Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance

Alderman Anglace called the meeting of the Board of Aldermen to order at 7 p.m. All those present stood and pledged allegiance to the flag.

Roll Call

Alderman John F. Anglace, Jr., President – present
Alderman Lynne Farrell – present
Alderman John “Jack” Finn – present
Alderman Stanley Kudej – present
Alderman Noreen McGorty – present
Alderman John P. Papa – present
Alderman Eric McPherson – present
Alderman Anthony Simonetti – present

Administration:

Attorney Tom Welch, Corporation Counsel

PUBLIC PORTION

Fred Wills, 167 Pheasant Ridge, Shelton

I am currently the Anti-Blight/Zoning Enforcement Officer, Inland/Wetlands Inspector and the signage nemesis. Earlier I came before you, and tonight I will repeat the signage ordinance in front of you is required to address the increasingly unauthorized, unwanted, and proliferation of signage from predominantly, outside of the City. I have been at this for sixteen years and most of the business leaders and the business establishments in Shelton have come to recognize that it is a benefit to not have all of these signs posted and littering all over the place; the general population does agree with me. The ordinance is an effective base of enforcement principles that have been in effect throughout many of the cities and towns all over the United States; they just do not permit it. Over the past decades, Shelton has developed into a very vibrant city. If you require any proof of this, try navigating the arterial highways before 4 and 6 pm. This administration has done many good things, many beneficial things for the city. Tonight I am asking them to do one more step to give us the ordinance, so we could enforce it. I
would like to dispel a lot of things that I have been hearing from the outside: It is not the intent of the fines to go after every Tom, Dick and Harry. Predominantly, I need that fine structure to go after the corporations that come in from the outside that are littering the poles, 30 to 40 a clip. I have made it a practice over the years to give them a courtesy call. Now I think we need to come down and issue a fine.

As far as the individuals that want to put up signs for tag sales and things of that nature, we are going to give them ample time, sign a certificate of compliance and there will not be a charge for that. The whole purpose for having that system is that we know how many signs they plan to put up. We basically want to know who the individuals are that will remove the signs, because the problem is that they put up too many signs but two weeks or two months go by and the signs are still up. This is an increasing cost to the city. So tonight, I am asking that you would approve the ordinance. If there are any questions relating to the ordinance, I would be glad to supply the answers. Thank you.

**Judson Crawford, 8 Jordan Avenue**

It is a question for Corporation Counsel, and for all of the aldermen to answer. After the bid opening that took place this afternoon, if a department puts an item up for surplus, and on the second time no bids are received, is there an ordinance governing the department as to how many more times it may put that item out for bid? Thank you.

Before reviewing the agenda items, President Anglace wanted to inform the Board of Aldermen that a letter was submitted from Lucia Furman, Vice President of Mercantile Development, Inc. President Anglace continued to say that this letter addresses their support for the sign ordinance. She also sent a copy of the Wilton sign ordinance. I will be glad to make this available for all of the aldermen.

It was noted that all of the aldermen had a copy of this memo.

Alderman Finn: The only one that we are missing is the Conservation Commission. They sent a letter out, and we do not have it in front of us. They sent over suggestions; they are not in support of the sign ordinance that is being submitted.

- Please see a copy of the memo submitted by Lucia Furman, attached to the June 11, 2015 Full Board Meeting Minutes.

**Agenda Items**

**MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

Alderman Papa MOVED to waive the reading and approve the following meeting minutes:
1. Regular Full Board Meeting – May 14, 2015  
2. Special Meeting – May 28, 2015  

SECONDED by Alderman Finn. A voice vote was taken and the motion PASSED unanimously.

Minutes can be viewed on the city website: www.cityofshelton.org.

5.1 FINANCE COMMITTEE

5.1.1 NO ITEMS

5.2 PUBLIC HEALTH & SAFETY COMMITTEE

5.2.1 NO ITEMS

5.3 STREET COMMITTEE

5.3.1 NO ITEMS

REPORT OF THE MAYOR - none

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT – none

6.0 LEGAL REPORT

6.1 CORPORATION COUNSEL BILLING

Alderman Papa MOVED to authorize a total payment of $4,799.64 to Corporation Counsel Welch, Teodosio, Stanek and Blake, LLC, for services rendered per statement dated June 4, 2015, with funds to come from the following Legal Services Accounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>001-1900-411.30-03</td>
<td>$1,622.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreclosure Fees</td>
<td>001-1900-411.50-01</td>
<td>$2,660.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Court Costs 001-1900-411.84 $ 517.14

SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti. A voice vote was taken and the motion PASSED unanimously.

7 LEGISLATIVE - OLD

7.1 ITEMS FROM PUBLIC HEARING

7.1 A PROPOSED ORDINANCE – SIGNS ON CITY PROPERTY/ POLES

Alderman McPherson MOVED to adopt the Proposed Ordinance – Signs on City Property/Poles which is included by reference.

Further, move that this ordinance be published in summary form with a full copy available for review in the office of the City Town Clerk.

Public Hearing was held on May 28th at City Hall.

WHEREAS, throughout the City of Shelton there has been a proliferation of signs placed on City property without the City’s permission or consent;

WHEREAS, throughout the City of Shelton there has been a proliferation of signs placed on telegraph, telephone, electric light or power poles which is a violation of Connecticut General Statutes 23-65;

WHEREAS, the Board of Aldermen finds that the codification and prohibition of signs on City property without permission or on utility poles will benefit the health, safety and welfare of the residents of the City of Shelton.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN OF THE CITY OF SHELTON:

A. Signs on City Property:
   1. No person, firm or corporation or company shall place, install, construct or store on City property any sign without written permission of the City of Shelton.
   2. The City shall have the right to immediately remove any sign that is placed, installed, constructed or stored on City of Shelton property.

B. Signs on Telephone Poles:

No person, firm, corporation or company shall affix to a telegraph, telephone, electric light or power pole a playbill, picture, notice, advertisement or other similar thing.

C. Penalty:
1. A violation of either subsection A or B by any agent or employee of such person, firm, company or corporation shall be deemed to be the act of such person, firm, company or corporation, and such person or any member of such firm or any officer of such corporation or company, as the case may be, shall be subject to the penalty herein provided, unless act is shown to have been done without his knowledge or consent.

2. A violation of this section shall be subject to a fine of $50.00 for the first offense, $100.00 for the second offense and $250.00 for the third and each subsequent offense. Each sign shall be considered a separate offense.

3. A citation for a violation of this ordinance may be issued by the Shelton Police Department or the Planning and Zoning Administrator, Zoning Enforcement Officer or Anti Blight Officer.

SECONDED by Alderman Papa.

Discussion:

Alderman Finn: I have a question for Corporation Counsel.

Atty. Welch: Sure. Just to note that Alderman McPherson said “Zoning Administrator” and that is correct, as opposed to “Zoning Administration”, so what he said was correct.

Alderman Finn: Counsel, during the Public Hearing it was mentioned that Planning & Zoning oversees private property, and that this ordinance will only address the city right-of-ways, or city property. However, the telephone poles are private property; they have UI and AT&T on them and various other companies that own the poles. How can we fine someone for putting a sign on a telephone pole, which is private property?

Atty. Welch: There is a state statute that actually mandates the city to do that.

Alderman Finn: Can we see that?

Atty. Welch: Yes. We brought this up at Street Committee.

Alderman Anglace: You did hear me mention that at the Public Hearing, and I did respond that it was state statute that directly orders us (the local municipality) to enforce it.

Alderman Finn: I know that it addresses that the utilities are supposed to enforce it.

Alderman Anglace: No, the municipality addresses it. I wish you were right, but we also received a letter from Larry Mai, from UI, reminding us that it is our responsibility for the enforcement of the proliferation of signs or anything on the poles.

Alderman Finn: Can I get a copy of that letter as well?
Alderman Anglace: Yes you can.

Alderman Finn: It would have been nice if we could have that for tonight.

Alderman Anglace: Any other discussion?

Alderman McPherson: Yes Mr. President, I want to take a moment to thank both, Corporation Counsel and Fred Wills, because a lot of time and effort has gone into this and we have met on this many times. I would also like to thank you for your input and the Mayor for his input, to encourage this ordinance to move forward. I would just like to thank the people for their help on this ordinance.

Alderman Anglace: It has taken a lot of work to evolve to this point. However, I do not think any of us should think that this is the end, because I am sure there are going to be issues that will come up and questions that will come up. So, if they come up we will address them but at least we have an ordinance that allows us to clean up, to have an orderly community. I know a lot of people are going to be impacted by this, and a lot of non-profits but we need to get the word out as best as we can and it is what it is. Another example that Counsel mentioned that could happen down the road, and if we can think of 3, 4 or 5 spots around the city that say ok these are definite sites that you can place your signs; that is permissible to do them in 3, 4, or 5 locations. However in the time permitted, we could not come up with 3, 4, or 5 locations or where the right spot would be. So we many come back to revisit this.

Alderman Finn: Who is going to enforce the ordinance?

Alderman Anglace: As the ordinance says, the Zoning Enforcement Officer, Shelton Police Department, etc.

Alderman Finn: Whom do we call for the list of signs for them to take down? How long will it take for them to remove the signs?

Aldermen Anglace: If you ask the authority to do it, he will do it immediately when he sees it.

Alderman Finn: Well can you travel to White Hills because no one has been over there.

Atty. Welch: I think this is responding to the President’s comments, that it is a first step because obviously you are authorized in here that you can grant permission to place signs on city property. So you are going to have to eventually develop an administrative policy, as similar to the Huntington Green going to Parks & Rec, you are allowed to place signs at this location for duration for a week before an event and a week after an event. So, the next step is to develop an administrative policy by this board to say that we are permitting them under these certain circumstances. I am sure that you will be revisiting that.
Alderman Finn: I am looking at the Shelton JC; they are having an arts and craft fair, and their signs are all over town. I would hate to see them get fined. You have the Relay for Life coming up this weekend and their signs are up all over town; I would hate to see them get fined. The Fire Departments are having a pancake breakfast; I would hate to see them get fined. They are also having a flower sale; I would hate to see them get fined. I would also hate to see real estate agents put their signs on the corners, advertising the houses for sale, that they are going to get fined as well.

Alderman Papa: I think Jack; we are going to use discretion on companies or associations that are non-profit-

Alderman McPherson: The problem is that no one picks up the signs. We still have carnival signs from St. Joseph’s Church, and there is another church up Ripton Road that has signs all over the place.

Alderman Finn: St. Joseph’s Church does not put up the signs.

Alderman McPherson: The signs are everywhere; no one picks up the signs.

Alderman Finn: In other words, you are going to fine St. Joseph’s Church $50.00 for each sign?

Alderman McPherson: I am saying Jack that no one picks them up. You want to put them up there; you want the tag sales to go up so someone is going to have to pick them up. It is not the people who put them up; it falls on Fred Wills, it falls on us and now we have a situation that becomes litter.

Alderman Anglace: Are you suggesting that we have a one or two month period where the information gets out so people have the chance to be aware of it before we put this into effect?

Alderman Finn: Yes they would have to come up with some sort of guidelines, and then the public is going to have to follow the guidelines. St. Joseph’s Church does not put up the signs, but the amusement center puts the signs up then they are gone and out of town. I would hate to see my church get fine $50.00 per sign, for having them up all over the city.

Alderman Kudej: How about issuing permits for specific times to have the signs up, like 2 days, 3 days, 4 days? Whoever gets the permit has to pick up the signs?

Alderman Anglace: Let us go back to Jack’s point: Jack, with respect to non-profit organizations putting signs out, what we are talking about here is any organization, whether you are non-profit or for profit, puts a sign on city property. If we need a month to get people to understand what we are passing and what the provisions are, then we can put that into the ordinance and not start it for a month. I think what we may find, to Stanley’s point, is that people would not find it convenient to come in and get a permit to put up a sign someplace. We are saying permit or no permit; you cannot put up a sign on
city property. So, a permit is not going to be the answer. It is just totally getting out of hand, and the majority of people that do it are non-profits so you need to address it sooner or later. I am willing to put this off and say, we pass it but it is not effective for a month. I think that would be the smart thing to do.

Alderman Finn: This will affect the Boy’s Club, when they have their signs around Veteran’s Park. They put the signs out there so people know that the carnival is in town.

Alderman Papa: If they would take them down after they put them up, that is what we are talking about.

Alderman Anglace: What we are talking about is putting signs up on city property, and that is what is wrong. The fact is that they place the signs up too early, and they do not take them down when they are supposed to. What we are saying is we are not addressing when you put them up or take them down. We are saying that you can place a sign on private property anywhere; that is your business. There is nothing prohibiting them. What I am saying is the city owns the property, so you cannot deface city property by putting up signs on city property. You may think it is great, but when you have 50 signs on one location, they do not take them down then they fall off the trees, fall off the poles then it is graffiti.

Alderman Finn: Let me go back to what Counsel said a couple of years ago, it is city property you do not need an ordinance for; just take it down.

Alderman Anglace: Yes that is what we are doing.

Alderman Finn: However, we are passing an ordinance and it says you do not need an ordinance.

Atty. Welch: There was no fine.

Alderman Simonetti: If I may Mr. President, Mr. Wills just stood up there and said that he is more worried about these people coming from out of town selling houses, buying houses- those are the signs that stay forever. If you went to St. Joseph’s or the Boy’s Club, there is going to be an ordinance to say that if you put up the signs, please take them down. If they get a permit first, I think they will do it without a problem.

Alderman Papa: I think the Boy’s Club do it all of the time.

Atty. Welch: If I may, the ordinance provides that someone has the right to put signs up on city property, provided that they have permission. So similar to the Huntington Green where there is a process, the board has to come up with an administrative policy to address these issues because I think everyone’s comments are correct. Years ago, it was that no one had the right to put a sign on someone’s private property, and no one has the right to place a sign on city property because it is not their property. If I codify this, what it does really is it codifies the penalty because no one has the right to place a sign on city property. To address your concerns, the avenue of doing some sort of
administrative task and who would handle that is the next task, where you can do it simultaneously if want to put it off for now.

Alderman Anglace: I think what would be in order here, is an amendment to make this effective one month from now, July 15, 2015, and in the meantime to develop an administrative policy, as you have just described.

Alderman Finn: It would be nice to have a copy of the ordinance to be sent to Center Street, Kinko’s, Staples on Bridgeport Avenue, for these places that produce signs.

Alderman Papa: Who would be the most logical person to administer this? Would it be the Police Department? Planning & Zoning? City Clerk?

Alderman McPherson: I would think Planning & Zoning.

Alderman Papa: The biggest thing is taking the signs down.

Alderman Simonetti: If they still have the sign up and you do not hit them with a fine, they are going to continue to do it.

Alderman Finn: Are we going to use a City Sheriff to deliver a letter?

Alderman Simonetti: A registered letter is another $6-$8, plus someone needs to type the letter; then it becomes a $20-$30 deal.

Alderman Papa: We have an ordinance in place; let us see how it works out. Like John said, we could always tweak it to add, delete or change something.

Alderman Kudej: You can put anything you want on private property. If you want to use city property, get a permit.

Alderman Simonetti: Jack has a point of sending the ordinance to these places that make the signs. That might be able to help.

Alderman Anglace: There are a few questions that you have asked; let me answer them. It says here, “The City of Shelton has right to immediately remove any sign that is placed, installed, constructed or stored on City of Shelton property”. That is a given. Who is going to enforce the ordinance? It is stated here, “A citation for a violation of this ordinance may be issued by the Shelton Police Department or the Planning and Zoning Administrator, Zoning Enforcement Officer or Anti-Blight Officer”. So you have four entities who can enforce it.

Alderman Finn: Which one of the four can issue a citation?

Alderman Simonetti: All four of them.

Alderman Finn: Planning and Zoning had it taken away from them in the past.
Alderman Anglace: The Planning and Zoning Administrator; that is only one person. The Enforcement Officer is only one person; the Anti-Blight Officer is one person and the Shelton Police Department, all who are certified. It seems to me the way to go is to delay the start of it for a month, and during that month Counsel will come up with an administrative policy to put that into effect. You do not need to come back to the board for an administrative policy.

Alderman Finn: You have communicated that Chief Hurliman reinstated the issuing of citations because the former chief did take away that authority to those entities.

Alderman McPherson: The ordinance itself grants the entities the authority to do it through the ordinance itself.

Alderman Finn: Even though the former Police Chief took away the citation power?

Alderman McPherson: The current Chief of Police supports this ordinance. We do not need him because the ordinance itself gives the Enforcement Officer, the Anti-Blight Officer or any of those entities to issue a citation.

Alderman Anglace: The police department cannot issue a citation without an ordinance to do it. They could only issue a citation in the case of signs on poles without an ordinance because that is covered under state statute. The rest they need an ordinance in order to issue a citation, or remove the signs.

Alderman Papa: If someone wants to put signs up, whom do they go to get permission?

Alderman Anglace: That is going to come when Counsel puts together the administrative policy.

Alderman Finn: It was mentioned to the fact that there may be forms that they need to get filled out, how many signs that they are going to put up, when they are going to put them up/take them down. Who is the person that is going to take them down? I assume this is going to happen to the average homeowner when they want to do a tag sale in their neighborhood; they are going to have to go through this as well?

Alderman Papa: All I am saying is that it would be logical to have one administrator to give out the permits, instead of having four different locations.

Alderman Anglace: My feeling is you have gone this far, you have this ordinance in place; put it in place and delay the start of it so people can know what is going to happen. The administrative policy is subject to change as you change things you improve them.

Alderman McPherson: I agree with the 30-day delay, this way we can educate the public and Counsel will have enough time to create the administrative policy. We have something here so that is a start and we need to move forward.
Alderman McPherson MOVED to approve the amendment to the motion, by adding a one-month delay to the effective start date of the Proposed Sign Ordinance, in order to better educate the public and for Corporation Counsel to create an administrative policy for the Proposed Sign Ordinance.

SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti. A voice vote was taken and the amendment to the motion PASSED unanimously.

Alderman Papa MOVED to approve the main motion as stated; opposition from Alderman Finn. A voice vote was taken and main motion PASSED 7-1.

8  **FINANCIAL BUSINESS OLD**

8.1 NO ITEMS

9  **FINANCIAL BUSINESS NEW**

9.1  **FUNDING FOR REPLACEMENT OF FIRE HOSE FOR FIRE DEPARTMENT**

Alderman Papa MOVED to appropriate $30,546 for the replacement of fire hose for the Fire Department with funding to be provided by bonding pursuant to Section 7.16 of the City Charter.

SECONDED by Aldermen Kudej. A voice vote was taken and the motion PASSED unanimously.

9.2  **CITY OF SHELTON/NORTHEAST FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATES AGREEMENT**

Alderman Papa MOVED to approve the Personal Property Tax Agreement by and between the City of Shelton and Northeast Financial Management Associates, LLC and authorize Mayor Mark A. Lauretti to execute any and all documents necessary to effectuate same.

SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti.

Discussion:

Alderman Finn: There is a typo on page 11 of the agreement that needs to be corrected: It says “City of Shelton, 54 Hill Street, Shelton, CT 06484”. Then, it says, “Attention Ms. Mark Lauretti, Mayor”. It should be changed to “Mr. Mark A. Lauretti, Mayor”.
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Alderman Anglace: Thank you for pointing that out, Jack.

A voice vote was taken and motion PASSED unanimously.

9.3 2015 NEIGHBORHOOD ASSISTANCE TAX CREDIT PROGRAM

Alderman Papa MOVED to approve the three proposals for Neighborhood Assistance Tax Credit Program as submitted by the Community Development Director and authorize the proposals to be submitted to the State of CT Department of Revenue Services.

SHELTON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION $15,000
BOYS & GIRLS CLUB OF LOWER NAUGATUCK VALLEY $50,000
JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT OF WESTERN CONNECTICUT, INC. $25,000

SECONDED by Alderman Finn. A voice vote was taken and motion PASSED unanimously.

9.4 JUNE STATUTORY REFUNDS

Alderman Papa MOVED that the report of the Tax Collector relative to the refund of taxes for a total amount of $33.47 be approved and that the Finance Director be directed to make payments in accordance with the certified list received from the Tax Collector with funds to come from the Statutory Refunds Account 001-0000-311.13.00.

SECONDED by Alderman McPherson. A voice vote was taken and the motion PASSED unanimously.

9.5 REFUND OF ZBA APPLICATION – DAVID GRANT

Alderman Papa MOVED to refund the ZBA Application #53155 in the amount of $160.00 to David Grant, 25 Birchbank Road, Shelton, CT with money to come from the General Miscellaneous Reimbursements Account #001-0000-381.34-00.

SECONDED by Alderman Finn. A voice vote was taken and motion PASSED unanimously.

10. LEGISLATIVE - NEW

10.1 ITEMS TO PUBLIC HEARING
10.2 RESOLUTION REGARDING DESIGNATION OF SINGLE SPECIAL EVENTS

Alderman Papa:

Pursuant to Code of Ordinance 9-150 Special Event License, the Board of Aldermen hereby designates the concerts on the Green and fireworks and concerts at the Riverwalk for which a separate event license is required and pursuant to Sec. 9-150b the application fee is reduced to $50 per special event.

SECONDED by Alderman McPherson. A voice vote was taken and the motion PASSED unanimously.

10.3 CROWN CASTLE INTERNATIONAL TOWERS (FORMERLY KNOWN AS PINNACLE TOWERS) – EXTENSION OF LEASE

Alderman Papa MOVED to approve the attached extension to the Antenna Site Lease (Trumbull Tower) between Crown Castle International Towers (formerly known as Pinnacle Towers) and the City of Shelton.

Further authorize Mayor Mark A. Lauretti to sign any and all necessary documents.

SECONDED by Alderman Finn. A voice vote was taken and motion PASSED unanimously.

10.4 AECOM PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT – DEMOLITION OF CHROMIUM PROCESS BUILDING

Alderman Papa MOVED to approve the following resolution:

Whereas, the City of Shelton, acting in concert with the Shelton Economic Development Corporation (SEDC) has received a grant from the State of Connecticut, Department of Economic and Community Development, for the purpose of the demolition and remediation of the building known as the “Chromium Process” building located in the downtown revitalization area on Canal Street, and which property presents an unacceptable risk to the public health and safety, and is an unacceptable blight, and;

Whereas, the Shelton Economic Development Corporation, acting in their capacity as implementation agency for this activity, has solicited engineering proposals, in accordance with the procurement requirements of the CT Department of Economic and Community Development, and a duly appointed selection committee has conducted interviews and rated and ranked the four submissions, and;
Whereas, the Selection Committee has recommended to the City of Shelton and the SEDC that the award of a contract for professional services be made to the engineering firm AECOM, in the amount of $78,095.00, including but not limited to preparation of project plan, testing for asbestos, lead and pcb contaminants, structural survey, preparations of plans, bidding and procurement support, and field oversight during demolition (30 estimated work days), and;

Whereas, the Shelton Economic Development Corporation, has an existing state contract, “master agreement” that can be amended to include this work;

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Board of Aldermen of the City of Shelton hereby authorizes the modification of the SEDC’s agreement with AECOM to allow for this work to proceed as soon as possible, and other such amendments as may be necessary to implement this project in accordance with CT DECD guidelines and provide a cost and time effective approach and result. Funding for this activity will be assigned to the grant to the City of Shelton ($1,019,470.00) and is reimbursable expense.

SECONDED by Aldermen Simonetti. A voice vote was taken and motion PASSED unanimously.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

11.A. REQUEST TO MOVE INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION

11.1 NO ITEMS

ADJOURNMENT

Alderman Papa MOVED to adjourn the June 11, 2015 Regular Full Board of Aldermen Meeting.

SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti. A voice vote was taken and the motion PASSED unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brittany Gannon, Clerk
Board of Aldermen
Addenda 1: Memo from Lucia Furman, VP of Mercantile Development, Inc, in regards to Proposed Sign Ordinance
June 11, 2015

Mr. John F. Anglace, Jr.
President, Board of Aldermen
54 Hill Street
Shelton, CT 06484

Re: Proposed Sign Ordinance

Dear Mr. Anglace,

I regret that I am unable to attend the June 11, 2015 Board of Aldermen meeting to voice support for the Proposed Sign Ordinance.

Mercantile Development, Inc. is a third generation family owned and operated manufacturing business in Shelton. We built our current 10 Waterview Drive headquarters in 1996 and we take great pride in maintaining a top-notch facility from top to bottom, inside and out.

We have watched with dismay as our well maintained grounds have become surrounded by unsightly signs plastered to trees and utility poles. These illegal signs, frequently advertising out-of-town businesses, are usually posted high up so as to require equipment to remove. Occasionally signs are removed but pop up again seemingly overnight. It has become a great embarrassment.

It is hard to believe that the Town of Shelton does not have an ordinance in place to prevent the visual blight of illegal signage on private and public property. We have included a copy of the Town of Wilton regulations where one can drive from end to end without being accosted by unsightly unapproved signs. Approved signs promoting community events are temporarily displayed and promptly removed after the event. We implore you to approve a similarly strong sign ordinance that empowers the Town of Shelton to pursue violators with fines and put an end to the sign blight.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Lucia Furman
Vice President