



City of Shelton
Planning & Zoning Commission
Shelton City Hall, 54 Hill Street, Shelton CT
Public Hearing– June 6, 2006

CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Allan Cribbins called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 P.M. All those present rose and pledged allegiance to the flag.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Chairman Alan Cribbins
Vice-Chairman Anthony Pogoda
Jason Perillo
Virginia Harger
Leon Sylvester
Karen Tomko-McGovern
Daniel Oraziatti

Staff Present:

Anthony Panico, Planning Consultant
Richard Schultz, Planning Administrator
Marianne Chaya, Clerk

Plan Update Committee Members:

Frank Osak
Peter DiCarlo
Fred Musante
Tom Harbinson

Also Present:

Eric Barz, Planimetrics
Glenn Chalder, Planimetrics
Alan Mess, Barkan & Mess
Mike Wilson, Barkan & Mess

Chairman Cribbins stated that we are in the adoption phase of the plan update.

Commissioner Oraziatti read the following public hearing notices and letters into the record:

SHELTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 2006 AT 7:00 P.M.

The Shelton Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Shelton, Connecticut hereby gives notice of a public hearing to be held on Tuesday, June 6, 2006 at 7:00 P.M. in the Shelton City Hall, Auditorium, 54 Hill Street to consider the following:

2006 Draft Plan of Conservation and Development dated April 20, 2006

prepared in accordance with Section 8-23 of the Connecticut General Statutes consisting of: Preface, Part 1: Planning Context, Part 2: Community Issues, Part 3: Protect Important Resources, Part 4: Guide Appropriate Development, Part 5: Address Community Needs, Part 6: Future Land Use Plan, Part 7: Implementation and Part 8: Conclusion.

Said 2006 Draft Plan was prepared by the Plan Update Advisory Committee (PUAC) submitted to and finalized by the Shelton Planning and Zoning Commission. Copies are available for review in the City/Town Clerk's Office, Planning and Zoning Office,

Plumb Memorial and Huntington Branch Libraries and the city's website at cityofshelton.org. At said hearing all persons will have the right to be heard and written communications will be received.

Dated at Shelton, Connecticut this 25th day of May, 2006

Shelton Planning and Zoning Commission

Allan J. Cribbins, Chairman

Daniel Oraziotti, Secretary

To be published twice; once on 5/25/06 and once on 6/1/06

First letter read into the record:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

June 5, 2006

Planning and Zoning Commission c/o Mr. Richard Schultz, ATCP Director of Planning and Zoning City of Shelton 54 Hill Street Shelton, CT 06484

RE: Comprehensive POCD update, dated April 20,2006 Finding: Consistent

Dear Commissioners:

Thank you for submitting the above-referenced draft Plan of Conservation and Development for our review and comments pursuant to Section 22ti-104(e) of the Connecticut General Statutes. Based upon our review for consistency with the goals, policies and standards of the Connecticut Coastal Management Act (CCMA), we Find the proposed draft consistent. However, we offer the following comments on the draft plan for the Commission's consideration.

Generally,, we find the plan to be a very well prepared document. Although we realize the POCD must address a broad range of municipal planning issues and coastal management is only one of the many comprehensive planning topics that must be addressed within a POCD, the plan would benefit from consideration of the following low impact development strategies to promote control of non-point source pollution that can adversely affect coastal resources and water quality;

- In the interest of improving water quality, u definition for "lot coverage" should be included in the zoning regulations to include not only buildings but all proposed impervious surfaces on a lot such as driveways, sidewalks, etc.;
- . Pervious surface parking options should be explored;
- Impervious surfaces could be reduced by encouraging sharing of parking areas by non- competing uses;
- Encourage cluster developments that incorporate features such as curb-less roads, narrow width roads, grass swales and retention ponds. Cluster regulations may apply to residential subdivisions as well as other developments such as office and industrial parks;
- Amend the subdivision regulations to require that new developments, where possible, retain the first inch of storm water on A site;
- Amend zoning regulations to encourage native landscape plantings that do not require the application of fertilizers and broad-based pesticides;
- Require land use applicants 1.0 delineate "limits of disturbance" on sue plans for proposed development sites with sensitive environmental features. This strategy could help minimize clearing, cutting, and filling;
- Amend zoning regulations 10 prohibit, storage of hazardous materials in coastal areas or aquifer protection areas;
- • Consider reducing required building setbacks which can result in reduced impervious surface coverage;
- • New sidewalk construction could be limited k> one side of the street where considered important such as within a certain distance of schools or other public amenities;
- • In the discussion of Scenic Resource Preservation (page 3-28), please note that there is statutory authority in the Connecticut Coastal Management Act [e.g., COS 22a-93 (15) (F)] to analyze the impacts of proposed development on 'Views and vistas" within the.- coastal boundary;

- The Commission may wish to consider adopting a buffer review area of 50-100 feet abutting coastal resources and waters.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we find this comprehensive POCD update to be consistent with the goals, policies and standards of the CCMA and recommend that the Commission give due consideration to the issues noted herein.

We hope these comments are helpful to the Commission. Please enter our comments into the official record. If we can be of further assistance to you in this or any other coastal management or Long Island Sound related matter, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,
Carol Szymanski,
Environmental Analyst
Office of Long Island Sound Programs

Second letter as follows:

COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS /CENTRAL NAUGATUCK VALLEY

60 NORTH MAIN STREET • 3RD FLOOR • WATERBURY, CT 06702-1403 (203) 757- 0535

Web Site: www.cogenv.org E-Mail: cogenv@cogenv.org

May 23, 2006

Mr. Allan J. Cribbins, Jr.
Chairman
City of Shelton Planning and Zoning Commission
54 Hill Street
Shelton, CT 06484

RE: 2006 Draft Shelton Plan of Conservation and Development

Dear Mr. Cribbins:

Staff has reviewed the *2006 Draft Shelton Plan of Conservation and Development* and finds it in conformity with Future Land Use Map contained within the *Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Plan of Conservation and Development*. In the portion of Oxford adjacent to Shelton, the *Regional Plan* recommends preservation and public access to the Housatonic River. Shelton's draft plan has a similar recommendation.

Left un-addressed by the draft is the inaccessibility from Shelton of waterfront parcels located on the Housatonic River in the northern part of town. These houses are located between the railroad tracks and river and have no road access to Shelton or any other town. At least some of the owners of these homes are permanent residents and access their homes via boat and park their cars along the Oxford shore of the Housatonic River. August Palmer III, First Selectman of Oxford, is particularly concerned about accessing these homes during emergencies. The Town of Oxford has one small boat and could foreseeably be the first responder to an emergency taking place in this portion of Shelton. Such a situation may be hazardous to the Oxford emergency responders. The *Draft Plan* does not address these issues.

Please contact us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Samuel S. Gold
Regional Planner
T:\General\Referrals\FY2006\SheltonPCD-050406.wpd

The last item for the record is the minutes of the May 23, 2006 Special Board of Aldermen meeting. This is a special meeting regarding the 2006 Plan of Conservation and Development. Copies are on file in the City/Town Clerk's

office and are available on the city web site. All Commissioners have copies.

Chairman Cribbins said that he wanted to make one comment that was in the BOA minutes. There was a letter from a Huntington resident who made reference to the plan update costing 2 million dollars. I can assure we didn't pay anywhere near that amount. I think the total so far is around \$130K. The reason why it was so low is because we had a group of wonderful people who got together for 18 months and they met almost every Monday afternoon to work on this plan. Their cost to us was free, as is ours on the Planning & Zoning Commission. I just wanted to share that with you before we get started. I want to reserve any comments because we have Eric Barz from Planimetrics who will make the presentation. This will give us the overview of the plan.

Eric Barz presented an overview of the plan. The audiotapes are on file in the City/Town Clerk's office. Copies of the Shelton Life Executive Summary are also available at the Planning & Zoning Commission office.

Chairman Cribbins asked to have Bill Purcell speak first as he has another speaking engagement.

Bill Purcell, President & CEO, Valley Chamber of Commerce, 900 Bridgeport Ave

Good evening and thank you for the opportunity to join you with what I would describe as a defining moment in the life and development of this great community of Shelton. I truly appreciate your accommodation to all the members of the Board. I am the President of the Valley Chamber of Commerce, with offices at 900 Bridgeport Ave, here in Shelton. First, on behalf the Shelton business community represented by the Chamber, let me congratulate and thank the members of the Plan Update Advisory Committee for its tireless efforts over the past 18 months. Special thanks, of course, goes to committee chairman Frank Osak whose combination of wisdom and experience in development matters, I'm sure have been valuable and indispensable in forging what I consider, and what you should consider a wonderful document. To Eric and Planimetrics, your work proceeds you here in the valley. Just a couple short years ago at the adoption of the region plan of development; so we know your work well. Finally, the real hero's in this exercise are the citizens and business owners of Shelton who came out over the last 18 months and who are here tonight and exercised what a great democracy offers, and that the right of self-determination; to determine our own destiny. I often say the world is ruled by those that show up. The folks that showed up had their hand in defining the future of this community. Before I offer a few comments of the draft plan itself, let me just share a regional statement and indeed a national perspective on this community. Sharing some observations from some recent and very prominent visitors to this community. Back in March we hosted our annual legislative session and brought Senate President Don Williams into this community. I want to tell you he left this community sighting it as a model, a model for job creation, economic growth that's recognized on the "Hill" and his quiet corner of CT where he hails from. Also, community that has recognized the value of open space preservation, riverfront recapture, farmland preservation, and really truly has achieved and is cognizant of the balance between those two forces. More recently the U.S. Secretary of Commerce was here. I will just briefly share with you his wonderful letter that I shared with the Chairman the other day. This is from the Secretary of Commerce, Carlos Gutierrez. "Dear Bill; Thank you for the

fabulous book on Shelton. It is a truly unique area with a great deal of history and I enjoyed visiting your community earlier this month. I was also glad to have the opportunity to talk about national issues with members of your Chamber." I will say people are recognizing the prominence of this community. We roll as an emerging economic center in the State and your important regional role you play is a bridge between the vibrant Fairfield County and the vibrant New Haven County, as a member of the Valley community. We want to keep you as such for many years to come. Literally and figuratively Shelton is the foundation of from which the valley economy will be built. I will say that business and industry in this community, and you have many; 1800 that employ a combined 22000 people in this City, have a vital stake in the future development of this community. These sentiments were expressed very clearly at a forum that we held last week with local CEO's and business owners that was hosted by your largest employer, our largest employer, Steve Nelson, the president of HealthNet, who today employs some 1600 people in this community. It is the 5th largest taxpayer in this community. I will tell you that a group of about 50 that were assembled at the HealthNet campus, we had 7 of the top 10 taxpayers that were present. They do have a vital stake to the future direction of this community. Let me just look briefly at the plan. If you would give me 2 minutes, Mr. Chair? First, some of the basic issues and trends inherent to the plan. Number 1, the job growth, population growth, and housing growth are likely to continue. I would just point out that the State is yet to fully recover from the 39,000 jobs lost in this State during the recession of 2001-2003. Over the last two years we've reclaimed 26,000 of them. The projection is that we will not come back to that level until at least the end of 2007, probably into 2008. I would bet or guess that a good proportion of jobs will emanate from this community if we continue the path that we are on. It was pointed out that age composition has changed dramatically. A community who has gone from 40% under the age of 20 to 40% over the age of 55. That is a significant demographic, and it questions our ability to continue to fill the jobs that we create. We have to be mindful of that. Briefly, on your planning priorities; we applaud the city's efforts to put first, and foremost in this plan conservation strategies. To protect important resources in this community is a natural and logical place to start. Riverfront recapture, farmland preservation, protecting and expanding the greenway system, protecting our water supplies and our wetlands, preserving and celebrating our historic resources; I will say that the Chamber has and will continue to go on record to support the purchase of strategic parcels of open space in this community. I will say it's good for the community and it's good for business, if we continue to do so. Second major point; guide appropriate development. If we use the term balanced growth. We need to avoid the mistakes of lower Fairfield County, where I hazard down today, down that painful drive, down Route 15 into a meeting this morning; less we run the risk of eliminating the very characteristics that have brought so many businesses to this community over the last 15 or 20 years. Lower cost of doing business and the relative ease of conducting business in this community; these are the other more congested areas of lower Fairfield County. We fully support the plan's focus on downtown Shelton and recognize its role as the civic center of this community. We encourage that you continue with your comprehensive planning the downtown, applaud the efforts of the important role that SEDC is playing by reclaiming the former Sponge Rubber site, first as a development parcel, now as permanent open space. Encourage 18-hour life in this city by supporting the kind of mixed-use development that's happening today as a result of the strategic investments that you have created in the public side. Huntington Center – the concept of a village district should be explored but with the partnership of the property owners and business owners in that community. I would offer the

Chamber's support to facilitate those discussions. The Bridgeport Ave. corridor is a phenomenon, from exits 11-13, and the new and emerging area of River Road from downtown to the Stratford line. We recognize the importance of our primary industries that are operating on a global scale in this community. Exporting services and products worldwide and bringing new dollars into this community. We need to maintain the facilities and opportunities to retain and recruit new firms, new primary industries into this community. With respect to residential development, I'm almost done, Mr. Chairman; recognize in light of the demographics the need for active adult and elderly housing. I will only grow more acute in the years to come. To underscore an issue that many chambers across the northeast are talking about, and that is low cost housing; the ability to house the people that we rely on to run this economy. Affordability is a major issue for the northeast; we are not alone. Finally, addressing community infrastructure needs. I will say that businesses rely on the adequacy and reliability of community infrastructure. The electrical power must come on. Water capacity and quality, wastewater treatment facilities, and transportation. With respect to transportation, we support and encourage engineering study to forecast traffic volumes on Bridgeport Ave., to evaluate road binding where possible and appropriate. To complete the Commerce Drive reconstruction project that is underway in a timely fashion, to explore further this notion of incident management, I understood as I was on Route 15, we had an incident there this morning. You've experienced it and we need to think about what happens if something goes wrong in these vital corridors. We need to encourage bus transit and provide our residents with appropriate shelters along Bridgeport Ave. I see them out there in the driving rain. We need to recognize the needs of these folks. And, hallelujah, sidewalks, sidewalks at last on Bridgeport Ave, and yes, with Huntington Center. I applaud this as a runner, a jogger, a walker I applaud you. Finally, with respect to implementation; I said to the Chairman that the plan is only as strong as those embrace it and those who are aware of it and understand it in all of its dimensions. We need to keep it out front. It cannot be shelved and I know you have an ambitious plan to do that. And finally, finally, I would urge as the report concludes that Shelton continue to forge regional partnerships working with and through the Valley Council of Governments. No man is an island; no city is an island unto itself. You've done a fine job of that and I thank you for your time.

Chairman Cribbins asked if members of the public would like to come up and make a comment about it, we would accept any written communication that you would like. If you have a question on a particular piece of property when we are finished with it, all you have to do is write your name down and say I really want more detail on what's going to happen on a specific piece of property and we will take your name, and we will have Staff get back to you and explain in more detail about what the plan is for that particular piece of property. We also will give you the opportunity to speak for or against any portion of this particular plan.

Joan Flannery, 8 Partridge Lane, Shelton

I have attended most of the workshops but I'm sorry, I forgot this man's name. Eric Barz? That presented to us and I know he was present at those workshops and somehow I don't think he was all there, ok? One thing through his presentation I noticed that the people who went to these workshops were not respected in his presentation tonight because a lot of things came out opposite of those workshops and he presented them as if we came out differently up on the screen today. I was very upset that he ignored our proposals and presented it as if we came out saying we wanted

this when we said the opposite. And let me give you some specifics. Number 1, nothing was mentioned about exit 14 going south. And we went over and over that. We want an entrance ramp from downtown to go to exit 14 south. Nothing was mentioned about that. I don't know why that was ignored but I worked on Relay For Life in Shelton downtown this weekend and I live by exit 12 Blockbuster and it was not fun going back and forth from downtown to exit 12. One thing that he said which really made my blood boil was how we had a workshop saying we want cluster homes and to stop sprawl. Discourage sprawl? Our workshop was the opposite. We want one acre zoning. We do not want clusters! Thank you, those people were there with me. I want you to stop the population in Shelton. Don't accept that we're going to have 10,000 more people in Shelton in 10 years. I want you to stop it and that's what we all said at the workshops. We want to stop the population growth. Number 2, 3, 4, whatever – you can tell I'm very upset because I feel like I was insulted going to those workshops and working and giving my time off. It was a waste of \$132K. It was a waste of 18 months because you didn't listen to us at all. (A member of the audience asked her to stop screaming). I disagree with the population growth being 40% 55 and over but all these residential buildings are going up with bedrooms, for children and we just expanded, voted, a couple of weeks ago to expand the school system. So I don't know how you come up with that. We talked at these workshops about open space. Where do we want it? Where the people are crowded, overcrowded in Shelton. Where's that? Ward 3. Nothing is mentioned about open space in ward 3, where we need it. Ward 3 is dumped on over and over and over again. Who came up with the proposal about having fees in lieu of open space? What, you're going to give us more wetlands in exchange? We did not talk about that or agree about that. Setbacks! Smaller? We don't want setbacks smaller, who came up with that idea? This is a nightmare and everything that we talked about at these meetings went down the tubes with everything else. You do not respect the public here in Shelton. Thank you.

Chairman Cribbins said I just want to make a quick comment about two particular items. The first item about having no mention about exit 14, it's item 10 on page 7-16, which has a recommendation of it. It is in the plan. It has been and will be addressed as a very important part of our future for the center.

Tape 1, Side B

Also, with respect to the elimination of PDD's it is addressed on page 7-18 as priority #1.

Joe Nechasek, 25 Waterford Lane

I'm not sure I can communicate that well. I might get some palpitations or something after the last person. I didn't know I'd be after that lady. I understand her points. I'm one of those residents of those detested, very attractive PDD areas. But I don't want to talk about that. I'd like to focus with some brief comments exclusively on my favorite theme, which is Bridgeport Ave. If I understand correctly, and I think I can dissect the language under economic development, point #2. I would suggest that it doesn't need to be this dense, that's it's really not particularly descriptive when you publish a statement limiting general commercial uses in areas better suited to more desirable office/industrial uses, produce higher net. I think the City, the P&Z and everybody would be better guided on such a critical area if we could get a little better language in that area. I have one theme. My theme is that not everything approved for Bridgeport Ave. has to be a restaurant. The food, going out to eat is a booming industry,

documented in the New York Times today. If you've been by Panera's, I was out of town, and I went there on Sunday and I was astounded to see that every seat was taken. I think there is some bad signs on Bridgeport Ave. I would love to debate with Mr. Purcell. He sees Bridgeport Ave. as a phenomenon. I see it as a high-risk corridor. I see some signs that there is inadequate parking at Madison's. The City has approved a series of concentrated small shops in an area that anyone from professional planning perspective, it seems to me, would not have endorsed. The mega project at Blockbuster on the hill, the traffic congestion that's going to ensue there, it seems to me that's pretty serious. Mr. Purcell covers that by saying; let's study density, and so forth and so on. But if you go down there you find that it's a pretty serious issue. My plea to all City leaders is to be a more assertive and to find ways that a bio-medical facility could be placed on Bridgeport Ave. which I think would follow this guideline which means would have a higher revenue associated with the concentration of research and personal property as opposed to an Outback. I think that you have to be assertive of that. You can't wait for these things. I recently reviewed a bond perspective for the City of New Haven. I was really flabbergasted by the degree to which the City boundaries of New Haven had included such a concentration of pharmaceutical bio-medical and other facilities. I know by looking at the list – bond proposals are remarkable. They're so detailed. You find out exactly every dollar spent for every person, retired or otherwise. I think that's the kind of thinking Shelton needs for that particular area. We do know that about 85% of all commercially zoned area around Bridgeport Ave. are owned by a single individual. I think that would require, that person of course is a loyal and long-term historic figure in this City. I think maybe figuring out ways to come up with ideas for outside international bio-medical and other kinds of things. I think holding back – the eating out industry is going to be tough, but that's my basic plea. That Bridgeport Ave., contrary to Mr. Purcell's perspective, I have a slightly different perspective. I think it's the one area that we don't want have approach the appearance of the Post Road in Orange or Route 22 in New Jersey, which was of course the most famous first location of malls. Thank you.

Dominick Thomas, 315 Main Street, Derby

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I am representing three separate property owners, addressing three issues. I'll try to be brief because I think your plan of development, and I applaud you by the way, for putting it on the Internet, is one of the finest planning documents locally that I've read. It addresses numerous issues that are obviously prevalent in Shelton. Actually the happiest thing I found in the plan was the fact that I wasn't listed personally in the stories, but I'm thinking somebody whited that out before they published it on the internet. Obviously I come with a bias. I represent developers. Everybody knows that some of the things people have talked about, I've been involved in. Initially I want to go back because I think in looking forward it's important to look back. Back to 1998 and 1999. This Commission went through the Route 8 corridor update. At that time I represented a concerned landowner along the Route 8 corridor update and we came to this Commission, and if you recall, presented to the Commission a buildout of this person's property, in accordance with the office park district. Showing, I think at that point, some 2.5M Sq. ft. of office space that could be conceivably constructed on this property. There is no indication this property is going to be developed but I think at that time we were attempting to show that there remained a long the Bridgeport Ave. corridor, the Route 8 corridor, which, with all due respect to the previous speaker, is the jewel of not only Shelton, but the envy of most other communities up and down Fairfield and into New Haven counties. In fact,

one individual towns at one point indicated that all I really wanted in discussing with them was for them to be like Shelton. I indicated that would be very appropriate if they had low taxes, overall good development – not perfect – and a sense of purpose when it came to economic development. The property initially that I represent is a specific parcel that the owners are concerned with. It is located in what you identify I think as a regional, a corporate park area, and in the future – the FLUP, it is identified as a future economic development area overlaying office and light industrial. It's at the corner of Cots Street and Bridgeport Ave. The concern that they have is a concern similar to that which was expressed in 1999 by a different landowner, and relates to this issue of the Planned Development District. It is no secret that when you zoned, when you did the Route 8 corridor update, and you zoned OPD up and down. As I stood before you 7-8 years ago and we said that the OPD had basically 13 uses, 8 of which were primary uses and 5 of which were accessory. It's primary purpose was to put a restrictive zone over thereby creating a situation with development along that zone was either exactly in accord with OPD or was in accordance with the PDD. The PDD in Shelton, in a sense is the girl with the curl. When it's good, it's very, very good. When it's bad, it's very, very bad. But it is primarily responsible for the success of Shelton and the development of Shelton because it has fed upon itself. Recently, and I have copies if anybody wants, because it's referred in your plan, recently the Supreme Court has spoke; in *Campion vs. New Haven*. Not on the basic 8-1 zoning authority, but on the special act which is similar to that. It is upheld Planned Development District. It has held it. I'm not going to go over it; this isn't a law class, but I recommend you reading it because it's very interesting in what it says. You, as a Commission, have the power to do when you're attempting to meet moderate zoning requirements and moderate planning requirements, which are different. The most important thing that is said there is that contrary to the appellate court the supreme court has rejected what is know in planning as Euclidian zoning – meaning very rigid large area zoning. Basically recognized something that Shelton has recognized for 30 years. You need to address parcels of land. Has it been perfect? You know, you were all at a hearing when I said be careful you will get your own words thrown back in your face. I did that to an attorney at that hearing. So, I'm going to say something and I don't mind if they get thrown back in my face. I agree wholeheartedly with the position that the Planned Development District is probably not the tool to be used in residential areas. I believe that a special development area is something that should not be laid on by the applicants but is something that should be laid on by this Commission. I think in reading through the plan, and I got the whole plan not the summary, and I read it, and I think that's what it's saying. I think that's a very important thing. The problem is I think you also have to do, especially for this client who is now has their property being laid into this office industrial area. An area that is really tenant generated. In other words if you don't have a tenant, you don't have a building. In an area that is primarily commercial, transitional zoned into residential area and an area that's its development of which is probably going to depend on whether the city or developer actually builds the beginning portion of the rest of Constitution Blvd. And I would hope that within that area, within that corridor of Bridgeport Ave. where it connects with Constitution Blvd. that in that area along Bridgeport Ave. you maintain flexibility. That is our primary request. You do not because I've reviewed your PDD proposal and I think when you read *Campion*, and I actually did bring extra copies and I will bring them up front, I believe that in order to avoid the problem of surprises it's important to have the uses somewhat stable. That's the purpose of my client. They do not go from the zone they're in, which I think currently is the restricted business district and go to a more restricted area of office and

industrial in an area where they do not believe it's going to flourish in the near future. They don't want to have to warehouse their property. So I think that's an important consideration. I was not surprised but somewhat disappointed unfortunately to hear the comments by the first speaker concerning the issue of cluster housing. I have clients that are interested. Cluster housing in no way means additional density. It can, and I want to commend the plan on its illustrations showing the difference in open space when you effectively as does the rest of the country, when you effectively allow housing to be clustered into what I think was a unique term we had when I grew up. They were called neighborhoods, ok. Instead of picking up a phone Anna Thomas would raise the window and talk to Eleanor Burn two houses away. I'm not saying we're going to go back to that in the suburban areas but the fact of the matter is, the concept of buffering a residential area of permitting the homes to be clustered together and increasing the open space to make it more useable and more environmentally friendly is a very beneficial thing and something that the rest of the country is doing if you read planning things. I want to make one comment on that and then leave it. At an Inland Wetlands Commission meeting when discussing a proposal that you have already approved a subdivision in which the developer, and believe me in many of these cases the developer would jump at the chance even if it did not involve additional density, but the developer was talking about what properties to designate as open space. Somebody got up and raised the issue of we don't want that open space that's wetlands. At that time I turned to your Wetlands Enforcement Officer, and we've battled occasionally but I have great respect for John Cook, and I said to Mr. Cook, when is it easier for you do make sure that wetlands aren't being invaded? Now this occurred after a very, very nice person got up and spoke about his water problems and proceeded to admit to about 7 violations of not getting permits. Not intentionally, he was just talking about he was trying to clear up his water problems. John said it's much easier if the wetlands is open space than if the wetlands is on somebody else's property. When you take that concept and bring it to its fullest, and I'm not suggesting this because you can't do it in Shelton; you don't have enough land to do it contiguous. You have a proposal like they have in Oxford, with Oxford Greens, which has 900 acres. 530 of which are open space. And when you remove the golf course, 350 of which are open space and believe it or not, there's not one bit of wetlands filled on the property. The enormous wetlands are all protected by extremely restricted open space declarations. I think that's a very important thing and I think the developers I represent are in favor of that. I think it is an important thing to consider. I want to close on an economic development point and I have to be careful because I have several applications pending and I don't want to vary into them because you've closed public hearings on them. I'm going to close with war story comment from a client – one that you've already approved. That was easy, not even a controversy. When the client came to me, they asked me a question, and they said, tell me a little bit about Shelton, and I told them about Shelton. I turned to them, now I'm going to ask you something. Why are you leaving where you're leaving? They said to me, well, we have some issues with our property, we have some issues with our factory, we have some issues with our neighbors, but the main reason is we need to get near our employees. They were in southern Fairfield County. The point of fact is they were have extreme difficulty in a growing business; they need to expand and they needed to come up here. They came there and began our proposal. This Commission was its usual, even though this was a tremendously benefit, this Commission was it's usual firm, determined self in making them do certain things. In the middle of it, and I don't think anybody on this Commission knows this; they were courted by another community. They were offered rebates; they were offered other things by

this other community. They came to me and said to me, what should we do? I said I can't tell you. I had actually conflict in doing it. They asked if I could get them tax rebates in Shelton? After I got done laughing I said no, if you want me to ask I will, but I said when you leave there are 5 more behind you, so there's really no benefit to the tax rebate. They said why should we go there? This was my answer and I concluded with this because I think it's indicative of your plan. I'm saying this because developers are not the enemy, developers can be your friend and businesses can be your friend. I said to them, you can go to this other community if you're interested in saving money in the short term. You will save money in the short term; you will not save money in the short term here. You will be able to almost dictate your site work and everything else. You won't be able to do that here. You will get tax rebates and in the shorter term your tax and your expenses will be less. When your taxes kick in, your taxes will be higher than they will be in Shelton. When you turn your key on your \$2.5M building you will have a beautiful \$2.5M building. When you're in Shelton, that building is going to cost you \$3M and when you turn your key on your \$3M building it will be worth \$5M. I got a call 24 hours later saying go ahead with the project. That's to your benefit and to the benefit of this plan. It's a fantastic plan. I hope you address the concerns of that one property owner and on the PDD's I hope you don't succumb to the fact that they are evil. They are not evil, they need to be fixed a little bit but they are what made Shelton what it is. Thank you very much and here is if anybody is interested, the Champion vs. Board of Aldermen, City of New Haven. I made copies.

Chairman Cribbins said I want to make one comment. Yes, what's in the plan says that in an R-1 zone if a developer or property owner can build 20 homes, the concept in the plan is to have them build 20 homes on half the acreage and the other half of the acreage as open space. It doesn't say in the plan and it doesn't say in our going forward in the PDD plan or the regulations that we're amending now that anybody can have 40 homes on 20 acres. It doesn't say that. I just wanted to clarify that point of order.

A member of the public asked: Can you tell me what it does say regarding one acre zoning in Huntington? I think a lot of us would like to know that. I apologize for speaking out of order. I'm running low on my oxygen.

Chairman Cribbins said I believe you're next, Mr. Devaney. I will answer your question on the way over. In the plan, that's what it says in Huntington, on the one acre zoned properties, we are not looking for any increase in multiples or anything like that. What we are saying is to protect those. What we are saying is to purchase the development rights of the farmers so that no development will go on in that particular area. In the plan there are very detailed things that say how to preserve property and not to increase. No where in this plan, going forward, no where in this plan does it say we are allowing any multiples. I hope that's clear enough.

Martin DeVaney, 16 Woods Grove Rd

Yes, thank you for clarifying it for me. I am here with my wife Theresa. Ladies and gentlemen, the reason I have come up here and this is the third meeting I have been to, is because Huntington is in a situation where it's a city and has an urban area with urban problems and urban social problems like Stamford. Let's compare Stamford and Huntington. They are more or less at opposite ends of Fairfield County, I-95, etc., Route 15 too, etc. Stamford has a business district, Summer Street down to like exit 6 and things like that. In the northern part of the town is millionaires row, your bedroom communities where businessmen go to Wall Street and go to Chase

Manhattan Bank and JP Morgan, work during the day, catch the train to Darien in the morning. Ok, what's the similarity? They both have urban, commercial, manufacturing areas, up in the north, bedroom community with people who have invested quite a bit of money, and it's a very good land, very good structures and ever increasing valuable structures. The long and short of it is that I don't know how Stamford made out when they forced urban area to be more or less devoid of population. I'm not trying to go into that. I am trying to say this. Huntington is designed not only by nature and the environment but also by law as a rural agriculturally based area of town. We do not in Huntington, I've spoken to a lot of neighbors, I've signed a lot of papers, I've gone to a lot of mailboxes, I've gone through a lot of things of oxygen, I'm not asking for anything. I don't care. It only cost me about 80 bucks to do what I did. I want to say this. In Huntington we want it to stay like Huntington. We don't want another Derby with drug addictions and syringes on the ground. We do not want another Bridgeport. We do not want another Waterbury with no economic future. And that's how we feel. In fact I did mention, not by way of any kind intended or accidental intimidation; I am saying that there's a possibility at some point that if Huntington gets messed with there may be an application for a special taxation district, which would mean that we could more or less fund our own services; if it would be approved by the legislature under the home rule law of every state of the union. Every state in the United States of America is unitary with respect to its subdivisions. Bridgeport's charter, Stratford's charter, Waterbury's charter, Litchfield's charter; they can all be lifted or x'd out any time by the legislature for just cause in accordance to the law in the Constitution and the statutes. That would only be if there was some kind of an improper, etc. and so forth that the lawyers talk about; illegal type actions or behavior. The long and the short of it is, that we have to present this town to people who want to live here who are economically independent. And for the poorer people clean up downtown a little bit as necessary. I want to say two things and I'll be quiet; I shall depart. First of Commerce Drive, I do believe; there are homes back there across from those big monstrosities skyscrapers. There's homes back there. Twenty feet of road has been taken away and hills. I don't know how the people are going to be able to keep their house value up with that. We have skyscrapers here. There is a big developer has a lot of businesses here. Well, the thing is, we don't want this business jazz encroaching into Huntington. Within the last 13 months there are two real estate offices and banking, loan sharking enterprises on the intersection of Huntington Street by Trap Falls, and Commerce Drive. Great skyscrapers but keep it in perspective. Geez, we don't need 13 story buildings here. The thing is that we are in a depression and have been since 1988 as I mentioned in my graduate course curriculum at the University of New Haven. The thing is that we have a big problem with the construction of that monstrosity pyramid like deal on Bridgeport Ave. I went over that way with my wife today, God Bless her, my lovely foundation, and we saw a parcel of water, a tributary going under the road right in front of the wall which I don't think is going to be bold enough to hold up the foundation of these monstrous pedestals put up. The long and short of it is that water is something that says under law in the CT Inland and Wetlands Commission established in 1976, that if there's water on the property, you can't build a commercial structure there. I don't know where the water's going, that's for the brains up there to think about, but I'll tell you this, on Mohegan Road there was a gas station. It was burnt out or something when we moved here in 1997. It was rebuilt. It was recently dug up and new tanks put in. The poor people around there are going to have a horrible cancer rate because that thing is leaching into the groundwater, people have various forms of water supply systems and it never should have been built. Look at the Raven in Stratford, ok, that's a different deal, ok. The

Raven. There are halls there, halls for weddings and everything for many, many years, and it was know as a place that was too hot to go to a wedding reception for because there was no way to get a seat. Anyway, it burnt down in 1975. It couldn't be replaced, non-conforming use. That should have been the same deal for the gas station. And it wasn't and it's the kind of thing in Huntington, we don't want. We have wildlife here. The whole Huntington is a series of underground springs which leads to either Isinglass reservoir or Trap Falls reservoir. Our aquifer, a fancy word, all it means is dirt, humus, and rocks. The water goes through it from up north and wherever it's coming from is filtered by the sub-terraineal things, and it gets to the reservoir clean so we can drink clean water and live properly. The thing is that gas stations in Huntington moving more and more florists and dog things and kid things and veterinary things, they don't belong in Huntington. They belong in the business districts of the City. There are plenty of them. Now I don't profess to be an expert about the Derby-Shelton bridge. I know there are buildings out there. I don't know if it's safe to go down there but I will tell you this, those buildings and the low-lying office space could be utilized that would provide as some one here said more general type of economic endeavors. Art studios, photography, perhaps some kind of community music lessons to be given for a small fee, which our community centers provide; I'm just throwing those out. But I do feel very strongly that Huntington should remain Huntington. Number two; I feel very strongly that we don't need sidewalks in Huntington. I'm speaking for myself, not for the people, the 100 people I've talked to in Huntington. For myself, I own the land. If you want the sidewalk, have a court order me to put it in or pay me for the land. We worked hard to get to Huntington, all of us. I was not born here, I chose to live here by the grace of God, my wife and I are here, and we're staying here. But I'll tell you, please don't ruin it for future generations. The public office is a public trust, number one, and number two, the government leaders, town fathers of state, national and local governments; they do no own the government. They do not own the policies or the buildings, or the laws or the statutes. You gentlemen and ladies and everywhere the representatives voted in by the people are here to handle the situation and preserve our form of government until the next generation comes. Nobody says, hey, I'm going to live for today, man, I'm slick, I'm cool, and to heck with the future. It doesn't work like that. Somebody with that kind of attitude is going to be in the Danbury Federal Correctional Institution. I would say always remember, no one owns the government. It's a wonderful thing owned by the people, the populous, the human residents, and that the people who are in government are simply caretakers of the public trust and interest. Good evening, folks.

Bill Bures, 224 Division Avenue

I was just going to ask a question. If at all if there is any chance that any small pieces of property could be picked up in the downtown area? I know there isn't much left; we probably should have been fighting for that in 1850. But, if there is something because we have nothing, I wish it could be considered. The second thing that bothered me was I live on Division and I don't think, it might be a good idea for a ramp going south on exit 14. There is a reason why it wasn't put there. When you just think of this – go to the level of Howe Ave. and how it hits Coram Ave. It's quite a level. So I didn't do any engineering calculations but what happens is you have to have graduated acceleration lane for the cars to merge in with the cars going southbound on Route 8. How far is that going to go down to get that acceleration lane to meet where they meet with the cars coming south, and then you're going have the other cars trying to get off at exit 13. It might look like the bumper car ride at a carnival. It may not be feasible to

do it, I mean, it would have to be looked in engineering wise. Basically I am glad to see the river being opened up over the last 5 years and I hope that continues, because in the 60's, 70's and 80's from Canal Street down to say, Lafayette School, the downtown was fenced off from the river. We're just very happy downtown that it's opened up to us.

Chairman Cribbins said those were all the speakers that were on the list. Is there anyone else in the audience? Can you take this list and sign in for us please? It helps the secretarial staff.

Margaret Paulson, 64 Sunset Drive

There is a lot in this plan. I am only going to speak about my back yard; it's all I can do. I am a member of the Shelton Land Conservation Trust and I am also a volunteer ranger in charge of lot 12, which is (inaudible), which is under consideration for development. These are what I know about the property. (Someone asked her to speak into the microphone) The biodiversity in this area is quite extensive. It is a host to many animal species like white tailed deer, gray, red, white and black squirrels, black squirrels being the rarest, wild turkeys, turkey vultures, brown-tailed hawks, white striped skunks, wild rabbits, coyotes, chipmunks, salamanders, and frogs. I've also seen red-headed woodpeckers, red-shouldered hawks, sharp-shinned hawks, and an eastern spadefoot toad, which are protected by the federal migratory bird treaty act of 1919, and the CT General Statutes, section 26-311. The bats in the area live in the caves created by the construction of Constitution Blvd. South under the rail roadway and control the insects in the swamp. The area is also a major migration route for deer coming up from Stratford following the Housatonic over the old dump, and picking up the Ivy Brook, crossing over Route 8 and continuing north. Building even one house in the swamp is a major concern by disrupting the ecology with silt and runoff, and construction noise; the frogs and animals would leave, resulting in the food shortage for the hawks and other top of the chain animals. The Coram Gardens area is over-developed as it stands. Lot sizes here range from less than a quarter acre to a half acre. The old apple orchard on Weybossett now looks like a slum with no mature trees and everyone's back yard is on top of each other. On the corner of Westminster and Toas, 5 houses are going up; when in fact the lot size would hold one house compared to the neighboring houses. Should I reiterate on that? It's like you got house, house, 5 houses, house. The kids in this area have created an extensive trail system for riding bikes, hiking, holding get-togethers, and just getting some fresh air. There's nowhere else a 10 or 15 year old can go safely in this area besides this. They build forts, play war, hunt and fish. To develop what little is left in Coram Gardens would adversely affect the quality of life here and our way of living. The kids have a chance to get some good, clean fun. I've printed out a map detailing the trails and circled the area under consideration. It is also available on the internet at www.sunsetnet.net/revised_map.pdf, and the frog and the area pictures can be viewed at www.sunsetnet.net/animals.html. In closing, I hope everyone here agrees on the importance of keeping this important eco-system protected. Thank you.

Gil Pastore, 150 Yutaka Trail

I just want to touch on one thing. I just picked up the pamphlet on the way in. I want to point out the preserve and protect the important natural resources. As you know from the previous moments I've been at these meetings; I spoke about preserving the water quality going to the Far Mill

River. One of the most important things I see in #5 is a zero percent increase in runoff going into the storm drains from construction sites and just general construction and road usage. This I find very important because specifically I brought to your attention the numerous amount of silt, lots of garbage, the trees coming down the Far Mill River; you heard it all before from me. This is all because of over-development naturally up in the Huntington area and along the Bridgeport Ave. corridor. This is very important and I hope you really – if you do adopt this to stick to this reduction of increased runoff, because this is the reason why we're losing the Far Mill River. We have too much runoff from Bridgeport Ave. going in there; we have too much runoff from all the commercial development up in the Bridgeport Ave. area, and this is what's killing the river. I brought to your attention the flooding characteristics of the Far Mill River over the past like 10-15 years to differences that I've personally seen and I hope you will adopt this and really stick to this runoff issue because it could really help us in the future because I really don't want to be, or all of us, none of us I don't believe want to be the people that 100 years or 50 years from now look back down and say, well these are the Shelton Planning & Zoning Commission people who lost the Far Mill River because they had no adopted regulations to stop the runoff going into the rivers. That's all, and I left my garbage home tonight. Thank you.

Terry Gallagher, 43 Judson Street

I am a member of the Shelton Trails Committee and I am also a licensed professional engineer that does a lot of site designing throughout the state. I would like to say it first that the folks at Planimetrics and Barkan & Mess are very good firms, done a very good plan. Shelton's got a very good in-house planning staff and it shows in the planned development. There is a lot of good things in here. In particular, I like the emphasis on pedestrian bicycle safety on the roads, because a lot of planned developments, particularly the old one focused more on the level of service on intersections and roadway capacity. It's very nice to see an overall balanced approach. There is a couple of areas I would suggest additions on page 5-32. I would suggest that we specifically add the Shelton Lakes recreation path as the City of Shelton capital project in there. There's some general emphasis for pedestrian safety; but having that written specifically in there, also the Huntington Center sidewalk project in there as specific projects. Then work with valley regional planning agency and the state plan of development for the DOT pedestrian plan. That helps get us points whenever a grant opportunity comes up and the more points you can show that your project is listed on these state plans, the more likely you are to get funding. The bike path in Derby that is just getting ready to open now; that's all federal funding through the Iced Tea Program. We don't have that really for the Shelton Lakes recreation path. We do have that for the downtown canal walk. The more times we put these specific projects in our plans of development as specific line items, it helps us down the road get funding. I also wanted to say that I echo the comment from the Chamber of Commerce. When you see sidewalks and bus shelters and bike racks, they seem like they are small items that most people don't use, but you look at what Farmington has done with Route 4 and every condo development, office building has a little wall pull workers bus shelter there. Yeah, they're maintenance items but it adds to the quality of everyone's life, particularly for the people who don't have cars; and to see people out in the rain in front of Staples waiting for the bus to come – it's nice to think that we, as one of the most affluent towns in the most affluent state in the country can afford to have some sidewalks and bus shelters for people. I think particularly whenever we get a chance, whether it's some private projects, or city projects like schools or roadway reconstruction, we should be requiring

sidewalks so people aren't walking out on road shoulders particularly on dark nights, particularly on high volume roads like Bridgeport Ave. or on collector roads like Nells Rock Road or Buddington Road or Long Hill Cross Road. Touching on roads, on page 5-4, there's a couple of roads listed for upgrades; Oak Valley Rd. and Lane St. Both of those are very low volume roads. With the Shelton Lakes Recreation path we are specifically trying to keep those low volume roads. They really don't go from anywhere to anywhere. There are issues with fire access that I know we dealt with on Lane Street with the gates and the crushed stone access there between Wesley and Lane. I think there's ways to deal with emergency access that don't dump more traffic in areas where we're trying to have fairly low volume roads. That gets into some quality of life issues. The other thing I didn't notice in the plan that I think we should mention is our designated scenic roads that we have, maybe I just missed it in there, but Mill St., Lane St, I think maybe Pearmain Rd., and that sets some certain standards, general standards about preserving street trees, stone walls, historic artifacts, water quality, that I think belongs in our plan of development; particularly if anything goes in along those roads. Not to say people cannot build but the development should be particularly sensitive along our designated scenic roads. I would like to concur that I think having Constitution Blvd. North constructed is probably the main capital project the city should look at as far as road reconstruction. I think it would alleviate a lot of congestion in Huntington Center and help distribute traffic a little bit more evenly to the exit 13 end of the Bridgeport Ave. corridor. I also think that having a comprehensive; maybe working with the state traffic commission, have a comprehensive plan for the entire Bridgeport Ave. corridor; maybe getting some state funding for that would eliminate all the ins and outs of all the turning lanes that we have at all the intersections. I would like to see a more comprehensive plan for that. I know the Commission has been working on that. I would like to applaud the plan for suggesting a capital improvement program. I think it makes a lot of sense for the City's long term fiscal management; whether you're buying dump trucks or building a new school 20 years out. You want to see how all the different city plans are coming along and I think it's a really good thing for long-term fiscal responsibility. The towns that have that – Madison has one, Newington has a public works committee, the towns that have that it's a little easier working with them because when you go in and work on a project if they say Smith Street is scheduled to have 500' of sidewalk in 5 years.

Tape 2, Side A

And you know you're adding extra traffic on Smith Street generally the town plan is going to fund all or part of the sidewalk, whether you're going private or not, but at least you have it in writing ahead of time you can plan for it. I think the more Shelton puts those things in writing, those goals down on paper, the more they'll actually get done. Some of the goals may not pan out over time, they may change year to year, but I think just to put everything on the table in writing. I know the water pollution control board has their long-range plans, the schools have their long-range plan, open space has theirs. All the money comes out of the same pockets, so just to put everything on the table so people can plan for it over time because we may not continue to have the building boom that we have had that has helped fund our grand list. The fourth item was a number of things were listed on the plan for possible future projects. One was having more of a Wolf Park type development where you have all central recreation facilities in Shelton Lakes. I personally don't think that's a good thing for Shelton. I personally would like to see more neighborhood parks scattered around town. More neighborhood soccer fields, little league fields where kids can

ride their bikes to get to them rather than having mom and dad throw them in the back of the van and drive them there, with sidewalks around all the parks so kids can safely get to them. But that's my own personal thing. The topography and the wetlands of Shelton Lakes probably makes that a little more difficult than what Monroe had working with, probably a lot of old farm land and farm fields. The other item I saw in there was a golf course; having a possible municipal golf course. I've worked on two of them in the last two years and getting the diversion permits from the DEP for the irrigation supply and dealing with the Army Corps of Engineers and dealing with the vernal pools; it's very difficult to permit something like that in this day and age unless you have a field that doesn't have a lot wetlands on it. I know certain people like Tom Harbinson want to golf through a many golf courses as he can in his life-time and I respect his goal fully but I just think logistically that's going to be hard for Shelton to fund and get done in our lifetimes. I would rather maybe a public-private partnership with the other two private golf courses in town or maybe some private if he does some nice deserted farm fields somewhere that it's no one's gravel pit. I see the city as being able to spend its limited dollars to an extra soccer field, an extra little league field, extra bike paths or extra sidewalks. The sixth item I wanted to mention was I echo what people are saying about having better site design in Shelton. I've worked for towns, I've worked for developers, and I think developers like working in Shelton because it's predictable. They know they're going to get a product approved in a certain amount of time. Shelton is probably one of the most liberal towns in CT when it comes to permitting things. They want to see things. As long as the process is fair and consistent; I've never seen anybody say I'm not going to build in town because they want me to have a 14' light pole or they want me to save 20% of the existing trees on the site, or they want me to put a sidewalk in front. As long it's in writing and everything is consistent. I think there is a lot of areas where Shelton could fine tune the regulations; the engineering regulations, the wetland regulations, the subdivision and zoning regulations, where we put these things in writing – like what the DEP was recommending regarding the low impact style stormwater BMP. If those are in writing and the developer knows I can't put that in the open space; that's going to eat up part of my parking lot or part of my building, or it's going to be "x %" of the site, like Branford does that and New Milford does that. It's a little easier design but you know what you've got going in. For a developer to spend 50, 100 or \$200K doing designs, get into a public hearing, and all of a sudden the stormwater management system or site design is no good and has to be pulled back; that is an inefficient use of time and money. So, as long as things are in writing and if Shelton wants to protect steep slopes or they want to do better storm water quality at the Far Mill River, I agree with that entirely. I just think we're going to have to spend money to do things where we retrofit Bridgeport Ave. storm drains or Huntington St. storm drains; it's not just the new developments. The existing infrastructure that we have and that's one reason I think have a good capital improvement program and having all those goals that you have in section 7 makes excellent ideas. I'll give you one example that I just worked on personally in Farmington. They had a natural resources inventory of the Unionville brook watershed, which is I think one of the items in chapter 7 of this plan. They did not have any Inland Wetland setbacks on the books; they had nothing. But they did a natural resources inventory recognize that Unionville brook and the Farmington river were primary trout streams and they wanted to have a good cold water fish habitat there. So they recommended a 100' undisturbed buffer to the streams and to try and use some of these low impact style development BMP's that would protect water quality in the river. The developer knew that going in and was able to design a cluster housing subdivision where they had the same number of units they would

have had with a conventional development, the 1-acre residential, actually it might have been 1 ½ acre, but they pulled everything back so it was in clusters and they stayed off the steep slopes and they stayed off the river buffers, but they knew that going in so their money was well spent. They went with narrower roads and innovative stormwater BMP's. The wetland board looked at it, reviewed it as changes, the conservation reviewed it as changes, planning looked at it as changes. They even knocked out some lots. They made them put in a sidewalk along the road. The developer offered to do a lot of good things; they did a very good job but the process could have been more efficient than it was but it worked out well, got approved, the environment was protected, the developer got 90% of what he was asking for, the town got probably 50% open space including wetlands, uplands, nice wildlife habitat, and these greenway corridors, which Shelton is trying to do. I guess my point is other towns around the state are integrating all these nice things that are in this plan of development and there's a number of suggestions for follow-up documents. I think these are all good. I think if we work together as a town we can do a lot to allow responsible development and protect our environment. Thank you.

Dan Allen, 36 Narragansett Trail, Pine Rock Park

I am here as a resident of Pine Rock Park and also representing the Pine Rock Park homeowners association. I haven't been able to digest the entire plan as put forth but I've tried to go through some of it. In overall I have to applaud everybody's effort on that. You can't please everybody and I do know that. I'm here more so to basically talk about Pine Rock Park and to just keep it in the forefront of all your thoughts. I've had meetings with quite a few of you – Jason, Rick, over the past few years. Pine Park is unique to Shelton; it's basically unique to the state of CT. Honestly speaking I don't really know of any other community that would have allowed Pine Rock Park to have public roads versus making them private; but we do. We're also obviously bordering the Far Mill River there which has been talked about tonight as a very important piece of geography. Pine Rock Park is special for many reasons. One of them right now is; prior to the 1987 zoning change, where we were changed from R-5 to R-3; they put the sewers and the water lines in to help the community. There was really no forethought on who that was going to attract. In other words, every single developer and builder that could possibly crawl out from under a rock. They put houses in Pine Rock Park during the middle 80's at a ridiculously heavy rate; I don't know exactly how many went up but I'd have to say in that period of time probably over 50. Right now we are supposedly an R-3 designation which is a 12000 sq. ft. Pine Rock Park has the original map from Oronoque Manor Estates 1931; I believe it's dated. The lot of Pine Rock Park were divided into 25'x100' camper/trailer lots; not building lots. It has been brought to the attention quite a few people the developers coming in and being told that because of the ambiguities in the town interpretation of the state merger clause that if you're able to combine two of those 25'x100' lots, thus giving yourself 5000 sq. ft. you can now build in an R-3 zone that's zoned for 12,000 sq. ft. I just believe that something should be done about that. I believe we were given the short stick by the town when they put the water and the sewers in and did not plan; or maybe they did plan and just didn't care. We have to live with what we have right now. If anybody who has lived in Shelton would like to come to Pine Rock Park and take a look at a very unique area along the Far Mill River and some of the pure granite rock faces that are going through there. It's truly a beautiful place. You would actually imagine yourself to be in New Hampshire. If anybody doubts me I live at 36 Narragansett Trail; come knock on my door anytime and come on my back deck. You don't think you're in New Hampshire then you've never been to New Hampshire.

That's basically all I had to say. I know it's been addressed to Jason, to Rick; we've talked to the Board of Aldermen; we've been talking to Mayor Lauretti about this for years and we've actually gotten more action in Pine Rock Park in the last 4 years than I've seen since I've been there in 1984, and I've been active within the community since then. I don't care if it's a Republican or a Democrat, or an Independent, we're getting action that we've never gotten before and I like what I see so far and I want to see it continue. In further developing of this plan and I'd like you to keep in mind the things I've brought up about Pine Rock Park and serious discussion should be made regarding the situation what is being perceived as building lots versus what were lots never, ever, ever intended to be a building lot. For some reason with this ambiguity they're being considered and houses are granted to being built on 5000 sq. ft. On top of that there have been in the past, not as much so, I will have to say the Planning & Zoning has stopped some of the regulations, some of the variances that people are asking for regarding the setbacks. The roads in Pine Rock Park are not where they were put on the map. So, I basically own 20' of the property on the other side of my road, which I graciously gave to my neighbor because I don't want to take care of a rock. But, you cannot enlarge the services to Pine Rock Park. The roads cannot; it's not a matter of money; it's an impossibility to increase the size of the roads, or to increase the services with water and or sewage in Pine Rock Park. I strongly believe that we've gone past the point of density saturation there. I believe that this should all be taken into consideration and addressed during your future meetings. I thank you for your time; that's all I have to say.

Ron Pavlucik, 287 Eagles Landing

First I want to thank the Planning & Zoning Commission and the Plan Update Advisory Committee for all the work that they put in on their own time and on a volunteer basis to get this plan to this current state as well as the others that contributed to it. I think it is unfortunate that these groups have to be exposed to some of the hysteria and rude comments from people, not just tonight as we've heard but in the past, especially since these people are volunteers and doing their best for Shelton. I don't always agree with all the decisions made by this Planning & Zoning Commission but I agree with most of them. I might put my aging dad in Bob Scinto's 17-story, not 13-story Renaissance Towers; I'm glad to see that's coming to Shelton. You know there are critics that say that why should the Split Rock development look the way it is, why can't we have all those trees? And I say to those people, the developers have a right to make a profit on their land just like any other person that owns property or investments. If you want to see trees instead of Walgreens, which I can't wait to open, it's going to be a very convenient store to go to. You just go up a couple of miles up Route 8 not far from where I live up at Aspetuck Village and there are plenty of trees up there. Or you go further up Route 8 to Beacon Falls and there is a very scenic road up there. So, Shelton can't remain all trees, all farms, all cows, but I think the City is doing a good job in maintaining quite a bit of acreage to look rural with the open space program and the large purchases of property, so I think we have what is referred to in a lot of places here in town as balanced growth. I think we are on the right track for that. I think we also need to keep this town affordable; that's the other key point that pops out at me. Affordable means that property taxes can remain reasonable and lowest in the area if this kind of plan is adopted that has balanced growth and has development in existing areas where there is development. You know people complain about Bridgeport Ave. and some of these comments are absurd when people say that we don't want it to look like Post Road in Orange. It never will. It will never look like Route 22 in New Jersey, wherever

the heck that is. It will never look like Stamford like some people keep bringing up at every Planning & Zoning meeting; there just isn't that much land there. And what you people on Planning & Zoning Commission for the last 20 years as far as I could tell is created a very desirable area for business development. We've got some top shelf, class-A businesses and office buildings and retail establishments there, and I am very proud how that area has developed. I happened to work on Bridgeport Ave. I've got two jobs on Bridgeport Ave. In the interest of full disclosure I'll tell you what they are. I work at Atrium; I've got a management position there. I'm one of those people that leaves the office at 12:01 everyday and makes the mad dash to a restaurant. I either have to get in line at the drive-up at Burger King or get in line at Panera Bread and kill half of my lunch hour waiting to get served at that wonderful restaurant, or the other establishments in the area. So I'm glad that there could be 3 or 4 more restaurants located on Bridgeport Ave. I also have a part-time job, again at the interest of full disclosure, at Starbucks. If you go to Starbucks Friday night this week you'll see me there pouring coffee. As I prepare for retirement I picked up a part-time job there which might take me into my older years. But anyway, I've got two jobs on Bridgeport Ave.; it's a great area. I live in Aspetuck Village and there we probably get the least bang for the buck of any community or any organization in town, with 450 residents there, units, times about \$5K that we pay in property taxes and sewer fees and car taxes, Aspetuck contributes \$2M. \$5K x 450 units. \$2M to the \$100M or so budget in town which makes us as an entity probably one of the largest taxes payers next to Mr. Scinto in Shelton. I think this is a great town. For this particular plan what is important to me is the senior tax relief that there is a reference to; that be provided with the aging of the population occurring in the next 15-20 as is projected in this plan. I like the references to the additional services for the seniors which would include the walking trails, maybe some of the sidewalks and exercise areas. I commend the people that put this plan together. I think you should adopt it and implement it and I look forward to all the recommendations being implemented. Thank you very much.

John Corvino, 20 Mohegan Road

I live on Mohegan Rd. I've been there for 40 years or so and traffic has really gotten heavy up there. There's only so much room on these roads and you can't make it much wider, so this long-range thoughtful planning is good. Just consider the town, especially in the Huntington area. It can only hold so much traffic. There are sidewalks up there that I know they plan to build new sidewalks. There are some sidewalks up there that have been there for a long time and they're in pretty rough shape. You can't tell the difference between the road and the sidewalk and it's a main road. A lot of people walk it so I think that should be considered before you start appropriating a lot of new sidewalks. All and all that Route – Bridgeport Ave., you know, it's nice to see development down there but every building you put up – there are a lot of empty buildings around in places that have their peak out and become pretty dumpy after a while when the surge is over. So that is something to consider long-range. I just want to make an announcement. My wife and my son have made a movie, a little documentary about farming in the Shelton area and CT; small farms, preserving them. It will be in the papers where it will be shown and might be of interest to a lot of people here to check that out. I didn't come here to advertise that but I just thought about it. She's working tonight. It's called Farmers Voice. Look for it in the papers and maybe we will show it here some night. Thank you.

Ingrid Waters, 261 Long Hill Cross Roads

Good evening everybody. I worked my way through the Executive Summary trying to comprehend everything that has been written. I address this question to Eric. What is considered a collector road?

Eric Barz responded that there is a hierarchy of roads. A local road being a road that can serve residential driveways. Local roads feed into what we call a collector road. A collector road serves neighborhood local streets and then the collector road then goes into arterial roads into roads such as Bridgeport Ave., Constitution Blvd., or Howe Ave. These are the arterials and then at the top of the chain are the expressways like Route 8. When we refer to a collector road the function of that road is to collect the traffic from the small residential streets and convey the cars to the arterial and they are transitioned. There are residents and businesses located on collector streets but not with the intensity we would find on a local street.

Ms. Waters said thank you for explaining that and I am glad that I asked this question because I have the bad misfortune to live on a collector road. My problem is and many residents on my street share this problem and concern that number one, the road is not paved properly for all the traffic that is going through. Heavy truck traffic through cars. The cars we can deal with, however the truck traffic damages the roads. The road is uneven. The noise that is created by this constant banging and clanging is reducing our quality of life. We can only actually live in the back of the house, not in the front; it's useless because the constant truck traffic that goes from Long Hill Ave. to Bridgeport Ave. because it's a short-cut is almost unbearable. We had broken water pipes, broken sewer pipes that took forever to fix because I guess the City didn't have the resources to fix it sooner. In the end it got fixed; I'm not complaining, it did get fixed eventually but it took up to year and more. If there are collector roads and I'm glad you identified on this map; it's the responsibility of this town to make sure these collector roads are paved properly and they are being upgraded as appropriate to the flow of traffic that goes through these roads. I thank you.

Ann Walsh, 189 Coram Road

I had the opportunity to attend a couple of the Plan Update Committee's meetings, which I was glad I did. I think that a lot of people's concerns were addressed at the meetings. I was glad I was able to get more insight as what's up and coming. My own personal selfish concern is I live in the traditional south Shelton, I'm concerned with over-crowding, over-developing. In my neck of the woods when the area is developed things are built in a more condensed area so there are more things. So I think we're overbuilt before the rest of town. For instance, one house on Coram Rd, it's cute little pink house, had garage, the garage was leveled and house went up, and 3 houses. I think if you stuck your arms out you could touch each other. To me I wouldn't have liked to see that house in there. I know it's a developer, I know it's money. But something about it to me says that was a little much. I would like to see that little much ceased, or restrained somewhat. I don't profess to know anything about Planning & Zoning rules and regulations. I know it's dollar generated but I'm concerned about the over-development on my side of town. I'm concerned also when someone gets up and says that they want Huntington to stay the way that it is, I don't want whatever that you're going to put in that gentleman's neighborhood in my neighborhood. Ok? Enough said. I want to know, on one of your maps you have something called an existing trail on page 9. I don't know if you can address it or if you want to send me a note to my address, but you have maps of, I think its page 8, existing trails. I just want to know, once something is existing, can it go away? Can you build something

on it? In other words, there is something by my house that I don't want to see go away. Again, I told you I'm being very selfish but I want to make sure that it stays right where it is. Ok, you can let me know.

Chairman Cribbins said I have to confirm what the underlying and who owns it; is it the City's property, does it belong to Conservation, is it open space, trails.

Ms. Walsh said ok, because I do try and use it and a lot of the existing trails. The other question I have is your historic definition and the delay on page 8. #4 says adopt a demolition delay ordinance to help protect historic structures. I would be curious and you don't have to answer it, you can drop me a note. I am concerned about something, "you all", the committees, or whatever committee, what is considered historic and what would cause its delay. Let's just say for instance, you have a building that no one is maintaining, the grass is growing but it's historic, you don't want to take it down or sell it. Well you don't sell it but you know what I mean? I would be concerned about the historic delay that you have in your plan update. The last thing is you have the pick the public, the plan implementation committee. I don't know if you are taking names but I would be interested in being a member if public at large is considered. Thank you very much.

Chairman Cribbins said thank you Ann for volunteering.

Nancy Steiner, 23 Partridge Lane

I attended many of the workshops. I just wanted to let you know that this is not first time I've seen this. I commend you on the booklet; it looks very nicely put together. I have a question on page 16/17-Summary Transportation Plan. Everyone is always familiar with their neck of the woods, and that goes without saying, I'm familiar with my neck of the woods. I see Armstrong Road being a collector but Old Stratford Rd. not; it's listed as a local road. I'm sure all of you have been on Old Stratford Rd. It's exit 12. It's what goes to Bridgeport Ave. It was called the gateway to Shelton when they were discussing Split Rock, the building of Split Rock, the planning of Split Rock; how important it was to make it a beautiful development because after all this road is the gateway to Shelton. But on this map it's listed as a local road, so I think that you should reconsider, and at the very least call it a minor arterial. It carries a lot of traffic from Stratford into the rest of Shelton. Maybe as much as Huntington Ave, which is listed as an arterial road. So can some attention be given to that? Thank you. The other point I wanted to make was page 10, Guide Appropriate Development - Major themes for community structure – number 1, protect and enhance downtown Shelton, 2, protect and enhance Huntington Center, #3 protect and enhance White Hills, #4 protect and enhance suburban office/industrial areas. My question to you is, are there any parts of Shelton that we are not going to protect and enhance? Are there any parts of Shelton that we are not going to protect and enhance, because just like the saying all cats are animals but not all animals are cats. All of Huntington is Shelton, but all of Shelton is not Huntington. There's a lot of Shelton that looks like it's being left out of protect and enhance and I have to admit that I got involved with learning about Planning & Zoning because something was happening in my backyard. But in the past 3 years I have learned to embrace all of Shelton. I'm interested in all of Shelton and I want all of Shelton to be protected and enhanced. So that's my comment.

Frank Osak, Chairman of the Plan Update Advisory Committee

I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Plan Update Advisory Committee. There are 6 of us. We actually started with 7. Mike Adanti unfortunately lost his life on a vacation accident, but he was there every Monday and is not with us today. We've had a make-up of people with different interests; we have Mr. Harbinson from Conservation and Trails, with his partner Jim Tate; Pete DiCarlo with housing expertise, and Fred Musante with economic development expertise, and Tony Pogoda who sits on your Commission who was with us every Monday, and myself; and they elected me the Chair. We did what we could do. I am very pleased with the constructive comments that we had today, and of course the last glaring defect is not calling exit 13 a collector instead of a local; thank you. But I think it's coming to a point where we're losing our options. You saw that we've only got about 3000 acres left to develop out of the 20,000 we started with when we first started the town. The options are really starting to dwindle and get shorter and we have to protect all the parts of Shelton and enhance them. Maybe this will be my last time I will be serving on a committee, all though I would be glad to serve on the implementing board. It has always been a pleasure to work before the public and I'm 78 years old now. I remember starting here in 1962 with the first plan. The challenges are always the same. We had a plan that wasn't as pressing as it is now. I'm glad I was a part of it and I think the other members of the Plan Update Committee were happy that it's coming to an end but I feel pretty good. Guys, don't you?

Chairman Cribbins said, you know, a couple of years ago when we decided, we had a plan of development, it was 1992, which we did some minor updates to, we did a bunch of modifications to, but it had some things in there like it said the town was going to be built out to 55,000 people and other people, as we went along we kind of thought, this isn't right, we need to do a complete re-do of the plan. What the Mayor and Joe Pagliaro did was they got together and said, what are we going to do, how are we going to put this thing together and they called on their friend Frank Osak to lead this group of citizens and put this together. Frank was with us 1962-1985; he was the chairman of this board. Say what you will, there is something to say about experience and people that know the different areas and sections of this particular community and they have a wonderful interest and they want to see it proceed. Frank has a saying that I've heard him say, you're going to have to help me with this. It's something about people who plant trees and it's the enjoyment of planting the trees, full well knowing that you are not going to be the one that's going to be enjoying the shade from which that tree as it grows older. There's still people that have that wonderful feeling about that. I have to paraphrase it because I don't remember it exactly. That's like all of us. Many of us who sit on this particular board have been here for a few generations and we certainly want the next generations to come after us to enjoy this wonderful city. So I really, really thank this committee for doing the work that they've done.

Royal Wells, 34 Blueberry Lane

You know when Frank was talking it brought back a lot of memories because when Blueberry Lane was started back in 1962 I think it was the first subdivision to come before your commission. I know I was building the roads and the plan wasn't even on file back in those days and I built the whole road for \$20/foot. That's section 1, and that included city water, paving, gravel from Frank Lorenzo up in Monroe, which is now Whitney Golf Course, and we laid out working with the planning commission the whole concept. That is what he wanted; he wanted like a master plan and people know I did that in 12 sections; the original Blueberry. Just one comment for the Wells

Farm; I hope you can stay flexible. It's not going to last forever. I'm going to start planning for that and I don't know what's going to happen down there. And like he said, he's 78 I'm 72. You have to plan ahead because you never know what's around the corner. Thank you, that's all I have to say.

Chairman Cribbins asked any Commissioners if they had any comments, hearing none, asked for a motion to close the hearing.

Commissioner Pogoda MOVED to close the Public Hearing. SECONDED by Commissioner Harger. All were in favor, the Public Hearing Closed and the MEETING ADJOURNED at 9:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Marianne Chaya
Clerk, Planning & Zoning Commission
2 tapes are on file in the City/Town Clerk's office