

**MINUTES FOR A LEFT OPEN PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

The Chair called to order the April 20, 2011 Planning and Zoning meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Edward Mead, Mark Bender, Robert Dickman, Janet Golden, KathyLynn Patterson, George Gasper, Victor Ferrante, Kevin Liddy, Susan Shaw, Chair.

Not Present: Gregory Vetter, Vice Chair

Staff: David Sulkis, City Planner; Emmeline Harrigan, Assistant City Planner; Phyllis Leggett, Board Clerk.

Mme. Chair: Asked for a motion to reorder the agenda to allow Item Number 2 to be presented before Item Number 1.

Kevin Liddy: So moved

Mrs. Golden: Second.

All members voted in favor of reordering the agenda.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. **1201 BOSTON POST ROAD (ZONE SCD) – WESTFIELD MALL**
Review of previously approved Westfield Pedestrian Bridge on East Town Road.

John Knuff, Esq., 147 Broad Street, Milford. He is here on behalf of Westfield, Inc. and the Connecticut Post Mall. When the last expansion of the Mall occurred for approvals that were obtained in 2004, an issue arose with the parking deck that is directly adjacent to the Sears store. It was required that the parking deck be restriped and some spaces were lost, approximately 72 spaces overall and they were required to obtain a waiver from the Board at that time. At the time that the waiver was requested, there was a lot of activity taking place on Old Gate Lane, particularly the Lowe's and Hilton Garden development as well as some other hotels in the area. There was concern by the Board, in particular the Chairman, Jack Jansen, about the pedestrians along East Town Road. East Town Road is not a public road. It is owned entirely by Westfield. There are sidewalks that stretch from Old Gate Lane on both sides of East Town Road up to the Bridge over the Indian River, but there is no pedestrian bridge

**MINUTES FOR A LEFT OPEN PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

across the Indian River, so there was a legitimate concern by the Commission for pedestrians who might be going back and forth on East Town Road. To allow for East Town Road, not only did Westfield propose and the Commission approve the bridge, but other improvements were proposed to make pedestrian travel much more safe. The Board has received the plans which are highlighted in order to delineate all the changes that were proposed and that will be constructed very soon.

Orange = the crosswalks and new sidewalks that are proposed.

Blue = new fencing that will be located along the river.

Green = the new bridge itself.

Yellow= rumble strips from both approaches, so as you get to the four corners of the ring road and the Stop & Shop entrance, drivers will be put on notice that they should be slowing down.

Pink = two flashing signs that are activated by pedestrians that they will be crossing.

When the approval was made it contained a provision that the bridge is to be built to the satisfaction of the Board. That is why they are here tonight; to receive the Board's approval of the plan.

Mr. Knuff referred to the third page of his handout which showed a prototypical bridge that the pedestrian bridge will look like and the fourth photo is a proposed fence that will tie into the bridge itself. Originally it was called out to be a chain link fence, but Staff requested a more attractive fence be installed. Therefore, an aluminum fence that looks like wrought iron will be used in place of the chain link fence.

The bridge will rarely be seen by anyone unless someone is actually walking across it. It will be built several feet away from and parallel to the vehicular bridge that crosses the Indian River.

A condition of approval was that the Planning and Zoning Board would have the final approval of this plan and that is why it is being presented to the Board tonight.

Mr. Sulkis: Stated that this is exactly how the Board had envisioned this project many years ago and this is the end of a very long road. He commended Westfield for doing such a good job and following through on this particular requirement.

Mr. Bender: Noted that the crosswalk goes to the Stop & Shop side on the corner it is very overgrown. Asked if there was a plan to clear that section out so there would be a line of sight for the crosswalk and to have a point for the people coming onto that crosswalk.

Mr. Knuff: Thinks the goal would be to clear out the vegetation in those areas.

**MINUTES FOR A LEFT OPEN PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mr. Liddy: Stated at the time this project was being discussed, he noted that vegetation along the sidewalks on both sides leading up to Old Gate Lane should be cleared out.

Mrs. Patterson: Made a motion to approve the new pedestrian bridge that will be constructed by Westfield, Inc. on East Town Road, with the new plans that were distributed to the Board; keeping in mind that the overgrowth be cleaned out so as to increase visibility for traffic as well as pedestrians.

Mrs. Golden: Second.

Mr. Liddy: Proposed there be an amendment made to substitute the aluminum fence in place of the chain link fence that has originally been proposed.

Mr. Dickman: Second.

All members voted in favor of the amendment. The amendment passed unanimously.

Mme. Chair: Vote on the motion.

All members voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

C. PUBLIC HEARING LEFT OPEN - CLOSING BY 4/20/11; Expires 5/19/11

2. 89 POND POINT AVENUE – 3 LOT RESUBDIVISION (ZONE R-12.5)

Petition of Two Ninety Six LLC/Gregory Field, for approval of a three-lot re-subdivision to construct two single family residences on Map 57, Block 529, Parcel 45A, of which Two Ninety Six LLC is the owner.

George Adams, Esq., Harlow, Adams and Friedman, 300 Bic Drive, Milford.

Announced that Robert Wheway, the engineer of the project would not be able to arrive until eight o'clock. Mr. Adams could proceed until Mr. Wheway arrives.

Mme. Chair: Agreed that would be a good idea.

The applicant is Two Ninety-Six LLC, and one of the principals, Gregory Field, is also present. Mr. Adams summarized the project as being a 3-lot subdivision in the R-12.5 zone. It is fully conforming in all respects and includes a rear lot with a 25-foot access way with a full acre in the back. There was also a small strip of land that will be exchanged with the neighbor.

The public hearing was kept open because of questions regarding the trees and some questions regarding the drainage.

**MINUTES FOR A LEFT OPEN PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mr. Adams described the newly substituted Sheet SP-5, submitted this evening which gave a calculation of the calipers of trees, which was requested at the last meeting. The engineers measured the trees and verified there are six times as many trees as are required by the regulations. The regulations require 75 inches of caliper measured at breast height for certain size trees per acre and 75 inches x 1.72 acres means there must be a total of 129 inches of on-site tree caliper. After doing the measurements it was established that Lot 1 had 143 inches of caliper; Lot 2 had 581 inches of caliper and Lot 3 had 85 inches of caliper.

With regard to the drainage, the Brannons who live at 235 Shadyside Lane testified at the last hearing that they have had a drainage problem for over 40 years and they did not want the water runoff to increase. Sheet SP-5 is a drainage study that shows that the drainage work will not increase water runoff onto their property.

Mr. Codespoti did a full drainage study and a 25-page report has been submitted for the file. The conclusion of that report is that this project will not cause the Brannons a problem, rather their situation will be improved. Westcott and Mapes, who was the on-call engineer who reviewed the drainage study made by Codespoti, the project engineer, wrote a letter to Bruce Kolwicz, Director of Public Works, dated April 13, 2011, wherein they state that the calculations prepared by Codespoti & Associates appear technically sound and accurate. No exception was taken to the material presented. The calculations conform to the standards of the City of Milford and the results demonstrate a decrease in peak flow and a decrease in volume of runoff under the plan's proposed conditions. The two respected engineering firms; one working for the applicant and the other working for the City have come to that conclusion.

The Brannon's other concern was how could they be assured that what is being proposed will actually be built. Mr. Adams stated that the property owners are willing to provide the Brannons with as-builts done by an engineer, with the construction of the drainage facility supervised by an engineer. These will be on file to show that what was built was what was supposed to be built.

Mr. Adams stated it was regrettable that the Brannons have a water problem and they may continue to have one, but the Codespoti study and Westcott and Mapes response indicates that this project will not be aggravating the Brannon's problem and perhaps will be alleviating a portion of their water problem.

Mr. Ferrante had suggested consideration of more pervious surfaces for the driveway. In discussing this with Mr. Wheway, for the house that it is on the front lot, which is a short driveway, he suggested an asphalt driveway as being more appropriate. For the access way to the rear lot, the long driveway, a pervious material, such as crushed stones with a caveat that allows him to pave the area outside the garage. Mr. Wheway noted that the drainage calculations were based upon impervious driveways entirely, so

**MINUTES FOR A LEFT OPEN PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

whatever is done by way of making a more pervious driveway, will help the drainage situation, rather than hinder it.

Mr. Adams reiterated that money will be given in lieu of property as open space payment. Dan Thomas, the assessor had reviewed the appraisals that were done and had concurred with the appraisals of one lot at \$110,000 and the other at \$115,000.

There is a buyer who would like to buy the existing house. The house cannot be put on the market until the subdivision exists. Asked that the Board approve the petition based on all the engineers' reports addressing the drainage problems, the driveway situation and the trees have been adequately met.

Mme. Chair: Asked to see the Westcott and Mapes letter. She asked for staff comments, to which Mr. Sulkis responded there were none.

Asked if there was anyone to speak in favor of the application. (No response)
Asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition to the application.

Kenneth Brannon, 233 Shadyside Lane. Thanked the Board for not rubber stamping this project. Mr. Brannon told the history of the water problems he has experienced on his property over the past 40 years and at this time, through a lot of effort and financial expense, the problem is pretty good now. Does not expect the contractor to take care of the existing problem, he wants to make sure the situation will not worsen.

Mr. Wheway, the engineer from Codespoti & Associates, came out to his property and saw he had a problem. Asked the Board what was his reassurance that the project will be built according to the plans. He is happy to know that as-builts will be provided, not just the construction drawings.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Adams: There are two engineering firms and the Public Works Department who have concluded that the situation should be improved. The applicant is not responsible for curing the situation that has been ongoing for 40 years.

Pat Brannon, 233 Shadyside Lane. They never should have had this problem to begin with on their property. The City of Milford created this problem and the Brannons should not have had to deal with it. Whoever engineered the construction of this property was wrong. Wants reassurance if something happens to create another problem for them.

Mr. Adams: Mr. Wheway will address the drainage situation.

**MINUTES FOR A LEFT OPEN PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mr. Bender: Mr. Bender stated everything looks good on paper. Asked for proof that the situation will not get worse. Asked about a bond.

Mr. Adams: Stated there was no authority to require a bond. In addition, there has been a 40-year history of water problems on the Brannon's property, which have not been documented as to their exact nature. How would it be known whether the applicant caused the problem, if there were to be a problem. The City is very careful with regard to engineering by having one engineering firm review another engineering firm's calculations. It was determined that the situation would improve, not get worse, but everything is on paper until it is built and there are no 100% guarantees. Something unexpected or catastrophic could occur. One cannot go bonding every possible contingency.

Mr. Liddy to Staff: Asked if a bond could be requested.

Mr. Sulkis: Not of the type that is being sought here. The bonds that are required have to do with fulfilling the requirements of the plan itself, i.e., public improvements, landscaping that the applicant says they are going to do and if there is any question about that, a bond can be requested. However, a bond for possible adverse impact on a neighbor is not within the Board's jurisdiction.

Mr. Liddy: Asked, based upon the letter received, who would maintain the stormwater gallery system and if it was not to be maintained, would the situation be made worse?

Mr. Adams: Maintenance would be the homeowner's responsibility after the house is sold.

Robert Wheway, PE, Codespoti & Associates, 504 Boston Post Road, Orange.
They were responsible for coming up with the site development subdivision plan for 89 Pond Point Avenue.

In response to Mr. Liddy's question he noted that the drainage system was no different from most other drainage systems. Everything needs maintenance. He noted the different components of the system that require review and maintenance. This underground gallery system requires some maintenance in the way of cleaning out leaves that may get into the system; making sure the pipes leading into the galleries are cleaned and functioning properly. Should the system become clogged, the top of the gallery should be inspected to make sure the water is infiltrating into the surrounding ground. Lack of maintenance could result in an increased water runoff.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Brannon: Noted that in his letter, Mr. Wheway states that if the galleries and drywells were not installed, it would have an adverse effect on his property. Also, if he

**MINUTES FOR A LEFT OPEN PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

were to have a water problem again, he would have to deal with the houses that are being put there. He still has a problem with this.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Adams: Does not feel it would be fair for the Brannons to be able to hold the development of neighboring parcels hostage based upon the idea that people would not do what is in their own self-interest to do, which is maintain their properties, and which would expose them to legal liability if they failed to maintain their drainage structures. If that were the case, there would be no development anywhere. The applicant has offered to do as-builts to make sure that what they build is exactly what is designed. He thinks it would be immensely unfair to not allow the development of this parcel based upon the Brannons' arguments.

Mr. Ferrante: Asked if the galleries are not maintained, the water may cause a problem for the owner of the house.

Mr. Wheway: Replied that would be the case.

Mrs. Golden: Asked if the people who purchase the property would know they are responsible for maintaining the property in this regard.

Mr. Wheway: That is customary when people purchase property. They get a site plan or plot plan as well as the deed. They would get copies of the as-builts and a copy of Sheet SP-5. The Commission may want to put in verbiage with the deed restriction that could be placed on the land records as to the drainage system and the maintenance that is required.

Mme. Chair: Closed the public hearing.

Mr. Ferrante: Pleased with the applicant's offer to make pervious surfaces where applicable and their offer to provide periodic as-builts. He suggested Mr. Sulkis prepare a motion addressing all the issues that were discussed.

[A recess was taken from 8:18 p.m. to 8:26 p.m.]

E. BOARD MEMBERS GREEN GUIDELINE BOOK AND BY-LAWS

Mme. Chair: Asked how the Board wanted to handle the clarification of the By-Laws. She reviewed the list she had made:

1. The term for the Chair and Vice Chair. Upon review of the Board's present by-laws and others and came up with the following:

"At the first regular meeting of each calendar year, the members

**MINUTES FOR A LEFT OPEN PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

of the Commission shall elect one of their number as a Chairman and one of their number as a Vice-Chairman. The term shall commence at that meeting.”

In the past, the Board had different interpretations of what the “term” of the positions actually were.

2. How does the Chairman vote? The information that was passed along to her was that the Chair may engage in discussion and vote in the same manner as any other member of the Commission. If the Chairman does not declare a vote, it is assumed that the Chairman has voted with the majority. This clarifies on a small Board with a number of ten, that the Chair has an active role just as any commissioner in making decisions and voting.
3. Chairman may suggest motions but may not make or second motions. This is not specifically called out in the Board’s by-laws, although Robert’s Rules say that sometimes the Chair can make a motion. For the Chair not to make a motion has been a matter of form, but should be clarified in the by-laws.
4. Agendas for the hearings and meetings of the Commission shall be prepared by the Secretary with approval of the Chair. The procedure has been that she has set the agenda with input from the Secretary to the Board.
5. A Commission member shall not meet or communicate in any fashion with any applicant, proponent, opponent or other interested party, excepting Commission staff members, to discuss any application before the Commission.

The Chair thought that language clarifying the communication roles and what is ex parte.

Mr. Liddy: On the last point the Board members cannot talk to people after the hearing. Does not see why a Board member cannot speak to people before the meeting for a better understanding of the situation. Ex parte would be after a hearing, not before.

Mme. Chair: This came out of what she understands to be a legal requirement.

Mr. Sulkis: If there is a pending application before the Board and you know that it is pending, what the Board member is doing is going out and collecting information about the application outside of the meeting forum. That is not supposed to be done. A commissioner can go out and look at something, but should not engage any of the parties in any conversations to get any information from them because the information that is gleaned by the Commission is supposed to be in the whole. Everyone is supposed to be exposed to the same information.

**MINUTES FOR A LEFT OPEN PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mr. Bender: Thought it contradictory to be able to drive by and look at the property individually, which is gaining information by looking at the property alone and not in a group.

Mr. Sulkis: You would be looking at something that anyone can look at. If you know there is an application pending before the Board, the members need to be informed of the environs that the application is in. It is being looked at within the context of the application. You cannot be gleaning any special information by meeting with any representative of that property or anyone who is opposed to that application. The meeting is the forum to do that.

Mr. Dickman: Periodically constituents call him at home and discuss situations with him. He reminds them he cannot say anything and can't discuss it, but will listen to anything they have to say. Does this suggest that he is not supposed to be listening to what they have to say?

Mr. Sulkis: If it's regarding an application, then he is taking testimony from someone who may be for or against an application, and the venue for that, especially if it is a public hearing situation is here (the auditorium). He suggested the person be told that this is a pending application and it cannot be discussed, but if it is a public hearing, come down and share your thoughts with the entire Board.

Mr. Dickman: Noted his phone number is on the City's website.

Mr. Sulkis: Stated this Board is different from all other boards, in that the members have constituents that they serve, but at the same time they have a duty to uphold the obligations for their office which has been spelled out by statute and unlike the Board of Aldermen or any other board, the members are sitting in judgment. They are the jury and judge for these applications and any hint of anything that looks as though a member could be swayed one way or the other has to be avoided. The Commission members must come with an open mind and hear the information as it is presented.

Mr. Dickman: Noted that sounds good on paper but it is difficult to tell someone you cannot listen to them

Mr. Bender: Does not think the Board is judge and jury as this is not a legal proceeding and no one is under oath. He feels he could be better informed if he has investigated the situation himself.

Mme. Chair: Asked if state statute dictates how the Board discusses applications and is it set to protect the Board.

Mr. Sulkis: This derives from state statute and is to protect the Board and the applicant. If an applicant comes before the Board and is turned down and it comes to light that Board members have been having conversations with people who have been

**MINUTES FOR A LEFT OPEN PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

telling them negative things about an application, that is influencing the Board. That becomes a big legal problem. The Board members have to be as impartial as they possibly can. However, it is recognized that the Board members bring a world of their own knowledge to the Board. Everyone has different experiences. Everyone knows the community differently and everyone has different opinions. The Board must look to avoid the appearance of impropriety and that is for the Board's protection as well as that of the applicant and the City.

Mr. Bender: Asked if someone mails a board member something because they cannot be at the meeting, but wanted to make their opinion known.

Mr. Sulkis: Responded that if someone cannot make a public meeting, they can send a letter that goes into the file.

Mme. Chair: If someone receives a letter on an application they should make it available to the other board members so that everyone has the same information.

This procedure falls under state statute and there is not much that the Board can debate about it.

Mr. Liddy: Noted there should be a number 6 on the list with regard to how to break a tie vote for Chair and Vice Chair. Stated he had suggested many ways to break a tie, one being flipping a coin.

Mr. Dickman: Said he did not think it necessary to over legislate or regulate on a situation that occurred one or perhaps two times

Mme. Chair: Thought if item 1 was settled, a lot of other issues would fall away and that future boards could work it out.

Mr. Bender: Stated he did not want another board to go through what this board went through in the last two years.

Mr. Dickman: Thought a set term for Chair and Vice Chair be established, rather than the expiration upon the election of another, or move the elections to before the end of the calendar year, or something to that effect. Feels strongly that the term should be set.

Mr. Ferrante: He is as displeased as everyone else about what occurred in January. He is ambivalent about legislating a formula for breaking a tie. However, he is convinced that an election should take place after a general election and not after a calendar year. He believes that is how the Board of Aldermen conducts its elections.

Mr. Liddy: The new members of the Planning and Zoning Board do not take their seats

**MINUTES FOR A LEFT OPEN PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

until the first Tuesday of the new year. He does not think the Board should vote in December because the new members would not have been able to participate in the vote.

Mr. Ferrante: Clarified that the election would take place when the new board is seated, and the next election would take place two years later. He would mimic the language in the charter, which is in accordance with the Board of Aldermen's election procedure.

Mme. Chair: Suggested she email the notes she had written. The Board can discuss it and form a subcommittee.

Mr. Bender and Mrs. Patterson agreed that the Board should review the Chair's notes and establish a subcommittee for the purpose of updating the by-laws and establishing procedures for the election and breaking a tie vote.

F. DISCUSSION OF FENCE REGULATION

Mme. Chair: According to the February 14, 2011 minutes, the motion was defeated to approve the proposed regulation pertaining to fences and walls, as it did not receive a 2/3 vote. The Board requested additional information, which Ms. Harrigan supplied at the last meeting. Asked how the Board wished to proceed at this point.

The heart of the issue was the knowledge that the Housatonic River, according to science is considered part of Long Island Sound. When Long Island Sound is mentioned in the regulations, it also includes the Housatonic River.

Mr. Bender: Asked why the Board was being asked to consider this again if approval was voted down.

Mme. Chair: At that time the Board requested Staff to provide additional information.

Mr. Ferrante: Felt that this item was bigger than the Board. Many of the requirements and definitions come from higher authorities and agencies, such as the State, FEMA and DEP. The water courses, storm courses, beaches, rocky protrusions, etc. do not allow fences by regulations higher than the Board's. It comes down to what did the ZBA do when they approved the fences. He stated the Board could not make regulations that, by definition, are contrary to those other agencies that define these things. Does not know if the Board could enforce a regulation that is more restrictive than those other definitions.

Mme. Chair: Commented that was an excellent point. The Board has been operating under the rightful assumption that the Housatonic was part of the Long Island Sound and therefore it follows the Long Island Sound regulations and the ZBA in finding

**MINUTES FOR A LEFT OPEN PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

differently has placed the Board in the position of changing its regulations, even though all the other agencies view the Housatonic as Long Island Sound. It is now back to the Board to resolve this. The Board could look at a definition change.

Mr. Bender: Would this need a public hearing?

Mme. Chair: Thought that such a change would have to go through the normal regulation change procedure once again.

Mr. Ferrante: At some point a regulation was passed years ago that is in conformity with the other agencies, i.e. DEP, FEMA, etc, and the staff has been enforcing it. Perhaps it can be left alone. The one matter that is hanging out there can be enforced by Staff.

Mr. Sulkis: The purpose of this change is so the ZBA cannot do this again. ZBA is based on hardship. This case was not a hardship, but a desire.

Mr. Liddy: Noted in Ms. Harrigan's memorandum, item No. 8, it is noted that other coastal towns (Darien, Fairfield, Westport) do allow fencing within the wetlands, they just have to be reviewed by various departments.

Ms. Harrigan: Did not have the information pertaining to this particular item number with her.

Mr. Bender: Stated if the Board proposes to go through with a change, it should go through the public hearing procedure.

Mr. Dickman: If the Housatonic River is already included in the Long Island Sound, why does it have to be changed by the Board?

Mr. Sulkis: To make it clear to the ZBA if such a case arises again.

Mr. Ferrante: Agreed with Mr. Dickman. Thought that in such a case as what happened with the ZBA, it should have been appealed. He suggested the regulation be left alone and direct the staff to enforce it as it has always been enforced.

Mme. Chair: Basically, there are two schools of thought on this. Asked the Board how they wanted to proceed.

Mrs. Patterson: Agreed with Mr. Ferrante. Thought ZBA should be educated by the Staff in such matters.

Mr. Bender: Close the door and don't let the ZBA interpret it in its own way.

Mr. Dickman: Stated he thought the options were to go through the process again,

**MINUTES FOR A LEFT OPEN PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

involve the public, or understand that the Board's regulations are complete as they are and don't change anything.

There was a show of hands: To go through the regulation change process once again. (The Chair and Mr. Bender). To leave the regulations as they are: All other attending members.

Mr. Ferrante: Made a motion to instruct the Staff to enforce the regulations of the City of Milford in accordance with all applicable federal and state laws.

Mr. Dickman: Second.

Mr. Sulkis: Could send the ZBA a memo from the Board stating that the staff will continue regulating this.

Mme. Chair: Agreed with both comments.

A vote was taken: Messrs. Bender, Mead & Liddy voted against the motion. The motion passed.

G. PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mme. Chair: An email was sent out as a starting point. There was an outreach to what she is referring to as liaisons. Ms. Harrigan put together a very good outline. Some commissioners have contacted her and she had a couple of meetings with them.

She has taken a swipe at transportation and circulation, which include bike lanes, sidewalks, infrastructure and safe routes to school. Also under open space, recreation. and community gardens.

Mrs. Golden: Asked to work with the Chair on these issues.

She met with Dr. McBride of the Health Department and Mr. Sulkis to discuss sidewalk planning. Mr. Sulkis had a map designed that showed the sidewalks in the City and requested an overlay to include schools, public parks and recreation areas and the train station. Also programs to encourage walking by school children, i.e. "walking school bus". Safety was the concern of parents with regard to children walking to school. Talked about walkability to recreation areas and the usability of the City's open public spaces, including the duck pond. There were ideas as to how to use these areas to their greatest benefit. By examining the existing sidewalks as well as their condition, the key areas where sidewalks or sidewalk repairs are the most critical. One area noted in particular was Gulf Street, near Gulf Beach, where they are no sidewalks going up the hill.

**MINUTES FOR A LEFT OPEN PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Also invited by Mr. Sulkis to join the meeting with Mr. Platus of Yale, who did the last POCD study.

Mr. Sulkis: There are parts of the Plan that need minor updating and other parts of the plan that will need outside expertise. Know of four areas that will require outside help: Walnut Beach, the ball field in downtown Milford, the Cherry Street corridor, the entrance corridor and the shoreline. That is what the meeting was about. In the process of getting a proposal from Yale for this particular portion of the study.

Mr. Liddy: Happy to hear about the sidewalks, especially in the Gulf Beach area. He has been an advocate of this for many years. Believes the Mayor has a budget for this.

Mme. Chair: One of the reasons for the POCD is it helps direct grant funding. The City was not able to get funding for bike trails because it was not in the Plan of Conservation and Development. Want to make sure no important issues are left out. Mrs. Patterson is working on transportation issues. She and Mr. Vetter will be writing letters to all the Boards and Commissions concerning the Plan.

H. LIAISON REPORTS - None

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – (4/5/11)

Mme. Chair: Asked the Board Clerk to verify the motion that was made on page 154. Also correct Mr. Liddy's time. The Board will not vote on the minutes until the clarification is made.

J. CHAIR'S REPORT – None.

K. STAFF REPORT – None

Mr. Liddy: Motion to adjourn.

Mr. Dickman: Second.

All members voted in favor of adjournment at 9:22 p.m.

Phyllis Leggett, Board Clerk.

**MINUTES FOR A LEFT OPEN PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**