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, APRIL 22, 2026, MINUTES

The Planning and Zoning Commission held a Regular Meeting on Wednesday, April 22, 2026, at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Trumbull Town Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Fred Garrity, Chairman
Anthony Silber, Vice-Chairman
Rich Deecken, Secretary
Karen DelVecchio
Rich Croll
Alissa Hall, Alternate
Dean Fabrizio, Alternate

ALSO PRESENT: Rob Librandi, Land Use Planner
James Cordone, Town Attorney
Abigail Farrell, Administrative Clerk

ABSENT: None.

A quorum being present, the Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:41 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN/ZONE CHANGE/OTHER

1. **241 Sterling Road:** Applicant, John Mancini, is requesting a Special Permit to construct an addition to establish an 800 sq. ft. one-bedroom Accessory Apartment in a Residence A zone pursuant to Article II, Section 1.3.2.7 of the Town of Trumbull Zoning Regulations. **File #26-11**

John Mancini (241 Sterling Road) introduced the application.

Land Use Planner, Rob Librandi, stated that based on engineering comments, the application must be reviewed by Inland Wetlands and Watercourses commission.

Chairman Garrity stated that due to that, the application must be withdrawn, and the applicant must proceed to IWWC prior to moving forward with the Planning and Zoning commission. The application is considered paused and will resume once all required approvals have been obtained.

Application File #26-11 is withdrawn.

2. **<u>Text Amendment:</u>** Applicant, CT Trumbull Village, LLC, is requesting to modify Trumbull Zoning Regulations by revising Article II, Section 2.7: Village Residence District. Copy of regulation on file with Trumbull P&Z Office and Trumbull Town Clerk. **File #26-05** ***Continued from March 18, 2026***

Attorney Raymond Rizio (10 Sasco Hill Road, Fairfield CT), representing the applicant, CT Trumbull Village LLC, went over the revisions that have been made by the applicant since the previous meeting. Such revisions include adding verbiage regarding how to apply this language to a zone/property, more specific location criteria, and adding an age restricted component.

Chairman Garrity questioned if the age restricted wording should be altered to clarify that the owner must be over the age of 55, but ultimately it was decided that it should remain the same, as zoning language dictates use, not ownership.

Chairman Garrity discussed the evolvement of the application over past meetings; highlighting the main asks from the commission which were adding an age restricted component to decrease the strain on the school systems, and a decrease of the overall density of the project. Mr. Garrity also noted his understanding that the applicant had met with town staff to discuss establishing a new cap of 35 units for the VRD zone, and Attorney Rizio confirmed that the applicant is amicable to that adjustment.

Commissioner Deecken reviewed new public comment that was submitted and noted the concerns regarding potential dam reclassification. Attorney Rizzio responded that the Engineering Department has strict requirements ensuring that runoff from projects is contained on the property, and that drainage conditions are likely to improve due to site modifications that must receive town staff approval. Chairman Garrity added that these concerns relate to a specific build rather than the proposed text itself, and should be addressed if and when a special permit application is presented to the Commission. Commissioner Deecken also confirmed the new language surrounding the location criteria of the zone.

Vice-Chairman Silber raised concerns regarding the dam and potential impacts on wildlife. Mr. Librandi noted that while CT DEEP may have information about wildlife in the area, the Town has not conducted a specific study to characterize wildlife in that region.

Public Comment:
Carmine DeFeo (15 Woodcrest Avenue) asked whether the regulation change would change this to an age-restricted zone. Chairman Garrity and Attorney Cordone clarified that the zone would remain VRD, but with an added age-restricted component, resulting in an 80% age-restricted and 20% non-age-restricted distribution, separate from the Age Restricted (Elderly) Housing Zone that is already in the regulations.

Work Session:
Town Attorney Cordone stated that if the commission wishes to modify the text amendment with the changes discussed tonight as well as the new density cap, they will need to make a motion to amend the text and a subsequent vote to approve.

Vice-Chairman Silber clarified the new density cap of the regulation.

Motion Made (Deecken), Seconded (Croll), to close the public hearing for Application File #26-05.
Vote: 5-0 **Motion Carried**

Motion Made (DelVecchio), Seconded (Silber), to approve Application File #26-05.

Motion Made (Silber), Seconded (DelVecchio), to amend the original motion:

1. Add new language to the end of **2.7.2.2. Establishment of District** as follows:
   "Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this regulation, for any application, the applicant must first obtain final approvals from the Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Commission, the Police Commission and the Water Pollution Control Authority prior to filing an application for zone change and special permit with the Commission."
2. Delete proposed language in **Section 2.7.2.3.c. Street Location. Paragraph #2** and replace with the following:
   "(2) a VRD must abut the Merritt Parkway and have frontage on Booth Hill Road."
3. Add new language to the end of **2.7.2.3.d. Allowed Uses. Paragraph (i)** as follows:
   "provided that a VRD abutting the Merritt Parkway and having frontage on Booth Hill Road must designate at least eighty percent (80%) of the dwelling units within the VRD to be occupied by at least one person who is fifty-five (55) years of age or older, provided, however, that if a surviving spouse or a spouse remaining after the issuance of a divorce decree is under fifty-five (55) years of age, said spouse may remain in occupancy of such dwelling unit."
4. Delete proposed language **2.7.2.3.e. Development Limitations. Paragraph (iii)** and replace with the following:
   "iii. Notwithstanding the foregoing, a maximum of thirty-five (35) units may be permitted on any one lot in a VRD which location satisfies subsection 2.7.2.3.c(2)."

Vote: 3-2 (Deecken, Croll) **Motion Carried**

Vote to approve Application #26-05, as amended, and to establish an effective date of April 29, 2026, and to make the determination that the application is in keeping with the POCD and the comprehensive plan.

Vote: 3-2 (Deecken, Croll) **Motion Carried**

The commission took a break from 8:13-8:26

3. **<u>2135, 2145 & 2155 Reservoir Avenue:</u>** Applicant, Vessel RE Holdings, LLC, is requesting reconsideration of their previously denied application for a Site Plan Approval of a multifamily development containing 150 units, pursuant to Sec 8-30g(h) of the Connecticut General Statutes. **File #26-10**

Joshua Levy (11 Beresford Lane, Livingston, New Jersey), Executive Vice President of Vessel, introduced the application.

Town Attorney Cordone explained that the applicant has submitted a resubmission of their previously denied site plan application, which is also under appeal, pursuant to Connecticut General Statute 8-30g(h). He noted that the resubmission reflects modifications made in response to the prior denial. Attorney Cordone also stated that he discussed the application timeline with the applicant's attorney, clarifying that the review period began on March 18, the date of the previous meeting. The Commission therefore has 65 days to render a decision, requiring action by May 22. Attorney Klein concurred with this timeline.

Land Use Planner Rob Librandi stated that since the applicant's last appearance, they have received WPCA approval. He requested clarification on the changes made to the plans, and Luke Mauro (501 Main Street, Monroe, CT), Project Engineer with Solli Engineering, explained that the revisions are primarily subgrade, with the building architecture, elevations, and parking remaining consistent with the previous submission. Mr. Librandi provided an overview of the proposed development: two buildings totaling 150 units, including 122 one-bedroom units and 28 two-bedroom units. He noted that although the development does not need to adhere to the Town's regulations due to its 8-30g designation, the proposal encroaches into the setbacks and exceeds the allowable building height. Mr. Librandi then asked the applicant the following questions:

> Is there a lighting plan? Are there mountable curbs? Will there be any fill brought in or removed? Will there be any rock crushing on site? When is the estimated completion date? Is the applicant still amicable to the previously proposed conditions of approval: removing one story from the building closest to the road, in turn reducing the number of units to 136, putting in a sidewalk along the property of Reservoir Avenue, and modifying the color of the building from white to wood toned?

Mr. Librandi added that, based on the applicant's recommendation, he spoke with the Building Official in Cheshire, who raised concerns about the Cheshire project. He requested clarification from the applicant on whether the buildings shared the same design, as there were building code issues and a stop work order at the Chesire site. The Chesire Building Official also recommended looking into a third-party code consultant for the town should the project be approved.

Joshua Levy reviewed the five reasons the application was denied in February, which included environmental concerns, the absence of engineering and WPCA approvals, the potential presence of watercourses on the site, and inconsistencies with town regulations. He noted that their environmental consultant has confirmed there are no environmental issues that would prevent residential development, full engineering plans have since been submitted, WPCA approval has been obtained, and their soil scientist has verified that no water courses exist on the property.

Project Engineer, Luke Mauro, reviewed the changes to the site plans, including the addition of loading zones and modifications to the drainage system, such as relocating the detention ponds to a more central area. Mr. Mauro also confirmed that any plans not re-submitted remained unchanged from the previous application and went over the departmental signs offs that have been received to date.

Jay Soltis (301 Catherine Terrace, Fairfield, CT), Licensed Environmental Consultant with Reef Environmental, stated that the environmental testing to date is considered pre-purchase testing to ensure that a residential development would be viable on the site. From here, additional testing, inspection and remediation have been recommended.

Joshua Levy addressed Mr. Librandi's questions raised during his staff report. Mr. Levy stated that he considers this a clean slate but is open to further discussions regarding the conditions of approval. He added that this is a planning and zoning application, so all building designs are schematic at this stage. Mr. Levy assured the Commission that when building permits are required, the plans will be prepared with Vessels' Connecticut-based code consultant and architecture team to ensure full compliance with all building department requirements.

Mr. Librandi read a letter into the record from Assistant Town Engineer, Tatiana Solovey, stating the department cannot give engineering sign-off at this time.

Mr. Mauro responded to the engineering letter by explaining that the stormwater management plans were developed with assistance from Mr. Soltis, and they believe any required remediation would not require significant changes to those plans. Chairman Garrity questioned this response, noting Mr. Soltis's earlier statement that additional testing could reveal further environmental contamination. Mr. Mauro replied that this level of uncertainty is inherent in all construction projects, as subgrade conditions cannot be fully known until work begins; therefore, there is always a possibility that plans may need to be adjusted during construction. Chairman Garrity reiterated that because the project is still in the prior-approval stage and remediation needs are already known, certain engineering criteria are being triggered that require more detailed information before approval can be granted.

Jay Soltis noted that under the new Connecticut environmental cleanup guidelines, additional reporting will likely be required as soon as new testing is conducted. He further explained that if the development does not proceed, the responsibility for this reporting will fall on the current property owners should they choose to conduct any testing prior to construction. Additionally, Mr. Soltis reported that their Phase I assessment revealed only minimal contamination and no evidence of underground tanks; therefore, in his professional opinion, the potential for significant deep contamination on the site is low.

Mr. Soltis and Mr. Levy engaged in a discussion confirming that the environmental contamination identified on the site is below state standards, will not require significant soil removal for remediation, and was not detected at depth during sampling. They also reviewed the remediation process under the new cleanup protocol, noting that once CT DEEP becomes involved, all associated reporting becomes public record. Mr. Levy added that the absence of contamination at depth and the limited need for soil removal means that site grading will remain largely unchanged, allowing the stormwater management plans to stay consistent with those already submitted. Additionally, findings from the remediation and site clearance will need to be provided to the Building Department prior to the start of construction.

Chairman Garrity requested that the applicant meet with the Town Engineer to address the engineering concerns and potential wetlands issues and consult with the Fire Marshal regarding the public safety concerns raised by Cheshire prior to next month's meeting. The applicant agreed to have these discussions.

Commissioner DelVecchio expressed support for another discussions with the Fire Marshal, noting that based on their previous application, the primarily off-site construction of the building seems to limit design flexibility. She stated that she would like confirmation that the issues raised in the Cheshire development will not present a problem for this project.

Motion Made (Deecken), Seconded (Croll), to continue the public hearing for Application File #26-10 to May 20, 2026.
Vote: 5-0 **Motion Carried**

REGULAR MEETING

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

Acceptance of the Minutes from March 18, 2026, Planning and Zoning Commission Regular. Meeting

Motion Made (Deecken), Seconded (Croll), to approve the minutes from the PZC March 18, 2026, Regular Meeting
Vote: 5-0 **Motion Carried**

Motion Made (Deecken), Seconded (Croll) and unanimously carried to adjourn the April 22, 2026, PZC Regular Meeting at 9:16 p.m.

Dated at Trumbull, CT this 29th day of April 2026.
By: Abigail Farrell, Clerk.