



## **Transportation Committee - Board of Representatives**

David Watkins, Chair

Terry Adams, Vice Chair

# **Committee Report**

**Date:** Tuesday, March 22, 2022  
**Time:** 7:00 p.m.  
**Place:** *This meeting was held remotely*

The Transportation Committee met as indicated above. In attendance were Chair Watkins, Vice Chair Adams and Committee Member Reps. Di Costanzo, Grunberger, and Sandford. Excused were Reps. Gilbride and Moore. Also present were Rep. Sherwood, Vikki Cooper, Deputy Corporation Counsel and Frank Petise, Acting Transportation, Traffic and Parking Bureau Chief.

Chair Watkins called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Committee Action</b>
1. <a href="#">T31.003</a>	ORDINANCE <u>for publication</u> ; Prohibiting certain Classes and Characteristics of Commercial Vehicles from Parking on Residential Streets During Certain Hours. 01/04/22 – Submitted by Frank Petise and Rep. Adams 01/10/22 – Moved to Pending 02/22/22 – Approved by Committee 7-0-0 03/07/22 – Recommitted by Full Board	<b>Approved 5-0-0</b>

Ms. Cooper explained that she made the latest change, which includes an item that had been deleted from the prior draft, after the Zoning Enforcement Officer reached out to her about removing the current exception. Under the Zoning Regulations, a resident may park only one commercial vehicle with a  $\frac{3}{4}$  ton capacity in a garage on their property. If someone does not have a garage, this is interpreted to permit them to park the vehicle in the driveway. However, they can't have more than one such vehicle. Without this provision, any remaining commercial vehicles with this payload capacity could be parked on the street. This clarification relates to vehicle payload capacity, since the vehicles would not meet the 12,000 pound threshold.

In response to questions from the committee, Mr. Petise noted that this language is straightforward enough to be enforced by the traffic enforcement officers

A motion to amend Item No. 1 to change the proposed language of Subsection A.6 as follows was made, seconded, and approved by a vote of 5-0-0 (Reps. Watkins, Adams, Di Costanzo, Grunberger, and Sandford in favor).

(6) ~~A motor vehicle which e~~Exceeds three-fourth (3/4) tons in capacity, and is not used solely by the occupants of a premises and that has been prohibited by the City of Stamford Zoning Regulations from parking on or being garaged on private residential property.

A motion to approve Item No. 1, as amended, was made, seconded, and approved by a vote of 5-0-0 (Reps. Watkins, Adams, Di Costanzo, Grunberger, and Sandford in favor)

- |                            |   |                                   |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 2. <a href="#">T31.008</a> | REJECTION; One-Way Designation of Irving Avenue per Chapter 231, Article IX of the Code of Ordinances.<br>03/04/22 – Submitted by Frank Petise                | <b>Rejection<br/>FAILED 0-5-0</b> |
| 3. <a href="#">T31.009</a> | REJECTION; One-Way Designation of Vassar Avenue per Chapter 231, Article IX of the Code of Ordinances.<br>03/04/22 – Submitted by Frank Petise                | <b>Rejection<br/>FAILED 0-5-0</b> |
| 4. <a href="#">T31.010</a> | REJECTION; One-Way Designation of a Portion of Young Dixon Way per Chapter 231, Article IX of the Code of Ordinances.<br>03/04/22 – Submitted by Frank Petise | <b>Rejection<br/>FAILED 0-5-0</b> |
| 5. <a href="#">T31.011</a> | REJECTION; One-Way Designation of a Portion of Wilson Street per Chapter 231, Article IX of the Code of Ordinances.<br>03/04/22 – Submitted by Frank Petise   | <b>Rejection<br/>FAILED 0-5-0</b> |

The Committee discussed Item Nos. 2 through 5 together.

Mr. Petise reviewed the [attached presentation](#) which was used at the public hearing in 2019 for these proposed changes and discussed the proposed changes with the committee.

- These changes were based upon requests from residents to convert Irving and Vassar to one way streets.
- As two way streets there was a significant history of sideswipes in the area because the roadways were too narrow; it is difficult to put in sidewalks.
- This change will improve traffic flow. .
- Two property owners voiced concerns about having to drive around the corner rather than just turning onto Selleck Street, but overall there were no objections.
- The TTP department will do traffic counts on the streets after the change
- The District Reps have been informed of this proposal
- No parking will be taken away
- All of the procedures for notice of the public hearing were followed and every property owner received a notice
- The Board of Representatives' authority is to reject these items within 60 days.

A motion to reject Item No. 2 was made, seconded and failed by a vote of 0-5-0 (Reps. Watkins, Adams, Di Costanzo, Grunberger, and Sandford opposed).

A motion to reject Item No. 3 was made, seconded and failed by a vote of 0-5-0 (Reps. Watkins, Adams, Di Costanzo, Grunberger, and Sandford opposed).

A motion to reject Item No. 4 was made, seconded and failed by a vote of 0-5-0 (Reps. Watkins, Adams, Di Costanzo, Grunberger, and Sandford opposed).

A motion to reject Item No. 5 was made, seconded and failed by a vote of 0-5-0 (Reps. Watkins, Adams, Di Costanzo, Grunberger, and Sandford opposed).

Chair Watkins adjourned the meeting at 8:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Watkins, Chair

This meeting is on [video](#).