STAMFORD PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
DRAFT MINUTES, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2015
6TH FLOOR, SAFETY TRAINING ROOM, GOVERNMENT CENTER
888 WASHINGTON BLVD., STAMFORD, CT

Stamford Planning Board Members present were: Voting Members: Theresa Dell, Chair, Claire Fishman, Jennifer Godzeno (arrived at 6:50 p.m.), William Levin, Roger Quick, Jay Tepper and Michael Totilo. Absent: Zbigniew Naumowicz. Present for staff was: Norman Cole, AICP, Land Use Bureau Chief, and David W. Woods, Ph.D., AICP, Principal Planner.

Ms. Dell, Chair called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m., and introduced the members of the Board and announced that Zbigniew Naumowicz would be absent. Ms. Dell asked the Board if they had any questions regarding the minutes of October 14th or October 20th.

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES:

Meeting of 10/14/15: After a brief discussion, Mr. Quick moved to recommend approval of the Planning Board Minutes of October 14, 2015; Ms. Fishman seconded the motion, and passed unanimously with eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Dell, Fishman, Quick, Tepper and Totilo).

Meeting of 10/20/15: After a brief discussion, Mr. Totilo moved to recommend approval of the Planning Board Minutes of October 20, 2015; Mr. Tepper seconded the motion, and passed unanimously with eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Dell, Fishman, Quick, Tepper and Totilo).

PLANNING BOARD DELIBERATIONS:

[NOTE: The purpose of these deliberations was for the Planning Board to carefully review and consider:

1. **All materials submitted by the applicant including the Market Study by the applicant and the Peer Review Report**

2. **The staff report by Norman F. Cole, AICP, Land Use Bureau Chief.**

3. **In addition, the Planning Board scheduled and conducted a Special Public Meeting on Wednesday, October 14, 2015 at Westover Elementary School, in which the Board:**
   a. **Carefully listened to a 2 hour presentation by John Knuff, Attorney for the Applicant; James Bernstein, consultant for the applicant; Scott Pollard, Architect; Craig Lapinski, William Heiple with Fuss & O'Neill and John Freeman after which Mr. Knuff handed the Board four attachments that were considered in the Board's deliberations;**
   b. **The Board asked questions of the applicant in which both John Knuff and the applicant's team;**
   c. **The Board then heard from the public who submitted letters requesting to speak as per City Charter No. C6-40-10, they all submitted written materials as well as spoke which the Board also used in its deliberations;**
   d. **Due to time constraints the Board also heard from two representatives in opposition and in favor of this application with the opportunity for those who were unable to speak to submit comments to the Land Use Bureau by noon on Thursday, October 15, 2015;**
   e. **A report from the Harbor Management Commission as well as a letter from the State Department of Energy & Environmental Protection (DEEP).**

4. **In total, the Planning Board used all of these documents and testimony to educate themselves of the issues and the Board found some of the information received less credible in their minds than others.**

5. **All these materials were produced and given to the Planning Board at this second public meeting on Wednesday, October 21, 2015 to be used as the basis for the Planning Board's recommendation to the Zoning Board on these six interrelated applications.**

It is important to understand that these minutes reflect a summary of the deliberations, not verbatim transcription.]

Ms. Dell stated that the purpose of tonight's meeting was to discuss what we heard (and the materials we received) last Wednesday evening in our public session on the boatyard which is the referral from the Zoning Board. I will list all six and then we will start with our questions from the Board, if we have any for the applicant, and questions for Mr. Cole and Dr. Woods then we will have discussion among ourselves. Ms. Dell then read into the record the six Zoning Board applications as follows:

1. **ZB Appl. #215-02 - THE STRAND/BRC GROUP, LLC - Text Change:** To Amend Article III, Section 9(J)(5)(b) by modifying non-residential floor area from .20 to .23 FAR in the SRD-S District.

2. **ZB Appl. #215-03 - THE STRAND/BRC GROUP, LLC, Amend GDP - Washington Blvd.:** Applicant is seeking approval of an amendment to the General Development Plan (GDP) for Harbor Point.

3. **ZB Appl. #215-04 - SOUTHFIELD PROPERTY, LLC - Text Change:** To Amend Article III, Section 9AAAA DWD Designed Waterfront Development District language.

4. **ZB Appl. #215-05 - WATERFRONT OFFICE BUILDING, LP, Map Change:** Applicant proposes to change approximately 8.15 acres of property located at 46, 62, 68 and 78 Southfield Avenue, Block #25, from C-WD to DW-D.

5. **ZB Appl. #215-06 - SOUTHFIELD PROPERTY LLC and WATERFRONT OFFICE BUILDING, LP, 28, 46, 62, 68, and 78 Southfield Avenue - Special Exception and General Development Plans:** Requesting approval of Special Exceptions and General Development Plan to construct 261 units of housing and a full service boatyard and marina with public access to the waterfront and water-dependent uses on approximately 13.4 acres.

6. **ZB App. #215-07 - SOUTHFIELD PROPERTY LLC and WATERFRONT OFFICE BUILDING, LP, 28, 46, 62, 68, and 78 Southfield Avenue - Final Site & Architectural Plans and Coastal Site Plan Review:** Requesting approval of Final Site & Architectural Plans and Coastal Site Plan Review.

Ms. Dell outlined how the discussion by the Planning Board would occur on these six Zoning Board applications. Ms. Dell made it clear that under open discussion all members of the Planning Board, including our two alternates, Jennifer Godzeno and William Levin, would also be encouraged to actively participate. Once the Planning Board went into the decision stage, then only the five voting members would be allowed to continue to discuss and vote.

Ms. Dell opened the discussion by asking the members to give their impression of the three acre site proposal and to ask either the applicant or staff any questions of clarification.

Ms. Dell stated that these are the items in front of us this evening. Ms. Dell asked Mr. Cole and Dr. Woods whether the questions asked of the staff by the Planning Board had answers.

Mr. Cole answered that the question posed was, and the applicant was going to respond to it, but in the meantime, I have spoken with the engineers at Fuss & O'Neill. The question was "What's the ground coverage on the property?" And they have submitted an updated zoning table that increased the coverage with the exemptions to 57% and the questions was, I think Jennifer asked, what the total coverage would be if you weren't counting any exemptions and the answer is 78%.

Ms. Dell then invited the Board members to ask questions starting with Mr. Quick, Ms. Dell instructed the members that if they have any for the presenters or ask questions among ourselves.

Mr. Quick focused his questions to Mr. Freeman: (1) Why can't the boatyard be placed on the 14 acres in a reduced size given the historic nature of the old Brewer's site; (2) this application combines multiple pieces which included boat owners, tenants, restaurants users, contractors, employees; the concern is there are so many moving parts have you considered a parking management plan; (3) is there a possibility of boat owners doing their own maintenance on the Magee Avenue site given how tightly squeezed that proposal is; (4) operating hours as well as the layout and amenities for the 205 Magee Avenue boat storage site.

Mr. Freeman answered that this proposal represents a replacement of the boatyard on the 14 acres as well as boat storage with no electricity and no amenities at 205 Magee Avenue and would be operated Monday through Friday 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. but people would have access to their boats 7 days a week. Mr. Freeman reminded Mr. Quick and the Board of the various elements and asked Mr. Bronstein to answer Mr. Quick's technical questions, which he did.

Ms. Dell asked Mr. Tepper if he had any questions for the applicant or staff. Mr. Tepper stated that he had no questions at this time but would ask other members of the Board during discussion.

Ms. Dell turned the floor over to Ms. Fishman who focused her concerns on fire safety, and boat storage. Mr. Freeman and Mr. Cole answered that these proposals were reviewed by Charles Spaulding, Chief Fire Marshal, who signed off on the City's ability to respond to fires at the Davenport Landing site but the 205 Magee Avenue site was not going to be sprinklered.

Ms. Dell asked Mr. Totilo if he had any questions. Mr. Totilo's focus was on clarifying fire suppression and whether the size of the building was big enough for the 60+ ft. boats could be maintained including height and size as well as the actual acreage of the Davenport Landing site.

Mr. Freeman answered that 65 ft. boats could be maintained in this proposed boatyard and that it's a matter of economics. Mr. Totilo stated that he was a little bit disappointed that there is not a better mix of uses on the site and too much rental housing is being proposed, and he further stated that he would like to see a better mixed use development with a larger building to provide more services, boat storage, reduction in rental units, stores on the first floor, retail, ship shops, restaurants, etc.

Mr. Levin stated that based on the historic evidence he saw at the Stamford Historical Society that he is convinced that the new boatyard does not need the 14 acres. Mr. Levin asked the applicant why they didn't maximize the residential units that could be developed on the Davenport Landing site while dedicating a smaller portion of the 14 acre site to water dependent uses of a boatyard, boatyard support uses such as sailmakers, engine repair, and boat storage?

Mr. Freeman reiterated the applicant's position on why they are proposing this six part request of the Zoning Board.

Ms. Godzeno asked whether any additional information has come forward regarding how the Harbor Commission came up with their referral to the Zoning Board that this proposal is not consistent with the Harbor Management Plan?

Ms. Dell asked Robert Karp, member of the Harbor Management Commission and Steven Loab, Alternate on the Harbor Management Commission, to briefly address the issue and as a follow up. Ms. Dell asked Mr. Cole whether the Board should take into consideration the Harbor Management Commission's report. Mr. Cole answered by stating that the Harbor Management Commission's deliberations as well as the letter to the Zoning Board from DEEP is all relevant in educating the Planning Board on all of the relevant information of BLT's application.

Ms. Dell systematically discussed all of the concerns with each of the six proposed applications that came before the Board. Ms. Dell started with the 14 acre site which was the former Brewer's Boatyard:

1. There was an understanding that the 14 acre site would remain intact and the remediation would be done in stages. Both the Zoning Board and Planning Board were very surprised that the applicant had demolished the entire boatyard. As the applicant has not yet submitted formal plans for the entire 14 acre site, Ms. Dell asked about the expectation of receiving plans encompassing all 14 acres.

2. Ms. Dell asked about the number of slips, noting that with BLT's proposed plan there would be a loss of 31 slips and it is felt that the plan should replace exactly what was there before the demolition.

3. Parking is shown in the upper corner of the property relatively far away from where the slips would be located and there does not seem to be enough spaces and facilities (i.e. restrooms, showers, etc.) for the number of slips planned. There should be more facility sites available as most boaters make full use of the docks and waterfront and do not just dock & go. Also, boaters and users of the waterfront would like and expect something nicer than the facilities in a trailer-type environment.

4. Ms. Dell summarized that she does not understand the planned usage of the 14 acre site.

Ms. Dell then focused on the fuel dock asking why couldn't the fuel dock at the 14 acre site remain along with the new fuel dock planned at Davenport Landing as an additional fueling site? The proposed strategy for Davenport Landing for boats wanting to fuel using the same queuing lane as for the travel lift and/or docking at the T's would seem to cause much confusion especially for transient boaters who may not know what procedures are in place to gain access to the fuel pump.

Ms. Dell felt that the 261 condominium units planned for the Davenport Landing site is much too excessive; that most or all of the 5.3 acres should be utilized for the boatyard.

Ms. Dell raised the following concerns with regard to boat storage:

1. Concerned that with the rack storage the width of boats is not being taken into consideration; the building may need to be larger to perform all the service functions as well as storage.

2. As for getting boats to Magee, it was said that boats would not be using Hinkley travel lift. How would they get there? Would the Davenport Landing route be used or travel a different way?

Ms. Dell asked about the reasoning behind the dredging plan of having half of the slips dredged at 8 ft. and ½ dredged at 12 ft. Why not dredge the entire area at 12 ft. and be consistent throughout?

Mr. Freeman noted that a large portion of Stamford Harbor is 8 ft. and working with DEEP would like to minimize the environmental impact of dredging. The first six slips would be at 8 ft. which would accommodate smaller boats.

Ms. Dell asked Mr. Cole about the text change for Southfield Properties. Stamford Landing is there now and operating fine. Why change the zone from C-WD to D-WD?

Mr. Freeman responded that the change is needed because of the residential units planned on the south side. They would not be permitted as currently zoned.

Ms. Dell then asked if we feel the density of the 261 units are too much do we still put the text change in? Doesn't it become inconsequential?

Mr. Cole added that he feels the text change would be a good idea. The design flexibility would be beneficial to the area.

Ms. Dell asked if there were any more questions. All responded they did not.

Ms. Dell called a 10 minute recess.

Dr. Woods stated he wanted to reiterate that the Zoning Ordinance referral gives two criteria for referrals to the Zoning Board. First, one is do we like it or not, and second, is it consistent with the Master Plan. Attorneys tend to over emphasize the second part and skip the first.

Dr. Woods also passed out "Draft Findings" to help with the deliberations.

Ms. Dell announced that the Board, including the two alternates, would discuss the six applications among themselves. When it came time to vote, only the five regular members would participate. The following is the result of the Board's discussion:

Most members of the Planning Board actively requested more information from the applicant and members of the Harbor Management Commission, Norman Cole and David Woods, and from each other, out of which a number of impressions and themes were derived. Starting with the Davenport Landing site:

A. The approximate three acres for the boatyard operations is not large enough to accommodate the larger boats of up to 60 feet.

B. The Davenport Landing site should either be the full 5½ acres for boatyard operations, including storage onsite or a minimum of 4½ acres for larger boatyard operations with a row of housing along the Southfield Avenue to serve as a buffer.

C. The issue of fire safety and prevention at the Davenport Landing boatyard building and at 205 Magee Avenue has not been clarified.

D. The 14 acre site needs considerably more detail as to what is being proposed to be developed in addition to the proposed boardwalk, parking, marina, slips and amenities. Without this detailed plan, the Planning Board unanimously agreed that amending Condition No. 7 of the General Development Plan (GDP) was premature.

E. The 205 Magee Avenue site has a number of issues that they disagreed with the applicant:

- Without a plan for where and what type of commercial building is designated for 75,000 sq. ft. of office space requested to be added to the GDP of the S-RDS District, adding commercial development requests to the S-RDS District is premature.

- The Planning Board's major concerns are with the proposed self-parking boat storage located there, including issues of security, access for owners to work on their boats, fire suppression and transporting 250 small boats to the site did not make planning sense.

Therefore, taken as a whole six part proposal, the Planning Board unanimously recommended that the Zoning Board deny five of the six applications.

1. **ZB Appl. #215-02 - THE STRAND/BRC GROUP, LLC - Text Change:** To Amend Article III, Section 9(J)(5)(b) by modifying non-residential floor area from .20 to .23 FAR in the SRD-S District. Ms. Dell read the Draft Findings on this application into the record as follows:

   All permitted commercial development within Harbor Point (SRD-S zone) has been constructed. The proposed amendment of SRD-S regulations would authorize an additional 78,290 square feet of commercial floor area within the Harbor Point development, but the applicant has not identified where this additional commercial development would be located and has not submitted GDP showing the footprint, height and general design of new commercial buildings. In the absence of a comprehensive GDP for the 14 acre site, this text amendment application is premature and the Planning Board finds it inconsistent with the Stamford Master Plan and the orderly planning of the Harbor Point development.

   After some discussion, Mr. Tepper moved to adopt the Findings, recommending that the Zoning Board ***deny without prejudice*** APPLICATION #215-02; Ms. Fishman seconded the motion, and passed unanimously with eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Dell, Fishman, Quick, Tepper and Totilo).

2. **ZB Appl. #215-03 - THE STRAND/BRC GROUP, LLC, Amend GDP - Washington Blvd.:** Applicant is seeking approval of an amendment to the General Development Plan (GDP) for Harbor Point originally approved as Application 206-57, by: 1) removing the note on the plan stating "maintain existing boat storage operation" and adding a note concerning permitted uses and 2) deleting the language of approval Condition #7 and replacing it with "Subject to SRD regulations, any future final site plan application, for full development of the 14 acre site, shall include a marina and public access improvements which shall be subject to review and approval of the Zoning Board." in the SRD-S district and to seek Coastal Site Plan Review of these amendments.

   Ms. Dell read the Draft Findings on this application into the record as follows:

   Approval of an amendment to the GDP for Harbor Point, consisting of three parts:

   a) Condition #7 of the GDP approval currently reads as follows:
      Phase I Final plan submittal shall include conceptual plans to improve and insure the continued operation of the 14 acre boatyard as a working boatyard and full service marina. Unless specifically approved by the Zoning Board and any required state and federal authorities, there will be no reduction in any current capacity, facilities, uses or services, insuring the continued operation of this important water dependent use for so long as the balance of the SRD-S Zoning Tract derives any benefits of the General Development Plan approval, as may be amended.

And is proposed to read as follows:
Subject to SRD regulations, any future final site plan application, for full development of the 14 acre site, shall include a marina and public access improvements which shall be subject to review and approval of the Zoning Board.

b) The labeling of the 14 acre site on the recorded GDP map currently reads, "Maintain Existing Boat Storage Operations". The proposed new labeling would read as follows: "Block P7 Permitted Uses: Office and Retail, Public Access, Marina, Parking".

c) The general site plan for the 14 acre site (P7) is proposed to be amended to reduce the boat slip count from 251 to 220, provide boat slip parking at a rate of 0.5 spaces/slip, install two trailers for bathrooms/showers, washers/dryers and marina office, and construct a public access boardwalk along the western and southern sides of the peninsula.

Removal of the requirement for a "working boatyard and full service marina" from GDP Condition #7 is only appropriate if the applicant's plan to relocate the original boatyard/marina facilities and services to the three properties is determined to be consistent with the Stamford Master Plan. It is the opinion of the Planning Board that the replacement boatyard/marina proposal is inconsistent with the Stamford Master Plan because it will result in a significant reduction in the boatyard/marina services and capacities in excess of any change that may have occurred in the demand for boatyard/marina services. Findings of inconsistency with the 2015 Stamford Master Plan are further detailed in the Planning Board referral comment on Application #215-06 and Application #215-07 and are incorporated by reference. The Planning Board therefore recommends that the Zoning Board deny the proposed amendment of GDP Condition #7.

The Planning Board, for the same reasons, recommends that the Zoning Board deny the relabeling of the record GDP map for the 14 acre site (P7) proposed to read, "Block P7 Permitted Uses: Office and Retail, Public Access, Marina, Parking". Redesignation of the 14 acre site "office/retail" use is inappropriate until an acceptable replacement boatyard/marina has been approved, and should only be considered and approved simultaneously with the approval of a comprehensive site plan to redevelop the 14 acre site.

Proposed amendments of the general site plan for the 14 acre site include public access around two-thirds of the peninsula, and to this extent are consistent with the 2015 Stamford Master Plan policies:

- 5C: "Encourage Public Access to the South End Waterfront"
- 7F: "Maximize public access to the waterfront"

However, the proposed general site plan has several deficiencies as identified in the MarineTec report, dated October 1, 2015 and the Staff Report, dated October 5, 2015. The Planning Board finds the proposed general site plan amendments inconsistent with the 2015 Stamford Master Plan policies:

- 5C.1: "Protect, enhance and promote water-dependent uses"
- 5C2: "Protect water-dependent industry"
- 5C3: "Encourage Development of a Full-Service Boatyard and Marina
- 5C.5: "Promote recreation and boating"
- 5C.6: "Maintain and enhance harbor access"
- 7E: "Support an Active and Diverse Waterfront"
- 7E.1: "Establish and maintain diversity of viable water-dependent uses"

Due to the following deficiencies:

- The original 251 boat slips should be restored
- Any marina phasing schedule should address when site remediation will be complete and the site graded and stabilized. Completion dates should be specified for each phase.
- Plans should include complete marina services and amenities to establish a destination for boaters.
- Continuous public access should be provided around the entire perimeter of the 14-acre parcel with public parking, seating, landscaping and lighting improvements and connections to Kosciuszko Park and the Harbor Point waterfront public access system.

After some discussion, Mr. Tepper moved to adopt the Findings recommending that the Zoning Board ***deny*** APPLICATION #215-03; Mr. Totilo seconded the motion, and passed unanimously with eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Dell, Fishman, Quick, Tepper and Totilo).

3. **ZB Appl. #215-04 - SOUTHFIELD PROPERTY, LLC - Text Change:** To Amend Article III, Section 9AAAA DWD Designed Waterfront Development District language regarding maximum building height, minimum side yard, add a new Water Dependent Uses paragraph and add a new paragraph regarding existing structures along the waterfront.

Ms. Dell read the Draft Findings on this application into the record as follows:

The Planning Board concurs with the Staff Report, dated October 5, 2015, recommending conditional approval of DWD amendments regarding building height, building setback and retention of existing structures, and finds these three amendments consistent with the Stamford Master Plan. In principal, the Planning Board supports the fourth amendment, an exemption of water-dependent uses from building coverage and ground coverage standards, when it will serve to promote the establishment or retention of bona fide water dependent uses, with adequate buffering and landscaping and compensatory measures to manage stormwater impacts. The Planning Board's concern with this DWD amendment is that it is not used to maximize the proposed boatyard facility, but rather is used to build the full residential density allowed for the vacant Davenport Landing property (260 units) while compressing the facility on approximately 3± acres. The Planning Board recommends that this exemption have a defined maximum limit that is related to the amount of water-dependent use.

After some discussion, Mr. Quick moved to adopt the Findings recommending that the Zoning Board ***deny*** APPLICATION #215-04, and the Planning Board found this request to be inconsistent with the 2015 Master Plan; Mr. Totilo seconded the motion, and passed unanimously with eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Dell, Fishman, Quick, Tepper and Totilo).

4. **ZB Appl. #215-05 - WATERFRONT OFFICE BUILDING, LP, Map Change:** Applicant proposes to change approximately 8.15 acres of property located at 46, 62, 68 and 78 Southfield Avenue, Block #25, from C-WD to DW-D.

Ms. Fishman read the Draft Findings on this application into the record as follows:

The Planning Board concurs with the Staff Report, dated October 5, 2015, recommending conditional approval of DWD amendments regarding building height, building setback and retention of existing structures, and finds these three amendments consistent with the Stamford Master Plan. In principal, the Planning Board supports the fourth amendment, an exemption of water-dependent uses from

building coverage and ground coverage standards, when it will serve to promote the establishment or retention of bona fide water dependent uses, with adequate buffering and landscaping and compensatory measures to manage stormwater impacts. The Planning Board's concern with this DWD amendment is that it is not used to maximize the proposed boatyard facility, but rather is used to build the full residential density allowed for the vacant Davenport Landing property (260 units) while compressing the facility on approximately 3± acres. The Planning Board recommends that this exemption have a defined maximum limit that is related to the amount of water-dependent use. The Planning Board concurs with the Staff Report recommending rezoning of Stamford Landing to DWD, Designed Waterfront Development District, and finds this application consistent with the Stamford Master Plan:

- 5C: "Encourage Public Access to the South End Waterfront"
- 5C.1: "Protect, enhance and promote water-dependent uses"
- 5C.2: "Protect water-dependent industry"
- 5C.3: "Encourages the development of a full-service boatyard and marina"
- 5C.5: "Promote recreation and boating"
- 5C.6: "Maintain and enhance harbor access"
- 7E: "Support an Active and Diverse Waterfront"
- 7E.1: "Establish and maintain diversity of viable water-dependent uses"
- 7F: "Maximize public access to the waterfront"

Norman Cole, AICP, Land Use Bureau Chief, reported that DWD rezoning is logical and will allow the property to be consolidated with the adjoining Davenport Landing property into a single 13.85 acre property. Elimination of the property line will increase design flexibility in the placement of structures and organization of parking, with the opportunity to distribute traffic ingress and egress to two principal streets. Rezoning requires the simultaneous approval of a DWD General Development Plan and Special Exception approval of uses (see referral comments on Application #215-06).

After some discussion, Mr. Tepper moved to adopt the Findings recommending that the Zoning Board ***approve*** APPLICATION #215-05, and the Planning Board found this request to be consistent with the 2015 Master Plan; Mr. Quick seconded the motion, and passed unanimously with eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Dell, Fishman, Quick, Tepper and Totilo).

5. ZB Appl. #215-06 - SOUTHFIELD PROPERTY LLC and WATERFRONT OFFICE BUILDING, LP, 28, 46, 62, 68, and 78 Southfield Avenue - Special Exception and General Development Plans: Requesting approval of Special Exceptions and General Development Plan to construct 261 units of housing and a full service boatyard and marina with public access to the waterfront and water-dependent uses on approximately 13.4 acres on Southfield Avenue in a DW-D zone. Special Exceptions being requested for proposed uses and development of the project and to establish a DWD district and to provide residential, retail and office and a boatyard/marina use and general public access.

Ms. Fishman read the Draft Findings on this application into the record as follows:

The applicant proposes to construct a 3± acre boatyard/marina/boat storage facility coupled with 261 units of housing at the Davenport/Stamford Landing site. The 3± acre boatyard coupled with marina facilities at the 14 acre (P7) site and a boat storage facility at 205 Magee Avenue represent the applicant's proposal to replace the boatyard/marina that formerly occupied the 14 acre (P7) site in the Harbor Point development. The Planning Board has considered the Market Study and Needs Analysis submitted by the applicant and the independent peer review report performed jointly by Bermello

Ajamil and MarineTec. As summarized in the staff report, the replacement boatyard/ marina capacities are reduced compared to the former Yacht Haven West boatyard: wet slips reduced 12%; winter boat storage reduced 25%; maintenance building reduced 15%; covered storage (29,000 sq. ft.) eliminated entirely; and travel lift pits reduced from two to one. A recent revision in the floor plan for the maintenance building allocates approximately 6,000 sq. ft. to a rack storage system, reducing the floor area available for maintenance to 16,100 sq. ft., or 38% less than the former boatyard. The capacity for boat storage at 205 Magee has been further reduced by changing the plan to a "self-park" facility where boat owners park their boats on their own trailers without assistance, reducing the number of boats that can be stored. MarineTec has pointed out that the 205 Magee facility needs further support to power wash and shrink wrap boats, and fencing, lighting and security staff. MarineTec has also observed that one lift well at the boatyard is not sufficient to service the Davenport yard and also haul and trailer boats to 205 Magee. MarineTec has also argued that the efficiency of the 3± acre boatyard layout is compromised by a driveway and public access walkway that split the site into three separate parts. The Planning Board has raised additional questions about the boatyard design including the capacity of the fuel dock to service larger boats while other boats wait their turn to receive fuel, the dredge depth of -8 feet limiting maneuvering of larger boats, and the assumption that the market demand at Stamford Harbor is principally for smaller boats and that the large boats that berthed at Yacht Haven West are unlikely to return.

In summary, the Planning Board concludes that the three separate facilities, taken as a whole, due to their size, design and operation, are not adequate to replace the boatyard/marina/storage yard removed from the 14 acre site. The Planning Board finds Application #215-06 inconsistent with the 2015 Stamford Master Plan, particularly with respect to the following policies:

- 5C: "Encourage Public Access to the South End Waterfront"
- 5C.1: "Protect, enhance and promote water-dependent uses"
- 5C.2: "Protect water-dependent industry"
- 5C.3: "Encourages the development of a full-service boatyard and marina"
- 5C.4: "Make non-water-dependent uses contingent upon providing public access and meeting other public objectives"
- 5C.5: "Promote recreation and boating"
- 5C.6: "Maintain and enhance harbor access"
- 7E: "Support an Active and Diverse Waterfront"
- 7E.1: "Establish and maintain diversity of viable water-dependent uses"
- 7F: "Maximize public access to the waterfront"

After some discussion, Mr. Quick moved to adopt the Findings recommending that the Zoning Board ***deny*** APPLICATION #215-06; Ms. Fishman seconded the motion, and passed unanimously with eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Dell, Fishman, Quick, Tepper and Totilo).

6. **ZB App. #215-07 - SOUTHFIELD PROPERTY LLC and WATERFRONT OFFICE BUILDING, LP, 28, 46, 62, 68, and 78 Southfield Avenue - Final Site & Architectural Plans and Coastal Site Plan Review:** Requesting approval of Final Site & Architectural Plans and Coastal Site Plan Review to construct 261 units of housing and a full service boatyard and marina with public access to the waterfront and water-dependent uses on approximately 13.4 acres on Southfield Avenue in a DW-D zone.

Ms. Fishman read the Draft Findings on this application into the record as follows:

The application for approval of final site and architectural plans (Application #213-07) includes

special exceptions and is therefore subject to referral to the Planning Board. The Planning Board incorporate by reference the Findings and comments made for Application #215-06, finding the application inconsistent with the 2015 Stamford Master Plan.

After some discussion, Ms. Fishman moved to adopt the Findings recommending that the Zoning Board ***deny*** APPLICATION #215-07; Mr. Tepper seconded the motion, and passed unanimously with eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Dell, Fishman, Quick, Tepper and Totilo).

NEW BUSINESS:

Next regularly scheduled Planning Board meetings are:
10/27/15 - Capital Budget (4th Floor Cafeteria)
10/28/15 - CANCELLED
11/3/15 - Capital Budget (4th Floor - Cafeteria)
11/4/15 - CANCELLED