

PLAN UPDATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes

Room 104, Shelton City Hall

Shelton, CT

Monday, March 14, 2005

I. Call to Order

Chairman Frank Osak called the meeting to order at approximately 4:30 P.M.

Members Present:

**Frank Osak, Chairman
Fred Musante
Tom Harbinson
Anthony Pogoda**

**Peter DiCarlo, Vice Chairman
Michael Adanti
Jim Tate**

Also in attendance:

**Rick Schultz, PZC staff
Marianne Chaya, Clerk
Glenn Chalder, Planimetrics
Eric Barz, Planimetrics**

II. Pledge of Allegiance

All in attendance pledged allegiance to the flag.

III. Minutes for Approval

Tom Harbinson MOVED to approve the minutes from the March 7, 2005 meeting. SECONDED by Fred Musante. All were in favor, MOTION PASSED.

IV. Discussion of contract with consultant: Planimetrics

Frank Osak asked Peter DiCarlo to go over the proposed changes to the contract.

Peter DiCarlo stated that they would like to amend the contract. After discussions with Glenn and Eric regarding a short fused program as opposed to extending the time on the current contract, we decided we could extend the contract and continue with the original contract. The other changes that we decided on is that we elected to forgo the telephone survey and to amend the contract in regards to the number of public hearings on the draft plan. The current contract calls for four, we would like to reduce that to one. We think that there are additional tasks that we would like to accomplish as far as the on-going effort. At the moment they are unspecified. Before we get in to additional effort we would like to quickly review where we are and how we will proceed. In

conversation that Peter and Frank had with Glenn and Eric we felt that on each of these 4 issues that are contained in Conditions & Trends, Conservation Issues, Development Issues and Infrastructure Issues; we don't know exactly where Planimetrics is at in terms of completion or readiness to submit a workbook. With that we would ask as each is ready to send to us with a week to digest the contents and then meet. If out of those meetings we feel we need to meet w/Planimetrics again, then we realize that there might be associated costs with that. Peter asked Frank to summarize the comment he made regarding our objectives and to have that statement kept in mind as Planimetrics addresses the various issues.

Frank Osak stated that we were concerned about the Land Use Analysis/Zoning/Buildout Analysis. We are saying to ourselves is the mission we have is to be sure that in the future we have the proper Grand List makeup, which is rich with taxable assessment and not as rich in service requirements, if such a thing could be put together. In seeking that we are going to be in the middle of a lot of "what if" discussions. "What if we have a greater amount of residential development versus commercial/industrial", or "what if we have more commercial/industrial"? I am saying to myself, are we getting the most addition to the Grand List from that part of our zoning that is not conducive to residential but for commercial/industrial? What are we getting from the residential buildout of the community? Maybe it is paying for itself and we shouldn't be concerned. Of all of the issues, no one has their finger on. We think we know, but we don't. We are concerned about the fact that in seeking the answers to those things if we consume all our money in the quick run-through of this thing and we really never stop and ask the "what if's", that we probably wouldn't do our job. That is what really drove us to conserve that money we will save by eliminating some of the services. We have gut feelings about this and we really won't know until we take a look at it. Our 2004 Grand List grew \$58M. 12% was from commercial/industrial, 85% residential and personal property and the rest was motor vehicles. We keep slipping away from the commercial/industrial component growing in match with residential. A match would be 22-23% of industrial/commercial. If that continues, will that be ok for the next 10 years?

Fred Musante stated that there isn't much you can do about it; it's reality. If we breakdown various elements that we have such as private homes, condos, apartment complexes, office buildings, and commercial/industrial; and put together a profile of those. Take each element and determine what services they would use and look at the demographics. Then you would start to get a picture and a factor that you could apply and get some direction. There is talk now of some apartment complexes coming in. What happens when you build 300 apartments? What is this going to mean? You can do this by starting to assign and presume certain things based upon our experience. 100% of services go to private homes, we know that. Education is a key. How many children from each group go to school, because 70% of our budget is education?

Glenn Chalder asked if the funds were in place so Planimetrics could continue?

Peter DiCarlo stated that the funds were in place and Glenn Chalder said that they just need a letter to that fact. They need to put in writing the amendments that were suggested

Glenn stated that they are ready, willing and able to pick up the ball where they left it and go.

Peter DiCarlo stated that one concern is that what we are dealing with as we go forward is probably 10% of the total land area that is usable and undeveloped. The question is what is the optimum use.

Glenn Chalder responded that the Plan of Conservation is more than the land use plan for undeveloped land today. It's also about redevelopment of the downtown area and how we try and encourage getting more economic value out of our existing business areas so we have a fiscally balanced community. All these things come into play.

They discussed the fiscal and physical buildouts that are done in relation to the potentials. Eric Barz gave some ideas on some of the strategies.

Glenn Chalder expressed that 9 months ago Shelton hired them to do a job and all we have done is talk about things and have several "contract" related meetings.

Jim Tate commented that all that is behind us now. Now going forward he would like a continuation of the interchanges like we just had. There was a conversation made relative to a topic about what Frank thought the end goal of the plan was to be, and then you commented on that as to how you made that approach. We want those conversations to occur in a dialog so you can take that information back and regurgitate that as planners do, and put it into a product that is saleable to the community. What we don't want to happen, where you've sat at meetings, collected data and at the very end with a report, which would be a good planning document, for you. But for us, we want the input into the document so it's truly our document. I think we are all on the same page here, and we want to make sure we spend the hours going forward, having these good interchanges. If we're wrong, you can tell us we are wrong, and if we have good thoughts, then that would be in the plan. You have comparables to Windsor. I am sure that evolved through series of discussions. Frankly, it has been frustrating to us that we have had to spend so many discussions regarding the contract.

The committee members and Planimetrics discussed again what exactly is to be done and what is in mind with the money for the items taken out. Glenn Chalder asked if they could give some consideration for the time put in, at least 60 hours on non-contract related work, which is \$6000 worth of time. He doesn't expect to be paid in full for that time, but it is time they have spun their wheels in good

faith. This is the first time that Planimetrics has done this without the money in place from the beginning, running through the available funding and then we ended up with a lull.

Frank Osak agreed and said that if he knew this would have happened he might never have agreed to be on this committee. This has put us through a lot of time.

Peter DiCarlo stated that he realized that they would need to negotiate a reasonable, in everyone's view, in terms of the additional effort Planimetrics put in.

Glenn Chalder stated that when we started this project he felt we were mentally and emotionally connected with each other. Somewhere along the way in the last 3-6 months, we have become emotionally disconnected. We are treating this contract as a business transaction. Planimetrics has never done that. We are there for you. If you say jump, we ask how high? This is not meant as criticism, but things went awry and started going downhill and kept going. We want to re-establish the emotional connection that we have with all our clients and follow through and give you the exceptional plan that you want to pursue. This is what we do; this is what we excel at. So as far as where we are at, we have about \$60,000 to complete the work in the agreement, roughly. We just need a letter that says that the funds are in place.

Peter DiCarlo stated that the contract requires us to put the amendment in writing.

Glenn Chalder said that they also need to pick one day a month for a work session to go over the material that has been sent the week prior. They determined that it would be the 2nd Monday of each month that would be the work session meeting. Eric Barz stated that the first item delivered for review would be the introduction draft chapter on Conditions & Trends. It would include the land use, demographics, community meetings results and responses and the fiscal buildout. Once the physical buildout is done then we can take the analysis of the cost and revenues in terms of land uses and allocate it. At the meeting we would be discussion demographic trends and projections in the future. We will look at the current pattern of zoning; what land is available by zone; what the residential build out potential is; what the square footage potential is. We do the conditions and trends analysis and what is going on in the community so we have strong, firm factors. We look at the age composition in the community and how the fiscal needs of the community are going to be different in 20 years from now than they are today.

Fred Musante commented about what is happening with the school population. We hear that it will decline in the next 10 years and yet Leon Sylvester said it's not going to go down.

Glenn Chalder stated that they will not be making policy. The meeting on April 11 will be a review of conditions and trends, and pretty much everything except the fiscal buildout. The next meeting after that will be May 9, which will be about conservation strategies. June 13 will focus on development strategies. The fiscal buildout would occur sometime before June 13.

Frank Osak noted that the letter/amendment stating that the money has been appropriated should come from Alan Cribbins. The committee members agreed. Peter DiCarlo said he would write the amendment and pass it on to Alan Cribbins for his endorsement.

Jim Tate asked about the transportation analysis. Planimetrics indicated they are in contact with the traffic consultant.

Rick Schultz indicated that he would follow-up with the Brody group on the education map, which is the student distribution.

It was determined that they did not need to meet again until April 11.

Glenn Chalder said that he and Eric Barz would talk and map out what we think our meeting schedule would be until the end of the year in terms of the topics I think we will cover at each meeting. We will email that to Rick.

Peter DiCarlo mentioned that when we get to infrastructure, I don't want to forget the discussions we had previously regarding a capital investment program and some assessment of what is currently termed the capital investment program as opposed to perhaps what it should or shouldn't be.

Fred Musante MOVED to adjourn. SECONDED by Peter DiCarlo. All were in favor, MEETING ADJOURNED at 5:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

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