Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance

President John F. Anglace, Jr., 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 – not present
- Alderman John “Jack” Finn – present
- Alderman Stanley Kudej – present
- Alderman Noreen McGorty – present
- Alderman Jim Capra – present
- Alderman Eric McPherson – present
- Alderman Anthony Simonetti – present

Administration:

- Attorney Thomas Welch, Corporation Counsel
PUBLIC PORTION:

Gregory Tetro, 281 Buddington Road

I am here tonight to talk about the Shelter Ridge Project. I want to thank Alderman Anglace, Alderman Capra, and Alderwoman Farrell, who have already spoke at one of the meetings; thank you very much. We would love to hear everyone’s opinion; there is another meeting that is coming up and we would like to know your thoughts on it so I am kind of in the know of how everyone else feels.

Alderman Anglace: When is that meeting, please?

Gregory Tetro: It is June 28th. My big concern was that I was never a big “go to a meeting kind of guy” to find out what is going on in the town. As I come in here that I find out all of these things that are so strange. I find out that I go to minutes from a January 12, 2016 informal meeting between Planning & Zoning and the developer; there was no public comment. The developer and Planning & Zoning are hashing out what they plan on doing together. I was under the understanding that we voted the Planning & Zoning board in, and it would be so kind that they would be working for us. I feel that it is almost backwards when something like that happens.

Then I move forward and talk about our meeting on the 27th of April, where mysteriously the minutes are never submitted. To this day, the minutes of the opposition are not on the website. No one can see them, no one can hear the opposition and my name was left off. I am quoted in the newspaper but my name was left off as the speaker; I find that as a really nasty tactic. I called up to find out where the minutes were. They said that their secretary quit; they had a stenographer come in. They said the stenographer has the minutes but we have not yet turned them into paper yet; if you want to pay for them you can pay for them. I can buy the minutes to a meeting that I went to in a public place? I said that you are out of your mind. I looked on the Internet and pulled up the Freedom of Information Act. I came here with the Freedom of Information Act, and I said that I wanted to let you know that the four-day window clock starts now. If you do not produce the minutes, it will be a denial of giving me the minutes. The minutes were made. They said the minutes were going to be transcribed; we are going to have it word for word. So I then asked if I was going to have the minutes in time for the meeting, because I wanted it as quickly as possible before the next meeting. They said, well it is going to cost us $800 if we want to do a rush job to have the person work overnight. We are going to do it the slow way, so you might get the minutes in a week and a half. Which means that we could look at it three days before the meeting. Again, I am shocked and amazed that this goes on. We have another meeting on June 28th; we need your voices. If you are for the project, say you are for it. I understand that not everyone is against it. I am going to give a very impassioned speech like I did the last time. I was also at the Long Hill meeting, and I listened to Joe Benkowski, who was trying to get here for the meeting. He did a beautiful presentation, with a storyboard explaining how fill was put into the property 25 feet high up on the trees, and about how they broke every rule there is in the book. I read the meetings from the last 10th
meeting; it was basically one-half of a paragraph saying he was a little displeased with the project. I spoke for 15-20 minutes; there is maybe a paragraph and a half worth. I had two sentences that I really did not like the project. It was not word for word; it was not from the minutes that were spoken. I do not know what is going on with Planning & Zoning. I do not know what is going on in this town and I really would like to know. I am going to go as far as I have to go to find out what is going on. I think it is horrible what they are doing to these people. These people are working for us and all of a sudden this City is being sold off. On the 22nd, you are going to hear about Mr. Scinto tearing down Tetley Tea to put up a building with a couple of drive-thru’s in it. Then on the 28th, you are going to hear about 400,000 square feet of retail without any guarantees. They now went to the DOT to find out if they could cut that road off with a dead end. Mayor Lauretti said that we are not going to allow that, and that we are going to put a cul-de-sac at the end. So they drew a circle on a plan and showed us a circle on a plan. The DOT does not know about it. When I spoke to the Fire Marshal, he said that we still have a plan that still shows that road coming out onto Buddington Road. Isn’t there any procedure that you go to first that says you could do it? In the meeting on the 12th, Chairwoman Parkins said, she was going to put a caveat on that building high end retail. Caveat? Does that mean that when they build that whole building and they cannot sell it to a Nordstrom, that they cannot give it to a Super K-Mart? To challenge the Walmart? We were told Trader Joe’s, we were told Whole Foods, we were told high end retail and we ended up with Big Y, Goodwill and a nail salon. There is not a good track record that says big business is coming here. They show 3, 5,000 square foot buildings that are going to be food establishments. I said if this goes through, I have to change my lifestyle; maybe I will buy into a franchise. You know what fits into 5,000 square feet? Little bar restaurants, Hooters, or maybe if we are lucky we can hit the trifecta and go with the young foods of a Pizza Hut, Taco Bell or Kentucky Fried Chicken? That is not what their plan is, but if they cannot sell it their plan is to sell something. And what they are selling off is Shelton one piece at a time. It is ridiculous of what they are trying to do.

You have DaSilva, who made a beautiful road, Maggie Lane. The market crashed a little bit and got four houses in of what he wanted. DaSilva is now rushing to get two more buildings sold so he could get those buildings up, get them sold before his property drops $100,000 when this tower blocks out the sun of some of these buildings. I do not think that people realize that this building that they are putting on: 9 stories, 450 units is a full acre. They are sitting next to five or six residents within 500 feet, who are living on R-1 and they are putting a 1 acre on top of them, blocking out any visible sun for them. You see that the sun is shining right now; that will be gone. It is 150 feet above 30 more feet of fill on top of it. It is immoral; I think it is morally corrupt to think this is good for Shelton. For some reason they think that no children will ever move in there, because they said it was for millennials only. Read the January 12th minutes and you will see it (this is for millennials: ages 24 to 42). They talked about an Alzheimer’s and senior citizens center; the developer said that is probably not going to happen because the people who move into that type of building will not want to see a bunch of old people and their family. That is a quote from him. At that same meeting, he said the people that are backing this have more money than anyone in the room and if they do not want it they are not going to put it in. That is pompous and arrogant. Why are these people
going to be able to benefit on the hardworking people of Shelton, when they have no interest at all in this town? They have nobody living in this town and they are backed by foreign investors. I ask you to do what you can to help. Can anyone give me advice? Go to a town committee meeting? We are on Facebook; we have pages, we have petitions, we have everything that we possibly can. It is very hard to do to get people out, and the people do not come out as much because my wife and I have gone to several different diners and had asked. They said they could not talk because it could affect their business here in town. You have people that cannot come to the meeting; they know me and it could cause trouble. Others say, what is the use? They already have the four votes and they have the Mayor that is going to back them. Who has those four votes? The people feel defeated already. I will be there for the last meeting even if I will be there alone, but I am trying to find out what you all could do to help us. You do not have to; I am asking you if you could. Thank you very much.

Alderman Anglace: Leave me your phone number before you leave, and I will call you.

Gregory Tetro: Absolutely. Thank you.

Joe Welsh, President of Shelton Land Trust

I am here with some real good news about the work of the Shelton Land Trust. As many of you know, we are a volunteer, non-profit that has around 370 acres of protected open space that compliments a lot of the open space efforts by the City of Shelton over the years. Just last Friday we closed on a small, but significant piece in the Means Brook Greenway. It is 4 acres, but it borders the farmland that the City has helped preserve, existing Land Trust property, City Open Space and water company land. It is protected, so it is just another example of how you try to fit all of the pieces of the puzzles together bit by bit, to block out nice stretches of green where we could enhance trails or give wildlife the corridor that they need. I just want to thank all of you for all of the work that you have done to support us, and the whole big picture of keeping a good amount of Shelton green.

Nancy Steiner, 23 Partridge Lane

I am here tonight partly to commend John Anglace, Lynn Farrell and Mr. Capra for attending recent Planning & Zoning meetings and voicing their opinions of the proposed Shelton Ridge Town Center on Bridgeport Avenue. They all spoke out against the proposal, Mr. Anglace commenting that Shelton didn’t need the tax income of some $780,000 that badly from the 9-story apartment building, and I agree. Thanks to the three aldermen who came to the meeting and spoke out.

Even though this is a Planning & Zoning issue, it really is much more than that. If this project is built as planned, it will have severe impacts on traffic, the blasting, and the wells of residents nearby, scenic Mill Street, not to underscore the rain runoff from 121 acres that are now pristine woods. If there is a storm, you can imagine the runoff of 121 acres into our beloved Far Mill River, which has been abused and abused so much
in the past. Every single resident and business in Shelton would be impacted by this proposal!

A group of concerned citizens, Save our Shelton: SOS, is currently doing their best to make their voices heard. I like the name: Save OUR Shelton...it is MY Shelton; it is YOUR Shelton. So I am hoping that my presence and words here, after an absence of many years will convince you to be a presence at future P&Z meetings on this subject. I know how meetings all of you attend. There was a time when my husband, Irving, and I attended several meetings each month...Board of Aldermen, Water Pollution, Inland/Wetlands, Land Conservation, Planning & Zoning...I get it but I urge you. This is so monumentally horrible that any voice that is against it, with certainly voices like yours will make an impact on the people that are going to make the decision here; you must let your thoughts on this proposal be heard. What eventually happens to this piece of property is important to the entire city, from White Hills to the Stratford border, from Trumbull to the Housatonic River. It is going to impact the entire city.

About the land itself: In 1662 when this area was still a colony, King Charles II deeded large tracts of land of what is now called Shelton, Stratford, Trumbull, and Monroe, to the Wells family. Another 100 years would go by before we became the United States; wow imagine! I’m sure much of that land has changed hands in the last 354 years, but there is still the 121 acres on Bridgeport Avenue; still wild, still beautiful and still pristine. It may be the largest tract of undeveloped land left in Shelton. One of the wonderful things about Shelton is not we have built, but what we have not built on the undeveloped land; that is probably one of the best things about this town.

Over the years Shelton being mindful, has put together plans of conservation and development; the last one in 2006 and I have a big binder sitting on the chair with our Nancy and Irving Steiner copies of that. Twice my husband and I were members of the concerned citizens encouraged to participate in the plans of conservation and development. It took a lot of effort from a lot of people. The biggest concern of residents then was preservation of open space. That was in 2006, and I really do not think that mindset has been changed

I am going to give you a quick quote from that plan of conservation and development. These are the words from the City: “Guide appropriate commercial and industrial development that seeks to maximize future revenue potential in order to maintain a balanced and healthy community”. So my words to you: stick to this plan, keep the 121 acres zoned light industrial as they were in 2006. Good, intelligent choices were made then, so keep them.

Here is a recent quote from the Letter to the Editor in Shelton Herald, by Adrienne Couture. She said, “a zoning designation is a promise to the surrounding homeowners”. It means that is what this land was intended to be used for. You may consider it a zoning designation but homeowners consider it a promise.

I have something for you to look at: this is a very simple map of the land that I drew up (See Addendum). This land is basically a rectangle. It is divided from end to end by the
Iroquois gas and power lines. It is bordered by Bridgeport Avenue, our beloved Far Mill River and Mill Street, which has been designated a scenic road. As I was online looking at a picture of this property, I thought it was almost natural the way this thing is dividing it. Some of us are very nervous about all of the blasting that could be going on around that. Wouldn’t it be wonderful if the bottom triangle could remain as light industrial, and keep the top triangle green. Maybe the city could reach a financial or philanthropic understanding with the Wells family about this top triangle. This top triangle is also an important part of the Paugussett Trail, which has been in planning for a long, long time. If we had this green triangle here, if somehow the City of Shelton and the Wells family can get together, everyone would get a little something. That could be developed and we can have some green; the Wells family can sell some of their land or the town can buy some of the land and make an agreement? We have to be creative because we do not want to lose this land. This could go a long way to protecting scenic Mill Street. It would better shield the river from the runoff. If we get a rain storm, do you know where that rain is going to go from that asphalt? No matter how many holding tanks they have, it is going to end up in the Far Mill River. We do not want that! A plan like this could shield the river from the runoff and provide the land for trails that we need, and protect residents along Buddington Road, Old Kings Road, and of course, Mill Street. This is not just any piece of land; it is a really precious piece of land. Thank you very much.

Jill Deloma, Buddington Road

I just wanted to thank Alderman Anglace, Alderman Capra and Alderwoman Farrell, for speaking against the Shelter Ridge Project. Like the other members of SOS, I am also opposed to it, and I encourage the other members of the board to also speak out.

Diane Tetro, 281 Buddington Road

My husband already spoke. Thank you to the three aldermen for speaking at our very first Planning & Zoning meeting; you do not know how good that made me feel to see that someone cares. A lot has been talked about the scenic issues on Mill Street; the building blocking out the sun. What we are forgetting is what this is going to do to Buddington Road, which is no bigger than a cow path. Should we open up this development to exit out onto Buddington Road; I do not know if any of you traveled on Buddington Road recently, if you know there are all culverts that are broken, all of the accidents that we have had, and the crime that we are having. This is even before this building opens up. I do not know if the developer has taken a drive down there, to see that we have a hairpin turn, blind hill that you cannot see a truck coming over, or S turns. What worries me is that someone is going to get hit by a newbie living in this building and get killed, and this town is going to get sued because it knows darn well what its doing. They cannot widen that road; at least not on certain parts of it are at a 45-degree angle already. That means how are these neighbors going to get in their driveway if we cut off 10-feet of their front lawn? They can’t. We already have some well problems with the people that live on Buddington Road. It is a well-known fact that Connecticut already has earthquakes, so the infrastructure is not that stable. All of this blasting no matter how new is it, how it can get done is not going to do well for these.
We do not have public water; we do not have public sewers. Not all of Buddington does; some do but most does not have that. I cannot believe that my neighbors would sit still for this. Somebody, if something happens, is going to pay for it. Whatever tax benefits we make off of this are going to go down the toilet.

Lastly, I would like to say all of my years I have never once voted. I have never registered to vote and I have never seen the need. Well this year, learning what I have learned now about this town and about the people who are running it, I registered and I am going to vote and make my vote count. Thank you.

Joyce Deloma, 180 Buddington Road

At the meeting last week or two, I do not know who was present and who was not. I had basically explained at that time my concerns. Yes, I am definitely opposed to this project, this PDD for all of those reasons that were stated at the last meeting, which should be on record. Now listening to what is going on, my main concern is my driveway is right up against where the plan is for exiting out on to Buddington Road. It is literally where the Iroquois pipe line comes across; that is our driveway. The proposed exit onto Buddington Road is that 60-feet next to it. As you come down the straightaway in a 25 mile per hour zone, most people fly doing 35 or 40 miles per hour because it is a nice straightaway. Then, it comes around to a very sharp curve. When I pull out of my driveway, I basically have to go onto the lawn to see who is coming to the left of me. It is a hazardous situation. I do not even know how many times that I have gotten out of my car to cross Buddington Road to get my mail. People go flying by and there is no regard for pedestrians trying to get their mail.

Maybe there has not been a death yet on Buddington Road, but I guarantee you when this project is passed if it is passed by all of you, that there will be many lives lost because drivers today do not have the consideration for the other person. There is no defensive driving, and everyone is in a hurry to get everywhere. If a road goes through on Buddington Road, a driver from Bridgeport Avenue comes all of the way across, I guarantee that it is not just for emergency exits only like it was previously stated in a few other meetings. For a project this size, as it was stated in the State of Connecticut, requesting that drive to go through. So I am asking you, members of the board, to also agree with Mr. Anglace, Ms. Farrell and Mr. Capra. Go along with their consideration, and I would urge you to please carefully look over this project that is presently proposed. It is too large for the area that you want to put it in, it is a residential area that you want to place a humongous entity that does not fit. It is going to destroy a lot of what everyone in this community strives to keep. We realize that Shelton is a growing city, many people come here and praise how wonderful our town is. What we live in is a beautiful town and Mayor Lauretti has done a wonderful job over the past 25 years that he has been in office. Yes, I had voted for him because I have seen all of the wonderful things that he was doing for this town. What I am saying is please give very close thought to everything that this whole project, as it is currently designed to us, the residents, of Buddington Road, Far Mill, Bridgeport Avenue- the whole area. People traveling to and from work; it is just too large to place on that property. Another woman spoke last week stating that she put up a wonderful plan of meeting up 50/50. Keep
the part where the Paugussett Trail is; not sure if it is east or to the west of the ridge but keep that light industrial, keep it zoned as is and keep it protected. The lower part of Bridgeport Avenue where you have plans of widening the road to six lanes, yes change the plan around a little bit and put your main industries down on Bridgeport Avenue where you are already structured for that. It was also stated 30 or so years ago or more that certain areas of the city were carved out for LIP and development. This little parcel of land, and we are realizing the owners want to sell it because of whatever issues. If the City would even meet half way? Purchase some of it for open space. I understand that by things quoted that we have over a $5 million surplus. Purchase some of that for open space; keep that retail and less than a 9-story. If it has to be an apartment building then keep it below on Bridgeport Avenue. Thank you for your time.

Judson Crawford, 8 Jordan Avenue

I do not think I need to add onto to anything that has been addressed to you, the Board of Aldermen, this evening. I will say this much, at the last meeting of Planning & Zoning which was held at the Intermediate School I was shocked by one thing: that they were going to bring in close to 30-feet of fill and then build this 9-story building on top of that 30-feet. Just as the gentleman has spoken to you tonight, the sun is going to be lost. Start right from the beginning, Mayor Lauretti actually answered one question that everyone should be asking: How many more people are coming into our municipality on a daily basis that works here, in the City of Shelton? Quote, “that is over 25,000 people”. We do not need more, and I think I have to say thank you to the aldermen that have spoken out and I thank you for that. The one thing that I am saying that I think should be looked at, addressed and not left behind is why is it that the Planning & Zoning Commission wants to change the zoning regulation from light industrial to a PDD regulation? The members of that commission, here we are in the year 2016, will every single member of that commission be on that board into the future? Once you change a regulation that is it. The only way doing it right now is to read to the zoning regulations.

First off, even though I am from the other section of our municipality, yes I am against this having to be built. There is no need for it.

The next section that I want to talk about is questions. Under Section 7.1, Ordinance #836, Section C: the Board of Aldermen, time to time, shall change the hourly rate. I am asking you, what is the hourly rate right now?

Number 2, under Section 9.6, after reading the agenda which is on tonight’s agenda, where does our city stand approving the contract #36-36? Between the three bidders that put in a bid for that contract on 5/26/16, I believe most likely it has to go to our Corporation Counsel. Is that item coming back with a low medium, or the high bidder? I thank you very much for your time.

Alderman Capra: I just want to thank you all for coming out tonight. Thank you for being very respectful to us as well. We appreciate you coming out, and I can assure you that we all hear you and many of the Shelton residents do hear you, as well. You are right; we do not need this project. I will help you all out as much as I can.
Betty Goddard, 39 Laurelwood Drive

I came here tonight to thank Mayor Lauretti, as appointing Doreen Laucella as the acting Director of the Senior Center. Since she has been director, the sun shines on the Senior Center no matter what the weather is like. One year ago when we scheduled a party or an activity, some of them had to be cancelled because there was no participation. Now we have so much participation that we have to turn people away. My husband runs the chorus there; before Doreen started we had 28 members. We now have 41 members; we have so many members that when we go to sing at a convalescent home they do not have enough chairs for us. The Senior Center has improved more than 100%; the whole new staff is absolutely fabulous and they get along well together. There has been so many changes that other towns are talking about how wonderful the Shelton Senior Center is. I would really like to beg him to make her permanent. It frightens me the fact that the Town of Trumbull is looking for a Director of their Senior Center. I am afraid of no matter how much she loves it here, if they make an offer to her and money talks, then she is likely to leave and I would really hate to see that happen. It has been almost one year that she has been there. I know that people have signed petitions that have had hundreds of signatures; people have written letters to the Mayor. I just wanted to come here in to say please; if you have any input at all make her permanent. Make us all happy! We are having an affair for Father’s Day; it would be wonderful if the Mayor could come and make her permanent. Thank you very much.

Alderman Anglace: Thank you Betty. We normally do not respond during public portion, but just let me comment on that. During the budget process, the Board of Aldermen was unanimous in that we wanted to make sure that the position of the Senior Center Director was a full time position. We did use our influence to speak with the Mayor, regarding not who to appoint, but to appoint that position as a full time. Who he appoints is the administrative decision that is up to him. I am sure that the performance of the incumbent acting director speaks for itself, and he will not have much difficulty deciding who to appoint once he decides to move forward on it. I think he will, that is my opinion. I think he will and, like you have said there is so much change and it is all for the better. It really is a great program.

I am going to make one comment in respect to the Town Center discussion. I have lived in Shelton since 1967. I am not the oldest person in Shelton; Jack and Anthony probably have more time than me but since 1967 like the Steiner’s, I was always actively involved in the local government, always. I have never seen the size of a turnout in opposition to a proposal like this time. Remember this is unheard of when Planning & Zoning had two meetings from 7:00 to 10:00 PM. The second hearing went on until 10:00 PM; the only reason that it was cut off was because the agreement with SIS was that you get out of the building at 10:00 PM. They are going for another meeting so you see and watch what happens there; keep the pressure on them. If you have a point of view, then present it and like Greg said, be respectful. I applaud you Greg for standing up and telling the audience please, you may not agree with the gentleman but please give him the opportunity to be heard and respect his views. That
is how our views our, people on the other side are even more respected once we do that. Keep up the good work, and I have never seen any proposal have so much intense interest as this one has, and I will think they will get the message.

Alderman Anglase closes the public portion around 7:45 PM.

**Agenda Items**

**MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

Alderman McPherson MOVED to waive the reading and approve the following meeting minutes:

2. Regular Meeting – May 12, 2016
3. Special Meeting – May 19, 2016

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](http://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 presented.
REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT – The Land Conservation Trust has given me an assignment, but they showed up so we are all set. Another item, the Board of Aldermen Clerk will be on vacation all of next week so please direct your inquiries to Jane Dowty.

6.0 LEGAL REPORT

6.1 CORPORATION COUNSEL BILLING

Alderman McPherson MOVED to authorize a total payment of $2,420.00 to Corporation Counsel Welch, Teodosio, and Stanek, LLC, for services rendered per statement dated June 1, 2016, with funds to come from the following Legal Services Accounts:

| Legal Fees | 001-1900-411.30-03 | $2,420.00 |

SECONDED by Alderman Kudej. A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

7 LEGISLATIVE - OLD

7.1 ITEMS FROM PUBLIC HEARING

7.1 A AMENDMENT TO CODE OF ORDINANCE CHAPTER 2 ARTICLE IV CORPORATION COUNSEL SEC. 2-134 SALARY (ORD. #836)

Alderman McPherson MOVED to adopt to the Code of Ordinance Chapter 2 Article IV Corporation Counsel Sec. 2-134 Salary (ORD. #836) 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.

SECONDED by Alderman Finn.

Public Hearing held on May 24, 2016.

AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE 836
LAST REVISED 3/8/12

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN OF THE CITY OF SHELTON
Section 2-134

(a) Commencing July 1, 2016, the annual compensation for general matters for the Corporation Counsel shall be $48,746.00 to be paid in monthly increments during the fiscal year. The salary for the Assistant Corporation Counsel shall be $34,093.00 payable in monthly increments during the fiscal year.

(b) The Corporation Counsel shall receive, in addition to such sum, the sum of $764.00 per month in lieu of secretarial assistance and the Assistant Corporation Counsel shall receive a payment of $622.00 per month lieu of secretarial assistance.

(c) For those matters which are not included within the above referenced items of compensation, specifically litigation, contested matters and labor work and such other matters as historically have not been included within the annual compensation of the Corporation Counsel, the hourly rate shall be approved by the Board of Aldermen from time to time.

Discussion:

Alderman Simonetti: When was the last time that this was changed?

Atty. Welch: That is why there is a typo. The last time was in 2012; that is why the typo says commencing July 1, 2016, and what is crossed out is 2015. The historical analysis is that it has been done every 4 years.

Aldeman Simonetti: Thank you, I have no further questions.

Alderman Anglace: The observation is this: Four years ago, Corporation Counsel and Assistant Corporation Counsel were given a rate, and that rate would stay in effect for four years. We are now acting on another increase of roughly $4,025, and that will stay in effect each year until it is changed in the future at some point.

A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

7.2 MOU REGARDING DERBY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION ANTENNA AT SHELTON HIGH SCHOOL

Alderman McPherson MOVED to approve the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the City of Shelton and the City of Derby to place an antenna on Shelton High School, 120 Meadow Street to enhance emergency communication services beneficial to both Derby and Shelton.

Further authorize Mayor Mark A. Lauretti to execute any and all documents necessary to effectuate same.
SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti.

Discussion:

Alderman Finn: What benefit is there going to be for the City of Shelton? Is it going to be for the EMS, Fire Department or the Police Department? Or is it going to be for all three?

Alderman Anglace: We do not know that. This was handled by Assistant Corporation Counsel. Do you have in front of you, the revised MOU?

Alderman Finn: Yes we just got this tonight.

Alderman Simonetti: If it helps one then I am sure it helps all of them.

Alderman Anglace: We cannot say because as I understand it, this is a general agreement to put the antenna at Shelton High School. If it benefits us, it is ancillary to that.

A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

7.3 AQUA CULTURAL PRODUCTION FACILITY LEASE

No action taken at this time because the contract is not yet finalized, per Alderman Anglace.

Alderman Anglace: I would like to make an observation that this project is geared toward assisting veterans, and as a result it is my understanding that it involves a lot of government contact through the other part to this. They cannot get quick answers so that is the reason for the delay for moving this along. If it is ready and things work out, we will put it on with the year end business.

8 FINANCIAL BUSINESS OLD

8.1 NO ITEMS

9 FINANCIAL BUSINESS NEW

9.1 JUNE STATUTORY REFUNDS

Alderman McPherson MOVED that the report of the Tax Collector relative to the refund of taxes for a total amount of $2,392.16 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 Simonetti. A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

(Supporting documentation from the Tax Collector is on file with the Board of Aldermen Clerk or Town Clerk’s Office.)

9.2 **AMENDMENT TO CONTRACT BETWEEN CITY OF SHELTON AND PRIMROSE COMPANIES REALTY, LLC.**

Alderman McPherson MOVED to approve the amendment to the contract between the City of Shelton and Primrose Companies Realty, LLC regarding the sale of property known as Lot 2 Canal Street (Assessor’s Map 130, Lot 2) to extend the closing date to be on or before September 30, 2016.

Further authorize Mayor Mark A. Lauretti to execute any and all documents necessary to effectuate same.

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

9.3 **ADOPTION OF TAX COLLECTOR’S SUSPENSE LIST**

Alderman McPherson MOVED that the tax collector’s suspense list in the amount of $177,330.34 be adopted and transferred from the Grand Lists into Suspense per State Statute Sec. 12-165:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grand List</th>
<th>Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$263.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$289.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$487.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$502.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$600.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$639.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$1,109.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$1,763.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$5,496.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$19,881.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$52,853.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$72,281.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$21,162.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $177,330.34
(Copy of entire suspense list can be seen in BOA or Town Clerk’s Office)

SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti.

Discussion:

Alderman Anglace: Just so you know, this was reviewed by several people in the administration: Finance Director, Assessor, etc. There was discussion that went around on this they assured me since our Tax Collector is new, she is right on target and she has some pretty good observations. You cannot collect money when someone is dead.

A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

9.4 LEASE BETWEEN KIDS ZONE, LLC AND CITY OF SHELTON

Alderman McPherson MOVED to approve the lease agreement between Kids Zone LLC and the City of Shelton regarding certain land and modular building located at 62 Perry Hill Road subject to a favorable 8-24 referral by Planning & Zoning and modification as may be approved by the Mayor and Corporation Counsel.

Further authorize Mayor Mark A. Lauretti to execute any and all documents necessary to effectuate same.

SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti.

Discussion:

Alderman Anglace: The rent here is based on the same amount that we have charged rent for other buildings for similar use, like the Community Center and the Hide-Out at Mohegan School. So it is based around the same principle, the same amount per square foot, etc.

A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

9.5 2016 NEIGHBORHOOD ASSISTANCE TAX CREDIT PROGRAM

Alderman McPherson MOVED to approve the four proposals for the 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
- Southwestern Area Health Education Center (AHEC), Inc. $10,000
SECONDED by Alderman Finn.

Discussion:

Alderman Anglace: Can someone tell me who is Southwestern Area Health Education Center (AHEC), Inc is and where they are located? This is the first time that they have shown up; it just raises the question in my mind. Are they a Shelton organization? Are they a new company in Shelton? As I understand it, this needs to be in by a certain date. If we approve it, can we approve it with the caveat that says that we want to know about who they are?

Alderman McGorty: I am looking and on Google, it says that their address is in Trumbull.

Alderman Anglace: Then why wouldn’t they file in Trumbull?

Alderman McGorty: I do not know. Maybe they have another location in Shelton?

Alderman Anglace: If the board does not mind, my thinking is you know my reservation. Let’s see that we approve it in order not to exclude them. There may be extenuating reasons why they are applying here, versus Trumbull? So let’s approve it; by approving it we are not granting them any money. All we are doing is saying that that they are submitted for consideration by the state. I am sure that we look into it and if there is more to it, we will let that be known. My thinking is let’s approve it, but we did have a reservation.

Alderman McGorty: Their mission is to enhance access to quality primary and preventive healthcare in Southwestern Connecticut, by linking students, providers and families through education, workforce, development and community collaboration. It is one of four regional centers within the Connecticut AHEC program.

Alderman Anglace: If it is regional then they must cover Shelton. Let’s go ahead and approve it.

A voice vote was taken and motion passed unanimously.

9.6  FIRE SAFETY CODE UPGRADES FOR SHELTON HIGH SCHOOL

Alderman McPherson MOVED to approve the agreement between the City of Shelton and MJ Daley, LLC for fire safety code upgrades for Shelton High School subject to modifications as may be approved by the Mayor and Corporation Counsel with funding in an amount not to exceed $1.2 million.

Further authorize Mayor Mark A. Lauretti to execute any and all documents necessary to effectuate same.

SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti.
Note: Funding of $995,000 was appropriated at the May 28, 2015 BOA Special Meeting.

Note: Agreement to come.

Discussion:

Alderman Finn: Back on May 28, 2015, we approved funding of $995,000 for this project. There is no where in this motion indicating where the additional funds are to meet the $1.2 million, is coming from. We are approving not to exceed $1.2 million, but we only had authorized $995,000. My question is that there is additional money that is not said in the motion of where it is coming from.

Alderman Anglace: The motion on May 28, 2015 reads: “Further, be it resolved that the Board of Aldermen of the City of Shelton hereby endorses and authorizes funding in the amount of $995,000, for the sprinkler project at Shelton High School with funding to come from General Fund Surplus. Any state reimbursement will be reported back to the General Fund”.

Alderman Finn: My question is, we are saying funding not to exceed $1.2 million, but yet we only funded $995,000. Where is the additional money coming from?

Alderman Anglace: As I understand it, the $1.2 million is the amount of the contract for the sprinkler system. We have to fund our share, and the balance is the state share; we do not have to fund that.

Atty. Welch: Alderman, I asked the same question the other day and the response was the state because we are 40% reimbursement rate, we usually appropriate the full amount of the contract. The response was that the state is okay with the appropriation as it is because we are at 40% reimbursement. It may be something that comes back; may be the state says no it’s not.

Alderman Finn: So it might come back to us?

Atty. Welch: It could. I did ask where the $250,000 was coming from.

Alderman Finn: Okay thank you. The other thing that I want to say is that it is a shame that we had to wait 8 years to put sprinklers in the school. It has been a battle back and forth between the City and the State of Connecticut. By putting sprinklers in the school system, you are resolving nine-tenths of the fire code violations especially with the interior classrooms.

Alderman McGorty: It was a long time coming.

Alderman Finn: Yes a very long time coming. I am glad to see it is here.
Alderman Capra: So this is quite a bit of money going into this. At the end of this, are we going to have a final walk through to say that everything is up to code; we are not going to have more issues at Shelton High School when it comes to the sprinklers or the safety codes? Who is going to approve this at the end? That is something that we should look into.

Alderman Anglace: That is not part of this.

Alderman Capra: I know but who is following through?

Atty. Welch: It is the committee; Don Sheehy is the Chairman. Those issues as related to the code upgrade, they are trying to get the sprinkler done and back to address those code related upgrades.

Alderman Capra: I just do not know a year ago to now if there is any more that we are not addressing? I just want to make sure.

Atty. Welch: That is where the second item is listed there. My understanding was for the summer process, to get the sprinkler going. That is why you are only approving that, but we went out to bid for both. That is my understanding.

Alderman Finn: To answer your question Alderman Capra, corrections of the fire code violations are completed. They had to be redone because they were done incorrectly; whoever heard of filling a hole in the door so you could put a doorknob on the other side—that is a fire code violation, but it was approved and put into the school system. We had to redo it.

Alderman Capra: This information is dated back one year ago so I do not know from now to a year ago that anything else was going on that was not addressed. I want to make sure we are closing a chapter on this.

Alderman Finn: Are we saying that this committee is the one that is going to say, okay all of the fire code violations at Shelton High School have been addressed and completed? What qualifications do they have to indicate that?

Alderman Simonetti: They are relying on the engineers and the architects.

Alderman Finn: We did that last time too, and they were wrong. Who is going to say that it has been completely correctly?

Alderman Simonetti: The building holds around 1,700 people per day. During that day anyone could break something, or plug and it could be a violation. Maintenance should be able to fix these things so they are not violations anymore. There is an inspection, and the inspection should find what is wrong and it should be corrected.

Alderman Capra: There was nothing here saying there was going to be an inspection in the last year so that is why a lot changes in a year, too.
Alderman Finn: State law says that they are supposed to inspect all schools once per year. That is a new state law that State Representative Perillo had passed, and it is up to our local Fire Marshal to inspect all of the schools.

A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

10 – LEGISLATIVE - NEW

10.1 A PROPOSED ORDINANCE – DESIGNATION OF LIMITED PARKING PERMIT AREAS AND PARKING BY PERMIT ONLY

DESIGNATION OF LIMITED PARKING PERMIT AREAS AND PARKING BY PERMIT ONLY

Sec. 1: PURPOSE

The Board of Aldermen (BOA) of the City of Shelton deems it to be in the best interest of the citizens of Shelton to:

   a. Provide for limited parking permit programs within certain sections of the City of Shelton where parking may be limited or may be restricted.
   b. Reduce hazardous traffic conditions
   c. Promote reasonable parking access to Proprietors and Residents within the Limited Parking Permit Areas
   d. Promote the peace, comfort, convenience and welfare of the residents and proprietors therein.

Sec. 2: DEFINITIONS

LIMITED PARKING PERMIT AREA: The area/streets where curbside parking on public highways is restricted by this “Permit Parking Ordinance.” The designated districts or areas will be particularly designated on maps titled, “Proposed Permit Parking Areas in [the map will insert named designated area within the City where the Limited Parking Permit Area is determined to be located]” and will be on file in the office of the City/Town Clerk of the City of Shelton, where curbside parking on public highways is limited to parking by permit only. The Board of Aldermen may from time to time designate Limited Parking Permit Areas under this ordinance and will then cause a map showing such designated area to be filed with the City/Town Clerk.

PARKING: The standing of a vehicle, whether occupied or not, upon a highway other than temporarily for the purpose of and while actually engaged in receiving or discharging passengers or loading or unloading merchandise or in obedience of traffic regulations, traffic signs or signals.
PROPRIETOR: A person who owns or leases real property within said Limited Parking Permit Area and who operates a business at an address within the Limited Parking Permit Area. A proprietor shall be entitled to parking permits equal to the number of parking spaces available and contiguous with the property where their/its business is located.

RESIDENT: A person who owns or leases real property within said residential area and who maintains either a voting residence or a bona fide occupancy, or both, at that address.

PERMIT PARKING DISTRICT: A contiguous or nearly contiguous area containing public highways or parts thereof primarily abutted by residential property or business property (including but not limited to such nonresidential activities such as schools, parks, churches, hospitals and nursing homes.) Said Limited Parking Permit Areas shall be so designated from time to time by the Board of Aldermen as set forth above.

Sec. 3 PERMIT APPLICATION

The Chief of Police shall issue appropriate permits and shall cause parking signs to be erected in said designated Limited Parking Permit Area. Said Limited Parking Permit Area shall be clearly designated and indicate that parking is limited by permit only and that violators will be towed at owner expense. A permit shall be issued, upon application only to those who are residents or proprietors as defined herein. A separate permit shall be required for each motor vehicle.

Sec. 4 PERMIT APPLICATION

The application for a permit shall contain:

a. The name and address of the resident or proprietor
b. The make, model, license plate number and registration of each vehicle owned by the resident or proprietor for which a permit is to be issued.
c. Such other information as the Chief of Police may deem pertinent in issuing and maintaining records of such permits.

The signature of the resident or proprietor for the Limited Parking Permit Area shall be designated as the Permittee. Said Permittee shall be responsible for applying all permits to each vehicle and shall notify the Police Department if there is any change in ownership of the vehicle.

The permits shall be non-transferable.
The Permittee shall make said application under penalty of false statement.

The permit shall be renewable bi-annually.

There shall be no cost associated with this application.

Sec. 5 USE OF PERMITS

a. All parking permits shall be displayed on or about the front windshield of the vehicle so as to be easily visible from outside the vehicle. Such parking permits shall contain the following:

   (1) The numerical designation of the parking permit issued; and
   (2) The expiration date of the parking permit.

b. The Police Department shall maintain a list of all permits issued and the name and address of each Permittee or resident or proprietor to whom such permit was issued.

c. A parking permit shall not guarantee or reserve a parking space within the Limited Parking Permit Area. A parking permit shall not authorize the standing or parking of any vehicle in such places and during such times as the stopping, standing or parking of vehicles is in violation of traffic regulations, traffic signs or signals, and shall not excuse the observance of any traffic regulations in the parking permit area.

d. Whenever the Permittee of a parking permit, no longer fulfills one or more of the applicable provisions of this ordinance or qualify for the issuance of such permit, the Permittee shall so notify the Police Chief who may then direct the Permittee to surrender the parking permit.

e. Until its expiration, surrender or revocation, a parking permit shall remain valid in the Limited Parking Permit Area for such time as the Permittee continues to qualify for said permit as provided herein.

f. A parking permit shall be valid only in the Limited Parking Permit Area for which it is issued.

g. It shall be a violation of this ordinance for the holder of a parking permit to fail to surrender it when directed to do so.

h. It shall be a violation of this ordinance for any person to represent in any fashion that a vehicle is entitled to a parking permit, authorized by this
ordinance when it is not so entitled. The display of a parking permit on a vehicle not entitled to such a parking permit shall constitute such a representation.

i. It shall be a violation of this ordinance for any person to duplicate, or attempt to duplicate, by any means, a parking permit authorized by this ordinance. It shall also be a violation of this ordinance for any person to display on any vehicle such a duplicate parking permit.

Sec. 6  EXCEPTIONS FOR SERVICE AND DELIVERY VEHICLES.

The parking restrictions imposed by this ordinance shall not apply to any service or delivery vehicle when used to provide services or to make deliveries to residences or proprietors within the Limited Parking Permit Area, provided that the parking of the service or delivery vehicle within said Limited Parking Permit Area does not exceed one hour in duration on any given day.

Sec. 7  PENALTIES FOR OFFENSES.

Whoever violates any provision of this ordinance shall have their vehicle towed at the owner's expense and/or be subject to a $100.00 fine. Failure to pay said fine timely shall make the violator liable for further penalties, including imprisonment as provided for in the General Statutes of the State of Connecticut.


10.1 B AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 9, ARTICLE VII STREET VENDORS SECTION 9-150 SPECIAL EVENT LICENSE (ORD. #891)


Sec. 9-150 Special event license.

(a) A special event license may be issued to persons as defined herein engaged in the sale of various products at parades, sidewalk sales, and other special events, as recognized and approved by the city. Application for said license shall be submitted to the Chief of Police along with a one hundred dollar ($100.00) fee. Said license shall be displayed conspicuously at all times. All sales under this special event license will be limited only to the hours of the special event and shall be conducted where the special event is being held.

(b) At the discretion of the Board of Aldermen, the application fee may be waived or reduced to a nominal fee and the licensing procedure under this chapter may be waived or curtailed in order to promote a special event, which the Board of
Aldermen finds will benefit the entire community. In exercising its discretion, the Board of Aldermen shall consider such factors as the cultural, educational, artistic, humanistic, charitable, scientific, literary, historic, and other benefits to the community of the special event. The sponsor of the special event shall maintain insurance coverage as required under Section 9-148 even if said sponsor is exempt under the provisions of section 9-143. The sponsor shall be required to request of the Board of Aldermen a designation as a “Special Event” and shall comply with any terms and conditions set forth by the Board of Aldermen.

Sec. 9-151. Territorial limits/prohibitions.

(The following shall not apply to Special Events set forth in Sec. 9-150):

(a) No street vendor shall operate:

(1) In a residential zone; or
(2) Within one thousand (1,000) feet of another mercantile establishment offering the same or similar goods, wares or merchandise for sale; or
(3) Within one thousand (1,000) feet of any public or private school, municipal building, or municipal park; or
(4) Within one hundred (100) feet of driveways, bus stops, or crosswalks; or
(5) Within five hundred (500) feet of any intersections; or
(6) Within one hundred (100) feet of any other street vendor; or
(7) In any metered parking area or no-parking zone; or
(8) Directly upon a street, sidewalk, or public place; or
(9) In any area, where the operation will be deemed by the chief of police, any police officer or state trooper to endanger or inconvenience the general public, including but not limited to sidewalk and roadside areas; or
(10) In a manner that obstructs or prevents the free and convenient use of any street or sidewalk by pedestrian or vehicular traffic.

(b) No street vendor, peddler, or solicitor shall have an exclusive right to any location in or near the public streets, nor shall they be permitted a stationary location.

(c) No street vendor shall set up a street selling operation without the written permission of the owner of the property on which the operation is located. Such document must be conspicuously displayed at all times.

(d) No street vendors shall operate on the following streets or in the following restricted areas

(e) No person or street vendor shall sell or offer for sale upon a public street, sidewalk, or other public place any spray string, stinkbomb, or other similar article.

10.2 APPOINTMENT TO NAUGATUCK VALLEY HEALTH DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Alderman McPherson MOVED to appoint Barbara A. Lombardi to the Naugatuck Valley Health District Board of Directors for a term of three years.
Barbara A. Lombardi – R  
85 Cranston Avenue  
Shelton, CT  06484  
203-922-8878

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

10.3 AMENDMENTS TO 457(b) PLAN PROVISIONS

Alderman McPherson MOVED, per the recommendation of the Pension Board, to modify the 457(b) Plan to add five (5) provisions and delete one (1) provision.

Additions  
1. Roth provision  
2. Voluntary In-Service Distribution provision  
3. 70 ½ In-Service Withdrawal provision  
4. Rollover to reflect EGTRRA portability  
5. Loan Provision to Plan

Deletion  
1. Unforeseeable emergency withdrawal

Further authorize Mayor Mark A. Lauretti to execute any and all documents necessary to effectuate same.

SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti.  A voice vote was made and the motion passed unanimously.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

11.1 NO ITEMS

ADJOURNMENT

Alderman Kudej MOVED to adjourn; SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti.  A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brittany Gannon
ADDENDUM – DIAGRAM PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN, FROM NANCY STEINER, 23 PARTRIDGE LANE, SHELTON, CT