Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance

President, John F. Anglace, Jr. called the Workshop of the Board of Aldermen to order at 7:00 p.m. All those present stood and pledged allegiance to the flag. Meeting was held in Room 104 at Shelton City Hall, 54 Hill Street, Shelton, Connecticut.

Roll Call

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

Also in Attendance:

Joe Welsh, President of Shelton Land Trust
Tom Harbinson, Chairman, Conservation Commission
Bill Dwyer, Vice Chairman, Conservation Commission
Frank Osak, Planning & Zoning Commissioner
Jimmy Tickey, Planning & Zoning Commissioner
Charlie Kelly, Planning & Zoning Commissioner
Rick Schultz, Planning & Zoning Administrator

1. DISCUSSION OF 2017 UPDATE TO THE 2006 PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Alderman Anglace: Essentially tonight’s meeting is to take comment from the aldermen and from anybody here with us tonight so we can all gain a better understanding of what the
plan of conservation is all about and it’s going to be a very informal meeting and we won’t have two people talking at the same time, but we will all get a chance to talk. But before we do anything I want to beg your indulgence for a few minutes because I want to take this special opportunity to say a few words about a long time and loyal friend of mine who is here with us this evening and who is the chairman of the Planning and Conservation subcommittee and the document that we are looking over this evening. And that’s Frank Osak. Frank I want to say I’m honored that you are here with us, I’m honored to be sitting across from you and I have known you since as long as I can remember and it’s always been an honor every time I’m in your presence and anything you ever did, you always made me proud of you. So, from a personal point of view I want you to know that. I want everyone in this room to know that Frank is considered to be the founding father of planning for the City of Shelton. He was the original chairman of the Planning Commission which was established by the Board of Aldermen back in 1963 and since 1963 Frank has participated in every plan of conservation and development and has contributed countless hours in making the City of Shelton a better place to live and work. Frank served on the Shelton Economic Development Commission Board of Directors since 1985. That represents a lot of work, a lot of time and a lot of effort. His work career started off at Sponge Rubber Products from 1945-1953. That’s where I worked with him at B.F. Goodrich. Frank always had a strong interest in Shelton, he was a Derby boy but he always had a strong interest in Shelton. We brought him over here to work and we never let him go back. He was a manufacturing manager up until 1969 with B.F. Goodrich and vice president of Shelton Products from 1969-1983 and with the alliance division of North American Phillips up to 1985. Frank joined Derby Cellular Products in the capacity as an organizer, set it up, was vice president, president and chief executive officer which means that’s guy who is doing all the work, all the thinking, getting all the money and after an impressive career he retired. His voluntary accomplishments in this community in Shelton and throughout the Naugatuck Valley are just numerous. He was on the Griffin Hospital Board of Directors from 1969-1991 and he only left because turnovers caused him to leave otherwise he’d still be there contributing. Frank was the first chairman of the newly formed Planning Commission of the City of Shelton from 1962-1972 and he adopted the first town plan in 1966, adopting the route 8 plan in 1965 and zoning regulations. The town plan was updated with four revisions during Frank’s tenure and it also set new regulations for Route 8. His accomplishments are just numerous and I just want to be sure that as we get into this discussion that were having tonight that we all recognize what Frank Osak has contributed to the City of Shelton and to the Naugatuck Valley that he’s lived all his life. I think it was important to say that and get it on the record because it’s truly an opportunity to thank someone.

Anthony Simonetti: You came to Shelton in 1958 is that right Frank?

Frank Osak: Yes, that’s when I moved here.

Anthony Simonetti: And the best thing he ever did was he married and Marchegiono girl from Derby. That was the best thing he ever did.
John Anglace: Frank has also gotten a number of awards and recognitions throughout the valley from a number of nonprofit organizations, it’s too numerous to mention. But what a career, what a wonderful thing, what a guy.

Terry Jones: You and I had talked about how special Frank is and I had a couple things I wanted to say from a perspective of someone who was born in Shelton, in 1947, but I would say Frank is probably Derby’s greatest gift to Shelton. In fact, I love Derby but think of what might have become of Derby if he stayed there. But as a kid, a young teenager your name was often a topic of discussion during family dinners and my father admired what you were doing here because the first few years in the mid to late 50’s there was starting to get subdivisions but there was no planning or zoning and I can’t imagine what would have happened if Frank had not come to take their place. I think the thing that has been most meaningful to me over these long years is the fact that Frank brought collaboration and bipartisan discussion and I think that’s what set the tone to make Shelton the great place that it is. And the one single thing this collaboration grew into is the notion that the Route 8 corridor was really an amazing resource and you got it right, you protected it for business, that was your vision. Business jobs, good paying jobs and it was ready after the March 1975 devastation of downtown thanks to you and your colleagues, we had a place for business for corporate headquarters and everybody in this room knows that’s made all the difference and lastly your work at Griffin Hospital has just been amazing…four generations, including myself, were born there and it’s a great place and no small part of it because of Frank. I still have my bill in 1947, cost me $25 to come onto this world. Thank you, Frank

John Anglace: Anyone else want to add anything? Okay Frank.

Frank Osak: Let me just say a word or two, I appreciate what you have to say about me and all that, but just as a word of explanation on why I am here tonight, I had a very difficult 1.5-2 years. I’m really ill and I’m a cancer patient who is undergoing all kinds of treatments and I have difficulty with my vision and my hearing, not so very much because of the cancer but from immunotherapy drugs they are infusing in me and things are looking better and I’m going to go on and get more of this, but I participated in this POCD effort in an absent way, I went to about 30 percent of the meetings and for the rest I did by telephone calls and usually from this room with Ruth Parkins and Rick Schultz, Tony Panico, and the other three members of that subcommittee. It’s a product and the reason that I’m here, I wanted to be sure, I could of missed it and just let it go at that, the subcommittee made up of Tony Panico, Rick Shultz, Ruth Parkins, the chair lady of Planning and Zoning Commission, myself and then later on in the progress of the meeting, I’ll explain later that 2 other planning commissioners were added, Ginny Harger and then Elaine Matto and the reason that they added the extra people is because were at logger heads. Ruth and I were the voting members, Tony and Rick were staff and so they had to get somebody in there to break the tie so we got two more members and we came with a product here, but of the people that involved themselves in this POCD I have to confess to you I’m the one negative vote. There’s something in this thing that I don’t like but that’s okay, majority rules. There are three votes for it and one against it, two staff members that seem to support it so it comes to the Board
of Aldermen in the way that it was. I’ve been on all three committees for POCD. In 1990 we had a consultant by the name of Sam Pine and he helped us to come up with a plan. In 2005 I was asked to serve again and I did with six other members of the community, three of them with no planning experience at all, and we had a consultant called Plan of Metrix and they produced a document which I think is a part of this presentation, because the stuff that we are presenting as new stuff is but an amendment to that basic plan of 2005 that’s in here. I have impaired hearing, so if I don’t hear you I apologize, my eye sight is not good, I can’t read without my computerized reader and I did not bring that with me but I’m going to listen to the conversation and listen to Rick Shultz and if you want to know a little bit about my negative approach to this thing a little later I’ll tell you, but with that I’ll leave it, it’s probably my last effort to do something in the City of Shelton. I’m now approaching, I’m past 89 years old and working on my 90th and me and my wife are home and we take care of each other and we have long term care insurance so we have some people who come in and help us get through daily chores and life and that’s about the end of it so I now am turning the meeting over to Rick.

John Anglace: Come up to the table, everyone else come up closer, this is an informal meeting so feel free. The next step from what I understand it from here after this workshop tonight the next step is for the Board of Aldermen to schedule a vote on the plan of conservation and development at our next regular Board of Alderman meeting which would be in March and the significance of that vote is that if the Board of Aldermen doesn’t accept it, then the vote by Planning and Zoning has to be by two-thirds vote versus majority vote.

Frank Osak: That’s to override the Board of Alderman’s vote, I see.

Rick Shultz: Okay good evening everyone, Rick Shultz, Planning and Zoning Administrator, in accordance with Connecticut General Statute Section 8-23 the purpose of tonight’s presentation is to present the final draft of the 2017 Update to the 2006 Plan of Conservation and Development to the Board of Aldermen. Upon completion of this presentation and review of the 2017 update, the Board of Aldermen shall either endorse the POCD update in its entirety, endorse in part or reject the entire POCD update. This endorsement shall be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission at its March 22, 2017 public hearing. The Planning and Zoning Commission, however, may render a decision of the update to the POCD without the endorsement of the BOA. If the BOA rejects the update or any portion of the update, the Commission may adopt the update to the POCD by two-thirds of all its members which is a total of four votes. Moving on, each member of the Board of Aldermen have received the following documents before them tonight: Final Draft (which the audience has); the 2006 adopted POCD, remember we are supplementing this, the subcommittee decided not to do an overall of this document but just to supplement it. This took over three years and a lot of time and effort went into it, as you can see by the maps, over 85% of the community is developed and the subcommittee did not see the need to go through that exercise again. This document is Labeled #1. The document labeled #3 is the 2009 Open Space Map that the Conservation Commission put together. This supplemented the earlier open space plan. The documents labeled #3 is the Open Space
and Trails Map and the document labeled #4 is the Community Resources Inventory. These documents collectively represent the 2017 Update to the 2006 POCD. Ultimately, after adoption these individual documents will be collated into one document which will be identified as the 2017 POCD. Once again, the subcommittee decided not to do a rewrite. It would take a long time to do, the City of Shelton has begun, for the members who are not aware, the State of Connecticut has put more teeth in the POCD’s and that every town has to prepare one every 10 years and you don’t do it then you lose out on all the grant applications. Right now, we have advised the State of Connecticut Office of Policy and Management that we are updating our plan and to please consider a waiver, the State has acknowledged and processed the grant for the Library Board, but there is a $200,000 Brownfield Grant that is being considered as we speak right now. The state called me to reconfirm that this process is moving forward and as I am going to report, all the referrals were made to the State of Connecticut as you are well aware. After the commission adopts this policy, the Office of Policy and Management gets a copy of the adopted document.

John Anglace: Excuse me, we are still eligible for discretionary grants however until such time as we approve this document and finalize it, if we haven’t done so in the proper time period then we have to submit with each application a waiver letter that we sent to Department of Community Development stating our position that we are working on it, then they decide case on a case by case basis so we are not ineligible, we can still get grants but it’s a different process.

Rick Schultz: Yes, it’s important to understand that the City of Shelton is proceeding, it’s the towns that are not doing anything that are losing the grant money.

Jack Finn: What caused us to behind the either ball with the State of Connecticut to not have this submitted on time?

Rick Schultz: To be honest with you, the Planning and Zoning Commission over the last few years had been inundated by reacting to applications of zone changes, up to their eyeballs. Public hearings twice a month, I should go back, this subcommittee started two and half years ago so the ball was rolling. It’s just that the commission members and the participation took a severe hit with this application. And then Frank finally said we got to do it, lets decide to do a supplement to move this forward and not a rewrite. So, 2.5 years ago it was either a rewrite or a supplement and as you know in this committee the commissioners received a lot of applications within the past two years. So, the willingness has always been there the commission did establish the zoning subcommittee. When the Planning and Zoning Commission created the POCD Update subcommittee, the subcommittee’s first task was to decide on whether to do a rewrite of the 2006 POCD or update the POCD where deemed necessary, they chose the latter. The subcommittee has now presented it to the full Planning and Zoning Commission which then sent it to the Board of Aldermen which you decided to have a meeting tonight and to the Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments, the City Town Clerk and various boards and commissions. At this time, I will now go through the entire document and will answer any questions from the
Board and the public. I want to emphasize it’s a supplement in all these documents will be part of the 2017.

John Anglace: Should we go through the entire document or should we allow the Board of Aldermen to ask their questions first, see if they have any questions get that out the way.

Rick Schultz: Yeah, let me go through the supplement because there is a lot of important information that needs to be discussed, there’s a lot to be digested. These four documents have already been prepared by the Conservation Commission, okay, and these are important planning documents that need to be part of the update.

John Anglace: Has the Conservation Commission updated it?

Rick Schultz: Yes, these are updated, but to give it more teeth the Planning and Zoning Commission has to go through a public hearing and recognize these documents and say they were officially a part of the 2017. That hasn’t been done since 2006.

John Anglace: We’ll hear from Conservation as well, alright? I’d like to keep that on the table and be sure to hear what the Conservation input is in this document.

Rick Schultz: Let’s go right to Page 3 of the document that you have, this is the executive summary, this summarizes everything. This is really probably one of the most important pages to read so you can get a flavor of what is going on. As indicted our plan that was adopted was in 2006. The state mandates that they update every 10 years and we are doing that. Specifically, this 2017 update of the 2006 is intended to conform to new and revised statutory requirements for POCD updates and we have incorporated that. The biggest thing is that this is was the state of Connecticut’s Office and Police Management wanted.

John Anglace: The paragraph that recognizes that the commission, about half way down, the City of Shelton is consistently guided and appropriate commercial industrial and more recently mixed use development has resulted in a net positive tax (inaudible) for the city. Just give me a definition of mixed use?

Rick Schultz: Mixed use is residential, commercial and industrial.

John Anglace: So that means you’re looking at residential, commercial and industrial in the same location.

Frank Osak: In the same application.

Rick Schultz: And this is what we are going to get into later tonight because as Frank alluded to we are creating a new language category that the City of Shelton has never anticipated before until more recent times.
Alderman McGorty arrives at 7:25 p.m.

Rick Schultz: Alright the second component is update and expand new recent economic development analysis and grand list growth. We all know what Frank Osak has done for the community, he happened to be the last chairman of planning commission that participated in the 6-year capital improvement program before the Aldermen took over that responsibility. So obviously grand list is very important to him and to any planning document for the City of Shelton. Three updates occur in the land use plan to reflect recent changes and certain adjustments to the future land plan and we have that here of course. There are four major bullets that I’m reading on page 3. And the last one is updated and revises as necessary the implementation schedule as set forth to the 2006 POCD. The commission recognizes that the City of Shelton has consistently guided appropriate commercial industrial and more recently mixed use development that has resulted in the net positive gain to the city. While much of this economic development has taken place in urban sites it is important to know that the downtown has not been overlooked. Since the adoption of the 2006 plan, downtown area has been experiencing major redevelopment transformation and revitalization. This can be directly attributed to the city’s ongoing commitment to the reestablishing of a pedestrian friendly safe, attractive and economically viable downtown Shelton.

Rick Schultz: John, as you indicated, especially after the B.F. Fire of 1975, all emphasis went on Route 8. Route 8 in now about 85% built out. We know the remaining sites, the Wells property has been in the newspaper; the U.I. site and the Mas property.

John Anglace: When you say U.I. site.

Rick Schultz: The former U.I. site.

Rick Schultz: And now we are experiencing the redevelopment of downtown which is something that SEDC has been working with the city.

John Anglace: There are two different approaches. What’s going on Bridgeport Avenue is brand new and coming out of the ground, but what’s going on downtown is really knocking down the old buildings, putting in the new and there’s a lot going on behind the scenes that makes that process real slow. It’s not like walk in and get the application have your meetings decide what you’re going to do, get approval, but downtown is taking much, much longer but there is tremendous amount of work going on behind the scenes and that’s the big area where the plan of conservation wants us to approve and finalize plans which should certainly help us get grants a lot faster. Maybe it might speed up, you never can tell.

Rick Schultz: To recap what you just said, there are two distinct development efforts going on. Downtown is separate and working with the state takes an awful lot of time from everyone, including the downtown subcommittee and then the remainder of the development on Bridgeport Avenue and more recently it’s been mixed use development.
And that’s what you’re going to hear tonight from Frank Osak, especially on this proposed land use category. Whether or not you support it, the reality is we are getting these types of applications; then obviously, the commission can deal with it, approve it or deny it according to their wishes but the fact remains that we need to address it and deal with it.

John Anglace: I think the vision that the community has and that’s long shared, my feedback is, that we set the tone adopting the plan of Conservation and Development. We agree this is the way we should grow and the community wants us to stick to our guns, don’t bring in and throw us a curve ball, a couple years into the plan, you see people come out and for whatever reason, they are not in favor and they always reference back to the plan of conservation and development. Even though the plan says, in black and white, that it’s only an advisory document, the people don’t see it quite so loosely. They feel this is the way we build out. Now is there something wrong with that view? Once we set this as our growth document, they want us to stick to it. Are we sticking to it or are we throwing some curve balls?

Rick Schultz: John, as you know, you are an eight member board. Eventually you are going to take a consensus and determine what component you agree with of this update and which ones you do not. Obviously, the big elephant in the room is the mixed use economic development area. I’m going to get into that later.

Jack Finn: I just want to go back to what John brought up about what the residents look toward the city to adhere to the plan that we approve and pass on to you and then you approve. In 2006 we approved it, we passed the resolution, three days later you changed the zoning down the end of Murphy’s Lane, (inaudible) and Commerce. That wasn’t part of your Master Plan of Development.

Rick Schultz: That’s correct, the Commission at that time felt differently as John indicated, the POCD is a planning document that can be used rigidly or can be used loosely and the residents do go to our public hearings and say, this was a plan that took two years create, please follow it and that is a big issue right now. Like I said to John you have eight members here, and just like with my commission, you are going to have to come up with a consensus on important issues.

Jack Finn: This was done back in 2006 and Planning and Zoning decided to change the zoning three days after we approved it a Master Plan.

Rick Schultz: That’s right. And they had every right to do that Jack.

Jack Finn: Residents don’t like it. We still have the boats and the condos (inaudible) all the way along the Housatonic River.

Rick Schultz: You raise a valid point. Obviously we can’t get into site specifics because we don’t have my commission here and there is pending applications, but as with any
community that embraces development at this level you are going to run into that. You have 6 commissioners that determine the physical fate of this community, 6 commissioners, we have two alternates but four out of 6 determine the physical fate of the community and that is what Frank Osak is talking about. He was one of the original two members then it grew to five and the consensus was to go with that mixed use development.

Jimmy Tickey: If I just may add, if I may, I think that the point is well taken and I thank you for your comments John and Jack because I think a plan is only as good as the attention it is paid to it. So once you have a plan and have a vision that people trust in, then you follow that plan the best you can and to not deviate from it, because that creates uncertainty to people that look to this as a real guide and some may view it a little more stringently than others but it really is a document that many people spend a lot of time on and we should try to stick to what the plan recommends going forward. I think it’s a point well taken and I thank you for bringing it up.

Rick Schultz: Last paragraph reads, this 2017 update and the vision statement incorporated here is intended to provide the commission with the guidance from 2006. We are going a long way, we are going to have a build out of this community, so obviously, this period of time is very important. Accordingly, if it is implemented, this plan update will help protect important resources, guide appropriate development and address community needs, protect community character and enhance quality of life of current and future residents.

Now, we can skip over page four, it is an introduction and overview, I want to go right to the vision statement. Please mark this one because an awful lot of different people have different visions in this community. This is a component of this update that John, it is going to have to go around your board, and you’re going to say don’t like it, expand upon it, or change it and rewrite it. So, let’s read it because it’s important. This is where we want to go. The vision of the 2017 update is to set forth the best thinking of the city as to its future physical growth reflecting the latest development trends, answer and give direction to both the public and private development regarding future development. While its long range, the POCD update upon adoption is useful in offering guidance for short range land use decisions. What the commission is dealing with right now, the long-term purposes is reflected in future land use plan and the adopted strategies presented in this document. This plan update which compliments the adopted 2006 POCD continues to be an advisory document. It is intended to provide a basis for consistent actions and decisions relative to the conservation and development in Shelton and to reflect the overall interpretation of the planning and zoning commission as to the most desirable development patterns for the foreseeable future. The POCD gains legitimacy of its use as an ongoing basis as a guide implementing future land use and zoning decisions by the commission over the next ten years. Development in Shelton continues to reflect the demands of the marketplace as well as the needs of current residents and economic development. Accordingly, for Shelton to remain a balance growth community, because that is that something we have used over the last few decades – balanced growth, new strategies must be anticipated to drive future growth and to develop for the next 10-20 years. POCD must not and can’t remain a static unalterable document to be followed without regard to market trends unfolding events and
changes in the conditions and assumptions upon which it is based on the contrary the POCD must be a flexible document able to adopt the changes and conditions. Believe it or not this is pretty much a generic general vision. The Board of Aldermen may say we have to be clearer on this, that’s your call or you can say to the commission go back and rethink this because the vision statements are an important part. You know we have 10, 20, 30 years left of our build out.

John Anglace: Rick, I think you need to ask yourself, are we skewing too much in favor of market demands versus the needs and expectations of current residents. They bought here, their expectations ten years ago when they bought here and invested their life savings, are that this is what they expected to see in the future and now we are coming and saying, oh market demand and people say, hey that’s not what I bought into, that’s not why I came here to Shelton. So where are the new strategies? I didn’t read them in here. Where are the new guides to future growth? That’s what I’m looking for because I purchased, I’m here, I’m living under the expectations of when I bought and now were making all these changes in the future, you see what I mean? And what’s absent is what are the strategies that we are going to employ for these new guides for the future change that’s going to happen? I mean it’s a difficult thing.

Rick Schultz: Please make an asterisk next to paragraph three.

John Anglace: I’ll just quickly give you one thing that’s on my mind. I just don’t think we’ve done enough in this plan to address what we did years ago and that was to address our conservation needs, we’re deficient.

Rick Schultz: I’m not here to make suggestions, but paragraph three says development in Shelton continues to reflect the demand. If you want to control the demands, you would say control. This implies something else, so put an asterisk next to paragraph three.

Jack Finn: Frank what’s your opinion on the vision?

Frank Osak: Well, I have one major problem which is mixed use development. You know that is just a major problem that to me is mind boggling. I’ve been at this thing since 1963 and forgive me because I form opinions on how to do that, and I’m listening to what John is saying that you bought here, you live here, you expect it to be a certain way and suddenly it changes. I think his comment is well taken, it’s something that we as a community have to think about. I mean what’s happening on Route 8 since the 1980s; is we just forgot how to say no. We have to leave that for another argument or discussion. I was not for mixed use development in any part of this city, let alone on Route 8, and there was a lot things that happened on Route 8 from middle 1990’s to the present day which we would never have done in the 80s. But that’s water over the dam. There’s new people, new thoughts, I’m thinking like how I thought back in the 80’s and maybe that’s defective. I don’t know Jack. It’s something you have to cope with. I look upon land use as financial strength of a community. You want to add to land use things that produce the greatest amount of tax
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revenue with the smallest amount of tax liability and cost. That’s the number. When you introduce residential development into a business zone and call it a mixed use because of the market demands it, well the market demands it because there a market for rental units. But that doesn’t do us any good because rental units bring in different cost, different population base and it brings in school children that you have to educate at $13,500 each. Now I have nothing against kids, we educate 5,000 of them right now, but that was my big argument with mixed use development and the way this plan accepts mixed use development as something that we should do and it’s important to do. I can’t explain it more.

John Anglace: Mixed use to me has to have some limitations on it. For instance, in the Route 8 corridor, Planning and Zoning has to say, look, 500 apartments. that’s all. Limit! End of story! Now you accommodate the need, the corporations up there are buying some of these apartments so when they bring people in they can house them, that’s okay and we have to provide some services for them, this is part of it, but we don’t have to go overboard with 35 million apartments on Route 8, that defeats the purpose of what we are trying to do, which is to bring in LIP as much as possible.

Frank Osak: Yes. You want to bring in development that produces the greatest amount tax revenue for the smallest amount of tax cost, we did that from 1968-86 when I came on and then I left Oly Severson there in 1986 for a couple of more years and it stayed like that. And then things changed and they did something in the zoning book by putting PDD just about any place. They changed a couple of chapters in the zoning book permitting them to go anywhere but then we got other things on Route 8 which I would never have approved. You know, I remember we use to have 6 typed written pages, they were dog eared, they were stapled in the corner, they had coffee stains on them from the use and we use to look at that all the time, at what our policy was and anytime someone came in that was contrary to that policy we just kindly said no, because these developers want to know if they have a chance to be successful in an application that cost them, a lot of money to put these applications together, they come in and talk to someone in City Hall and say what do you think? Do I have a chance? Is this something I should do? If they get a nod from someone that it’s okay they go ahead and do it, but that’s the way the business system works. That’s the way land development works. All I have is my own experience. We used to have these dog eared pages of land use policies and we stuck by them you couldn’t have a strip of stores, cinder block with only cash registers up there and call it a strip mall but the back land would have been wasted you would have destroyed the potential of the back land, we wanted substantial stuff and we got it, we hit the jackpot in late 1970’s and the early 80’s, we have some projects that were put on the ground and brought tax grand list edition of $4 to $5 million dollars per acre. A one-story building with structured parking rolls the grand list up like you couldn’t believe. And what cost does it have? You have some out of town non-resident job holder that you essentially give police protection, fire protection, and clean the snow off the roads in the winter and they are gone. It costs you maybe $300 per capita for those kinds of people for the time they are there. But the taxes on the building
and structure was monumental. We have gotten away from that. Slowly it’s going to catch us. That’s my problem.

Jack Finn: You’re absolutely correct because they don’t go by the plan of development. They change it as they seem necessary, and they put the special development areas in all over all the time as you pointed out and now the residents are not looking for that.

Frank Osak: They don’t have any special development areas, they have PDDs, but remember PDD’s were created in 1968 before we were the zoning power. We couldn’t change them, the Aldermen used to run the Zoning Commission. They did it until the charter was adopted in the early 1970s. You were the zoning commission, we had nothing to say about it, but as soon as we became the zoning commission by act of the people, they put a special question on the charter revision, when they had a referendum vote, whether the planning and zoning commission should be the zoning commission and they had an overwhelming yes.

We never lobbied for it, we just got it. And when we did it, we created the special development area for which qualified a PDD. You couldn’t put a PDD in any place else but a special development area and the special development area we had that dog-eared policy on what we would let in and what we wouldn’t. I don’t know what happened to those papers. I hate to tell you how many times Severson would have to come down to the office and talk to a potential developer. We had a job where we could control our own time. We were executives in our own businesses so we would come down and talk to them and we explained what we’re looking for and what we’re not looking for and we kindly said no many, many times, and that’s the way we ran things and I miss that. I still think it’s a good idea to do that. As far as mixed use development on Route 8 and what we now call LIP districts, it’s a tragedy, it’s just wrong. And were using some very phony numbers for school children, and multiple unit apartments, that’s another thing. I see these numbers. I don’t agree with them at all. We can get into that detail another day but I come down here to say that piece, I’m a sick guy I have to get a ride to come down here.

Rick Schultz: The next two components are critical, but we can go over them rather quickly. Population projection is very important. We are not in sync with the mayor’s office but these are the numbers Planning and Zoning is going with. Shelton’s current population is 41,500, the mayor’s office is saying under 40,000 - 39 in change. The projected 42,500, is based on the information based (inaudible), which takes me to the next page, but before you move onto page 7, I want to note that the certificate of occupancy for multifamily has increased dramatically from 5 in 2010 to 270 units in 2013, that’s a big jump. That shows the breakdown of single family on the left category and multifamily on the right. This is what we’re dealing with, these are projects approved not what’s pending,

John Anglace: The trend is probably okay, it’s where they are located that’s the issue with that growth. I don’t think it was intended to be out in the Bridgeport Avenue area for that type of multifamily growth.
Rick Schultz: As Frank indicated, he created the LIP which is a 2-acre light industrial zone that served the community well. We have the remaining parcels left, they’re saying we can’t build these types of uses and the market is saying mix use emphasis on multifamily, so we know where we are at.

John Anglace: The question is, does Planning and Zoning want to grow the way the market wants to grow or are they going to stick to their guns and say this is the way we are going to grow?

Rick Schultz: Right, that’s why the vision statement is important.

Frank Osak: Let me add something to that John, you use the word grow, grow is correct, swell is the wrong thing. Grow is when you get bigger in a healthy way, swelling is when you get bigger in an unhealthy way. We don’t want to swell, we want to grow. End of comment.

Rick Shultz: On pages 8,9,10,11.

John Anglace: Page 9 talks about downtown mixed use that seems to be my vision of what that place is for. That’s the place for the mixed use. That’s what is happening. It may not be happening as fast as we’d like to see it, but that’s because there are so many difficulties with taking down the old and putting in the new, but it’s moving. Just the other night, at the Board of Aldermen meeting, we settled the MacCullum issue, that’s been how many years? Six years of impediments to downtown growth and it’s settled and we are going to move ahead. There is so much that goes along with that agreement that is positive. That is a major plus for downtown development.

Bill Dwyer: Could I just point out on Page 7 the projections does not include anything?

Rick Schultz: No, because it hasn’t been acted on.

Bill Dwyer: I know but we are projected, someone ought to be projecting...

Rick Schultz: The commission is very sensitive to that Bill, assuming that the vote is there, they felt very particular about that. Please remember this document needs to be updated.

Bill Dwyer: Ok, but these numbers look mighty light for projections.

Rick Schultz: They are, there is no question about it, these are our zone changes. They are not incorporated.

Jack Finn: We were also told there is 660 apartments, that’s not reflected in this.

John Anglace: When we talk about the projections, we are not saying where.
Rick Schultz: I am hearing you loud and clear. We really need to be more detailed on the projections, especially in the multifamily. The economic development analysis, as I indicated, this is something that has been very critical for Frank as part of this planning. He just alluded to any time he spoke about an issue. The grand list, the negative/positive impact to community services etc. What we did was took a snap shot of different developments starting on page 9, downtown mixed use. You did Kyle’s corner and the Polish Club which is an $8 million project and you can see the revenues it’s going to produce versus what it was paying the City prior. On page 10 we have Bridgeport Avenue, The Mark, and you can see the revenue that it generates. The issue is the potential for school aged children, and what that presents to the community, the family unit has changed dramatically as well all know. More and more families are moving into multifamily. Frank is suggesting that the cost multiplier should be higher. Our cost multiplier, as determined by these projects, are very low and to be honest with you, Frank is not buying into it and he would like it to be adjusted.

Frank Osak: That multiplier, you’re saying by your statistics formed the basis for this theory is that there’s .12 school aged children per multiple bedroom apartment unit which is a fallacy, it comes from the 2000 census data that basically reflects family formation in the 80s and 90s, then people were moving into condos, not to create new families but basically to get away from plowing snow, cutting grass, cleaning gutters, moving into a condo or apartment to make life easy. There was a change in lifestyle back in those days, today these apartment units are starting new families, there’s a difference, the guys getting out of college now have college debt, they don’t have the money for a down payment for a single family home so the rental units are blossoming, $1400 dollars a month, two bedroom, you get one, that’s a lot of money but that’s why the market is looking for that.

John Anglace: It seems like the market is driving what is being built, because that’s lines the pockets of the developers, that’s the cash cow. If they can get rid of that that’s what they are going to build. It answers the developer’s needs for making a good profit but it doesn’t answer the community needs where so many people have come here, we are 41,000 people, and most come during the days that you just talked about, for single family houses and we are all seeing the change and saying “What? The congestions, what?” Isn’t somebody looking out for these things? I don’t want to talk about traffic because I can’t substantiate that, but I can sure substantiate congestion.

Rick Schultz: And John, I want to elaborate its important to note that at a public hearings the consultants are usually the multipliers. Frank has stood up and said I’m not buying it, and as far as I’m concerned your work is flawed because that’s what the commission is getting.

John Anglace: But what you’ve got to say Jimmy Tickey...when Frank leaves the board...you have to say the things Frank has been saying. Somebody’s got to pick up the baton.
Rick Schultz: It is ever evolving, but the number of school aged children in these multifamily development is going up. My department works with the Board of Education, we called them last week, where is it going to end? Is it going to flatten out or will it increase?

Jimmy Capra: Rick are you thinking there are certain areas seeing growth, such as Huntington or downtown Shelton? Do you see an increase in a certain style? The reason I bring that up is because in Avalon Huntington, that’s more geared toward families.

Rick Schultz: (reply inaudible)

John Anglace: Before Frank gets too tired; I want to hear what conservation has to say.

Rick Schultz: That was the purpose of that analysis of Frank really wanting to see case by case basis. On page 12 is the Grand List Growth based on a .5% across the board. Obviously we are going through a “reval” this year, the grand list is going to be available at the end of February/early march. So, that document is very important.

John Anglace: It’s usually March 1st. Having talked to the tax accessor, the commercial assessments went out late and then the commercial assessments were then modified a month later, so I don’t know what to expect.

Frank Osak: What’s going to happen with the commercial assessments John?

John Anglace: I have no idea at this point.

Frank Osak: It’s very interesting, let me just tip you off to something. Back in the 80s, thirty-three percent of the grand list was nonresidential. When we did the 2005 update, it was 27% of grand list was nonresidential, now the less that drops the more taxes the residents pay, that’s the ratio were talking about. To my surprise last year when I looked at the breakdown of the grand list, only 19% of the grant list in Shelton was nonresidential, what the hell happened between 2005 and 2011? I asked Tony Panico and Rick to go look at some property cards to see what the hell went on. They couldn’t find it, you know what I’m saying John?

John Anglace: Yeah there’s a shift in the burden of taxes.

Frank Osak: Listen, commercial property assessment is a tough science. It’s very difficult to work. You have a building that is full of rentals you use one method of assessing its value mostly based on the income approach, if you have latter rental income you use a multiplier to get at what the building is going to cost and you tax as that. The other kind, where it’s owner occupied such as a factory or an office building that has a business wholly owned in it, they use different methods again. I am still perplexed by what happened to all that nonresidential tax list, it disappeared. You got to find out.
Rick Schultz: On Page 16, this is the elephant in the room issue. Mixed use economic growth area. This is a whole new category that the commission has created and has taken to the public hearing.

John Anglase: Why does the commission put so much importance on this? Is it because this is what brings us the highest amount of revenue with the least amount land use? Any other reasons?

Rick Schultz: In part, but it’s such a drastic change from the LIP. There are four areas the commission has considered changing the land use category. The Burr’s farm, the Mas property, the two Wells property (Shelter Ridge and Wells Hollow) and UI site. Three sites were LIP at one time, the Mas property was single family, the Burr’s farm is still one family. Let me read you a definition and I’ll put an asterisk on it whether you keep it or modify the definition. Areas that are substantially vacant or under-utilized, served by or can be provided with adequate roads and which have or can be provided with necessary public utilities and services. Such areas are intended to be developed with one or an appropriate combination of a variety of economic development uses that will result in a positive economic impact on the taxable Grand List and impose minimal burden on City services and municipal infrastructure. Such uses can range from multi-family residential and senior citizen’s services and facilities to restricted commercial, light industrial and business and corporate offices and supportive hospitality facilities. The commission recently approved a hotel, that was the seventh, we have an eighth being considered tomorrow night. To assure high-quality, compatible development, all uses should be authorized only by the application of Planned Development Districts (PDDs). The commission has the controls, all of the applications that are pending on Bridgeport Avenue are PDD zone changes.

Jimmy Tickey: Can I just add one thing, because this ties into Bill’s comment and yours earlier. I noticed on page 13 and this is something for your view and when Planning and Zoning takes it up, in the middle of the first paragraph there it says, I realize this is under the Grant List, but it’s talking about the various projects that are not yet approved and it says there are some 8 additional development projects that have received or are awaiting final approval, and its anticipated to be completed by 2020. These projects, if completed in a timely manner are estimated to result in another $40-$50 million for the grand list but those projects are not included in our projection?

Rick Schultz: That’s correct.

Jimmy Tickey: So back to the conversation earlier about what’s good for market trends and what’s good for the developer, we are looking at $40-$50 million being added to the grand list, but I think we should take both sides of the equation and see what that adds to the projected numbers because those aren’t being added to the project number of homes and all the other elements that affect a community like schools, roads, infrastructures so if were saying that it adds to the grand list for your $50 million I think we need to say what also adds to the other part of the ledger.
John Anglace: Tom, I’d like to hear conservation’s views on this. As I read this document, twice, I kind of felt we were talking about economic development and returns but we aren’t addressing the conservation issues. One of the things that comes to my mind is that maybe we have to develop as a community, have to develop a better set of priorities going forward, what properties we think we should take, not by eminent domain, but buy the conservation rights to the property like we did with the Jones family farm. 10% cost to us I believe and we secure the future under-development of that property forever. And it’s important to have large tracks of land that is available to the community, so I’m dying to hear your thinking from the plan of conservation perspective.

Tom Harbinson: Greetings Aldermen. Thanks for scheduling this workshop and giving the opportunity for input toward this important guiding document, the Plan of Conservation & Development. As you know, I've lived in Shelton all my life, my father served on the Conservation Commission in the 1970s, and I've served on the same since 1998. I was appointed by you to serve on the prior committee that put together our current POCD, so I believe I'm well prepared to offer some comments. I recognize that any POCD serves as a guide, and although it is updated regularly as a "planning" document, a lot can happen in the span of 10 years between revisions. Still, there are some principals that don't change: Protect Important Resources; Guide Appropriate Development; Address Community Needs; Protect Community Character; Enhance Quality of Life for Current and Future Residents;

Some thoughts on the Draft: There is a focus on fiscal issues resulting from economic development, and I think that is very important. There is a finite resource of undeveloped land remaining in Shelton, as there always has been, but the amount of raw land in the economic engine corridor of Rte 8/Bpt Ave is under pressure as several of the last remaining large parcels are actively in application process for development. Developments need to be the highest and best yield to the community as it consumes the final parcels of this resource. As raw land is eliminated, economic conditions will cause redevelopment of existing buildings (current examples such as Tetley Tea, UI), and that is something that will likely eventually occur in the residential areas as raw or infill parcels are consumed. The commercial and industrial development needs to be dense to achieve the highest net yield of taxes vs services, and purely from a fiscal perspective that demands creativity from applicants with features such as structured parking, something I have not seen in the recent large applications. Back in the day they included structured parking and they generated a tremendous amount of return in the grand list. Although I recognize the importance of the fiscal matters in this plan which bring or maintain a low or stable tax rate, We should not lose sight of the admiration from surrounding communities for the conservation measures we have implemented over many years to preserve appropriate environmental resources in our community that are of value to the region. Shelton's leadership was at the forefront of preserving class 3 watershed lands from development far in advance of the state recognizing that importance, as illustrated by our 1998 land purchase from BHC (Bridgeport Hydraulic Company, now Aquarian). Shelton was at the forefront with Purchase of Development Rights to preserve land with good agricultural soils from the Shelton Family, Jones Family, Beardsley Family and Stochmal Family. Shelton was at the forefront in
acquiring appropriate Open Space so that collectively they created Greenway Corridors that was a greater value than the sum of their parts, and contributed toward the passive recreational opportunities enjoyed by the community such as the hiking trails network, and the Shelton Lakes Recreation Path that connects Huntington Center up through the Intermediate and High School campuses, and toward nearby access to the downtown areas. We cannot rest on these laurels however, and as stated, this flexible document must adapt. I have a couple of observations that may impact the draft. This is really myself speaking and not from Conservation Commission. With prior residential development, there was set-aside of Open Space, or if not appropriate within the application, a fee paid in lieu of land that accumulated in a fund to acquire appropriate Open Space. One of several purposes of Open Space is to provide for recreation, both passive and active (and these terms are defined in State Statutes). I'm sure that the Park & Recreation Department would agree that capacity for active recreation needs are stressed. Youth soccer, baseball, lacrosse, etc - these are meeting current demands. What concerns me, and I touched upon this in a recent public portion of a PZ meeting, is that much of our recent residential development is not including those preparations. While an apartment complex may include certain recreation aspects such as a community pool or exercise room, they do not have the open field to toss a frisbee, fly a kite, or enjoy a pick-up game of softball, flag football, or volleyball. This should be a consideration that PDD’s for residential development have some consideration toward contributing toward those future needs like more standard residential developments do. Again, with residential development in our economic/commercial corridors, we need to yield the greatest NET of taxes generation vs expenses. Typically, development in the Rte 8/Bpt Ave corridor impacts traffic and road maintenance, but those costs are burdened to the State since the major roads and signalizations maintenance is State of Ct. As residential becomes a component in the corridor, there will be some educational costs associated with these that reduce the net. While perhaps a small impact depending upon which demographic study is to be followed, they do exist and should be recognized. Once the raw land along the Rte 8/Bpt Ave corridor is consumed, your opportunity to improve upon this net fiscal yield is gone until a re-development occurs (witness Tetley Tea). With an aging population being sought, again with an eye that they as residents are going to have less potential fiscal impact with education age children, these retirees or non-working population will look for outlets for their lifestyle as "active-adults". Much of our community's recreational opportunities exist on school campuses, and these are off-limits during hours they are in session. Be it tennis courts or running track, while White Hills has a "complex", Shelton differs from Trumbull's Tashua Recreational Complex, or Monroe’s Wolfe Park complex, and utilizes a distributed system of playgrounds (Pine Rock Park, Riverview Park, etc.), but for the active-adult age bracket, we are limited in our offerings, and should keep an eye on where that could be accomplished as the demand rises with that population set. One answer is the Wiacek Park property on Meadow Street that was purchased and land-banked for just such a potential, in addition to being adjacent to the school campus. One creative example in another community is a ball-field in their urban area where the lights can remain on late into the evening to accommodate league play by adults. Regarding strategies that are being updated: Our Open Space Plan has followed a Greenways principle as I previously
mentioned. Traditionally, we have used maps to outline their location that followed parcel/lot lines, but we all recognize that a ridge or stream we seek to protect may be on a portion of a large parcel, while the remaining portion of the large parcel is appropriate for economic development. I would suggest that since the Greenways are not an overlay zone in the sense of a Special Development Area, that they be given a revision with latitude to more generally define a corridor boundary. This would have allowed us to better communicate to PZ commissioners who were ill-informed that large Bpt. Ave parcels have importance for scenic resources and elements. We assumed that goals and work we together accomplished over decades toward achieving them were understood by all - but we all know the adage of what happens when we Ass-u-me. I do have a number of formatting or identification errors in the draft and maps, that I can address privately with Rick. Having been on the prior one, and knowing the amount of focus it takes, I applaud the work of the Committee, and particularly Frank Osak's long-term dedication to the community these many years via the Planning & Zoning Commission. I'm open to any questions regarding Conservation issues for this draft.

Terry Jones: I want to know Frank's secret? If I get to be your age which I might because my father did, I can only pray I am as far sighted as you are Frank.

Frank Osak: I’m fortunate that I have my mental wits about me. My body is a wreck but my mind is still with it. I enjoyed your father so much. I remember the first day I met him I was invited to sit in the Democratic Town Committee and they elected me to it and I came to the first meeting and we used to have them at the War Memorial at Riverview Park, once a month on Friday. I got there pretty late, and there weren’t too many seats left in those days because everyone attended and I found a seat and sat down next to a guy and it was your father and I didn’t know it at the time and we got into a discussion about the budget and someone brought up the subject of Percy Kingsley, remember him, the Superintendent of Schools, and he turned in his final budget and he came within 6 cents of spending everything and his budget was right on the button. I remember saying boy he must be a real good fiscal manager, and your dad turned to me and said, OR he spends every nickel you give him! I said who are you and he said Phil Jones and that’s the way we started and I’ll never forget it.

Terry Jones: I have to say and apologize that this is very informal but I remember my father going to a meeting but that doesn’t change all of you, I thought as I was driving down here, that’s what I’ve seen over my lifetime, citizens of Shelton coming together to figure things out and that’s pretty special.

Frank Osak: You talk about people getting together and talking issues and that’s what is missing, the art of intrapersonal communications between community members got lost, because they lost the daily newspapers. There is no more Evening Sentinel, Bridgeport Post, and Register, they used to have reporters on staff, all three papers, we knew what was going on and when we saw each other at the market or even a meeting like this, we knew
what was going on and we exchanged ideas. Now the art of interpersonal communication that we had back in the 60s as I remember is now gone and it’s something I miss like crazy.

Terry Jones: I think it’s not unique to Shelton and is part of our society, I agree with you. You see people walking down the street with their devices rather than talk to the person next to them and I think it also happens when instead of growing, we swell. But I would love to say I trained that boy Tom. Tom did take the helm after I retired from the commission. I can say Shelton has been the #1 municipality for economic growth and good management of its natural resources, and we’ve got community’s around the state that are sniffing at our heels for one or the other but I don’t know any communities that follow the path that we have, in recent decades to grow a balance and keep greenways. There’s been a pretty good relationship with planning and zoning, we always used to say in the 90’s, conservation does not have much statutory power but is the a conscience of the community and I still believe in conscience and I think you do too. I just want to say a couple words about elements of our community that cannot speak for themselves and that’s our natural resources. They have to rely on us as the citizens to be good stewards and I wrote this sentence “they say in the long run, it will be the stewardship of our natural resources, water, streams, the river, our ponds what a sweet song to hear the streams flowing again being dry for so many months, the ridge lines, the forests, the farm land and how we blend them with our economic growth that will define Shelton in the next half century and that’s what we got to get right, and that’s why I applaud the board here for interfacing with Planning and Zoning to get this right, these resources cannot speak for themselves but what they do for us speaks volumes. They feed us, clean our air, you can’t eat gold and can’t drink the oil, it’s a broad base, our natural resources, we have to get it right and how they balance with economic growth, we only have one shot with this but it’s really tricky, look at how hard with what we are going through downtown to reinvent it, and like you said John, that takes a long, long time compared to spreading out all over the forest. Tom alluded to this, they restored spirituality, having our trails and our trail corridors, and streams running clean and places for the citizens to go, I always remember many people walk on our farm, they walk in a ton of other places. I met this gentleman who said to me, I walk here, I just lost a member of my family and need to be with nature. You don’t go into a crowd or a congested area to restore your spirit to deal with your sense of well-being, you do it in nature. So, I just want to make a final plea to really be thoughtful how we go forward with what we have left and to thank the aldermen over recent decades, and planning and zoning to help us get this right.

Joe Welch: A lifelong Shelton resident here to talk about what’s going on, I was fortunate enough to grow up here and live here, raise my family the same way but we have to take care of what we have, so I’m here wearing my land trust president hat, and I want to make everyone realize that on this open space, 370 acres of that is owned by Shelton land trust we are private nonprofit and run by all volunteers and we look for planning and zoning to pay close attention to what’s going on next to our properties and unfortunately in my tenure there’s been two big ones where we have to really fight and things were far along into the approval process, when we got into the range so to speak, and what I want is a
little more attention because it’s unfair to the developer, I was given the nod saying...you could probably do something there because no one realized that land trust is next to it, instead of saying...oh wait that’s land trust you probably don’t want to go next to that. We won’t have to fight them and we could spend our time doing other things that benefit us going forward, not going back. And we got some stipulations, Aspen Ridge above Block Buster, great project, great development but things were pushed a real close to our boundary lines, and the funny thing is the neighbors there are so against what’s being proposed in their new neighborhood on Bridgeport Avenue that we formed an alliance together and became friends and its funny because we were fighting where you were living and obviously it got approved and those things happen, it’s strange the way things work. The other thing was another project on our Vachinsky (sp) property and it was another thing that was so far along, I read about it in the paper that someone wanted to build 22 condos on a couple acres and it’s a PDD. I thank John for coming out and taking a look because on a map it’s on the edge of town by Trumbull and its close to the highway but until you get on the ground and see what’s on the property even though you’re close to the hustle and bustle you tune everything out and those things are important and we were fortunate even though we had to hire an attorney to fight what was going on and spend good land trust money to better things with, we had to fight this one and luckily the developer decided to withdraw the application but it wasn’t P & Z saying no, the developer realized he would take the high ground, but anyways my main thing is if we get something to hold land trust in a little higher regard that leads to city open space and our connection to that to form these greenways, but we work hard to do our part as good environmental citizens and we hope that when things are planned our properties are looked at as something to safe guard and not maximize building. Thank you all for your time.

John Anglace: We might have withdrawn because planning and zoning wasn’t going to make it happen. So, he withdrew it.

John Anglace: Okay anybody else have any comments for us? Any observations from the Board of Alderman?

Alderman McPherson: Yeah I just have one question, looking on Page 6 which struck me. If we are going with 2016 current population, we are at 41.5 and we are very close to the 20-20 projected and we are three years from that. Are these conservative numbers? They are going to have to be modified, I would expect, because 8 years out, we are close to the 20-25 projection.

John Anglace: Well, regardless of the approach that the aldermen take, let me make some suggestions. I think we will provide you with the minutes of this meeting as best we can and try and capture what we’ve heard tonight, so P&Z can be guided by it but ultimately P&Z has to make the decision. We can reject it in whole or in part and force you to a 2/3 vote. We can’t twist your arm and make you do anything but we can certainly give you our thoughts and ideas and we’ll take appropriate action at our March meeting, unless anybody from the Aldermen have any other thoughts? Any thoughts?
Alderman McPherson: I think that it very important to have this meeting and to get the different viewpoints and I would like to thank Frank. I think it’s very important for us to hear your thoughts from your experience from many years that you contributed so I say thank you.

Alderman Simonetti: Frank, anything else you want to add.

Frank Osak: No, I could go on forever about the past but it’s not about the past, we just reflect on it to remember the mistakes that we made, we have to look to the future and it’s up to you guys really. It’s not for me anymore, I won’t be here much longer.

Terry Jones: What was time frame?

John Anglace: The BOA will take this up at the March meeting which is the second Thursday of the month.

John Anglace: If you sit here and you think about it, thoughts go through your mind. In the downtown area we seem to have a pretty solid approach to what we are going to do. We seem to be working toward it and everything seems to be moving forward. It’s taken time but that’s not because we have put road blocks in, but because we have a lot of outside agencies. As the mayor said the other day to the Board, this approval with MacCallum has taken six years, because I believe P&Z refused their application and they took us to court. We have been in court trying to negotiate it but it was extremely complicated with the canal and the piping in the roads that used to be there and we had to work out the right things so P&Z could do what they have to do in the downtown. We were thrilled with the outcome. Yes, it’s going to cost us some money but I think it was a fair resolution. There are other things that are smaller. So there are a lot of good things going on and hopefully all the comments we heard tonight will be thrown into the mix and make it even better. Thank you all for coming.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ashley Conklin

Ashley Conklin
Clerk, Board of Aldermen