Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance

President John Anglace called the meeting of the Board of Aldermen to order at approximately 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium at Shelton City Hall. All those present stood to recite the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag:

Roll Call

Alderman John F. Anglace, Jr., President – present
Alderman Eric McPherson, Vice President – present
Alderman Stanley Kudej – not present
Alderman Anthony Simonetti – present
Alderman Noreen McGorty – present
Alderman Jim Capra – present
Alderman Cris Balamaci – present
Alderman Adam Heller – present

Administration:

Attorney Francis Teodosio, Corporation Counsel
Jack Bashar, Administrative Assistant

PUBLIC PORTION

John Glenn: I live at 16 Emerald Ridge Court along with my wife, Jane and we have lived there since 2007 when we built the house and I would like to bring an issue to your attention regarding address number 19 Emerald Ridge Court. We live in a subdivision with clear covenants which are on record with the town, which include no stockade fences. Exceptions for other types of fences are allowed only on approval of the subdivision, and are meant for enclosing pools for safety reasons. This property owner has erected posts all over his property line and puts up stockade fence panels in between these posts making his way around the property; this has been going on for over two years. The stockade fence along his property and an adjoining property was higher than the city allowed five feet. He has also put different types of fencing up along his back area. Additionally, he has also put up a fence on top of a shed, that is again to say ‘on top of the shed roof’, not in front of the shed. This fence on top of the shed he may or may not take down from time to time. The general timeline of this problem unfolds as follows. After thanksgiving of last year my wife called Mr. Dingle to apprise him of the situation. He came out to see this for himself and actually talked to the homeowner. Mr. Dingle later called my wife and asked “why didn’t you complain about the terrible blight all over the property as well?” Mr. Dingle said he told the home owner that he had till the spring to lower his fence along the driveway to a
proper height. He also gave him six weeks to clean up the blight. Mr. Dingle also acknowledged all the building materials strewn across the property was not all fencing material and in fact was not building material either. Mr. Dingle assured my wife that a letter would be sent out to the property owner to officially state what their conversation entailed and that we would receive a copy. Mr. Dingle was asked why he had given the homeowner so much time to take down or lower an illegal fence when in fact he had workers there, in fact putting up more fence, that very day they spoke. There was no good answer given. Inevitably we did not receive a letter and the homeowner did not take down his fence. After this conversation with Mr. Dingle, the homeowner slowly, mostly at night, put up more fencing or posts for future fencing. Eventually he made his way around the left back side of his property putting up different types of fencing and included fencing on top of the shed. Just this summer he started putting his stockade fence on the front property line, further blighting our neighborhood. The fence is right behind a guardrail and is not set back far enough off the street according to city guidelines, even if it was allowable. Additionally, the homeowner removed the grass in front of the guardrail and replaced it with unsightly gravel along the street property line. Once again, the city guidelines call for either a cement or grass sidewalk, and this is clearly neither. Going further into city guidelines, this homeowner is also changing the grade of areas around a naturally running brook that is right behind the guardrail. Although this was brought up to the city officials, this has not been addressed either. He is also changing the grade in certain areas of his property to a degree that is not allowable. These items go against city guidelines but have not been addressed by the city today. The length of time the homeowner spends completing his projects further goes against city guidelines. Calls were made to the town hall again this summer, and this time Mr. Shultz was involved stating that he had no knowledge or record of our previous conversations. Tediouly again, our viewpoint and concerns were explained, and this was looked into again by city officials who came out to look at the situation all over again. We were assured if he did not take down the stockade fence along the guardrail the city would take it down themselves. This has not happened. We would like to know why this homeowner is allowed to continue blighting the neighborhood in which we pay high taxes for a planned subdivision that includes no fences. Again, this fence detracts from the unity of the natural beauty of the subdivision which ensures our home values stay up, which justifies the high taxes we pay on our houses. We would like to know what you will do to make sure that the tax bill we pay to the city each year aligns with the obvious blight in our neighborhood, and what you will do about the inaction of the city officials to this situation.

William Chappa: 12 Emerald Ridge Court. I’ve lived there roughly 15 years and you have a letter my wife and I submitted so rather than reading the whole letter, my concern is it doesn’t meet restrictions, it purely lays out with what we’re are allowed to and not to do. For 15 years I complied to all requests, we have a wonderful area there, I’ve retired 75, and we are in the process of downsizing and what upsets me is that when my two real estate agents came to evaluate my house last November the first thing they said to me is “what’s going on with that fence?” I asked “why would that affect it?” he said it’s just people coming down the cul-de-sac will see that fence and it will lower your value of your house right away, now you’re dealing with my time, I have no problem with neighbors doing what they can do on their own property but when it comes to they’re not following
restrictions that I abide by, I kind of get upset. We have met with some of the town engineers. I do have a letter dated July 14th that he was instructed to take down the two or three sections in back of the mailbox and in back of the guard rail and that has not happened. I am concerned, my wife would like to stay in Shelton, I would like to downsize my house, buy a smaller house, at the time my mother in-law is living with us so for 4,000 square feet, two people is overwhelming. But when these two real estate agents say you’re going to have a lower price on your house because people are not going to like it. At that time, the fence had different sizes; 6 feet, 7 feet, 8 feet. And I’m just concerned about going forward and what my future holds in Shelton here and I appreciate your attention to it and see if we can get this matter cleared as soon as possible. Thank you for your time.

Michelle Hundt: 11 Emerald Ridge Court: I’m right next to 19 Emerald Ridge Court, I sent a letter this morning. Once again as Mr. Cappa said I’m really concerned about how the cul-de-sac looks, we bought the property 17 years ago, we put a pool in, I got to meet with planning and zoning and wetlands and it says a fence is not allowed. We complied with the homeownership and did not put up a fence, we put a fence around the pool but that is not an offensive fence. Once again, I’m worried about the value of the house, I have a nineteen-year-old and a sixteen-year-old, so they’re getting ready to fly the coop and I’m going to be downsizing at some point as well, I’m just worried about property value. It doesn’t look nice, every cul-de-sac you go down in Shelton, you drive around it all looks so pretty and manicured, and there are no fences. So, I’m just really concerned about that. The fence, especially behind the guardrail, I use the cul-de-sac, my girls run on a daily basis, we walk our dogs, our neighbors walk their dogs, I’m concerned about it. A lot of the time people go up the road really fast to turn around and there are times you jump out of the way because they can’t see me. It does not look nice at all. It was different sizes, now it’s all six feet but it still is not a pretty sight and it blocks views of people from us while we are walking. Safety is a big issue, I appreciate you looking into this, and hopefully we will come to a good resolution, he has a lot of blight and a lot of things being delivered and from my vantage point I don’t even see. All I see is pallets and it’s not a pretty sight when I look over my pool.

John K. Fitzgerald: 7 Emerald Ridge Court. I will just piggy back on what my neighbors have told you about the situation, I was a part of Emerald Ridge Estates LLC that built the street, provided them with a packet of all the covenants and restrictions, I’d just like to read a letter to you which I provided to Mr. Shultz today which I believe you have a copy of:

Dear Mr. Shultz,

Thank you for the attention of the stockade fence placement at 19 Emerald Ridge Court, Shelton. As previously discussed, the clear and declaration of covenants and restrictions for Emerald Ridge Estates subdivision clearly states section 9K – that not stockade fence shall be on any of the lots, and as you explain to me and several of the neighbors that is not a city jurisdiction to enforce on private property restrictions it is my attention to seek a resolution to this present conflict, to prevent future issues. The very requirements for heights of fences then why is there not a simple permit process in place to recognize and collect the nominal fee to inspect it for height. This type of permit would alert the town to the activity of fences relation and as a curtesy to the developer or the declarant, a civil
cross check of the covenance would eliminate these needless fence issues. To inspect the fence for proper height where they should not have been installed in the first place promises confusion and implies that the city approves of this fence. When Mr. Dingle was out there, I went to discuss it with him, he said town says it’s okay and I said its okay but it’s not allowed. It’s okay for height but that’s not our issue, this put together fence at 19 Emerald Ridge Court is installed in two locations on the property, clearly violating our covinance, regardless of the height. Its my understanding that the city engineers latter dated July 14th 2017 asked the owner of the property to move the fence behind the guardrail and to see the right of way, however it is still there as well as the other section. This point we would like to start the process to address these issues by the change of your permit process or guidance change to prevent this destruction to our street scape and the decline in property value due to this blight in our sub division. Today I met with several town officials, Ritchells, John Cook, Reamus, who informed me, that he email chain going with Mr. 19 Emerald Ridge Court, and he is on it but as of August 11 his last correspondence to him because it is a city issue, the vast majority behind the guard rail, nothing has been done. In his other emails in that same chain, he also addresses the stockade fence going up that easily could have been provided to ever source and I believe he has that documented as well, because that’s on top of underground electric pipes from transformer to transformer. Shrubs, trees as the property owner comes out of the driveway as Michelle stated, people walk around the cul-de-sac, and out of the driveway he cannot see the kids walking around due to the stockade fence, it’s only natural and he comes out and that’s what happens, we’ve someone get swacked out there, bottom line we’d like to seek a way for future fences and attack it that way but at this point we’d like to see that the fence come down immediately behind the guardrail as long as the stockade fence. Thank you for your time.

**John Anglace:** I would just note that our Administrative Assistant Jack Basher is here for this meeting to hear your concerns and he will be managing these issues on behalf of the city. We will close the public portion.

**AGENDA ITEMS**

**MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

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

1. Regular Full Board Meeting – AUGUST 10, 2017

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

Minutes can be viewed on the city website: [www.cityofshelton.org](http://www.cityofshelton.org)
5.1 **FINANCE COMMITTEE**

5.1.1 *NO ITEMS*

---

5.2 **PUBLIC HEALTH & SAFETY COMMITTEE**

5.2.1 *NO ITEMS*

---

5.3 **STREET COMMITTEE**

5.3.1 **SIDEWALK REIMBURSEMENT – 449 CORAM AVENUE**

Alderman McPherson MOVED, per the recommendation of the Street Committee, to approve the sidewalk reimbursement of $1,544.40 to Marie Sampieri, 449 Coram Avenue, Shelton, CT 06484 per Ordinance #877 (Section 14-9 of the Code of Ordinances) with funding to come from Sidewalk Reimbursement Account #001-3600-713.80-43.

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

---

**REPORT OF THE MAYOR** – None presented.

**REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT** - I would like to remind the public that on September 24, 2017 on 2 pm on Sunday there will be the dedication of the Richard O. Belden Cultural Center held at the former Lafayette School.

---

6.0 **LEGAL REPORT**

6.1 **CORPORATION COUNSEL BILLING**

Alderman McPherson MOVED to authorize a total payment of $1,860.82 to Corporation Counsel Welch, Teodosio, and Stanek, LLC, for services rendered per statement dated September 1, 2017, with funds to come from the following Legal Services Accounts:

- **Professional Services** - 001-1900-411.30-01 $  
- **Legal Fees** - 001-1900-411.30-03 $123.75
- **Foreclosure Fees** - 001-1900-411.50-01 $  
- **Miscellaneous Fees** - 001-1900-411.80-03 $  
- **Court Costs** - 001-1900-411.80.84 $1,737.07

SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti. A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.
6.2 ASSISTANT CORPORATION COUNSEL BILLING

Alderman McPherson MOVED to authorize a total payment of $437.25 to Assistant Corporation Counsel Ramon Sous for services rendered per statement dated September 1, 2017 with funds to come from the following Legal Services Accounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>001-1900-411.30-01</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>001-1900-411.30-03</td>
<td>$437.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreclosure Fees</td>
<td>001-1900-411.50-01</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Services</td>
<td>001-1900-411.80-03</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Costs</td>
<td>001-1900-411.80-84</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

7 LEGISLATIVE - OLD

7.1 ITEMS FROM PUBLIC HEARING
7.1 A – NO ITEMS.

8 FINANCIAL BUSINESS OLD
8.1 NO ITEMS

9 FINANCIAL BUSINESS NEW

9.1 SEPTEMBER STATUTORY REFUNDS

Alderman McPherson MOVED that the report of the Tax Collector relative to the refund of taxes for a total amount of $17,783.46 be approved and that the Finance Director be directed to make payments in accordance with the certified list received from the Tax Collector with funds to come from the Statutory Refunds Account 001-0000-311.13.00.

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

9.2 FUNDING FOR PERRY HILL SCHOOL DEDICATION PLAQUE

Alderman McPherson MOVED to appropriate an amount of $2,145 for the Perry Hill School Dedication Plaque with funding to come from Contingency General Account #001-9900-900.99-00.
SECONDED by Alderman McGorty. A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

9.3 FUNDING FOR MEDIA CENTER FURNITURE AT ELIZABETH SHELTON SCHOOL

Alderman McPherson MOVED to appropriate an amount of $35,173 for media center furniture at Elizabeth Shelton School with funding to be provided by bonding pursuant to Section 7.16 of the City Charter.

Discussion:
John Anglace: The Board of Education is very pleased to receive this money for this.

Adam Heller: Is the only manner of funding through bonding?

John Anglace: Yes, it’s a capital item, it’s a 5-year bond.

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

9.4 FUNDING FOR REMAINING PROJECT COSTS FOR INSTALLATION OF BIRDSEYE ROAD WATER MAIN EXTENSION

Alderman McPherson MOVED to appropriate an amount of $58,000 for remaining project costs related to the installation of Birdseye Road Water Main Extensions Phase I and Phase II with funding to come from five-year bonds per Charter Section 7.16 Borrowing Authorization with 10-year total costs expended reimbursed by the beneficiaries.

Discussion:
John Anglace: This is the third allocation of funds for this project and the city repays this over five years. Note beneficiaries repay over 10 years and the interest rate is phenomenal. And they’ll be a special hearing held with the final cost.

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

9.5 CONVERSION OF STREET LIGHTING TO LED
Alderman McPherson MOVED to approve the agreement between the City of Shelton and United Illuminating Company (UI) for the conversion of street lighting to LED subject to modification as may be approved by the Mayor and Corporation Counsel.

**Discussion:**

Jack Basher: They are converting all street lights in your service area, Bridgeport and Stratford have been done, they came to us and talked to us about it, short term we made a proposal about a week ago where they did a demonstration and invited us. We looked at the proposed LED lights, they will install the lights free of charge, no cost to the city and it will save the city an enormous amount of money through the years because of energy savings. It will be 4,000 lumen light which is a white light. On the road if you go past Sikorsky you can see the lights being installed in Stratford. We have a list of all the city lights that we have now and we will convert. It will be the same watts, there is a rear card in all the lights so they won’t interfere and shine into any of the residences. For surveillance and police officers, the 4,000 lumen is much more clear and precise, where the 3,000 lumen is not as clear. Taking a picture of a car with the 4,000 lumen you will see the red car, with the 3,000 lumen it’ll look like a brown car. UI owns the poles and lights, with the LED lights they will have a longer life, 25 years.

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

---

**9.6 CONTRIBUTION TO ST. VINCENT DE PAUL FOR HOUSTON RELIEF**

Alderman McPherson MOVED to appropriate an amount of $3,000 as a contribution to St. Vincent De Paul for Houston Hurricane Relief with funding to come from Contingency General Account #001-9900-900.99-00.

**Discussion:**

John Anglace: What’s happened here is St Vincents has a truck going down full of items, last minute they found out they had to pay for the fuel, so they are out asking for contributions.

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

---

**10 – LEGISLATIVE – NEW**

**10.1 ITEMS TO PUBLIC HEARING**
10.1 A. AMENDMENT TO CODE OF ORDINANCES CHAPTER 7 ARTICLE 1, SECTION 7-9 LITTERING AND DUMPING PROHIBITED (ORD. #894)

Public Hearing Scheduled for September 26, 2017

Be it ordained by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Shelton that:

Littering or dumping prohibited.

(a) No person shall throw, scatter, spill, or place or cause to be blown, scattered, spilled, thrown, or placed, or otherwise dispose of any litter upon any public property in the City of Shelton, or upon private property in the City of Shelton not owned by him, or in the waters of the City of Shelton including, but not limited to, any public highway, public park, beach, campground, forest land, recreational area, mobile manufactured home park, highway, road, street, or alley except: (1) when such property is designated by the City of Shelton for the disposal of garbage and refuse, and such person is authorized to use such property for such purpose, (2) into a litter receptacle in such a manner that the litter will be prevented from being carried away or deposited by the elements upon any part of said private or public property or waters.

(b) Any person who violates any provision of subsection (a) of this section shall be subject to a fine of two hundred and fifty dollars ($250.00). When any such material or substances are thrown, blown, scattered, or spilled from a vehicle, the operator thereof shall be deemed prima facie to have committed such offense.

(c.) “Litter” means any discarded, used, or unconsumed substance or waste material, whether made of aluminum, glass, plastic, rubber, paper, or other natural or synthetic material, or any combination thereof, including, but not limited to, any bottle, jar, or can, or any top, cap, or detachable tab of any bottle, jar or can any unlighted cigarette, cigar, match, or any flaming or glowing material, or any garbage, trash, refuse, debris, rubbish, grass clippings or other lawn or garden waste, newspaper, magazines, glass, metal, plastic or paper containers, or other packaging or construction material which has not been deposited in a litter receptacle. “Litter” shall also include the placing, throwing or distribution of items, books, telephone books or advertising material on property where the owner thereof has neither requested nor granted permission for the placing, throwing or distribution of the items, books, telephone books or advertising material. “Litter” also means and includes items, books, telephone books or advertising material placed, thrown or distributed on property without the prior permission of the owner.

10.2 RESOLUTION HONORING MRS. PAULA STEPHENSON SHS GRADUATE 1970 APPOINTED AMERICAN LEGION VICE NATIONAL COMMANDER
PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, Mrs. Paula Roog Stephenson, a 1970 Shelton High School graduate and distinguished ROTC University of Connecticut Alumni has served 32 years in the U.S. Military with 22 years of those on active duty, and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Stephenson has recently been elected to the office of National Vice Commander of the American Legion, and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Stephenson has brought great credit to our Shelton Educational Institutions, to the City of Shelton, and to her family by virtue of her military, medical and now her American Legion accomplishments.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Shelton, CT that we extend our heartiest congratulations to her on her achievements, as well as her election to such high office. We thank her for her dedicated service to our country and shall continue to hold her in high regard by posting this resolution in Shelton City Hall for all to see.

May God grant her good health and Bless the good work she is about to undertake. We are comforted in knowing that our Veterans will now have an active and effective voice in the halls of Congress.

GOD BLESS AMERICA!

Mayor Mark A. Lauretti

Alderman Anthony Simonetti  Alderman Adam Heller
Alderman Eric McPherson  Alderman Stanley Kudej
Alderman John Anglace  Alderman Cris Balamaci
Alderman Noreen McGorty  Alderman Jim Capra

September 14, 2017  Shelton, CT

EXECUTIVE SESSION

11.A REQUEST TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION

11.1 CONTRACTUAL NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING PEARMAIN ROAD PROPERTY
Alderman Anglace asked Corporation Counsel if the executive session item was ready. Corporation Counsel replied that it was not.

**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 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ashley Conklin

Ashley Conklin, Clerk
Board of Aldermen

DATE APPROVED: __________ BY: ______________________________________

Mayor Mark A. Lauretti
September 14, 2017

City of Shelton

John Anglace

Shelton Board of Aldermen

Dear Alderman,

We are homeowners across the street from 19 Emerald Ridge Court, Shelton, CT.

We live in a subdivision with covenants which are on record with the town, which include ‘no stockade’ fences. Exceptions for other types of fences are only on approval of the subdivision, and are meant for enclosing pools for safety reasons. This property owner has erected posts all over his property line and puts up stockade fence panels in between these posts slowly making his way around the property. The stockade fence along his property and an adjoining property was higher than the city allowed five feet. He has also put different types of fencing up along his back area. Additionally, he has also put a fence on top of a shed, that is to say again ‘on top of the shed roof’, not in front of the shed. This fence on top of the shed he may or may not take down from time to time.

The general timeline of this problem unfolds as follows. After thanksgiving of last year my wife called Mr. Dingle to apprise him of the situation. He came out to see this for himself and actually talked to the homeowner. Mr. Dingle later called my wife and asked “Why didn’t you complain about the terrible blight all over the property as well?” Mr. Dingle said he told the homeowner he had till the spring to lower his fence along the driveway to a proper height. He also said he gave him six weeks to clean up the blight. Mr. Dingle also acknowledged all the building materials strewn all across the property was not all fencing material and in fact was not all building material either. Mr. Dingle assured my wife that a letter would be sent out to the property owner to officially state what their conversation entailed and that we would receive a copy. Mr. Dingle was asked why he had given the homeowner so much time to take down or lower an illegal fence when in fact he had workers there, in fact putting up more fence, that very day as they spoke. There was no good answer given. Inevitably we did not receive a letter and the homeowner did not take down his fence.

After this conversation with Mr. Dingle, the homeowner slowly, mostly at night, put up more fencing or posts for future fencing. Eventually he made his way around the left back side of his property putting up different types of fencing and included the fencing on top of the shed. Just this summer he started putting his stockade fence on the front property line, further blighting our neighborhood. The fence is right behind a guardrail and is not set back far enough off the street according to city guidelines, even if it was allowable. Additionally, the homeowner removed the grass in front of the guardrail and replaced it with unsightly gravel along the street property line. Once again, the city guidelines call for either a cement or grass sidewalk, and this clearly is neither. Going further into city guidelines, this homeowner is also changing the grade of areas around a naturally running brook that is right behind the guardrail. Although this was brought up to the city officials, this has not been addressed either. He is also changing the grade in certain areas of his property to a degree that is not allowable. These items go against city guidelines but have not been addressed by the city. The length of time the homeowner spends completing his projects further goes against city guidelines.
Calls were made to the town hall again this summer, and this time Mr. Schultz was involved stating that he had no knowledge or record of our previous conversations. Tidiously again, our viewpoint and concerns were explained, and this was looked into again by city officials who came out to look the situation over again. We were assured that if he did not take down the stockade fence along the guardrail the city would take it down themselves. This has not happened. We would like to know why this homeowner is allowed to continue blighting the neighborhood in which we pay high city taxes for a planned subdivision that includes no fences. Again, this fence detracts from the unity of the natural beauty of the subdivision which ensures our home values stay up, which justifies the high taxes we pay on our houses. We would like to know what you will do to make sure that the tax bill we pay to the city each year aligns with the obvious blight in our neighborhood, and what you will do about the inaction of city officials to mediate this situation.

Thank you,
Jean & John Glenn
16 Emerald Ridge Court
Shelton, CT. 06484

cc: Mayor M. Lauretti
    Alderman Anthony Sionetti
    R. Schultz - Planning & Zoning
    T. Dingle Planning & Zoning
September 13, 2017

City of Shelton

Planning and Zoning

Attn: Mr. Richard D. Schultz

Dear Mr. Schultz,

Thank you for your attention to the stockade fence placement at 19 Emerald Ridge Court, Shelton, CT.

As previously discussed, the Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions For Emerald Ridge Estates Subdivision, clearly states in section 9(k) that no stockade fence shall be erected on any of the lots.

As you explained to me and several neighbors that it was not in the city’s jurisdiction to enforce on private property restrictions, it is my intention to seek a resolution to this present conflict and prevent future issues.

If there are requirements for heights of fences, then why isn’t there a simple permit process in place to erect a fence and collect a nominal fee to inspect it for height.

This type of permit would alert the town to the activity of fence installation and as a courtesy to the developer or declarant, a simple cross check of the covenants would eliminate these needless fence issues.

To inspect a fence for proper height, when it should not have been installed in the first place causes confusion and implies that the city approves of the fence.

This particular fence, at 19 Emerald Ridge Court, is installed in two locations on the property, clearly violating our covenants, regardless of the height.

It is my understanding that the city engineer, in his letter dated July 14, 2017, asked that the owner of the property remove the fence behind the guardrail in the city right of way. However, it is still there as well as the other section.

At this point we would like to start the process to address these issues by the change of your permit process, or an ordinance change to prevent this disruption to our streetscape, and the decline in property values due to this blight in our subdivision.

Sincerely,

John K. Fitzgerald
7 Emerald Ridge Court
Shelton, CT. 06484

cc: Mayor Mark Lauretti
John Anglace – President, Board of Alderman
Rimas J. Balys – Assistant City Engineer
Mr. John Anglase  
President of the Board of Aldermen  
City of Shelton

Mr. Anglase:
We purchased our home at 12 Emerald Ridge Court on February 3, 2003 and at that time we were given a declaration of covenants and restrictions. In article 14 of these restrictions it is stated that no shrubs, trees, gardens or any other improvements shall be erected within any utility easement areas. The stockade fence that has been installed at 19 Emerald Ridge Ct is in violation of this clause. We understand that UI has an easement running up this piece of property.

We are a retired couple and would like to down size by selling our home in the near future and purchase another in Shelton. Our real estate agent has informed us that the stockade fence as it is constructed is lowering the value of our home. One the first things you notice entering the cul-da-sac is this stockade fence and that it continues to rear of such mentioned property.

We also have been informed that a request from the town engineer Mr. Balys dated July 14, 2017 directing this home owner to remove the stockade fence behind the guard rail and as of this date it has not been removed.

We would appreciate your attention in resolving this matter as soon as possible.

Very truly yours

Mary Chappa  
William Chappa
09/13/2017

Dear Mr. Schultz, Planning and Zoning and the City of Shelton Board of Aldermen:

My name is Michelle M. Hundt and I live with my husband and two teenage daughters at 11 Emerald Ridge Court, Shelton, CT 06484. I am writing this as a formal complaint against my present neighbor, Wang Xu, who resides at 19 Emerald Ridge Court, Shelton, CT 06484.

My neighbor has put stones on the city easement to his property along the cul de sac that we live on. He has also planted many trees and plants that touch the guard rail in the easement, as well as putting up stockade fencing behind the guard rail. When I chose to buy my house I did so with the understanding that there were no stockade nor deer fencing allowed to be put up. Mr. Xu has started doing just this and my property butts up against his. This fencing will go right against my property. He is putting structures up on the easement which I was told was not allowed as well.

My daughters are both runners and attend Shelton High School and are on the swim team. They run daily on our quiet road and there are times when vehicles have come up the road at medium/high speed and they have had to jump over the guard rail for their safety. Both my husband and I also walk our dog up the road for exercise daily, as do our neighbors. The same issue exists with us in regards to safety in that the stones can easily get into the roadway and picked up by a car’s tires and thrown out at us as we walk. As a car comes up Emerald Ridge Court, depending on where we are in the cul de sac, they are unable to see us due to all of his plantings until they are on top of us. This is quite scary and unsafe. Safety is my first concern for pedestrians as visibility is greatly decreased as you come up the road.

Mr. Xu has told my husband that he wishes to completely encircle his property with a stockade/deer fence. He has started putting up the fencing and I am concerned that he wishes to put the fencing, a structure, across our named stream in Shelton. He has not taken out any permits to do any of this planting or erecting of fencing and I do not believe that he is aware that we all live with a named stream in the front of our properties and that there are wetland regulations to follow. He has told me similar things. He wants to create waterfalls within the stream path. Once again this concerns me as this is a named stream in Shelton and we, as homeowners, are bound to leave the stream to its natural beauty and to preserve it for the future.

Lastly, my present neighbor has many palettes of building material and other things which makes the cul de sac look like blight. These palettes are quite ugly and frankly huge and look horrible. I believe that this blight will devalue all of our properties and have been present for over a year with very little use.

I ask that you please look into these concerns, both planning and zoning and wetlands. Once again, we all need to be respectful to each other and the wetlands. My husband and I were educated how to safely live with a named stream on our property and filed permits with the town when we put in our pool. Mr. Xu seems to not be aware and or not to care about the stream and this is quite distressing.

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter as the fence has started to be erected.

Michelle M. Hundt and family.