

Town of Trumbull  
CONNECTICUT

Planning and Zoning  
Department  
Telephone (203) 452-5044  
Fax (203) 452-5169



Town Hall  
5866 Main Street  
Trumbull, Connecticut 06611

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**WEDNESDAY, JULY 15, 2020 MINUTES**

The Planning and Zoning Commission held a Special Meeting on Wednesday, July 15, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. via videoconferencing.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Fred Garrity, Chairman  
Anthony Silber, Vice-Chairman  
Larry LaConte, Secretary (remote)  
Anthony Chory  
David Preusch, Alternate  
Tony D'Aquila  
Donald Scinto

**ALSO PRESENT:** Rob Librandi, Land Use Planner  
James Cordone, Town Attorney  
William Chin, Director of Information Technology  
William Maurer, Town Engineer

A quorum being present, Chairman Garrity called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN/ZONE CHANGE/OTHER**

1. **5065 and 5085 Main Street:** Applicants, K&K Developers, Inc., Trumbull Shopping Center #2, LLC and WEA CT Houses LLC are requesting a Special Permit with a site plan to allow a proposed 260 unit multi-family residential community and associated site improvements pursuant to Art. II, Sec. 3.4, of the Town of Trumbull Zoning Regulations. **File #20-04**

Chairman Garrity opened the meeting by explaining the reasons for the special meeting. He thanked staff for their coordination in making the live and Zoom meeting happen. He also explained that the application is being made toward a regulation that was passed in 2018. Details of the application would be discussed tonight and at a subsequent meeting.

Attorney Cordone presented an overview of the Governor's Executive Orders regarding videoconferencing. He also discussed procedures for the meeting and public comment via videoconferencing. He thanked staff for their efforts.

Rob Librandi presented his staff report on the application. The full text is available with the agenda which are posted on the Town of Trumbull website. He mentioned that the application had received

approval from the Police Commission at their meeting on the previous night. A correction to the notes for Sec 3.4.6 should read 260 units, 64 1 Bedroom and 196 2 Bedroom. External signage would require an additional special permit as the proposed does not meet setback requirements. If approved, application must go to Office of State Traffic Authority (OSTA) for review. Librandi discussed aspects of the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD). He asked that letters received for and against the project be submitted into the record.

John Knuff, Hurwitz, Sagarin, Slossberg, & Knuff (147 Broad Street Milford CT), Attorney Knuff representing the applicants, K&K Developers, Inc., Trumbull Shopping Center #2, LLC and WEA CT Houses LLC discussed the MDD and the two parcels – Mall parcel and Main Street parcel. He remarked that all notices had been posted and letters had been mailed. Last week they held a neighborhood Zoom meeting to receive comments. A total of seven speakers will discuss various aspects of the application.

Leonard Glickman, Rose Equities (CA), described his involvement with the project as an owner-builder.

Steven Fluhr, Rose Equities (1 World Trade Center NYC NY), discussed impact of the project to the mall area and similarly built projects.

Scott Loventhal, Garden Homes Management, discussed the parcel on Main Street which consists of 10 acres and the site plan for five four-story buildings. He also discussed the fiscal and education impacts of the project, expecting that it will generate 27 school-age children. He mentioned that the community will be gated with access cards and a 24 hour manager on-site.

John Schmitz, Civil Engineer with BL Companies (355 Research Parkway Meriden CT) reviewed the site plan, access points, and pedestrian crosswalk. He described the queuing of three cars at the entrances and turn around areas. Chairman Garrity had questions concerning the queuing and turn around. Schmitz mentioned that the plans provide 64 garage spaces and 437 surface parking spaces. He summarized the stormwater report and described the runoff which would require 3 detention systems. He mentioned that WPCA had approved the sanitary sewer system.

Dave Minno, Minno & Wasko (283-299 Market Street Suite 1700 Newark NJ) displayed a PowerPoint presentation showing architectural plans for the buildings. The full PowerPoint is available with the agenda which are posted on the Town of Trumbull website.

Wayne Violette, Landscape Architect with BL Companies (355 Research Parkway Meriden CT) described landscape considerations for the project. He mentioned that they intend to save some of the existing large trees. If necessary, substitutions of species would be discussed.

Chairman Garrity informed the audience that due to the length of the application presentation, public comment would not be heard at this meeting but would be heard at a subsequent meeting.

Michael Dion, Project Engineer in Traffic with BL Companies (355 Research Parkway Meriden CT) explained the data collection for the traffic study which was conducted in October, 2019. The full Traffic Study is available with the agenda which are posted on the Town of Trumbull website.

Commissioner Chory asked about the bus stop. Attorney Knuff responded that it would likely be south of the main entrance. Discussion ensued among the Commissioners and Attorney Knuff about left turns, the gated entries, exiting from the development and traffic flow.

Lovental presented answers to the questions posed in Librandi's staff report. The response is available with the agenda which are posted on the Town of Trumbull website. He remarked that the Civil

Engineer would provide more detailed information about the main entrance and queuing at the next meeting.

Chairman Garrity asked the Commissioners to raise any issues that they needed clarification on to be addressed before the next meeting. Issues mentioned included: safe access to public transportation; parallel parking; protecting parking in front of garages; night lighting shining in windows; sound buffers between the development and the Merritt Parkway; walking to the Mall; how many students using the bus; are the elevators adequate; additional expenses for town services; responses to the Engineering review; maintenance of the sidewalks; the turnaround; details on walkability and biking to the mall; availability of light and elevators upon losing power; adequate parking; any room for growth; and the future of the mall.

**Motion Made** (Chory), Seconded (D'Aquila), to continue the hearing on File #20-04 to the August 19, 2020 PZC Meeting at 7:00 p.m.

**Vote: 5-0**                      **Motion Carried**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:19 p.m.

Dated at Trumbull, CT this 22nd day of July, 2020.

By: Linda Finger, Clerk.

Good Morning,

Please forward my concerns/questions to the board. I sent an email to the planning and zoning department with my concerns/questions but did not receive a reply.

I have a few questions regarding the plan submitted regarding the apartments.

What is the target rent at the neighborhood meeting the developer said \$2000-\$2800 per months, however on the application and in other comments made they stated \$1900-\$2400.

Is there a maximum occupancy per unit? Are there any fire code regulations regarding maximum occupancy of individual units? Can a one bedroom have 3 people or 1 more or is it limited to 2 maximum. Same question for a 2 bedroom are there limits say my husband and I rent a 2 bedroom but then my adult daughter and family move in with us going from 2 to 5-6 people. Is the proposed parking enough for 260 units.

How will the issue of personal property tax be addressed? If college students rent they are not likely to register their cars in Trumbull. The same question applies for all residents, as we all know not everyone who lives in Trumbull changes their registration to Trumbull within the required time frame costing the town revenue.

The developer noted a decrease in school population and the decrease in enrollment at Frenchtown. Frenchtown's enrollment decreased because they had to move students from the Royce apartments to Middlebrook to reduce the student population. How is it that the Royce has 105 students enrolled in TPS only counting those in 1 and 2 bedroom apartments and yet the new apartments are projecting 27? The Royce also under projected the student enrollment when they submitted their application to build.

Can the town adjust fees/tax liability if it is found that that the developers property tax projections are grossly overstated and school enrollment is understated?

Annamarie

Dear Planning and Zoning.

I am against approving the new apartment at the mall. These apartments should fall under the moratorium.

There has been no time to fully understand how the already approved apartments will affect Trumbull. As I resident, I do not feel we need more rentals. Even if a mixed use Redevelopment at the mall is needed it should be with an ownership model not a rental model.

I also believe that no decision of this magnitude should be made with out the public being able to be present.

With Regards , vote no!!

Susanne Berne And Mark Chandler  
18 Tashua Parkway Trumbull

Dear Planning and Zoning Committee,

We are vehemently opposed to the proposed multi-family residential community in the Trumbull Shopping Center location.

Our family has lived in Trumbull since 2005. We feel our town cannot support the additional influx of people and children that this complex would bring in. We cannot fund the current education budget as it stands, let alone adding potentially large numbers of students. If you look at the student increases from the most recent apartments constructed in town, you'll see that those numbers contribute to possible additional sections in Jane Ryan. How will these teachers be funded? Clearly the taxes collected do not cover the cost of students. There is also a matter of police funding and other first responders to take into consideration.

Please do not grant this proposal. Keep the small town feel of our community that made us want to raise our family here.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Jon and Jenn Burke  
40 High Ridge Road

Dear Members of Planning and Zoning Commission,

I am writing today to urge you to reject the special permit requested by K&K Developers, Inc, Trumbull Shopping Center #2 LLC and WEA CT Houses LLC. We have no idea yet what impact the other apartment project will have on the town and board of ed resources. I understand the desire to develop and bring in more tax revenue, but we need to be careful about how that happens. I don't believe any developer when they try to estimate the number of children that will be added to the school system when they have zero idea of who will want to buy/rent their property. We are already in a terrible situation with the Board of Ed budget...please don't make it worse by approving this permit.

Thank you,  
Laura Citarella  
50 Westfield Drive

I wanted to be sure my questions were received by the group, in the event they will not be addressed on the zoom call tonight. Please see below:

1) School Impact: it was noted that the impact, of this housing development, will be minimal to schools (an additional 25 kids?). How can this be determined or even controlled? What surveys and/or research were done to validate this? The schools are already over crowded, and limited with resources due to many budget cuts. There is no way to monitor or control this. Saying that you are targeting specific communities with this project, such as seniors & young professionals, is not an answer nor is it plausible. You can't and won't be able to control who the residents may or may not be. In fact, if the apartments don't rent what is your plan? Dorms? Low income housing? Will we need double the buses for schools?

2) Young Professionals: This idea/concept of apartment does not "fit" in Trumbull. If you are really looking to attract the young professionals, as it was explained in the last meeting, you will not find them near the Westfield Mall in Trumbull. This is not the right location nor the right price point. Again what research or surveys have been done in Trumbull to be confident with this target audience? In all honesty, this development would thrive better in areas closer to a train, beach or downtown area such as Fairfield, Norwalk, Westport, Stratford, Milford.

3) Senior Housing/55 plus: I ask again has there been any surveys or research done, in Trumbull, to see if there is any interest among the senior community to reside near the mall and in a gated community? How does a layout really work well for a Senior? Why would they want to live in close proximity apartments with multi levels? In fact, can you guarantee this set up will allow for easy accessibility from car to the home? Most people I know don't want to deal with walking through hallways, steps, elevators to get to their home.....especially when carrying packages, mail and groceries. Again this does not fit.

4) Safety: has anyone taken into consideration the ongoing concerns of many Trumbull residents, specifically in regards to the overall safety in and around the mall area? Over the last couple of years there have been many acts of violence, theft, assaults etc, at the mall. In short many don't feel safe being in the mall at certain times of the day and even going alone. So I ask: why would anyone want to live next door to the mall and in a gated community? We already have condos around that area, why more housing? This same sentiment was clearly and strongly brought up during the last meeting, which I fully agree with. Not the right location.

5) Health and Wellness: specifically in regards to the current global health crisis with concerns of proper air ventilation, social distance and even close living space. Do you think it is feasible and safe to have apartment style living as a future plan in Trumbull? It has become very clear that more people are looking to steer away from that? In fact, many who are looking to relocate from the city to CT, specifically the Trumbull area, are looking for free standing homes or town houses that are separated. Again to my point earlier, this development does not fit in Trumbull.

6) Why not a Costco or better yet a satellite campus site for Sacred Heart or UCONN? These would function much better for the location and be a better utilization of the space, including opportunities it would create for many.

I hope the project team, for this development, seriously listens to the many voices of concerned Trumbull residents. In a world where things are becoming more and more disjointed, I hope you can all respect the community this will ultimately effect.

Thank you for your time  
DawnMarie DiCocco

To whom it may concern,

I write to the committee to encourage it to approve the plans to build the apartments at Westfield for one reason only: it is their private property and they should be free to do with it as they see fit, provided what they do does not directly harm another's property.

It would be unjust and immoral for the Town of Trumbull to deprive the owners of the property their right to dispose of said property however they wish.

I urge you to do the moral thing and approve the plans.

Thank you.

Steve Dincher,

Citizen of Trumbull.

Good afternoon,

The apartments being proposed at the Westfield Mall must be stopped. The town of Trumbull is not made to be overwhelmed by new apartments especially when there are existing vacant apartments to be filled first. If you give them this opportunity to build 260 apartments, what happens in the future to the rest of the mall space? Will they turn the rest into more apartments and overwhelm our education system? The Mall business model is being devastated by online shopping. Do you want to give them this leeway to build more and more over time as the mall becomes less profitable? It's a fact that you need to keep in mind for the future of our town. It is NOT just about now. Moving here 6 years ago, my favorite part was the quaintness and the suburbia feel. We are not a city. Please stop trying to push this on the town. Once you continue to expand like this, it gets out of control. I lived it in Brooklyn and in the Bronx. Overbuilding does not bring anything good. Just burden for years to come. If you overwhelm the education system and cause it to lose credibility, you will lose the desirability of the town which in turn affects property values. That's a guarantee.

I respectfully ask you to vote NO.

Kind regards,  
Patricia Kelly  
15 Gibson Avenue

To the members of Trumbull's P&Z.

As a lifetime Trumbull resident and tax payer I strongly urge the P&Z to vote extend the moratorium on apartments for 3 years in Trumbull and deny the application from K & K development.

File # 20-04.

Consider the LONG TERM IMPACT to our town. The viability of the mall is NOT in jeopardy and is a card the developer is playing.

Not only will this application, in all probability have a major impact on our schools but also on our emergency services as well. Let's take the time to see what the other 500+ new units impact on our town is prior to approving the additional apartments.

This in no way is in the benefit of Trumbull and our POD for future land-use.

Please, think of our town and STOP the madness!

Mark MacKeil

27 Edgewood Ave

Trumbull, CT 06611

While not much has changed about my feelings of this project, I know that it is not relevant to the subject at hand.

I also know several of you voted against the change that is allowing this to happen and I want to thank you for your foresight while looking out for the best interest of the town. This project is not that.

I understand it is the developers and their attorney's jobs to put this in its best light but I don't believe they are being fair to our town. I get it is their job to make money and only pretend to care about us in order to get what is best for them. But their estimation on children, regardless of who they say they are marketing to, is far lower than what we can expect in reality. As I have said a number of times, as a local realtor, I have never had someone call me about a rental in Trumbull that does not have children and you would be surprised how they are willing to in order to do so. And Trumbull has nothing to offer a younger generation that does not have a child/children and as someone hoping to retire someday, an apartment on Main St. in Trumbull would never be my goal or that of anyone I know personally. I can live elsewhere for that kind of money much nicer.

Now I can sit here and rewrite all my objections to this project but I think Tracy Vonick said it best in today's letter to the editor.

[https://www.trumbulltimes.com/opinion/article/Letter-We-need-more-time-and-answers-15410253.php?fbclid=IwAR1eswK3XWWcaB-GP87nan3X9eOmKqUcH\\_1k-dAhetWAPWcE25\\_AwmJxclc](https://www.trumbulltimes.com/opinion/article/Letter-We-need-more-time-and-answers-15410253.php?fbclid=IwAR1eswK3XWWcaB-GP87nan3X9eOmKqUcH_1k-dAhetWAPWcE25_AwmJxclc)

So I say ditto. I hope you will take every bullet point to heart and consider them all with the intent I believe they were written; in the best interest of the Town of Trumbull and its future. One we hope will exist long after we are gone.

Cindy Penkoff - Realtor & Trumbull Resident

From: Sarah Tropp <[saeltr@yahoo.com](mailto:saeltr@yahoo.com)>  
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 12:27 PM  
To: Roberto Librandi <[rilibrandi@trumbull-ct.gov](mailto:rilibrandi@trumbull-ct.gov)>  
Subject: Residences at Main

Dear Mr. Librandi,

I am writing to you to express my support for the planned Residences at Main project. As a Trumbull resident and homeowner, I feel that this project will support the town's tax revenue and commerce due to its convenient location adjacent to the mall.

Additionally, I feel that the project will make Trumbull residence more obtainable for young people without families. Several years ago, I moved out of my parents' home in Trumbull, but I was unable to afford any form of rented housing within the town, so I was forced to look elsewhere, despite having a strong desire to remain in town. As soon as I was able, I purchased a home in Trumbull, and now reside in the Tashua area. However, had ample rental housing been available, I would have remained in town for those years without question. I believe that young professionals who grew up here or are looking to take advantage of the many new businesses both in town and in surrounding towns will find that Trumbull makes a comfortable and desirable place to live, if they are given the opportunity.

I strongly support the proposed Residences at Main, and I thank the town for considering the project.

Sincerely,  
Sarah Tropp-Pacelli  
167 Fresh Meadow Drive  
Trumbull, CT  
203-331-7862

Dear Members of the Commission,

I have lived in Trumbull for my entire 45 years and chose to raise my family here 17 years ago when my husband and I bought our first home. I've always considered myself to be a "lifer", but that has come into serious question the last few years, as I am saddened and honestly scared of the direction our town is headed in.

The approval of the Westfield Development will drastically change the face of my beloved town even further and I am begging you all to deny this application. We do not need or want this in Trumbull. Look at what happened to Avalon (now the Royce). We don't need a repeat of that at the gates of our beautiful town off of Exit 48, we don't need the burden of our public services like education, police, fire, EMS, etc. The cons far outweigh the potential pros with this development.

Further, a development like this will not make Trumbull more attractive to families and its not going to attract young professionals from NY or Stamford either - don't fool yourselves.

I strongly urge you to listen to your neighbors and say NO to the "Residences on Main" and continue the moratorium on multi family rental developments.

Janel C Volpicelli

Tracy Vonick  
155 Killian Ave  
Trumbull, CT 06611

TO: P&Z Commission

Re: Development application for 5065 and 5085 Main Street:

Mr Chairman & Commission Members;

I will be unable to attend the Zoom meeting tonight, but would like my comments read and entered into the minutes of the Public Hearing section of the meeting.

1. I would request the application and public hearing be postponed and/or extended until the regular August meeting to allow the public time to review the full documentation and attend any neighborhood information sessions the developers have indicated they would provide.
2. I would request the public be allowed to attend the meeting and voice their opinions directly rather than a Zoom meeting.
3. The developers should be required to deed restrict a number of affordable units above and beyond the minimum threshold within CT State Statutes (8-30(g) I believe) or the application should be rejected.
4. Are the developers receiving or been offered any special tax deferrals, abatements and/or reductions in conjunction with this application pertinent to the proposed development or existing Westfield Trumbull Mall property? If so, who within the Town Administration held these discussions and on whose authority were they offered?
5. The developers have stated the "positive fiscal impact on Trumbull" and net revenue is estimated to be \$910,000. Are they willing to make any written guarantees to a minimum amount of revenue for any number of years? If services are required beyond their estimates (Fire, Police Education/Children, etc...) are they willing to put in writing an escalating payment schedule in proportion to the extra services being provided?
6. Please ask The First Selectman, yes or no, does she support the application as presented before you?
7. As presented, I am not in favor of this application at this time.

Thank You  
Tracy Vonick