

PLAN UPDATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes

Room 104, Shelton City Hall

Shelton, CT

Monday, July 11, 2005

I. Call to Order

Chairman Frank Osak called the meeting to order at approximately 4:40 P.M.

Members Present:

Frank Osak, Chairman	Peter DiCarlo, Co-Chairman
Tom Harbinson	Fred Musante
Jim Tate	Anthony Pogoda

Also in attendance:

Marianne Chaya, Clerk

II. Pledge of Allegiance

All in attendance pledged allegiance to the flag.

III. Minutes for Approval

Tony Pogoda MOVED to approve the minutes from the June 27, 2005 meeting. SECONDED by Peter DiCarlo. All were in favor, MOTION PASSED.

IV. Discussion on responses to questions by Planimetrics

Peter DiCarlo noted that the answer to the first question showing the Business Property Values as a percentage of the Grand List appears that it is pretty flat. We do know that the last Grand List is only 12% commercial/industrial.

The State Dept. of Education agreed to look into why Monroe gets significantly more state aid than Shelton. They would be getting back to Eric Barz.

Peter DiCarlo mentioned that approval of an invoice from Barkan & Mess was to be put on the agenda. Peter and the rest of the committee felt why should they approve it when we haven't seen anything yet. The information has been passed on to Planimetrics and won't be available until the August meeting.

The timeline provided from Planimetrics was discussed and they noticed that there is nothing provided to PUAC in the month of September. Peter said that he would e-mail Eric to find out if this was an omission on purpose or not.

The initial consensus was that the answers to their questions gave them what they needed. There is still the need for data from the 2002, 2003 & 2004 Grand List percentages for the business property values as a percentage of the Grand List.

Tony Pogoda said that in regards to question #5, getting the maximum value from the remaining land available, what can be done with some of the residential or where? There was discussion of what would give us more to the Grand List. They also discussed various types of development in the Armstrong Rd. area and the possible impacts. It was noted that the answer to #5 wasn't very positive.

The feeling was that after the last meeting that we were on a good course and that Planimetrics would have a buildout for the next meeting, which would be representative of these comments. Then we are in a position to change the FLUP (future land use plan) to take advantage of all the things that were addressed in question #5. This would be an optimized FLUP and have them tell us what the buildout is going to do to us there. If there is a substantial difference between the two models in terms of revenue stream, it is reinforcement for introducing the FLUP and letting it be a gate. Even perhaps using some version of that modeling to understand the ramifications of any major activity that is being proposed that is contrary to the plan. We will see the FLUP from Planimetrics in November. The fiscal buildout analysis (based on the current land use plan) will be presented at the July 25 meeting. This will lead to the FLUP presentation. The schedule of upcoming events shows that this committee will finish the plan in January and it will take until June 2006 to be finally adopted by Planning & Zoning.

The question came up whether they should have Planimetrics do a second fiscal buildout analysis based on a revised FLUP. There has been some money set aside and it might be something to consider after the November presentation.

The question regarding residential land used for commercial/industrial purposes, Jim Tate pointed out that the question should be asked, what land in transition can be appropriately pushed to commercial? There are lands that are in transition, that have historical references that aren't purely R-1 on the plan.

Since there are 4500 acres of residential and 300 acres of commercial/industrial left, we have to make the 300 acres really count and leave the residential alone. The residential that you are looking that is open and near and dear to everyone.

The question arose about all the different zone districts in the plan now and is some of the zones obsolete. Some of the zones have become obsolete because of the use of the PDDs. The PDDs were never intended for residential. They were intended to give someone the design flexibility that would produce a better project rather than by the rigid standards of what the zone was. They also discussed some of the areas changed from industrial to residential.

They discussed how they thought when they got into doing this plan that there would be a lot of options for us and we could be really creative. We don't have a lot of options. There is just a small area of land available to plan for. We will

need to stick to our guns on the residential density and focus on the maximum return on the rest. There was discussion on restoration of downtown and continuing on down to the river front properties south along Route 110. It was discussed how much input this committee is going to make on the future land uses for areas such as downtown, the Mas property, Constitution Blvd, the riverbank area along Route 110, and some of the downtown areas such as around Lafayette School. Planimetrics will give some general guidelines but this committee may need to make recommendations and what direction the City should take or explore for the land that been acquired or will be acquired. They also discussed some of the limited possibilities in the White Hills area along Route 110 for commercial use. We will wait to see what Planimetrics presents before getting into the details of recommendations of future land use for the areas discussed earlier.

V. Schedule Next Meeting

The next meeting date is Monday, July 25, 2005.

VI. Adjournment

Peter DiCarlo MOVED to adjourn. SECONDED by Fred Musante. All were in favor, meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

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