



**APPLICATION FOR TEXT CHANGE OF THE STAMFORD ZONING REGULATIONS**

Complete, notarize, and forward **thirteen (13) hard copies and (1) electronic copy in PDF format** to Clerk of the Zoning Board with a **\$1,000.00 Public Hearing Fee** and the required application filing fee (**see Fee Schedule below**), payable to the City of Stamford.

**NOTE:** Cost of required Public Hearing advertisements are payable by the Applicant and performance of mailing of required property owners is the sole responsibility of the applicant. **LAND RECORDS RECORDING FEE:** \$60.00 for First page - \$5.00 for each additional page)

**Fee Schedule**

Minor Text Change	\$1,060.00
Major Text Change	\$5,060.00

APPLICANT NAME (S): CITY OF STAMFORD ZONING BOARD

APPLICANT ADDRESS: 888 WASHINGTON BOULEVARD, STAMFORD, CT 06901

APPLICANT PHONE 203-977-4711

IS APPLICANT AN OWNER OF PROPERTY IN THE CITY OF STAMFORD? NO

LOCATION OF PROPERTY IN STAMFORD OWNED BY APPLICANT (S): N/A

PROPOSED TEXT CHANGE: The purpose of this text amendment is to create a separate Section for General Development Plans in the Zoning Regulations with uniform requirements across different uses and districts and to simplify application procedures.

DOES ANY PORTION OF THE PREMISES AFFECTED BY THIS APPLICATION LIE WITHIN 500 FEET OF THE BORDER LINE WITH GREENWICH, DARIEN OR NEW CANAAN? NO (If yes, notification must be sent to Town Clerk of neighboring community by registered mail within 7 days of receipt of application – PA 87-307).

DATED AT STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT, THIS 25<sup>th</sup> DAY OF March 20 23

SIGNED: Ralph Blessing

**NOTE:** Application cannot be scheduled for Public Hearing until 35 days have elapsed from the date of referral to the Stamford Planning Board. If applicant wishes to withdraw application, please notify the Zoning Board at least three (3) days prior to Public Hearing so that the Board may have sufficient time to publicize the withdrawal.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
 ss STAMFORD March 29 20 23  
 COUNTY OF FAIRFIELD

Personally appeared Ralph Blessing, signer of the foregoing application, who made oath to the truth of the contents thereof, before me.

Patricia Ann Goffo  
 Notary Public - Commission Expires 3/31/27

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

APPL. #: 223-18 Received in the office of the Zoning Board: Date: \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_

**Narrative: Proposed Text Amendment to Add Section 19.J., General Development Plans, and Related Provisions**

**3/20/2023**

**1. Purpose**

In many instances, General Development Plan (GDP) applications are required for the rezoning to certain districts (such as the MXD-D or DWD-D), new developments in certain districts, or certain uses. However, because the GDP regulations evolved from the requirements of the Designed Waterfront Development (DWD) District, there are variations in how to apply the regulations in different districts. In addition, the GDP applications are often cumbersome, often requiring pre-applications before the GDP application proper which in turn always requires Final Site and Architectural Plan Approval.

The purpose of this text amendment is to create a separate Section for General Development Plans in the Zoning Regulations with uniform requirements across different uses and districts and to simplify application procedures.

**2. Proposed Changes**

*a. Creation of a Standalone GDP Section in the Regulations*

Currently, most regulations for GDPs are contained in Sections 9.D.7 and 9.D.8 of the Designed Waterfront Development district regulations with many references to waterfront dependent uses not applicable to GDPs in other districts. Relevant regulations would be moved to a new Section 19.J. (Section 19 contains rules for different types of Zoning Board approvals) and waterfront-specific references would be changed to be more broadly applicable.

*b. Simplifying Procedures and Requirements for GDP*

Currently, Applications in the DWD-district require a pre-application with its own review procedures even though a GDP in itself is a type of pre-application for Final Site and Architectural Plans. The proposed text would eliminate the pre-application requirement thus creating efficiencies in reviewing GDP applications.

In addition, for certain districts (e.g., the MX-D or DWD-D), GDPs are required in conjunction with zoning map changes. Zoning generally regulates permitted uses and bulk for development, therefore, requiring a GDP in conjunction with a rezoning which creates an additional process without value added. Additionally, for larger, area-wide rezonings GDPs are not feasible because they are site specific.

*c. Proposed Regulations*

The proposed regulations would clarify that GDPs are only needed for larger, multi-phased developments requiring Final Site and Architectural approvals but for which such final plans cannot be prepared as the project may evolve due to its complexity and long duration. GDPs would also be required for certain uses (e.g., Museum or Hospital Complexes) for which long periods of development are anticipated. Prior to construction of a specific development phase, Final Site and Architectural Plan approval would be required. Both GDPs and Final Site Plans approvals would require a public hearing (as currently).

As the intent of a GDP is to a) create for the developer a sense of predictability as to what can be developed under which conditions and b) for the Zoning Board and the public what potential development impacts may occur after completion of the a project over a long period of time, the proposed amendment would also clarify which aspects of a development are approved and which regulations apply should the zoning change during the development of a project.

Application requirements and procedures are proposed to remain largely the same as they currently are.

As GDP relevant requirements are spread throughout a variety of districts and uses, amendments are necessary to make sure that the district and use regulations are aligned with the proposed GDP regulations.

*d. Other Changes*

The proposed amendment would also clarify how long Final Site Plan approvals are valid for (generally 5 years) and link the validity of a Site Plan to the time frames established by State Statute. It would also clarify which zoning regulations apply, should regulations change between the approval of a GDP and approval of the Final Site Plan.

**Narrative: Proposed Text Amendment to Add Section 19.J., General Development Plans, and Related Provisions**

**3/20/2023**

**1. Purpose**

In many instances, General Development Plan (GDP) applications are required for the rezoning to certain districts (such as the MXD-D or DWD-D), new developments in certain districts, or certain uses. However, because the GDP regulations evolved from the requirements of the Designed Waterfront Development (DWD) District, there are variations in how to apply the regulations in different districts. In addition, the GDP applications are often cumbersome, often requiring pre-applications before the GDP application proper which in turn always requires Final Site and Architectural Plan Approval.

The purpose of this text amendment is to create a separate Section for General Development Plans in the Zoning Regulations with uniform requirements across different uses and districts and to simplify application procedures.

**2. Proposed Changes**

*a. Creation of a Standalone GDP Section in the Regulations*

Currently, most regulations for GDPs are contained in Sections 9.D.7 and 9.D.8 of the Designed Waterfront Development district regulations with many references to waterfront dependent uses not applicable to GDPs in other districts. Relevant regulations would be moved to a new Section 19.J. (Section 19 contains rules for different types of Zoning Board approvals) and waterfront-specific references would be changed to be more broadly applicable.

*b. Simplifying Procedures and Requirements for GDP*

Currently, Applications in the DWD-district require a pre-application with its own review procedures even though a GDP in itself is a type of pre-application for Final Site and Architectural Plans. The proposed text would eliminate the pre-application requirement thus creating efficiencies in reviewing GDP applications.

In addition, for certain districts (e.g., the MX-D or DWD-D), GDPs are required in conjunction with zoning map changes. Zoning generally regulates permitted uses and bulk for development, therefore, requiring a GDP in conjunction with a rezoning which creates an additional process without value added. Additionally, for larger, area-wide rezonings GDPs are not feasible because they are site specific.

*c. Proposed Regulations*

The proposed regulations would clarify that GDPs are only needed for larger, multi-phased developments requiring Final Site and Architectural approvals but for which such final plans cannot be prepared as the project may evolve due to its complexity and long duration. GDPs would also be required for certain uses (e.g., Museum or Hospital Complexes) for which long periods of development are anticipated. Prior to construction of a specific development phase, Final Site and Architectural Plan approval would be required. Both GDPs and Final Site Plans approvals would require a public hearing (as currently).

As the intent of a GDP is to a) create for the developer a sense of predictability as to what can be developed under which conditions and b) for the Zoning Board and the public what potential development impacts may occur after completion of the a project over a long period of time, the proposed amendment would also clarify which aspects of a development are approved and which regulations apply should the zoning change during the development of a project.

Application requirements and procedures are proposed to remain largely the same as they currently are.

As GDP relevant requirements are spread throughout a variety of districts and uses, amendments are necessary to make sure that the district and use regulations are aligned with the proposed GDP regulations.

*d. Other Changes*

The proposed amendment would also clarify how long Final Site Plan approvals are valid for (generally 5 years) and link the validity of a Site Plan to the time frames established by State Statute. It would also clarify which zoning regulations apply, should regulations change between the approval of a GDP and approval of the Final Site Plan.