



CITY OF DANBURY
155 DEER HILL AVENUE
DANBURY, CONNECTICUT 06810

ZONING COMMISSION
(203) 797-4525
(203) 797-4586 (FAX)

MINUTES
APRIL 11, 2006

=====
The meeting was called to order by Chairman Jack Knapp at 7:35 PM.

Present were Theresa Buzaid, Anthony DiCaprio, Ted Farah, Theodore Haddad Jr., Helen Hoffstaetter, Richard P. Jowdy, Donald Kennedy, Jack H. Knapp Jr., Robert Melillo and Alternates Victoria Hickey and Joseph Notaro Jr. Also present was Planning Director Dennis Elpern.

Absent was Alternate Jean Anderson.

Chairman Knapp led the Commission in the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Melillo made a motion to accept the minutes of the March 28, 2006. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoffstaetter and passed unanimously.

=====
PUBLIC HEARING:

7:30 PM – Petition of the City of Danbury by Dennis I. Elpern, Planning Director to Amend Secs. 3.H.3. and 4.F.3. of the Zoning Regulations. (Amend Lot Frontage Regulations and Use Regulations in the R-O Zone)

Chairman Knapp read the legal notice into the record. He then read the Planning Commission recommendation, which was positive.

Dennis Elpern then spoke in favor of this petition. He said the purpose of these amendments is to help ensure buildable lots that are not too narrow for their intended use. He made reference to a drawing that he had prepared to demonstrate this. He said the first part requires that lot frontage defined as the width of the lot at the street line, be a minimum of fifty feet. This was inadvertently deleted with the housing moratorium amendments. It also adds provisions to clarify flag lots and deletes the design provisions governing access ways since these standards are included in the Subdivision Regulations. This will prevent any conflict between the design standards in the Zoning and Subdivision Regulations. He added that in this case, zoning is subservient to the Subdivision Regulations. The second part states that all proposed lots must meet the minimum lot width requirement, which is defined as the width of a lot between side lot lines at the front yard setback. He pointed out that the minimum lot width is measured at the front setback, not at the lot frontage along the street line. This will allow flexibility in design,

especially where side lot lines cannot be extended perpendicular to the street line (e.g. cul-de-sacs). In order to prevent oddly configured lots which get narrower once they meet the front yard setback, this also requires all lots to remain at least fifty feet in width from side to side. He said no proposed lot width can infringe on required setbacks or minimum square requirements even if they otherwise meet the fifty foot width requirement. Existing lots which fail to meet these requirements cannot be reduced further and are protected as nonconforming lots. He said the proposed amendment to the R-O Zone will add minimum lot widths since there currently are none. He said all other zones except C-CBD include minimum lot widths, so this will just clarify the existing regulations. There was brief discussion among the Commission members.

Mr. Melillo made a motion to close the public hearing. Ms. Hoffstaetter seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously by voice vote. Ms. Hoffstaetter then made a motion to move this matter to the Old Business on tonight's agenda. Mr. Melillo seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously by voice vote.

=====
OLD BUSINESS:

- 1) Petition of the City of Danbury by Dennis I. Elpern, Planning Director to Amend Secs. 3.H.3. and 4.F.3. of the Zoning Regulations. (Amend Lot Frontage Regulations and Use Regulations in the R-O Zone)

Ms. Hoffstaetter made a motion to approve this petition as presented for the following reasons:

- These amendments will add further clarity to the Zoning Regulations.

Mr. Melillo seconded the motion to approve this petition and it was passed unanimously by voice vote.

=====
Chairman Knapp said the New Business listed the public hearing scheduled for April 25, 2006. Mr. Elpern noted that he would not be present at that meeting as he will be at the APA conference in San Antonio, TX. The Correspondence consisted of one Cease & Desist Order and there was nothing under For Reference Only.

At 8:05 PM, Mr. Melillo made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Farah seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.