

**MINUTES OF THE ZONING BOARD
MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, JUNE 09, 2008,
7TH FLOOR, LAND USE BUREAU CONFERENCE AREA,
GOVERNMENT CENTER BUILDING,
888 WASHINGTON BLVD, STAMFORD, CT.**

Present for the Board: Harry Parson, Maria Nakian, Audrey Cosentini, David Stein and Mitchell Kaufman. Present for staff: Norman Cole, Principal Planner and Todd Dumais, Associate Planner.

Mr. Parson called the public hearing to order at 7:09 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING

APPL. 208 – 07, Text Change, Richard Redniss

Mr. Parson opened the hearing at 7:09 p.m. and announced that it was a continuation of the public hearing held on May 12 for application #208-07.

Mr. Richard Redniss, the applicant, began the presentation by reviewing the information presented at the May 12 public hearing. He stated that the genesis of this project began as Mr. Kiley contracted to purchase the Lotstein property, designed a building, met with City staff and was encouraged to purchase the Nogima property in a swap for parkland with the City. After, summarizing the contents of the previous meeting, Mr. Redniss distributed a modified text amendment application to the Board. He described the changes as the result of the Board's and staff's concerns. Mrs. Nakian asked if the Nogima property had any connection with the Archstone project. Mr. Redniss answered no and briefly described the Archstone project. Mrs. Cosentini then asked if the Nogima property was the same size as the City parkland to be swapped. Mr. Redniss stated that it was slightly larger. Several members of the Board then questioned the process by which City parkland would be swapped.

Mr. Parson asked the applicant to discuss the specifics of the text amendment and for the Board to hold all questions until the conclusion of the presentation. Mr. Redniss then discussed each of the seven parts of the text amendment. Mr. Kauffman asked if the residential amenity bonus was applied for and constructed elsewhere in the City. Mr. Redniss answered that both the Ritz and Tresser Square projects used this amenity, however, neither were constructed. Mr. Kauffman then asked since this amenity essentially allows for a doubling of the residential density, do we double the BMR units requirement. Mr. Redniss answered no. He said that the existing requirement is for 6% of the total number of units or 10% of the as-of-right requirement, whichever yields the higher number. Mr. Stein added that he was concerned with the amendment's potential effect on BMR regulations and that he would like to see more discussion on the Board if this was a good thing. Mr. Stein stated he was also concerned that the text amendment was crafted in such a way that the City would not be getting additional benefit for allowing the increased building height. Mr. Redniss stated that when an applicant like Mr. Kiley who is working with the City to promote the City's Mill River Plan, gets additional zoning

requirements placed upon him is unfair and contrary to good planning. Mrs. Nakian stated that she understood what the applicant was asking for but that she believed it was written in such a way that the applicant would be getting a bonus for doing something that was against public policy. Mrs. Cosentini then added that she had a problem with the additional building height. She stated that the 150' height allowed under the current regulations was to achieve a step back off of the park up to the CC-N zone. Mrs. Cosentini requested to see a model of a 250' building.

Mr. Cole stated that Mr. Redniss repeatedly said the City wants a particular project and wanted to know who encourage the additional height. Mr. Redniss stated it was the URC. Mr. Cole went on to say that it was odd to include only the West Side of Washington Boulevard as a retail street and not the East. He went on to say that the biggest problem with this application is that the Board's only experience with fully built out commercial and residential on the same site is the Biltmore and that he was concerned how this design could work on smaller sites. Mr. Cole stated that the applicant should demonstrate how the parking would be designed for a site of one acre.

Mr. Kiley, the applicant, stated that from the developer's perspective increased building height is good plan and makes cities attractive and that all of the tools must be left in the toolbox to encourage future development in the City.

Mr. Jack Conlin, of the Stamford Chamber of Commerce, added that this is a unique piece of property and he was happy to see something happening here. He urged the Board to be more creative with parking requirements in the future.

Mr. Parson closed the public hearing on application 208-07.

REGULAR MEETING

Present for the Board: Harry Parson, Maria Nakian, Audrey Cosentini, David Stein and Mitchell Kaufman. Present for staff: Norman Cole, Principal Planner and Todd Dumais, Associate Planner.

Mr. Parson called the regular meeting to order at 9:15 p.m.

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Parson called for a motion to change the order of the agenda and discuss applications 207-27 & 28. Mrs. Cosentini moved discuss the applications out of order, seconded by Mrs. Nakian and unanimously approved, 5-0.

Appl. 207-27 & 28 – Stillwater, LLC & Spin Water, LLC, West Avenue (300 Stillwater Avenue), Special Exception

Mr. Vin Tufo, of the Stamford Housing Authority, explained the extension of time request. After a brief discussion, Mrs. Cosentini moved approval of the request, seconded by Mr. Stein and unanimously approved, 5-0.

Mr. Parson called for a motion to change the order of the agenda and discuss applications 207-26. Mr. Stein moved discuss the application out of order, seconded by Mrs. Cosentini and unanimously approved, 5-0.

Appl. 207-26 – Soundview Farm, LLC & S.A.C. Capital Advisors, LLC, Site & Architectural Plan & CAM, 22 Gatehouse Road

Mr. William Hennessey, attorney for the applicant, explained the extension of time request was the result of unexpected delays with the State Traffic Commission. Following a brief discussion, Mrs. Cosentini moved approval of the request, seconded by Mr. Stein and unanimously approved, 5-0.

PENDING APPLICATIONS

APPL. 208 – 07, Text Change, Richard Redniss, (C-G Amendments). Tabled to a future meeting date.

APPL. 208 – 02, Special Exception, Poster Conservation, INC., 583 Pacific Street

Mr. Dumais summarized the applicant's presentation from the May 12 public hearing and distributed a list of potential conditions of approval. Mr. Dumais and the Board discussed each of the following conditions:

1. Submission of a final written description, plans and specifications defining the proposed historic restoration measures, subject to approval by Zoning Board staff in consultation with the Director of the Historic Neighborhood Preservation Program, Inc., prior to start of construction and renovations to the historic structure.
2. Execution of a standard historic facade preservation easement, subject to approval by Zoning Board staff prior to the issuance of a building permit, to be recorded with final photo exhibits prior to certificate of occupancy.
3. Submission of final written certification of the historic restoration by a qualified expert acceptable to the Zoning Board, prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
4. Submission of a professionally prepared landscaping plan, subject to Zoning Board staff approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.
5. Final lighting specifications and designs are subject to approval by the Zoning Board staff, including an analysis of illumination levels and construction documents prior to the issuance of a building permit.
6. Final construction plans, including site grading and utility plans, shall be subject to approval by the Engineering Bureau prior to the issuance of a building permit.
7. Submission of a parking management plan with adequate provision for "event" parking, subject to final approval by Zoning Board staff, to be implemented prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
8. Submission of a trash management plan subject to Zoning Board staff approval, in consultation with the Director of Operations, or designee, prior to issuance of a building permit.
9. A Street Opening Permit shall be required for any work within the City of Stamford street right-of-way.

Mrs. Cosentini requested an additional condition be added to the list to require the dedication of a plaque designating the year of construction on the building prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. Following an additional discussion of the conditions, Mrs. Cosentini moved approval of the application, seconded by Mrs. Nakian and unanimously approved, 5-0.

CSPR-824 Fast Cat, LLC, 247 Davenport Drive

Mr. Dumais explained the contents of the application and following a brief discussion and review of the conditions recommended by EPB staff, Mrs. Cosentini moved approval subject to EPB conditions, seconded by Mrs. Nakian and unanimously approved, 5 to 0.

CSPR-829 Bindh & Maya Wariyar, 233 Southfield Avenue

Following a brief discussion and review of the conditions recommended by EPB staff, Mrs. Cosentini moved approval subject to EPB conditions, seconded by Mrs. Nakian and unanimously approved, 5 to 0.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Parson adjourned the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Harry Parson, Secretary