**

After a brief discussion, Mrs. Cosentini moved to approve the minutes as modified. Mr. Michelson seconded the motion and it passed with the eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Mills, Michelson, Cosentini, Nakian and Parson).

Due to the lateness of the hour, Mr. Mills adjourned the meeting at 11:35pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Maria Nakian, Secretary  
Stamford Zoning Board