



SHELTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

HELD WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 2018 AT 7:00 PM.
Shelton Intermediate School Auditorium
675 Constitution Boulevard North, Shelton, CT 06484.

PZC Commissioners Present:

Virginia Harger, Chairman
Anthony Pogoda, Vice-Chairman
Elaine Matto, Secretary
Jimmy Tickey
Mark Widomski
Ned Miller, Alternate
Nancy Dickal, Alternate

Charles Kelly (absent)

Also Present:

Richard Schultz, AICP, Planning and Zoning Administrator
Anthony Panico, Consultant
Pat Gargiulo, Stenographer
Karen Kemmesies, Recording Secretary

Tapes, correspondence and attachments are on file in the City/Town Clerk's office and the Planning and Zoning Office and minutes are available for review on the City of Shelton Website www.cityofshelton.org

I. Call to Order

Chairman Harger called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

Comm. Harger stated that Alternate Ned Miller will be a voting member sitting in for Comm. Kelly.

Comm. Harger asked for a moment of silence for the passing of long time resident Frank Osak. Mr. Osak served the City for many years as a Planning and Zoning Commissioner.

IV. Other Business (going out of order on the agenda)

A. 8-24 Referral: Municipal improvements to former Chromium Process property on 31 Canal Street West

Comm. Harger read a letter from the Planning and Zoning Commission administrator regarding the 8-24 referral dated 6/27/2018.

The Shelton Planning and Zoning Commission has received a request from the Mayor's office to provide an 8-24 referral for the improvements to the City owned property identified as 31 West Canal Street known as the former Chromium Process property. The following background information is provided to the commission. The City received title to the property through back taxes. The City received State and Federal funding to assist the City to clean up this Brownfields site. The City also provided funding to clean up the site. The City has insurance to use the property temporarily as a municipal parking lot and that's noted on the master plan dated 12/27/2017. The property is located in the Downtown Shelton Redevelopment area and it will be utilized in future economic development projects.

Mr. Schultz stated that staff is recommending to report favorably the 8-24 referral to the Mayor's office.

On a motion made by Comm. Tickey, seconded by Comm. Miller it was unanimously voted favorably for the 8-24 referral.

III. Public Hearing

Comm. Harger reviewed the guidelines. All members of the public who wish to address the Commission on the item being discussed will need to clearly print their name and address on the sheet at the front desk. This is to assist the recording secretary and the stenographer to correctly identify the speakers when doing the minutes and transcripts of the public hearing. The applicant and/or associates will make a presentation to the Commission. During the presentation the Commission and/or the staff may ask questions to which the applicant and/or his associates will be given the opportunity to answer during or at the end of the presentation. After the presentation has ended and if there are no further questions from the Commission, the public will be given the opportunity to address the Planning & Zoning Commission about the item being discussed by the Commission. All comments or questions will be directed to the Planning and Zoning Commission Chair and to the Chair only; not to the applicant or his/her associates. During the public hearing dialog is not permitted between the public and the applicant and his/her associates. Members of the public are expected to practice appropriate etiquette and be quiet, observant and respectful. Disruptive attendees will be asked to leave. All comments should be informational directed to the criteria of the zoning regulations, not of personal feelings. Unless a member of the public has new comments or a question to the Chair, members of the public are asked to indicate whether or not they are in agreement with the previous speaker and to please not repeat the same testimony verbatim when it's your turn. The applicant's attorney and/or consultants will be given the opportunity to address any comments or questions from the public after the last person from the public has been given the opportunity to speak. If the public hearing has not concluded by 10:00 p.m., when the building closes and the staff, the custodial staff has to leave; the public hearing will remain open and a day for continuation of the public hearing will be announced at which time the public hearing will pick up from the point where it was left open. If the public hearing remains open, the Planning & Zoning Commission is not allowed to make any public comment, discuss any part with the applicants and/or his associate's presentation or receive any additional information from anyone. After the Chair is satisfied that the applicant and/or his associates have concluded their presentations, has answered all questions and have directed all concerns from the Commission and the public, there will be a motion to close the public hearing.

A. **Application #18-11**, Bridge Street Commons, LLC for Modification of Detailed Development Plans and Statement of Uses and Standards for PDD #67, (conversion of storage room to one (1) apartment unit), 50 Bridge Street (Map 129D, Lot 37)

The legal notice published on June 14, 2018 in the CT Post was read into the record:

The Shelton Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Shelton, Connecticut hereby gives notice of a public hearing to be held on Wednesday, June 27, 2018 at 7:00 P.M. in the Shelton City Hall, 54 Hill Street to consider the following:

1. Application #18-11: Petition of Bridge Street Partners, LLC for Modification of Planned Development District #65 by modifying the Detailed Development Plans and Statement of Uses and Standards by converting an existing second floor storage room to a studio apartment unit located at 50 Bridge Street and identified as Assessor's Map 129D, Lots 37, 38, 39 and 40. The modified floor plans are titled "Part Second Floor Plan, Bridge Street Commons" dated 6/11/18 prepared by Mingoello and Associates, Architects, LLC along with the modified Statement of Uses and Standards. The property is currently served by public water and municipal sanitary sewers.

A letter (attachment #1) was received from the applicant requesting a continuance of the public hearing on his application.

On a motion made by Comm. Miller, seconded by Comm. Tickey it was unanimously voted to accept the applicant's request to continue the public hearing for application # 18-11 to the July 10, 2018 meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

B. **Application #18-12**, Dominick Thomas on behalf of Primrose Development, LLC for Initial Development Concept Plan and PDD Zone Change, (20 single family dwellings in common ownership), 16 Ripton Road (Map 73, Lot 80), R-1 and R-2 Districts

The legal notice published on June 14, 2018 in the CT Post was read into the record:

The Shelton Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Shelton, Connecticut hereby gives notice of a public hearing to be held on Wednesday, June 27, 2018 at 7:00 P.M. in the Shelton City Hall, 54 Hill Street to consider the following:

2 Application #18-12: Petition of Dominick Thomas on behalf of Primrose Development, LLC for approval of a Planned Development District zone change and the approval of Initial Concept Development Plans for the rear portion of the Huntington Congregational Church property located at 16 Ripton Road containing an area of 6.1 acres and identified as Assessor's Map 73, Lot 80. The proposed PDD zone change location is described as follows: Easterly: by property now or formerly of Huntington Congregational Church, and McEwen a distance of approx. 682 feet more or less; Southerly: by property now or formerly of St. Paul's Episcopal Church and Wilson a distance of approx. 509 feet more or less; Westerly: by property now or formerly of Wilson, Gura, and Foothorap a distance of approx. 636 feet more or less;.and Westerly: by Ripton Road a distance of approx. 357 feet more or less. The Initial Concept Development Plans are titled "Huntington Village, Cluster Residential

Development" prepared by James Swift, Professional Engineer and Landscape Architect dated 4/26/18 and Guedes Associates, Inc., Architects dated 4/26/18 and Lewis Associates, Land Surveying dated 4/25/18 along with the submission of Statement of Uses and Standards. The intent of the PDD is to accommodate the construction of twenty single family residential dwellings in common ownership on a private road accessing Ripton Road. The property is currently owned by Huntington Congregational Church and zoned partially Residence R-1 and R-2 Districts and is served by municipal sanitary sewers and public water. Said Petitions are on file in the City/Town Clerk's Office and in the Planning and Zoning Office. At said hearing all persons will have the right to be heard and written communications will be received.

A number of correspondences were received at the Planning and Zoning Commission office:

1. Close to 90 letters (attachment #2) were received at the Planning and Zoning office and they are in opposition to this proposal. The names were read by the secretary and the letters were placed on file in the Planning and Zoning Commission office.
2. City of Shelton Fire Department – office of the Fire Chief Chris Jones to Rick Schultz dated 6/20/18. (attachment #3) He voiced concern for traffic congestion and emergency vehicles response times, the need for adequate road access space for emergency vehicles to position effectively in an emergency, and for the Planning and Zoning Commission to review the Huntington Green area for appropriate development within the restrictions of the road system and existing development.
3. City of Shelton Water Pollution Control Authority to Rick Schultz dated 6/21/18 (attachment #4) states that based on a discharge rate of 210 gallons per day per household there would be sufficient capacity. There has been no application submitted as of yet and it will require WPCA approval.
4. City of Shelton Fire Marshal James Tortora to Rick Schultz dated 6/26/18 (attachment #5) raised concerns for emergency vehicle access and referred the inquires to the Fire Chief.
5. City of Shelton Inland Wetlands Commission John R. Cook, Wetland Administrator dated 6/26/18 (attachment # 6) states that an application is required as this would be a site plan review and the application must be filed by the day the application is filed with the Planning and Zoning Commission. There are regulated activities that will need review through the application process.
6. City of Shelton City Engineer Robert F. Kulacz to Rick Schultz dated 6/27/18 (attachment #7) raised a number of concerns such as traffic congestion issues, the absence of drainage calculations, the callout for the detention basins is misleading and there are notable impacts to the watershed. He strongly recommended that the application be denied for deficiencies and inconsistencies with the 2017 Plan of Conservation and Development.

Atty. Dominick Thomas came forward, representing the applicant. In response to the correspondences presented this evening he noted he received the Inland Wetlands Commission letter yesterday and he did submit a response today.(attachment #8) He stated that he has had

many discussions with the wetland administrator regarding the issue of site plan review. This is not a site plan review application. The applicant is seeking an Initial Development Concept Plan review and PDD Zone Change. He felt the Wetland Administrator comments were a blatant misstatement.

Atty. Thomas presented details of the application. He noted that the certified notices were delivered to the Planning and Zoning Commission office.

The first slide presented an aerial photograph of the region. It shows a mostly treed area that slopes upward. He highlighted the commercial uses in the area, the moderate to higher density residential areas, the condominium and cluster housing developments, the Bronson Golf Club as well as the City owned parcels for municipal and recreational use. He noted the trails on Lane Street, a street designated as a scenic road.

The second slide defined the zone map which shows the parcel is split between zones R-1 and R-2. He presented the area as being a transitional residential area with commercial development.

The third slide referenced the 2017 Plan of Conservation and Development. It details future land use plans for the City and he noted that the plan is advisory as a model for future development. He pointed to the diverse land uses within the map. Rather than simply a single zone there already is a mixed use as there are commercial intermingled with residential intermingled with higher density housing intermingled with municipal and recreational uses.

Atty. Thomas explained that the Huntington area is a downtown location in an outer suburban development, developed as a village area with mixed use representing as a transitional setting. The area has unique traits in that it supports a mixed use with pedestrian friendly accessibility. The proposal supports the suggested mixed use based on the fact that the R-1 zone does not really fit within the village concept nor within the Plan of Conservation and Development.

Atty. Thomas noted that it is always more difficult to propose a development when the site is in its natural state verses a reuse of already developed land. He stated that the alternative could be for the City to purchase the land for open space. That comment elicited applause from the audience. The fact of the matter is that single family homes would be allowed by right under the current zoning. This proposal attempts to keep with the transitional nature of the area by creating a moderately dense residential development of single family homes in a cluster with a conservative use of the land.

In addressing the Fire Marshall and Fire Chief letters, Atty. Thomas indicated that as a member of the local golf club he is familiar with the traffic patterns on Rte 108 and around the green. He has many clients in the area so he is aware of the driving conditions currently existing. He stated that he may have missed during discussions of the many projects presented for the downtown but he does not recall the Fire Chief ever citing traffic concerns as a reason for denial of a project. If a community decides to deny because there is a traffic problem then the outcome is that you have no development. Traffic is an indicator of a thriving community. Further, Atty. Thomas noted that the specifications cited by the Fire Chief would not allow for access in a number of developments already in the City,

Atty. Thomas noted that there has been previous interest in this site that did not go forward, one being a 90 unit assisted living facility and other related residential uses. He indicated that it would appear the best use would be a single family clustered use that would be in line with the homes in the vicinity.

James Swift, professional engineer and landscape architect made his presentation on this application. The site is 6.14 acres and it is currently completely wooded. The proposal is for twenty (20) single family dwellings with a single entry point off of Ripton Rd. The layout is divided with two cul-de-sacs and it was noted that they do meet the FD apparatus requirements. Seventeen of the dwellings will have two car garages and three will have a single car garage. There will be scattered parking spaces to accommodate visitor parking and additional space could be made available if needed. There will be sidewalks that extend to the access point on Ripton Rd. Currently, the design is for sidewalks on only one side of the road but both sides could be accommodated. There will be 1.4 acres of open space.

There are no wetlands on the site. There are two different watersheds on site. First is an open detention basin in the northern area of the parcel which will have a 24 inch discharge pipe that flows under Ripton Rd. The second system is an underground contained unit in the vicinity of the church parking lot and this will have a 15 inch discharge pipe that flows toward the parking lot area. The system will include Vortex basins and other measures to ensure best practices for cleaner water discharge. The design does satisfy that the post-development flow will be equal or less than the pre-development conditions.

Mr. Swift reviewed the soil and erosion control measures that will be in place as well as the temporary management of the disturbed site during construction. He explained the method of managing the temporary protections that will be in place for sediment control.

The parcel will have all public utilities. There is water, sanitary sewers, electricity and natural gas.

The landscape plan will result in minimal disturbance of the woodland area that adjoins Ripton Road as well as within the designated open space. He noted that the average distance between the street property line and the paved portion of the street is 30 feet. This is customary with many streets in the Huntington area where the road right of way is much wider than the actual paved portion of road. Deciduous and evergreen trees and other plantings will be placed around the overall parcel to enhance the aesthetics of the homes.

Reviewing the City Engineer's comments, Mr. Swift felt the basins were explained during his presentation. Yes, there is an open basin and an underground infiltration system. Speaking to the single point of access he noted that per the regulations 20 dwellings are permitted in a permanent cul-de-sac in a planned subdivision. Speaking to increased run-off due to the increase in impervious surface, the calculations demonstrate that there will be no increase in flow as per the requirements within the regulations.

Commission members raised a number of questions. Comm. Harger asked about the house design. Atty. Thomas indicated that generally there will be three bedroom homes of roughly 2,000 sq. ft. This will be a common ownership community with a private road.

Comm. Pogoda asked if a traditional subdivision layout was researched. Atty. Thomas indicated no as it is not consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development. The split zoning of the lot between R-1 and R-2 lends itself to be consistent with a PDD concept or it would likely have to be realigned to be completely within the R-2 zone.

Members sought further clarity of the zone classifications of each section of the parcel. Members questioned the basis of thinking it would transition to R-2 as it seemed the R-2 extended more toward the church and its parking lot and R-1 encompassed a greater portion of the undeveloped land.

David Sullivan PE from Milone and MacBroom was retained by the applicant for his traffic expertise. Existing conditions were observed. He noted that the posted speed limit on Ripton Rd. is 35 MPH. The site access point was studied. He looked at traffic volumes and what the development will generate in terms of traffic volumes onto the adjacent roadways. Then future traffic projections were explored. The difference between the two conditions is known as the traffic impact. They studied whether this development would create or exacerbate an unsafe or operational traffic condition. The geometry of the driveway was evaluated for residential traffic as well as emergency vehicles, delivery vehicles and commercial use vehicles.

The access point was reviewed and it was determined that the line of sight is fine with the posted speed limit with only a modest amount of clearing of trees generally within the city right of way; mostly low brush and small growths. Comm. Widomski questioned whether existing trees would be coming down that are in close proximity to the existing neighbor's house, the response being that trees within the public right of way may be removed. Comm. Widomski felt that there should be a buffered area between the neighboring home.

Comm. Harger noted that on page 2 of the traffic report that the observations were done on 6/13/17 from 7am to 9am and 4pm to 6pm with additional data recorded on 6/21/17. She questioned why it was done so long ago. Mr. Sullivan indicated that there has been no significant change in the region and that one year was within an acceptable range. Comm. Widomski questioned if summer traffic was measured. Mr. Sullivan indicated that he could research when school is out and can compare with other volumes observed by the CTDOT to consider trends. He noted that traffic volumes trends have decreased since 2008.

Projected scenarios with and without the development were used to determine how much traffic might be generated. Typically there would be 20 vehicles in the morning peak hours and 25 in the afternoon peak hours with about 70% going toward the green and 30% away. Based on the analysis there is no noticeable increase.

Looking at the adjoining roads and traffic intersections calculations show that in peak hours there can be 1,000 to 1,300 vehicles passing within an hour. Traffic generated from the development on average would be an additional car every five minutes. While there are traffic concerns now, the development would not impact the conditions.

Commissioners all voiced concern with the existing conditions and the congestion they have encountered. They could not imagine how this would not exacerbate the problem. If someone was turning in and halted traffic, there would quickly be a backup. Further, taking the left into the development especially when weather conditions are poor could be quite treacherous.

Mr. Sullivan indicated that it is difficult to respond to the specifics. There are protocols to evaluating safety conditions and it includes operational conditions and criteria and how to define the projected impacts. Those are standards that have existed for decades utilized throughout the city, the state and the country. After doing this work for 30 years he stated that there will be no impact from this development.

Comm. Harger noted that in her traffic report she is missing figure#7. Atty. Thomas indicated he would correct that omission. Atty. Thomas noted that there is sufficient space to create a bypass area to the side of the lane going up the hill if that was the commission's request. Comm. Harger noted that snow plowing could make such a lane unusable. Atty. Thomas indicated that it certainly would be dependent on the size and intensity of the storm but it is conceivable. He noted that the proposal was submitted to the Traffic Authority and no comments were received.

Atty. Thomas concluded his presentation by displaying the architectural renderings of the houses. Mr. Swift indicated that they will be two story homes with two car garages with the exception of the three with only one garage. Some houses will have a walk-out dependent on the slope of the parcel. The final offering on the homes may be slightly different but this is generally what is envisioned.

Comm. Tickey indicated that this was an unconvincing presentation. Concern is TRAFFIC, TRAFFIC, TRAFFIC. He did not feel the transitional designation was accurate. He felt that the parcel was mostly an R-1 zone designation. With 6.1 acres minus 1.4 for open space that leaves 4.7 acres for 20 three bedroom homes. Under an R-1 or R-2 zone it would more likely be four to five houses. He stated that if Frank Osak was here today, he would call this greed.

Comm. Matto agreed with Comm. Tickey. She commented on the terminology that has been presented this evening. Cluster housing to her is that you figure out the density for the parcel as it exists and in this case 6 acres which would equal 6 houses. With cluster housing you configure the development with the number of houses allowed in the accepted zone but you are able to group them so as to create more open space. The village concept being described, she was not aware of any language that provides for increasing the density. Again, it should be calculated based on what the underlying zone supports.

With no further comments from the applicant, the public portion was opened.

Paul G. Littlefield of 3 Earl Street stated that he is a close neighbor to this development. He has served previously on the Trumbull Zoning Board of Appeals. Cluster housing has it's place, but not this place. Cluster housing on Ripton Road is not feasible. This is an interior parcel with complications. He concurred with the Commissioners that traffic is a problem. He felt that the proposed road should not be private and he could see future economic problems for the City.

He felt there was no benefit to the City. Management of cluster houses is not as simple as it seems and it can become cumbersome. He recommended that the parcel remain as 1 acre zoning and the applicant's request should be defeated.

Scott Gura of 8 Centerview Dr. stated that the historic green and the historic homes should be looked at and at the true value of the Huntington community. There is a cemetery here dating back to before the Revolutionary War. This will take the little remaining open space in this 300 year old town and place houses on these postage stamp lots. Hopefully the zone change will not be allowed. Changing to twenty ¼ acre housing is not moderate density. The cluster concept does not match the Huntington district. The definition of cluster is to group similar things closely together. That does not fit the Huntington district. We should not set a precedent with this zone change that will change this community's future. Regarding the traffic, he could certainly give a first hand report. The traffic report does not reflect the day to day flow accurately nor does it reflect the conditions in inclement weather. He hoped the Commission considers the consequences and does not allow the zone change.

Anthony Simonetti of 6 Hayfield Dr and 1st ward alderman stated that it should stay R-1 zoning.

David Gidwani of 49 Independence Dr and 1st ward alderman stated it was time to listen to the people and the property should remain as R-1 zoning.

Jim Capra of 11 Elizabeth St. and 4th ward alderman stated that the people do not want or need cluster density. People moved there for privacy. The City has approved things for John Geudes in the past and he did not think that the tough questions were asked and he did not want to repeat the mistakes of the past. This proposal is greed.

Noreen McGorty of 30 Wigwam Dr and 4th ward alderman opposed the zone change and yielded her time so others could speak.

Leo Sands of 3 Brookfield Dr. said that he has lived here for 42 years. That property has been for sale for 3-4 years. This project does not fit. Making a left hand turn into that development will cause vehicles to back up on Ripton Rd. Currently the water run-off soaks back into the ground but what will happen once the houses are constructed. Run-off from the development will be going into the brook.

Carl Musante of 7 Centerview Dr. stated that a lot of what he was going to say has already been said. He noted that Sorghum Rd was developed prior to the current zoning and is not considered high density living. It was developed for those who could afford a small house. About the traffic on Ripton Rd., there is no way vehicles will be able to by-pass a stopped vehicle. He encouraged the Commission to unanimously vote against this application.

Harry Foothorap of 6 Centerview Dr. stated for the record that he opposes this application. He purchased his home 20 years ago with the understanding that the area was 1 acre zoning. He understood the church owned the parcel. He moved from Fairfield to Huntington thinking it was going to be his starter home and he stayed. He stated that the parcel should only be developed with the respect of the community and the people. There may be zones that provide that level of density but not here. The biggest asset we have is our home and the City must protect its

value and the value of the community. Cluster housing does not belong in this R-1 zone. If it passes it will change the neighborhood and other neighborhoods throughout Shelton. By the level of public attendance it is clear this not only affects the neighborhood but rather the whole City. He is disappointed that the church did not reach out to the neighbors. He understands there may be financial reasons but the church needed to consider the neighborhood. He feels betrayed as he understood that this type of development could not happen. Approximately six years ago a surveyor for the church was on the parcel and in speaking with him he understood the church may be considering selling the property but had no intentions to hurt the neighborhood. He asked that the Commission deny the zone change as it does not meet the regulations.

Eva Foothorap of 6 Centerview Dr. living here 21 years has raised her family here, joined the PTO, joined the fire auxiliary. She presented a petition against this zone change signed by 492 people. Her children have grown up here, enjoyed the grass and the fresh air. She stated she opposed this zone change.

Robin Musante of 7 Centerview Dr. stated that most of her concerns have already been covered. If this passes she noted that many years from now we will be looking back and will say "What were we thinking". She stated that the Commission should vote against this application and she thanked the members for their time and effort.

Christopher Gallo of 16 Centerview Dr. has lived here since 1984 and has raised his children here. He stated that Mr. Geudes has done some pretty nice work for the downtown development and it has helped the city's tax base. More dense development and the repurposing of the old factories in the downtown has been beneficial. Creating more density in Huntington is not. This is being done just for the money. Twenty homes right in the middle of a country setting is wrong. The Huntington district with its rural setting has made it a desirable destination in Fairfield County. There is another church in the area. What may their intentions be in the future. He applauded the planners for being smart and developing the Huntington area with 1 acre zoning. He also questioned what is going to happen to all the wildlife currently in this open space. He asked that the Commission vote against this application.

Scott Turnbull of 35 Centerview Dr. stated his concerns have already been mentioned. He thanked the Commission but questioned what the direction for the City is. Is this the trajectory we want to go? Yes, there are parcels spotted here and there that have been grandfathered. Yes, the traffic is bad already. Do we want to make it worse? Good luck making a left hand turn there, they are lucky there is a church there because they will be saying their prayers.

Jim Hansson of 60 Great Oak Rd. stated that what happens in Huntington Center affects all of Huntington. He travels from Buddington Rd to Huntington Street and turning onto Huntington Street he takes his life into his hands. The line of traffic on Huntington Street starts at 6 am and goes all day. There is an out of town lawyer who seems to represent nearly every developer in town that smugly states that building single family homes on an acre of land is a thing of the past. It's a thing of a past for greedy lawyers and developers. Comm. Harger asked that the comments focus on the application only, not personalities. Mr. Hansson noted that Mr. Schultz referenced the trend to put multi-family housing in proximity to existing stores or village centers such as Huntington Center. He stated that his mother used to say just because others are

jumping off a bridge, you don't have to do it too. The developers are not satisfied to make thousands of dollars with single family homes on an acre of land, they are looking for millions.

Tracy Tate of 266 Waverly Road is the Director of the Historical Society located at 70 Ripton Rd. She stated that her Board has not drafted a statement yet on this matter but she was present this evening to bring attention to some historical information. She wanted it known that adjacent to this parcel of land is a nationally recognized historical district. The Ripton Road parcel and the Huntington shopping areas are not included in the historic district. The historic district extends from the Means Brook on the North end of Ripton Rd. to slightly past the Far Mill River to the south consisting of approximately 16 acres. She stated that Atty. Thomas referred to the Huntington district as a downtown but more precisely it is a historic district that is nationally recognized.

Bob Bohn of 25 New Castle Dr. stated that he and his wife have lived in Huntington for 58 years and have raised their family there and it has been a wonderful place to live. One of the reasons they moved to Huntington is that it was rural. They have seen it grow. Attempts have been made to keep it somewhat rural. He hoped that the Commission will fight in the future to keep this area 1 acre zoning, it's a good thing to have.

Robert Duckworth of 59 Dexter Dr. stated that his family has lived here for 35 years. He indicated that this is our community and the people do not want this project. It does not belong here. It does not fit in with the nature of the community. We have a diamond here, don't change it.

Greg Tetro of 281 Buddington Rd had handouts that he distributed to the commission members that show this to be a nationally recognized district. He stated this application is really over the top. Looking at the aerial picture and knowing the density, there likely will be no trees left, the wooded area will be cut down replaced with eight foot trees. Going from 1 acre and now asking for less than ¼ acre per house is unacceptable. Traffic is going to be rough and they say only 20 cars but it seems their numbers are low for a three bedroom house. Call it a village district or PDD or whatever you want, but this is overdevelopment. This is a national historic district and it's embarrassing to think they want to change things in such a way. While he understands that the Commission has said in the past that it is not a deciding factor as to how much money the developer can make this is like a lottery ticket and the result can be a financial win or it can mean that things go forward within the set standards. It has been a very tough night and he commended the members for their devotion. He did note that while a resident was chastised for not staying on topic he felt compelled to raise the fact that Atty. Thomas used the wetlands application conversation as a podium to mention another development.

Comm. Harger noted that the meeting was moved to the Shelton Intermediate School Auditorium due to a conflict with scheduling at City Hall. This school has time restraints as the custodial staff go home at 10 pm. The sign-in sheet has John Corbino as number 26 and currently those that have spoken were only up to number 15. The next meeting for this public hearing will be August 21st.and the public comment will continue at that time Mr. Schultz encouraged the public to forward their comments to the Planning and Zoning office.

On a motion made by Comm. Miller, seconded by Comm. Tickey it was unanimously voted to continue the public hearing for Application 18-12 to August 21, 2018.

At this point the chair was approached by a family member of Alice Gratchian. She explained that Ms. Gratchian is disabled and it has been very difficult for her to attend the meeting and now she has waited all night without being able to voice her concerns. They asked that a moment be taken to allow her to speak. Comm. Harger noted that Ms. Gratchian was on the list to speak. Given the circumstances all agreed to provide her this opportunity to speak.

Alice Gratchian of 61 Soundview Ave. stated that she has lived in town for over 60 years. She loves the town and has served the town as a teacher. When she thinks of open space she thinks of her backyard and all the land and beautiful trees. She feels very strongly that Shelton is part of the valley but she also remembers that it is part of Fairfield County. We have a lot to offer. She is strongly opposed to anything other than 1 acre zoning. We must live by the standards set. Maybe we can make a change to ensure that the 1 acre is protected so that we do not have to go through this again. She hoped that the Planning and Zoning Commission would think to change the regulations so that this can not be brought up again. She thanked the commission for their time.

V. Adjournment

On a motion made by Comm. Widomski, seconded by Comm. Matto it was unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 10:05 p.m.

Submitted by:

Karen Kemmesies
Recording Secretary

Attachments

- #1** – letter from Application #18-11 requesting a continuance
- #2** – list of correspondences from residents opposing Application #18-12
- #3** – letter from Chief Jones to Rick Schultz dated 6/20/18
- #4** – letter from City of Shelton Water Pollution Control Authority Thomas E. Sym, Sewer Administrator to Rick Schultz dated 6/21/18
- #5** – letter from City of Shelton Fire Marshal James Tortora to Rick Schultz dated 6/26/18
- #6** – letter from City of Shelton Inland Wetlands Commission John R. Cook, Wetland Administrator dated 6/26/18
- #7** – City of Shelton City Engineer Robert F. Kulacz to Rick Schultz dated 6/27/18
- #8** – Atty. Thomas response to Wetland Administrator 6/26/18 letter