

**PLAN UPDATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

*Minutes*

*Special Public Information Meeting  
Shelton Intermediate School Auditorium  
675 Constitution Blvd. North  
Shelton, CT  
Monday, December 5, 2005*

**I. Call to Order**

Chairman Frank Osak called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 P.M.

**Members Present:**

Frank Osak, Chairman  
Tom Harbinson  
Jim Tate

Peter DiCarlo, Co-Chairman  
Fred Musante  
Anthony Pogoda

Also in attendance:

Rick Schultz, Planning & Zoning Administrator  
Eric Barz, Planimetrics  
Marianne Chaya, Clerk

**II. Pledge of Allegiance**

All in attendance pledged allegiance to the flag.

**III. 2006 Draft Plan of Conservation and Development: Presentation by PUAC and Planimetrics**

Frank Osak introduced the members of the committee and Rick Schultz, the Planning & Zoning Administrator. He asked for a moment of silence to remember Mike Adanti, a former member of the committee that met with an unfortunate accident in Europe.

Eric Barz gave the members of the public a Power Point slide presentation of the 2006 Plan of Conservation and Development. The outline of the draft plan is as follows:

**Overview**

The 2006 Plan of Conservation and Development will become a tool for guiding the conservation of important resources and the future development of Shelton. It establishes a common vision for the community's future and recommends strategies and action steps that will help attain that vision when implemented.

The Plan Update Advisory Committee (PUAC), working with Planimetrics, LLC of Avon and numerous Shelton agencies, developed the draft Plan being presented tonight

over the course of a year and a half. Four public workshops were held throughout the planning process to gather public input on conservation, development and infrastructure issues that are important to Shelton residents. Tonight's meeting is intended to review the results of the PUAC's efforts and gather feedback before forwarding the draft Plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC), which is ultimately responsible for its adoption and implementation.

Tonight is by no means the last opportunity for public input. Under State law, the PZC must still hold a separate public hearing after their review and refinement of the draft Plan in order to obtain final public comment prior to adopting the Plan. The PZC will in-turn forward their proposed Plan to the Board of Aldermen for its review and endorsement, before the PZC can adopt the Plan.

Once adopted, the Plan is an advisory document that promotes consistent decision-making and positive efforts by local boards and commissions and by all people interested in maintaining and enhancing the character and quality of life in Shelton.

## **PROTECTING IMPORTANT RESOURCES**

### **Preserve More Meaningful Open Space**

- Increase the open space set-aside in new developments to 15%
- Improve the quality of open space
- Continue to fund the purchase of desirable open space
- Pursue state and/or federal open space grants
- Encourage conservation residential developments
- Continue to allow off-site dedication of open space
- Continue the success of the greenway system
- Integrate the Housatonic riverfront into the greenway strategy
- Maintain the open space plan

### **Preserve Agricultural Resources**

- Preserve existing farmland
- Continue to offer local tax incentives for preserving farmland
- Encourage and support current farming activity

### **Protect Important Natural Resources**

- Adopt density-based zoning in the R-1 and R-1 A Districts
- Enhance the buildable land regulations
- Minimize habitat loss and protect endangered species
- Adopt aquifer and watershed protection zones
- Adopt an underground storage tank ordinance
- Address stormwater and "non-point" pollution issues

### **Preserve Historic Resources**

- Encourage preservation through education, incentive, recognition and regulatory programs
- Update the historic resources inventory
- Consider local historic districts
- Seek Certified Local Government status to become eligible for grants
- Investigate village districts Downtown and in Huntington Center
- Adopt a demolition delay ordinance

### **Preserve Scenic Resources**

- Inventory and establish regulations to protect scenic resources
- Preserve scenic roadsides with easements or open space

## **GUIDING APPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT**

### **Protect and Enhance Downtown, Huntington Center, and White Hills**

- Continue to provide development flexibility Downtown
- Reestablish Downtown as the civic center of the community
- Consider becoming a Main Street community
- Update the Downtown Shelton Revitalization Plan
- Provide adequate parking for current and future uses Downtown
- Balance vehicular and pedestrian needs in villages
- Consider local historic district and village district designations
- Improve traffic safety and circulation
- Balance vehicular and pedestrian needs
- Encourage residential appropriate development patterns in White Hills

### **Protect and Enhance Suburban Office/Industrial Areas**

- Limit general commercial activity in corporate office and industrial areas
- Improve traffic safety and circulation
- Continue to provide pedestrian and bicycle improvements

### **Guide Appropriate Economic Development**

- Optimize economic development
- Create additional land for economic development
- Ensure compatible economic development
- Remove uncertainty from the zoning process
- Consider adopting design review
- Encourage green development principles

### **Guide Appropriate Residential Development**

- Reduce the intensity of rural/suburban development
- Encourage conservation development patterns
- Correct issues with the planned residential development process
- Provide for housing diversity in appropriate locations
- Encourage Downtown mixed-use and multi-family development
- Consider pedestrian scale mixed-use redevelopment in Huntington Center under village district regulations
- Ensure continued elderly housing options
- Continue to provide income diverse housing
- Continue to enhance elderly tax relief programs

## **ADDRESSING COMMUNITY NEEDS**

### **Maintain and Enhance Community Facilities and Services**

- Consider consolidating and relocating City Hall within Downtown
- Address long-and short-term education facility needs
- Address emergency services needs

- Address public works needs
- Address parks and recreation needs
- Consider desired recreation facilities such as a municipal golf course
- Address Library needs
- Make planned improvements to the animal shelter
- Resolve disposition of the Old Shelton Intermediate School
- Ensure adequate maintenance and staffing of community facilities
- Implement a Capital Improvement Program

#### **Maintain a Safe and Efficient Transportation System**

- Relate road design to function and desired land use
- Facilitate capacity and safety improvements to the road network with emphasis on the Route 8/Bridgeport Avenue Corridor and Huntington Center
- Complete Constitution Boulevard

#### **Address Alternative Forms of Transportation**

- Encourage mass transit and ride sharing
- Ensure safe pedestrian access in appropriate locations
- Connect the village and other activity nodes with sidewalks or trails
- Consider bicycle circulation in road and site design

#### **Provide for Adequate Utility Services**

- Complete upgrades to water pollution control plant
- Ensure public sewer service supports desired growth
- Continue to separate older sanitary and storm sewers
- Support efforts to improve regional electrical distribution
- Proactively plan for future telecommunication towers

### **Additional Information**

Copies of the draft Plan have been available for review at the Town Hall and the Libraries. The entire Plan has also been available on the web at:

**<http://www.cityofshelton.org>**

After the slide presentation Eric Barz mentioned that this process is by no means finished. After we receive comments from you tonight the PUAC members will get together to talk about any changes to make to the plan based on the comments and then forward the plan to Planning & Zoning Commission which is ultimately responsible for adopting the plan and the implementation of the plan over the next 10 years and beyond. The steering committee will be refining the plan during December and into January, and then once it's turned over to Planning & Zoning they will have an opportunity to thoroughly review the plan and make any changes they feel is appropriate and they will create what we will call the Proposed Plan. They will forward that to the Board of Aldermen, who will have an opportunity to review and endorse the plan. Then it will be sent back to Planning & Zoning and then they can adopt it. There will be a public hearing before they send it to the Board of Aldermen. You will have an opportunity to speak on the record and have your comments recorded.

#### IV. Public Questions and Comments

Eric Barz and Frank Osak opened the meeting for public comments and questions.

The first comment from a member of the public was complementary to Eric for the professional outline of the draft. He said that any plan like this would be subject to political judgments, control and funding. He asked if Eric has knowledge of Shelton's relative capacity for debt and funding in comparison to other towns? Do you do that and look at what it is today, and what is the potential? Specifically when you look at the section on community facilities and enhancements, which could be a very substantial and weighty amount. Eric responded that they did a number of comparisons to neighboring communities but didn't believe they compared bonding capacities per se.

Jim Ryan stated that he could respond to that question. The city whenever it goes out to borrow money has to develop a financial prospectus and included in the document is a list of the current debts, the schedule of the retirement of the debt and what it can bond. Statutes and federal tax regulations cover it all.

Frank Osak mentioned that projecting future costs has been discussed at many meetings. He said what concerns them is that over the last 10 years the ability to generate revenue at a pace keeping up with the expenditures is getting tricky. The last grand list was \$58M. Of that \$58M, 85% was residential construction, 12% was commercial, industrial, and 3% was personal property. If you look at the total grand list through the town after that was added to it, we had about 22% industrial/commercial, some personal property and the rest was residential. If you look back to the middle of the 1970's, we had about 32% industrial/commercial, and the rest was residential. Your ability to take profitable, marginal, taxable revenue is slipping, and that concerns us. Frank Osak also discussed the need for a Capital Improvement Program and the implementation plan. The key to success is help from all.

There was discussion on the conventional subdivisions versus the conservation development and the fact that cluster homes are not desirable.

A comment was also made about downtown revitalization and the need for attracting younger residents and the need for a southbound exit on Route 8. It was also noted about the Riverwalk-bike path that Derby has built and how since it was paved the amount of use it has generated.

Eric responded that we did address in the plan that the City should work with the State to identify whether the exit 14 southbound ramp is feasible. I didn't touch on it tonight as I was trying to give broad strategies. We didn't specifically identify particular uses in the downtown but we want to encourage synergy. We want to get people living downtown in close proximity to businesses. I have noted that you are not in favor of the conservation development pattern that came out of the workshop.

A gentleman noted that most of the housing in Huntington Center is 1-acre zoning. Most people in Huntington are paying big bucks for government services. We need the money for zoning because we have an investment. We have a rural community, and the other areas that are industrial and commercial,

that's fine, but the thing is, if we are not careful, in 5 years we'll be a Bridgeport, and we don't want to get into that. We also don't want to get like the main streets in Monroe, Newtown, Trumbull, where there are gas stations here and there with all kinds of businesses. It's a bad situation when the economic interests come before the rights and interests of the people. Our founding fathers and current fathers are elected officials. They do not own the city; it's a public trust and public service they are providing. Huntington is a very nice area and we'd like to keep it that way.

Jim Ryan made a comment that one of things that a newcomer misses to this process is the comparison against the progress of the old plan. There have been significant progress in some areas and when a newcomer hears about undertaking a project it sounds like it hasn't been done before. It would help to make note that great gains have been made and what the new work is to be done. He also said he hoped the Brownfield's were part of the contents of the plan. The city has a very successful Brownfield's program. Also, he noted that there is proper reference to the City's anti-blight ordinance and the fact that the city has used it very effectively in the downtown area. Eric responded that at times he hasn't always given credit where credit is due and apologized for that. The committee was paid a visit a couple of months ago by the Mayor that brought that point to our attention and we then went back to make revisions to the plan trying to recognize wherever possible to on-going projects. The Brownfield's and the anti-blight ordinance is part of the draft.

A comment made by Mr. Wells was, that part of what made our town great is that we've had economic growth. He noted that his subdivision on Blueberry was the first one that went through Planning & Zoning back in 1963, and before the Board of Aldermen did it. One thing that concerns the Wells family is his property along Bridgeport Ave. is zoned as office-park district. He said he spoke against the office park district in 1990. He said he is not against the office park, but for his 225 acres, he'd like a flexible opportunity to develop with some commercial uses in there. He likes what Scinto has, and knows we need the growth and wants the flexibility built into this plan now. Frank Osak noted that this is the type of constructive discussion that is needed for constructive solutions. The concern is what happens with a large parcel of land to the grand list addition to the tax base without attendant service costs. It is going to be a major point of discussion with Planning & Zoning to deal with these 225 acres, which is most of what is left undeveloped. Back in 1976 when we did the plan update I think we had 800 acres commercial/industrial. Now we have about 280 left. With the grand list, between commercial and residential slipping the wrong way. We have to put some stops into that or we are not going to have the quality of life left that a few bucks could buy. It's time to think about it now. I agree with your comments; someone is going to have to do some creative zoning to get grand list additions per un-utilized acre up. Eric stated that what the plan is saying now is, first and foremost, we want the Scinto type development. If all things were equal and we had our choice that is what we'd like. But, we also have to recognize that all the employees need a place to eat, a place for daycare, drycleaners, banks, etc. These are ancillary retail uses that are supportive of that

office/research/industrial environment. We don't want a place where people come from Monroe for shopping; this is set up for support for the people who are there for a purpose. Perhaps the bank or small retail function could be integrated right into the office building. We don't want to discourage that and we don't want to encourage retail and commercial development of the land.

Eric explained that the map Mr. Wells was referring to was not a zoning map. It is a Future Land Use Map to be used for guiding future zoning decisions. It is not saying that his land is going to be zoned office/park district; it is just saying that we want to encourage office/park development in that area.

Another member of the public expressed the importance of the Brownfield's and how it is a critical piece when you look at the downtown redevelopment and the opportunities to create the taxes that you are talking about in the tax base. The state program that was launched three years ago can provide grants to developers upfront, and doesn't cost the town any money, and creates a program between the town and the state which then generates lots of taxes. That is a key to Brownfield redevelopments; getting the developers upfront funding. Another thing he mentioned was certain slivers of properties, one being the property above Blockbuster on Commerce Blvd. which is zoned for light industrial. We have to be very careful of what type of uses that go into certain properties that are sensitive or on rivers so that we don't end up with a Jiffy Lube or a storage plant which would not be the best use for a site like that.

Terry Gallagher thanked Eric for emailing certain sections of the plan to him. He said he wanted the plan to mention the Shelton Lakes Recreation Path as a major capital project by the City. It was formally adopted by the Board of Aldermen, P&Z, Inland Wetlands Commission and the city has gotten some grants for it and we have completed about a third of phase I. We have spent about \$255K on it so far. Because he works as a civil engineer getting permits around the state that he agrees wholeheartedly that we need a better capital facilities plan for the long range planning. He mentioned the current spending projects going on. A lot of other towns in the state are a lot stricter than Shelton when it come to requiring public infrastructure improvements when a zone change or a PDD goes in, whether it is sidewalks or fixing roads or culverts or any other necessary improvements. If you are just putting in a two-lot subdivision I don't think the City should ask you to put in a half-mile sidewalk. But if you are a developer putting in a multi-million dollar office building or subdivision I don't think it's unreasonable for the City to ask you to put in sidewalks. I think the key factor in this program is recommending a more organized plan than what has been done in the past. He said he would be sending in written comments to the committee when he has gone through the rest.

One gentleman discussed the public relations aspect of the plan. He feels there is a brick wall between Planning & Zoning, land use boards and the residents. It has to be broken down and there has to be communication between the residents and land use boards. He feels it will reach a point when the public won't have an opportunity to speak. He said he liked what is going on here tonight showing things that he has never seen before. He was surprised to be

charged \$20 for a copy of the plan. He asked over the time period since they started this plan, how many zone changes, how many PDDs, how much land has been lost, and how much more development will take place over the next 6 months? Are they starting to follow this plan or will they catch up?

Eric Barz responded that development is occurring faster than his office can keep up and keep changing the map. Rick Schultz, Frank Osak and Tom Harbinson and Jim Tate from the Conservation Commission have been feeding me information to try and keep the maps up to date. We still have a few months before this will be adopted but this document is not regulation, it's a policy document to provide policy guidelines and it will take time after adoption for these strategies to be put into place. Some things can be tackled right away, and some could take years. In regards to the PDD process, P&Z has heard loud and clear, and they have opened up the regulations and are trying to put some standards in there that will hopefully address the residents concerns. They are not waiting for the plan; they heard it and are doing something about it now. The actions of the Planning & Zoning Commission are currently guided by the 1993 plan. Until this plan is adopted, it is not policy.

Frank Osak explained the funding process for this plan and the fact that they have spread the funding over 3 fiscal years. In regards to the gentleman's comments about having to spend \$20 for a copy is frankly, we didn't have the money to make 4000 copies of this document. The plan is on the city web site if anyone has the capability to view it.

Mr. Cribbins made the comment that for those who are new to this process, there is special legal significance to this document. Although it is advisory it is commonly referenced in lawsuits against municipalities. It has standing and is recognized by the courts. For someone like Royal Wells who has the concern that a land use map doesn't provide him the flexibility, it may provide a barrier. I think if any residents that are interested in a particular point in there, that they object to or not, may need to understand that if it is in there or not in there, that it may have a bearing in a legal matter. Another thing that the City has done very well with, and I don't know how you'd address it in the plan is, in the case of downtown they have had several occasions had an interim use of properties. The Slab, for example, while we were waiting for development to happen there the City used it for open space, recreation and a staging area. The City has leased certain property for a mini park while they are waiting for a long-term development plan. Where the elderly housing is there was a mini park for a while. I think if the Plan made a reference to looking at properties that have a long-term use but a short-term public use that there should be standards or priorities set for that. Interim uses for properties.

Judith Augusta said that she commended all for the work you've done. It is a very insightful and thoughtful plan. I would like to urge you to expand the mass transit section of the plan. With the oil problems we are facing I think there should be more encouragement of mass transit – different kinds of mass transit with larger vehicles and small vehicles to take residents from residential to commercial and industrial areas of the City and beyond. I also wondered if the design review you suggested would apply to outlying areas and the corridor as

well as downtown and Huntington center? The other question I have is regarding building height recommendations – is there anything in the plan?

Eric Barz responded that there are no specific requirements in the plan for residential areas regarding building heights. The PDD has been used to replace the height standards of the R-1 to allow significantly higher buildings. What the plan is doing is saying don't use PDD anymore in residential areas; limit them to commercial areas and limit them to the uses ordinarily allowed in the zones prior to the PDDs being adopted but buildings and flexibility and require the developers to produce development superior to that might be capable under the existing zoning. If someone comes along on a piece of commercial land and they feel they could do a better job if they had the flexibility to put a building closer to the street than the regulation allows but put sidewalks there and make it pedestrian friendly, and the current regulations say no, put the building 100' from the street, they can't do that under the current regulations so a PDD might allow them to do something a little more creative that might be better for the community. It should not be used to take a piece of commercial land and turn it into residential condominiums or a piece of residential land and turn it into an office building. We are saying to ream that in and make it a more specific tool for creating superior development to that which is allowed normally. There are a couple of different tools for design guidelines. In downtown Shelton and Huntington Center, the tool that is probably most appropriate is called a Village District. The Village District is adopted by P&Z Commission and allows them to regulate the esthetics of new development or redevelopment. Under normal circumstances P&Z Commissions are treading on thin ice if they try and regulate esthetics of development. What a Village District says is that P&Z can say we want buildings close to the street; we want 8' sidewalks; we want park benches; we want landscaping; we want 2-3 story to go along with the other buildings; etc. They can legally specify that and the developers have to provide it. They have to find a middle ground where they won't be breaking the bank of the developers so you don't discourage development by the requirements. This way they are assured that all development will be held to the same standards. This plan has a suggestion of a design review committee that may consist of architects, landscape architects, engineers, planners; people with expertise of design and land development to create guidelines. They would spell out what the City would like to see.

Frank Osak asked Eric Barz to explain the change in the statues that changes the way the town adopts the Plan regarding the legislative body. Eric explained that the legislature felt the need to build a public input component into the planning process. Many cities and towns who developed their plans held their public hearing and then adopted their plans with very little public input. The legislators changed it so that prior to the adoption of the plan, the P&Z Commission refer the Plan to the legislative body of the town for its review and comment prior to the hearing on adoption. This was forcing the towns to bring it out in the open. It was well intended but to us we felt your involvement is one of the most important aspects of the plan. If we don't have you on board, it's not going to be implemented. We need you to hound the Boards and Commissions

to make sure that the strategies that are important to you get implemented. We had workshops in the beginning plus this informational meeting tonight. This was not happening in other towns, so that is why they had the legislation changed. In short, they made a change not contemplating communities with Boards of Selectmen and town meeting form of government. What they said was now, the P&Z Commission shall hold their hearing, create the Proposed Plan of Conservation and Development, and then refer that to the legislative body. If you have a Board of Selectmen town meeting form of government it shall go to the Board of Selectmen who will review and endorse it within 35 days and send it back to the P&Z Commission. They addressed the problem with town meeting form of government but left a big gaping hole. They didn't say Board of Aldermen, or town and city councils have 35 days to respond. So, we are having this meeting tonight for your input, the committee will take that into consideration, make modifications and forward it to Planning & Zoning, who will review the plan and create what they call the proposed Plan of Conservation and Development. They will refer that to the Board of Aldermen and they have no time limit but are required by the statute to review and endorse all or parts of the plan and send back to the P&Z Commission who would in turn adopt the plan. When we started this process it would have gone to the Board of Aldermen for 65 days prior to the hearing. Now it goes to them after the hearing for an unspecified time.

Tom Harbinson asked Eric Barz to touch on mass transit and the interaction with the other agencies such as the Valley Regional Planning and the DOT. Eric stated that the Valley Regional Planning and the Transit District are all working together to create a mass transit plan for the region. One of the strategies in the plan is for the City to work closely with the region to make sure that they address the mass transit needs in Shelton. There are also strategies such as adding additional bus shelters along the routes.

Another resident expressed concern over the congestion on Route 8. It seems to be increasing rapidly. It is such an important by-way for Shelton. It seems relatively clear that land occupancy is moving north and employment remains in Shelton and south.

Eric said they recognize there are bottlenecks there and Route 8 is beyond the City's control. All you can do is try to effect change through your legislators and elected officials to exert pressure for things that need to be done. The problem on Route 8 if there is an accident it forces people off Route 8 and a lot of times they don't know where to go. The traffic lights aren't set up to handle the massive influx of traffic from Route 8, so we recommend the City pursue with the State and the Region what we call incident management system which might be those electronic sign boards which would indicate where the heavy congestion is and where alternative route are. You might integrate that with a signal system along Route 8.

Ann Walsh thanked Eric and the committee for listening to all the inputs and expressed the wish not to forget south Shelton. There are a lot of bottlenecks and congestion in the south Shelton area, especially around Sikorsky to the Route 8 bridge. Center Street is also an area heavily congested; it's not just Huntington Center. Also my concern regarding zoning is, I don't know how a

house on a street gets that had a house and garage, where the garage disappears and now there is another house built in its place. I don't know how it occurs but I would like to see it's review so all the additional homes that are sprouting up in south Shelton on these little pieces of land. This type of development doesn't get mentioned; just the ones that have an acre or more. Eric responded that is what they call in-fill development. What is happening is, for instance, someone had a house and a garage on ¼ acre and the house was situated such that they could put another house and keep all the yard requirements of that R-5 zone. The zoning didn't change they just have excess land. It is very common in older developed areas. He also said that in response to the gentleman's comments from earlier where he was concerned about increasing densities. There are several points in the plan where we say that has to stop. If someone has 10 acres of land and they have to give 10% open space, it gives them 9 building lots. If they do a conservation development or similar that creates more open space, they shouldn't get additional housing in return for that open space.

Alderman Joe Lanzi said that the area Ann was discussing are where the lots are 50'x100'. There isn't much elbowroom as it is.

Alderman Chris Panek said that he found it amazing that we had to spread the cost of this plan over 3 fiscal years. This plan should have been given the same amount of attention as the City charter, which is updated every 10 years. I did read the plan and found it very comprehensive. The open space is a high priority and everyone agrees that we have done a great job in the acquisition and the administration and Boards should be commended. It seems that the average citizen is concerned over the development of Bridgeport Ave. and the traffic, plus the concerns of farmland being turned into residential development. I would like to see if there is a way to get funding to do a mass mailing of this plan; obviously not the whole document, but things that would directly affect the citizens. I also recognize the importance of implementation of the plan. One thing I had a question on was when you mentioned development of the property across from the White Hills Shopping Center, what is the zoning?

Eric responded that right now it's zoned R-1. The thought of the committee was because of the brook to the rear and it's location along Route 110 that the likelihood of it being developed into single-family homes is pretty remote. They didn't want to suggest rezoning it commercial to have the shopping center being able to spill across the street but specify it as a limited professional office. This might be a residentially scaled office building. This would serve as a buffer from the commercial uses and the residential. This is only 1 or 2 parcels that we are talking about.

A question came up about affordable housing and how we can do a better job in meeting the standards without development in inappropriate areas.

Eric stated that there are recommendations in the plan. When we did the inventory of Shelton we found that Shelton is relatively affordable compared to other Fairfield County communities. This is due to the multi-family homes and small single-family homes, condos and apartments. We have only met 3% of the State's goal but the State's definition is one that the funding is assisted through

CT housing finance authority or Section 8 certificates to offset the rent, or deed restricted for 30 years. What we propose in the plan is to require a small amount of affordable housing for every development. If a developer doesn't want to provide for that we would get a fee-in-lieu of affordable housing. This money would not go into the general fund; it would be earmarked for affordable housing. One example of what to do with the money is to purchase a property that has been on the blight list, renovate it, put a 30-year deed restriction on it to guarantee the affordability, and then put it back on the market. Then you can take the proceeds from that sale and move on to another property, and do the same thing.

Another comment came up about addressing the "McMansion's" and balancing revenue in this plan. You have to address the "tear-downs" and large housing. This could be a problem that could just start sneaking up on you and then you realize you have a problem. It should be addressed in the standards with the Village Districts. I could see this happening in quite a few areas. Also, as this plan is being revised, how can we keep track until P&Z gets the plan? How does the average person trying to follow along to the revisions?

Eric responded that this is a 175-page document and it would be almost impossible to redline and make the changes you request. The only thing I could recommend is that P&Z and PUAC keep a separate running documentary on what is being changed.

Frank Osak responded that implementation is obviously the key to success. The last 9 pages of the plan address the strategies for implementation. It assigns a priority and responsibility to each. The committee members want to continue after the adoption to insure that the plan is implemented.

Mr. Steiner brought up the fact that the attitude of the public and the administration has to be one that it is a viable document. The past plan was treated rather poorly, going out of date. The public, Planning & Zoning Commission and the Board of Aldermen have to really embrace it and willing to put their support in the document. Then when people move into the community they can know what the city will look like in 10 years. Many towns not only have a 10-year plan, but a 10-year fiscal plan as well. He also said there are many reasons why more people aren't here tonight. Had the plan been available earlier the attendance may have been better. In the earlier meetings, I felt that we were almost being spoon-fed. There are a lot of proud people who don't want to be spoon-fed. They want to give their impression so you could take it and run with it. When they sat down they were given a piece of paper and told what to do with it, which was totally alien to what they want their town to look like; they got burned out a bit. There are also a lot of people who work long hours and when they get home they are tired, and when they get this 175-page document the day before; how are they going to have time to make a meaningful contribution?

Frank Osak responded that this is not the final document and there will be more time to make comment. All we can do is do the best with what we got and why we are here tonight.

Mr. Wells made note of the fact that Shelton absorbs a lot of population from the surrounding areas. There are neighboring towns like Easton who has 3-acre

zoning and they don't want anyone else there. We have a great balance in Shelton and sometimes we lose sight of that. We have to absorb people and it's a shame that other towns aren't open to it. We should be thankful we live in Shelton and we have great people here and those who will speak up. We are moving forward and our tax base is fair.

Another suggestion is to get some money to have more draft copies printed and placed in more areas around town.

Eric Barz and Frank Osak thanked the residents for their attendance and participation.

The residents in the audience thanked Eric and the committee and commended them on the plan.

Respectfully submitted,

Marianne Chaya  
Clerk, Plan Update Advisory Committee  
2 tapes are on file in the City/Town Clerk's office