

Public Comment

Column 1
Staff Response

My comment is in reference to the proposed definition of Substantial Improvement found here:
<https://www.norwalkct.gov/DocumentCenter/View/29586/Zoning-Reg-flyer---flood>

The proposal of 25% of a structure's value over a 10-year period would rank Norwalk dead last (most restrictive) among the 23 coastal communities of CT with rolling periods that adhere to FEMA's regulations.

Currently no towns uses any value less than 50% of a structure's value, and only 6 of the 23 use a rolling period longer than 5 years.

The most common regulation (8 instances) is 50% over 5 years. The second most common (7) is 50% over 1 year and the average over the 23 towns is 50% over 4.6 years.

If Norwalk wants to be very restrictive, the definition should be 50% over 10 years. If Norwalk wants to be regionally competitive it should be 50% over 5 years. If Norwalk wants to be progressive it should be 50% over 1 year.

There is no reason Norwalk should be dead last. I recommend being in-line with the coastal community average at 50% over 5 years.

Thank you for your service.

City Staff acknowledges that Norwalk's regulation of the floodplain was more restrictive than most communities, perhaps the most restrictive community in the state. While it can be argued that as a community that values resilience, we should maintain strict standards; however, the proposed changes will allow for significant improvements to structures, while maintaining the integrity of the intent of the flood zone regulations.

I had other comments in mind but I find it concerning that residents who do not own property are not a collated category for these comments. Obviously property owners will bear the brunt of the effects related to zoning changes if they engage in construction or other changes to their property, but renters will also have their city shaped and influenced by the decisions made by the PZC. We pay taxes too.

The City values renters and homeowners and appreciates your feedback. We invite you to continue to participate and let your voice be heard regarding the changes and any impacts you feel the changes will have.

These zoning changes that are being made with the stroke of a pen and zero public input are dangerous and short sighted. The mayor has sold out to developers. This is not in the best interest of the residents of Norwalk

Obviously, this comment was made in haste, without an understanding of the process that has been undertaken and the outreach performed to date.

Please help me understand why B residence zone is being proposed as a single and two family residence zone? I don't understand why the change is being proposed?

Not all B zoned properties are proposed for upzoning to the new 1-2 family zone (CD-3). In working with the Commission, we have scaled back the areas proposed for upzoning. The upzoning is proposed in order to provide for additional housing opportunities in areas proximate to transit, major employment centers and infrastructure. Our area has some of the highest rental and home prices in the country, coupled with some of the lowest vacancy rates in the country. These two factors, coupled with a steady demand for housing make it difficult for first time home buyers to purchase a home or rent an apartment, without becoming housing cost burden. The proposed changes for unzoning are meant to allow gradual in-fill development over time as the community changes and the market dictates the appropriate amount and type of housing needed.

There is a small area to the west of highland ave and to the south of devil's garden rd that is proposed to be part of new zone CD-3 (2 family community). There is no basis for this classification. It is inconsistent with the surrounding uses (all single-family residences, most lots .2 acres or larger) and does not resolve the inconsistency on streets and within the neighborhood (West side of Vanderbilt would be CD-3S and East side would be CD-3). Further, there are appx. 20 parcels within that small area that are part of the 6TD (Rowayton) yet are being classified differently than the rest of Rowayton (all of the rest of Rowayton is CD-3S or CD-3L). Based on the explanation given by TPUDC, existing zone B either move to CD-3S OR CD-3 so updating the map to correct for this clear inconsistency in existing zoning seems logical and within the norms set in the draft proposal.

The Devil's Garden area has been removed from the CD-3 Zone and reverted to a single-family zone CD-3S.

Bed and Breakfasts should NOT be permitted as of right in single family neighborhoods. At a minimum a special permit requiring public input should be required.

Staff would agree regarding special permits for this use.

The new zoning regulations should explicitly define hotels to include short term rentals (ie AirBnB) and exclude them as a permitted use within single family residential (CD-3S) zones.

Air BnB's are not currently regulated by the City. Our experience has been they should be treated just like any other rental, so long as the use remains residential and they abode by all other Zoning Regulations and city laws.

The building standards for residential buildings cite a requirement that the vertical composition of the facade include a Base, Middle and Cap. The terms are capitalized but do not seem to be defined. Please provide some discussion of what these terms mean. I think I know the intent of these terms, but as an architect I take exception to the requirement. Unless these terms are clearly defined there will be countless arguments about what is actually required.

If necessary we will provide a definition for these 3 terms. These standards DO NOT pertain to single-family housing however and only apply to multi-family residential, commercial and mixed-use projects. Having these standards is necessary for transforming and ensuring that future development is consistent and improved over the minimums allowed today.

The new definition of building height is problematic. The idea that the "perception of how tall a building is, is based on the number of stories, not a numerical height" is not an opinion that is shared by everyone. In my opinion, a 2 story building that is 25 ft tall is not the same as a 2 story building that is 30 feet tall. Although the draft regulations regulate the interior clear height of each story, it does not address the interstitial space between the ceiling and the floor above. If I am not constrained by an overall building height I may choose to use deep open web joists as the floor structure to minimize cost and maximize clear span. I may also choose to run all of my ductwork within the ceiling cavity. Altogether, the floor assembly could add three feet or more (per story) to the building height.

Staff recommends revising how a Story/Ceiling Height is measured from "floor to ceiling" to "floor to floor." This will result in the allowable floor to floor height for the residential floors needing to increase from the 10' maximum to a 12' maximum to account for the interstitial space between the ceiling and the floor above. The result of measuring by number of stories as opposed to a total height number will not change the maximum height of buildings that we typically see in Norwalk, regardless of the zone. It also provides flexibility to the mixed-use buildings where a taller first floor can be constructed to accommodate a variety of commercial tenants that may need a higher ceiling while not penalizing the developer by that additional space counting against the overall height of the building.

Additionally, the draft regulations no longer appear to use the average grade plane to determine the base plane. Rather, the draft regulations use the grade at the front of the building. If the development lot slopes down from the street, the building height is again increased by these draft regulations.

Measuring the number of stories from the finished grade along the frontage of the property removes some difficulty in structures being built on lots that slope down to the rear property line. The lower grade at the rear pulls the overall grade of the property down which results in the structure being shorter. Therefore homebuilders would need to fill the rear of the property to bring the grade back up, allowing the structure to be a commensurate height to lots that are flat or slope up to the rear of the property. This change removes the need to add fill to the lot which can reduce the cost of construction as well as drainage issues and will not result in a building being taller than other nearby structures.

Also, by requiring the structure to be raised from the street by 18-36", we are again increasing the building height. Altogether, these draft regulations could increase as-of-right building height by 6 to 10 feet for a 2 1/2 story residential building.

The requirement for the first floor to be at least 18-36" above finished grade can be removed.

The regulations need to include a maximum building height for all zoning districts.

Staff's opinion is that measuring based on stories and revising the maximum floor-to-ceiling height to floor-to-floor will not result in structures being taller than what we have historically seen in Norwalk.

The term "shall" is included in the definitions, but the term "should" is not. Although these terms are similar they are not the same. This could become an issue in many parts of the draft regulations. For example, section 6.11.3 Shading of Glazing, A. General Requirements, states:

Your point regarding defining "shall" versus "should" is valid. However, in the example cited, the term "should" is a recommendation cannot be enforced.

1. Southern facing windows should be shaded during summer months.

Sure, they should be shaded, but is it a requirement that they shall be shaded? Please review this ambiguity and consider either adding a definition of "should", or replacing all instances of the term "should".

A recent Norwalk Hour article referenced a new "interactive map" which illustrates the proposed changes. This map does not seem to be on the city website.

Given the date of the comment, it is likely the commentor was not familiar with the update page.

I think it's most important that zoning changes come at the request of neighborhood residents only. Changes should not be considered for any other reason and if they are to be considered should never be implemented without approval of those living there.

Unfortunately, you cannot make landuse decisions based on popularity only. The Commission's charge and City staff's guidance is to do what we feel is best for the City. We follow adopted land use plans and make decisions based on the plans recommendations as well as other factors and variables.

Hello Norwalk Zoning Department,
I've lived on Acorn lane for over twenty years. This area in North Rowayton with single homes is a family friendly area with home owners who take care of their homes. Over the twenty plus years I've been here there have been many single family homes built in the area making for a dense population- over time we have seen an uptick in the amount of cars driven in the area making for sometimes unsafe situations for children, flooding due to the back up of water in drains and less environment for animals. I am very much opposed to changing the zoning in our single family home area to multi family zoning! I wish to meet with your department managers to voice my concerns as soon as possible. Thank you, Susanne Bryer and Thomas Mulligan

At present, there are no proposed upzoning changes in Rowayton. Staff had evaluated 2-family zoning at the train station, but the lot widths would lead to significantly more density than presently exist. Staff is further evaluating the possibility of "Cottage Communities" in the area immediate proximate to the train station.

Dear P&Z,
I am reaching out to voice my opposition to the proposed residential zoning changes from single family (CD-3S) to two family homes (CD-3) in my neighborhood where I have lived for 25 years and where we plan to retire. My home itself is not part of the proposal but my immediate neighbors' homes are. My key concerns lie with increased traffic density (we are walkable neighborhood attractive to young families), drainage (increased paved areas causing additional flooding to many already wet basements), and loss of green environment (we have many old growth trees in the area). Changing a single family home to a two family home will be an opportunity for developers to tear down a good starter home to optimize profit in their investment and without regard for the nature or environment of the neighborhood. I ask that you visit our area to personally view the impact and that you rescind these changes to our neighborhood.

25 Vanderbilt is in the Devil's Garden area. The Commission has decided to leave this area as single-family.

Thank you for your attention.

Janis Kaiser
20 Vanderbilt Avenue 06854

I am an 18 year homeowner in Norwalk. We have raised 3 children and have been members of the Norwalk Public Schools. After reviewing the proposed zoning map it has come to my attention that my single family home neighborhood is now slated for multi family home (2 family, CD-3). In your documents you state that multi family home promotes ownership. This is false. Many multi family homes are landlord owned and house renters. My neighborhood is an AMAZING family neighborhood where families live for many years to raise their kids. Renters come and go. Home owners take pride in their homes and want to stay to raise a family. If this neighborhood turns into a neighborhood of renters then the community feel that has been fostered here for years will be lost. My kids grew up walking, biking, skating in these streets. Traffic is not an issue here. Kids are safe! With multifamily units allowed there will be more cars and these once quiet streets will become unsafe for young children to walk over to their friends house. YOU say you want to promote home ownership and neighborhoods in Norwalk? Do not take away what we have in our community. Before you proposed this zoning change did anyone actually walk around my wonderful neighborhood to see how unique it is? We looked at many areas when we were house hunting, NO other area came close to this family oriented suburban community. However, once again, I somehow have to defend my position for living in Norwalk (to my friends who live in other nearby communities) There will be some point where I can no longer feel there is a reason to stay in Norwalk if this city keeps pushing out middle class families.

Staff has provided documentation to the Commission that shows that two-family homes in Norwalk are at about a 59% owner-occupied rate. Stating that renters do not take pride in their homes, make streets unsafe or provide less of a community feel is not based on any facts and is a matter of opinion. In addition, two-family homes are often cheaper to purchase than a single-family house and rent than a new apartment unit and would therefore not result in middle-class families being pushed out. What can push middle-class families out are rising housing costs which now show the median sale price of a single-family house in Norwalk exceeding \$450,000 per Census data and according to most real estate websites such as Zillow, Realtor.com and Redfin, now exceeding \$550,000. We also see that the percentage of cost burdened homeowners in Norwalk at 38% per Census data, meaning that about 20,282 Norwalkers are spending more than 30% of their income on housing costs, which was determined before the recent median sale price of a house increasing from \$450,000 to \$550,000.

Norwalk Draft zoning regulations 4-4-23 Please revise proposed changes to this zoning map back to single family residential CD-3S from Two family dwellings CD-3 as it would be inconsistent with the foundational premise, inconsistent with the surrounding areas north, west, and south, and a distinct difference from the two-family area east of Highland Avenue.

Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.

Hi, thank you for all the effort going in to preparing Norwalk for future growth and taking the time to solicit input on draft zoning regulations.

I'm a new Norwalk resident living in an established neighborhood of single family homes West of Highland Ave, South of Devil's Garden Rd, East of Vanderbilt Ave., and North of the Metro North tracks.

In addition the house itself, the walkable, family oriented neighborhood is what sold my wife and I on buying our first home in this area. We hope to start a family soon and can't wait to raise kids in this area.

This draft zoning plan converts this area to two family homes and I'm concerned this will create meaningfully more traffic congestion, cars driving fast around corners and reduce the walkability of this beautiful neighborhood. The neighborhood lacks sidewalks for the most part and two family zoning will lead to many more cars parked on streets. This will force casual walkers, dog walkers, stroller walkers, kids riding bikes and more to veer into the center of the street where there will be bottlenecks for passing cars.

Second, we've already been warmly welcomed to the community by many neighbors who have lived in their homes for 10, 20 and even 30+ years. We hope to join their ranks and welcome new families over the years. I'm concerned two family zoning with developer incentives will lead developers to 'build to rent' and encourage professional landlords to move in leading to transient rental tenants, undermining this established family oriented community.

Thank you for your consideration,
Kevin George
kgeorge1827@gmail.com

Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.

Staff would like to make the following points:

Cars traveling at unsafe speeds is generally caused by road design, not zoning, that allows for cars to travel above the posted speed limit. Norwalk DPW and TMP have been working towards redesigning existing road networks that will slow cars down and make walking and biking safer. To convert a property from the existing single-family residence to a two-family residence, four off-street parking spaces will need to be provided behind the new structure which will prevent and/or reduce on-street parking.

Lastly, we have neighborhoods in Norwalk that permit two-family residences but less than half of all properties eligible to be a two-family residence have become a two-family residence since zoning was first adopted in Norwalk in 1929. Therefore changing the zoning to allow for two-family residences will likely result in a gradual change over a long period of time.

Hello. As a long time resident of the 6TD, I want to express my opposition to the proposed residential zoning changes from single family (CD-3S) to two family homes (CD-3) in my neighborhood. We moved here 25 years ago. Our home is not part of the proposal but our immediate neighbors' homes are. The area west of Highland Avenue, south of Devils Garden Road and east of Rowayton Avenue is, to all of us, special. There are many reasons I'm against the proposed zoning change. The first is that it doesn't appear to be very well thought out. The line between CD-3S and CD-3 is literally down the middle of the street in front of our house - splitting our neighborhood in half. This is a neighborhood with no sidewalks, where people walk their kids and their dogs. Where people from nearby come to walk and exercise. I ask that the board seriously reconsiders the proposed changes and maintains the area west of Highland Avenue as single family homes. Thank you, Kevan Olesen, 20 Vanderbilt Ave, Norwalk, CT 06854

Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.

I do not support the proposed zoning to CD-3: Two-Family from CD-3S Single-Family in the area of Vanderbilt, devils garden, Possum Lane & Circle. This is a single family neighborhood.

Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.

Section 4.3.17 Private Lighting Standards

Is this requiring site lighting for single family dwellings? Or can I interpret the min/max footcandle allowance of 0-1.0 fc (for CD-3 zones) to allow up to 1.0 fc but not requiring any site lighting?

Section 5 of this section seems to prohibit christmas lights on a house. Is that correct?

5. Use of illuminated tubing or light strings outlining or defining property lines, sales areas, roof lines, doors, windows or similar areas or features in a manner that is not primarily for safety purposes, as determined by the Planning and Zoning Director is prohibited. This paragraph shall not limit the use of lights illuminating outdoor dining or gathering areas.

thank you,

Jason Little, RA
12 Park Lane
jason@jalittle.com

The intent of the regulation is not to require site lighting for single-family residences but to also not allow for lighting that exceeds 1.0fc at the frontage line.

1.21.3.A.2 Non Conforming Lots:

"If two (2) or more adjoining parcels of land are in single ownership and are recorded in the Norwalk Land Records as separate legal building Lots before a Zoning Change, and if one (1) or more of the Lots does not conform to these Regulations, then such Lot or Lots shall be considered to be an undivided parcel for the purpose of these Regulations, and no portion of said parcel shall be used or sold so as to diminish conformance with these Regulations, except as may be granted by Special Exception by the Zoning Board of Appeals."

So, let's say I have (2) 40 ft wide lots in the Harborview neighborhood (formerly B district, now CD-3S). The lots are under single ownership and at one time both had non-conforming structures. One was destroyed in Superstorm Sandy and was not rebuilt. How does section 1.21.3.A.2 change the Owner's rights in respect to the development of this property? Due to the small lots in Harborview, the development of these lots always go through ZBA. But is there something else hidden in the new zoning regulations that will limit what can be done on these small lots?

I guess I am wondering why this section is necessary. I know this is an open ended question, but something to consider for the zoning presentation to Harborview on May 15.

thank you,

Jason Little, RA
12 Park Lane
jason@jalittle.com

1.21.2 C would govern - the structure would be allowed to be reconstructed and the lots would not be merged.

Good Day - My concern is with the re-zoning of the area West of Highland Ave, South of Devil's Garden, East of Vanderbilt and North of the Metro-North RR Tracks to accommodate 2-family homes, which I STRONGLY disagree with. This area is designated as residential, single family zoning, and should not be amended/changed to accommodate two family homes. This is inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhoods, and there is a distinct difference between this neighborhood and the are East of Highland, and from other Norwalk neighborhoods already zoned for two-family homes. The rezoning to two family homes will not spur the "American dream" of home ownership, but instead will encourage further home ownership by investors seeking rental income from tenants. This lack of ownership interest in the community degrades the neighborhoods due to the transient nature of rental properties. This is not a positive thing for this neighborhood, or Norwalk in general. I have seen this trend in Norwalk during the last 25 years as a resident of this city and Norwalk cannot afford any further degradation of its image as a community wanting to attract families. I strongly urge a revisit on this issue as well as a drive-through of the area. Thank You. Scott Peterson - 9 Acorn Lane, Norwalk, CT

Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.

The proposed zoning regulations appear to require sketch plans for most projects. Additionally, it seems like the amount of information required in a sketch plan far exceeds what is currently required, but maybe the proposed zoning regulations are just being more clear about what has always been required. Nonetheless, my comment here involves section 8.4.10.E.5.b which states:

This is a good question regarding "sketch plans," the intent is that for expansions of structures to require a plan to show such expansion. However, the intent is not to require small renovations from having to hire an architect to draw floor plans.

"Each Sketch Plan and Application shall include or show...The name, address, signature, and seal of the professional preparing the Sketch Plan."

The CT State Building Code does not require a design professional for most one or two-family residential projects. Do the proposed zoning regulations require that a design professional develop the sketch plan?

The requirement of a design professional on one or two-family residential projects adds significant cost to the permitting process. Please confirm that this is the intent.

Thank you,

Jason Little, RA
12 Park Lane
jason@jalittle.com

I live on Deepwood Lane that is currently zoned for "single family housing". I am strongly against and very concerned to The proposal of re-zoning to "multi family housing". You will be seeing me at every zoning meeting to oppose this.

Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.

No two family zoning on Devils Garden Road/Brookside neighborhood.

Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.

If planning to change established single family zones bear in mind such factors as parking as some areas do not have any on street parking and have narrow roads...changing from single to multi family would exacerbate an already difficult situation

Any change in use, for example from a single-family house to a two-family house, will require that the minimum parking requirement be provided off-street and behind the structure.

No to 2 family zoning as drawn in the new proposed zoning map that includes my home.

Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.

NO to two-family zoning in 6th taxing district on Possum lane!!!!

Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.

No to two-family zoning in the neighborhood of Possum Lane.

Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.

No to two-family zoning

Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.

New Zoning maps are being drawn up in Norwalk and our area is slated for two-family zoning. I am saying NO to two family zoning. I want the area to maintain its single-family zoning.

Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.

No to two-family zoning

I oppose the rezoning of the Possum Circle neighborhood to allow 2 family houses. This has always been zoned for single family as is the surrounding areas. We do not have the infrastructure to accommodate multi-family dwellings and this change would be detrimental to our neighborhood. I respectfully request you revisit this matter.

NO to two-family zoning.

Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.

As a property owner at 3 Possum Lane, I am not interested in a change in the zoning laws making my neighborhood a two-family zoning.	Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.
We vote NO to two-family zoning. Keep SINGLE-FAMILY Zoning!	
NO to two-family zoning in the 5th and 6th taxing district.	Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.
As homeowners we are most concerned that our area would become zoned for 2 family housing.	Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.
No 2 family zoning around BMHS	Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.
To whom it may concern:	Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.
<p>My family is writing in regards to the Planning & Zoning Commission proposed changes to the Norwalk Zoning Regulations and to ask that you revisit the draft mapping for our area.</p>	
<p>We live on Possum Lane and our neighborhood is located in Western Norwalk and can be generally defined as the area West of Highland Ave, South of Devil's Garden Rd, East of Vanderbilt Ave., and North of the Metro North tracks (shown below within highlighted lines). The particular streets addressed in this document are: Vanderbilt Ave, Possum Ln, Possum Cir, Watson Ct, Timberline Rd, Acorn Ln, Devils Garden Rd, Erin Ct, Deepwood Ln, Knollwood Rd and Highland Ave.</p>	
<p>The residents of our affected neighborhood are requesting the current draft proposal reclassifying this area as "CD-3: Two-Family" be revised and changed to "CD-3S: Single-Family" to be consistent with the surrounding areas North, West, and South and to be aligned with the goals and intentions of the zoning rewrite and modernization effort.</p>	
<p>The rationale for this area remaining CD-3S:Single Family:</p>	
<p>1) Remain consistent with the current neighborhood use and surrounding area: All lots in the Focus Area currently contain single-family dwellings.The entirety of the Focus Area is a quiet residential area with infrastructure and structures consistent with the surrounding areas that are proposed as CD-3S. Illustrate consistency with the foundational tenets of the 2019-2029 Citywide Plan: "Preserve and maintain the overall character of traditional single-family neighborhoods (link: Norwalk Citywide Plan: 2019–2029, p.60). This is and always has been a single family neighborhood.</p> <p>2) Align application of zoning changes relative to the rest of region: All areas South of I-95 and West of Highland Ave are proposed as "CD-3S: Single-Family"; however, the portion in the Focus Area would be "CD-3: Two-Family", making it inconsistent with the surrounding region and in some circumstances homes directly across the street (Vanderbilt, Devils Garden and Highland)</p> <p>3) Homeowners have not requested a change of zoning: As predominantly owner occupied properties we have not requested this change of zoning from single family to two family (over 90% owner occupied).</p>	
<p>We ask you to consider our request to address the noted inconsistencies in the proposed zoning plan and maintain the city's commitment as stated in the 2019 city wide plan to preserve single family neighborhoods.</p>	
<p>How many chickens are allowed on a property?</p>	<p>Zoning will not regulate number of chickens, this is regulated via the Health Department.</p>
<p>I live in an older, well established, single family neighborhood that has not been overbuilt or "gentrified". I've always been grateful for the lack of McMansions being built here. On the other hand, having it overbuilt with multi family housing is also inappropriate. It's a middle class, diversified neighborhood that works as is - leave it alone.</p>	<p>Gentrification can occur as a result of a high demand to live in an area and a lack of housing to meet that demand. What happens is that the price of the existing house stock increases rapidly, referred to as "up-filtering," where older housing which is typically more affordable than new housing increases in value as a result of the demand to live in the area. This causes the folks who previously may have been able to afford an older home in the area to no longer be able to as wealthier folks who want to live in the area can outbid them for the residence.</p>
<p>OPPOSED TO TWO-FAMILY ZONING ON DEEPWOOD LN/KNOLLWOOD RD (Brookside section of Norwalk)</p>	<p>Staff has revised the proposed map to have the Devil's Garden area be zoned as CD-3S.</p>
<p>No to two family zoning</p>	

Homeowners/Taxpayers should be notified via every means available of the proposed changes being proposed, including direct mail, email, robocalls, newspapers (local and online), and social media. Changes to zoning (AA & A combined, B & C combined, no back lots permitted) may greatly affect property values. The removal of square footage area which will be replaced with front lot with only in many districts must be further explained, especially if smaller lots will be allowable in currently zoned areas, i.e, anything less than one acre in AAA. Thank you, Lisa Henderson 21 Appletree Lane, Norwalk

Direct mailers were sent to all property owners in Norwalk. The city's social media page has been posting updates on upcoming meetings.

Please make available a spreadsheet list of each street/address in Norwalk and the current zoning (AAA, AA, etc.) and future proposed zoning (CD-3L, CD-3S) along with the changes as outlined in the SCHEDULE LIMITING HEIGHT AND BULK OF BUILDINGS RESIDENTIAL CITY OF NORWALK chart currently found on the City of Norwalk Website
<https://www.norwalkct.gov/DocumentCenter/View/371/Schedule-limiting-height-and-bulk-of-residential-?bidId=>
Thank you, Lisa Henderson, Appletree Lane, Norwalk, CT

Shorefront Park seems to have been singled out for downzoning. A historic district with a community charter, being re-zoned to multi-family will only cause this neighborhood to become exactly what Norwalk has tried so hard to reverse for the past 20 years.

Staff has revised the proposed map to have Shorefront Park in the CD-3S. However, Staff will point out that Shorefront Park remaining in the single-family zone will not prevent historic structures from being demolished which as occurred heavily in the Shorefront Park area. Many older beach homes have been torn down and replaced with large waterfront single-family homes.

I don't want any changes which will decrease lot size in the current one acre AAA zone. I am concerned about overbuilding.

Staff has reviewed the existing AAA zone in comparison to the CD-3L zone and if removing the minimum lot size will cause many subdivisions. What we found is that by removing the minimum lot size there is the potential for approximately 107 new subdivisions in the CD-3L that under the existing zoning could not happen; but by removing the ability for rear lots to be created there is a removal of 57 potential subdivisions, for a net increase of 46 lots which is a relatively low number.

1) Please explain why the former Holy Ghost Father's property (now Lakota Oaks) is being changed from R&D zone to Residential?
2) How will P&Z enforce auxiliary apartments in Residential zones? I can envision significant misuse of "auxiliary apartments" on one acre plus properties with additional illegal apartments destroying the character of these neighborhoods.
3) The definition of "religious organization/structure" is too broad.
4) Developers and their legal counsel should be forbidden from contributing to Mayoral candidates' coffers. Probably not a P&Z issue, but we residential homeowners see the negative impact that results from zoning favoritism shown to contributing developers and their legal representation over homeowners/taxpayers' interests.
Thank you for your time.

1) Staff does not believe that a Research & Development zone is necessary because only two lots in the entire city are designated as such. Those two lots, based on their unique characteristics, can be zoned as CD-3L and have similar uses allowed on them based on their unique characteristics.
2) ADUs are already permitted in Norwalk and only one is permitted on a lot.
3) All definitions were peer reviewed by our third-party attorney.
4) Not a consideration for P&Z.

Please don't turn our neighborhood in 2 family zone. We don't need more cars and people. Stop with this. You will be voted pit and the first chance we get..we're out of this city that doesn't support its citizens

Should planning and zoning decide to modify the definition of a B zone (single family with compliant accessory apartments), to a version of C-Zone, be prepared for a mass law suit. I and my neighbors will be active participants in such.

The Connecticut General Statutes provide the ability for municipalities to revise their zoning regulations, consistent with Section 8 of said Statutes. All proposed changes are within the Commission's legal authority.

To whom it may concern:
I have reviewed the proposed changes to Norwalk zoning with great interest. While I must commend your City officials on undertaking this significant project, I am dismayed by the vast amount of current single family zoning that is subject to change under this proposal. The proposal exposes too many established neighborhoods to significant changes in density, and too many residents of the City will be impacted by this. While it is important to reevaluate zoning after so long, I urge you to look at ways to limit the changes to single family zoning. Have you considered the impacts on infrastructure, schools, medical care, emergency services? How will our existing roads accommodate the increases in traffic? Where will we educate a greatly increased number of school-age children? Will our limited hospital and medical resources be over-burdened?
Please reconsider whether the proposals are in the best interests of the residents of Norwalk.
Thank you for your consideration.

Staff has focused the proposed changes in areas around our mass transit stations, job centers and major infrastructure. By focusing future development in these areas, the need for a car will be diminished as what are typically car trips can be replaced via walking, biking and/or mass transit. In addition, the number of students in the public school system has remained relatively stagnant over the last 20 years and the proposed changes should not significantly impact that trajectory.

The proposed zoning changes in Norwalk can affect current and future real estate transactions in the city. There are on-going neighborhood hearings going on right now. (East Norwalk's was last night).

One example: by changing the current Zone B (single family with accessory apts) to a type of Zone C (two-family) changes the dynamics of a neighborhood.... parking, owner-occupied vs non-owner occupied and annual tenants... We know how a current C zone looks compared with single family zones. We know many of our buyers prefer a single family neighborhood.

Anything that was sold in the past in some of the changed zones will affect past buyers. Realtors need their clients to be informed. Current transactions may need to correct their property condition disclosures to notify potential buyers of potential municipal changes. There will be less inventory of single family zoned homes.

The changes in home values are determined by the market and undoubtedly they will be adverse.

I respectfully request that the Planning & Zoning Dept. consider this adverse effect on property values before making changes in the zoning structure.

Thank you.

Anthony Barca
50 East Rocks Rd.
Norwalk, CT 06851
TonyBarcaRealtor@gmail.com

Parking: Driving on many of Norwalk's narrower residential streets I see cars parked on both sides so that two average-size cars traveling in opposite directions can barely pass, let alone two trucks or a bus. This tells me the existing houses, some of which are 50 to 100 years old, don't comply with the new parking requirements.

I see 4.3.12.B.2. 2. "A Building in existence at the time of adoption of these Regulations may continue to be used without adequate Parking and loading as required Table 4.3.12.B-1 (Vehicular Parking Requirements)." In other words, existing homes are grandfathered as to parking, is that right? It would be reassuring to homeowners who don't comply if this were mentioned at the public information sessions.

However, this doesn't solve the problem of off-street parking being so scarce in many areas of Norwalk that cars are parked bumper to bumper all along both sides of narrow streets. As residents have pointed out at the public information sessions, families often have one car per teenager/adult, not just 1-2 cars per family. A family with 2 parents and 3 teenagers might have 5 cars, even if they live in a house with only 1 off-street parking space (or none). How do the proposed regulations and the city's master plan address the need for more parking?

I'm opposed to changing current Zoning. It will affect property values in the negative, and change neighborhoods, limit parking, and increase density.

Please do not change the B zones to C zones. I am a Real Estate agent who sells in Norwalk and I believe this will will negatively impact homeowners who chose to live in neighborhoods where the properties are owner occupied vs. investment properties where there are annual tenants.

Thank you for your consideration.

The Connecticut General Statutes do not allow for the basis of zoning regulations to be made on property values. For a list of what zoning regulations must do, please see Sec. 8-2 of the Connecticut General Statutes, linked here: https://www.cga.ct.gov/current/pub/chap_124.htm

Of particular note are the following: "*Zoning regulations adopted pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall...address significant disparities in housing needs and access to educational, occupational and other opportunities...affirmatively further the purposes of the federal Housing Act...provide for the development of housing opportunities, including opportunities for multifamily dwellings...promote housing choice and economic diversity in housing, including housing for both low and moderate income households...*"

However, Staff did research property transactions of homes within existing two-family neighborhoods in Norwalk and found that there is no negative impact on property values as a result. The homes in two-family neighborhoods increased in value commensurate with single-family only neighborhoods.

A property that was previously approved and does not have the minimum number of parking spaces would be grandfathered in and cannot be forced to add more parking on their property. We see many homes that were built in Norwalk in the 50s and 60s when homes were being constructed at a record rate in the city, that provided one off-street parking space. These homes will continue to only have to provide one off-street parking space until the entire property is ever redeveloped.

However, Staff does feel that it is necessary or good practice to require more parking for residential uses. By requiring more parking, the amount of land that becomes impervious increases and driving becomes de-facto encouraged through site design.

The Connecticut General Statutes do not allow for the basis of zoning regulations to be made on property values. However, Staff did research property transactions of homes within existing two-family neighborhoods in Norwalk and found that there is no negative impact on property values as a result. The homes in two-family neighborhoods increased in value commensurate with single-family only neighborhoods.

The Connecticut General Statutes do not allow for the basis of zoning regulations to be made on property values. However, Staff did research property transactions of homes within existing two-family neighborhoods in Norwalk and found that there is no negative impact on property values as a result. The homes in two-family neighborhoods increased in value commensurate with single-family only neighborhoods.

You can't just change B zones into C zones. It will adversely affect property values and create parking and traffic problems. You're basically stealing from current homeowners.

The Connecticut General Statutes do not allow for the basis of zoning regulations to be made on property values. However, Staff did research property transactions of homes within existing two-family neighborhoods in Norwalk and found that there is no negative impact on property values as a result. The homes in two-family neighborhoods increased in value commensurate with single-family only neighborhoods.

Stop the change in the zone in norwalk! I do not support it as a homeowner and tax payer!

I own my home with my wife on Possum Lane in Norwalk. I am writing to express my objection and opposition to the recent proposal to convert a portion of our neighborhood (currently Zone "B" residential) to a new zoning designation (CD-3) that would allow 2-family homes and even group homes and halfway houses to be developed by right. We bought our home in July of 2009, choosing to invest in Norwalk in large part because we were attracted to certain aspects of our neighborhood, including its racial and cultural diversity and the fact that it was and remains zoned only for single family use. Before we signed a contract to buy our home we were able to determine through conversations with would-be neighbors that most of the homes were owned by the residents themselves, with very few rental homes and resulting transience. This was very important to us as we considered various factors regarding where to live our lives, raise our family, and lock up our assets in what was to be (and now is) the largest financial investment we will ever make. I and many of our neighbors strongly feel that the proposal to now rezone our neighborhood would operate as something of a "bait-and-switch," i.e., we purchased our homes in large part because of the lovely, quiet, stable, and low-traffic character of the neighborhood, but now the City proposes to alter that character by allowing for 2-family homes as of right, which by definition would mean more people, more traffic, and more renters and transience. Adding significantly to these concerns is that from my understanding, the new CD-3 designation would also potentially allow other higher density uses "by right," where most of those other uses currently require a special use permit. See Article 30, § 118-340(B)(2).* These other uses that would be permitted to be constructed "by right" under the new zoning proposal include "congregate housing," "group homes," and "halfway houses." The proposal, if finalized, would result in lower property values than the status quo, with some families potentially choosing to move and other prospective purchasers opting not to purchase properties in a transitioning neighborhood. Any suggestion that these proposed changes would not have a substantial effect on the character of our neighborhood, our quality of life, and the value of our properties would be arbitrary and capricious and would not pass the "straight-face test." We strongly urge the City to prioritize preserving the character of our neighborhood and the substantial investments of our lives and assets that all of our neighborhood's property owners have made in Norwalk by abandoning the proposal to modify the zoning regulations for our neighborhood to allow for more than single family housing by right.

Possum Lane is in the Devil's Garden area which was originally proposed to be rezoned from 1-family to 1 or 2-family. The Commission has recommended not changing the zoning for this area and having it remain single-family. Staff is reviewing certain potential "protected classes", regarding whether they can be excluded zones or not.

Sincerely yours, Daniel E. Estrin 5 Possum Ln

*Available at <https://www.norwalkct.gov/DocumentCenter/View/349/ARTICLE-30?bidId=>

I'm a Norwalk resident since 2009. My address is 29 Possum Lane. I am very concerned you want to change our neighborhood from a single family home to 2 family home's neighborhood. The only people who benefit from this change would be builders who want to make money. The residents in this community do not want multiple family homes. We want to preserve our quiet family neighborhood. That's why many of us bought in this neighborhood. Please be aware we are all against this change. We are all voters and our votes will be lost if this is allowed to happen. Thank you

Possum Lane is in the Devil's Garden area which was originally proposed to be rezoned from 1-family to 1 or 2-family. The Commission has recommended not changing the zoning for this area and having it remain single-family.

Hello, we recently moved to Norwalk in August of 2020 during the pandemic. We picked a home on Possum Lane in a beautiful, single-family neighborhood. I am writing to express objection and opposition to the proposal to convert a portion of our neighborhood to CD-3 / multi-family zoning, away from its current status as an established single family neighborhood.

Before buying our home, we did extensive research on the area and overall neighborhood to validate our hopes of moving into a quiet neighborhood with long-term residents and very few renters. It is a diverse neighborhood on all fronts which was similarly attractive. These factors were hugely important to us in our choice of where to move our family, raise our children, and assign a large portion of our assets as the largest financial decision we have ever made.

Our neighborhood is united in that we feel the proposal to change our zoning would be hugely impactful to the value propositions that had us move to and invest in this area in the first place. Others have alluded to it as a "bait and switch", which is a fair characterization due to the potential of this zoning change to alter the structure of our established neighborhood. Similarly this is not just about the risk of new two-family homes, but the potential right for other high density uses (Article 30, 118-340(B)(2)).

We are disappointed to see this development and truly hope the right decision will be made to keep our neighborhood as currently structured. There would be a large negative effect on property values as well. It is unfair, and not in good faith, to describe these changes as "taking a while" or not meaningful to how we live, property values, etc... This is a major deal to all of us.

Please maintain the character of our neighborhood, the investments we've made of our assets and time spent to build a life here.

Best,
James Wolff
8 Possum Lane

Possum Lane is in the Devil's Garden area which was originally proposed to be rezoned from 1-family to 1 or 2-family. The Commission has recommended not changing the zoning for this area and having it remain single-family.

As a long time Norwalk Realtor and homeowner, I am concerned with parts of the proposed zoning changes. Representing Norwalk home buyers, real estate brokers often hear buyers' preferences for locations for streets with "no yellow lines", single family neighborhoods (vs multi-family neighborhoods), specific school districts, etc.

By down-zoning B into C you are changing the desirable single family nature and ultimately the real estate value of the current B-zone neighborhoods.

Real estate values are determined by the market (not the tax assessor, as we were told by the director). We are also told that a change from B to C would increase homeownership opportunities. This is not the case since we are discussing two-family homes (one owner) not the creation of two condos. Same number of owners. In addition, you are actually potentially decreasing home ownership opportunities since buyers will be in competition with investors/developers.

The current character of a B zone is already impacted by accessory apartments (legal as well as those without permits) and the subsequent parking issues. Changing that character to allow two-family homes will cause parking to increase incrementally. But mostly, down-zoning the character of a modest single family B-zone neighborhood to multi-family homes will alter the ratio of resident-owner occupied to non-resident and tenant occupied properties.

As can be observed by the properties in most current C-zone Norwalk neighborhoods this is not a positive improvement. It is not desirable.

The Connecticut General Statutes do not allow for the basis of zoning regulations to be made on property values. However, Staff did research property transactions of homes within existing two-family neighborhoods in Norwalk and found that there is no negative impact on property values as a result. The homes in two-family neighborhoods increased in value commensurate with single-family only neighborhoods.

Staff would argue that the existing market conditions decrease home ownership opportunities as homes that were previously priced at relatively affordable levels have increased significantly and folks are still competing with investors and developers for those same single-family residences.

"Character" is also a term that zoning regulations can no longer be based on since it means different things to different people. The proposed zoning regulations require that new two-family homes look similar to single-family homes, meaning that the height and bulk of the structure is the same, all of the parking will be located to the rear, and we can control the materials that the structure is built from. Therefore the physical characteristics of the neighborhood will not change as a result of a two-family house.

As mentioned in other comments provided by Staff, we have reviewed property values in existing two-family zones and those properties have increased commensurate with single-family only zones, meaning that these neighborhoods are not any less desirable.

I own a single family home in Norwalk in a single family B-zone. I am ABSOLUTELY OPPOSED to the proposition of changing my property zoning to two family. How can it be legal to make such sweeping changes through a city without property owners consent? It would be hard to find a B zone resident/owner who would be in favor of this zoning downgrade - and it IS a downgrade. I know there are wealthy developers who see Norwalk as an easy target to make millions of dollars building enormous apartments and condo complexes, all the while keeping their own exclusive towns free of these eyesores. BUT WE DON'T HAVE TO PAVE THE WAY FOR THEM TO CHANGE THE NATURE OF OUR SMALL CITY AND TURN IT INTO A BRONX-LIKE ATROCITY! Who is behind these sweeping changes? Do you care about the quality of life in this town? The traffic in Norwalk is already heavy, especially during rush hour. We don't have the capacity in many ways to handle the increase in population this would bring. I have lived here many years and I know a "2 family" district would become a 4-story (or more) apartment "district" through simple variance applications. I haven't received any notification in the mail of this proposition. It is buried in a zoning section on the city website. The vast majority of residents never go on the city website so most people are unaware. Please take the residents of Norwalk, the taxpayers who pay your salary, into account. These changes are not for the good of Norwalk, they will make outsiders wealthy and make Norwalk an undesirable place for families. Please take Bob Duff's slogan and "STAND UP FOR NORWALK". PLEASE!!!

The Connecticut General Statutes do not allow for the basis of zoning regulations to be made on property values. However, Staff did research property transactions of homes within existing two-family neighborhoods in Norwalk and found that there is no negative impact on property values as a result. The homes in two-family neighborhoods increased in value commensurate with single-family only neighborhoods.

Staff does not agree that allowing two-family residences is a "downgrade," and the two-family structures that will be permitted will be the same size as what is allowed for a single-family house to be constructed to.

Traffic issues are mostly caused through a historical development pattern of separating uses from each other resulting in the necessity for a car trip for all functions, ie work, groceries, recreation. The proposed zoning regulations focus the future development of the city near our mass transit stations as well as near businesses and jobs which allow for more trips to be replaced by walking, biking and/or mass transit.

We are against changing some B zone to CD3, in the Park Hill Ave. area. We want it to stay single family zone only. We have owned our property since 1954 and like our neighborhood the way it is. Please consider the wishes of our long term resident homeowners and taxpayers. Thank you

Park Hill Ave is within 0.5 miles from Wall Street and 0.25 miles from Route 1. Staff recommends the proposed zoning remain. It is important to note that changing the zoning to allow for 2 families does not mean change will occur. If and when it occurs it will most likely occur incrementally.

Where are regulations regarding the installation of a permanent, hardscaped fire pit outlined in either the old or newly drafted zoning regulations and/or building codes? I am a residential property owner and my neighbor has built a fire pit, plus other hardscaping, approximately 20' from our joint property line. This is a fire hazard. Additionally, the project is along a wetland area. I couldn't find regulations anywhere - existing or new. I don't understand how a fire pit can be allowed so close to another neighbor's property. Thank you.

Zoning does not regulate most fire pits. There might be instances where there is a fully constructed outdoor oven that might be deemed a structure under the new regulations. The draft regulations better regulate impervious surface, while the current regulations do not.

As a Realtor and home owner, changing the zoning map will not correct the housing crisis. Changing the zoning to include 2 family housing in single family street will devalue the current property values as value is determined by the market which is dictated by aesthetic/condition and buyer demand. Changing the zoning is not good for East Norwalk right now - better after the train station is finished.

Staff has provided documentation to the Commission that shows that two-family homes do not negatively impact property values. Property values in two-family zones in Norwalk have increased commensurate with single-family only zones.

This master zoning plan has to consider the crushing financial blow that would be delivered to private home owners whose properties are arbitrarily slated for drastic zoning changes. My husband and I own and live in a single family home at 339 Strawberry Hill. It is in a single family B zone. We were horrified to see on the proposed zoning change map that the whole section between the triangle of Strawberry Hill, Wolfpit and the Post Road is proposed to be changed to commercial and multi family zoning. There are 10 private homes on the northern tip of this triangle, all on small lots. All are lived in by their owners. These are not dilapidated buildings, they are not rentals, they are our biggest investments where most of our money is. They will be worthless to sell as private homes if they become urban zoning. Our small lots are useless as themselves to anything other than a single-family home. None of our lots are big enough to support multi family structures or commercial buildings. To someone just looking at a map they might say let's just zone it all Urban! But you have to consider the humanity living in that triangle! It is not just a piece of paper. There are plenty of apartment buildings going up in Norwalk. Please allow us to keep the value in our homes by keeping us zoned single family! -Sandy and Bill Marr

Staff has provided documentation to the Commission that shows that two-family homes do not negatively impact property values. Property values in two-family zones in Norwalk have increased commensurate with single-family only zones.

Stop ruining Norwalk.

Traffic issues are mostly caused through a historical development pattern of separating uses from each other resulting in the necessity for a car trip for all functions, ie work, groceries, recreation. The proposed zoning regulations focus the future development of the city near our mass transit stations as well as near businesses and jobs which allow for more trips to be replaced by walking, biking and/or mass transit.

The traffic is unbearable all over the city.

Staff has also reviewed the school population which has been relatively stagnant over the last 20 years, increasing from 11,062 (PK-12) in 2000-01 to 11,509 (PK-12) in 2020-01.

In order to get to work across town takes 30 minutes or more in the morning and again at night.

Schools are overcrowded.

Don't make one family zones into two family plus.

Don't allow more multi-family units or apartments.

Don't reduce anymore streets from 2 lanes to one lane like was done on East Avenue by the Green.

It's becoming a terrible place to live and raise our children.

Hello, I live in the Norwalk neighborhood of "Broadriver," west of Springhill Ave. I see that much of this neighborhood plus parts of the Springhill neighborhood are proposed to be changed from Zone B (single family) to what's called CD-3 (single and two family). I am strongly opposed to this change. I'm a young homeowner and in the last six years I have seen more and more young families move into this area. It's a nice area and comparably affordable to buy into, while still maintaining modest hallmarks of single-family dwelling. In my opinion this is what Norwalk should want: young professionals populating their neighborhoods with homeownership. Changing this neighborhood to two-family zoning seems unfairly targeted. I am not wealthy enough to buy into the neighborhoods that are proposed to maintain single-family-only zoning, but I still deserve to maintain the zoning regulation my home had when I bought it. The proposed zoning articles do not mention potential changes to property values, but I have to assume I'm at risk of my property value going down with the proposed change. That is very disheartening. These neighborhoods are filled with small houses set close together. Not only can the area not support the increase of people that two-family dwellings would bring, but there is no available land. That means you are inviting developers to come in and snap up our little houses, kicking out the homeowners in favor of building two-family rentals, and potentially changing the face of the whole area. Does this benefit the city somehow? I see absolutely NO benefit for the RESIDENTS of these neighborhoods or for any of Norwalk's existing residents.

I see that zones may also change from B to CD-3 in parts of the Flax Hill area and even parts of Dry Hill and Strawberry Hill. Please don't change our neighborhoods! If Norwalk doesn't seriously reconsider this, you're going to zone and price out the modest single-family homeowner. This type of buyer will continue moving to Trumbull or Monroe and Norwalk will be left with renters.

What is the plan to increase enforcement of these new regulations? A quick drive around the city and you can see a multitude of violations. Quality of life is a concern as we increased density and add more residents and cars to our city. What new efforts will be made to address zoning violations in a timely manner? Will you PLEASE offer residents the opportunity to report violations anonymously? Given how unhinged (and many with guns) people can be these days residents shouldn't have to identify themselves when reporting a neighbors violation. Anyone who has watched a zoning violation meeting knows that some of these issues go on for months and even years, How can the process be sped up and also make sure fines are being assessed?

Keep commercial vehicles from parking on residential streets. For example, landscaping fleets kept on street, instead of having a garage. Streets are narrow and this is not enforced.

What's the purpose of having standards if they are not enforced? There are illegal multi-family dwellings all over Norwalk but they are not shut down. I suspect it's because we're a sanctuary city and those in townhall are ok with it. In addition, small business owners and landscapers constantly park their commercial vehicles in residential neighbors. These are eyesores and detract from the overall beauty of residential streets. The budget needs to allocate more resources for zoning enforcement and have them actually perform their jobs. Those responsible for zoning enforcement should be proactive, drive through the neighborhoods issuing warnings and violations to those who are clearly in direct conflict with the regulations. It also shouldn't be the responsibility of only homeowners to bring these violations to the attention of P&Z. These issues are only going to become worse as Norwalk continues to grow and without enforcement a revision of the zoning regulations is a farce.

New zoning that will increase the ability to create additional multi family units in the Fifth Street/Gregory area should not be considered. We already have tons of multi family units and a significant parking and traffic problem. With the revelry approved Mill Pond project, it will be much worse. Perhaps enforcement of traffic rules and of rental units can happen now. There are so many illegal multi family units already that come with many cars. Please do not allow for new multi unit dwellings.

NO to proposed zoning changes! Our area simply cannot handle this type of density!

Staff has provided documentation to the Commission that shows that two-family homes do not negatively impact property values. Property values in two-family zones in Norwalk have increased commensurate with single-family only zones.

In addition, all areas that were proposed to allow for two-family houses or multifamily were based on proximity to mass transit, jobs and our major infrastructure.

By not allowing for more dwelling units to be built, the cost of housing in Norwalk will continue to increase as it has been doing consistently since rebounding from the Great Recession. What were previously attainable houses in Norwalk at a modest salary have now increased beyond \$500,000 to purchase which causes many folks who work in Norwalk to reside elsewhere and then exacerbating the traffic issues. The percentage of cost burdened homeowners in Norwalk was 38% per the latest 2021 Census data which was gathered prior to the most recent spikes in housing prices, where the median home price in Norwalk jumped from about \$450,000 to \$550,000. What we do know is that a unit within a two-family dwelling, condominium and other types of multifamily living situations are more affordable to purchase than a single-family residence.

Staff responds to complaints and issues violations as quickly as possible, however, zoning is limited in authority to access a property where a possible violation may exist per law. In addition, there are minimum timeframes from which a notice of violation is issued to where a person is provided time to comply with the order.

There are multiple paths to enforce such issues which include zoning, DPW and the Police Department.

Staff responds to complaints and issues violations as quickly as possible, however, zoning is limited in authority to access a property where a possible violation may exist per law. In addition, there are minimum timeframes from which a notice of violation is issued to where a person is provided time to comply with the order.

The area in and around Gregory/5th is already zoned for 1 or 2 family development.

Any change in density as a result of zoning changes will occur over a long period of time. The proposed changes are focused in areas where we have infrastructure as well as the ability for people to live near jobs and mass transit which can reduce the need for a car. In addition, WPCA provides regular updates of their capacity which there is plenty of for future development and the number of school children has remained relatively stagnant over the last 20 years.

Dear Steven, Lisa Brinton and I participated in last night's ENNA meeting on behalf of the Shorefront Park City Watch Committee. Other members of the committee are copied above. I am writing to correct the record regarding your misunderstanding of the current zoning designation of Shorefront Park. Given how comprehensive this zoning rewrite is, I can understand that even the Chief of Planning & Zoning might experience a memory lapse from time to time. After all, those who live and own homes in a specific neighborhood are more likely to know their own zoning designation than someone who lives in a distant town. When you stated that parts of Shorefront Park were already zoned C for two-family, you were mistaken. I apologize if my attempt to correct you was overly-passionate. But I have been immersed in these neighborhoods since early 2017, a few months after I moved in and learned about the Firetree application. It was then I learned that one side of Quintard (the odd numbered side) was zoned C residential and the other side is B single family residential. There is one two family home on the even numbered side that I am aware of which was probably grandfathered in and another home, number 6, which has been the subject of numerous complaints due to illegal occupancy in the basement occurring over a period of several years. From the intersection Quintard and Sheridan down to the intersection of Lowndes, Quintard is single family on both sides. Currently, out of the 80 homes in Shorefront Park, only one has a Quintard address. However, this home is within Shorefront Park. Adjacent homes on Quintard are single family. The closest two-family homes are across the street on the odd numbered side. But here is the larger point that you perhaps understandably--but lamentably--got wrong at the public meeting last night. Shorefront Park is a single family neighborhood. Every home within the Park is a single family home. There was one pre-existing accessory dwelling unit that no longer exists, and one home previously used as an illegal rooming house that also no longer exists. The goal of zoning to bring non-compliant uses and structures into compliance has been fully achieved in Shorefront Park. To help better illustrate the point, I've attached below both the existing zoning map and the proposed map for your review. Every time I review the proposed map, I find something new of interest. So thank you for compelling me to engage in this exercise once again of reviewing the proposed changes. Whereas in the existing map, Shorefront Park is listed as a distinct neighborhood with a name, in the proposed map, Shorefront Park vanishes altogether. Perhaps this is some oversight on the part of the consultant who was ignorant of the history of our neighborhood, the deed restrictions, etc. I'm sure my neighbors here would be very surprised to learn our neighborhood is being erased.

2023-05-16.png
2023-05-16 (1).png

We would appreciate very much if you would reach out to Diane Cece to correct the record on this.

Many thanks for your patience last night and always! Donna Smirniotopoulos

Shorefront Park has been reverted to single-family zoning.

On the current zoning map, Shorefront Park appears on the map as a distinct single-family B residence neighborhood. On the proposed map, Shorefront Park no longer exists and is absorbed into the surrounding neighborhoods which do not align with it by any metric. An update to zoning regulations to make them more current should not require the complete erasure of an historic neighborhood. Just as the Lockwood Matthews Mansion is historic. Perhaps P&Z should consider upzoning at the LMM in order to increase the housing supply, promote affordability, improve housing options across a wide spectrum of incomes and return sorely needed revenue to the city. LMM does not currently pay property taxes and is within an easy walk of the SoNo Train station.

Shorefront Park has been reverted to single-family zoning.

The city is being over built. Transforming quiet residential neighborhoods into multiple family dwellings is counter to the very nature of what makes Norwalk an attractive place to live.

The predominate land use in the City, even under the proposed zoning scheme, is single-family zoning. The goal is to provide modest in-fill development in areas proximate to transit, and employment centers that are facilitated by City infrastructure.

Stop! Your over crowding All ready over crowded streets and homes!!! Leave the neighborhoods alone!

The proposed regulations seem to exempt rear lots, which would make the many existing rear lots nonconforming (which is contrary to the concept of eliminating nonconformities over time). What is the rationale behind this? If this is enacted, what would be the height/bulk requirements for these lots? And if the proposed regulations that would include paved surfaces such as driveways (and sidewalks/patios etc.) in the coverage calculation, many of the existing rear lots would also become nonconforming as to coverage. This would result in owners of rear lots being required to apply for variances should they want to construct additions or patios - even if these additions fully comply with setbacks. Just as an example, there are at least 10 rear lots on Chestnut Hill Avenue from its intersection with Admiral Lane south for about 2 miles. Most of these rear lots have paved driveways. What would their new setbacks be? And it's likely that all of these property owners would exceed maximum coverage when their paved driveways are now counted as coverage should they ever decide to construct additions, patios, additional walkways. This situation will emerge throughout Norwalk and unnecessarily inundate the ZBA with variance applications. Rear lots should continue to be permitted.

Any existing rear lot would be unchanged by the regulations. Perhaps there change to measuring impervious surface could impact some properties if they have more paved surface than others, but the other metrics, such as setback would be unchanged. Staff reviewed the areas on Chestnut Hill Ave and Admiral to further evaluate the impacts. 5 Admiral Court for example contains 1.29 acres and perhaps the longest accessway in the area. The main parcel area is approximately 40,000 SF. 25% impervious surface coverage would allow 10,000 SF total. Existing deck, garage & first floor total ~ 2,600 SF. Applying a conservative driveway distance of 500' by 10' wide, that totals 5,000 SF, which still would theoretically leave an additional ~ 2,500 SF of impervious surface.

The proposed regulations seem to eliminate conservation developments entirely. There are in excess of 15 conservation developments that exist today. This would make all of them nonconforming, which is contrary to zoning. More importantly, conservation developments properly protect large swaths of property as open space in perpetuity, which is a beneficial and important concept. What is the rationale behind removing this land use opportunity?

While there is some merit to conservation developments, they have resulted in very little public benefit and considering that Norwalk is nearly built-out, there will be further demand for this use going forward. While a goal of zoning is to eliminate nonconformities, the City's land use patterns have not been properly adjusted or reviewed in decades, which has lead to conflict and inconsistent. The goal of these changes will be to correct that over time.

I object to the change of zoning for the Shorefront Park neighborhood from B residential to CD-3. Shorefront Park has historically been zoned for single family dwellings and the change does nothing to further the interests expressed by Planning and Zoning while posing a threat to the property values and overall quality of life of residents. The current infrastructure of gas, water and electric will be compromised by increased density in the neighborhood. Our current road and the ingress and egress points can barely support the traffic that we have now, without the additional traffic that would come with increased density. The flooding issues, exacerbated by inadequate sewer and drainage in the neighborhood, would only be worsened by increasing the hardscape, which would occur with the increase in parking spaces that is required to support two-family housing.

Shorefront Park has been reverted to single-family zoning.

In public forums it has been stated that the reasoning for the change from B Residential (single-family) to CD-3 (two-family) is to bring the zoning regulations in line with the recent Plan of Conservation & Development (POCD), and to increase housing density in areas that are in close proximity to transit hubs such as the South Norwalk train station. First, we note that the POCD is an advisory document, not a binding requirement. Second, it has been stated in public forums that the change in zoning is unlikely to have an immediate impact, i.e., it is unlikely that two-family residences will be built in the near future. If that is the case, then it seems as if the change would do nothing to increase density and achieve the stated aims of the POCD. Finally, it has also been stated that the change is to make zoning in Shorefront Park similar to the surrounding neighborhoods. Other than allowing for a larger portion of the map to be the same color, this seems to be a spurious rationale for the change. After all, the City has been able to manage for decades with Shorefront Park having different zoning from its neighbors. Furthermore, our "sister" neighborhoods for the purposes of current zoning regulations and almost every other city activity, including the POCD, are Village Creek, Harborview and Marvin Beach. Yet these neighborhoods will remain exclusively single-family zones, designated CD-3S, should the proposed changes pass, singling out Shorefront Park for disparate treatment.

Thus, the stated justifications for this change in zoning all fail to achieve any of the goals that Planning and Zoning has laid out as justification for the change and result in disparate impact to Shorefront Park over other similarly situated neighborhoods, while imposing significant negative consequences on the quality of life and economic interests of the homeowners in Shorefront Park.

I would like something to be done regarding the amount of combination trucks that take up Stuart Ave. It makes it very difficult for people to go in and out of our driveways. Also, I would like something done regarding the permissible amount of cars/trucks a single family home can have. It seems outrageous that a single family home can have over 7 cars/trucks on Stuart Ave and take up a whole side of one street(3 properties worth). Just outrageous

We will have enforcement staff inspect Stuart Avenue to determine if there appears to be illegal contractor yards and or illegal parking of commercial vehicles. If they are parking on the street, that may be a matter for the Police Dpt.

How many total new dwelling units and square footage of office space could be created under the proposed regulations? Why is it so important to have very very tall buildings on Main Ave? Office space is not needed - all recent trends say there is an overabundance - so why have taller structures been included? Has the city calculated the number of school-aged children that could be the result of the number of new dwelling units that could be created, and what does that mean to existing school capacity? Have the proposed regulations been shared with public works, water pollution control authority, fire department, health department, police department and other agencies to gain their input? Can the city's sewer system handle the number of new dwelling units? What about the impact to other infrastructure components - water mains, gas & electric? The roads are already taxed - this will only create further use and decline and DPW won't be able to keep up with maintenance. Can Norwalk Hospital accommodate the medical needs of the increase in residents?

The request to increase the height within the CD-4C zone (Bus 1 or 2) was a Commission recommendation to incentivize better development in those areas. There is no evidence that the infrastructure concerns stated are presently taxed or in danger of being overburdened. The areas proposed for redevelopment are already developed parcels, not virgin land, so existing infrastructure is in place for these areas. Furthermore, each development proposed is subject to review by all the departments you mentioned below (note the hospital is a private entity) and if any individual development cannot be handled by the road network, wastewater treatment plant or water supplier, they cannot be approved.

What studies have been done to evaluate the impact on property values (and the associated tax base) that may result from the proposed changes? If such studies have been undertaken, where are they so that the public can view them? Have the regulations been discussed with the assessor's office and has it evaluated the impact of the regulations on the city's grand list? Has the city evaluated the costs associated with the increase in residential units to city services such as police and fire?

Staff has reviewed recent property transactions in existing two-family zones as well as single-family only zones and found that the properties have increased in value at the same rate. Please note that property value impacts are not a legal mechanism for making zoning regulation decisions, however, the data still proves that there will not be any negative impacts as a result of any rezoning.

Norwalk is essentially entirely built out, meaning that the city is no longer expanding horizontally and most new development is infill or redevelopment. The police department and fire department already serve these areas so there is no change to the area in which they service.

I'm against this! You can't just change a neighborhood from a B zone to a C zone. Parking and traffic will be hideous!!!

Please note that some areas initially proposed for the CD-3 zoning (1 or 2 family) have been scaled back to just single family. Regardless, existing single family zones can have attached or detached ADU's, which does require 1 or the other to be owner-occupied, but does not change the density. Secondly, a new 2 family dwelling is required to have four (4) compliant parking spaces, which must be on the subject property. In addition, the data suggests that existing 2 families are approximately 60% owner-occupied and that less than 50% of the properties that are eligible to become 2 families have chosen to do so.

Your changes to encourage more multi unit particularly in east norwalk will not make it more walkable. It will add cars and add traffic. The zoning changes will be detrimental to property values

Please note that some areas in East Norwalk initially proposed for the CD-3 zoning (1 or 2 family) have been scaled back to just single family. Regardless, existing single family zones can have attached or detached ADU's, which does require 1 or the other to be owner-occupied, but does not change the density. Secondly, a new 2 family dwelling is required to have four (4) compliant parking spaces, which must be on the subject property. In addition, the data suggests that existing 2 families are approximately 60% owner-occupied and that less than 50% of the properties that are eligible to become 2 families have chosen to do so. In addition, all available data indicates that there is no decrease in property values for neighborhoods that allow both single and two families.

Does our Fire Department have the staff and the equipment to handle fires in higher story buildings? Given the amount of fires in the city lately I would hope these codes are being discussed with them.

There are no changes proposed to increase the allowed number of stories verse what exists today.

As a real estate agent selling Norwalk, I can state unequivocally that the 2-family zoning changes under discussion are having enormous impact on housing decisions made by my clients, and on my ability to wholeheartedly recommend the town and its management. Concerns associated with population density include: # of cars on the roads, and the infrastructure to support that population increase such as sufficient schools, grocery stores, retail centers, wide enough roads, etc.

Please note that some areas initially proposed for the CD-3 zoning (1 or 2 family) have been scaled back to just single family. Regardless, existing single family zones can have attached or detached ADU's, which does require 1 or the other to be owner-occupied, but does not change the density. Secondly, a new 2 family dwelling is required to have four (4) compliant parking spaces, which must be on the subject property. In addition, the data suggests that existing 2 families are approximately 60% owner-occupied and that less than 50% of the properties that are eligible to become 2 families have chosen to do so. In addition, all available data indicates that there is no decrease in property values for neighborhoods that allow both single and two families. Furthermore, there is no evidence that supports the claim that City infrastructure has been strained by redevelopment in the City. This includes schools, sewer, water or roads.

It will negatively impact the real estate values.

There is no data to support the assertion that upzoning will decrease property values

We do NOT want more multi family residencies around the Wolfpit neighborhood. There is already too much traffic and congestion. We do not want to see our property values go down. We, and I suspect many families in our situation, will move to Wilton or Westport if you rezone.

Any rezoning in and around the Wolfpit area is proposed following the same criteria established elsewhere (applying buffers or either 0.25 miles or 0.5 miles for walkability purposes. Given this location's proximity to transit and employment centers, providing more opportunities for housing in these areas is appropriate. Further, the areas proposed are often flanked and surrounded by either commercial or more dense housing, such as PUD's.

Zoning redistricting proposed will be detrimental to property values and the standard of living in town. More people in an already congested town makes no sense. It will change the landscape negatively. I oppose changes to the zoning.

There is ZERO evidence that any change from 1-family to 2-family will lead to a depreciation of property values or has lead to widespread turnover in these areas. The data we have reviewed indicates that about 50% of the existing 2-families are at least 50% of the existing 2-family units. In addition, in areas that have allowed either 1-family or 2-family for nearly 100 years, less than 1/2 of those properties are 2-families.

Submitting in opposition

No to increased zoning for multi family homes

Do not make any changes the infrastructure in norwalk are not able to handle any more people or buildings!!! Your are putting a major strain on our systems!

There is ZERO evidence that City infrastructure is strained as a result of additional development.

I am very against changing zoning of possible rezoning of current single family homes into 2 family homes. We purchased our homes to live in a neighborhood of single family homes. Also streets become clogged with multiple cars parked along streets, making it difficult for walking and traveling down those streets. Also most homeowners take pride in their own properties, unfortunately not the same with renters.

Please note that some zones initially proposed for the CD-3 zoning (1 or 2 family) have been scaled back to just single family. Regardless, existing single family zones can have attached or detached ADU's, which does require 1 or the other to be owner-occupied, but does not change the density. In addition, the data suggests that existing 2 families are approximately 60% owner-occupied and that less than 50% of the properties that are eligible to become 2 families have chosen to do so.

I am very against combining B and C residence into one zone CD3.

Leave the B Residence Zone alone. What's with the obsession on density? Learn about our neighborhoods and start realizing there will be cars parked in the street in front of each other's yards, loud music and parties and plenty of fresh dog crap on your lawn every day. Promoting two families on to a 60' X 100' lot is just trashing our already crowded City.

Those of us who bought and invested into our single-family neighborhoods expect them to remain that way, and others who advocate to overbuild our City hoping their rents will go down are sadly mistaken and don't seem to view quality of life as a priority. Using "Home Ownership Opportunities" as a slogan for selling the high-density concept will no doubt result in teardowns of existing homes while absentee landlords simply collect two rents on duplexes. Claims that the effects would not be immediate but would take twenty years are probably false, but still an intentional slow destruction of Norwalk's living conditions.

How much more traffic do you want on our arterial roads making it more difficult to pull out from a side street? How many more sirens do you wish to hear on any given day? There are plenty of issues like infrastructure, public safety, enforcement, recreation, education, environmental considerations and other matters that aren't being addressed. Water flow restrictions and sewage treatment operations aren't part of the discussion?

The only other two municipalities that are considering widespread rezoning changes are Bridgeport and Hartford. These are the last two Connecticut cities that Norwalk should try to emulate.

Richard Bonenfant

I oppose.

I oppose.

With all of the requirements currently existing for affordable housing and those proposed with the draft regulations, Sec. 6.12.4.3 is unnecessary and will serve as a disincentive for new non-residential construction. This is not the way that Norwalk, which has more 10% affordable units, will encourage new business. Rather, it will do quite the opposite and discourage new businesses from coming to Norwalk and also discourage existing businesses from expanding. In addition, what "fund" has been or will be created? What department or staff will monitor the funds? Will the city use the funds to create affordable housing? Who will make the determination as to use of the funds? What are the criteria? This is reminiscent of the "fund" that was to be created for the construction of a parking garage at the Webster Street lot. When property owners sought variances for parking for uses in SoNo over the years, they were required to pay the cost of parking spaces into such a fund. No one has ever provided any update on how much exists in that fund, who paid into it, or what has been done with it.

Norwalk is a growing community and desirous place to live. Change and growth is inevitable. How and where we choose to allow it is what is being considered. The City has done a good job of allowing more dense housing in areas that are appropriate, such as around transit, employment centers and our critical infrastructure. Single family housing is and will be the predominant land use in the City, even if the changes proposed are fully adopted. The City has not provided for what is termed as "missing middle housing", which is generally considered 2-10 unit housing. The proposed changes seek to potentially allow for this change, which will occur incrementally over a long period of time, not overnight. No one will be forced to build more dense housing, but they will have the option of adding to or replacing what exists. Providing more options is not a bad thing and could provide additional home ownership opportunities and may decrease the housing need over time. While Hartford and Bridgeport have recently redone their zoning, following a form-based approach, they are not the only communities. In addition, the proposed recommendations are specific to Norwalk to address what is best for the City over the long term.

This particular change in the regulation was a Commission initiated recommendation. The reason being is that the commercial users are also a driver for housing, including affordable housing. While the fee is an additional cost, it is a very modest cost in the overall cost of redevelopment. The funds, per statute, are required to go into a fund dedicated solely to the development, repair or replacement of affordable housing. The Common Council is currently working on an ordinance relative to an Affordable Housing Trust Fund, which outlines the rules and procedures regarding expenditure of these funds.

First, there is a need to update and simplify the zoning regs; I attended the WNNA meeting where the proposed regs were presented; great job by Bryan Baker.

During a recent zoning presentation on May 1st at the Fox Run School, one of the proposed zoning changes included removing the "lot" or acre size from the regs. Ten attendees asked why the lot size would be removed, and we didn't receive a clear answer. Could you share details of the proposed change? I and many residents I have spoken to do not support this change. I have own properties in Darien and Greenwich; here, they use include the size of the lot in zoning. I suggest the city research best practices in other CT towns/cities to see how many include the size of lots.

Second question, why did the city of Norwalk use a consulting firm from Tenn? You could find a firm in New England to perform this work and a firm that is more familiar with the area.

Greg Willis
162 Fallow Street
Norwalk, CT 06850

203 858-1977
gtwillis@gmail.com

The main impetus to removing lot area as a metric is because the perception of one's "lot" is based on what the person on the street perceives as someone's property. You cannot see lot area, only how wide the property is. From what we have heard, the concern with this change is whether this will lead to a proliferation of additional lots. Our analysis does not indicate that, except if someone has a corner lot, which has a lot of street width, that could lead to additional lots. However, eliminating the ability to create new Rear Lots, lowers the potential number of new lots significantly. As a safety measure we are proposing to include a minimum lot circle and minimum distance the lot width must be retained, in order to eliminate any potential proliferation of additional lots.

We have lived in a single family zoning area for 45 years. It is insane to believe that our officials would want to change our area to a 2 family zoning. Our streets cannot handle the traffic let alone the parking situation would be a nightmare. Finally our property value would go down and I have worked over 43 years to pay my property taxes every year without fail. Mayor, I invite you to visit our Deepwood,Knollwood area to see first hand if this area could handle 2 family zoning!!! Please keep our area beautiful by keeping our area single zoning.

Devil's Garden has been reverted to single-family zoning.

To increase density in the city you must first enlarge and update the sewage treatment plant. Where will the children go to school? Will you increase and widen roads? Traffic is horrible. We also need mass transit, THEN you can increase density.

WPCA provides regular updates on their capacity which they are well below. Per WPCA in May 2022, their average annual rate of flow is 12.4 million gallons per day and their capacity is 18 million gallons per day. The Norwalk Board of Education provided us with the number of school children over the last 20 years which increased from 11,062 in 2000 to 11,509 in 2020, which is a total growth of 4% over 20 years which is much slower than our population growth. Also, the general direction of transportation planning is to allow for increased pedestrian safety, walkability and bikeability, and moving away from widening roadways which causes induced demand.

We live in Shorefront Park. It is a small neighborhood with single family homes on small lots. The proposed Zoning changes to allow multiple family homes in Shorefront park does not make sense as there are very few lots left with older homes on them. The impact to our property values is not warranted for such a small opportunity. Further, Water St has been redeveloped with hundreds of new apartments. We oppose this Zoning change.

Shorefront Park has been reverted to single-family zoning.

Stop the rezoning of our neighborhoods! We do not have enough resources to sustain anymore people!!

There is no evidence that we do not have the resources to accommodate more people in Norwalk.

I own a house in Norwalk near Kendall School. I also operate a business in Norwalk. My brothers own houses in Norwalk. Piecemeal change is not ideal, this is a good methodology. I and my brothers whole heartedly support these new zones. The city should do as much as it can to increase housing. It's good for residents and businesses locally. There will always be some opposition to change. I hope you don't give in.

Staff has recommended some scaling back for consistency purposes. Our chief goal is to get het zoning districts correct, which will enable the zoning boundaries to be adjusted over time.

When I hear people claiming that their property value will go down if their neighborhood is "up zoned" (changed from 1-family to CD-3 allowing 2-family), it echoes things I remember hearing back in the 1960s. In those days, "my property value will go down" was a "dog whistle" code for opposition to racially integrated housing. I'm not sure how Norwalk should address this diplomatically, but it is troubling that people assume their property value will go down, and that the motivation for this concern might be an unspoken fear that the "wrong kind of people" might move in next door.

We agree. There is ZERO evidence we have seen where this has been the case. The new regulations have stricter standards related to design of building and property for new 2-family dwellings.

No to two-family zoning in our neighborhood.

<p>What can be done to address the architectural look/style of new buildings/houses? If you drive around some of the areas with our older/historic houses it would be nice to be able to maintain that look/feel. Some of the new builds are completely out of character for the areas (prime example is the new build on the corner of West Norwalk and Stephen Mather). What are we putting in place to protect some of our older homes from either being demolished or remodeled in a way that doesn't fit the neighborhood (France street is a prime example)?</p>	<p>The new regulations are a hybrid code of our traditional zoning (Euclidian) and form-based, which a lot of architectural elements you see. However, that only applies to 2-family, multi-family and commercial. Single-family districts are not under design purview.</p>
<p>Who is looking at the financial implications of continuing to increase density? Property taxes are the main source of revenue in the city. Every year we don't have enough money to keep our parks clean, enforce our current zoning regulations, pave our roads, fund our schools, etc. More residents equal increased costs and strain on our infrastructure. Will this development pay for itself? It hasn't so far so how will these new zoning regulations change that?</p>	<p>These are good questions. All the available data indicates that multi-family, in comparison to single-family housing requires less services and pay more in taxes.</p>
<p>Is the city planing to change the way zoning violations are discovered and enforced? Why is it the job of residents to report violations only for them to drag on for months sometimes years with no fines? Without enforcement why do we expect residents to follow proper zoning regulations? Clean up all the zoning violations before you allow any additional upzoning.</p>	<p>The 2 really have nothing to do with the other. Some violation are obvious on observation and others we may never know about unless reported by a neighbor who is knowledgeable about the activities occurring and when they are occurring. We will coordinate larger sweeps of areas for things like illegal contractor yards where we know there is a concentration of illegal activity.</p>
<p>Please point out whether any areas of Norwalk will be "down-zoned" -- that is, areas that are currently 2-family and will be changed to 1-family, or currently multi-family and will be changed to 2-family. In an area to be down-zoned, will existing 2-family or multi-family homes be grandfathered? How will existing ADUs in a down-zoned area be handled (also grandfathered)? Thank you.</p>	<p>Any area, whether downzoned or upzoned that becomes nonconforming as a result of any regulation change will be grandfathered" in and allowed to remain in perpetuity. There was no "downzoning", unless you consider the combination of existing single-family zones to one another downzoning.</p>
<p>I like the look of the new regulations. They are certainly easier to understand and the pictures are very helpful.</p> <p>Are aesthetics considered part of zoning? If so we should not be placing solar panels and cable dishes on the front of houses. Or if we have to allow it, can it only be one or the other and not both on the same house? In relation to that, what is the oneness on a property owner to maintain a basic standard of cleanliness of their property?</p>	<p>The new regulations do not regulate the aesthetics on single-family housing, but do on 2-family, multi and commercial. Any new 2-family built will be subject to the form-based standards. Where people actually park is a separate matter. In addition, in areas that have allowed either 1-family or 2-family for nearly 100 years, less than 1/2 of those properties are 2-families.</p>
<p>The pushback on these "upzoning" areas is because absent landlords are not taking care of their properties. They are creating illegal boarding houses and turning two families into 3 or 4 families. Cars are parked on lawns and covering the streets. This is what people don't want coming to their neighborhoods and they associate it with two family properties.</p>	
<p>It's unlikely that any B zone residents want to be rezoned to CD-3. The change would cause undue harm. Replacement of owner/occupants with renters would downgrade neighborhood quality of life, and would depress values of remaining owner-occupied single-family homes.</p>	<p>There is ZERO evidence that any change from 1-family to 2-family will lead to a depreciation of property values or has lead to widespread turnover in these areas. The data we have reviewed indicates that about 50% of the existing 2-families are at least 50% of the existing 2-family units. In addition, in areas that have allowed either 1-family or 2-family for nearly 100 years, less than 1/2 of those properties are 2-families.</p>
<p>How do residents voice concern regarding overdevelopment of apartment buildings in the area of Main Ave- the iPark along the Wilton border.</p> <p>How are new large scale apartments approved in mixed commercial / residential areas. What consideration is there to 1) keep open space, 2)control traffic, 3) look at environmental impact</p>	<p>The City has focused development in several areas, one of them being the area neat the under construction Merritt 7 train station. That redevelopment will be phased and is conditioned upon numerous traffic and infrastructure improvements, including several intersections in this area. That redevelopment also included the development of a 2+ acre park for the enjoyment of all residents, as well as links to the NRVT.</p>
<p>I live in a double AA area of Norwalk. I understood as a resident here for 40 years that it is a residential neighborhood. Why are certain people allowed to operate a commercial business out of a newly built facility on their property. Also I don't believe a C.O Has-been issued for this facility asset</p>	<p>If Staff is provided with the address we will investigate the property for any possible zoning violations.</p>

As an architect who had done coastal projects throughout Fairfield County, Norwalk's regulations are completely out of step with the reality of other towns and how it should be. Norwalk's Coastal Regulations, specifically how it currently defines and administers FEMA "Substantial Improvement" requirements [Article 110: Flood Hazard Zone - Definition of "Substantial Improvement"], are Draconian and Counter-Productive to the intent. Even the City attorney has produced a memo recommending that Zoning take steps to be better aligned with other towns. As the FEMA Substantial Improvement regulations are currently enforced [back-dating the "value" of the house to a time in which values are out of step with today; counting the dollar value of ALL improvements against the 50% limit (without "re-sets", as other towns allow)] make it nearly impossible to for someone to simply repair old siding on their home without triggering compliance for a Substantial Improvement. The obvious result of this Draconian regulation is that the City loses oversight of projects, as people who need to make repairs and minor updates are financially forced to do them without permits.

As an architect licensed nearly 30 years, Norwalk Zoning's current enforcement of FEMA is over-burdensome, (and way beyond any requirements of FEMA, so there's no clear benefit to the city for being so Draconian), unfair, creates the need for citizens to perform unpermitted work, and is easily the single most ridiculously stupid Zoning enforcement measure I've come across.

PLEASE make this better for your citizens, for Norwalk, and for professionals who design and build in your city.

Changing single family zoning to be two or multi family zoning in my neighborhood of Bettswood would negatively change the character of the area. We already have a few multi-family homes (some of them not legal) causing parking and traffic issues. Our lots are often only 1/10 of an acre which is WAY too small to safely accommodate two family houses and the necessary parking and still maintain the historic character of the neighborhood.

Density in Norwalk is already very high compared to surrounding towns. Please see the article in the CT Mirror 5/26/23: "Zoning norms slow efforts to cut transportation pollution in Connecticut
Land use is the single biggest factor in determining how much people drive. As the state tries to lower vehicle miles traveled, officials are seeking legislation to encourage more local governments to allow denser development." by Lisa Prevost | Energy News Network May 26, 2023 @ 11:56 am
<https://tinyurl.com/4khv3v3w>
I understand New Canaan has 4-acre zoning. How do you think New Canaan homeowners would react if the town of New Canaan decided to allow 2-acre lots so that each 4-acre homeowner could build a second house on their additional 2 acres? I can't imagine people would accept this. Yet it's areas like New Canaan that need more density, not Norwalk.

Our names are Michael and Kristy. Sweeney, we live at 26 Ludlow Manor in East Norwalk. We wanted to let you know that we are against the upzoning of Ludlow Manor from Single family B zone to one and two family CD-3 zoning for many reasons. We request that Ludlow Manor stay Single family zoning to keep stability for the current home owners. We are concerned that the value of our house will go down if two family homes are allowed to be built on Ludlow Manor. A couple of Construction Managers have told me that it would be a prime investment opportunity for them. They would turn the single family home into a two family rental. Historically, renters have a higher turnover and would not care for the property as well as a homeowner. The up-zoning will change the look and feel of Ludlow Manor. Ludlow Manor is a charming tree lined street. Several of my neighbors are having replacement trees planted by the City. The stakes are in the ground for new plantings. Two family zoning would not allow for as many trees on the street. There would be many more driveways where the trees would have been. We also believe that we should preserve Ludlow Manor in East Norwalk because of its historic value. Mike Mushak, P&Z commission member, spoke about keeping Ludlow Manor and Staples Court as single family residences in the meeting held on Wednesday, June 7, 2023.

City Staff acknowledges that Norwalk's regulation of the floodplain was more restrictive than most communities, perhaps the most restrictive community in the state. While it can be argued that as a community that values resilience, we should maintain strict standards; however, the proposed changes will allow for significant improvements to structures, while maintaining the integrity of the intent of the flood zone regulations.

Bettswood Rd is less than 0.25 miles from East Ave and less than 0.5 miles from Westport Avenue, as well as the Wall Street area, which contains a significant amount of employers, services, amenities and transportation option. This location is appropriate for upzoning. Please note that any redevelopment will have to conform to all applicable standards, including providing four (4) compliant parking spaces.

Our development is targeted around infrastructure, transportation and employment centers. This provides the opportunity to be less reliant on an automobile for work and also to get to the services and amenities that the community has to offer. Providing a more walkable environment will lead to less pollution. While we agree that communities like New Canaan should provide more housing and loosen their zoning restrictions, that is not under our purview. In addition, communities like New Canaan are subject to CGS 8-30g applications, since they do not provide the required affordable housing mandated by the state, which results on large, unpopular developments that is often out of scale with the surroundings. Norwalk is following a plan of development, aimed at density in strategic locations and slower in-fill development over time.

Staff would recommend that a thoughtful review of this area be considered by the Commission. This area is bordered by 1-2 family housing to the west and north and single-family to the south and east.

This can't be happening! A handful of people on a zoning board who aren't even elected can't have the power to pull the rug out from under single family home owners in B zones. They appear to want to go forward - bulldozing through our investments (our B zone homes). I saw the updated map, it's not much different! Our property is in the Strawberry Hill/Wolfpit area and we are being re-zoned C4 Urban!!! NO, NO, NO! No reason for this! We are tax paying Norwalk RESIDENTS. We are the people you serve! This is criminal! We bought our house in a single family zone for a reason. In fact the houses on either side of us were bought in 2018 and 2021. Lived in by the owners. Now our finances are being attacked by a few people on a board? Do they even live in Norwalk? How is this legal? Who is influencing them to do this? Developers? Certainly not Norwalk residents. I don't know know a single person who is happy about the proposed zoning. They have targeted B zone home owners. This must be rescinded! Norwalk does not have the thoroughfares needed for high density housing. If the city changed as shown on the map, the traffic on the post road would be at a veritable stand still. That is the only street that cuts through the city east to west. Route 7 and East Ave would be similar. If affordable housing is a goal, keep in mind that the most affordable housing is found in the older buildings you are targeting for demolition via zoning changes. Ask any Realtor - they know where the truly affordable apartments are. The new apartments going up around town have very expensive "affordable" units. Affordability is all a ruse so developers can make big bucks. STOP THE ATTACK ON THE PEOPLE OF NORWALK.

Mr. Kleppin, Thank you for responding. This plan is being imposed on existing neighborhoods and home owners. It is indeed an attack on anyone whose zone is being changed in a negative way, i.e. "up zoning". Yes, there are small businesses on Route 1. I wouldn't call it an "employment center". And there IS existing housing, my house being one of them. This idea that a person gets a job, then finds an apartment down the street is pie in the sky, and not real. I don't think the residents knew the draconian changes that would come with the "master plan". This plan would drastically change the character of Norwalk - in a bad way. Nobody wants the main streets in this town lined with Waypoints. Nor do we want people pushed out of their homes. In order for the zoning change proposed for the Strawberry Hill/Wolfpit area to be realized, all of our homes would have to be torn down. Think about that. None of us would even be able to sell our homes because the proposed zoning would doom them. That would drive the selling price to a level where we couldn't even buy another home in CT. There is no commercial demand for our property, we have never been approached by a developer. Put yourself in our position. Would you want your biggest investment crushed by an outsourced master plan? This isn't a case of eminent domain for a major project, that would be different. It is just a plan whose goal is to cram as many apartments as possible in Norwalk. It is awful. I'm sure you wouldn't want your town to take on a master plan like this one. I do have a question. How can I email the people who are going to make the final decisions on this plan?

I oppose group homes, halway houses, bed and breakfasts and Air BnB in proposed zone CD-3s.

While I can understand the concern regarding upzoning, it is not an "attack" on Norwalk residents. The area is less than 0.25 miles from Route 1 and within an area compromised of large multi-family developments and significant commercial developments. One of the goals of the rezoning is to provide housing in proximity to transit and employment centers, which this area falls into. This area should not be single-family zoning. There is nothing that will require anyone to sell their property or building multi-family housing as part of the rezoning.

Staff responded directly, indicating the email will be forwarded to the Commission. Given the location of these properties to Route 1 and what is surrounding these properties, upzoning this area is appropriate. Furthermore, there is no evidence to support the assertion that upzoning will diminish property values, in fact, providing the ability to add more density will most likely further increase the value of their property.

Hello Steve and Brian,

I am aware of the city's project to propose new zoning regulations and was looking through the materials provided late in the day yesterday. My organization is located in Mathews Park, and we are an art gallery/studio/artist residency and a 501 (c)(3) non-profit located in what is proposed as a new "Civic District". In using the interactive map and accessing the Uses document for buildings in a Civic District (<https://www.norwalkct.gov/DocumentCenter/View/29653/Use-Table>), I have questions about some items listed on page 4 of the Prohibited uses which would seem to include the very things that we do such as Artist Live/Work or Artist Studio or Workspace.

How will these proposed new zoning regulations impact us if they are approved? Will have been here for 28 years. Are we to be evicted because we will no longer fit into the allowable uses in the new zoning plan?

I am very concerned. Please advise.

Kimberly

Kimberly Henrikson
Executive Director
Center for Contemporary Printmaking
khenrikson@contemprints.org
203-899-7999
<https://contemprints.org/>

Staff recommends that the allowable uses in the CV include language that would permit programs such as Ms. Henrikson's to continue. The City ultimately controls the type of programs that occur on city property so being flexible seems like the most reasonable approach.

96 Shorefront Park

Norwalk, Connecticut 06854

2 June 2023

Dear Members of the Planning and Zoning Commission, We write to express our profound concern regarding the proposed zoning regulations that would change Shorefront Park from “B” residential, which permits single family homes only, to “CD-3,” which would allow two-family homes. This change would fundamentally alter the character of our community of single family homes, and is not consistent with the proposed continuation of “B” zoning in the neighboring and very similar communities of Village Creek, Harborview and Marvin Beach. The Commission’s proposal to maintain single-family zoning for those communities, while proposing two-family zoning for ours, is inexplicable. If walking distance to a train station was one of the criteria that led to the proposed change, this criteria does not appear to have been applied consistently. For example, many communities in East Norwalk, including Marvin Beach, are closer to the East Norwalk train station than we are to the South Norwalk station, yet they retain their single family designation under the proposed zoning changes. We bought our house at # 96 Shorefront Park in 2022 in large part because we value the quiet, peaceful atmosphere that results from single-family zoning. We have invested a significant amount to completely renovate what was a dilapidated eyesore over the last year so we could retire here. Our experience is not unique, as gradual turnover in housing has resulted in the renovation or complete replacement of many single-family homes in the neighborhood, resulting in an overall increase in property values in the community, without an increase in density. We would never have made this investment had we known that the neighborhood would be re-zoned to two-family housing. The proposed change would result in a serious financial consequence for us, as seniors looking toward retirement, along with our similarly-situated neighbors. For all these reasons, strongly urge you to reconsider the proposed zoning regulations permitting two-family housing in Shorefront Park.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lisa Speer

Michael Case

Hello Mr. Kleppin,

Thank you for presenting the proposed zoning plan revision to District A last night. I'm writing to remind you of my question about "down-zoning," i.e., are there any areas of Norwalk that are going to be down-zoned from 2-family residential to single-family residential? If so, will existing 2-family homes in that down-zoned area be grandfathered? And what about existing ADUs in that down-zoned area?

It would be helpful to clarify about "down-zoning" in future presentations/hearings since the topic of "up-zoning" seems to be very hotly debated.

I appreciate your work and the goals of making Norwalk's zoning less complex, more user friendly, and more efficient to work with.

Sincerely,

Elsa Peterson Obuchowski

Shorefront Park was revised to be included in the CD-3S.

Decisions on where to upzone were based on proximity to mass transit, jobs and infrastructure. Shorefront Park is located closer to the South Norwalk Train Station (about half a mile as the crow flies) compared to Marvin Beach to the East Norwalk Train Station (about a mile as the crow flies). Shorefront Park is also surrounded by two-family zoning and within walking distance to all of the amenities in South Norwalk. Again, we removed Shorefront Park from the two-family zone, but how we applied the zones throughout the city was a consistent approach.

Staff found no evidence that two-family zoning would negatively impact property values.

No areas in Norwalk were designated to be downzoned from an existing two-family zone to a single-family only zone.

Bryan:

I have given some thought to the proposed zoning change - "removing lot size" and believe it will result in higher density and open the door to more construction of new homes.

Could you tell me what the reason is for removing the lot size from the zoning regulations?

I attended the May 1st meeting at the Fox Run School, and 11 residents raised concerns and questions about the proposed change, removing lot size.

Please share why it is being removed.

Regards,

Greg

Greg Willis

162 Fallow St, Norwalk, CT 06850

We looked at what the outcomes would be of removing the minimum lot size in all of the zones and came to the same conclusion on each which is that it will not lead to a proliferation of subdivisions. The reason being is that the vast majority of properties in Norwalk were built to the minimum requirement for street frontage for the zone that property was located within. So in West Norwalk's case, much of the land was zoned as AAA Residence with a minimum frontage requirement of 150' and a minimum lot size of one acre. As you look at most residential properties in the area, they have exactly 150' of frontage and certainly not 300' of frontage which would be necessary to subdivide or split a lot. The proposed regulations continue to require a minimum of 150' of frontage in the CD-3L (formerly the AAA Residence zone) so if you were unable to do a subdivision under the current regulations, you would continue to be unable to do a subdivision under the proposed regulations. The proposed regulations also eliminate the ability to create a rear lot so that would further limit the amount of new lots that can be created under the new regulations.

The purpose of removing the minimum lot size requirement is for two main reasons: 1) form-based zoning codes focus regulations on the built-form of a neighborhood. This means that when you walk or drive down the street, you don't perceive how large/how deep a lot is, you perceive the location of the structures in relation to you on the sidewalk/in your car and in relation to the other buildings on the street. This leads to 2) which is that because development is already regulated based on how wide a lot is and where buildings can be placed on a lot, the minimum lot size becomes an arbitrary requirement that requires people to buy more land than they would otherwise need for a house and lot that is perfectly in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood.

Good to meet you in person the other night at the Rowayton Community Center. It was an informative evening.

I'm still not entirely sure how despite the current zoning regs, the wall at 111 Rowayton Ave at a state-road intersection couldn't have been foreseen with computerized renderings – or by anyone who may have visited the street location.

Unfortunately, we can't turn back the clock and say, "Whoa. Wait a minute here." Or hold a public hearing. What's done is done. As you continue to tweak the new codes, whatever can be achieved to emulate "133 Rowayton Avenue" in size and scale, including its view corridor could help. (I think it's called Barclay's Landing.)

133 is a model example of everything a village condo complex on a river should be. Are you familiar with it? If not, it's worth coming out to see.

Thanks again,

Dean

Staff recommends that #5 in the Rowayton Avenue Village District regulations be deleted (page 103). That section allows for structures in the RAVD to have an additional story if the first story is dedicated entirely to parking. By removing that section, that additional story is no longer permitted which will lower the overall mass of buildings.

Mr. Baker, last Friday I emailed you regarding my concern about the upzoning proposed for East Norwalk but I failed to tell you that I am a resident of 7 Ludlow Manor and more specifically am opposed to the upzoning of Ludlow Manor from a B to a CD3. I'm having a hard time trying to understand the purpose of this change and why a P&Z commission would think this is an improvement on a lovely, small lot, small one way street in East Norwalk. To me it could lead to a diminution of value to the existing homes on Ludlow Manor. Ludlow Manor has approximately 23 small lot single family homes. What possible improvement could be gained by increasing the density on this street? I just can't reconcile this with the purpose set out as the goal of the rezoning. Please pass on my concerns to the full P&Z commission, Steve Kleppin and the Mayor. And please, come and have a drive down our street and ask yourself what good will come from increased density on this street. Thank you for your time.

Lynn Dacey

Letter from Attorney Rick Costantini regarding 70 MLK moving to CD-5.

Margaret Suib, Fair Housing Officer

While I couldn't come to the District C redistributing hearing, I want to let you know that I am vehemently opposed to making the area where I live—6 Old Saugatuck Road— into both one and TWO family zoning. My house is on the corner of Old Saugatuck and Gilbert Street. As it is, people who live on, visit and service houses on Old Saugatuck currently park on Gilbert Street, as there is no parking on Old Saugatuck. Since I'm on the corner, sometimes there aren't spots on Gilbert Street even now for me and my guests to park there. I know that Melrose Ave nearby is almost impassable because of the trucks lining the street. I also know, because I'm a landscaper, using my foreman's truck, that landscaping guys (I.e. my foreman) are looking to buy a home that will allow them to park their trucks on the street instead of paying for a yard—like they do now. It would be a disaster aesthetically too if Gilbert Street becomes lined with huge trucks. It would increase traffic logjams and decrease our property values. All we need is for one of these beautiful old houses to be sold to a landscaper and poof, there goes the quiet, quaint neighborhood. This is one place where the last thing we need is more density. My house has been a small, single-family dwelling since 1915. It is ridiculous that you are even considering changing its status to two family over a hundred years later. Please, tell me it isn't so!

Separately, I have become aware of the proposed new zoning regulations and would be remiss not to reach out to you and express my considerable concerns. Candidly, there appears to have been an error, or at least an oversight, in the drawing of the new maps. The neighborhood in which I reside with my family, Shorefront Park in South Norwalk, is being proposed as CD-3 which represents an upzone from its current B residential zone. SFP is a completely single-family residential neighborhood along the Norwalk shoreline and has a 150-year history as such. Furthermore, the aesthetic and character of SFP is most analogous to Harborview and Marvin Beach in Norwalk, neither of which are being proposed for upzoning to CD-3 and remain B. I discussed this matter briefly with Steve Ferguson who was helpful and recommended that I take this up with you directly and alert you of my concerns via email, hence this message. For your convenience and information, I have attached a letter prepared by the Shorefront Park board of directors providing commentary, and opposition, to the proposed zone change 'as it impacts Shorefront Park specifically'. I am in agreement with the letter. I also include below a link to a presentation which was prepared by a neighbor and current Shorefront Park resident which details the historic evolution of Shorefront Park from a development and architectural perspective over the last century and a half. It is brilliantly prepared and I believe you may find it interesting and informative to the discussion.

Ludlow Manor is currently zoned as B Residence and is directly adjacent to C Residence on the west and A Residence on the east. Based on the existing proximity to the East Norwalk train station and the size of the lots being more consistent with the CD-3 (two-family zone, 50' of frontage) it makes the most sense to include this area in the CD-3.

Staff agreed with the change and it was incorporated previously.

Staff is reviewing concerns with Corporation Counsel.

This property is currently in the C Zone and permits a 2-family dwelling today, as-of-right. There is little to no change to your property.

Shorefront Park was revised to be included in the CD-3S.

I hope this note finds you well as this is something I am not accustomed to, but feel like I should reach out. My name is Kevin Soldani and I live at 19 Ludlow Manor. I bought this property because of the charm of the street. I am firmly against the rezoning of my street to allow for two-family homes. Our street is a lovely one-family community, and introducing multi-family housing would change the character of our neighborhood. Firstly, adding more families to our street would increase traffic and congestion. Our quiet, peaceful community would become busier and noisier, making it less enjoyable for those who currently live here. Secondly, rezoning could lead to overcrowding. With more families living on our street, there may not be enough parking spaces or room for everyone to comfortably coexist. This could lead to tension between neighbors and a decrease in property values. Lastly, our neighborhood has always been known as a one-family community. Changing this would take away from the charm and character that we all love about living here. In conclusion, I urge city officials to reconsider their decision to rezone our street for two-family homes. Let's preserve the beauty and tranquility of our neighborhood by keeping it a one-family community.

Ludlow Manor is currently zoned as B Residence and is directly adjacent to C Residence on the west and A Residence on the east. Based on the existing proximity to the East Norwalk train station and the size of the lots being more consistent with the CD-3 (two-family zone, 50' of frontage) it makes the most sense to include this area in the CD-3.

Prior to tomorrow's community meeting in Rowayton, I wanted to share some additional feedback and potential alternatives to the current proposal. I understand that we are looking for ways to ensure that our community can grow in a sustainable and affordable way over the coming years and that as such certain areas will require changes to the current zoning to accommodate that. My partner Nathan and I live at 33 Vanderbilt Avenue, the street that was seemingly arbitrarily selected to be the cut-off street for the CD-3S/CD-3 line. This particular neighborhood - running west of Highland Ave, south of Devil's Garden Road, and east of Vanderbilt Ave - is far from suitable to reasonably support long term growth through multi-family dwellings. Aside from providing "x" number of lots that are now zoned as CD-3, there is no logical reason for this area to be selected. That said, I do understand that there is a need to identify areas that could in fact be better suited. To that end I'd like to propose for your consideration the following: The large area south of 95 down to Flax Hill Road and between Rampart Road and the Five Mile River is currently proposed to be CD-3S. This is an area much more suitable for the potential of multi-family dwellings, particularly along Flax Hill Road. This is an area that better fits the criteria outlined in your plan (close to the highway, not disruptive to existing neighborhood) and includes far more lots than our small area does. There is also the potential to include all of Highland Avenue as far south as Roton Middle School, which gives you the entire street containing 3 schools, and which has large sidewalks and a double yellow line road capable of handling the incremental foot and car traffic. Finally, there are the 2 streets immediately parallel to the Rowayton Train station, Belmont Place and Arnold Ln. These are both directly next to the train station whereas our neighborhood is over ¼ mile away. In summary, there are a number of other areas in the vicinity that would be much better suited for potential multi-family units and also less disruptive to the existing neighborhood. Our small narrow streets that lack sidewalks or other infrastructure for multi-family units is just not a reasonable proposal. Please reconsider and explore alternatives, allowing our small residential community to be zoned as CD-3S.

The Devil's Garden area has been removed from the CD-3 zone.

I am writing in regards to the proposal to change the B-zone from Single-family to 2-family. I own a single family home in the B zone and I can't tell you how upset I am about this proposed change! I am VEHEMENTLY against it. First off it is a downgrade in zoning and will affect my property values and those of others in the B zone. If you were creating zoning on virgin land it wouldn't be an issue, but that is not the case here. There are many home owners you will be affecting. I feel it is an assault on residential property owners. Secondly, the enormous increase in 2-family zoning would change the character of Norwalk. I have been a home owner in Norwalk many years and I see how easily variances are issued. Two-family neighborhoods would morph into enormous apartment neighborhoods quite easily through variances. There is a real possibility that a large portion of the city could become Bronx like eventually - no one in CT wants that. And there is no shortage of wealthy developers who see Norwalk as an easy target. They have successfully been attacking our neighborhoods for a while. Of course their upscale home towns are free of these apartment monstrosities. Please realize the harm you will be doing to residential property owners. I don't see how anyone can see these changes as being desirable to Norwalk residents. Who benefits - outsiders? Let's do right by our residents. PLEASE!!!

The Wolfpit area is less than 0.25 miles from Route 1 and within an area compromised of large multi-family developments and significant commercial developments. One of the goals of the rezoning is to provide housing in proximity to transit and employment centers, which this area falls into. This area should not be single-family zoning. There is nothing that will require anyone to sell their property or building multi-family housing as part of the rezoning.

The area in proximity to the hospital that was proposed for upzoning was significantly reduced, perhaps more than any other area and is now consistent in terms of measurement separation across the City.

As a homeowner in the current single-family B zone of Norwalk I want to strongly urge the city to reconsider the proposed zoning changes in turning much of the B zone into "CD-3: single and two-family." I do not see how these changes will benefit residents of Norwalk, and in fact it seems like they may be a detriment to the property values of many of us. If the residents are not benefitting, then who is? And why should they benefit over the property owners? Below is what I submitted through the Zoning Regulations Fillable Form option. I thank you for taking the time to read and consider! "Hello, I live in the Norwalk neighborhood of "Broadriver," west of Springhill Ave. I see that much of this neighborhood plus parts of the Springhill neighborhood are proposed to be changed from Zone B (single family) to what's called CD-3 (single and two family). I am strongly opposed to this change. I'm a young homeowner and in the last six years I have seen more and more young families move into this area. It's a nice area and comparably affordable to buy into, while still maintaining modest hallmarks of single-family dwelling. In my opinion this is what Norwalk should want: young professionals populating their neighborhoods with homeownership. Changing this neighborhood to two-family zoning seems unfairly targeted. I am not wealthy enough to buy into the neighborhoods that are proposed to maintain single-family-only zoning, but I still deserve to maintain the zoning regulation my home had when I bought it. The proposed zoning articles do not mention potential changes to property values, but I have to assume I'm at risk of my property value going down with the proposed change. That is very disheartening. These neighborhoods are filled with small houses set close together. Not only can the area not support the increase of people that two-family dwellings would bring, but there is no available land. That means you are inviting developers to come in and snap up our little houses, kicking out the homeowners in favor of building two-family rentals, and potentially changing the face of the whole area. Does this benefit the city somehow? I see absolutely NO benefit for the RESIDENTS of these neighborhoods or for any of Norwalk's existing residents. I see that zones may also change from B to CD-3 in parts of the Flax Hill area and even parts of Dry Hill and Strawberry Hill. Please don't change our neighborhoods! If Norwalk doesn't seriously reconsider this, you're going to zone and price out the modest single-family homeowner. This type of buyer will continue moving to Trumbull or Monroe and Norwalk will be left with renters."

Bryan Baker has met with MR. Little.

Thank you for hosting the informative zoom call with Harborview, Village Creek and Brookside last night. I was surprised with the lack of public comment and I appreciated opportunity to ask several questions. I could have asked many more questions, but I felt like a separate meeting with you and/or Steve would be a better approach. I am an architect and as I read through the proposed regulations I think about how they would shape future development. I don't have a problem with the redistricting, but I do have concerns about the design standards and the many unintended consequences that will result if these regulations are approved as currently written. Take, for instance, the question of an auto repair shop that came up at the last Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Do these regulations actually require that the loading bays are on the side or rear of the building? That seems absurd (to me) that the principal function of a building would be hidden from view in favor of a contrived facade that evokes some other building function. It also reduces development opportunities for small lots and makes them less valuable. Would it be possible to set up a meeting at some point in the next few weeks? I want to be engaged in this discussion and I think my point of view would help your team refine the regulations towards a better outcome. If a meeting is not possible I will continue to write comments in the online portal, or send emails directly to you and Steve. But my preference is for a discussion so that I can better understand what is being changed in the draft regulations so that I don't waste any time in public forums with commentary that is no longer relevant. Thanks again for your hard work on the update. I can imagine this phase of the project is very difficult.

Dear Mr. Kleppin and Mr. Baker, Attached please find a letter outlining our concerns regarding the proposed re-zoning of our Shorefront Park neighborhood.

Golden Hill zoning was reverted to single-family.

Specific to Item VI tomorrow - Draft Zoning Regulations etc I would like to enter a public comment in opposition to the current plan to rezone a portion of Golden Hill (specifically Brooklawn Ave and neighboring streets). This area should remain as currently Zoned. This neighborhood is currently Zone B for single family homes. The proposed plans call for Zone CD-3 for two family homes. Traffic is already a problem in this area, specifically up and down Garner. There are too many cars, not enough parking, terrible visibility due to illegal parking, vehicles travelling far in excess of the speed limit not to mention we have seen an increase in break ins over the last few months. Zoning for more density will make these issues worse. There are plenty of other areas that are being planned for additional density and more opportunities for ownership. This is an established single family home owner neighborhood. Changing the zoning will only take away for what is already here. The infrastructure on these street will not support more density. There is not even enough room for continuous sidewalks. We have also issued complaints about commercial vehicle parking as well as the speed of traffic and failure to properly remove trash cans after pick up in the past none of which have been rectified and a denser zoning will add to those issues. Please let me know if I need to add anything else to formally include this in the Agenda/Comments/Minutes.

Golden Hill zoning was reverted to single-family.

We in the Golden Hill Association support Steve Kleppin’s proposal shared with us last night (6-6-2023) to rezone the current C zones in Golden Hill to CD-3 rather than CD-4. A CD-3 zone will maintain front yard setbacks closer to what they are now, retaining the neighborhood feel for those walking and living here. Additionally, the CD-3 zone requirements and guidelines for new structures will create new housing stock that is aesthetically more compatible with our older historic homes.

I live on Yost St. in South Norwalk It’s a 1 block dead-end street on a salt marsh between Harbor View and Village Creek. I see this road is slated to be zoned as 2 family which I oppose. There are a few older 2 family houses that are grandfathered but it’s a charming little road that goes underwater every time the tide is 8’ or more (7-10 times per month) Adding more density to this road would go against any flooding mitigation proposals, wetlands preservation and would add more residents/cars, that would quickly be ruined by the salt water. Please take a second look at your map and keep Yost St. (District E) zoned 1 family (B) as are our neighbors in Harbor View and Village Creek. Thanks for getting right back to me and for forwarding my email to the Commission. Yes, I believe all of Yost St. should have the same 1-family (w/grandfathered 2-family properties) zoning. Doesn’t make sense to have 2 separate zones on one tiny street that sits on an environmentally valuable salt marsh.

The properties on the north half of Yost Street are in the 1-2 family zone today, so the proposal is to also include the southern parcels.

I wanted to express my utter dismay about the proposed zoning changes for my neighborhood. I live at 173 Ponus Ave, and I've lived there since buying it from the Vanderbilts in 2017. I disagree wholeheartedly about the change to our 1 acre zoning. I am in support of equitable zoning changes to support better opportunities for housing, but this does not seem like one that will do anything to support that ultimate goal. Instead, it will incentivize developers (small ones, like my neighbor who destroyed the oldest house in Norwalk without a permit) to create density chaos AND design chaos in search of maximum profit, not to create equitable living opportunities. Between the watershed, the insane traffic that already frequents our neighborhood, the construction/development company owners who illegally store vehicles in their yards and do work on their homes/yards without permits, I cannot imagine that changing the zoning will have the outcome you perceive it to have. I am a young homeowner who sees all the amazing things Norwalk already possesses, as well as the many opportunities for creating a diverse, well-designed, environmentally-conscious neighborhood. Again, I am in support of equitable housing. The proposed zoning change to West Norwalk is not the way to get there.

Staff is unaware of any proposed changes that are consistent with the content of the email.

Please explain, in simple layman terms, how this push to rezone residential neighborhoods to now allow 2-Family and Multi-family homes, *(thereby increasing the density of the population, traffic, parking, demand on infrastructure for water, power, sewer, trash & recycling, etc.)*, will improve the quality of life for any of the current Norwalk residents who are already struggling with the current strain, shortages and limitations of our resources. In other words, what is the upside? Why are we looking for ways to increase our burden when we are all suffering from shortages? There must be some “icing” on this “cake” that I just can’t see. A logical answer to this concern will be most helpful to those of us who will be listening and trying to understand what the motive and benefits (if any) are to this proposed change.

There is ZERO evidence that any change from 1-family to 2-family or multi-family will lead to a depreciation of property values or has lead to widespread turnover in these areas. The data we have reviewed indicates that about 50% of the existing 2-families are at least 50% of the existing 2-family units. In addition, in areas that have allowed either 1-family or 2-family for nearly 100 years, less than 1/2 of those properties are 2-families. The region, including Norwalk, has some of the most expensive housing costs in the country, coupled with some of the lowest vacancy rates in the country. Further, there is no evidence on any city infrastructure or services as a result of any developments that city has approved or supported.

Associated neighbors alerted me that a town council meeting is being held today in regards to concerns of the indicated Norwalk property rezoning. I was given your contact name to share my concerns. I am a home owner towards the top of Garner Street and am alarmed about this rezoning having a major impact on the traffic in my area. It is already a problem that I often have to deal with little assistance from the Norwalk Parking Authority or the Police Department. Plus the cut thru traffic has escalated and we had a major problem here when the workers at the mall were parking here during construction a few years ago. That alone was a prime example that created problems with garbage trucks being unable to pickup, school buses unable to get down Garner street for drop offs, plus cars getting hit due to lack of visibility coming out of side roads. I've discussed with another neighbor, Diego, down the street on the other end of Garner towards West Avenue that has been contending with major issues of parking on the hill and crime. I notified him of the upcoming zoning considerations and he can retell the issues he's had with dealing with the apartments and housing that borders in from West Ave onto Garner. That area since Walgreens was put has become a major problem. If they allow an increase in lot zoning the parking in just these few blocks will be worse than Queens, NY!!! We've already experienced it to some degree and the lots in this area are not conducive to overbuild. They could not even manage the traffic here when they were putting in new sidewalks and fixing the gaslines. If we can sign any petitions or create a protest to the planning of this rezoning many of us are already on board to take action. The impact of such changes are already at our doorsteps with the traffic we deal with daily here. I'm not sure what can be done as it appears the city has full intentions to implement by the veil that they are trying to provide more home ownership in the city. WHAT? My lot is very small and when I requested to build a garage on my property I was denied due to setbacks. YET... they want to allow an entire neighborhood to be overbuilt with no agreement from a majority of home owners in the specified area???

We are seriously opposed to this rezoning!

Garner Street is less than 0.25 miles from West Avenue, Interstate 95 and Route 1 and is surrounded by 2-family and multi-family housing. Changing the zoning does not mean anyone has to build 2 family housing. The market, as it has always done, will dictate what is most appropriate for a given area.

It has come to my attention that there is a new zoning proposal for Yost to allow for more 2 family housing which I wholeheartedly oppose. With all the apartment buildings popping up all around South Norwalk is there really a need for for more housing on this small dead end street!? There are a few older 2 family houses that are grandfathered. It's a charming little road that goes underwater every time the tide is 8' or more (7-10 times per month) Adding more density to this road would go against any flooding mitigation proposals, wetlands preservation and would add more residents/cars, that would quickly be ruined by the salt water. Not to mention how narrow the road is with just a few cars parked on the street. Adding 2 family homes will incur more cars on the street leaving little to no room to pull around them. Please take a second look at your map and keep Yost St. (District E) zoned 1 family (B) as are our neighbors in Harbor View and Village Creek. This sounds more like a greed proposal than a growth proposal.

The properties on the north half of Yost Street are in the 1-2 family zone today, so the proposal is to also include the southern parcels.

Attached

I listened in on the whole 4½ hour meeting last night, but especially when you were discussing agenda item VI. “DRAFT ZONING REGULATION AND ZONING MAP DISCUSSION”. I paid special attention to your explanations about why some of the areas previously proposed to “upsized” from single family to two family zones, were now being reconsidered and proposed to remain a single family zones as identified with red outlines around those zones, as shown in the screenshot below for the “Golden Hill” area designated “CD-3” in yellow but now outlined in red. Reasons for these proposed reconsiderations of the proposed rezoning ranged from the impact of the topography on pedestrian traffic, to possible “overreaching”, lot size and historical architecture in a neighborhood. You even addressed concerns and questions about the reasons or logic behind these reconsiderations, concerns like real or perceived political influence, pressure from organized neighborhood community groups, and most relevant to my request, the considerations used to flip back to single family several “pockets” of proposed 2 family rezones that were surrounded or flanked by 2 or multi-family zones. I live in one of those existing single family zoned “pockets” that you are proposing to rezone to 2 family (see the CD-3 area circled in green below). If you survey the homes and lots in this truly isolated neighborhood, you will find that the structures, some of which do have historical architectural significance, including Colonials, Cottages (one stone) and even a 1903 Victorian, one of the few remaining in Norwalk which I believe is listed with the town historical register (check with Ralph Bloom), don’t lend themselves to 2 family conversion, nor is that the makeup of this quiet, family friendly enclave. Additionally, it is such a small area that it wouldn’t even make a meaningful contribution to the numbers you are looking for. So I/we would urgently and respectfully request that you remove our little “pocket” neighborhood from the proposed 2 family rezoning and add it to your list of proposed rezones that should remain single family. I have BCC’d this email to an organized group of family residents in this neighborhood who all share the same concern over and objection to this proposed rezoning of our neighborhood. Please let us know if compiling a signed petition would help with your decision, or should we just all show up at the public hearing. Thank you for your consideration.

The map referenced was the Garner Street area. Garner Street is less than 0.25 miles from West Avenue, Interstate 95 and Route 1 and is surrounded by 2-family and multi-family housing. Changing the zoning does not mean anyone has to build 2 family housing. The market, as it has always done, will dictate what is most appropriate for a given area.

Good afternoon Steve, I have a question that I hope will get addressed in tonight's meeting, specifically with regard to agenda item VI. "DRAFT ZONING REGULATION AND ZONING MAP DISCUSSION" (see below) Here then is my question: Please explain, in simple layman terms, how this push to rezone residential neighborhoods to now allow 2-Family and Multi-family homes, *(thereby increasing the density of the population, traffic, parking, demand on infrastructure for water, power, sewer, trash & recycling, etc.)*, will improve the quality of life for any of the current Norwalk residents who are already struggling with the current strain, shortages and limitations of our resources. In other words, what is the upside? Why are we looking for ways to increase our burden when we are all suffering from shortages? There must be some "icing" on this "cake" that I just can't see. A logical answer to this concern will be most helpful to those of us who will be listening and trying to understand what the motive and benefits (if any) are to this proposed change. I would also like to add that two-family and multi-family units are predominantly leased not owned. This plan may work to bring developers in and provide more rentals, however I highly doubt you will get buyers as you hope for unless you provide affordable single family options (people do not leave the city for an apartment or condo - they leave for a house and a yard). This might drive tax revenue from the owner/developer for the city, but would hardly be in the interest of the neighbors. I also believe this would most likely lower the neighboring single home values when an existing home is bought and replaced with a multifamily right next door. To the infrastructure issue - West Avenue is already over-crowded at rush hour and the planning around lights at the mall has been terrible. People use Garner as a cut through and exceed the speed limit by double. I would like to see you do a study in partnership with the NPD where you hide and do radar over the 3 hours of morning and evening rush hour to have real time information to use in your case for this densification. Lets not forget that year and year this stretch of 95 is one of the worst. Until these issues are rectified we should not be focused on densification. As far as high housing costs I think that is a very misleading statement - yes the Northeast and Tri-State is far above national averages, however Norwalk is much more affordable than our direct neighbors and is in fact one of the cheaper areas when considering neighboring counties in NY and NJ. I appreciate the cities opinion however I believe it is miss guided especially in the case of our small community that far out dates areas in east and west Norwalk. We will work to prepare more comments for the next commission hearing.

Thank you for your service to the Norwalk community. As a three year resident of East Norwalk, I am quite pleased with the municipal services in the City. I am very concerned about the prospect of my neighborhood being up zoned to include more multi family housing units. Living on Fifth Street between Hawkins and Gregory, we are already living the life with a significant number of multi family units, some I believe to be illegal. The neighborhood is already packed with cars for all of the residents with little to no parking available on the Street. We are also subjected to regular reckless driving, speeding and commercial vehicle being parked on the street making it a hazardous area for pedestrians, children, pets and residents. Regular calls to the police regarding the speeding and commercial vehicles lead to no enforcement and change. Additionally, in just a few weekends with the new parking arrangement at Calf Pasture, the street is overrun with beach parking. Our Street is an afterthought in Norwalk and it shouldn't be the case. Many of us attended community forums over the past year and were pushed off and told there would be forums for us to share our ideas. None of that has happened. We have a huge safety issue and rezoning will make it far worse. Please do not make the change. Rather, get a handle on the current housing picture, knowing what the landscape is regarding illegal rentals and ADUs. Don't move forward with a plan that will lead to more development, more residents, more vehicles and bigger safety issues. Thank you.

The areas proposed for upzoning are recommended based on their proximity to infrastructure, transit and employment centers. The predominant land use currently in Norwalk and which will remain under the current proposal is single family. The Norwalk area is 1 of the most expensive places to live in the country and has one of the lowest vacancy rates for housing units in the country. This leads to extremely high home prices and extremely high rents. So consider if you have kids and where they might wish to live one day. They may not be able to afford to stay in the area or they are going to be so cost burdened paying rent or their mortgage they may struggle in other areas. There isn't a 1 to 1 replacement of single family houses to new buyers. There are more buyers than there are available houses. We have provided a lot of opportunities to provide multi-family housing in the City and as I mentioned, the predominant land use is single family. What we don't have enough of are smaller developments, and in the case of 2 family dwellings in particular, the opportunity for home ownership and chance to build equity with a real estate investment. A 2 family provides the possibility of condominium ownership, which is much cheaper than a single family dwelling and provides the opportunity for someone to enter the housing market. In addition, the change that will occur in the areas proposed to be upzoned will occur incrementally and not in a wholesale way, which is consistent with the way the 2 family zones have developed historically. Note, these properties are in the Garner Street area. Justification for inclusion in CD-3S was previously provided.

This area is already allows for 1 and 2 family dwellings.

Ludlow Manor is currently zoned as B Residence and is directly adjacent to C Residence on the west and A Residence on the east. Based on the existing proximity to the East Norwalk train station and the size of the lots being more consistent with the CD-3 (two-family zone, 50' of frontage) it makes the most sense to include this area in the CD-3.

Steve, don't think we've met but I'm a life long resident of Norwalk, 73 years, and a resident of East Norwalk for 40 years. I've watched and listened over the past year as to proposed zoning changes, not only through out Norwalk, but closely as you would imagine to what is being proposed in East Norwalk. For 15 of the years in East Norwalk I lived on Ludlow Manor, one of the finest streets in Norwalk and for the life of me I can't comprehend how that street could be considered zoned for two family housing, along with some other streets in East Norwalk. The comments I've heard is that this is what the Zoning Commission and Council are hearing from residents want, yet I've not spoken with anyone I know in East Norwalk who is in favor of these changes, including Council members. While there is seldom a way residents win in a he said/she said with local governments a thought I had was for the City to put some of these zoning changes , not only in East Norwalk, but throughout Norwalk up for approval by ballot when we vote in the fall, just a thought. One other thought, being a business person for about 50 years I would never stand in anyone's way to work, earn a living, develop property, and I respect Spinnaker's proposal for the site of the Wells Fargo Bank, and while I do think it's a little over the top. I listened to one of the presentation's that Alex Knopp commented on regarding the traffic study, and as I said being a resident of East Norwalk for 40 years, I can't understand how anyone in good conscience could consider that a traffic study done in March could be used to justify the changes being made. Steve, while I recognize the difficult task you have as Director of Planning and Zoning and appreciate the work you do, I would hope you would consider alternative ways to get feedback from residents, including my comments on the vote. Look forward to meeting you at one of the up coming meetings,

I am a board member of the Washington Street Preservation however, the opinion stated in this letter are my own. Attached is a letter regarding SoNo Noise ordinance dated 2017. I am writing to voice my concern regarding the upcoming review of existing zoning regulations on June 21 2023. There are certain zoning regulations in place that facilitate the co-existence of business and residents on Washington Street in Norwalk. The one that I am writing about is as follows which is excerpt quote from Chief Kulhawik of the Norwalk Police Dept taken from the email attached. ' zoning does not permit windows/doors open if playing loud music. They (Saltwater) can be open if not playing loud music. There is no time or day restriction. It is anytime. The problem is that it is a civil zoning issue' Without this civil zoning regulation, the operators of restaurants that become night clubs will operate with disregard to the level of noise/music until 2am. I have been working with Chief Kulhawik over the years to keep them in check. It would be a bad idea if the zoning regulations are modified to allow them to operate with impunity. Please note that even with the windows and doors shut the music is very loud. However, it is a compromise that allow me as an owner of a unit at 131 Washington St to keep my sanity. This is a quality of life issue.

Staff directed him to the noise ordinance.

Letter outlining oppositio to halfway houses, group homes and Air BnB in CD-3S.

Staff is reviewing this with Corporation Counsel.
Staff is reviewing this with Corporation Counsel.

I want to know the Commission's specific reasoning why Halfway Houses and Group Homes are NOT permitted in proposed zone CD-3L but such uses are permitted in neighboring proposed zone CD-3S? If the size of the minimum lot in 3L is the distinguishing factor, I don't know why. Actually, the larger the lot, the more space for these uses. It would be most objectionable if the reason is relative bargaining power of homeowners in 3L. More generally, I remain strongly opposed to the permissibility of Halfway Houses and Group Homes in proposed CD-3S, especially as these uses are currently prohibited in AAA, AA and A zones. While I recognize the need for such facilities, these uses, as well, create undue burden in many more single family residential zones than previously. I understand that a goal of the Commission is to achieve zoning consolidation, but in fact you will merely be shifting permissibility from one current zone to three of the former single family residential zones. It seems to me that difficulty of addressing lot widths and building setbacks is a minor drafting issue which pales in comparison to the effects of such uses on the neighborhoods in question. I appreciate your willingness to raise with the Commission why B&Bs will be permissible in CD-3S and CD-3L. I think that B&B use should be restricted/limited because such uses: turn single family residential zones into a transient, motel-like neighborhood; create greater burden on public services/utilities; subject residents to comings and goings of renters 24/7/365; and, create more opportunities for questionable activities and behavior by transients who don't care about Norwalk. These uses are by definition and/or practice solely for "transient guests". The same logic would apply to AirBnB uses. I will ask my nearest neighbors if anyone else has these concerns or if I'm the old man yelling on his lawn! I'd appreciate it if you could pass along this email to the members of the Commission.

Sweeney, we live at 26 Ludlow Manor in East Norwalk. We wanted to let you know that we are against the upzoning of Ludlow Manor from Single family B zone to one and two family CD-3 zoning for many reasons. We request that Ludlow Manor stay Single family zoning to keep stability for the current home owners. We are concerned that the value of our house will go down if two family homes are allowed to be built on Ludlow Manor. A couple of Construction Managers have told me that it would be a prime investment opportunity for them. They would turn the single family home into a two family rental. Historically, renters have a higher turnover and would not care for the property as well as a homeowner. The up-zoning will change the look and feel of Ludlow Manor. Ludlow Manor is a charming tree lined street. Several of my neighbors are having replacement trees planted by the City. The stakes are in the ground for new plantings. Two family zoning would not allow for as many trees on the street. There would be many more driveways where the trees would have been. We also believe that we should preserve Ludlow Manor in East Norwalk because of its historic value. Mike Mushak, P&Z commission member, spoke about keeping Ludlow Manor and Staples Court as single family residences in the meeting held on Wednesday, June 7, 2023. Thank you for your consideration in this matter

HONORABLE COMMISSIONERS OF THE NORWALK PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION: I oppose group homes, halfway houses, Bed & Breakfast, and AIRBNB uses in proposed zone CD-3S.

Proposal to include 43 Harbor Ave in CD-5.

Dear Director Kleppin, We purchased 12 ParkHill Avenue, in the Bettswood section of East Norwalk, during the Summer of 2022, and moved our family of 4 from the Upper East Side of Manhattan (Carnegie Hill to be precise), for a better quality of life. I was born and raised on the UES, having lived there for four decades. That's right, WE LEFT there after finding our home here. Our home search included other CT towns as well as other parts of Norwalk. In areas of Norwalk where our realtor pointed out there were multiple family units we noticed a severe lack of space on the streets due to excessive amounts of cars, the areas also seemed more unkept on properties as well as sidewalks and streets. To me, there was a sense of overcrowding in those areas which is what we were trying to avoid. One of the main reasons we chose this neighborhood was that it offered a taste of City life but without the majority of issues that come with it. There were only single family homes which offered us a legitimate suburban life. We have a real backyard but are close to major transit and shopping - oh yeah, and a nice little beach close by. There is not a lot of traffic (except for typical East Ave rush hour), just enough neighbors who are also home owners, zero crime and little opportunity for criminals. There is the saying, "more money, more problems" and I believe it also applies to people as well. In less than a year I have met many people living on the avenue, and in the neighborhood, who have lived here anywhere from 2 to 30 years - all home owners. The neighbors with more tenure were especially happy we own this home as it previously was a rental/investment property with people coming and going every few years. The couple who were temporarily renting this house told us we only made their move sooner than expected and were leaving Norwalk within a year regardless. We do not consider this a starter home, we want to be here for a long time. We consider this our neighborhood now. We fear this zoning change will ruin the chances of that. Renters in general have very little interest in staying in the same place for decades. Investors of those homes only care if someone is renting it. I have experienced first hand how zoning changes can easily deteriorate a once sought after neighborhood into one that simply wasn't what it used to be, and overall not for the better. What this street and neighborhood needs is more home owners who want to make this town better, participate in local elections, plant roots, and make their lives better. You attract those people by investing in infrastructure (driving on East Avenue reminds me of the FDR Drive), schools (Norwalk doesn't have a great PS system compared to neighboring towns), and overall quality of life. We do not need "investors" and landlords with potentially questionable track records looking to make a quick buck. We do not need twice or even three times the number of residents in an already small neighborhood.

Ludlow Manor is currently zoned as B Residence and is directly adjacent to C Residence on the west and A Residence on the east. Based on the existing proximity to the East Norwalk train station and the size of the lots being more consistent with the CD-3 (two-family zone, 50' of frontage) it makes the most sense to include this area in the CD-3.

Staff is reviewing this with Corporation Counsel.

Mr. Flaherty has made a good case for inclusion of the property. Staff met with him and expressed concerns about gentrification and impacts to existing residential properties to the north. Prior to current staff involvement, this area was proposed for upzoning when Waypoint was approved. At that time the City declined to include this property and the areas to the north. Those same concerns remain, but the modifications proposed by Mr. Flaherty may mitigate some of the impacts and concerns.

Parkhill Avenue is located less than 0.5 miles from Wall Street, East Avenue and Westport Avenue, which are all areas serviced completely by City infrastructure, have available mass transit and also contain many large employers. In addition, IF any of these properties change over time, that will be dictated by the market, not by the regulations. Furthermore, no property will be forced to build a 2-family dwelling on any of these properties. This is evidenced by the data that shows that only, approximately 40% of eligible properties choose to build 2 families versus single families that are eligible to do so.

I truly hope you take this into consideration and remove any planned zoning changes to Parkhill Avenue and the Bettswood neighborhood. The only people who will ultimately benefit from the zoning change are those with the financial backing to afford that practice within Real Estate, not the people who have spent their hard earned money and invaluable time keeping this neighborhood great. A great neighborhood can easily be destroyed with one signature. Do you want to be the one who possibly destroys this neighborhood? Do you want “investors” to own Norwalk neighborhoods or do you want families trying to attain the American Dream of owning their own home choose this great town? To the better future and ownership of Norwalk,

Dear Mr. Kleppin- Hope this email finds you well. I am sending this email as a concerned resident and homeowner of a single family property located on Highview Avenue in Norwalk. I was recently informed by my neighbors about the Zoning and Planning department’s plans to rewrite zoning regulations in the Bettswood neighborhood to allow for two-family homes. I find this problematic for many reasons especially since it will encourage more tear downs or conversions of beautiful single family homes to accommodate two families (or more, illegally) and destroy the beauty of our neighborhood’s urban design. Our Bettswood neighborhood is one of the few remaining in the city of Norwalk which maintains the character of a single family neighborhood with limited traffic & noise, smaller streets with limited parking, well maintained single family homes each with their own uniqueness and no sidewalks. Also, from a safety point of view our neighborhood has limited fire hydrants. Bettswood has unfortunately already experienced the effects of a former single family home, which was rebuilt in the past several years, and now houses multiple families. The rebuilt home throughout its development and thereafter created inquiries from concerned residents as well as prospective buyers when an adjacent property was for sale as the rebuilt property had materials, equipment and cars all over the property even after it was rebuilt. Norwalk already experiences significant challenges with cracking down on illegal apartments or accessory dwelling units so it’s ridiculous to consider allowing additional two-family homes which will most likely become more than two family units.

Steve, I have been a many year member of the zoning commission 15yrs or more, I am very concerned about the downzoning of properties in our city In my opinion when an area is changed from a single family zone to a multi-family zoned we have always called it downzoning. By calling it up zoning is fooling the public to think they are getting something to their benefit When the public hearings are held they must be live in front of the people. We had many hearings in the city hall auditorium. Please do not hide behind a computer. A major change like this has to be out in the open. If you do not it will be said the city hid behind a screen. These large meetings can be long. Maybe until early in the morning or more than one night. But this it what the public should have and deserves. Joe Santo, 14 Eugene Dr.

Steve, people need neighborhoods to move to when they have made it in life. Bettswood is one. Thirty years ago we bought our first house on Winfield Court. It was all we could afford. When we could afford a better house, we moved to Highview Ave. There are already plenty of neighborhoods in Norwalk where young couples can get a start. We don't need to change the zoning in Bettswood. Greg Smith

14 Highview is not proposed for rezoning to CD-3 and is proposed to remain single-family. However, the Bettswood area is located less than 0.5 miles from Wall Street, East avenue and Westport Avenue, which are all areas serviced completely by City infrastructure, have available mass transit and also contain many large employers. In addition, if any of these properties change over time, that will be dictated by the market, not by the regulations. Furthermore, no property will be forced to build a 2-family dwelling on any of these properties. This is evidenced by the data that shows that only, approximately 40% of eligible properties choose to build 2 families verse single families that are eligible to do so.

The 2 public meetings are hybrid (in-person and virtual). Changing from 1 family to 2-family or multi-family is considered upzoning.

Bettswood Rd is less than 0.25 miles from East Ave and less than 0.5 miles from Westport Avenue, as well as the Wall Street area, which contains a significant amount of employers, services, amenities and transportation option. This location is appropriate for upzoning. Please note that any redevelopment will have to conform to all applicable standards, including providing four (4) compliant parking spaces.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS RECEIVED ADDRESSED AFTER 6.21.23 HEARING

Density in Norwalk is already very high compared to surrounding towns. Please see the article in the CT Mirror 5/26/23: "Zoning norms slow efforts to cut transportation pollution in Connecticut Land use is the single biggest factor in determining how much people drive. As the state tries to lower vehicle miles traveled, officials are seeking legislation to encourage more local governments to allow denser development." by Lisa Prevost | Energy News Network May 26, 2023 @ 11:56 am

<https://tinyurl.com/4khv3v3w>
I understand New Canaan has 4-acre zoning. How do you think New Canaan homeowners would react if the town of New Canaan decided to allow 2-acre lots so that each 4-acre homeowner could build a second house on their additional 2 acres? I can't imagine people would accept this. Yet it's areas like New Canaan that need more density, not Norwalk.

While we agree that many of the surrounding communities could do more to loosen their restrictions, are recommendations are what we feel is appropriate for the long term health and stability of the community. The changes proposed will occur incrementally, if at all, as evidenced by our historic development.

I am hoping that there will be some rules about the use of residential property for building and installing arenas to have sporting or other events on a residential street at a residential property that should be held otherwise at a local facility whether it's a pay to attend or not a pay to attend and to have a resident penalized for repeatedly disrupting traffic and disrupting the neighbors right to peaceful enjoyment! Oh yes, and this by the way is directed to 57 Clinton Ave events that are still on going. Thank you

The new code regulates many of these features in the jurisdiction subject to the form-based standards, 2-family, multi-family and commercial. Staff will coordinate with other City departments regarding current activities at 57 Clinton Avenue.

I hope people don't lose sight of the overall goal to make the regulations better organized, more navigable, and clearer. Currently a non-professional could look up a given question in the regulations and think they've found their answer, only to learn later that there's another sentence somewhere else in the code that contradicts it. More user-friendly regulations will mean that individual property owners and small builders can function better in Norwalk -- it won't be just the big developers with staff to navigate the difficult code.

We received your card in the mail today re: the updating of zoning regulations. Norwalk is the United Nations and the United Nations is Norwalk. Congratulations on selling the country out.

I'm so glad you sent out a postcard to everyone. Not sure if it went to all residents or just homeowners, but even if the latter it's certainly a good move. People don't always read The Hour or look at the city website. The postcard should be effective in letting a lot more people know what's going on. Thank you!

You must actually click on the map to bring up the zoning designations. 67 Wolfpit Ave is currently zoned B res (single family). It is proposed to be rezoned to CD-4, which allows multi-family. Your areas is proposed for rezoning to CD-4, because it is a 0.25 miles from to Westport Avenue and that it is in an area containing multi-family housing

We are located in Zone B. 67 Wolfpit Ave west of Strawberry Hill. Will we now be in Two Family zone? It is hard to tell on the small, fuzzy maps.
Karen

I'd like in person meetings and very much less multi family dwellings. In fact, it appears to me that the city is overly developed with regard to multi family dwellings. However I do appreciate the fine efforts to improve East Avenue vintage homes, ie 96 East Ave and the corner of Morgan. But no more towers, please!

The draft regulations and map changes do permit additional 2-family dwellings as well as some additional areas for moderate scale multi-family housing. Those locations were chosen based on their proximity to transit, employment centers and infrastructure.

Regarding zoning regulations update: Do not allow any more multi family zoning in existing neighborhoods. Norwalk has enough along with the outrageous amount of apartments. We don't have enough schools or property to accommodate the amount of people and cars that these multi family houses bring. Most houses in Norwalk are now accommodating more than one family and cars are parked all over the place. Our city and neighborhoods are being trashed. Strawberry Hill Ave is an example. The numerous cars that are allowed to park on the street along with bike and walk paths is a joke. Not to mention businesses being run out of homes with numerous trucks parked in once nice neighborhoods. Is anyone regulating this? It will get worse if we allow these proposed changes. I as a lifelong Norwalker am opposed to any changes regarding allowing anymore multi family zoning.

Hi. My wife and I recently moved to Rowayton and do not know how our area is currently zoned, so we are not sure if/how we will be affected in the proposed plan. Is there a portal where one can type in their address to see their current zone and where they would be? Thank you.
Steve and Sally Adelman

This link will allow you to enter your address and see the proposed and current zoning.
<https://norwalk.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=d19312a301204643bef039ac0cb940e1>

Hi again. Please disregard the comment I sent a few minutes ago. I just found the Interactive Zoning Map, which is exactly what I needed.
Thank you. Steve and Sally Adelman

To what extent do the proposed revisions make housing that is currently nonconforming (i.e., illegal) legal? We hear about lack of enforcement for "illegal rooming houses," for example. It might be a relief to owners of such multifamily homes if they will now be in a multifamily zone so they don't have to hide. OTOH, neighbors who dislike these residences may not want to see them made legal. Obviously you can't please everyone. I would like to see the most benefit for the most people, which seems to be allowing "illegal" properties to come out of the shadows and be legal.

If someone has illegally added a unit or units to their property, they would still need to obtain permits for the conversation to make sure the work done was consistent with all applicable codes, including zoning, which regulates the number of units, the location of the structure(s), as well as parking number and location.

The zoning changes appear to be discriminatory in that some property owners will be more affected than others. Some property owners will have their property devalued by the changes without receiving any sort of 'eminent domain' type compensation. Other property owners will not be impacted by the zoning changes. It does not seem right or fair.

It also does not seem right that property owners do not get to vote on this proposal!

Also, given the persistent lack of zoning enforcement in Norwalk, is this project a good use of property taxes and city employee time (and hence property taxes). Unfortunately, I think not. I do not think the lack of zoning enforcement has had to do with the language of the current zoning ordinances.

It looks like A and AAA property zoning is not changing. And, it looks like AA property zones are being devalued to A property zones.

This does not seem fair.

"9]-All rooftop mechanical equipment, including all heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) units, shall be setback a minimum of ten (10) feet from the edge of the roof and fully screened with architecturally compatible screening. [Amended effective 9-26-2014]" As a condo owner, the above regulation is unreasonable, not enforced, and should be removed.

Impervious coverage is proposed to include driveways and walkways made of concrete, asphalt or hard-packed gravel surfaces, which have previously not been included in coverage calculation. This will impact many property owners who have paved driveways and walkways around their homes and will result in many becoming nonconforming as to coverage. Should this occur, a property owner who may want to construct an addition (even if it meets required setbacks/height/stories) would need to apply for variances for coverage, which is unfair. The definition does not appear to include permeable pavers, so one could presume that this type of surfacing is exempt from coverage. As for decks also being exempt from coverage - does it depend upon the height of deck from grade? Materials? Decks had been counted toward coverage if above 8". Are on-grade patios of impervious surfacing (concrete, slate etc.) included in the coverage calculation or excluded? What about pool equipment, large permanent grill areas? Tennis courts?

Regarding density, I would like to see a maximum occupancy limit equal to the greater of: 2 persons per approved bedroom or 3 persons per approved bathroom, plus one person per additional 1/2 bath. This standard should apply to every district in the city. This formula could replace the number of families designation that is causing public strife, and dividing our city. Reasonable and safe occupancy is a function of how many bedrooms and bathrooms a house has (which the city already regulates), not the number of entrances. Thanks.

I have lived on Mack Street for over 30 years, and have seen South Norwalk improve from being the poor part of the city to being a cool place to live. Mack Street and Knorr Streets are two of the few streets left in Norwalk where families can purchase an affordable home. Please do not change this into two family homes that will be rented out. We are already surrounded by apartment buildings, although they are lovely to look at, those tenants have little connection to the community. I see that the wealthy homeowners in Shorefront park have been accommodated. I would hope that the same consideration would be given to the middle class homeowners on Mack and Knorr Streets. Joan Ridgeway

The new zoning map is on a continuum of Norwalk's environmental injustice. The working class and minorities again have their quality of life impacted by the new zoning: greater density in small lots, more cars parked on both sides of the streets, more noise pollution, more exhaust contaminants. The democratic leadership in Norwalk is at odds with the White House' efforts and drive for environmental justice. The time for Norwalk to stop environmental discrimination is now.

For the most part A & AA properties were combined. There are some exceptions where AA where some AA properties were combined with AAA properties and even some instances where A zoned properties went into the CD-3 zone. There should be no devaluation by combining A & AA. Both zones have the same required lot width today. Existing A zone properties will have a grandfathering clause regarding setbacks.

This is enforced on all new construction and included for aesthetic purposes.

The intent of regulating impervious surface is to prevent someone from paving their entire lot, which they could technically do today. What counts toward impervious surface is indicated in the definitions. Page 452, Article 9.

This is not something the City can legally regulate through zoning. Perhaps there is a Health Code that is applicable.

Mack St. is currently zoned 2-family, as is the northern part of Knorr St. The southern part is single family. The southern portion was initially proposed for 32-family but that is no longer under consideration.

One of the goals of the rezoning is to become a more walkable community. One way to achieve that is by providing more density in areas close to transit, infrastructure, amenities and activities and employment centers. The areas proposed for upzoning (going from single to 2 family or going from m2-family to multi-family) are not concentrated in one area, but spread out throughout the City.

After looking at the newly proposed zoning map I can't help but become confused as to what the direction for Norwalk is. Is it affordable housing with the increase multi-family zones? Is it expensive apartment complexes with the increase in commercial zones? Is the vision to pack in as many people as possible, making an already notoriously traffic heavy city even more unnavigable?

Specifically the changes near the Strawberry Hill x Westport Ave intersection. Re-zoning that area into multi-family and even Commercial(!) when there are only two flows of traffic out, Strawberry Hill & Wolfpit ave (Not even a traffic light, a stop sign). Increasing the population in that area and generating more car traffic would cause insane back-up on an already terrible traffic light. A traffic light that is used as the MAIN route for NHS & NHMS. I just don't see how this would be a good idea for the City of Norwalk, and especially for the residents who are and have been currently living here.

There are some very specific neighborhoods that are slated to be up zoned to two family that shouldn't be changed. There are some real historical and all currently single family streets that are being targeted. Please look at the streets in depth (drive around) and take notes as to which ones already have two family homes on them already. Those would probably be the best streets to upzone for two family housing. Please leave single family streets in tact - there are plenty of them that need to stay in tact and just don't need further people/traffic congestion.

Thank you.

Hello, I am a Norwalk residential property owner and am writing to express my trepidation toward parts of the new zoning proposal (the revised June 6 version) in regards to the changing of many "single family" neighborhoods. Please reconsider the neighborhood block where Strawberry Hill Ave ends and meets Wolfpit Ave, just north of Rt 1. This area is proposed to go from B Residence to CD-4 General Urban (in other words, "commercial"). That is a huge change. It's pretty shocking, honestly. It may appear to be a small area with little collateral damage, but there are over 30 single family homes in this stretch and they are not rental properties. Most are occupied by the property owner. I grew up in one of them and my parents still live in it. These are very nice, very well kept houses. The neighborhood does not need revitalization. Have you driven through it? I suppose someone has because it's been identified as meriting a "general urban" designation although I can't see why. It is close to the commercial area of Rt 1, yes, but its character is clearly residential. The neighborhoods directly surrounding it are remaining either single family or moving to multi-family, but not commercial. Why is this one piece designated for commercial? It seems so unfairly targeted. I understand that just because an area will be upzoned doesn't mean that increased capacity or development is required of new construction. I understand that these single family homes won't be knocked down the day after a zoning change goes into effect. I also understand that CD-4 General Urban allows for civic spaces such as a green, playground, sports field... but I know that's not the real intention. You are turning a B Residence Zone into a General Urban zone because the neighborhood is intended to be an eventual target for apartments, condos or commercial property - because that is what investors and developers are interested in. It may take 10-20 years for change to occur, but don't you know that these people will still own these homes in 10-20 years? These 30 families are getting a particularly raw deal here. My mother wrote to protest the first proposed zoning map regarding her neighborhood (and others), and I can't tell you how upset she is over all the changes in B Zoning. She feels totally dismissed like the city couldn't care less about her as a property owner or as a resident. I have to say it's a pretty tough pill to swallow considering the people spearheading all these zoning changes don't even live in Norwalk. I do understand the need for updating zoning regulations in general, but there a LOT of changes in the plan meant to force density upon unsuspecting neighborhoods. It's disingenuous to pretend otherwise. My mom has owned her house in this Wolfpit neighborhood since the early eighties (all my life). Now she's being ambushed ("screwed" is the word she used). I own a house in another B zone, when I bought I considered myself lucky enough to get a property in Norwalk, and I DO still feel that way.... however if Norwalk is going to be so cavalier about single-family property rights in favor of courting property developers, I may soon feel differently. I see the June 6 revision has scaled back a lot of the B zone changes. I am happy to see that because it means the plan is open to feedback. I hope you have some further considerations, and further revisions. Please put the neighborhood of Strawberry Hill Ave/ Wolfpit Ave back on the table for CD-3 or CD-3S designation. NOT CD-4.

There are numerous goals as part of the upzoning. Many are interconnected and achieve multiple goals. Providing additional housing near transit, employment centers, amenities & activities as well as where infrastructure is, allows for more walkability and less reliance on an automobile and can help transform areas such as Westport Avenue. Unzoning in certain areas also provides the potential for additional homeownership.

The initial proposal including a much larger area for consideration for upzoning. The City heard those concerns and scaled the areas back considerably. It is important to remember that even if the zoning changes to allow 2 family dwellings in an area previously zoned for single family only, that no one is required to build 2 family housing. Historically less than 50% of eligible properties have chosen to add a second unit.

This can't be happening! A handful of people on a zoning board who aren't even elected can't have the power to pull the rug out from under single family home owners in B zones. They appear to want to go forward - bulldozing through our investments (our B zone homes). I saw the updated map, it's not much different! Our property is in the Strawberry Hill/Wolfpit area and we are being re-zoned C4 Urban!!! NO, NO, NO! No reason for this! We are tax paying Norwalk RESIDENTS. We are the people you serve! This is criminal! We bought our house in a single family zone for a reason. In fact the houses on either side of us were bought in 2018 and 2021. Lived in by the owners. Now our finances are being attacked by a few people on a board? Do they even live in Norwalk? How is this legal? Who is influencing them to do this? Developers? Certainly not Norwalk residents. I don't know know a single person who is happy about the proposed zoning. They have targeted B zone home owners. This must be rescinded!

Norwalk does not have the thoroughfares needed for high density housing. If the city changed as shown on the map, the traffic on the post road would be at a veritable stand still. That is the only street that cuts through the city east to west. Route 7 and East Ave would be similar. If affordable housing is a goal, keep in mind that the most affordable housing is found in the older buildings you are targeting for demolition via zoning changes. Ask any Realtor - they know where the truly affordable apartments are. The new apartments going up around town have very expensive "affordable" units. Affordability is all a ruse so developers can make big bucks.

STOP THE ATTACK ON THE PEOPLE OF NORWALK.

Bill and Sandy Marr
339 Strawberry Hill

Agree with changes of current zoning in Norwalk. To allow renters have more options if new housing are built or expanded as the city is growing at a fast pace.

need more mixed use or commercial space in norwalk

Eliminate any requirement that a certificate of variance or zoning/building permits must be secured within a certain time period. Variances run with the land according to Connecticut case law, so these requirements are inappropriate.

In the Devils Garden area, my property 5-80-168-0 (9 Possum Circle) as well as Possum Circle lots 169,170,171,172,173,177 &178 are all "A" residence but it is incorrectly proposed on your zoning map grouped with "B" & "C" as CD-3. These lots should be classified as CD-3s in accordance with your documents.

Nonetheless, I am OPPOSED to the 2-family zoning proposal in my area under any circumstances.

37 years ago, I moved from the Bronx, a dense and 2-family area, for a better life out of NYC . I decided on establishing my home in Rowayton, Norwalk on Possum Circle. My home is not only the physical house and lot, but especially also includes the neighborhood. My single family area has created the fulfillment of my American Dream and my daughter graduated from the Norwalk public school system. I paid a premium for my home and continue to do so in taxes for my home. I certainly will not want the 2-family zoning proposal which will rob me of my QUALITY OF LIFE achievement and investment. PLEASE reconsider your proposal and keep my area as single family!!!

Thank you
Anthony & Eileen Romeo

i live on west norwalk road 1/2 mile from the post road. this town is already over crowded and we don't need to make it more crowded by making single family homes into 2 and 3 family homes.

MANY of the homes on my street are already housing 2,3 and 4 families already even though we are zoned AA single family. We NEED AT LEAST 5 NEW INSPECTORS PER VOTING ZONE ASAP!!!

By changing aaa bbb to cd s cdl etc NORWALK GOVT IS confusing and hiding the truth from the people. Also by using zoom instead of real meetings the present norwalk government is trying to hide and sneak bad policy on the people, The plague is over. And if govt people are too scared to meet in person, please do us a favor and quit. We won't ruled by chickens.

This comment is in regards to merging the B residence and C residence zones to form zone C-D3, which is proposed to include single or two-family homes. Today's B zone includes single-family homes. People who purchased single-family homes in B made a decision to invest in a home in a lower-density, single-family home area. Changing the regulations there to include two-family homes puts B zone neighborhoods at risk for future density increases that homeowners did not sign up for. Please reconsider this change.

Hello,

My wife and I moved to Norwalk in 2018 and now have two kids. We live on Ludlow Manor, which you are proposing to rezone for two-family dwellings. We chose Norwalk over other cities in CT for a few reasons. We wanted to maintain the diversity of NYC but with a quieter atmosphere. This was the case in 2018 but it seems that all of the changes have involved more traffic and closer living. I hear much talk about affordable housing but haven't seen any results. The addition of two-family dwellings on streets like Ludlow Manor will only benefit developers who will tear down nearly century-old houses in favor of monster rent producers (just take a look at the end of Staples Court, how did that get approx, anyhow?). Is that what Norwalk is about, dismantling thriving neighborhoods in favor of "citizens" like Jason Milligan? It sounds like this is already a foregone conclusion. Our neighbors have spoken with Steve K and he said "don't worry, it won't affect you immediately."

What a selfish way of thinking, leaving the problems to the next generation. In fact, there are quite a few older residents on Ludlow Manor, who will soon die. When that happens, the developers will come in. We bought your house to raise a family. We bought it from another family who had raised their kids in it for nearly 40 years. We hope to sell it to another family for the same purpose. In fact, our lot is so small, I can't imagine it being able to hold two families. We are thankful that the commission has spared the affluent community on Pine Hill, where there is plenty of land for new development. We will be out in force this week to attempt to change your minds. Of course, it will take listening ears.

Thank you for considering changing the map to reflect Ludlow Manor as single family units.

-Patrick, Elizabeth, Benjamin, and Sebastian Fennig

If Norwalk seeks to align the zoning regulation with the POCD that states that the maintenance of the overall character of established single family neighborhoods then why increase the frontage requirement from from 50' to 100'. South Norwalk's B-zone neighborhoods are dominated by lots of 50' or less that will be grandfathered, notwithstanding this it doesn't make sense to me on its face to make property owners modify properties with some excess land under current zoning to now rush to be grandfathered in so that they can provide an opportunity in the future for single family home ownership that will be taken away by new zoning. The new frontage regulation is having the exact opposite consequence for both character maintenance and providing new home ownership opportunities. If anything the frontage requirements should be reduced

As a life long resident born and raised. Concern tax payer who works at the Merritt 7 Buildings and lives in East Norwalk you have ruined the quality of life. Some days takes me 1/2 hour to get to work with several attempts at my life by motor vehicle. Never a cop in sight. Everyone is so angry about the traffic.

I will not be voting for this mayor again. We wanted to leave our house to our child who is a civil engineer and they have no interest in living in this area anymore. "East Norwalk is screwed unlike affluent Rowayton. True colors are showing on the map rewrite. Money = winners.

My house is currently in a B Zone. The new designation for that zone will be CD3 which allows for one and two family homes. These new regulations, if adopted will result in a down zoning of my property. I do not see a reason to down zone all B residence zoning simply because that will fit into the proposed code for administrative purposes. What drives the value of property is stable zoning. Allowing two family houses in a one family zone devalues the one family houses and drives those owners out to seek a one family house elsewhere. The goal of creating opportunities for more home ownership should not be the subject of amended zoning regulations. That is social engineering at the expense of current home owners. Rather than create opportunities for more home ownership, it may create incentives for investors to buy single family homes and convert them. Is that what the public wants? I suggest not. At least in residential areas, maintain single family ownership. Otherwise the character of this city will change and not for the better.

The bulk height standards are too broad and will have a negative impact on our town. In order to fully understand how increased massing (bulk and height) there must be an EIS so that we can fully understand the environmental impact on the people who live and work in this area. This is a developers dream - but it can coexist with the people who live in the small neighborhoods that make Norwalk a wonderful place to live. Develop, don't destroy. That should be the approach - and these changes to the zoning regs have the potential to destroy.

Sirs, Few things in life really matter to me; one is standing up for handicapped people's rights and another is questioning when educated people knowingly break environmental laws using their entitlement, authority, and access to power to avoid enforcement. Many who depend on walkers, canes, crutches, wheelchairs, in addition to people with short-term injuries, have handicapped parking stickers. **Why not require at least one handicapped parking space at these new mixed use, multiple unit dwellings, where there is a time limit for parking, like 10- min, and a bench where people can sit?** This would allow for people with walkers and special needs to be safely picked-up and dropped-off; this is what handicapped people minimally need. With just one or two handicapped parking spaces, first come first served, one car with a sticker can sit for days. Sure, building codes require a minimum of handicapped spaces, but as you cut down spaces, the competition for spaces increases, the gaming of how to get one, just for you, increases. The Fair Housing Act is also in play here, so it isn't just building codes, not our problem. Anyone who has helped handicapped people knows the importance of being close to flat spaces, seating, and entryways. Anyone with even a minimal disability can request their own space, see links below, so one unit could request multiple spaces, leaving fewer spaces for other residents (or guests). Parking is a conundrum, which is why it requires some thought, consideration, and maybe even a new idea, like a handicapped space with a time limit, for drop-offs and pick-ups, and a bench where people can sit and wait for rides, wait to be escorted inside. <https://northeastada.org/blog/the-fair-housing-act-fha-and-accessible-parking> <https://www.thehousingcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Fair-Housing-Explained-Accessible-Parking.pdf> Regarding Outstanding Concerns: please see the attached and consider whether WP (the landowner is responsible for getting proper permits) gamed the system, following getting proper permits for work on our Shagbark Rd drain (my Jan 2022 Clean Water Act presentation). Do you believe, as Laurie Jones, now WP President, wrote, that they followed a legitimate process, that the out of context email from DPW (Vanessa agreed with me that permits were required, but she does not enforce) and the one T. Closter wrote, attached, represent that DEEP approved this work, without ever seeing plans? Laurie Jones writes that outflows will not increase with hundreds of feet of new pipe yet shares no evidence. Why is my evidence ignored? Now my neighbor, 5 Nathan Hale Drive, is actively landscaping inland wetlands without a permit, likely trespassing beyond their property line, yet, and again, no enforcement, despite a complaint to Conservation while work was being done. Work done on Nathan Hale Drive (property on every coastal flood zone map), including the filling of tidal and inland wetlands, requires plans, review, permits and now enforcement. My presentations, my Stormwater Management Comments and email include comprehensive research, serious evidence, and proof of pollution from the Coast Guard and EPA. Records don't lie, people do. Yes, I get it that Attorney Blank trashed me, attached, but following DEEP issuing a NOV this Feb, following the realization that the Norwalk Yacht Club had the wrong permit (!), the Club was required to train, keep weekly records, get a Stormwater Management Plan and test for a variety of bacteria and minerals twice a year. Did Attorney Blank cross the line, violate legal ethics standards? Attorney Blank is dead wrong in the attached, but Commissioners and Agencies expect attorneys to behave as they would in front of a Judge or in Court; this is why people dismissed me. Take a close look at the communications included in my presentations, the email

Handicap spaces are regulated within the Building Code and administered by that department. The other matters referenced have been investigated by numerous City agencies and CT DEEP. No further action will be taken.

the realization that the Norwalk Yacht Club had the wrong permit (!), the Club was required to train, keep weekly records, get a Stormwater Management Plan and test for a variety of bacteria and minerals twice a year. Did Attorney Blank cross the line, violate legal ethics standards? Attorney Blank is dead wrong in the attached, but Commissioners and Agencies expect attorneys to behave as they would in front of a Judge or in Court; this is why people dismissed me. Take a close look at the communications included in my presentations, the email from & to Attorney Nagler (who would ever expect that a partner from a Wall St law firm would knowingly misrepresent to staff?!?), the ones Laurie Jones believes represent the “pre-clearance process,” and let me know when we can sit down together, so you can explain to me what I am missing. No rush, as I know you are busy; I am not moving away and my questions about required permits and wetland enforcement are not going away just because no one ever reads my email or thinks it is worth their time to respond. Jeff Spahr is cc-ed here, as he has a special needs child, and hopefully understands the special needs of an elderly person requiring a walker or any handicapped person who still drives. Attorney Spahr is aware, because the City fought my FOI request (suggested by the then Chief of Police!) to see the video cam of the then WP President accusing me of being a potential arsonist (months after my “Good Governance” email, timed when I was in South America, where I was grabbed by police and strip searched, since they believed they had a terrorist!) that I have been bullied and disparaged by the Wilson Point Board, in addition to being insulted by Attorney Blank. Multiple unsubstantiated allegations have been made about me in police reports, all documented. While I do not know if Attorney Spahr has seen all my presentations, if he hasn’t, he can just ask me to share them and he can explain to me what I am missing regarding the filling of tidal wetlands and work done in a coastal flood zone. Thank you for thinking about public health and safety, the health and safety of special need citizens, and why filling tidal wetlands is a public nuisance. Respectfully,
Lynnelle Jones

Dear Mr. Klepping, I support your vision for overdue regulations upgrade. I support you and the commission for updating all 30 year old regulations changing single family to two family or multiple zones which are in need at this time. The visionary change will allow the city to grow by leaps and bounds. It will bring new business to support the increased population with an increase in property taxes for two family houses. This change is good and will bring tax revenue for the city. Norwalk is uniquely situated in the suburbs of New York. Your approach is 100% correct with one kaviack if the city is upgrading utilities and sewage systems in all new zones including CD-3L. Thanks. Mohinder Singh Kalsi, 519 1/2 Flax Hill Road, Norwalk CT 06854.

Dear Mr. Kleppin, My husband and I are 25-year residents on Olmstead Place in East Norwalk. Our daughter attended Norwalk public schools from kindergarten through 12th grade. Prior to purchasing our home, I met with the principal of Marvin Elementary School who generously gave me an hour of her time. As a teacher and concerned parent, I wanted to be sure that the elementary school our daughter would attend was well revered. I also met with the then Director of Public Affairs for the Norwalk Public Schools to get her perspective on the quality of the city's schools in general. Convinced that this would be a good experience, we decided to buy the house and move to Norwalk. Our daughter received, for the most part, a good education here in Norwalk. Since graduating 11 years ago, however, the student populations in the elementary, middle and high schools have dramatically increased, while the teaching staff has continued to dwindle. Just last week, The Hour reported that 6 teachers would lose their jobs, while there were 87 VACANCIES in Norwalk's school system! Yes, 87!!!! And to make matters worse, some teachers will actually have to SPLIT THEIR TIME AMONG THE VARIOUS SCHOOLS this year. I was horrified to read this. Additionally, billboards (4 at last count) are prominently displayed in Bridgeport along I95 and Route 8, desperately recruiting special education teachers in Norwalk! It's appalling to think we cannot provide a respectful education for these children; in fact, many parents must pay thousands of dollars PER YEAR to private professionals to get the services their deserving sons and daughters need. The #1 criteria for young, growing families considering moving to Norwalk (or any town) is living in a town that offers exceptional school choices and quality education for their children. Two-family homes and large apartment buildings are NOT the answer. Instead, they will serve to further overcrowd our schools where discouraged teachers are either quitting, choosing to retire early, or seeking employment in other, more supportive towns. And recruiting new, qualified teachers for schools bursting at the seams simply won't happen. The plan to INCREASE DENSITY when there is an EXTREME SHORTAGE of teachers is completely unfair to taxpaying parents seeking quality education for their children. The children, parents, and teachers deserve better. I implore you, and the entire P&Z Commission, to HALT ALL EFFORTS to up-zone and allow more 2-family zoning in East Norwalk, and all of Norwalk, as well. I understand and truly support a plan to simplify and consolidate zoning in Norwalk - WITHOUT, however, converting one-family zoned parcels to two-family parcels. Thank you, Kerrin and Bob Cole

Hi, I'm writing to express my support for the proposed changes to Norwalk's zoning map and say that I believe they could go even further. I'm fortunate to own a home in Norwalk, one that my wife and our son may live in for a long time. Most of my peers (I'm 35) don't get this opportunity -- anyone following the real estate market knows supply is far outpaced by demand. We need to increase the housing supply, and one way to do that is by increasing areas for multi-family homes. Multi-family housing supply near mass transit centers allows for new generations to purchase homes, build their wealth, and -- if they choose -- keep the cycle going by selling and moving into single-family homes. We need changes like these to make Norwalk an appealing and affordable place for young people. For these reasons, I'd support more areas rezoned for multi-family housing. I imagine it's easy to get wrapped up in the criticisms of this plan since those appear to outpace approvals or neutrality. The civic engagement process favors older homeowners -- people with loads of time to get involved -- and judging by pictures of this week's meeting attendees, that feels especially true. Homeowners and retirees aren't the only residents of Norwalk -- younger people like myself want increased walkability, bike-ability, and mass transit in town. While I understand people not wanting high-rises like Stamford, there are middle grounds that we can find, and expanding multi-family housing to more zones gets us toward them. Further, the current zoning process is auto-centric. Norwalk existed long before cars but our development, like many U.S. suburbs, means cars are the most convenient way for getting around town. More bike lanes, more sidewalks, and better mass transit reduce the number of cars needed, improving the perception that "Norwalk is full." I'd argue we aren't full but with all the cars needed to get around, it feels that way. I hope you'll consider perspectives like mine when you make your final recommendations. For Norwalk to be an attractive place to live, we need changes, even if they upset the privileged few. Thanks. Ben Candea, Norwalk, CT

Dear Mr. Kleppin, my name is Matthew Fieffe and I live on Walnut Ave. My whole life I've lived in this neighborhood, and I've seen the ups and downs of this neighborhood. If you go through with these plans it will forever change the state of our neighborhood. It will never be the same. Kids who move in will never have the joy to learn how to bike in a quiet and safe environment, there will be tons of noise every night with altering homes into two families. Please do not go through with these plans, for if you do other thirteen year olds won't have the joy of growing up in the best neighborhood in America. Please try your best to get back to me soon. From, Matthew Fieffe of 18 Walnut Ave

Walnut Ave is less than 0.25 miles from East Ave and less than 0.5 miles from Westport Avenue, as well as the Wall Street area, which contains a significant amount of employers, services, amenities and transportation option. This location is appropriate for upzoning. Please note that any redevelopment will have to conform to all applicable standards, including providing four (4) compliant parking spaces.

Kathy Siever Correspondence (Document within PDF)

City Staff and the Commission are continuing to reevaluate the location of any of the proposed zoning districts. Public feedback at this point is helpful in determining the appropriate bounds. Ludlow Manor was recommended for inclusion into the CD-3 zone based on the zoning to the west and the areas proximity to the train station.

Mr Baker, I am one of the upset homeowners in East Norwalk who is due to be affected by the proposed zoning changes of my neighborhood. As a homeowner I feel that my long time, established ownership rights are being stolen by this zoning change. An increase in density on my street and in the area will be untenable. P&Z has already utilized traffic studies that are debatably suspect on recent development considerations. As a CT real estate broker, my professional opinion is that the desirability and appeal of the neighborhood will certainly diminish. Real estate values will be affected, and no one at P&Z can guarantee that it will not have a negative effect. P&Z has heard from numerous Realtors stating the same opinions. I am also deeply concerned by the comments of Steve Kleppen that he will go ahead with his belief that this is the right thing to do, even if there are thousands of people in opposition. I am concerned with the lack of impartiality demonstrated by the comments of one of your zoning commissioners. They have disparaged East Norwalk as "a ghetto" (as well as "rebutted" public comments while speaking along with the developer of the Cemetary St development.) Michael Pavlicin, 16 Olmstead Place, East Norwalk

Regarding property values, we've looked at many of the existing neighborhoods in Norwalk, including East Norwalk, where two-family homes are allowed and exist today and found no evidence that there is any negative impact on property values as a result of a two-family zoning designation. Property values in existing two-family neighborhoods increased not uncommonly by more than 100% from their previous sale date going back to the mid-1990s which is commensurate with similar single-family neighborhoods. Furthermore we've researched this question about property value impacts in communities who have changed their zoning to allow other housing options in previously single-family only areas, and there is no evidence in empirical data or peer-reviewed research that shows that property values go down when they are upzoned. Most research at this point has actually found the opposite effect. Steve and my own recommendations to the Commission are based on our professional knowledge regarding city planning and how to solve problems that the city is facing within that discipline. The city is facing a housing crisis with prices of homes quickly becoming unaffordable for people interested in living here as well as for folks who already live here and cannot afford to continue to do so. An option to help solve this problem is to provide more property rights and flexibility on housing options that moves beyond either large apartment buildings or single-family homes and allow for all of the housing options in between. Where these housing options can be located is largely focused on proximity to the city's major employers and mass transit facilities which enables people to live a less car dependent lifestyle if they choose, which cuts down on traffic concerns, on-street parking availability or lack thereof and carbon emissions. Public input is extremely valuable but if that input is stating things that are not what the evidence indicates then, in my opinion, we should not be using that to make our decisions. With that being said, Steve and I do not vote on these items, we just provide our recommendation and the Commission comes to their own decision.

Adam Blank Letter - 57 Chestnut St. 6.21.23

This proposal was discussed during the industrial zones changes. Staff agrees that the changes proposed make sense but remains concerned for the preservation of the existing building at 57 Chestnut Street. In addition, there are several other properties to the south, currently zoned I2 that should probably be reconsidered for rezoning, since the remaining properties would be "orphaned" and surrounded by mixed use or strictly residential use.

Adam Blank Letter - 10 Bartlett Ave. 6.20.23

Based on the historic legal use for the property as office, which is more consistent with CD-4 than CD-3.

Craig Flaherty Letter 43 Harbor Ave

Staff will be providing a revised proposed height table for areas within the CD-5 zone and include a map, so there is no uncertainty regarding the allowed heights withing the district. Regarding 43 Harbor Avenue, Staff did meet with Mr. Flaherty regarding the proposal and feels that what is proposed could potentially fit into the broader neighborhood. However, Staff remains concerned with the overall height and is more concerned with the potential impacts of the residential area to the north. It is Staff's understanding that when there was a rezoning for Waypoint that this property and areas to the north were excluded.

Volet Letter - 35 France St. (5 Properties) 6.26.23

The City will continue to evaluate the areas proposed for any rezoning. While the properties to the east are currently single-family, the block are the subject properties are in contain multi-family or 2-family zoning. Given the proximity of these properties to the Route 1 corridor, some consideration for upzoning may be appropriate.

Hello, I am a single family homeowner on Olmstead place and do not want anymore two family apartments built on this street! I will attend the in person meeting on Wednesday to voice my concerns and fight for this project to not continue. Thank you, Judith Johnson, zip code 06855

The City will continue to evaluate the areas proposed for any rezoning. Olmstead Place is within 0.5 mile walk from the train station and immediately accessible to I-95

Thank you for the elimination of Shorefront Park from the zoning changes of single to two family and change back to single. I urge the same treatment for part of Quintard Avenue. The entire east side of Quintard Avenue has long been single family. About fifteen years ago (based on memory as to how long ago) the west side of Quintard from near Sheridan south to the end at Loundes was rezoned to single family B from two family C. I urge that all areas on Quintard that have been zoned as single family continue to be treated as single family - just as Shorefront Park is to be. Can you confirm Quintard Ave. that has been single is to remain single at the end of the day. Also, Burritt, from Water into Shorefront is all single family (although I do not know how it is zoned) and should be zoned single family for uniformity. You have indicated the upzoning in the A and B residential zones throughout much of the city in the new plan of zoning was in response to recommendations in the most recent PODC. Could you please identify (circling is fine) and email me the specific sections of the PODC that you believe contain these recommendations. Thank you. Urban Mulvehill, O'Neill DiManno & Kelly

The current draft zoning map matches the existing zoning map. However, I will include your comments in the record for consideration by the Commission. To address your other email, the POCD does not specifically state to update any specific zone. The POCD is not meant to be that prescriptive, but is meant to provide guidance and identify issues and then leave it up to the responsible entity to develop the strategies to address the issue(s). Chapter 4 is the housing section.

Dear Mayor Rilling and Messrs. Kleppin and Baker, and to all members of the P&Z Committee, I own and reside at 24 Ludlow Manor in East Norwalk, and would like to express my opposition to the change in zoning law to increase density in East Norwalk, specifically converting one-family zones to two-family zones. My reasons are as follows: 1. Allowing two-family zoning in preferred East Norwalk neighborhoods will potentially make our homes less **valuable**. Those of us who purchased homes in one-family zones did so with **intent**. Real estate is one of our most important investments – for some of us, our only **investment**. Many owners on Ludlow Manor have recently retired or will retire within the next three to six **years**. It is unfair to jeopardize our retirements and investments, especially, with so many other economic factors working against us for which we have no control, including the rapidly rising cost of living in a major metro area. 2. Two-family zoning will likely see the quality of our neighborhoods **decline**. Individuals are more likely to purchase two-family homes for an **investment**. There is a higher probability that individuals who rent will not have a vested interest in maintaining the real estate, property, parks and green space, and our community and family values. Thank you for your consideration. *Deborah Accurso*

The City will continue to evaluate the areas proposed for any rezoning. This area was recommended for consideration for 2-family zoning based on it's proximity to the train station and surrounding zoning to the west, which is primarily 2-family zoning.

project. For those of us who live on Ludlow Manor and further south, it can take up to 15 to 20 minutes just to reach the I95 access ramp on East Avenue during the daylight hours – a mere one **mile**. Additionally, when I95 traffic is slowed or stopped, we have overflow traffic using Route 136 in lieu of the **highway**. It compounds the volume of traffic, and endangers bikers and pedestrians. 5. Our neighborhood should be preserved for historical **reasons**. It is a special area settled and developed by the founders of Norwalk; there are many older homes that are well-maintained and **valued**. The area should be valued and respected, another reason to oppose the development around the cemetery; it should be sacred **space**. There is little peace to be found as things exist today. The proposed zoning changes will have dire lasting **consequences**. Norwalk was at one time a quaint, New England town . . . a desirable place to **settle**. In just the 10 years that I have been a resident, I have witnessed its **decline**. I urge our town leaders to preserve the areas and neighborhoods that are still desirable and valued. Thank you for your consideration. *Deborah Accurso*

Argent Acquisitions - Carmody Letter re: Manresa 6.21.23 (see scanned PDF)

Staff is in agreement regarding the uniqueness of the property and further agrees that a separate zoning vehicle such as an overlay zone is appropriate for this area.

Mr Baker, I am one of the upset homeowners in East Norwalk who is due to be affected by the proposed zoning changes of my neighborhood. As a homeowner I feel that my long time, established ownership rights are being stolen by this zoning change. An increase in density on my street and in the area will be untenable. P&Z has already utilized traffic studies that are debatably suspect on recent development considerations. As a CT real estate broker, my professional opinion is that the desirability and appeal of the neighborhood will certainly diminish. Real estate values will be affected, and no one at P&Z can guarantee that it will not have a negative effect. P&Z has heard from numerous Realtors stating the same opinions. I am also deeply concerned by the comments of Steve Kleppen that he will go ahead with his belief that this is the right thing to do, even if there are thousands of people in opposition. I am concerned with the lack of impartiality demonstrated by the comments of one of your zoning commissioners. They have disparaged East Norwalk as "a ghetto" (as well as "rebutted"

Regarding property values, we've looked at many of the existing neighborhoods in Norwalk, including East Norwalk, where two-family homes are allowed and exist today and found no evidence that there is any negative impact on property values as a result of a two-family zoning designation. Property values in existing two-family neighborhoods increased not uncommonly by more than 100% from their previous sale date going back to the mid-1990s which is commensurate with similar single-family neighborhoods. Furthermore we've researched this question about property value impacts in communities who have changed their zoning to allow other housing options in previously single-family only areas, and there is no evidence in empirical data or peer-reviewed research that shows that property values go down when they are upzoned. Most research at this point has actually found the opposite effect. Steve and my own recommendations to the Commission are based on our professional knowledge regarding city planning and how to solve problems that the city is facing within that discipline. The city is facing a housing crisis with prices of homes quickly becoming unaffordable for people interested in living here as well as for folks who already live here and cannot afford to continue to do so. An option to help solve this problem is to provide more property rights and flexibility on housing options that moves beyond either large apartment buildings or single-family homes and allow for all of the housing options in between. Where these housing options can be located is largely focused on proximity to the city's major employers and mass transit facilities which enables people to live a less car dependent lifestyle if they choose, which cuts down on traffic concerns, on-street parking availability or lack thereof and carbon emissions. Public input is extremely valuable but if that input is stating things that are not what the evidence indicates then, in my opinion, we should not be using that to make our decisions. With that being said, Steve and I do not vote on these items, we just provide our recommendation and the Commission comes to their own decision.

David Pasqua Letter re: Bettswood 6.27.23

The City will continue to evaluate the areas proposed for any rezoning. This area was recommended for consideration for 2-family zoning based on it's proximity to Wall Street and Route 1.

Jenn McMurrer Letter 6.21.23 (Included with scanned PDF's thru 6.27)

The City will continue to evaluate the areas proposed for any rezoning. This area was recommended for consideration for 2-family zoning based on it's proximity to the train station and surrounding zoning to the west, which is primarily 2-family zoning.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS RECEIVED ADDRESSED AFTER 6.28.23 HEARING

Good morning Steve, My husband and I were unable to make the last 2 public hearings in person but were able to dial in. While we don't live on a street that is part of the 1 to 2 family change, we are against the extreme increase in density in our East Norwalk area. Norwalk was ranked one of the top places in CT to live, why would anyone want to ruin that for us? We have the same belief as all our neighbors - traffic, safety, school, utilities, etc will be negatively affected. If we add a walkable community near the train station, that will only slow and congest the traffic even more as we wait at each light for pedestrians to cross. Adding people and cars and expecting them all to walk everywhere is an unrealistic vision. Please reconsider the density issue by removing the 1 to 2 family homes in East Norwalk. Thank you, Julie & Oliver Dizon, 41 Pine Hill Ave

Additional reductions in the proposed upzoning will occur over the course of the next couple of months as the Commission reevaluates and adjusts the areas proposed for upzoning. However, creating a more walkable community, regardless of whether its near a train station or not, will ultimately decrease reliance on automobiles and increase livability and property values as well.

3,601, 3,984, 7,700, 7,170, 6,965, 4,868: These are the density per square mile figures for the cities of Stamford, Norwalk, Bridgeport, New Haven, Hartford, and New London, respectively (source: Wikipedia 2020 census). 1,667, 932, 680, 1,360: These are the density per square mile figures for the towns of Darien, New Canaan, Wilton, and Westport, respectively (source: Wikipedia 2020 census). Is it your intention to turn the city of Norwalk into a city like Bridgeport, New Haven, Hartford, or even New London? That's the direction we're heading, with your new zoning regulations that will further increase our density / sq. mile. And the neighboring communities of Darien, New Canaan, Wilton, and Westport are going to be delighted because it enables them to continue having restrictive zoning practices, that keep the perceived riff-raff (i.e. people of lesser socio-economic status) out of their pristine communities. They'll still have easy access to shopping (in Norwalk). Their domestic staff, such as nannies, gardeners, etc., can live nearby (in Norwalk). They can keep crime out of their community. Tradesmen, such as electricians, plumbers, HVAC technicians, and carpenters, are nearby (in Norwalk). They won't have to build new schools, sewer treatment plants, increase emergency services, etc. They won't have traffic jams. They're loving it! Norwalk will be doing their dirty work. There was an article recently in the Wall Street Journal about how zoning laws contribute to racism and poverty. Did you happen to see it? It was very interesting. It reminded me of Norwalk, in that Norwalk is trying to 'take the high road' and be a zoning-friendly community by changing the zoning laws to permit increased density that will offer greater opportunities to disadvantaged people. That sounds really good. However, instead of improving the situation, you're going to make an already bad situation even worse by enabling the neighboring communities to perpetuate elitism. During your discussions, have you given any thought and consideration to this? Here's an idea: Instead of increasing the zoning in the areas of the city that are already the most dense (i.e. along the major transportation arteries), why not increase it immediately on the border of the neighboring towns? This will put our collective problems (i.e. this is a society issue) right on their front door, where they can't ignore it, along with the benefits of Norwalk that they so selfishly enjoy. By the way, my concern is not for my own neighborhood, as I am not located in the proposed up-zone area. My concern is for the city I've lived in for over 30 years. I'm all for change; I've witnessed plenty of it over the last 32 years. But there are two types of change - there's good change and there's bad change. Your proposed zoning changes are bad for our city. They will not make our community or region better. You're not paying close enough attention to the big picture. I think you guys need to go back to the drawing board.

Norwalk cannot dictate what other communities do with their zoning laws. While P&Z Staff is in agreement those communities could and should do more, that is beyond our control. We can only address what we feel is appropriate for our community. With that said, we anticipate further reductions to the areas proposed for upzoning. Even if the unzoning wasn't further reduced, single-family zoning would still be the predominate land use in the City.

Dear Norwalk P&Z Commissioners June 29, 2023 Thank you for holding 2 public meetings in the large room at City Hall. I attended both meeting on zoom and last night was so inspired by the outpouring and love-for-Norwalk that I hopped in my car and came down for the end of last night's meeting. I hadn't prepared to speak but wanted to show my support for a town/city that I love. It's not easy dealing with the public, I think everyone should -- and see how hard it is. You were all very good sports even when folks rambled on. I was especially taken by (A) how much pride folks have for Norwalk and (B) that they don't trust big developers. If you were to zone all these neighborhoods "Owner occupied" 2-family, I doubt you'd get much pushback. Corporate developers are snapping up properties all over the country and they get rich and downgrading once thriving cities and towns. It's no secret. Norwalk's history goes back nearly 400 years. And it's not so much a city but a whole lot of small neighborhoods. Out-of-town friends are amazed that I live in such a warm and welcoming community. Families have been here for generations while attracting new residents of all ages and diversity. Norwalk's art scene, old buildings and funky neighborhoods are an asset not a liability. While I understand that 31 zones are too hard to manage, please don't change Norwalk's character and charm. The many new condos going up in S. Norwalk are soulless and poorly constructed. We can do better. Below is a note that I sent to P&Z Director on 6-7-23 about my personal concern about the new up zoning proposal. I look forward to help in any way I can to keep Norwalk unique & wonderful. *Dear Mr. Kleppin, emailed 6-7-2023 I live on Yost St. in South Norwalk. It's a 1-block dead-end street on a salt marsh between Harbor View and Village Creek. I see this tiny street is slated to be zoned 2-family which I oppose. The old pre-Hurricane Sandy zoning has north side 1-family and south side 2-family (which makes no sense). There are a few older/grandfathered (owner-occupied) 2-family houses. Yost St. is charming -- and goes underwater every time the tide is 8' or more (7-10 times per month) We all live with our tide calendars prominently posted. Adding more density would go against any flooding mitigation proposals, wetlands preservation and would add more residents/cars, that would quickly be ruined by the salt water. Please take a second look at your map and keep Yost St. (District E) at the same zoning as our wetland neighbors in Harbor View, Village Creek & now Shorefront Park. All best, Trudy Hodenfield, 21 Yost St. Norwalk CT 06854*

Unfortunately, we cannot regulate who owns the units within a development, single family, 2-family or multi-family.

Hi Steve, Thank you for taking the time to come to our office meeting in Westport today. It was at my suggestion to our office leader. I have been selling the City of Norwalk since 1984. I although not living in the City of Norwalk, have been proud to be able to introduce it to many buyers. Many of them relocation buyers. However, that portion of the business has changed. Companies are not relocating buyers - but rather since Covid having them work remotely. I believe that Realtors who have such a vast amount of knowledge such as Ellie Balazs and Jeff Byington and others should be as Ellie suggested part of the input moving forward. Numbers of the luxury apartments that now dot the landscape in Norwalk have sent a standard for many multi- family landlords. High rents along with more children which will need overloaded school system to accommodate and educate them. This is respectfully submitted and hopefully as you said - there will be opportunities for some of the re zoning to be reconsidered moving forward. Please think perhaps of a meeting with Realtors who have such long history and understanding of Norwalk - which might be of value to you moving forward with such an enormous change to zoning. Sue Cooper

Sir: 1) There is too much traffic in Norwalk CT. 2) The already clogged roads are over capacity. 3) There are always backups 4) The traffic studies are flawed and do not show these conditions. Thank you Sch (Steven Schole)

As a taxpayer of Norwalk for a combined total of 27 years, I am appalled to learn that the City of Norwalk is trying to convert our single-family neighborhoods into two-family. Owning a single-family home has always been a dream of ours and we were blessed to obtain it. We do not want to live in a two-family or multi-family neighborhood. I understand this will create additional tax revenue for the City, but it will also lower our property values. We are writing this letter to ask that you not convert our single-family neighborhood into a two-family. We live on a cul de sac off of Ponus Avenue. The street is very narrow and was not built for cars to be parked on both sides of the street. There are some families on the street that have as many as 4, 5 and 6 cars per house. When cars are parked up to our driveway and across the street behind our driveway, it makes it hard or impossible to get out of the driveways. On March 23, 2023, a car hit my neighbor's parked car causing over \$15,000 worth of damage. We have a video of the damage on our Ring app. Our sideview mirror has been damaged along with the side rear of our car. I have witnessed a neighbor hit a parked car while driving between two parked cars. There is no parking on Ponus Avenue. Some of the residents use our street for additional parking. If you change the neighborhood to two-family, that will only create more of a parking problem, additional traffic and more disputes between neighbors. Residents from surrounding streets will park on our street. This will make it even harder for garbage/recycling trucks, delivery trucks, snow plowing and street sweeping. We do not agree that this will create affordable housing, and it will only make the neighborhood more overcrowded. Single family homes will be purchased by investors who will outbid prospective homeowners. They will then convert them to two-family as investments. We should not be punished because there is a lack of housing in Norwalk. I attended the Zoning meeting last week and listened to all the property owners who shared their disapprovals regarding this zoning proposal. Mayor Rilling also appears to be against the conversion of single family to two family. Not sure how this approval process works, but I would think that as the Mayor, he would have to approve it. Again, we are asking you to not change the character of our neighborhood. This will have an impact on our quality of life. It is not fair that it is even an issue. We would have to uproot our family and move out of Norwalk. I pray this is not part of the plan. By copy of this letter, I am asking our Council Members to support our position. Thank you for your consideration. Deborah and Victor Corley

Areas proposed for rezoning from either single family to one or 2 family or from 2 family to multi family are being reviewed and no decision will be made until all factors are considered and a thorough review completed.

I'm following up on my concerns raised with you, and at the P&Z Commission's public hearing last Wednesday, about which I'd like rational answers: 1. Why will Group Homes and Halfway Houses be permitted in 3S even though not currently permitted in AAA, AA and A? These uses are inappropriate for single family residential zones in general and for a myriad of other reasons such as public facilities and services. I don't think consolidation is a compelling reason in this case. 2. If GH and HH will be permitted in 3S why prohibited in 3L? In fact, these uses might be more suited for residences with larger lots! I haven't heard any reasons whatsoever to distinguish between 3S and 3L for these uses which means to me that the distinction is solely based on discriminatory reasons, e.g. wealth and/or political power of 3L owners. 3. Why will B&B and AirBnB commercial uses (by definition) for transient lodgers be permitted in single family residential only zones? These uses also create a substantial drain on public services, especially parking and law enforcement, and are specifically commercial uses which I understand are prohibited in 3S and 3L. I look forward to your responses. Thank you for your ongoing consideration. George Eichen

1 & 2) Staff is confirming with counsel on ensuring the definitions of those uses are correct and will align uses with statutory requirements and in keeping with existing zoning, whenever possible. 3) B&B are not a current use. They are proposed as permitted uses in the single and 2 family zones as well as many of the commercial zones. The Commission can consider making them special permit uses in the resident zones or not allowing them altogether. Airbnb is currently not regulated buy the City. The City has always viewed them similarly to any other rental property, so long as they are using them as a residential property.

Tanner Thompson Memos on Sustainability & Zoning Policy & Public Hearing Comments, received 6.29.23

Staff will be addressing technical issues through August and will provide responses during those phases.

Seelan Pather Memo re: CD-5 changes dates 6.16.23

Staff will be addressing technical issues through August and will provide responses during those phases.

Adam Blank Letter on 100' Rule & 1 Cemetery St presentation 6.29.23

Staff will be addressing technical issues through August and will provide responses during those phases.

In reviewing proposed Sec. 4.3.1-1 SD-H, there appear to be various uses that are noted as NP which should be revisited and changed to be permitted in the SD-H to enable Norwalk Hospital to evolve, flourish and serve the community. These include: congregate housing, nursing/convalescent homes (should this type of care be something contemplated by the hospital in the future), dormitories/multi-family (for medical students, medical residents intern, especially if new health- and medical programs emerge in the future that the hospital seeks to commence). Office should be permitted in addition to medical office, for administrative staff and hospital leadership. So should colleges or universities to afford the hospital the opportunity to offer programs to students in the medical/health care profession. Parking structures are permitted, but parking lots are not. This does not seem rational. Amphitheaters, auditoriums, and even libraries should be permitted so the hospital can continue its outreach to citizens through lectures and other events. Thank you for your consideration of these comments. Hospital leadership may have additional comments in upcoming weeks. Regards, Liz Suchy

Most of the uses seem appropriate in conjunction with hospital use; however, would be accessory to the hospital use, so maybe that is approach might make the most sense.

Lajoie's Auto Wrecking Letter & correspondences dates 6.30.23

Staff will be addressing technical issues through August and will provide responses during those phases.

My husband and I are 25-year residents on Olmstead Place in East Norwalk. Our daughter attended Norwalk public schools from kindergarten through 12th grade. Prior to purchasing our home, I met with the principal of Marvin Elementary School who generously gave me an hour of her time. As a teacher and concerned parent, I wanted to be sure that the elementary school our daughter would attend was well revered. I also met with the then Director of Public Affairs for the Norwalk Public Schools to get her perspective on the quality of the city's schools in general. Convinced that this would be a good experience, we decided to buy the house and move to Norwalk. Our daughter received, for the most part, a good education here in Norwalk. Since graduating 11 years ago, however, the student populations in the elementary, middle and high schools have dramatically increased, while the teaching staff has continued to dwindle. Just last week, The Hour reported that 6 teachers would lose their jobs, while there were 87 VACANCIES in Norwalk's school system! Yes, 87!!!! And to make matters worse, some teachers will actually have to SPLIT THEIR TIME AMONG THE VARIOUS SCHOOLS this year. I was horrified to read this. Additionally, billboards (4 at last count) are prominently displayed in Bridgeport along I95 and Route 8, desperately recruiting special education teachers in Norwalk! It's appalling to think we cannot provide a respectful education for these children; in fact, many parents must pay thousands of dollars PER YEAR to private professionals to get the services their deserving sons and daughters need. The #1 criteria for young, growing families considering moving to Norwalk (or any town) is living in a town that offers exceptional school choices and quality education for their children. Two-family homes and large apartment buildings are NOT the answer. Instead, they will serve to further overcrowd our schools where discouraged teachers are either quitting, choosing to retire early, or seeking employment in other, more supportive towns. And recruiting new, qualified teachers for schools bursting at the seams simply won't happen. The plan to INCREASE DENSITY when there is an EXTREME SHORTAGE of teachers is completely unfair to taxpaying parents seeking quality education for their children. The children, parents, and teachers deserve better. I implore you, and the entire P&Z Commission, to HALT ALL EFFORTS to up-zone and allow more 2-family zoning in East Norwalk, and all of Norwalk, as well. I understand and truly support a plan to simplify and consolidate zoning in Norwalk - WITHOUT, however, converting one-family zoned parcels to two-family parcels. Thank you, Kerrin and Bob Cole

The Commission is reviewing all areas proposed for upzoning and will make further recommendations on those boundaries over the next couple of months. However, providing more housing options and hopefully more affordable housing could actually increase the possibility of having more educational professionals reside within the community.

34 Meadow Street Letter, Rick Constantini 6.28.23

This language was widely debated as part of the industrial zones study. The Commission should consider whether it should be included going forward.

Rachel Pote Letter re: Manresa dated 6.20.23

Staff will be addressing technical issues through August and will provide responses during those phases.

My husband and I bought our existing conforming 2-family home in East Norwalk in 2004. We knew when we purchased it that we were living in a 2-family zone. For much of my adult life, I lived full time in a rented tenement apartment in Greenwich Village. After Charles and I bought our home, we started coming to Norwalk on weekends and it was a welcome respite from city life. In 2017, we moved here full time. We understand and appreciate how difficult it is to find true affordable housing. Indeed, we could have never purchased our home had we not had the rental income from our downstairs unit. In our early years of home ownership, we needed this income so we could pay our mortgage. Now it helps us pay for repairs and maintenance on our home. We know how important owner-occupied homes are. The concern for us is when you create investment opportunities for real estate developers who are in it for the money, not for the good of the community. We would not be as opposed to changing zoning in some neighborhoods to multifamily if they would indeed be owner occupied, much in the same way you would regulate ADUs to require owner occupation. We ARE opposed to how you are making these decisions. What makes Golden Hill different from East Norwalk? Why are you upzoning to multi-family zoning on the blocks closest to the entire corridor you've just upzoned to EVTZ? Your decisions occur to us as arbitrary – although we find it interesting that you've decided to scale back upzoning in neighborhoods where commissioners live. East Norwalk has already been upzoned 3 times in the past 10 years– 230 East Avenue, TOD Zone and the EVTZ . Why must you continue this assault on our once charming, historic neighborhood? In the TOD study, we implored you to reinforce the small town feel of this community – that would preclude allowing three and a half stories AS OF RIGHT on East Avenue. The current EVTZ will already create excessive density in East Norwalk. Instead of spurring affordable housing, I believe this plan is more likely to squeeze lower-income residents out of the area. This plan benefits upper-income residents, big developers, and real estate investors. More people equal more costs for infrastructure and reduced quality of life for us all. Already Norwalk does a lousy job of enforcing zoning – there are many illegal and dangerous multi-family homes resulting in overcrowded conditions, noise pollution and spillover parking. Does Mr. Baker's assertion that illegal apartments are simply testament to the need for more housing suggest that at some point there would be no more illegal rentals? I find that hard to believe. I also do not believe that density is going to drive down the cost of housing. We need only look to our neighboring New York City, which was my home for many years, to see how disingenuous this statement is. East Norwalk has streets and other infrastructure that were developed hundreds of years ago, and the number of cars and residents here is already well past carrying capacity. (Once again, what is the impediment to issuing residential parking passes?) Your so-called walkability plan is NOT going to change that. Already I walk and bike as much as possible but there are many errands that require a car, as does my job. cont.....

The Commission is reviewing all areas proposed for upzoning and will make further recommendations on those boundaries over the next couple of months.

You are overdeveloping this area which is violating our right to quiet enjoyment of our homes, overburdening schools and infrastructure, and threatening our watershed. We are opposed to this level of upzoning – not just in East Norwalk but throughout our fair city. Stop increasing density for the sole purpose of population counts and maximizing tax revenue at the expense of the quality of life for those of us who already live and pay taxes here. Roberta DiBisceglie, 2 Osborne Avenue, Norwalk, CT 06855

Domenick Sammarco Letter 6.20.23

The City made considerable changes to the industrial zones in 2022 and for the most part, has kept those changes in the new regulations. The Commission and Staff are supportive of growth of the industrial zones.

I have attended Planning and Zoning information sessions in person at City Hall and via ZOOM led by Steve Kleppin. Mr. Kleppin often stated that one of the premises of converting one-family zoning to two-family zoning is to give people an opportunity to own homes in Norwalk – a two-family home could be designated as two condominiums, making it more affordable for families to purchase homes in Norwalk. I am not following this logic. I have questions that I would like you to address:

- Where is the data that substantiates this claim?
- Currently, how many two-family “condo units” are there throughout Norwalk, and what areas are they located?
- Are there comparable cities like Norwalk that have undergone such a zoning change?
- Has that shown an increase in home ownership in those areas?
- How many 2-unit condos currently exist in Norwalk?

In my opinion, this will have minimal or no impact on increasing home ownership opportunities and provides more opportunities for “absentee landlords”. In fact, it could have an adverse affect – people may not want to purchase in a potentially more densely populated area and instead consider homes in the single family zoning areas, or in other more affordable cities/towns in Connecticut or elsewhere.

Also, why would this n-o-t apply to those Norwalk zones where zoning changes that were previously scheduled for “upzoning” be reversed? To me, it would be more desirable for a household to consider a condo on properties where lot sizes in general are larger such as Rowayton Village, Devil’s Garden, Shorefront Park and more?

Thank you,
Lisa Roger
11 Hayes Avenue, East Norwalk

Staff response regarding upzoning can be found at the Zoning Updates page on the City of Norwalk Planning & Zoning page: <https://www.norwalkct.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30508/Regulation-Rewrite-Memo-6-23-2023-to-Commission-with-Prior-Planning-Docs>

The spring hill area is already very dense and has many cars parked on the street constantly. Further expanding the multi-family zoning in this area will just lead to further congestion, decreased property values, and a lower quality of life for the residents living here.

There have been reductions in the amount of upzoning in this area. However, the hospital is one of the largest, if not the largest City employer. Providing as much housing opportunity and walkability in this area is important and good practice.

Please do not change B zoned Park Hill Ave. area !!!! It is unfair to long time property owners who have invested in single family neighborhoods like ours. This change feels like we are being punished for having dutifully paid our taxes and maintained our property. I believe this is akin to confiscation of property(value) without compensation.

The Planning & Zoning Commission is reevaluating all areas proposed for rezoning and will be making additional revisions to the draft zoning map over the next couple of months.

The idea of having to get a permit for tree removal is not the government’s business - it is overstepping its boundaries for property rights. If the town does not allow tree removal and a branch or the tree causes bodily or personal damage there will be lawsuits against the town - this is just wrong on so many levels.

This is not the case. You will only need to get a permit for vegetation or tree removal if you are doing site work, not associated with a building permit and greater than 5,000 SF, which is the size of a lot in the current B zone.

Park Hill Ave is a cul-de-sac with a turning circle designed in 1929. It's diameter restricts even garbage trucks from successfully negotiating the turn, and most elect to back down the street. A school bus (or firetruck) would be almost impossible. Many people enjoy walking this street and neighborhood with their pets and small children because of the lack of traffic and feel safe. Kids, dogs, and parents pushing strollers are inherently safer with fewer vehicles passing by. The opportunity for healthy outdoor activity is a benefit to the community and should not be overlooked. Allowing for increased density eventually would be detrimental to the health, safety, and well being of Norwalk residents. This portion of the street should remain single family and become CD-3S instead.

The Planning & Zoning Commission is reevaluating all areas proposed for rezoning and will be making additional revisions to the draft zoning map over the next couple of months.

I do not approve of the zoning proposal on certain areas in Norwalk. WE ARE NOT STAMFORD AND DON'T WANT TO BE LIKE STAMFORD. We are losing the hometown feel and it's ridiculous.

I was born and raised in Norwalk, continue to live and work here as a teacher (the schools are getting too full and not taken care of enough), and hope to continue to live here...however the city needs to stop building so many apartments and big buildings. It is taking away from the charm of the city. There are too many people, too much traffic. We don't need more two family houses or apartments - what we do need is more open outdoor easily-accessible public space - not every space needs to be developed

Data shows that the apartments do not meaningfully contribute to the school population. The draft zoning map is intended to provide for missing middle housing and smaller development options.

Why are we doing this on line. We need to use our city hall auditorium etc. All

Just as the Shorefront Park potential rezoning was reversed, instead of 1 and 2-family homes to allow only single family homes (B zone) and 54 Quintard Ave is zoned B, so should 56 Quintard Ave be zoned (B) and all the way down to Lowndes Avenue on Quintard. All of these have long been single family homes and there should be no zoning difference from Shorefront Park when you look at the layout. We pay very high taxes and specifically chose to live in a single-family block that has been peaceful for us for 20+ years. Please don't allow for 2-family zoning within this part of Quintard. -- Robert Weiner and Kathy Younkins, owners of 56 Quintard Avenue, Norwalk.

The Planning & Zoning Commission is reevaluating all areas proposed for rezoning and will be making additional revisions to the draft zoning map over the next couple of months. However, the draft zoning maps for this area is consistent with the existing zoning map.

Thank you.

To destroy current single family zoning in favor of multifamily zoning is OUTRAGEOUS. You will destroy our property values. Fix and rehab the current multifamily zoning to increase the grand list. Leave our single family zones alone!!!

Staff response regarding upzoning can be found at the Zoning Updates page on the City of Norwalk Planning & Zoning page:
<https://www.norwalkct.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30508/Regulation-Rewrite-Memo-6-23-2023-to-Commission-with>

Dear P&Z,

Your dedication to public comment should be commended; neighboring towns do not embark in such democratic diligence and while the answers for Norwalk residents may not to be what they want to hear, at least they have them.

Staff response regarding upzoning can be found at the Zoning Updates page on the City of Norwalk Planning & Zoning page:

I think there needs to be more clarity about the two-family zoning issue. What I don't understand is that an ADU technically makes a one-family property a two-family property. Good rental income for retirees or young families. But maybe residents think you mean to allow to subdivide the house itself versus having a detached structure, and that there's where the outrage is coming from. It may be prudent to table two-family or allow it by special permit in the areas that do not have it, and then in 10 years' time revisit the topic when the majority of attitudes change.

<https://www.norwalkct.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30508/Regulation-Rewrite-Memo-6-23-2023-to-Commission-with>
-Prior-Planning-Docs We agree that there is some misunderstanding and that ADU's also can provide the ability to retain home ownership and since those are already allowed, there is no actual increase in density because of the ADU's. Your comments on TOD and transit are interesting and considering our long term transportation needs is something the City needs to be vigilant of going forward. Regarding Route 1, the concepts your outline, are consistent with the intent and goals of the form-based code.

I do hope you are looking at TOD from the perspective of a multi-modal transportation system and the methods you can use to promote other modes, such as /safe/ biking (i.e., not shared but physically separated bike lanes), walking, etc. Transit Oriented Development is a laudable goal, but much has changed in the last three years. The rise of remote work and hybrid work makes TOD perhaps a bit less desirable (except where it can more than a half hour to get from West Norwalk to East Norwalk on Rt 1), and more importantly, the proposed 14% cut to Metro-North service after Labor Day 2023 and the correspondingly slight increase to fares, will negatively impact ridership even more. (*1) Crowded trains will not increase ridership. Residents of TOD communities will resort to private transportation instead.

Furthermore, while Norwalk dodged the bullet to dissolve the Norwalk Transit District this year, that is not to say it might happen in the future. And currently taking the bus from Norwalk to other towns is difficult. (*2) A hypothetical trip from the Battle of Rocks monument to Landmark Square, Stamford, takes an average of 1 hr 10 min by bus during non-rush hour. It's 20 minutes by car. (*3)

With the precarious position of existing public transit, what planning steps will Norwalk undertake to combat congestion while accommodating future density? Can you consider a future rebuilding of Route 1 with multi-modal transportation, with tree-lined sidewalks, physically separate bike lanes, a central light rail/tram line and a roadway with bus laybys (pull outs)? On a recent visit to Philadelphia, I pleasantly experienced just that. (*4).

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Jeremi Bigosinski, RLA

Regarding enforcement, you've previously stated multiple times, 'Staff responds to complaints and issues violations as quickly as possible, however, zoning is limited in authority to access a property where a possible violation may exist per law. '

1. Can you provide the definition of 'limited in authority to access a property'?
2. Can you site the specific law?
2. Can you provide the link to the current enforcement process?

There's a gap between zoning violations and enforcement given your response so is your commission working to address this gap? If not, who in our local government is responsible for correcting it so Norwalkers don't have to experience quality of life issues that are being ignored? I would like specific names. Please don't just say it's a different commission, parking authority or the police department.

The lack of enforcement is a legitimate component why this rezoning is causing such an uproar. You don't enforce the existing regulations and fall back on the position you don't have the authority. It will only become worse with the increase in density that you are striving for. It should be obvious to you and the mayor the enforcement process is broken and needs fixing even if that means coordination across multiple city functions.

Hi -

There's been multiple inquiries about keeping Ludlow Manor in a single family zone and your response was 'Staff would recommend that a thoughtful review of this area be considered by the Commission.'

We live on Merrill Rd which is a beautiful single family tree lined street with lots of young children and homes fast approaching 100 years in age. It is comparable to Ludlow Manor, with one exception that I'm aware of...that it sits on the .5 mile criteria distance from Route 1. In addition, one of the residents on our street coordinated with City Hall in 2021 to get 13 new trees planted (2 sugar maples, 1 red maple, and 8 yoshino cherry) along the street to replace a few mature ones that had come down over the years.

If Ludlow Manor is reverted back to a single family zone, could we know the specific criteria used to make that decision and if Merrill Rd meets it.

Thank you for your time and service!

The P&Z Commission has said multiple times renters not taking pride in their home or providing less of a community feel is not based on any facts but a matter of opinion.

However, many home owner associations cap the number of renters to 30% because they know from past experiences renters are often less invested in the property than the owners and don't care as much about curb appeal.

How do you reconcile this since this is a concern to many in our community?

1. Unless there is an open permit, we cannot access a property without the property owner's position. However, if a violation is visible from the street, we can pursue enforcement. 2. It is trespassing if we access a property without permission. 3. The process, as outlined in our Standard Operating Procedure is not posted; however, that can be posted. P&Z Staff is working with Jessica Vonashek and Tom Livingston to identify gaps in the system such as increasing communication, education & outreach, expediting the citation hearing process and adding staffing to address the shortfall. Stating we don't enforce the existing regulations is blatantly false. Every violation may not get corrected as quickly as the public may like, but we follow a statutory process. In addition, we prioritize some complaints and violations over others, such as illegal apartments, illegal auto repair and contractor yards.

The Planning & Zoning Commission is reevaluating all areas proposed for rezoning and will be making additional revisions to the draft zoning map over the next couple of months.

We would agree that some landowners who do not reside at their property do not maintain their property as well as some owner-occupied properties, but unless the property is in violation of zoning or blight, there is little the City can do in those situations. HOA's have private, civil abilities to seek enforcement on their neighborhoods.

Why are bed and breakfasts a permissible principle use for single family zoned neighborhoods??These are commercial enterprises and should not be permitted as a principle use by right! No one wants the single family house next door to be turned into a bed and breakfast where there is no way to know who is coming and going on a daily basis. This is a potential safety issue for children in neighboring houses. Would you be ok letting your young child play outside in your yard without knowing who is next door from day to day? I don't understand how this possibly adds any value to a residential single family neighborhood. Please limit this use.

Staff has no opposition to this use becoming a special permit use or not being allowed in the single-family zones at all.

In regards to "Section 6.11 Sustainability: A. Requirements" (pages 345-346), if the end goal is to have a measurable effect on heat island mitigation and improving urban drainage, this section should be expanded to include requirements not only for new construction, but for existing as well, as there is far more roof surface area for existing structures. We are a mere 7-12 years away (depending on whom you ask) from the point of no return for climate change and enacting policies that require a substantial investment now, will ensure a less costly investment for future generations.

Thank you for your comments. We are looking at ways to increase sustainability into the redevelopment process. We will be making more concrete recommendations to the Commission. The 25% # may very well increase, but 100% may not be possible with the constraints being placed on by our local utilities.

The average lifespan for a roof is 30 years. A well-built green roof can last 50. It makes economic sense to spend a bit more for a 166% lifespan.

A. Requirements

Language that says:

"Unless demonstrated by the Applicant that the proposed Use(s) or Building Construction makes it unfeasible, ..." should be removed. Otherwise, every applicant will try to think of fanciful ways to avoid implementing green roofs, solar roofs or blue roofs. If the solar orientation of the building prevents practical application for solar (such as shading trees), then a green roof can be utilized instead. And if the argument is that the roof needs to be pitched, there are construction methods for pitched green roofs. And if there's nowhere for the water from a Blue Roof to be stored, the suggestion under "C. Natural Drainage", Subsection 6 --recirculate stormwater from buildings-- is an excellent idea for sustainable non-potable water use that can also reduce operating costs.

Additionally, the 25% roof requirement for Solar, Green or Blue Roof is far too small for a 25,000 sq ft building footprint. It should be 100%. Rooftop Mechanical systems such as HVAC can be located within the 100%. Sustainable strategies should be mixed together. For example, 75% Blue Roof and 25% Solar. Or 25% Green, 50% Solar, 25% Blue, or 75% Green, 25% Blue, etc.

Language that says:

" All new Construction with a footprint of twenty-five thousand (25,000) square feet or greater shall also include stormwater management strategies identified in Section 6.11.2.C and the LID Site Planning and Design Strategies in the City of Norwalk Drainage Manual and Low-Impact Development Appendix of the latest Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual, unless demonstrated by the Applicant that it is unfeasible."

In regards to "Section 6.11 Sustainability: B. Solar Energy" (page 346): Section 1. Subsection B: "To the extent possible Solar Panels shall be parallel to the roof surface." This represents a substantial disadvantage for full-scale implementation of highly efficient solar. Best results for solar energy production are when the panels are perpendicular to the source, not parallel to the ground. Perhaps a demonstration of energy efficiency of how solar works would be warranted here, or ask a solar energy expert. If the issue here is to prevent shading of adjacent panels, then this needs rewording. Also, please consider a provision for rotating panels that rotate with the sun path. Section 1. Subsection C: "In Historic Districts, roof mounted Solar Panel location shall be referred to the Historic District Commission for Review." The Historic District Commission may discourage the use of /any/ solar panels. Can an alternative with ground mounted or "roof installed but hidden from pedestrian view" language be included here to increase the likelihood of solar adoption for historic structures? Section 1. Subsection D: "Signage or writing of any kind is not permitted on any portion of the system, other than required manufacturer plates and safety labeling." That's fine, but you also need to add a clause about shading the panels either intentionally or unintentionally through the use or construction of other things, such as antennae or cell towers or other roof structures that can cast shadows on the panels or design the system in such a way that existing or proposed trees, do not shade the panels either. This also concerns adjacent properties with existing solar. Section 2, Subsection B: "Maximum Height shall not exceed the allowable Height of an Accessory Building, in the District." Please ensure that vehicles can park underneath of the parking solar panels. For example, is a box truck taller than the height of an Accessory Building? Do you determine the maximum height to be up to underneath the panels or above them? Section 2, Subsection C: "All panels must be constructed of non-reflective materials, or treated with an anti-reflective material." Solar panels are made out of glass, which is a naturally reflective material, so the text here doesn't make a lot of sense. Even the Tesla roof tiles are reflective. There's a house on Bell Island covered with Solar Roof tiles; go there on a sunny day to see how reflective it is. Let me ask you this: do you require a glazed building to be built with non-reflective materials? Like the Merritt 7 buildings, all those have reflective glazing... Section 2, Subsection D: "Freestanding Solar Panels must be encircled by a security Fence or Wall a minimum of six

sct 1, sub sct b. We agree with this comment and will review further with our consultant. Sct 1, subsct C, Staff also agrees with this comment as well and will work on language to that affect. Staff will review whether additional language about potential shading is necessary. The solar canopies will not occupy the entire lot, but this must be accounted for by the applicant in any redevelopment scenario. Staff will review the glazing language to ensure it is appropriate. We will review the fencing requirement for appropriateness as well as with the building department to ensure public safety is met and code requirements are met.

feet (6') tall, with a vegetative Screen provided outside the security fence meeting the Screening standards of these Regulations." This item really doesn't make any sense. Fairfield Ludlowe High School does not have a security fence around their ground-mounted Solar Panels over the parking lot. This item should be removed but can be considered on a per property owner basis if the property owner is concerned with potential vandalism. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Jeremi Bigosinski, RLA Adjunct Faculty, Architectural Engineering Technology, Norwalk CC

I am a resident and home-owner in Norwalk. I have lived in my home on Ells Street for 33 YEARS, originally purchasing this home for the reason this area was ONLY SINGLE-HOME dwellings. I am AGAINST changing my street to two-family homes! I pay TAXES on a SINGLE-HOME AREA of Norwalk and expect the zoning to remain the same as when the property was purchased - PERIOD!!!!

The Planning & Zoning Commission is reevaluating all areas proposed for rezoning and will be making additional revisions to the draft zoning map over the next couple of months.

Thank you for all of your efforts. It would be very helpful if the city could produce a list of all properties that would become nonconforming as a result of the map changes and a list with addresses of all businesses and uses that would become nonconforming.

Staff can provide an analysis of Uses that will become nonconforming. However, we do not believe that many uses will become nonconforming. The combining of the single-family zones may results in some lots becoming nonconforming, but Staff will provide language to ensure that the combining of zones, does not result in hardships or excessive variance applications.

What are the total number of new apartments and other housing units that the proposed map change and zoning regulations could create? It would be helpful for us residents to get a sense of these numbers and where the concentrations would be. Have you evaluated the traffic impact and the number of new children to enter the school system? Thank you

Since the map is very likely to be change considerably, including reduction of the proposed unzoning, it is premature to undertake that exercise. In addition, traffic studies are not typically undertaken in zoning rewrites of this scale. That is because every application for development that is proposed must undertake analysis of traffic impacts, impacts on the wastewater treatment plant, availability of water, etc. It is important to note that development never realizes the maximum densities allowed because there are many other constraints on development such as parking, how tall a building can be, etc.

My apologies, but the zoning maps are difficult to read so I cannot site specifics on the map. I am a resident of South Street, zip code 06854. South Street is a narrow dead end street and is a mix of multi-family, single-family and commercial properties. It is not clear why or how this happened. The volume of cars parked on this street include residents overcrowding single and multi-family homes and employees of the commercial properties. South Street has been identified by DPW as one of the streets that is difficult for garbage trucks and plows to maneuver. What is your plan for streets such as these and in particular, South Street? Your time and attention to this concern is greatly appreciated.

The Planning & Zoning Commission is reevaluating all areas proposed for rezoning and will be making additional revisions to the draft zoning map over the next couple of months.

A few things to consider as you work on revisions to this draft. Language should be added that explains the process and timeline for applicants to receive unused portions of consultants' design fees as well as the process and timeline for bonds to be returned. In addition, Sec. 1.21.3C should include another section that specifies the so-called "Conroy doctrine" that the court has created which allows vertical building over nonconforming portions of structures. Thank you for your attention and consideration of these comments.

Thank you for your comments. Staff will review whether additional language is needed or more diligence by Staff is needed regarding returning of the applicant's design fees. Staff will review the appropriateness of allowing vertical expansion or whether that should require a variance.

Appreciate this forum for comments on the draft regulations. When will the revised map and revised proposed regulations be released so property owners and others can see the changes?

Has the city and/or the consultant created a master list of all properties that will become nonconforming (residential rear lots, residential properties where driveways and sidewalks will count toward coverage for example)? Is there a master list of all commercial properties that will become nonconforming (parking in front of buildings, landscaped islands etc.)? Is there a list of the estimated number of new apartments that could be created under the proposed regulations and the impact on the schools? Will property owners - residential and commercial - be notified that their properties will become nonconforming and what that may mean? Many simply have no idea of this and its significance. Thanks for this forum to add input.

Staff can provide an analysis of Uses that will become nonconforming. Although we do not anticipate that many uses will become nonconforming. The combining of the single-family zones may results in some lots becoming nonconforming, but Staff will provide language to ensure that the combining of zones, does not result in hardships or excessive variance applications.

Found the June 21 forum interesting and look forward to the June 28 forum. I think the city should have more of these public meetings in September and October once the revised draft map and regs are available for all to read, and these types of meetings should continue for as long as the public wants to attend. I see no need to rush through a complete rewrite of the regs especially since it hasn't been done in 40 years. Take your time, listen to the public and do it right - not fast. Another 6 months to thoroughly vet this document that will affect the city and its residents for years to come, won't hurt. Thank you.

There will be at least one additional public hearing to receive comment. In addition, the Commission will be meeting publicly to discuss various aspects of the comments received.

I am not in favor of changing zoning regulations. The changes to make single housing to multi or 2 family housing is going to make our neighborhoods and roadways more crowded with traffic and less parking. I do not want Norwalk to become Stamford or NYC. There is too much crowding and traffic as is.

The Planning & Zoning Commission is reevaluating all areas proposed for rezoning and will be making additional revisions to the draft zoning map over the next couple of months.

How are our existing roads going to manage more traffic? Already over burdened with too many vehicles causing heavy traffic on main thorough ways (ct ave, westport ave, main ave, East ave, Newtown ave, West ave..) Think we new to stop all new construction until infra structure thought out and implemented to accomodate existing new numbers and then maybe more numbers/units

Every application must verify that their project will not negatively impact the traffic network. In addition, for more complex projects, the City utilizes an outside peer review system to ensure the projects are designed appropriately.

I attended Steve Kleppin's meeting 26 June 23, BHHSNE, Westport; and have not yet read all the presentations. My questions pertain to regs regarding 'clear-cutting' by developers, and homeowners. When any permits are issued, can we pay close attention to "Our Tree Canopy" as a matter of our health? As it relates to our environment and climate change...I witnessed the destruction of that beautiful Beech at 124 East Ave, parking lot, thru the owner's lack of care! BerkshireHomeServicesNewEngland was 1st tenant beginning 2011. I think Norwalk Tree Advisory Group must have a stronger hand (permit-wise) to reflect where we live...Between I-95, Route 1, & Merritt Pkwy!

The proposed regulations regarding vegetation and tree removal are new to Norwalk and are meant to protect Norwalk property owners for unattended development on an abutting property. It is important to note that tree maintenance and tree removal of diseased or trees threatening their property is allowed, as-of-right, provided the area is less than 5,000 SF in area.

I think it is despicable that the Zoning Commission and Zoning Department is even considering to change single family neighborhoods to two-family. There is already not enough parking on the streets for single families. People who live on streets such as Ponus Ave that do not allow parking will park on streets off of Ponus, thereby creating a parking nightmare. One family to two family neighborhoods will also lower our property values. I do not wish to live in a two-family neighborhood and would have to uproot my family. And no one will enforce the parking on the property that owners must have to qualify for two-family residences. There are many violations now that do not get enforced.

The Planning & Zoning Commission is reevaluating all areas proposed for rezoning and will be making additional revisions to the draft zoning map over the next couple of months. Please note that any property developed for a 2-family dwelling MUST provide four (4) compliant off -street, compliant, parking spaces.

There is an overwhelming amount of information on the proposed new zoning regulations. To date, the media has focused on the plans, which have been revised, for multi family zoning.

The Commission is evaluating where the zoning boundaries ultimately should go and it is very likely that the upzoning will be reduced. Once that has been settled it is possible that an additional single-family zone may need to be added, which should address the setback issue you raise. For areas that will be combined, a clause has been proposed to address any nonconformity on the issue of side setbacks. Staff would be happy to address your last comments off line: skleppin@norwalkct.gov

Can the City and Media please also summarize the other changes in zoning in an easy to read format!!

For instance, it looks like the AA zoning side setbacks are being reduced by 33%, and yet other residential zoning setbacks are not being changed. This is material. I am not sure why this has not been discussed. And, I am confident that most AA property owners are unaware of this change.

And, I suspect there are other material zoning changes buried in the onslaught of information that have also not been discussed.

I think many residents are just resigned to the fact that Norwalk zoning will just do as they wish. And, for good reason based on recent events.

It would be helpful if there were opportunities for residents to attend sessions on other days of the week than just Wednesday.

Wednesdays are the days the Commission normally meets. In addition to in-person meetings, there are other opportunities, such as this form to provide comments to the Commission.

If someone has a conflict on a Wednesday there is no opportunity to participate.

I think such important events should be scheduled on different days of the week so more residents can participate.

The proposed regulations for the CD-3S zone suggests 10' side yard and 20' rear yard setbacks. This will make hundreds of B residence zone lots/structures nonconforming. This does not make sense for a community that is already established and built, and will prevent property owners from adding onto their homes. The proposed regulations should be revised back to 6' side yard and 15' maximum rear yards.

The Commission is evaluating where the zoning boundaries ultimately should go and it is very likely that the upzoning will be reduced. Once that has been settled it is possible that an additional single-family zone may need to be added, which should address the setback issue you raise. For areas that will be combined, a clause has been proposed to address any nonconformity on the issue of side setbacks.

Thank you for responding to comments - the information is instructive and enlightening. However, many of the responses are not substantiated with empirical evidence. For example, it is noted that staff has reviewed the impact of various proposed zoning reclassifications on property values. Has the city or its consultant undertaken appraisals to demonstrate this? Similarly, has the city or its consultant undertaken traffic studies to evaluate the impact of increased density? We always are required to listen to an applicant's consultants - is there similar data that the city gathered on these topics?

While we did not perform appraisals, Staff has put together development pro-forma's and analyzed property value data which is included in a memo sent to the Commission. That memo can be found at: <https://www.norwalkct.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30508/Regulation-Rewrite-Memo-6-23-2023-to-Commission-with-Prior-Planning-Docs>

<p>My name is Anthony and I live on Fairfield Ave. I'm going to refrain from mentioning how long I've lived here or whether or not I own a home, because I want to remind everyone that the city has a duty to all of it's residents. New or Old, renter or property owner, we deserve equal voices in the place we live and work together. I'm testifying in support of up-zoning, but first I'd like to address one of the concerns of the very vocal minority we appear to have in this city. Over the last few weeks I've heard them complain about the insane traffic in this city, the never-ending stream of cars that clog up the streets daily. They blamed this on the claim that "Norwalk is full" which should seem immediately ridiculous given the all the other larger, denser cities which handle their transportation needs more efficiently. The problem is obviously car traffic. But why is there so much? And the answer is single family zoning. When you have huge zones of single family housing, so spread out that you need a car to do anything. It's no wonder you're forced to use your car. I don't want to live like that. And a lot of my peers are coming to the same conclusion. I want to be able to bike and walk places and robust public transport so that I'm not forced to take a massive personal vehicle everywhere. I want more than density. I want a functional & complete city, not a drive-thru city. Even if everyone like me lived in the center of town (and most of us do), we still have to deal with the car traffic from the suburbanites. Who retreat to their personal castles at the end of the day for peace and quiet but then drive their personal vehicles through my neighborhood every day. Honestly you have to laugh when you hear them complain about traffic, when they ARE the traffic. Here in the center of town, we end up paying the price for their lifestyle: for single family zoning. The new zoning is a step in the right direction, but there are several changes I would like to see made. I want the parking minimums reduced across the board. The current requirements for CD-5, 4 and 3 are based on pseudoscience and they are going severely hamper sustainable development. Keep that in mind as wildfire smoke engulfs Norwalk again in the near future and we grapple with the exacerbating climate crisis. I like the inclusion of neighborhood retail in CD-4 and I would like to see it included in CD-3 and lower even. Everyone should have stores within walking distance. I want to see more requirements for bike parking in the denser zones (for induced demand).</p>	<p>The City is continuing to evaluate their parking needs going forward and has provided reductions as appropriate over time.</p>
<p>Thank you for listening to my concerns. And I hope that you make the decision to up-zone Norwalk and allow us to transition into a walkable, bikeable, sustainable city.</p>	
<p>My name is Joan Ridgeway and I have lived on Mack Street for over 30 years. this is a small street, small capes, with small lots of 50 x 100. There is parking on only one side of the street, and that side has many curb cuts. there is very limited street parking. I just can't imagine changing the zoning to allow 2 family homes, with parking for 4 cars on such a small street.</p>	<p>The Planning & Zoning Commission is reevaluating all areas proposed for rezoning and will be making additional revisions to the draft zoning map over the next couple of months. Please note that any property developed for a 2-family dwelling MUST provide four (4) compliant off -street, compliant, parking spaces.</p>
<p>Section 4.3.17 Private Lighting Standards has some basic requirements for reducing light pollution, but they currently appear to be fairly minimal. Has the zoning commission considered additionally adopting some of the recommendations of the International Dark-Sky Association, such as in their model policies? https://www.darksky.org/our-work/lighting/public-policy/model-lighting-laws-policy/</p>	<p>Staff will review this section again.. We are in agreement regarding dark sky compliance in the appropriate zones.</p>
<p>I am opposed to changes in Norwalk zoning laws that will lead to greater density that will lead to more traffic in the Merrill Road neighborhood where I live.</p>	<p>The Planning & Zoning Commission is reevaluating all areas proposed for rezoning and will be making additional revisions to the draft zoning map over the next couple of months.</p>
<p>Can you compile a Master list of Every Street in Norwalk and what the current zoning is and what the proposed is. The maps are difficult to read</p>	<p>If you are having difficulty using the map, please contact P&Z Staff and we will assist you.</p>
<p>I oppose zoning that increases density near my home at 2 Riverwalk Lane. It's ridiculous that zoning was approved on Richards Ave across the Five Mile River disturbing wetlands and animal habitat for Alzheimer's facility, the new duplex community and probably also the proposed duplex complex which have destroyed the character of the adjacent neighborhood. Christine Henry</p>	<p>Riverwalk Lane is currently single-family zoned and is currently proposed to remain single-family zoned.</p>
<p>Thank you for your work on this. There seems to be a discrepancy in the parking space dimensions set forth in the CD-5 proposed standards and proposed Sec. 4.3.12.C. I think one says the spaces at 10x20' but the other says 8.5x19'. Is this a misreading of the sections?</p>	<p>We are looking at the stall dimensions to ensure they are appropriate and consistent.</p>

Good afternoon. I noted in the answers to comments shared and which are available online to review, that the staff "researched" and evaluated peer review information on impacts to property values and concluded that the upzoning or downzoning (depending upon your perspective) will not negatively affect property values. Can you share that information that you reviewed? Are there appraisers on staff who can evaluate this impact? If not, shouldn't there be? Have you discussed these proposed changes with the tax assessor to see if he agrees with your conclusions? I envision multiple tax appeals being filed, supported by analyses by certified appraisers, that may impact the city's grand list. Thank you.

While we did not perform appraisals or discuss this with the Tax Assessor's Office, Staff has put together development pro-forma's and analyzed property value data which is included in a memo sent to the Commission. That memo can be found at:
<https://www.norwalkct.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30508/Regulation-Rewrite-Memo-6-23-2023-to-Commission-with-Prior-Planning-Docs>

Creating a sustainable, liveable, and walkable Norwalk can only be done by increasing our density and creating car free zones. The rollback in up zoning is a short sighted move that only works to appease current home owners without taking into consideration all the renters and future home owners in the city.

Our only way of getting out of this housing crisis is to build more housing, and the only way to do it sustainably is through density. Additionally, by zoning a large portion of the city to single family housing, you are not only driving up building costs but are also endorsing land waste and lowering tax revenue (<https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2023/6/21/whats-the-sweet-spot-for-building-housing-inexpensively>).

If we want to set up norwalk for success in the 21st century, we need to be bold. The first map was bold, watering it down because of "property values" and "neighborhood character" will only serve to cement the haves and the have nots.

Re:Current Aaa zoning -the proposed regulations not to require a 1 acre lot, relying on frontage measurement as the controlling criteria. I am totally opposed to this change. The assumption that frontage measurement is an equal criteria for buyers is without foundation. A minimum one acre property is visualized, and in reality does provide for the space desired by individual property owners. The frontage measurement has no meaning whatsoever in the real estate world. A fine example is my next-door neighbor, who has an extremely limited street frontage, but has had, by variance, a home built on a 1 acre property, and its market value is determined by the 1 acre lot size rather than the street frontage. The idea that restricting, the measurement to frontage will not have an effect on property values is invalid. The concept that it will produce additional home sites is also unproven and invalid.

For the single family zones, we are inserting the minimum lot areas as well as the lot width requirements.

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the city's proposal to change Veterans Memorial Park from AAA zone to CV CD zone, and Seaview Avenue from a D Zone to CD 4W zone. I firmly believe that this plan will pave the way for increased commercial activity in our predominantly residential community, which is a cause for concern. While I understand that certain public parks may warrant these changes, I believe it is necessary to make some exceptions. I have no objection to the Oyster Festival, parades, and public ceremonies being held there, however, I believe that the following uses should be reconsidered with careful consideration for special permit approval: - Amphitheater: Permitted by Right - Auditorium, Community Center, or other Place of Assembly: Permitted by Right - Performing arts theater: Permitted by Right with Limitations - Restaurant: Permitted by Right with Limitations - (*LOOPHOLE*) Other civic uses not specifically listed under any category: Permitted by Right. Although the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) suggests utilizing waterfront locations for restaurants, employment, recreation, and festivals, it also emphasizes that the public realm should be designed primarily with people in mind, rather than focusing on vehicular needs (page 233). As you are aware, Norwalk's Complete Streets program intends to add over 50 new parking spaces along Seaview Avenue, a significant portion of which will be within the park. I strongly believe that it would be a disservice to our community to capitalize on Norwalk's only Memorial Park by introducing an amphitheater, food and alcohol sales, and activities that require amplified sound, all of which would disrupt the peace and tranquility of the neighboring homes adjacent to the park. Much like memorial parks across the country, zoning regulations should respect the purpose of a memorial park, providing visitors with an atmosphere of natural beauty, offering peace for quiet meditation, and instilling a sense of dignity and honor in memory of our loved ones. I urge the commission to reconsider and exclude this area from the proposed changes, as a gesture of respect for the park's intended purpose. Thank you for your attention to this matter. Sincerely, Charles A. DiBisceglie, 2 Osborne Avenue

Staff is reviewing the use table and expect to make revisions to the allowed uses shortly, including where commercial uses are allowed in CD-4, as well as where the CD-4 zone bounds will be. In addition, allowed Civic Zone uses will be reviewed as well.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER 7.10.23

I purchased my home in East Norwalk in March 2020 (pre pandemic) to be closer to family members moving from the Upper West Side of New York City. I chose East Norwalk due to the proximity to NYC/airports and loved the small city feel with amenities without overpopulation. I wanted to live in a walkable area near water. I found the perfect place here in East Norwalk, however, I am dismayed to say the least at the monumental changes proposed since moving here. East Norwalk can not sustain the changes you are suggesting. The added population to this area will cause devastating stress: 1) on traffic from I95 Exit 16 in both directions. It is so stressful to try to lineup to get onto the exit, especially going north anytime after 2:30 pm - 6:00pm. The number of near accidents is incredible as well as the drive down East Avenue to my home on Marvin St. It's an obstacle course with continuous near misses in rear ending. 2) Water supplies- 3) Services- fire, police, garbage collection, schools. Needless to say, if you continue to change the dynamics of this area many people will move away. **In addition, I purchased my property as a one family home and it is unfair to change it.** You must reconsider the up zoning in East Norwalk. Sincerely, Sarita Cole, 14 Marvin St, East Norwalk, CT 06855

At their August 9th special meeting, the Commission authorized the issuance for discussion, a greatly reduced draft map regarding proposed upzoning. Many areas in East Norwalk previously proposed for upzoning have been removed.

Re:Current Aaa zoning -the proposed regulations not to require a 1 acre lot, relying on frontage measurement as the controlling criteria. I am totally opposed to this change. The assumption that frontage measurement is an equal criteria for buyers is without foundation. A minimum one acre property is visualized, and in reality does provide for the space desired by individual property owners. The frontage measurement has no meaning whatsoever in the real estate world. A fine example is my next-door neighbor, who has an extremely limited street frontage, but has had, by variance, a home built on a 1 acre property, and its market value is determined by the 1 acre lot size rather than the street frontage. The idea that restricting, the measurement to frontage will not have an effect on property values is invalid. The concept that it will produce additional home sites is also unproven and invalid.

P&Z Staff is recommending that the minimum lot size requirement for all the single-family zones be put back in as a requirement.

Hello, first of all thank you for undertaking this process. I know it's hard to balance everybody's opinions. I am looking forward to a more walkable city as a result.

One of the impetus' and goals of the industrial zones rezoning was to preserve as much of the existing industrial land for future job growth. Some of the rezoning proposed in the area, particularly within the DC-4 area does allow for some limited neighborhood commercial uses.

My comments are around two areas currently zoned for LI which I think would benefit greatly from an increase in permitted uses:

1) The small parcel of LI around Woodward Ave & Burritt / South Main - it's an obvious, and walkable, gathering place for the community and preventing further development of restaurants, bakeries, cafes, and other 'village essentials' type businesses would be detrimental to the community.

2) Similarly, the LI district along Woodward, Meadow St and Wilson Ave. Especially the tract along Woodward - this is super walkable land bordered by *lots* of housing, and it would be great to allow a wider variety of uses to create a focal point for the community. Eating establishments, retail, etc would be walkable for tons of people. There's also the new school going in nearby, too.

Thanks for your consideration.

I am a senior citizen and cannot attend the in-person sessions, however, I would like to express my feelings and would like to know who/how I can do this and be sure it is seen by someone who is intimately familiar with the rezoning plans/process. To whom should I address my concerns. Felice Werwin - 22 Saddle Rd, Norwalk

City Staff will reach out to Ms. Werwin.

I live on Highview ave, located a few streets from stew Leonards. there are only single family house on lots lest than 1/4 acre. this street is on the map to allow 2 family housing which would only bring down the values of the house and possibly add unnecessary traffic to street many kids play on. there is no mass transit in the area so i do not know why you would ruin these single family neighborhoods. please amend the zoning map according. we do not need to add multi family housing to the single family neighborhoods

The Highview Avenue area has been removed from the proposed upzoning.

Please do not change our neighborhood into a duplex zone. We have lived in Norwalk for over 60 years because of the ability to live in a nice middle class one-family neighborhood. And, with the thousands of apartments being built, the density is already through the roof.

No address provided to address the comment.

We are searching through the Q&A as of 7/17/23 and have been unable to find the rationale behind retaining Rowayton's Devil's Garden neighborhood (within .5 mile of MNRR Station) as single family, and why East Norwalk side streets have not been changed back to B single family.

At their August 9th special meeting, the Commission authorized the issuance for discussion, a greatly reduced draft map regarding proposed upzoning. Many areas in East Norwalk previously proposed for upzoning have been removed.

The remaining historic single family homes that are zoned single family should not be changed to multi family. Don't destroy our neighborhood.

No address provided to address the comment.

This is in regards to switching sections of the Hayes Ave/Amundsen Ave/Naples/Ave area of East Norwalk to CD-3 from the current B. These three streets, with a cross by Seldon St. form a small enclave set apart from the area due to their being all dead ends. The three streets north of Seldon are presently set to C zone (multi) while the parts of the three streets south of Seldon are B zone (single). Full disclosure, my home is on the edge of the C zone, bordering Seldon. There would be no change to my own property with any proposed changes. The concern is related to those parcels of the three streets south of Seldon.

The neighborhood was built about 100 years ago, with somewhat small parcels. The roads are each somewhat narrow, and when people park on both sides, the travel lane is wide enough for one vehicle, but not two passing.

We have seen, and even DPW in the winter has publicly commented, how Hayes is too narrow with all the parked vehicles on the northern end of the street, due to several houses which are multi family. Not all from Seldon north are currently in multi family use, but about half of them are. There is precious little off street parking. Thus, on street parking is tight, bordering on unsafe due to the tightness. Emergency vehicles do have a tough time at times.

The concern I have is with the parcels south of Seldon. Each street dead ends. The streets remain narrow. Off street parking and even land, are very limited. Should those parcels be allowed to shift to permitted multi/two family, the ability to move around on those dead ends will be severely restricted when more vehicles are parked. And, where and how will those vehicles turn around to be able to exit the neighborhood? Nice, wide, round cul-de-sac's were not built 100 years ago!

When I first looked at the old maps, I thought "well, that's dumb, splitting the streets up like that." But on further examination, it makes sense because of their being dead ended.

If the new regulations will require conversion from single to multi and, in order for that to take place, the parcels must have 4 off street parking spaces, that will help, as many of these parcels simple won't be able to accommodate 4 off street spaces.

The best way to understand the demands of parking and access would be to visit the neighborhood just about any evening, after most people have returned from work, say, 7 pm. One drive down Hayes will convince you.

Please reconsider the upzoning for this neighborhood enclave as it simply can't support it.

Staff has driven the area multiple times and during the evening when it is likely more residents will be present. While the streets dead-end, Seldon, while narrow, does provide access out to other streets. What is very noticeable about the single family dwellings and 2-family dwellings in this area is how most are legally nonconforming to required parking. Many have no off-site parking and if they do they are often barely enough to support 2 vehicles. The new regulations require four (4) compliant off-street parking spaces. And if they cannot provide that they cannot obtain a permit to construct a new 2-family.

I believe the Uses table is a subset of Article 4. There was not a good category in this comments form to discuss the Uses table.

This error has been flagged for correction. Distribution and storage should not have been allowed in SD-LI and are recommended for deletion. However, warehousing does not generate the traffic volume that distribution does. The inconsistency regarding amphitheatres has also been flagged for correction.

This is concerning the SD-LI permitted uses. In particular, the ability, as of right, to have any parcel zoned as SD-LI to be able to have warehouse, storage, and wholesale distribution is not compatible with the Light Industrial concept. Today's modern warehouse/distribution facilities are large scale heavy industrial facilities, using sophisticated conveyor systems and semi automated storage and picking systems.

A key factor to consider here is that these sorts of facilities, and SD LI in general are located as Norwalk has developed over the past 200 years. Today, these are generally located surrounded by dense residential areas. Further, they are located where the surrounding roadway and other infrastructure facilities are not designed for efficient access and exit from the SD LI properties. A warehousing facility will, by definition, require significant numbers of trucks, of many sizes to support such a facility. These will, due to their locations throughout the city, be travelling through residential areas, on roads designed many decades ago, and not built to handle the weight and wear.

SD LI permitted options, such as office, R&D, light manufacturing and the like are more compatible when the SD LI is considered in the totality of the surrounding areas. Warehousing and distribution is not.

I urge the commission and P&Z department to remove warehousing and distribution *AS OF RIGHT* for SD LI. This should actually be a not permitted use, in my opinion. However, if you cannot switch to NP, then such a use should be set as a Special Permit USE and certainly not as of right.

Side note: In the SD LI use chart, under Recreational and Entertainment, "amphitheatres" are shown as PL, but under Cultural and Entertainment, they are Not Permitted. there's a contradiction.

New Zoning Regulation

Good morning. We're hearing differing dates/timelines for further public comment, Commission hearings, final adoption of regulations and the zoning map, effective dates and action by the Commission. It would be helpful to have an update calendar that provides property owners and other interested parties with the latest timeline and benchmark dates.

Once Staff and Commission work through more of the edits we will have a more firm date for additional hearing(s) and adoption of the regulations. It is likely it will not occur until later in October or November.

I urge you to reconsider upzoning the Seldon St neighborhood. As it stands today, street parking deters residents access to their homes and even city services like trash pickup or snow plowing having difficulty due to the fact that there are several homes with multi units in the area and/or illegal units. Emergency vehicles would not stand a chance to help those in need.

Staff has driven the area multiple times and during the evening when it is likely more residents will be present. While the streets dead-end, Selden, while narrow, does provide access out to other streets. What is very noticeable about the single family dwellings and 2-family dwellings in this area is how most are legally nonconforming to required parking. Many have no off-site parking and if they do they are often barely enough to support 2 vehicles. The new regulations require four (4) compliant off-street parking spaces. And if they cannot provide that they cannot obtain a permit to construct a new 2-family.

I am highly concerned that this will become a further issue and impact quality of life in the neighborhood as well as my property value. I am not interested in living in a multi family upzoned neighborhood and my home / my real estate investment will be negatively impacted. I am a lifelong resident of this city and these changes are extremely detrimental to the quality of life here. Enough!! Stop the upzoning in residential areas.

A previously submitted petition signed by the majority of home owners on the street has requested that Ludlow Manor, E. Norwalk NOT be changed from single family. It is a small narrow street with small single family homes on small lots and is presently as congested as is safe. Please find this petition submitted to the mayor and act upon it. Jim Dobbs 13 Ludlow Manor.

Ludlow Manor was removed from the proposed upzoning.

Letter from the Ahearns dated 4.8.23 regarding 4 Mack St.

Mack Street and the northern part of Knorr Street currently allow 1 or 2 families depending on the minimum lot area. Lots eligible to become 2-families have not, which is further evidence that the market will dictate the appropriate use. Staff recommends leaving zoning as proposed, which is mainly consistent with current zoning.

Lisa Brinton Thompson, Overcrowded Streets

At their August 9th special meeting, the Commission authorized the issuance for discussion, a greatly reduced draft map regarding proposed upzoning. There was considerable discussion regarding the individual streets. While further changes are likely, in Staff's opinion, the streets where upzoning is still proposed are appropriate.

Jason Little Letter 7.18.23

Form Based Code: Staff is in agreement regarding not wanting to stifle or curtail design or other improvements. We will review with the consultant the ability, which will probably occur through the special permit process.

Penalties/Enforcement: Language has been reviewed by Counsel. Staff recommends no change.

Downzoned Areas: Because of the removal of much of the upzoning, an additional single-family zone, which mimics the existing B Residence zone will be added.

Edits: Staff will be providing a list of all the accepted Commission edits prior to any additional public hearings as well as supporting staff memos.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER 7.10.23

George Eichen Letter 8.10.23

Comments previously addressed. Staff has no issue either removing B&B's as an allowed single-family use or allowing via Special Permit. Staff disagrees regarding Airbnb's. Any single family house can be rented now as either an investment property or someone could be located overseas for a year(s) and rent their dwelling. So long as the dwelling is used as a dwelling and not rented out for family reunions or event space, it is being used consistent with any other single-family dwelling.

I appreciate the update on Cottage St and Upzoning.

I know most of the neighbors on Cottage St do not approve of this.

You said the plan was reduced by 70%? So why are the four streets remaining? Is it because they are poorer neighborhoods and you think the neighbors will not object?

I have included the Mayor in the correspondence because I want it perfectly clear that this is not good for the street. Fire trucks have a hard time getting through the street as it is. It will give developers incentive to tear down the older homes that give integrity to the neighborhood. The neighbors that I spoke with DO NOT WANT THIS. It would go from a C to a CD4 zoning. Why? Is it because developers with big bucks are pushing for this? It is VERY difficult to get by on the street as it is. Enough!! We do not want this!!

As for myself I own 1 Cottage St and plan on moving back in soon. But I have no driveway and front yard. I have not budgeted the driveway needed to stay within the Architectural integrity of the home. It will involve me tearing down the belgium brick to the left and rebuilding and reworking it somehow. The parking on the street continues to be a big problem. This upzoning is a disaster for me.

Please pass this along to the council and keep me informed of any meetings. The best way to reach me is on my phone 203 434 1678 via text. but i will also be checking my email.

Thank you,

Georgette Wirth

The Cottage Street areas is concluded in the upzoning, based on its proximity to the East Norwalk Train Station. It is important to note that the Commission discussed only permitting the large multi-family development for properties within 0.25 miles of a mass transit station. This would most likely result only the eastern most properties being included in that area. Also, any properties that adds units or redevelops must provide the requisite parking on their property.

Please don't use my name, but I would like to pass along a thought about the current discussions about changes in the zoning code. This is a thought I've seen mentioned in other communities as well.

When a minority of residents become very vocal and hostile in opposition to a proposed change, it is hard for residents who support the change to speak up because they fear being targeted by the hostility that's already being expressed to the city government or board/commission proposing the change.

In this way, a majority opinion in favor of the change -- or certain aspects of it -- may be quashed.

To Steve and the Commissioners:

You have advised that Connecticut General Assembly Sec. 8-3e provides that so-called 'group homes' in (1)-(4) below are and will continue to be by right in all single family only residential zones. If the Commission agrees with that conclusion, please confirm that the restrictive portion of the statute which I have highlighted below in BOLD applies to such group homes.

Sec. 8-3e. Regulation of community residences for persons with intellectual disability, child-care residential facilities, community residences for persons receiving mental health or addiction services and hospice facilities. (a) No zoning regulation shall treat the following in a manner different from any single family residence: (1) Any community residence that houses six or fewer persons with intellectual disability and necessary staff persons and that is licensed under the provisions of section 17a-227, (2) any child-care residential facility that houses six or fewer children with mental or physical disabilities and necessary staff persons and that is licensed under sections 17a-145 to 17a-151, inclusive, (3) any community residence that houses six or fewer persons receiving mental health or addiction services and necessary staff persons paid for or provided by the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services and that has been issued a license by the Department of Public Health under the provisions of section 19a-491, if a license is required, or (4) any residence that provides licensed hospice care and services to six or fewer persons, provided such residence is (A) managed by an organization that is tax exempt under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or any subsequent corresponding internal revenue code of the United States, as from time to time amended; (B) located in a city with a population of more than one hundred thousand and within a zone that allows development on one or more acres; (C) served by public sewer and water; and (D) constructed in accordance with applicable building codes for occupancy by six or fewer persons who are not capable of self-preservation.

Thank you.
George Eichen, Esq.

This question has been addressed by the Commission's outside counsel and our own counsel. Groups Homes are considered a protected class and must be treated like other single-family uses in single-family residential zones.

Mr. Kleppin, Please be sure to copy this letter to the full P&Z Commission and enter it into the record.

We are writing to express our ongoing apprehension regarding the City of Norwalk's proposed upzoning plan for our neighborhood. Specifically, we are troubled by the suggestion to rezone the segment of Cottage Street where it intersects with East Avenue to a CD-4 zone, as well as the proposal to change our portion of Osborne from a C zone to a CD-3 zone.

Furthermore, the City's intent to rezone Veteran's Memorial Park from an AAA Zone to a CV CD zone, and Seaview Avenue from a D Zone to a CD 4W zone, seems indicative of an impending surge in commercial activity within our community - a prospect we find unsupportable.

We respectfully request that you consider implementing a moratorium on any upzoning, and indeed, any further development, throughout Norwalk for the following reasons:

1. The City's current enforcement of traffic, parking, and housing regulations leaves much to be desired. Amplifying density will exacerbate an already problematic situation.
2. We have already surpassed the carrying capacity of our land. Constructing in flood zones and wetlands is ethically indefensible.
3. Our infrastructure, including schools and water supply, is presently strained to its limits. Let us address our existing concerns before assuming additional burdens.

We implore you to pause and carefully consider these concerns before moving forward.

Sincerely,

Roberta and Charles DiBisceglie
2 Osborne Avenue
Norwalk, CT 06855

The Cottage Street areas is concluded in the upzoning, based on its proximity to the East Norwalk Train Station. It is important to note that the Commission discussed only permitting the large multi-family development for properties within 0.25 miles of a mass transit station. This would most likely result only the eastern most properties being included in that area. Also, any properties that adds units or redevelops must provide the requisite parking on their property. Staff and the Commission agreed to remove the Seaview Ave area from the CD-4W area. All municipal property is proposed for the CV Zone, which is appropriate. Lastly, there is no evidence of negative impacts on the City infrastructure as a result of development.

To: The Honorable Commissioners of the Planning and Zoning Commission

Staff recommends that if the City feels that Airbnb's are a problem or something that should be regulated, that a City ordinance would be a better route.

I object to B&B and AirBnB uses in single family residential only zones. I can readily say that having such a use next door to me in zone CE-3S would be undesirable. How about any of you?

1. I have listened to Commission meetings and read Staff memoranda on this issue. My biggest concern is whether there are any actual benefits to Norwalk permitting these Uses by right or by SPU. I recognize no substantial benefits. Can Norwalk get some inconsequential revenue, maybe. But such revenue would not be sufficient enough to favorably balance the extra work to our city employees who will now have to create and enforce additional rules, guidelines and conditions. If P&Z staff are unable to supervise and enforce regulations, neighbors, by necessity, will have to police and report violations. I'm sure I'd be thrilled if a neighbor becomes agitated with me when I turn them in!
2. With due respect, Norwalk is not a destination vacation community although our public beaches are lovely. As far as I know, Norwalk does not advertise itself as a resort community and does not even have a substantial vacation hotel or resort population. It seems to me that the number of people who do or might rent for these uses is minimal at best, so why go through the effort of developing and enforcing short term rental rules and regulations; just prohibit.
3. Such uses are substantially similar to hotels, motels, inns, lodges, etc., all of which are now and will be prohibited. New rental type designations are contrary to current Norwalk policies.
4. By P&Z definitions, B&B uses, and AirBnB by analogy, are both a Lodging Use characterized by bedrooms of a building offered to paying transient guests for overnight lodging. "LODGING USES: a Commercial Use sub-category characterized by premises available for daily or weekly renting of bedrooms for periods of less than 30 days." The only difference between B&B and AirBnB use is that a B&B offers an undefined breakfast. Is breakfast toast and coffee, or toast, coffee and a scrambled egg? An AirBnB could also offer breakfast. AirBnBs can be an entire house or a room within a house occupied by the owner. These are differences without distinction. Regardless, these uses are commercial, for profit businesses which are inappropriate for single family only residential zones. If these business are permitted, why not others? Norwalk has the opportunity to maintain our single family zones regardless of varied solutions other communities are devising.

5. These uses are not and will not in any way be similar to other permitted uses in Norwalk single family zones, such as parks, religious facilities, playgrounds, firehouses, sports fields, schools, etc. Why do we want to allow any commercial uses in our single family neighborhoods?

6. Such uses will add extra burden on public services and facilities, such as garbage collection, snow removal, policing, parking problems, noise, parties and transient neighborhoods.

For these reasons, I object to B&B and AirBnB uses in single family residential only zones.

George Eichen, Esq.
10 Beechwood Rd.

Johan Lopez Letter Dated 9.20.23

Hello, I currently own and operate a Group Day-Care Home out of my single family home in the A residence zone. I wanted to point out a discrepancy in the draft zoning regulations use table, and also make a request to expand the allowed uses.

1. Currently Group Day-Care Homes are allowed as of right as an Accessory Use to a Single Family dwelling in all residential zones, and Child Day-Care Centers are allowed with Special Permit as an Accessory Use to a school or place of worship in all residential ones. Under the new Use Table Group Day-Care Homes are only allowed in zones 4, 4, 4W, and 4C, and Child Day-Care Centers are only allowed in zones 4, 4C, 4W, 5, and 5W. This change will make existing Group Day-Care Homes and Child Day-Care Centers legally non-conforming, and limit the growth of new day-care options for Norwalk families. Was this an intentional change? If not, I would ask that you update the use table so that the Group Day-Care Homes and Child Day-Care Centers at least retain their current allowances within the residential zones.

2. Under the new Use Table, Child Day-Care Centers are allowed in zones 4, 4C, 4W, 5, and 5W under a special permit. There is a maximum of 35 children and a minimum of 500sf of lot area per child, and no occupancy limit if the use is accessory to a school, place of worship, community center, etc. I am asking that you create an intermediate level of Child Day-Care Center to be allowed in the residential zones 3L, 3S, and 3. It would still require a special permit and would have a maximum of 24 children and a minimum of 500sf of lot area per child, and would have to be an accessory use to a single family dwelling. I believe it is important to maintain a way for small and medium sized home based day-cares to exist in residential zones, i.e. "where the homes are". When day-cares are discreetly located within residential neighborhoods it helps families, reduces miles driven, and the children have safe non-commercial streets to use for daily neighborhood walks. There is always a need for more child-care facilities in Norwalk, and this proposal would create space for medium sized home based centers, while maintaining the Planning and Zoning Commission's discretion to ensure that the center conforms with the character of the neighborhood, meets parking and drop off requirements, and would not cause problems for nearby neighbors.

As an example, I have space in my home to expand my day-care from 12 children to 24 children, but because the daycare is in my home, and not in a church or school, I cannot apply for a special permit under the current zoning regulations. The revised regulations are an opportunity to create more day care slots for children. If a single family residence has the minimum required lot space for the number of children, and could be licensed for that number of children by the state of CT, and would meet all other requirements related to fire code, parking, screening, outdoor play spaces, etc., there is no reason why it should matter that it is not also a school or house of worship. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Respectfully, Mayra Garcia

Staff has proposed suggested revisions to the Use table to address this. However, adding a new classification for daycare is not advisable.

Current Norwalk FEMA regulations have the most restrictive definition of "substantial improvement" of any coastal town in Connecticut. Norwalk includes the costs of all changes to a building from the time it was created. If that cost is 50% or more of the value of the structure, the proposal is a "substantial improvement" and the structure must comply with FEMA regulations (typically requiring the structure to be lifted so the first habitable floor ("FFE") is 1' above the base flood elevation ("BFE") which is the height of a 100 year flood event.

The proposed definition of "substantial improvement" shortens the look back period to 10 years but halves the allowed costs to 25%. As indicated in an earlier public comment, other coastal towns vary the look back period from 1 to 10 years with the average at 4+ years and none of them use 25%.

I support shortening the look back period but suggest the period be 7 years which is still substantially more restrictive than most coastal but more relaxed than the proposed 10 years.

I do not understand the rationale for reducing the 50% cost allowance to 25%. Why does staff propose this change which is not consistent with any of the comments made in the 2019 Planmetrics report and is such an outlier given how other coastal towns administer the FEMA program?

I suggest the Commission consider adopting the Planmetrics proposal to increase the minimum FEMA height in high hazard flood zones from 1' above BFE to 2' above BFE. This is consistent with how some coastal towns are tightening regulations and actually will increase resiliency of Norwalk's coastal buildings. In light of climate change impacts on mean high water ("MHW") with the DEEP predicting a close to 20" rise in MHW by 2050, this change would be more effective in protecting properties for a longer period than reducing the cost allowance of "substantial improvement" to 25%. Increasing the FFE height to 2' above BFE would also put Norwalk at the forefront of coastal communities seeking to increase resiliency of its structures in high hazard flood zones.

However, if PZC decides to increase the FFE required to comply with FEMA, it should consider ways to relax building height limitations in a high hazard flood zone to encourage retention of existing structures. I would be

Respectfully,
Wilder Gleason, Esq.
Norwalk Resident since 2007

Staff has previously provided a memo outlining the rationale for the proposed changes. While we acknowledge that the standard is still restrictive, it accomplishes what the FEMA regs recommend; allowing for upkeep and maintenance of the structure, but for significant projects they should make the structure flood compliant.