SHELTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, June 25, 2025
Shelton City Hall (In Person & Virtual)
54 Hill Street, Shelton, CT 06484

TRANSCRIBED, BUT NOT YET REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY SPZC

PZC Commissioners Present:	Virginia Harger, Chairwoman Charles Kelly, Vice-Chairman Robert Cristiano Matt McGee (seated for Elaine Matto) Win Oppel (seated for Ruth Parkins)
PZC Commissioners Absent:	Elaine Matto, Secretary Ruth Parkins Jimmy Tickey
Also Present:	Atty. Francis Teodosio, City Counsel Alexandrea Castro, Asst. Planning and Zoning Admin. Dominick Di Gangi, Professional Engineer Tina Kelly, Recording Secretary

USB disks, correspondences, and attachments are on file in the City/Town Clerk's office and the Planning and Zoning office. Minutes will be on the City of Shelton website, www.cityofshelton.org by 7/2/2025. An audio/visual recording of the meeting can be found on YouTube: http://www.youtube.com/@cityofshelton3805/streams.

I. Call to Order
Chair Harger called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

II. Pledge of Allegiance
All those present rose and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. Roll Call
Chair Harger identified members present and gave the meeting protocol.

IV. Other Business
8-24 Referral – For the purchase of State of Connecticut land along Bridgeport Avenue (CT Route 714), CTDOT file No. 126-034-024A.

Atty. Teodosio read the 8-24 Referral Memorandum written by Kellie Vazzano, Admin. Asst. to the Mayor and to Alexandrea Castro, Asst. Planning and Zoning Admin., dated June 20, 2025. Chair Harger noted that the City has the right of first refusal regarding the purchase of the parcel.

Motion made by Comm. Kelly, seconded by Comm. Christiano, to report favorably for the purchase of the land described. On a roll call vote taken by Chair Harger, the Commission voted as follows:

Comm. Kelly – Aye Comm. Oppel – Aye Chair Harger – Aye
Comm. Christiano – Aye Comm. McGee – Aye

The motion passed 5 to 0.

V. Public Hearings

A. Application #22-26, Dominick Thomas for Agim Ismaili & Shprza Ismaili at 2 Mohawk Drive (Assessors Map 12, Lot 4) on .76 acres in a CA-2 & R-3 Zone, for a Planned Development District, Initial Concept Development Plans and Final Site Development Plans to have thirty (30) one and two-bedroom residential rental units in a single building with basement and surface parking.

Atty. Teodosio reviewed the project's history and the reasons for the final resolution once it became an 8-30g proposal. Atty. Dominick Thomas and Manny Silva, Registered Civil Engineer at Rose Tiso & Co., presented the final proposal in compliance with the terms of the agreement/resolution. They pointed out that the applicant made changes to the proposal based on concerns raised by the Commission, the City Engineer, the Fire Marshal, and the public.

Atty. Thomas indicated the following:

- Parking was increased from 1.5 to 2.0 spaces per unit.
- The roof was lowered by 5 feet.
- The number of units was reduced from 40 to 30, and the top floor was eliminated.
- The three floors of the building will be fully equipped with sprinklers so that in the event of a fire, the fire trucks can be staged as far as 450 ft. away.
- A standpipe will be installed on the rear, lower level of the garage for fire hose access.
- A section in front of the building will be prepared for a sidewalk as requested by the City's engineer.
- The road will be repaved to its current width wherever it is disturbed from trenching, etc., but there are no plans to widen it to 30 feet.

In response to Comm. Oppel's question, Atty. Thomas indicated that the law states 8-30g units cannot be designated ahead of time. Instead, whenever a client eligible for affordable housing requests a unit, they must be offered whichever rental unit is available.

In response to Comm. Oppel's inquiry regarding methane gas monitoring, Atty. Thomas stated that as per the agreement, test holes would be sampled and evaluated before work begins.

Manny Silva presented the modified plans and elevations for the Commission:

- There is a significant separation between River Road and the building, which is set back and uphill from the corner building and gas station.
- There are 61 parking spaces on the property, with some located adjacent to the first-floor entrance and the majority situated underneath in the garage.
- All the surface runoff from the parking lot and the roof will be collected in a treatment drain with snouted catch basins, which will connect to a 2,400 cubic foot, underground gallery system and eventually to an existing catch basin at the corner of Long Hill Avenue and River Road.
- During construction, a temporary sedimentation tank will be used to collect stormwater sediment. Hay bales and a silt fence will be placed around the perimeter to control soil erosion and filter out mud and debris, and prevent them from reaching adjacent roads and neighboring properties.
- The lighting plan for the driveway is night sky compliant and is designed to prevent light spillage onto neighboring properties.
- Two retaining walls will be constructed in the rear to create a flat, amenity space for residents to socialize outdoors.
- The ornamental landscaping plan will include a Black Cherry tree, an American Dogwood, and other shrubbery native to Connecticut.

Mr. Di Gangi asked if the garage would have a sprinkler system, and Mr. Silva answered that he thought there would be dry heads, but neither he nor Atty. Thomas were 100% certain. Atty. Thomas stated that a sprinkler system may not be required since the garage is not fully enclosed.

Comm. McGee inquired about the process to install a traffic light at the River Road/Long Hill Ave. intersection. Atty. Teodosio stated that the City Traffic Control Authority can request that the Office of the State Traffic Administration conduct a study to determine if a traffic light is warranted.

Residents of Shelton spoke during the public portion of the Public Hearing as follows:

1. David Eldridge, 17 Seneca Lane, stated that he is not satisfied with the resolution and does not believe all safety issues were addressed; the Commission missed a good opportunity to be proactive and set the standard for all future 8-30g projects in our city; professional engineers who could make a compelling case that this location is unsafe and unsuitable for this project should have been hired; the cost associated with the tie-in to the Stratford sewer system should have been determined and publicized.

2. Mark Beseschеck, 56 Ojibwa Trail, stated that notification of this meeting was insufficient as many neighbors were unaware that it was scheduled, and the placard posted was obscured by brush and cars parked in front of it.

3. Jeff Sninsky, owner of a business at 1 Seneca Road, stated that he is concerned that the property is small and has a multitude of issues; EMS personnel would not be able to access the rear of the building with life-saving equipment nor could a ladder truck access the rear roof in the event of an emergency evacuation; a traffic light is needed right now at the corner to reduce car accidents and the wait time to turn onto River Road, conditions which will worsen when 30 more units are built; a culvert is present on the property which can collect storm water, become contaminated, and overflow onto neighboring properties; methane gas contamination should be tested not only before but also after blasting and drilling concludes; a faulty rear location has been designated for plowed snow, since it can flow onto neighboring properties when melted.

4. Paula Zahar, 21 Algonquin Road, stated that the development encroaches greatly on her backyard where she has lived for 53 years; the planned outdoor amenities space will greatly reduce her privacy; she also concurred with comments of previous speakers regarding traffic accidents and methane gas concerns.

5. Diane Flessas, 26 Algonquin Road, stated that homes in the country neighborhood she has enjoyed for 30 years will be ruined, and the streets will be so overcrowded with parked cars that there will be no room for school buses.

6. Paulette Campbell, a Meriden resident, spoke on behalf of her mom, Diane, who resides in Pine Rock Park, and requested an answer to the question of what safety precautions will be taken to prevent damage to Diane's portion of the nob/ledge when the applicant uses blasting to remove his portion. She also stated that a portion of the amenities area is actually on Diane's property, and she would like to see exactly what evidence the Commission presented in opposition to this proposal.

7. Thomas Harbinson, a Shelton resident, *(no address provided)*, stated that he feels cheated and expressed his overall disappointment with the Commission's approval of this project; the City made no attempt to illustrate how the public health and safety is negatively impacted by this development, even though more children will be around crossing River Road, Mohawk Trail, Long Hill Avenue, etc. to reach bus stops, stores, and eateries nearby; the 8 ft entry height to the property and the lack of turnaround space in the surface parking component prevents delivery trucks from entering the property and instead will be parked on the congested street; Shelton has no City Planner to provide a perspective concerning the long term, broader effects of multiple developments on infrastructure and WPCA issues; he takes umbrage with Commission statements that the decision is "out of our control."

Atty. Thomas responded to the public's comments as follows: he believes it is unfair for members of the public to say that the Commission "did nothing" in opposition to this application; most of the issues raised during the public hearing have previously been identified and addressed in Commission meetings and workshops dating back to 2022; all plans have been submitted to and approved by the Fire Marshal; a peer reviewer attended a Commission meeting early on and agreed with the findings in the parking analysis and traffic reports conducted by the applicant; it is not yet certain that blasting will occur during the construction process, but if it does, the Commission has direction from DEEP should an issue with methane gas arise; there will be no encroachment on any neighboring property by this development, and GIS maps have a disclaimer indicating that property boundaries may not always be accurate; a removal plan, involving a bucket loader if necessary, will be followed to ensure that no snow will be allowed to melt onto neighboring properties; sewers and not septic tanks nor leaching fields will service this property; regarding notification of this meeting: 1) at the time of posting, Atty. Thomas made sure the placard was in full view, 2) Atty. Thomas found no other location for the posting that cars could never obscure, and 3) notification letters of tonight's meeting were sent via Certified Mail to 17 abutting and nearby neighbors.

Chair Harger stated that since the denial of this application in February, 2024 and the subsequent appeal, Commissioners have spent many hours formulating and presenting arguments that addressed every one of their and the public's concerns as to why this development was unsafe and inappropriate for this 0.75 acre parcel of land; the Commission suggested alternatives to the applicant, such as constructing homes, duplexes, or townhouses that would be better suited to the location, but the applicant never had any interest in other proposals; in consideration of the push for affordable housing in Connecticut and the resources available, the Commission concluded it does not have enough evidence to convince a Connecticut state court to deny an 8-30g appeal by the developer, and there is a significant risk that a decision more unfavorable to residents than this resolution could result.

Comm. Christiano stated that the Commission spent a tremendous amount of time weighing the factors on both sides of the project, and concluded that this is the best resolution for the community and neighborhood; the Commission's work did result in an increase from 1.5 to 2 parking spaces per tenant; the Fire Marshal, not the PZC, determines what fire safety regulations must be followed; with development comes traffic, and the state makes decisions regarding traffic safety based on studies done by professional, traffic safety experts. The Commission cannot use increased traffic as a reason to deny development.

Comm. Kelly stated that for three years the Commission has worked on this application, and while no Commissioner believed a development of this size was appropriate, the Commission had to follow the law regarding this project.

Comm. McGee inquired whether trees could be planted on the property line to shield the activity in the amenities space from the neighbor's view. Atty. Thomas stated his client would consider the idea, and Mr. Silva indicated that the view from the neighbor's backyard would be blocked by the height of the wall in the amenities space.

In response to the public's comments, Mr. Silva stated that no slab/ledge will be eliminated along the property line between the site and Ms. Flessas' home; the WPCA has determined that the sewer tie-in fee will be approximately $80,000 for 30 units; he overlaid the site plan with the GIS map to illustrate where buildings will be placed relative to existing topographical features of the land; in response to Chair Harger's question about the survey, he stated that a preliminary survey established boundaries based on land records, deeds, and reinforcing bars/pipes found on the property; a final survey and "as-built" will be obtained; the culvert referenced will not be at all impacted because it is in the valley to the west of the nob and all construction will be done to the east of the nob; the maple tree on the neighbor's property will not be damaged and any branches of trees intertwined with it and will be carefully removed; from the maple tree looking uphill only the top 2 floors of the building will be visible.

Motion made by Comm. Christiano, seconded by Comm. Oppel, to close the public hearing for the project. On a roll call vote taken by Chair Harger, the Commission voted as follows:

Comm. Kelly – Aye	Comm. Oppel – Aye	Chair Harger – Aye
Comm. Christiano – Aye	Comm. McGee – Aye	

The motion passed 5 to 0.

Atty. Teodosio advised that the Commission must still vote to approve the written resolution, which will be ready for the Commission meeting on July 9, 2025.

B. Application #25-09, PDD #53, Splash Management Group LLC., at 376 Bridgeport Avenue, for a Major Modification to the PDD to add a 9,500± sq. ft. parking area; relocate wash tunnels; add self-service vacuum stations; relocate and increase ADA-accessible parking spaces; add an exit-only driveway; realign the existing driveway entrance to the driveway of a commercial business across the street, and improve site lighting, landscaping, and storm water management practices.

The application was presented by Paul Morgan, Regional Manager, Splash Car Wash, LLC; Todd Ritchie, Civil Engineer and Licensed Professional Engineer, SLR Consulting, Cheshire Office; and Jason Frank, Vice-President, SCW, LLC.

Mr. Morgan provided a general outline of the project, which included the addition of 19 self-serve vacuum stations to the west of the current carwash; construction of an improved, underground storm water management system; changing the existing exit to a single entrance and moving the exit to improve on-site vehicle circulation; flipping the locations of the full-service and express wash tunnels so the vacuum stations will be alongside the express service tunnel for the convenience of customers

Mr. Ritchie stated that his company, SLR Consulting, worked with the Commission and the CT DOT regarding the McDonald's site plan and the widening of Platt Road to improve sight lines and traffic flow, and the reorganization of entrances and exits on the Splash property has been done in coordination with that work.

Mr. Frank stated the separation of the full-service, hand-wash area of the business from the self-service, express wash area of the business at other locations has made on-site traffic more orderly. It is also safer for employees who no longer have to dodge traffic as they stand outside the exit of the full-service tunnel to hand-wash windows and hand-dry vehicles.

Chair Harger inquired whether this proposed configuration was in use at any other location. Mr. Frank stated that there are two other double-tunnel sites, one in Greenwich, CT, and one in Bedford Hills, NY.

Chair Harger's asked if all issues with the city regarding the property line had been resolved. Mr. Morgan responded that the discrepancy discovered by the SLR surveyor regarding ownership of the portion of land necessary for widening Platt Road has been resolved.

Chair Harger mentioned that any ornamental plantings, including shrubbery and trees, must be native to Connecticut.

Chair Harger stated that if there is a need to change any signage beyond on-site, directional markers, the applicant must return to the Commission for approval.

Comm. Oppel stated that he believed the configuration of the two new handicapped parking spaces could be troublesome since there is not a lot of room to maneuver in and out of them and they are located on a roadway. Mr. Ritchie explained that at many Splash sites, handicapped drivers wait in the lobby while employees take their vehicles through the full-service car wash

and back them in so handicapped clients can conveniently drive out. He also explained that the spaces are not actually on a roadway but on an emergency bypass exit lane, used if a vehicle must be driven off the property before receiving service.

Comm. Oppel inquired if any trees would be cut down, and Mr. Frank stated none would be removed; but instead, a few screening trees would be planted as per the plan.

Comm. Oppel asked if the outcropping of ledge between the building and Bridgeport Avenue was being removed and Mr. Frank answered that the parking lot planned for that area will be built over the ledge.

Mr. Di Gangi asked if the business would be closed during expansion and Mr. Frank stated that the plan is to remain open with one tunnel in operation at a time.

No one came forward to speak regarding this application during the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Motion made by Comm. Christiano, seconded by Comm. Oppel, to close the public hearing. On a roll call vote taken by Chair Harger, the Commission voted as follows:

Comm. Kelly – Aye	Comm. Oppel – Aye	Chair Harger – Aye
Comm. Christiano – Aye	Comm. McGee – Aye	

The motion passed 5 to 0.

Motion made by Comm. Christiano, seconded by Comm. Kelly, to approve the application, as presented, with the stipulation that a new map illustrating the revised property line must be submitted within seven days. On a roll call vote taken by Chair Harger, the Commission voted as follows:

Comm. Kelly – Aye	Comm. Oppel – Aye	Chair Harger – Aye
Comm. Christiano – Aye	Comm. McGee – Aye	

The motion passed 5 to 0.

C. Application #25-10, PDD #93, Stephen Bellis for Mathew Calandro at 509-517 Howe Avenue for a Major Modification to Final Site Development Plans to reduce the previously approved residential unit counts (no change to the current commercial uses).

The Application presented by Atty. Steve Bellis, Matt Calandro, Owner and Member of 509, LLC, and Joseph Mingolello, AIA, of Mingolello & Associates Architects, LLC.

Atty. Bellis explained that this project was approved for an addition in January 2019, but the project never started as it was overly ambitious and did not have economic viability. He stated that the current application has been scaled down, requesting 12 units instead of 27; includes the addition of two stories on top of a portion of the building within the current footprint; no longer contains a request for a lateral addition; has 21 parking spaces in the main parking lot which meets the parking space requirement of 20 spaces for the 12-unit, studio/1 bedroom/2 bedroom mix; has additional parking available in the rear on the lower level for use by employees and basement studio occupants.

Mr. Mingolello stated that: there will be five units on the second and third floors, with two studios facing the front on Howe Avenue, two, one-bedroom units in the rear- left; a two-bedroom unit in the rear-right; two studio units will be in the basement with an entrance on White Street; the existing parking lot has increased to 21 spaces; a new restaurant with a kitchen, dining room, bar, and outside deck will be located in the back of the building; a glass foyer will be constructed to the left of the restaurant containing elevators to the second and third floors; the outer, architecturally-interesting elements such as the brick columns and stucco finish will be carried up through the new stories and the staggered, vintage design of the upper roof will remain.

Mr. Calandro stated that there is a small triangular piece of land that he has offered to purchase from the City several times to create additional, on-site parking. Should he be granted an easement, Mr. Calandro will come back to the Commission with an improved parking plan.

Chair Harger questioned how parking spaces for take-out would be accommodated. Mf. Calandro stated that although there are no state regulations for take-out parking spaces, three of the 10 spaces on White Street next to the restaurant will be dedicated for curbside pick-up.

Comm. Oppel stated that the application is incomplete since the plans indicate 19 parking spaces, not the 21 that are required, and that on the plan another parking space is being utilized for access to the trash room.

Comm. McGee asked if there will be a mechanism to prevent restaurant patrons from parking in occupants' spaces. Mr. Calandro stated that if the easement is not granted, personnel will be paid to surveil the parking lots and ensure that only occupants are parking in the 21 spaces.

No one came forward to speak regarding this application during the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Motion made by Comm. Oppel, seconded by Comm. Kelly, to close the public hearing. On a roll call vote taken by Chair Harger, the Commission voted as follows:

Comm. Kelly – Aye	Comm. Oppel – Aye	Chair Harger – Aye
Comm. Christiano – Aye	Comm. McGee – Aye	

The motion passed 5 to 0.

Motion made by Comm. Christiano, seconded by Comm. Oppel, to approve the application with the stipulation that a new map illustrating the updated parking to the left and rear of the building and space for trash storage be submitted within 7 days. On a roll call vote taken by Chair Harger, the Commission voted as follows:

Comm. Kelly – Aye	Comm. Oppel – Aye	Chair Harger – Aye
Comm. Christiano – Aye	Comm. McGee – Aye	

The motion passed 5 to 0.

VI. Old Business

A. Application #20-22, “Riverview Park Royal” at 125 Canal Street, Stephen Bellis for Canal Properties, LLC., to amend the existing approval requiring 10% affordable residential units to 20% per CHFA Build 4 CT loan requirements.

Atty. Bellis stated that two questions arose at the June 11, 2025, Commission meeting: Kellie Vazzano, Admin. Asst. to the Mayor, asked whether or not the CHFA loan in the Build4CT program could be assumed by another borrower? Atty. Bellis indicated he confirmed with Vincent Bergin, CHFA Senior Business Development Officer, that under certain circumstances, the loan could be assumable by a subsequent owner of the property so long as the first mortgage holder for that borrower is a participating lender under the Build4CT program, or at a minimum, agrees to an intercreditor agreement consistent with the agreement by the existing first mortgage holder.

Atty. Bellis stated that the second question was if the Commission approval of 10% of the units at 80% AMI on January 19, 2022, was or was not restricted for 40 years. Admin. Asst. Alexandrea Castro provided the answer that in his presentation, the developer, Mr. Guedes, noted that the 40-year restriction would be in place.

Atty. Bellis stated that he confirmed with Mr. Bergin that the Commission has two options for approval:

1) Make a change to the 2022 approval and designate that all 20% of the total housing units, 18 units, become part of the Build4CT program, and be restricted such that all occupants are at 80% AMI and that the CHFA loan be in place for at least 6 years but no more than 20 years; or

2) Keep the original 2022 approval, where 10% of the total housing units, nine units, are restricted at 80% AMI, and codify the restriction for 40 years; and designate that the additional 10%, nine units, become part of the Build4CT program, restricted such that all occupants are at 80% AMI and that the CHFA loan be in place for at least six years but no more than 20 years.

Motion made by Comm. Oppel, seconded by Comm. McGee to amend the existing approval as follows, effective in seven days: 1) require the original 10% of total housing units, nine units, remain at 80% AMI, and codify the restriction for 40 years, and 2) approve the additional 10% of total housing units, nine units, as part of the Build4CT program between the CT Department of Housing (DOH) and the CT Housing Finance Authority (CHFA), restricted such that all occupants are at 80% AMI and that the CHFA loan be in place for at least six years but no more than 20 years. On a roll call vote taken by Chair Harger, the Commission voted as follows:

Comm. Kelly – Aye	Comm. Oppel – Aye	Chair Harger – Aye
Comm. Christiano – Aye	Comm. McGee – Aye	

The motion passed 5 to 0.

B. Application #23-13, PDD 91, “Fountain Square,” Dominick Thomas for Fountain Square LLC., at 745 – 795 Bridgeport Avenue (Assessors Map 21, Lot 18) for a Major Modification of a PDD – Amendment to the Statement of Uses and Standards, Initial Concept Development Plans, and Final Site Development Plans to allow 100 residential apartments, with 20 being listed as affordable, 10 units at 60% AMI, and 10 units at 80% AMI.

Atty. Teodosio stated that this proposed resolution is based on the previous Commission decision and complies with the requirement that he and Atty. Thomas have with the Superior Court. It finalizes the agreement for the 100 units at Fountain Square and the document is required for the 8-N hearing that he and Attorney Thomas must attend, because of the nature of the appeal before the Superior Court. It essentially recites that the fourth amended plan and restated statement of uses and standards, which is essentially the zoning regulations for this property. He then read the resolution into the record.

Motion made by Comm. Oppel, seconded by Comm. Christiano to open the discussion. On a roll call vote taken by Chair Harger, the Commission voted as follows:

Comm. Kelly – Aye	Comm. Oppel – Aye	Chair Harger – Aye
Comm. Christiano – Aye	Comm. McGee – Aye	

The motion passed 5 to 0.

Comm. Oppel noted that there were six changes to the Statement of Use.

Comm. Kelly commented that there are multiple changes because the project changed from a hotel to residential units.

Comm. McGee requested and received clarification that 1.75 parking spaces per unit was correct.

Motion made by Comm. Kelly, seconded by Comm. Christiano, to approve all the changes included in the resolution, effective on the second Friday following approval. On a roll call vote taken by Chair Harger, the Commission voted as follows:

Comm. Kelly – Aye	Comm. Oppel – Aye	Chair Harger – Aye
Comm. Christiano – Aye	Comm. McGee – Aye	

The motion passed 5 to 0.

C. Application #24-20, Dominick Thomas for Crown Point II LLC at 0 Bridgeport Avenue and 48 Long Hill Crossroads (Assessor's Map 50, Lots 15 & 16) for a Planned Development District in an LIP zone for a mixed-use commercial development to include a hotel, restaurants, grocery, and retail.

Chair Harger noted that a favorable resolution was authorized by the Commission at the March 19, 2025 meeting and recognized Atty. Teodosio to read the resolution into the record.

Motion made by Comm. Oppel, seconded by Comm. Kelly to open the discussion. On a roll call vote taken by Chair Harger, the Commission voted as follows:

Comm. Kelly – Aye	Comm. Oppel – Aye	Chair Harger – Aye
Comm. Christiano – Aye	Comm. McGee – Aye	

The motion passed 5 to 0.

Comm. McGee inquired if the bond needed to be adjusted. Atty. Teodosio noted that the resolution stated the need for the City Engineer to recommend to the Commission the value of two bonds to be issued.

Chair Harger stated that the applicant is currently restricted from doing any work on the property by the State of CT and the City of Shelton Inland Wetlands Commission.

Motion made by Comm. Oppel, seconded by Comm. Kelly to approve the resolution, to be effective in seven days. On a roll call vote taken by Chair Harger, the Commission voted as follows:

Comm. Kelly – Aye	Comm. Oppel – Aye	Chair Harger – Aye
Comm. Christiano – Aye	Comm. McGee – Aye	

The motion passed 5 to 0.

Adjournment

Chairwoman Harger adjourned the meeting at 10:37 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tina Kelly

Recording Secretary
Shelton Planning & Zoning Commission