

**ORDINANCE COMMITTEE  
MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING  
FEBRUARY 4, 2008**

The Ordinance Committee of the Board of Aldermen held a meeting and public session on Monday, February 4, 2008. Chairman J. Patterson called the meeting to order at 6:51 p.m. and read the public notice as posted in the New Haven Register on January 29, 2008.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

J. Patterson, Chairman  
J. Blacketter, Vice Chairman  
N. Veccharelli  
V. Ditchkus  
A. Gianattasio

Chairman J. Patterson opened the public session of the Ordinance Committee at 6:51 p.m. regarding the following Ordinance:

An Ordinance Amending Chapter 18, Article X, Section 18-131 of the Milford Code of Ordinances and Chapter 18, Article XII, Section 18-169 of the Milford Code of Ordinances (Name Change of Agency from Milford Human Resources Development to Department of Human Services.

Speakers in Favor:

L. Diamond-Graham – stated she is the Executive Director of Milford Human Resources Development Agency also known as HRD. She stated she is very much in favor of changing the name to Milford Department of Human Services. She state she is also here tonight representing her Board of Directors and asking the Board to pass this Ordinance to allow them to change their name. She stated she has been with the agency for 25 years and since day one it has been very confusing as to what HRD stands for and what they do. She explained their mission is to ensure that the people in the City of Milford are aware of what services they provide. She stated they hear very often that people in the City are not aware they are here. She also stated the new name is far more representative of what they do and are here for. She also commented they will be moving to Stern Hall, the old Milford Academy and that they will be ordering new stationary, etc and would like to do it all as one. She thanked the Committee for their time and stated she would be more than happy to answer any questions anyone had.

Speakers Opposed - None

Chairman Patterson closed the public session at 6:54 p.m.

Ald. Blacketter and Ald. Veccharelli made and seconded a motion to forward to the full Board a favorable recommendation an Ordinance Amending Chapter 18, Article X, Section 18-131 of the Milford Code of Ordinances and Chapter 18, Article XII, Section 18-169 of the Milford Code of Ordinances (Name Change of

Agency from Milford Human Resources Development to Department of Human Services. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Patterson stated at this time he would like to take up the tabled matter from last month, an Ordinance Amending Chapter 6-5 and 6-6 of Chapter 6 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Milford (Demolition Delay).

Ald. Blacketter began to make a motion . . . .

Ald Ditchkus raised a point of order stating a motion was needed to remove the tabled item.

Ald. Veccharelli and Ald. Blacketter made and seconded a motion to remove from the table an Ordinance Amending Chapter 6-5 and 6-6 of Chapter 6 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Milford (Demolition Delay).

By roll call vote, motion carried 3 yes (Veccharelli, Patterson, Blacketter) and 2 no (Ditchkus, Giannattasio).

Ald. Blacketter and Ald. Veccharelli made and seconded a motion to forward to the full Board with a favorable recommendation an Ordinance Amending Chapter 6-5 and 6-6 of Chapter 6 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Milford.

Ald. Ditchkus asked if this was run through the City Attorney and if she wrote and approved this Ordinance.

Chairman Patterson responded he spoke with the City Attorney and that she was somewhat in agreement.

Ald. Ditchkus asked if they were being asked to vote on changes from 45 days to 90 days and 75 years previously 50 years.

Ald. Giannattasio commented he thought they were looking at the years.

Chairman Patterson responded it was the Ordinance as noticed last month and the amendment to 90 days for the delay.

Ald. Ditchkus stated he had concerns with the Ordinance proposed last month. In particular, he stated he was concerned with the language that you must submit something in writing attesting to the year the structure was built and what would happen if they were unable to do so.

Attorney Lipton responded you could put “unknown to the best of that person’s ability”.

Ald. Ditchkus stated he still was concerned what the penalty would be if someone were unable to put something in writing. He stated there are many buildings that are best guesses and no actual time frame.

Attorney Lipton stated her office did not write the language in this Ordinance. She explained her office was only requested to advertise and notice the Ordinance, which they did. She stated she subsequently discussed portions of this Ordinance with the Chairman.

Ald. Ditchkus asked if the language was sufficient.

Attorney Lipton stated you could take out “doubt” and replace it with language that would tell someone what you were going to do. She stated you could also supply an architect’s best guesstimate, but you leave the question open.

Ald. Giannattasio suggested they get the language qualified and leave it on the table.

Ald. Blake suggested incorporating into the language “that this is a rebuttal presumption that the building is over 75 years”.

Ald. Ditchkus stated while he appreciates the comments of the Chairman, he believed this should go through the City Attorney and get the proper language. He also pointed out there is a hearing next week regarding the Cadley property so they should do it right. He stated he had grave concerns this was not run by the City Attorney. He also commented they are supposed to be protecting the City stating this was wrong not to run this through the City Attorney. He stated to do this haphazardly was wrong and that they should not be trying to piecemeal this. He suggested the Committee do the right thing and table this and have the City Attorney write up the language. He also pointed out the City Attorney is the one being paid to do this.

Ald. Blacketter suggested they alter the statement “submit in writing the structure was built or best estimate”.

Attorney Lipton asked it was a best “estimate of whom”.

Ald. Giannattasio stated he would be more comfortable voting on a revision that he can have in hand and review and that he was not able to review this. He stated he would also like to see the City Attorney provide the language.

Ald. Ditchkus expressed his concerns this was not initially run by the City Attorney. He stated without her review they could leave themselves up for liability. He asked the Committee to do it right and that was what he was asking. He stated the motivation behind the Ordinance is good but reiterated the importance of doing it right from the start. He asked the Committee table it and forward it to the City Attorney.

Ald. Ditchkus and Ald. Giannattasio made and seconded a motion to table the matter and forward it to the City Attorney for review and have her put in the proper language.

By roll call vote, motion fails 3 no (Veccharelli, Patterson, Blacketter) and 2 yes (Ditchkus, Giannattasio).

Ald. Blacketter and Ald. Veccharelli made and seconded a motion to amend the part of Section 6-5, the paragraph that states “built prior to 1902 to read “*is at least 75 years old*”.

Ald. Giannattasio commented at the last meeting the City Historian was going to come up with an inventory list. He stated before they vote he would like that list and asked why he had not received a copy.

Ald. Blacketter stated at the last meeting this was tabled to see what impact this would have to the Building Department. She stated she contacted the Building Department and was transferred to the Assessor’s Office and that this really only comes down to a matter of 1 or 2 homes.

Ald. Ditchkus stated the information he has is that the concern is whether it is 50 years and now it is 75 years. He stated they are talking about 50% of the homes in Milford that would fall into this category. He also commented he believed Ald. Blacketter was looking at a partial list. He reiterated his concerns that they do this right and take their time. He also commented he felt they were putting all their eggs in one basket with the City Historian and that while he is very fair he may not always be the City Historian and that there may not be someone as fair as he in the future. Ald. Ditchkus also stated they were delaying the process for the homeowner and they were tying up the general public.

Ald. Ditchkus and Ald. Giannattasio made and seconded a motion to amend the motion to reduce this down to at least 60 days from 90 days.

Ald. Blacketter stated they did a fair amount of research and 90 days is consistent with other towns.

Ald. Giannattasio stated it is not a problem with the years. He questioned the study and the norm of 90 days and questioned whether these towns have the same burden as our City's Building Department. He stated 60 days is more than enough time and reasonable.

By roll call vote the amendment (to the first amendment) failed 3 no (Veccharelli, Patterson, Blacketter) and 2 no (Ditchkus, Giannattasio).

By roll call vote the amendment carried 3 yes (Veccharelli, Patterson, Blacketter) and 2 no (Ditchkus, Giannattasio).

Ald. Giannattasio reiterated the comments made earlier that the City Attorney did not look at this and that they should have her look at it before moving forward tonight.

On the main motion, by roll call vote, the motion carried 3 yes (Veccharelli, Patterson, Blacketter) and 2 no (Ditchkus, Giannattasio).

Ald. Veccharelli and Ald. Blacketter moved to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously.

The Committee adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen K. Huber  
Board Secretary