

## NEW HAVEN CITY PLAN COMMISSION ADVISORY REPORT

RE: **58 FOUNTAIN STREET** Coastal Site Plan Review for the addition of 9 dwelling units in an existing structure. Zone: RM-1. (Owner/ Applicant: 58 Fountain NCM, LLC.)  
REPORT: **1557-21**  
ADVICE: **Coastal Site Plan: Approve**

### PRINCIPAL APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

#### Section 55:

A written Coastal Site Plan Review (CSPR) shall be conducted for all buildings, uses, or activities located within the Coastal Management District. The review shall determine that potential adverse impacts of the proposed use on both coastal resources and future water-dependent development activities are acceptable within the meaning of the Connecticut Coastal Management Act (CCMA), as amended.

### BACKGROUND

The applicant is seeking a special exception to increase the number of dwelling units in an existing multi-family building from 20 to 29 by converting existing, unused space in the basement on a 1.29 acre site. The site is in a low-middle density zoning district. The structure currently is a two-story structure with 20 units. The proposed change will feature 9 dwelling units incorporating the basement as a mix of one- and two-bedroom dwelling units.

### MAY 14 PUBLIC HEARING

The applicant along with Attorney Mingione and the architect Wayne Gerrick explained the nature of the site and the proposed renovations which are kept within the interior of the structure with the exception of egress from the proposed basement apartments. They stated that the Coastal Area Management requirements have been reviewed by city staff and meet city standards.

No members of the public spoke in support or opposition of this application.

### PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

#### COASTAL SITE PLAN REVIEW

The Board's Coastal Site Plan Review, in accordance with Section 55.C of the New Haven Zoning Ordinance shall consider the characteristics of the site, including location and condition of any coastal resources; shall consider the potential effects, both beneficial and adverse, of the proposed activity on coastal resources and future water-dependent development opportunities; follow the goals and policies of the Connecticut Coastal Management Act, as amended, and identify conflicts between the proposed use and any goal or policy of the Act.

#### Characteristics and Condition of Coastal Resources at or Adjacent to the site:

**Coastal Flood Hazard Area (Flood Zone):** The property is within Flood Zone X Areas determined to be outside of the 0.2% annual chance (100-year) floodplain. Map# 09009C0429J (July 8, 2013).

**Nearshore Waters:** The site is approximately 1,000ft to the west and 1,200ft to the south of the West River.

**Shorelands:** the site is within the coastal boundary on a previously developed non-waterfront or waterfront-adjacent site consisting of paved parking lot and a single building.

| Coastal Program Criteria   | Comments |
|--|----------|
| 1. Potential adverse impacts on coastal resources and mitigation of such impacts | None     |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| 2. Potential beneficial impacts  | The project plans to decrease the stormwater runoff by using the existing catch basin which will be connected to the proposed underground retention system via a 12-inch HDPE pipe. This system is designed to capture and treat the first inch of rain. A catch basin is also proposed at the street line within the existing driveway to capture run-off. Peak rates of run-off are reduced to zero for one inch of rain and reduced for a 10-year 5-inch rain. |
| 3. Identify any conflicts between the proposed activity and any goal or policy in the §22a-92, C.G.S. (CCMA)   | None  |
| 4. Will the project preclude development of water dependent uses on or adjacent to this site in the future?  | Not waterfront  |
| 5. Have efforts been made to preserve opportunities for future water-dependent development?  | Not waterfront  |
| 6. Is public access provided to the adjacent waterbody or watercourse?   | Not waterfront  |
| 7. Does this project include a shoreline flood and erosion control structure (i.e. breakwater, bulkhead, groin, jetty, revetment, riprap, seawall, placement of barriers to the flow of flood waters or movement of sediment along the shoreline)? | No  |
| 8. Does this project include work below the Coastal Jurisdiction Line (i.e. location of topographical elevation of the highest predictable tide from 1983 to 2001)? New Haven CJL elevation is 4.6'.   | No  |

The City Plan Commission will review the application in accordance with the Connecticut Coastal Management Act, as amended, and determine whether the potential adverse impacts of the proposed activity on both coastal resources and future water-dependent development activities are acceptable.

This application is for interior renovations within an existing building. The applicant addresses Shorelands as the coastal resource most applicable to this site. Shorelands function as immediate sources of upland runoff contributing to coastal drainage; serve as immediate sources of upland sediment; provide scenic vistas; and have high development and redevelopment potential. Redevelopment of this site will reduce existing impacts in several ways:

- Implementation of stormwater retention systems reducing stormwater runoff;
- Reduced impervious surface on the site;
- Introduction of window wells with pervious surface to infiltrate runoff; and
- Existing stormwater management system consisting of sub-surface retention chambers to mitigate any increase in rate and volume of runoff.

**Sec. 60 Stormwater Management Plan:**

The applicant submitted a Stormwater Management Plan as part of this application. This plan indicates that the proposal will result in no change to the impervious surface on the 1.29-acre property with site changes being limited to window wells for egress from the basement apartments, pavement striping, and the installation of the underground retention system as noted above. The report shows that the post construction flows leaving the site will be less than or the same as existing conditions flows for all storm events up to and including the 100-year design storm.

**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on considerations discussed above, the Commission views the Special Exception to be essentially in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the ordinance and that the public health, safety and general welfare will be served, and substantial justice done by its approval.

**ADOPTED:** May 15, 2019  
Edward Mattison  
Chair

**ATTEST:**   
Aicha Woods  
City Plan Deputy Director

