

Items in **yellow highlight** and/or **red font** are our comments. Those in **red** are of greater importance.

Page 1 (cover) *Please zoom in closer on ½ mile, remove yellow arrow and draw distinct circle for study/plan area.*

Page 2 Acknowledgements *Under Planning Teams, note Steve Cecil and Kartik Shah thru ONLY their end dates.*

Page 4 Plan Purpose and Process *4th sentence says oversight committee met over 18 months – as of May, is 15 months*

INTRODUCTION – page 5

-QUALITIES OF EAST NORWALK

1st sentence: East Norwalk offers an enticing quality of life, particularly for families and commuters.....

A primary concern of EaNo residents in supporting a TOD study is the ERODING quality of life due to development, congestion, proliferation of apartments, lack of enforcement, poor traffic signalization, neglect of infrastructure, lack of walkable services, and perceived increase in petty crime. Many of these items are discussed in the plan. I don't recall any conversation about petty crime. I also think we should discuss that ENNA does not speak for every East Norwalk resident and that East Norwalk is not its own municipality, they are part of a larger city. The plan seeks to strike the correct balance between community preservation and growth in order to obtain the quality of life that is desired by the community and city. We can discuss including those in the challenges listed on the next page.

-CHALLENGES:

2ND sentence: "Because of the convenient highway access and proximity of the beaches to the south, East Ave is ideal for cut-through traffic to the beach"

This makes no sense as East Ave to Gregory is the primary route to beach from all major areas of city except SoNo, therefore not a cut-through. East Ave, however, IS a cut-through to and from Westport and SoNo. Will review with NV5 and revise if necessary. The plan text and your comment do not appear to be contradictory.

3rd sentence: "Additionally the four gas stations surrounding the east Norwalk station attract man trucks which cause further back up and delays."

Where did this conclusion come from? The gas stations attract primarily passenger vehicles from East Norwalkers and Westporters. The truck congestion is cut through to and from storage yards, waste water plant, and yard waste sites, Two Men and a Truck, Fedex, UPS, City Public Works. What about the fact that East Avenue bypasses Exit 15/new Mall Exit for trucks as well as Exit 17 (Westport)? Will review with NV5 and revise if necessary.

4th sentence "Community members have expressed great frustration at the congestion caused by these conditions.

Hundred more apartments are only going to exacerbate the problem and excessive retail intended for a regional draw will compound that. Congestion is primarily due to poorly designed roadway, poorly timed traffic signals, left turn allowance out of Ft Point, and Westport/Sono cut through. Regarding "Recent Projects" Section; impact of other developments adjacent to E. Norwalk proper have also greatly impacted us (Head of Harbor, SoNo Collection Mall, construction

projects adjacent to E. Norwalk, etc.) These items are addressed later in the study, but why not a part of the introduction as well? What evidence is there that there is increased mall traffic in East Norwalk. Any comments regarding this need to be factual and not opinion. The sentence gets to the point of congestion problems on East Avenue. Proposed roadway improvements are designed to improve existing conditions.

5th sentence: Other traffic-related challenges include speeding on Gregory Blvd and Strawberry Hill Avenue. Limited parking and parking enforcement near the train station, and substandard pedestrian amenities which require improvement.

Speeding on Gregory and Strawberry are due to lack of police enforcement and long straightaways. Strawberry has some control with smart technology traffic signals that monitor speed and change green lights to red. Gregory should also employ this technology.. Nothing in the study would address speeding at those locations, except that increased congestion at East Ave will create road rage at satellite streets. Will review with NV5 and revise if necessary.

Last sentence: Non-traffic related challenges include a desire to guide new development to ensure that it aligns with and/or enhances existing neighborhood character and improves access to existing open space.

The “desire to guide new development” stemmed from a fear of redevelopment agency designating area as blight and proposing high density, increased height development. Access to existing open space (Calf Pasture, Taylor Farm, Ludlow, Veterans Memorial Park, Constitution Park, EaNo Historic Cemetery) is not particularly challenging expect for access hours and parking enforcement. It’s the lack of additional open public space in and around EaNo central village that is the issue. The desire to guide development and redevelopment in the area is a concern of the City and not just ENNA. This is why the City plans. No change recommended.

-RECENT PROJECTS

1st sentence: Several recent development projects in EaNo acted as a catalyst for this planning process.

What recent development projects acted as a catalyst? If #230, the community wanted the project denied unless and until a full blown TOD STUDY could be substantially completed. Many residents preferred a MORATORIUM on any major development.

Impact of other developments adjacent to E. Norwalk proper have also greatly impacted us (Head of Harbor location and architecture, SoNo Collection Mall, construction projects adjacent to E. Norwalk, etc.) These items are addressed later in the study, but why not a part of the introduction as well? This comment is confusing and in the preceding sentence the concerns expressed in previous comments are stated. The messaging is neutral to the pros and cons of the development project. No change recommended.

5th sentence: The building will sit on top of a sub-grade parking garage with 311 spaces and a public courtyard on the roof deck above grade.

Is this the parking garage roof above grade or the building roof? The approved project was to have committed to a rooftop public restaurant, which was removed from the plan. Comment not relevant, no change recommended.

Last sentence: The Walk Bridge project.....

The actual Walk Bridge project was to convert a 100 year old railroad bridge to a new structure .The state subsequently added on peripheral projects, one of which is widely opposed by EaNo residents: the lowering of East Ave to allow tractor trailers and large trucks to pass under the

EaNo railroad bridge. Will add sentence to the indicating that there is a neighborhood concern that lowering the bridge could lead to increased truck traffic.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – page 7

PLAN AREA

1st sentence: East Norwalk station.....carrying around 200 passengers on a daily basis, which is low compared to comparable stations.

Please verify this statistic as several daily commuters estimated the morning and evening rush hours alone at upwards of 550 passengers. Will review with NV5 and revise if necessary.

4th sentence: In addition, a new, elongated station platform is planned which could result in increased ridership by allowing more train cars to drop off and pick up passengers.

How many additional cars and passengers are planned in the DOT/MetrNorth project. Will review with NV5 and provide clarification

2nd paragraph, 1st sentence: East Avenue.....disjointed development and non-complimentary uses ...uninspired site design and architecture resulting in an unfriendly pedestrian experience

An unfriendly pedestrian atmosphere is due primarily to poorly maintained, obstructed and sometimes non-existent sidewalks, along with inadequate crosswalks more importantly than aesthetics. Will add language about poor sidewalk connections.

2nd paragraph, 3rd sentence: The City has seen increased interest in small warehouse and industrial space in this area and should seek to capitalize on this growth.

P&Z recently enacted a 12month moratorium on multiple uses within our Industrial 1 zone, essentially ensuring an opportunity for increased mixed use for the purpose of adding apartments. The final moratorium text was not reviewed by ENNA, but should not include small warehouses and industrial space, as a large portion of the city's industrials space has already been eroded by residential complexes. It should include rock crushing plants and large materials processing sites. The moratorium does not include industrial warehouse space. No change recommended.

3rd paragraph, 1st sentence: The areas.....core streets (Fitch, Ft. Point, Van Zant boast vibrant...

Who describes Fitch, Ft Point, Winfield and Van Zant as “vibrant” (need definition versus “active”) Will review and revise as necessary.

TOP 10 ACTION ITEMS – page 8

1 Village District:

A good idea to help protect interests of residents, but should not have any additional “bonus” height must be limited to 1 additional story. Allowed bonus height is limited to 1 story.

2 Façade improvements in Charles, Osborne and Fort Point

Façade improvements should be neighborhood- wide, and have supplemental funding through CBDG city programs and state grants for qualifying property owners. Can discuss with the group. However, first thought, many other areas are well established, traditional single-family neighborhoods and façade improvement programs in these areas would not be appropriate.

3 Relocate the DPW Garage:

As much as this could benefit residents by reducing DPW and other truck traffic, the residents did not ask for this and it should not be considered as part of the TOD plan unless it is to preserve as open space only – not marine commercial or residential development. There is precious little city-owned property that could be converted to passive open space. Any redevelopment of this space would go through a very public process with many opinions and options. Not all concepts proposed for the plan originated by the residents.

4 Rezone a new Liberty Square Village District:

The suggested in-house planning project should be BEFORE Walk Bridge completion, not after, and be funded 100% from Walk Bridge mitigation sources and should seek to complement the Veterans Memorial Park Master Plan. Agreed on timing. Not sure if funding would be available for this.

5 Rezone from commercial to residential:

Residents have consistently expressed a lack of support for excessive apartment development in the East Avenue corridor area. Zoning that would allow upwards of 1200-1600 additional units would be unacceptable. The planning team has heard and understands this concern. Our position is the proposed density is measured and appropriate and furthermore is needed in order to realize the broader vision and plan goals. The densities and heights are much lower than you would often see in TOD near a mass transit station, especially in a city such as Norwalk. RKG's analysis indicated there is no economic incentive for developers to reinvest in their properties under the current regulatory scheme. Furthermore, we have observed that the City will never realize 100% buildout of this area and nor will it occur in a short or midterm horizon. Lastly, the smaller lot sizes and fractured ownership will further deter redevelopment.

6 Allow residential units above ground floor I-1:

This is acceptable depending on the number of units, but not at exclusion of other industrial 1 options

7 Rezone to the new EVTZ:

This states to undertake street & sidewalk improvements on Gregory Blvd in order to improve safety for all modes of transit. Where on Gregory, and why only Gregory? Is it for benefit of Wells Fargo development at Mill Pond? Future improvements will be studied by the City in conjunction with CT DOT. As we discussed numerous times, there is no pedestrian connection in the area and can be improved for all modes of travel.

8 Create a promenade along Seaview Ave:

...to connect SoNo to Cove area and be used for multi-purpose recreational and entertainment options..."

Zoning must identify what is city-owned property there, coordinate any public space improvement in conjunction with the Veterans Memorial Park Master Plan, and NOT create an activity zone that infringes upon the quiet enjoyment rights of private property owners and tenants along Seaview and peripheral streets. There are also multiple references in this document and elsewhere as to making turning Seaview into a promenade for the benefit of the entire city, when in fact, all city owned property is for the benefit and enjoyment of all residents. This comment is confusing. Zoning does not need to identify city owner property in this area. The City will work on design options and consult with all appropriate parties.

9 Rezone to a new Cove Avenue Village District

Why a Cove Avenue Village District and how would it differ from central EaNo village district? And wouldn't it actually be a First Street Village District as that is where the residential and bulk of commercial properties meet? No changes are recommended to the bulk and height standards for these 2 additional village districts. The goal, consistent with past plans, is meant to aide in preservation and enhancement.

10 Area-wide actions:

Explore job-generating incentives such as TIF's and BID's..

If TOD properly executed, the job-generating incentive is that someone can operate a business or industry within walking distance of a train station in a neighborhood with desirable amenities.

Respect and preserve the character of the surrounding residential neighborhoods.

Respect the character of the entire area, not just "surrounding" residential. This comment was discussed at the last meeting. Text can be modified if the committee feels necessary.

SECTION 1 FIGURE 3 STUDY AREA

ENNA has asked since the first workshop and Steering Committee meeting that the dashed lines for ¼ mile 5 minute walk and ½ mile 10 minute walk be bolder and in two different colors. And please move the description for 230 East Ave bullet up to the bullet ABOVE East Norwalk Library bullet/description. Team will verify that all map representations are clearly marked.

PURPOSE OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD TOD PLAN & PLANNING PROCESS - PAGE 10

Primary purpose should have been to study area and then recommend a vision, collaborate with stakeholders and finalize a vision. Based on resident feedback, the plan appropriately focuses on the need to improve walkability and pedestrian experience, but missed the mark on infrastructure, the desire to limit future apartment developments, the specific requests for neighborhood grocer space, recommended uses (specific), an erosion of industrial 1 space including a pending moratorium on potentially desired uses (boutique manufacturing) in favor of other less desirable uses (apartment complexes).

Plan should be "recommending" a variety of tools to achieve successful vision, OUTSIDE OF ZONING REGULATION RE-WRITES. For example, proactive economic development, especially that doesn't impact tax revenue.

If "most vital" data came from public via participation in the 3 public workshops then why was their input largely ignored? Residents overwhelmingly rejected the idea of apartment developments that could be approved throughout the East Ave area.

Unfortunately, as pointed out time and again, this plan did not result in a "community driven vision". It appears to be the vision of city planning staff, Harriman Consulting and local developers, especially as it ignores significant feedback from the residential community to limit future growth, especially the proliferation of apartment buildings.

2nd paragraph in Planning Process indicates that the planning team (who is that?) met with the committee at regular intervals to received feedback on progress to-date as well as vital input on the next steps in the process. Regular intervals should be changed to intermittent . ENNA feels strongly that much of the residential feedback was ignored.

Very little resident input each of the 3 sessions, with each running out of time before real valuable, indepth resident input could be achieved. City planning staff and Harriman worked on plan, came back to show committee what they wanted, and made minor adjustments based on committee feedback, mostly grammatical and semantics. At some point in the year-long process, the name of the Steering Committee, with authority to "steer" city staff and consultants, suddenly changes to Oversight Committee, relegated to simply reviewing and commenting on the desired results of city staff and consultant

These comments are in response to all the preceding comments related to Page 10 above. There are many points of view on what is appropriate for this area. The planning team (city P&Z staff and the consulting team) disagrees that the community was ignored. There are many voices and while you have from the beginning indicated your preference for no increase in density or height, we have clearly indicated why increased height and density is necessary. As the meetings went on, more voices were heard and we heard more acceptance than not from what was being considered. I doubt we would have obtained funding from the state for a TOD study if the outcome was going to be improved sidewalk and additional greenspace. These things come with a price and providing incentives for redevelopment of an area in need of improvement is the best mechanism. Furthermore, raising height 1 story and increasing density to moderate levels, verse what is allowed in many other areas of the City is a very measured and tactical approach. City staff feels that the majority of people of the meetings were satisfied with the length of meetings and ability to participate.

Page 11 figure 4 context

Same thing with diagram dash delineations – but also map is redundant to figure 3 and appears to be “filler”– should be eliminated *Agreed, this section will be shortened since its contained in the appendix.*

Page 12 What’s in this Plan?

Where is Infrastructure existing conditions (streets, curbs, sidewalks, sewer, stormwater, utilities, traffic signals, lighting, tree canopy, signage)? *See # 5, can expand to talk amore about infrastructure.*

Page 13 figure 5 – Veterans Park –

Eliminate this page – filler page - Otherwise use shot of the park itself and military homage and make sure name is reflected throughout doc accurately as “Veterans Memorial Park”.

Vision and Goals

Vision – the vision wording is confusing and doesn’t make sense. *Disagree wording is confusing. Will defer to the committee.*

Figure 6 East Norwalk Train Station

Figure is railroad tracks and unflattering utility and catenary lines, unattractive village center. You consistently used the platform pic for the committee presentations, which is better than this. Will review.

Goals –

PAGE 16 Enhance quality of life: *again, a “vibrant public realm” is not defined anywhere and is subjective. Also the terminology “well connected open space” wording is misleading and not articulated by stakeholders. The idea is not to lead people from one open space to the other... thriving commercial nodes need definition, especially to desired uses. (a neighborhood could have a thriving adult business and bar commercial node?!)* *Comments are confusing. Public realm is defined in the zoning regulations.*

Foster Community Stewardship – *is this a means to shift maintenance & preservation to residents and stakeholder groups? Deliver a plan based on public engagement and input: Most residents have rejected the height and density. Goal for community involvement to advocate for the changes they want to see: Community advocacy is not effective if necessary to leverage against well-funded, politically connected developers, architects, landscape designers, retailers, small business owners.* *Text does not imply shifting maintenance and preservation to residents. Staff disagrees that voices have been ignored. Reasons for the recommendations have been articulated several times.*

Balance growth & neighborhood character – *spot on. This is not a “growth and development at all costs” initiative, but neither is it a “you wanted the amenity, so you have to have the density and height”.*

PAGE 17 Enhance Neighborhood Identity – *spot on again. Need to maintain or enhance the sense of village, small community, new England charm, and implement in a way which reinforces, rather than degrades this identity.*

Coordinate with other Plans and projects – *This whole section has East Norwalk vision and plan following decisions that were made prematurely, in the absence of any holistic planning or even POCD. At each of these projects (Walk Bridge, East Ave lowering, and 230 East Ave the residents of East Norwalk overwhelmingly rejected those projects. In fact, 230 East Ave was approved in order to meet the timeline of a private developer to ensures profits rather than postponed pending the TOD plan. East Norwalk should NOT coordinate with other plans, rather OTHER PLANS SHOULD COORDINATE WITH EAST NORWALK. It is important to note that*

these projects were approved before the TOD plan was started, let alone approved. This plan allows the City to restart the clock and process on all projects going forward.

Improve multimodal accessibility and connectivity -Address public health safety needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users and motorists. *This need goes beyond health and safety and should focus on convenience, reliability, and appropriate mix of accessibility and connectivity options.* Will review with NV5, but will defer to the committee if modifications are necessary.

SECTION 3 - PLANNING CONTEXT

The other plans are **Citywide Plan (POCD)** which is vague and generic when it comes to defining future of East Norwalk. **Walk Bridge Replacement** was widely rejected by East Norwalkers. It provides NO benefit to East Norwalk, requires years of community disruptions with construction, traffic detours, overnight relentless construction noise, etc. Eano residents do not want trucks coming through our community to access SoNo or Westport. Most of the country is adopting road “diets” to shrink lane widths, which encourages slower speed and safety, but Norwalk is turning East Avenue into a 50mph speeding zone. Norwalk pedestrian and bikeway transportation plan.

2012 Pedestrian & Bikeway Transportation Plan: Strawberry Hill bike lanes are routinely ridiculed for being poorly designed and implemented and Winfield is a death trap for cyclists given the volume and speed of traffic, which until recently, went largely unenforced. East Ave cannot accommodate cyclists now, and speeding cars and trucks post- widening/lowering will make the situation dangerous. Complete consideration needs to be given to pedestrians, with extra wide sidewalks and adequate buffer from cars, trucks, buses, etc. The pedestrian improvements are long overdue on East, Gregory, Winfield, Seaview.

The **2012 Transportation plan** sits on a dusty shelf. **The 2008 POCD is obsolete.** The **2004 East Norwalk Plan** recommendations were the foundation for ensuring residents were engaged early and often in planning and that resident feedback would be of paramount importance in decision making. This has never been accomplished, through multiple administrations. The **Harbor Management plan** is outdated and the Harbor Commission did not participate in the TOD OC.

Remove the timeline pages #22 and 23– they are irrelevant and page fillers.

Plan analysis in this section is not lengthy. Will review and reduce text as appropriate.

SECTION 4 - COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

PAGE 24

(Readability with tan background and white print is poor.)

Needs to list all the stakeholder meetings with dates, attendees and brief recap.

ENNA does not agree with the conclusion that this plan is the result of close collaboration among the community, the Oversight Committee, the city and the planning team. The plan is mostly conceived and written by city planning staff and the consultant and merely presented to community to comment on.

It was always the intention of this plan to be drafted by the consultant team with input from the committee. If meeting dates are necessary, those can be included, but we would recommend simply stating the number of meetings. This information is relevant to the appendix.

PAGE 26

States three public workshops, but listing only has two, the 3rd is called open house, again with limited time for community input.

Last sentence: The planning process saw a high level of participation from the community.

The process actually saw disappointing levels of participation. The community is approximately 6,000 adults. Regarding the (3) workshops, there were 77, 73 and 50 attendees respectively. How many are duplicated? How many unique individuals actually participated. Of the 121 Visual Preference Survey respondents how many were workshop attendees and also how many were East Norwalk residents? Of the 61 Commuter Survey respondents, how many were workshop attendees and also how many are East Norwalk residents? Who are the stakeholders that were interviewed in April 2019 and what other stakeholders met with Steve Kleppin or Harriman or any planning consultant prior to or after April 2019? Staff strongly disagrees that turnout at the public meetings was disappointing and in fact felt it was very strong with different faces and voices as the meetings progressed. In addition, the numbers listed reflect those who signed in. The number of attendees was actually high higher than the listed number. *Harriman, list who they met with?* City staff met with DiScala team as previously discussed.

Page 28 visioning workshop

Comment cards:

*Does any appendix contain the feedback from all 50 comment cards?
The comment cards were developed the week before using a tool provided by ENNA, and though the 4 questions were intended to gather important feedback from resident on what they want and don't want for a future East Norwalk, the exercise was conducted quickly and inadequately. The 4 questions were meant to be asked within the scope of the different segments of a development plan:
Housing, employment, transportations, retail, government offices, dining, entertainment, city services, recreation and open space, environmental, infrastructure, etc
For example, page 29 "word clouds" match Mike's Deli against Parks and Village Feel.
And sets Flooding against Laundromats.
It sets C-working Space against Improved Sidewalks.
And finally the new Walk Bridge against Apartments.*

The number one thing that 77 (?) residents did tell consultant and planners is that they don't want is APARTMENTS, FOLLOWED BY BOX STORES, MORE TRAFFIC, HIGH RISE 3-4 STORY, AND CHAIN RETAIL...



PAGE 31 COMMUNITY PERCEPTION EXERCISE

(This exercise not pre-approved by or seen by steering committee). None of the exercises afforded enough time nor were they explained well by consultants. While we completely disagree with the comments, the exercise occurred so the results should be reported.

PAGE 32 PLACES

It appears Seaview Ave places high on priority list, but that is mostly likely due to existing amenities and businesses such as Mill Pond, Veterans Memorial Park, Overtons and Mr Frosty?

PAGE 33 WALKING

The plan concludes there are streets that "people don't like to walk due to broken or missing sidewalks or fear for safety due to traffic control, blighted parcels and lack of security." Where did that conclusion come on "security" from? How many people said they felt unsafe from a security point of view walking on East Ave? Figure 16 is said to include participant comments, but is not legible. No further comment needed recommended.

PAGE 34 BIKING

How many of the 77 participants said they like to bike?

PAGE 35 DRIVING

*The consultant focused on shortcuts and cut-throughs but missed the point of understanding **why** people were taking shortcuts, and from where to where.*

Figure 18 with participant comments is not legible.

Again they reference truck traffic coming off 195 to get gas, which is bizarre. Who said this? There is a large highway rest stop at exit 13 and cheap gas at exit 1 off the connector. Easy off easy on at exits 13 and 14. The plan identifies "large trucks having to turn on to Fort Point to avoid bridge" but doesn't question or identify why large trucks would be coming into East Norwalk, outside of the tractor trailers going to/from oyster company and sewer/public works trucks.

*Anyone who has lived in East Norwalk for even a day recognizes the danger of the train station design, and that improvements are long overdue; they are planned to be done, funded and nearly ready to go to bid. This TOD plan making the point here is irrelevant and redundant but should highlight residents **do NOT want the road lowered.***

A question regarding cut through traffic and gas stations was raised earlier. We will review the relevance with NV5 and modify if necessary. The CT DOT project is not under consideration by this group.

PAGES 36-37

CHART OF "DOTS" PLACED FOR DESIRED USES IN AREA

Once again highest desire are neighborhood grocery and café and least desired is apartments, yet the Mill Pond parcel and almost every other one is under consideration for an apartment complex.

Staff is unaware of any other developments aside from the Mill Pond proposal. While residents may want a grocery store there, there needs to be a market for it, which the study indicated is not feasible under existing conditions.

PAGE 38 MAIN STREETS, VILLAGES AND NODES

What is this paragraph trying to say?

Unsure as to reference to page 38.

Exercise 1 – Visual Preference Survey results

Why are the online responses excluded from the plan?

See page 53.

PAGE 39

Visuals are too small and illegible..

(PLEASE READ THE 1ST SENTENCE. THEN READ IT AGAIN):

"AT THE PUBLIC WORKSHOP THE COMMUNITY EXPRESSED A FAIRLY STRONG ADVERSE REACTION TO ADDING NEW HOUSING"

"PARTICIPANTS CONVEYED THAT ANY NEW DEVELOPMENT SHOULD MAX OUT AT 2.5 TO 3 STORIES.

"PREFERENCE RETAIL AND RESTAURANT VERSUS OFFICE" (REALLY?)

"NO SWEEPING CHANGES"

"EXPAND OPEN SPACE"

“COMMUNITY SEEMS TO BE WARY OF THIS PLANNING PROCESS AND MEASURES SHOULD BE TAKEN TO ENSURE THAT DEVELOPMENT WILL BE CONTEXTUALLY APPROPRIATE IN ENHANCING EAST NORWALKS IDENTITY AS COASTAL NEW ENGLAND VILLAGE”

LOOK AT THE RESULTS OF THE VISUALS.

Prefer 2 – 2.5 story and don't want 4 story. If only other choice had been 3-story, that would have been rejected!

The entire exercise with East Ave Main Street, Side Street Villages and Nodes was not well understood, did not originate from Steering Committee and appears intention was to guide decision to concentrate mixed use on East Ave and protect side neighborhoods. But this should not be done at the expense of East Ave side street residential!

The final plan recommendations were gathered from all 3 public meetings, economic analysis and discussions amongst the committee as well as planning team recommendations. Feasible, measured and appropriate recommendation are contained in the plan. The goal at the outset was not to achieve unanimous approval

Page 43 figure 21

Wasn't "East Avenue as Main Street" supposed to have ended at train station? Past the train station should be Village designation only, and East Avenue "main street zoning" should not extend to cemetery and Mill Pond or Van Zant and Winfield. Increased height and density can be designated for the train station parcel itself (Pooch Hotel?) Plan recommendations were developed and proposed to benefit the entire area and lead to a cohesive pattern in the future. As stated previously, there is no incentive or reason for property owners to improve their properties now, which is why East Avenue and some other areas look the way they do. Village district designation alone will not change that. Contrary to that, in Liberty Square and the Cove area, there is an established high quality aesthetic that should be preserved.

THE ILLUSTRATION NEEDS TO ZOOM IN SO THE PUBLIC CAN SEE THE SCOPE OF THE MAIN STREET OPTION. We will review to make sure the graphics are clear. Most likely was the PDF document was printed from.

PAGE 44 SIDE STREET VILLAGES

**THEY REFERENCE IMAGES B-1, B-10, B-13, ETC BUT NO LEGIBLE PICTURE OF THEM
NOTE THAT PARKING REGULATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT IS A COMMON THEME**

“Participants viewed the Side Street Villages option as more practical than turning East Avenue into a Main Street.” East Avenue is already a Main Street. There was concern that Villages would be commercially overdeveloped, limited parking and inadequate at relieving traffic on East Avenue. We will review to make sure the graphics are clear. Most likely was the PDF document was printed from.

PAGE 46 COMMUNITY OF NODES

The idea of “nodes” was not widely understood, and brought many questions from community, even recently. Again the plan is referencing images from visual preference exercise but not providing legible pic of them. While some may not have understood the concept, it was discussed as part of the process. Illustration not legible

PAGE 48 COMMENT CARDS

Did we really need an exercise to tell us that residents would prefer main street to be East Ave and the side streets there to be “side streets” and that Cove and Reynold could be considered as nodes?

Plus, area H on the map on page 48 had appeared out of nowhere, as did a Seaview Ave “promenade” notion. Exercises were conducted as part of the process. Comment is not relevant.

PAGE 50 – NOVEMBER OPEN HOUSE

The boards that were on display need to be included in the plan document and online at tomorrow.norwalkct.org.

PAGE 51 – 52 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS PRIORITIZATION

SEAVIEW AVE AS PROMENADE FOR ENTIRE CITY OF NORWALK.

Isn’t everything in Norwalk for the entire city, with the exception of some Rowayton taxing district properties? One of the recommendations of the plan is connecting East Norwalk to SoNo, which the promenade can accomplish. In addition, while Norwalk has many distinctive areas, it is 1 City and needs to think of itself that way.

East Norwalk Historic Cemetery as a respectful open space probably got only 1 vote because Harriman depicted a large concert in a large cemetery. There were concerns expressed about activating the cemetery area, which was removed from the plan.

PAGE 53 ONLINE SURVEYS.

Where are the survey results? Should be included.

PAGE 55

PARKING –

There should be “resident only” parking passes on many of the side streets.

The DiScala property (Wells Fargo parcel) is AWAITING the zoning changes? And “the owner is willing to negotiate a public amenity” for added density and height? Such as “access to the water”? Don’t residents already have access to the water there by land deed and easements?

This statement alone is why no trade offs for height and density should be considered unless there are major concessions and amenities offered, not a sculpture, water fillers and free wifi..... No changes needed. Points are summaries of conversations and information gathered.

MARKET CONDITIONS

“There is no market for office space in East Norwalk”. Why not? Tons of office buildings going up in Stamford. No changes needed. Points are summaries of conversations and information gathered.

“The market only supports rentals as a result..” So there is NO market for affordable condos? No changes needed. Points are summaries of conversations and information gathered.

“The city should focus on supporting small and local businesses....” How exactly is the city doing this? No changes needed. Points are summaries of conversations and information gathered.

“The city should develop programming to attract, support and retain younger demographics who currently have limited opportunities to live and or work in east Norwalk” What age group are you suggesting? Will the city “programming” be via apartment rentals? What will be done to encourage home ownership? No changes needed. Points are summaries of conversations and information gathered.

“The city should prioritize the redevelopment of blighted parcels”. Where are they? Have they been cited? No changes needed. Points are summaries of conversations and information gathered.

PAGE 68 PARCEL SIZES

Why was there / is there no mention of the Moratorium on specific uses within I-1 Zone? Not relevant to the plan.

PAGE 69 illustration need legend and notes on the page Will move Legend to same page.

PAGE 70 illustration needs legend and notes on the page Will move Legend to same page.

PAGE 74

Olmstead place traffic safety issue is being temporarily controlled by a stop here on red regulation, and residents will continue to work with State and local officials as a revised highway interchange is considered.

PAGE 77

Regarding traffic impact, it's a disservice to this study and to East Norwalk residents that the SoNo Collection Mall has been closed due to Covid, as the actual traffic impact can only be measured now for a short period of time (October to March) and with limited stores open. This TOD study/plan/recommendation takes a soft approach on the use of Exit 16 versus Exit 15 with such phrases as "there is concern amongst some residents...", "may result in..", "there is a possibility that during these congested periods...", "diverted mall-generated trips may pass through...". Why is this Study so soft on such obvious future predicaments? There is no evidence or certainty in this statement. There is no need for further expansion or consideration.

PAGE 79 eliminate the MetroNorth sample fares chart – is filler Can be moved to appendix.

PAGE 80 Why is diverging diamond included in "planned" transportation projects? Should the proposed DDI project really be leveraged in this Plan as a method to alleviate traffic when there are still too many unknown factors regarding the DDI project? Has been discussed. Should only mention DOT is looking at options, including.....

PAGE 83 eliminate Norwalk transit district fare system – is filler Agreed or move to appendix.

PAGE 93: "Concerns over car traffic and parking may play less of a role in curtailing development activity than the study area's layout and existing land uses." OR, perhaps car traffic & parking are among the key components in development activity. The statement given is subjective and by stating "may", simply providing opinion.

PAGE 97 Even though rendering is "For Illustrative Purposes Only..." What happened to the Mobil Station at the corner of Winfield & East Ave? If the station is not going anywhere, why use this "for illustrative purposes"? Why not pick another area, such as Webster Bank lot, which is under control of a developer who is awaiting zone changes to submit development application? No further action recommended.

PAGE 101: "Promote an inventory of available public parking..." What available public parking in East Norwalk? Where does it exist? (There's a small lot next to East Avenue Pizza) "Designated truck routes..." sounds like a great idea, but how will that be policed? In order to enforce the truck routes, incentives would have to be provided; either way needs policing. A possible means to achieve this is stated below the goal.

PAGE 104: *It's good that Non-compliant property code enforcement has been mentioned, but more specifics could have been provided other than a web-referenced "Toolkit". (is that outside of the scope of this study?)*

It appears there's quite a bit of general recommendations on this and on subsequent pages.

PAGE 113 *Absolutely no charging for on-street parking near train station! Enforce a no parking 5am to 9am or something else to enforce illegal commuter parking.* No further action recommended.

PAGE 114 *No trade off of amenities for height and density. The amenity list is not adequate compared to the volume of potential new residents (1800-3000?) and traffic (one car per person?). Signage that guides residents to water. Really? Residents know where the water is.* No further action recommended.

PAGE 116 *Why does planning insist on referencing a Seaview Avenue Promenade as "for the entire city of Norwalk? Everything in Norwalk is for the entire city. Additionally, any promenade (seasonal or permanent) can be incorporated into the existing Veterans Memorial Park Master Plan.* Previously discussed. No further action recommended.

PAGE 117 *Regardless of the conceptual sketch itself, , at least Harriman took an existing photo and showed precisely what a change would look like. We would have preferred, and did request, overlays of many existing-to-proposed areas. At least with this sketch-over photograph, there is an idea. It would be important to highlight "conceptual" development at the Exit 16 empty parcel, the Olmstead/East Ave parcels, the St. Thomas Church School property and importantly, the Wells Fargo property.* We are looking at previously discussed scenarios for potential inclusion.

PAGE 118 *An affordable grocery store is not the same as a community garden. The idea of the store was to provide one-stop for milk/eggs/bread/prepared meals/deli for a commuter on the way home, or for neighbors not wanting to drive to a larger store. Farmer's markets are usually one day a week; different concept from the reliable neighborhood small market. Farmers markets could already be held weekly/seasonally at our churches, bank property, Marvin school, the Marvin Senior Center, library, etc* The City cannot require someone to build a grocery store. As pointed out numerous times the only thing preventing the construction of a grocery store now, is the lack of market demand.

PAGE 118 *Just for accuracy, is there no Norwalk Public Library in East Norwalk. Our East Norwalk Librarty is not a branch of the public library. It is run by an Association and funded through the Third Taxing District District ratepayers.* Will correct. Former Committee member Deb Goldstein previously mentioned this.

It appears that most of the remainder of the document is cookie cutter verbiage and cut & paste "filler" that is used in many urban studies. While this comments is not accurate, portions of the community engagement and transportation sections will be shifted to the appendix.