

**PLAN UPDATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

*Minutes*

*Room 104, Shelton City Hall*

*Shelton, CT*

*Monday, October 25, 2004*

**I. Call to Order**

Chairman Frank Osak called the meeting to order at approximately 4:45 P.M.

**Members Present:**

**Frank Osak, Chairman  
Fred Musante  
Jim Tate  
Michael Adanti**

**Peter DiCarlo, Vice Chairman  
Anthony Pogoda  
Tom Harbinson**

**Also Present:**

**Richard Schultz  
Marianne Chaya**

**II. Pledge of Allegiance**

All in attendance pledged allegiance to the flag.

**III. Approval of Minutes**

Anthony Pogoda MOVED to approve the minutes from the October 18, 2004 meeting. Tom Harbinson SECONDED the motion. All were in favor, MOTION PASSED.

**IV. Board of Education Long Range Plan Discussion**

After reviewing the report from the Board of Ed, Tom Harbinson felt that it does call into question the growth of the population of students. Is that a valid argument? One thing that Tom did not see in the report was a geographic distribution of the student population. Where is the distribution now and where is it likely to be in 10 years? That would impact where a new or newly constructed elementary school would be. Frank Osak stated that they are looking for more capacity but there seems to be enough capacity even at 20 students per room in the elementary system. The reason given to put a new school someplace is lack of diversity in Lafayette. They are saying in the report that the state is warning them that you have too much minority in one school. It was noted that by building another school you would dilute it somewhat. It is a hard political

decision to make them bus the kids. Frank Osak stated that if they didn't have a plan by 2008 for a new school, at about \$14M-\$15M capital expenditure, we wouldn't even be concerned with what they are doing. We might have something to say about where are the kids and what are we going to do in land use to make more kids someplace, and after that, the discussion ends. They are talking about a big capital expenditure to put into the capital improvement program that begs the answer, you don't have a capacity problem, and you have a building. It is clear why you have to build it. You would have to face the parents of the children in White Hills or Long Hill and say we are taking some of these kids downtown and some from downtown and moving them up there. As much as we say we are a diversified society, we're really not. What I think they are backing into is, put a school someplace else, knock Lafayette off-line and then you can more homogeneous can spread kids around. It may be that what is needed is to spend the money, then build a school someplace that permits you to redistribute the population. Anthony Pogoda stated that spending that kind of money to get diversity. Peter DiCarlo stated that from our perspective, we could include the two options and let the politicians make the decision. Tom Harbinson said that there are some programmatic changes, like full day Kindergarten that would cause a need for expansion at the elementary schools, and whether renovate Ripton or build another school, is a cost. Beyond that, we should let the politicians decide. Mike Adanti brought up the fact regarding the numbers, that even the Superintendent didn't believe them, that they were too conservative. It was discussed regarding the study done for the BOE, was done by the appropriate firm. They had a vested interest. If you hire an architectural design-engineering firm, there is a slant to their expertise. The architectural firm should have been from tem-buck-to, who isn't going to come in and bid on the contract, and has no vested interest except to collect the fees to do the survey. Frank Osak said he felt it boiled down to, where are the kids now and where will they be later? What are going to do to change that pattern of distribution of kids? Then you have some input. That kind of begs what Leon Sylvester said regarding the number of students. It was kind of a gut feeling he had. You have to wonder if there will be a big development coming into town that would considerably change the number. Peter DiCarlo said that what would come out of this will be a final build-out, that would corroborate the 5800 or question it. Built into our recommendation for education can be the fact that the build-out that we project is compatible with the numbers in the report, or it's incompatible, and therefore you need additional room. If we do more than one build-out, which would be a financial issue for us, perhaps you can point a way to holding it to the 5800, and there is where our work would pay off. If, for instance, you change the zoning from 1 acre to 3 acres, that would hold down the build-out from 50,000 to 45,000, or whatever the numbers might be; by virtue of build-out A versus build-out B. Then you at least point to avenues that can control it other than spending. Our work isn't centered on whether 5800 is right or wrong, but how you manage it. Fred Musante stated that this committee has it's own point of view and should state so in the report, stating whether we agree or not with the plan. We should question what was presented and start looking at where we are going. Frank

Osak said that we should layout what our assumptions are, whether you agree with it or not. Mike Adanti stated that after we make our assumptions he doesn't want to take on the BOE's report. If we set the parameters, regarding the zoning everything would fall into place.

## **V. Review Department's Input**

The discussion turned to reviewing the presentation from the Police Dept. last week. Rick Schultz said some had asked, what is taxing the police, is the retail, or is it the condos? Anthony Pogoda noted that P&Z is not going to make decisions for the police department or even the BOE. We should not have to go through each of the department's reports with a fine-toothed comb. We can only make recommendations for P&Z to adopt. Anthony stated that this information is going to be valuable to P&Z. Tom Harbinson noted that one issue is that the GIS system is under-utilized. You should be able to take a map of the city and key in for every lot, how many students are in that lot, and see a graphic representation where all the students reside. You should also be able to click on where every police call has been for a specified time. You would be able to graphically see it on a map so that you would be able to see where all the police activity is. Then you could overlay the commercial and retail zones and see the ratio graphically. This is a very powerful tool for planning. Rick Schultz said you would need multiple layers. The key question is, where are the kids now? It's not a hard task to do. What will our build-out do to where our kids will be in 10 years? We should ask Leon Sylvester back here to ask where are the kids and where does he get his idea that there is more coming, then we will work on our build-out, and then bring him back in. Mike Adanti asked if we could control where the kids will be? Frank Osak said we would be able to do that. Tom Harbinson said at times developers come in and make the statement that there is only "x" number of students in the new development, such as Old Dairy, and then you find you have 20 kids at the bus stop. Obviously it's in the developer's best interest to present it in the best light. The reality is, it's not often checked. Has that subdivision been analyzed to say how many students were generated from that type of subdivision, so when you go forward with a similar type of proposal you can put real numbers and ratios against what is being proposed? Then you have some reality. Two things that you can't control by demographics is the birth rate and the kind of in-migrates you get and what kids they bring in. The discussion continued regarding projections of the students and what the report from the Board of Ed shows. The committee members discussed the GIS software and the uses for the planning. It was discussed asking Planimetrics to pull this data for us.

Fred Musante asked if Planimetrics done any report from the meetings with the departments that have made presentations? What can they share with us? Is what we need to do is take what has been presented to and come up with a plan and vision of what the city should money on? We need to come up with a strategy first because we could be here forever if we don't know what we are trying to accomplish. How do we get a plan together, we have to have some

criteria to make the plan. Do we tell Planimetrics, this is what we want to do, and put it into a plan for us? They discussed some of the issues regarding the WPCA and what facts would be needed for the planning questions. We have to put the questions on the table. We will need to go through each department to recap what was presented and discuss this with Planimetrics. Ask them for an example. What are we going to get from them? There was discussion on what will they be giving us. It seems that so far the residents have said they don't want a lot of growth. If you take that factor, then you know how much vacant land is available for development; do a build-out that casts it at what ever that number is, tell us what that means in terms of zoning. That's your first build-out. There is the consensus from the committee members that it could be done right now. Then you can back into everything else. Frank Osak suggested getting Planimetrics here the same day Leon Sylvester is here. We just have a few more departments to hear from.

## **VI. Future Meeting Times and Schedules**

Monday, November 1, Rick Schultz said he would try and get Public Works to come for their presentation. November 8 is the infrastructure workshop at the Intermediate School, November 15 is when we would like Planimetrics and BOE to attend, and November 22 is slated for the Valley Heath and the Housing Authority.

## **VII. Other Business**

Frank Osak advised the committee members that as of this time they do not have a traffic consultant set for the traffic study. He and Peter DiCarlo had a phone conversation with Planimetrics and were brought up to date. We are in limbo because there has not been any money put up for Planimetrics to do a traffic study. They discussed the terms of the contract regarding the dollars allocated for the study if Barkan & Mess will be or can be used for the traffic study. Frank Osak and Peter DiCarlo have a meeting scheduled with the Mayor on Tuesday to discuss this issue. Planimetrics is now asking for \$55,000 to get through January. Glenn asked us to intervene to see if we can get the Mayor to allocate the money. Peter DiCarlo said that he felt that the Mayor should not be as involved as he is; this is a Planning & Zoning function. P&Z should have had the budget for this and we shouldn't be involved in resolving the issues of the contract. Anthony Pogoda said that the Mayor keeps saying that what the city has there is enough information. We should find out if Eric and Glenn (Planimetrics) has found what the city has that the Mayor says is comprehensive enough on traffic. Peter DiCarlo shared the fact that Planimetrics said they are not traffic engineers. They cannot do the technical analysis and sort out technical issues and problems regarding traffic and how to accommodate it. Glenn Chalder told Frank and Peter, if the Mayor doesn't want Barkan and Mess to do the study, we would go out and find someone else to do it for the \$15,000. The question came up if Barkan & Mess was the issue, and the issue is, the

Mayor thinks it's done already. Anthony Pogoda suggested going into the meeting, telling the Mayor that, you say the City has the all the information that is possibly needed and yet Planimetrics is telling us that they need more than just the information that you presently hold someplace. They need engineered solutions, more than what is presently there. We still need someone to take that information and put it together; that is needed by a traffic engineer. Frank and Peter said that they have mentioned this before to the Mayor. We, as the committee, feel that an engineering firm should do the traffic study. We believe the lowest cost and most effective way to do it is with someone who has sufficient background in the city, and not by someone who has no background. It was asked if everyone would be happy if Barkan & Mess would do the study? It was answered unanimously, yes. Rick Schultz asked Frank and Peter to add that the Planning & Zoning Commission has been advising this committee, that they have been getting traffic reports for each project, and there is an alarming rate of class "D" and "F" level of services. "F" is as bad as it can get. Frank and Peter said they would take this information when they meet with the Mayor tomorrow.

### **VIII. Adjournment**

Tom Harbinson MOVED to adjourn; SECONDED by Anthony Pogoda. Meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Marianne Chaya  
Clerk, Plan Update Advisory Committee  
One tape is on file in the City/Town Clerk's office