

TOWN COUNCIL  
**Town of Trumbull**  
CONNECTICUT  
www.trumbull-ct.gov

TOWN HALL  
Trumbull

TELEPHONE  
(203) 452-5000



MINUTES  
August 1, 2016

CALL TO ORDER: called the regular meeting of the Town Council to order at 8:08 p.m. All present joined in a moment of silence with the Chairman asking all to remember the passing of Maureen Wright, mother of former Board of Education Chairman, Stephen Wright, and the Pledge of Allegiance.

The clerk called the roll and recorded it as follows:

<u>Present:</u>	Joe Pifko	Lisa Valenti	Lori Rosasco-Schwartz
	Bill Mecca	Mary Beth Thornton	Matt Caron
	Dawn Cantafio	Jack Testani	Carl Massaro, Jr.
	Mark Block	Tony Scinto	Enrico Costantini
	Richard Kascak, Jr.	Jason Marsh	Michael London
	Vincent DiMasi, Jr.	Ann Marie Evangelista	

Absent: Thomas Whitmoyer, Edna Colucci, Donna Seidell and Mark LeClair

Also

Present: First Selectman Timothy Herbst, Chief of Staff Lynn Arnow, Town Attorney Vincent Marino, Economic Development Director Rina Bakalar.

---

\*The Chair reserves the right not to vote unless otherwise noted.

Approval of Minutes: Moved by Costantini, seconded by Kascak to approve the July regular meeting minutes. VOTE: Motion CARRIED 16-0-1 (ABSTENTION: Massaro)

Public Comment – There were four (4) people present to speak. (*Public Comment Attached*)

Business:

Moved by Costantini, seconded by Testani to take item #3 out of order.

Ms. Valenti recused herself at 8:21 p.m. due to the fact her firm represents one of the sellers.

VOTE: Motion CARRIED unanimously. (Valenti did not vote)

1. RESOLUTION TC26-73: Moved by Rosasco-Schwartz, seconded by London  
BE IT RESOLVED, The Purchase and Sale Agreement for the Town of Trumbull to acquire real property known as 93 Church Hill Road is hereby approved and the First Selectman, Timothy M. Herbst, is authorized to execute said agreement and any and all documents necessary to close title to said property.

Motion made by Rosasco-Schwartz, seconded by London to waive the reading of the committee minutes. VOTE: Motion CARRIED unanimously.

The Chair explained under the Freedom of Information Act, contract negotiations are not open to the public. The council will only be acting on item #'s 3&4. There is no proposed eminent domain. All 4 properties have come to the Town and Town Council's purview because one of the residents had reached out to the town to see if there was interest in purchasing their property. There is no specific use planned for the properties at this time.

The Chair opened the public hearings for Resolutions TC26-73, TC26-74, TC26-75 and TC26-76 at 8:26 p.m.

There were 20 people present to speak. (*Public Hearing Comments Attached*)

The Chair Closed the public hearing at 9:34 p.m.

The Chair called a recess at 9:35 p.m.

The Chair called the meeting back to order at 9:45 p.m.

First Selectman Herbst stated the committee report was extensive. We have heard questions regarding the plan for the properties. At the L&A Committee he spoke about the Plan of Conservation and Development (PPOCD), a 10-year blueprint that was ratified by both the Town Council and P&Z in 2014. The last time it was developed was in 2006. It was accelerated and updated early in 2014 as opposed to waiting until 2016. The POCD was done by a land use planner using a well-respected firm, Planometrix, along with the elected officials and community feedback. Planometrix conducted public hearings as well as many focus groups. Page 31 of the POCD speaks to development patterns and Chapter 5 page 32 speaks to walkable development patterns for the Town Hall area, the Town Center of Church Hill Road and White Plains Road and Whitney Avenue. Key principals are as follows: Buildings should be orientated towards streetscapes. Page 42 of the POCD speaks to the connectivity to the trail and specifically identifies the area in question. From the POCD the following was read into the record, "The Town Hall area is comprised of an array of uses within walking distance of one another, retail, offices, municipal offices, the library, single family houses and multifamily houses should be located here. The municipal presence greatly influences the tone in the area. The Town Hall and library draw visitors, the landscaping and architecture set the tone and the grounds provide a community gathering spot. Trumbull should maintain a strong municipal presence here. Zoning should be updated to better reflect the actual uses that have emerged here and to set the framework for future development." First Selectman Herbst stated this is the council's and P&Z's plan and was approved by both bodies. Page 81 of the plan discusses open space and parks. A specific section had been dedicated to the parks in the POCD which had not been done before. The goals are to expand and enhance the open space greenway system to better connect neighborhoods, commercial and parks. Strategically preserve open space and create more trails spurs for more connectivity. Page 85 of the POCD speaks to continued strategic open space acquisitions and perceived open space which could be developed in the future. With little vacant land left the POCD suggests a strategic approach to future open space preservation to help Trumbull determine acquisitions that will best meet the

Town's goals. The acquisitions can be for connecting parks, protecting rivers and streams or mitigating flooding. Page 87 specifically identifies 3 areas for open space, the Town Hall area, Trumbull Center and the Long Hill Green. Page 89 speaks to community facilities & utilities and how to prioritize community facilities and what thought process for decision making. Goals are outlined for community facilities. Page 92 encourages long term planning for community facilities. Department Heads were interviewed for these needs. Appropriate locations and their criteria should include maintaining the municipal hub. Page 106 speaks to recommendation future land use plan for the town and this identified again the Long Hill Green, Town Hall area and Trumbull Center. It speaks to patterns for recreational, commercial, development and redevelopment areas. The planners, Planometrix and this body recommended Trumbull should do what it can to connect, create connections to the Pequonnock River Trail and other points of gathering in the community that are focal points of this plan.

First Selectman Herbst spoke to layers of review for municipal use v. private use. P&Z changed the zone at lower Main Street last week in a 3-2 vote even with significant amount of the public against it. It took only 3 commissioners to do that. At tonight's meeting the council is voting to purchase the properties not on its use. The 8-24 referral was positive on 2 of the 4 properties by P&Z. The positive referral requires a majority of the council to vote affirmatively to pursue the purchase, the negative 8-24 referral requires a 2/3 super majority vote by the council. There are three layers of review by the Town for any municipal use while it only takes 3 people on P&Z to change a zone. There is more review on municipal use in this case. The land use acquisition history began in the 1990's and changed under Wilson. When Heiman was first selectman the Town was growing fast. Acquisitions began in the 90's to ward off the threat of 8-30-g's. Many of the acquisitions were made without a definitive plan, i.e. Hillandale, the Nature Center and the Bill property. This was done for the betterment of the Town. It is always better for the Town to have control than to have to react to a developer. As the economy gets better we will see more development. There are currently three other parcels in Town that have been identified for development. The next 2 first selectman will have to deal with this. The POCD is a nonpartisan guide for the future. Tonight the council is only considering the acquisition. The use will come back at another time. No one should be forced to sell their home and no one will be forced to sell. First Selectman Herbst did go the Town Council on these properties and there was broad unanimous bipartisan support to acquire these properties. They would not have proceeded without that support. The properties cannot be acquired without Town Council approval. First Selectman Herbst suggested an amendment to the resolution, "The P&Z commission must grant site plan approval for any use." This would add a 4<sup>th</sup> level of review and the neighbors would be notified.

Mr. Marsh spoke to page 44 of the POCD and how the east side of Church Hill should remain residential. The new village would be a BC zone, page 43 speaks to maintain residential use and page 85 and 84 link origins and to off road spurs. The Town should acquire easements not parcels. Page 92 does not discuss to expand the Town Hall area footprint and the POCD speaks to the traditional open space notion. The First Selectman stated expanding the BC zone is recommended and under the existing zoning regs zone

A's recommended use is permitted in Zone A. The POCD provides community guidance to update zoning regs. Page 84 of the POCD speaks to easements but also contemplated acquisitions and does not agree with Mr. Marsh's interpretation. Page 85 speaks specifically to the open space acquisitions. Mr. Marsh indicated page 92 uses the word might not should. After further debate on the interpretation Mr. Marsh stated they would have to agree to disagree.

First Selectman Herbst explained for Ms. Cantafio there was discussion during focus groups of an active role by the P&Z during the review of proposed acquisitions when the POCD was being developed. Land Acquisition Boards are advisory and do not have the authority to bond or rezone. There was a concern an advisory committee was commissioning appraisals. There was also an issue with finding people to serve on the Land Acquisition Committee therefore they had quorum issues. The Land Acquisition Committee is also an extension of the first selectman's office therefore it is better to have the P&Z and Town Council to review and approve. P&Z should be more engaged and it is important to bring the Town Council and P&Z into this process before negotiations. First Selectman Herbst spoke against the process where the Executive Branch can act in a vacuum to review a price being offered and comps and appraisals. The Chair stated the Land Acquisition Committee formed when there was rampant affordable housing being proposed in Trumbull and it led to the Town purchasing properties for top dollar. The land Acquisition Committee was charged with studying the Town to locate and recommend parcels of 3 acres or more. As stated in Committee, that function is not applicable here. The land acquisition committee is not being bypassed and the town can buy and sell property without the use of that committee.

First Selectman Herbst explained for Mr. Scinto that the two properties approved by P&Z, those agreements were further along and had affirmative answers from the homeowners. The other two wanted more time to think which is why there was a negative referral on the other two properties.

First Selectman Herbst explained for Mr. Testani that any use of the properties will go to the P&Z for an 8-24 referral. If it approves, the Town Council will then have to act as a majority, if it is a negative referral the Town Council will need a super majority vote of 14 affirmative votes out of 21. There has not been any influence from the administration with regard to eminent domain. The process began when a homeowner contacted the Town to buy their property. The Town did not cold call anyone. One resident said no and the administration said ok they were done and would not proceed on this matter. Two weeks later the homeowner called the Town because they had more questions and may want to sell and that is when the administration went to the council for a consensus. No one was threatened. The eminent domain process can take place unilaterally it needs council approval. The previous administration did use the threat of eminent domain for the acquisition of the Town Hall annex. If the homeowners don't want to sell the Town the Town will not proceed. First Selectman Herbst stated there has been talk of this being done in a vacuum, it has not been. There is a process to follow one of which every city or town in the state of CT follows. It is the state statutory 8-24 referral process. The P&Z regs have been updated. At one time they were a disgrace where there was no notification

of the abutters and there was a provision that municipal uses didn't apply to the regs. That has since changed.

Ms. Thornton stated she is famous for changing her mind. She does not agree with this as being an enhancement for the Town. The Town should not be in the business of acquiring/purchasing private property and spoke in favor of putting business back in the preferred areas that are on the peripheral of the Town. Ms. Thornton stated she will vote against these resolutions because she is putting herself in the homeowners' shoes after listening to them and requested a roll call vote on these items. First Selectman Herbst noted that Ms. Thornton was on the Council when the Town purchased the Wagner Tree Farm and the Bill property. The Town gave Mrs. Bill right to use the home for her life. The Town has acquired other private property previously and Mrs. Thornton did vote in favor of those acquisitions. The Chair stated the corner of Main Street and Church Hill was commercial property and the Town for its reasons elected to take that property off of the tax rolls. One of the reasons was because it adjacent to Town property and it was important to maintain the character of the intersection.

Moved by London, seconded by Pifko to enter into executive session for the purpose of discussing contract negotiations on both Resolutions TC26-73 and TC26-74.  
VOTE: Motion CARRIED 11-4 (AGAINST: Thornton, Mecca, Cantafio and Marsh).

The Town Council entered into executive session at 10:50 p.m. with the following people present: Joe Pifko, Lisa Valenti, Lori Rosasco-Schwartz, Bill Mecca, Mary Beth Thornton, Matt Caron, Dawn Cantafio, Jack Testani, Carl Massaro, Jr., Mark Block, Tony Scinto, Enrico Costantini, Richard Kascak, Jr., Jason Marsh, Michael London, Vincent DiMasi, Jr., Ann Marie Evangelista, First Selectman Timothy Herbst, Chief of Staff Lynn Arnow, Town Attorney Vincent Marino and Economic Development Director Rina Bakalar.

Moved by London, seconded by Testani to end Executive Session.  
VOTE: Motion CARRIED 14-1 (AGAINST: Evangelista)  
The Town Council ended Executive Session at 11:40 p.m.

#### Roll Call Vote

The ayes and nays are as follows:

#### Ayes

Joe Pifko  
Lori Rosasco-Schwartz  
Matt Caron  
Jack Testani  
Mark Block  
Tony Scinto  
Enrico Costantini  
Richard Kascak, Jr.  
Vincent DiMasi, Jr.  
Ann Marie Evangelista  
Michael London

#### Nays

Jason Marsh  
Bill Mecca  
Dawn Cantafio  
Mary Beth Thornton

VOTE: Adopted by roll call vote 11-4 (AGAINST: Thornton, Mecca, Cantafio and Marsh)

2. RESOLUTION TC26-74: Moved by Costantini, seconded by London  
BE IT RESOLVED, The Purchase and Sale Agreement for the Town of Trumbull to acquire real property known as 85 Church Hill Road is hereby approved and First Selectman, Timothy M. Herbst, is authorized to execute said agreement and any and all documents necessary to close title to said property.

Reading of the Committee Report was waived by unanimous consent.

Roll Call Vote

The ayes and nays are as follows:

<u>Ayes</u>	<u>Nays</u>
Joe Pifko	Jason Marsh
Lori Rosasco-Schwartz	Bill Mecca
Matt Caron	Dawn Cantafio
Jack Testani	Mary Beth Thornton
Mark Block	
Tony Scinto	
Enrico Costantini	
Richard Kascak, Jr.	
Vincent DiMasi, Jr.	
Ann Marie Evangelista	
Michael London	

VOTE: Adopted 11-4 (AGAINST: Thornton, Mecca, Cantafio and Marsh)

Ms. Valenti returned to the meeting at 11:44 p.m.

3. RESOLUTION TC26-71: Moved by Testani, seconded by Marsh  
BE IT RESOLVED, That RESOLUTION TC26-28, the Equipment Lease/Purchase Agreement with Banc of America Public Capital Corp dated May 27, 2016 is hereby amended. (Full Resolution Attached).

The Finance Committee met on July 25, 2016 and voted unanimously.

VOTE: ADOPTED unanimously.

4. RESOLUTION TC26-72: Moved by Block, seconded by Rosasco-Schwartz  
BE IT RESOLVED, Timothy M. Herbst, First Selectman is hereby empowered to execute and deliver in the name and on behalf of this municipality a contract with the Connecticut State Library for a Historic Preservation Grant.

The L&A Committee met on July 25, 2016 and voted unanimously.

VOTE: ADOPTED unanimously.

5. RESOLUTION TC26-75: HELD IN COMMITTEE  
BE IT RESOLVED, The Purchase and Sale Agreement for the Town of Trumbull to acquire real property known as 77 Church Hill Road is hereby approved and First Selectman, Timothy M. Herbst, is authorized to execute said agreement and any and all documents necessary to close title to said property.
6. RESOLUTION TC26-76: HELD IN COMMITTEE  
BE IT RESOLVED, The Purchase and Sale Agreement for the Town of Trumbull to acquire real property known as 2 South Edgewood Avenue is hereby approved and First Selectman, Timothy M. Herbst, is authorized to execute said agreement and any and all documents necessary to close title to said property.
7. RESOLUTION TC26-77: HELD IN COMMITTEE  
BE IT RESOLVED, That the Town of Trumbull is hereby authorized to conduct a survey of all residents to determine the need for a new Senior Center that may also serve as a Community Center and may also include a pool. This survey will be created and executed by an independent consultant and said survey shall be conducted before any funds are disbursed for the design and construction of said Center.
8. RESOLUTION TC26-78: HELD IN COMMITTEE  
BE IT RESOLVED, The following question be placed on the ballot for the General election on November 8, 2016:  
Do you agree that the Town shall build a new Senior Center/Community Center, shall purchase land as necessary to build said center, shall allow the designated architectural firm to determine scope and design before town residents are surveyed by a professional independent consultant to determine if said center is the will of the people of Trumbull?

There being no further business to discuss and upon motion made by London seconded by Caron the town Council adjourned by unanimous consent at 11:48 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Margaret D. Mastroni, Town Council Clerk

FULL RESOLUTION TC26-71

Form of Authorizing Resolution:

A RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF TRUMBULL, CONNECTICUT AUTHORIZING (i) THE EXECUTION AND DELIVERY OF AN AMENDMENT TO A CERTAIN EQUIPMENT LEASE/PURCHASE AGREEMENT DATED MAY 27, 2016 WITH RESPECT TO THE ACQUISITION, PURCHASE, FINANCING AND LEASING OF CERTAIN RENOVATIONS AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS; (ii) THE EXECUTION AND DELIVERY OF DOCUMENTS REQUIRED IN CONNECTION THEREWITH; AND (iii) AUTHORIZING THE TAKING OF ALL OTHER ACTIONS NECESSARY TO THE CONSUMMATION OF THE TRANSACTIONS CONTEMPLATED BY THIS RESOLUTION.

WHEREAS, on or about May 27, 2016, the Town of Trumbull (“Lessee”) entered into an Equipment Lease/Purchase Agreement with Banc of America Public Capital Corp. (“Lessor”) in the amount of \$4,130,000 (the “Agreement”) for certain renovations and energy efficiency improvements to various public schools, including, without limitation, for the replacement of the existing roof at Hillcrest Middle School (“Hillcrest”); and

WHEREAS, the cost to replace the roof at Hillcrest is less than was expected and budgeted and up to \$580,000 of funding pursuant to the Agreement is now available to Lessee for other purposes; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Education of the Town of Trumbull has a long-term plan for additional energy efficiency improvements to the Tashua Elementary School at 401 Stonehouse Road (“Tashua”), the Middlebrook Elementary School at 220 Middlebrooks Avenue (“Middlebrook”) and the Daniels Farm Elementary School at 710 Daniels Farm Road (“Daniels Farm”) for the 2017-2018 fiscal year, including, but not limited to, replacing existing interior and exterior lighting with more efficient LED lighting; and

WHEREAS, Lessor is willing to amend the Agreement to permit Lessee to use up to \$580,000 of the existing \$4,130,000 of funding for the purpose of replacing the existing incandescent and florescent lighting at Tashua, Middlebrook and Daniels Farm with LED lighting; and

WHEREAS, the Town Council deems it for the benefit of the Town and for the cost-efficient and effective education of its students by the Board of Education of the Town of Trumbull to accelerate the replacement of existing lighting at Tashua, Middlebrook and Daniels Farm by amending the Amendment for the purpose of expending up to \$580,000 for the aforesaid LED lighting improvements to Tashua, Middlebrook and Daniels Farm.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the Town Council as follows:

*Section 1. Approval of Documents.* The Town Director of Finance or its designee is hereby authorized and directed to execute an amendment to the Agreement and any related Exhibits attached thereto, for the purpose of using up to \$580,000 from the Agreement for the aforesaid purposes at Tashua, Middlebrook and Daniels Farm and to deliver said amendment to the Agreement (including such Exhibits) to the respective parties thereto, and the Town Director of Finance or its designee is hereby authorized to affix the seal of the Lessee to such documents.

*Section 2. Other Actions Authorized.* The officers and employees of the Lessee shall take all action necessary or reasonably required by the parties to said amendment to the Agreement to carry out, give effect to and consummate the transactions contemplated by said amendment (including the execution and delivery of Acceptance Certificates and any tax certificate and agreement, as contemplated in the Agreement, as hereby amended) and to take all action necessary in conformity therewith, including, without limitation, the execution and delivery of any closing and other documents required in connection with the amendment of the Agreement as aforesaid.

*Section 3. No General Liability.* Nothing contained in this Resolution, the Agreement as, hereby amended, nor any other instrument shall be construed with respect to the Lessee as incurring a pecuniary liability or charge upon the general credit of the Lessee or against its taking power, nor shall the breach of any agreement contained in this Resolution, the Agreement, as hereby amended, or any other instrument or document executed in connection therewith impose any pecuniary liability upon the Lessee or any charge upon its general credit or against its taxing power, except to the extent that the Rental Payments payable under the Agreement are special limited obligations of the Lessee as provided in the Agreement, as hereby amended.

*Section 4. Appointment of Authorized Lessee Representatives.* The Town Director of Finance or its designee are each hereby designated to act as authorized representatives of the Lessee for purposes of said amendment to the Agreement until such time as the governing body of the Lessee shall designate any other or different authorized representative for said purposes.

*Section 5. Severability.* If any section, paragraph, clause or provision of this Resolution shall for any reason be held to be invalid or unenforceable, the invalidity or unenforceability of such section, paragraph, clause or provision shall not affect any of the remaining provisions of this Resolution.

*Section 6. Repealer.* All bylaws, orders and resolutions or parts thereof, inconsistent herewith, are hereby repealed to the extent only of such inconsistency. This repealer shall not be construed as reviving any bylaw, order, resolution or ordinance or part thereof.

*Section 7. Effective Date.* This Resolution shall be effective immediately upon its approval and adoption.

Public Comment:

1. Kathleen McGannon of 59 Jackson Drive spoke to item #'s 7&8 of the agenda which were both held in committee and put forward by the minority party. The coming election is expected to be one of the biggest for voter turnout. We don't know if the taxpayers want a community center. Ms. McGannon spoke in favor of an independent survey and the ballot question. When we have those answers we should then determine if the community center is wanted and if it is what it should be.
2. Tony DAquila of 29 Valley View Road spoke to item #'s 7&8. We have a representative type of government and disagrees the town council knows what the seniors want. There have been 4 public hearings, comments during the budget, internet surveys and emails. Many seniors do have internet access, or access to newspapers or don't want to speak at meetings. Mr. DAquila spoke in favor of a mailing to all households, this will allow us to reach out to all seniors.
3. Jeremy Rampino of 14 south Edgewood Avenue spoke to item #'s 7&8. He spoke in favor of item #'s 7&8 and stated more questions are needed and believes both resolutions are the same.
4. Cindy Katske of 129 Meadow View Road noted the lack thereof a survey regarding the proposed community center and spoke in favor of a survey being sent to every household in town. We need to ask the right questions and know if we are heading in the right direction.

### Public Hearings Comments:

1. Vincent Convertino III stated he found this disheartening, he currently lives in Shelton but grew up on South Edgewood. People are talking about a senior/community center and stated this doesn't make sense, extending a municipal campus doesn't make sense either and does not see the rationale to displace these residents. If they buy one of course they will go the second. If the town does not buy it can be developed by a different developer. You are asking someone to leave their home, that is rotten and is not looking out for the best of the residents and found this disheartening and sad.
2. Nikki Magee of 8 South Edgewood Avenue stated more information is needed, her fear is they would be next and questioned what will happen if the second property does not sell, she asked that they let her know when it will be her turn to have to go through this.
3. Vincent Convertino II of 22 South Edgewood Avenue stated he is concerned over how people were intimidated and now they are infringing on South Edgewood Avenue, the next thing you know there will be a restaurant next to the veterinarian.
4. Brian Calandro of 252 Church Hill Road explained he had received a flyer in his mailbox regarding the purchase of these properties. He spoke to the distrust of government and stated it is hard to believe there is no plan for these properties, something exact would nice to be able to really discuss.
5. Kerry Malzewski of 163 Blackhouse Road extended her gratitude to the council for their time and stated she was concerned over the process. She understands the issue. The robo call should have gone to all of the town's residents not just the area of Church Hill Road, there is no clear plan and the process is rushed. The public hearing is on the same night as the vote and spoke against that. The agendas online are not updated to reflect items not moving forward and voiced her frustration with the administration. She has lost count of how many emails she has sent with no responses and finds that disrespectful. The Town Council should have coffee with the residents as the first selectman has a brown bag lunch quarterly and asked that the political bickering stop, she has had enough.
6. Walter McGura of 60 Kent Lane stated at the June 6<sup>th</sup> meeting the council changed wording to a community center and voted on an architect. The council has an obligation to the residents and to listen to the people. A moratorium should be put on spending, it is not known what is to be built and you do not know what you are doing. Having it on the ballot would be simple.
7. Richard White of 169 Church Hill Road sent an email to the council prior to this meeting. He read the email into the record, (Attached).

8. John Karpowich of 29 Ellsworth Street noted there is no plan and that there is no plan for the senior center is a concern for him.
9. Cindy Katske of 129 Meadow View Drive stated that it has been heard that this was started by a resident not the town. Process matters, the town worked on this for months without the neighbors being aware. It is not required by law but it is the right thing to do to notify all the residents. There are no zoning requirements if the Town has control of the properties, on 8-24 referrals there will be no notice requirements to the neighbors. Referring to page 82 of the POCD, there is plenty of parking available at Trumbull Center and at the other end of the trail. Ms. Katske spoke against the fact there has been no special committee to research the need for the municipal facility and expanding the municipal campus. This could happen anywhere in town and sets a dangerous precedent and asked the council to vote no.
10. Edward Grillo of 38 Woodlawn Drive echoed all of the previous speakers' comments. There has been no due process given to this and seems to be passed through. He asked that these be tabled for more input, and to create a plan. There are wetlands and suggested this be the nature center which could be a great community idea. More time is needed to flush out ideas and spoke against rushing this through.
11. Kathleen Fearon of 38 Sherman Avenue and veterinarian on Church Hill Road asked for more transparency and a plan for the properties' use. The process took her 8 months when opening her veterinarian office, she had two (2) 500' abutters' mailing required. She thanked the First Selectman Herbst for meeting with her and explaining the purchases, the purchase would change the zone. If there is no plan the council should vote no.
12. Vincent Girot of 34 Woodlawn Drive spoke against that there is no plan, there may be a use for parking and he spoke against that explaining that only 4 or 5 days per year the additional parking is necessary, the Tellelian building's parking is underused. He would like the town to consider a plan and to give more thought to the process. Please vote no.
13. Edith Jonas of 38 South Edgewood Avenue stated this is a beautiful residential area. Because there is no plan those that own property on South Edgewood do not know what the use of these properties will be, the residents don't have any say. The taxes in town are pretty high and the area is zone A right now. The value of her house will change if this happens. The area is very steep to the trail, if used for access to the trail it will be impossible to climb back up. Once the town owns the properties there will be no more public hearings and they can do what they want. It has been said no one is being forced out of their house, but if you had invested your life in your family home there will be an impact on the value and will not have a say anymore. There is no plan and questioned what it would be if it were a shopping center. There is another person who wants to sell.
14. Kalman Jonas of 15 Ascolese Road stated he is a 1/3 owner of 38 South Edgewood Avenue and is upset this is being pushed through without notice, it may be legal but

questioned if it was ethical. This will be a domino effect, only one resident has a vested interest in selling and getting the best price for their property. His father built this house with his own hands, and spoke against the lack of a concrete plan. This could remove 4 houses from the tax logs. He said people park at one end or the other when using the trail not the middle. He questioned the effect of runoff from a parking lot and the removal of trees and the grass area that would be lost. There is no well thought out plan and stated the majority of people are not aware of this.

15. Carmine DeFeo of 15 Woodcrest Avenue stated most of his comments have been already said by previous speakers. There is confusion and contradiction, it may be a community center, if this is being considered it needs to be brought up. The Town Council is their voice, 4 acres may be too small for a community center and asked the council to consider the Public Works Yard as a location for the center and to relocate Public Works elsewhere.
16. Robert Janceusti of 109 Church Hill Road went to the Town Engineering Dept. to check on the elevation of the area and found it to have a 300' elevation change. Some areas by the trail are two people wide while other areas are 4-5 people wide. A bigger plan is needed; this doesn't make sense or add up.
17. Jeremy Rampino of 14 South Edgewood Avenue stated there has been talk that this may be the area to expand the municipal campus. There are 4 properties and one that is too high in price for the town to consider. He does not want to lose the neighborhood and does not want a lot of foot or vehicular traffic there and does not want any development.
18. Vicki Tesoro of 133 Beechwood Avenue requested the two resolutions be tabled or vote no. There should not be a vote on the same night as a public hearing. The process has been flawed from the beginning. The people should have been notified. It is common sense and is the right thing to do. The intent of the administration was to have an empty meeting in the height of the summer. There is no clear plan for the use of these properties. If you were a neighbor, you would want to know what will be there. The answers should be in open session. The answers to how much it will cost and how the dollar amount was established v. fair market value and if there are any other incentives being offered should be information available. The process should be slowed down and planned properly. If the council votes tonight vote no.
19. Debbie West of 85 Church Hill Road explained she is not leaving the state she is leaving town to move closer to her grandchildren. She has lived there for 17 years and noted it is not a neighborhood, she does not know most of her neighbors. What appealed to her about the area and the house she purchased has ended up being the very things that has held back the sale of her house. It is a busy road with traffic, the rear of the property is woods to the trail. This area is not part of a community. The pokeman-go-game has brought many people out into the community which is very pleasant to see for a change. It does make sense to expand the municipal campus there or to have access to the trail from here. There are switch backs in the area to the trail already. She does drive to Old Mine as well. This has been an interesting process. The people have been heard. Per a

town ordinance if the town does develop the properties there will be required landscape buffers, the neighbors will not be looking at a parking lot.

20. Tony DAquila of 29 Valley View Road has one compelling concern if the town purchases 4 properties. The Town Hall Village attracts business and developers. A developer could convince them to sell to them to develop. P&Z allows two or more parcels to be combined and up to 8,500 sf buildings to be built on them. Three of these are 4 acres. If used as access to the valley the properties are too steep and there would be no handicap access available. The valley is state owned and it is their responsibility to provide parking. He takes offense to having a police officer at this meeting and noted that is intimidating, a police officer was also at the L&A and BOE meeting. He asked that the public stop being intimidated.

Richard Whites email to the council read into the record at this meeting:

My name is Richard W. White, my family and I live at 169 Church Hill Road. I'm a computer mapping and analysis professional with wide experience developing, promoting, and utilizing the town's GIS. I have experience with wilderness trail development having consulted with the Appalachian Trail Conference on their first GIS. And I also participated with P&Z, our former Town Planner, and the Conservation Commission with input into the town's current Plan of Conservation and Development. I'm speaking on behalf of myself and my family.

Purportedly, the four (or two) properties before you tonight are needed to solve a town hall / library overflow parking problem and a trail / parks access problem. There is also concern that these residential parcels may be developed beyond the traditional control of our P&Z Commission. Before you move forward with an actual purchase, I'd ask you to request that the administration complete the research needed so that you can make an informed decision. There are several boards, commissions, and agencies that have not publicly weighed in on the purchase of the parcels, demolition of structures and trees, and development of a new parking lot, trail head, and trail development. I ask that you slow this down so that the administration can complete proper due diligence.

I'll address parking at the library first. The state has identified the section of the Pequonnock River Watershed through Trumbull as being impaired and in need of mitigation. The Pequonnock River Watershed Plan lists several town improvements that need to be made by the Town of Trumbull in order to help improve and preserve the watershed and specifically lays out a plan for developing improved parking and additional parking at our library using pervious pavement, tree boxes, and other design concepts to limit non-point source pollution from the existing Town Hall and Library complex. The document (attached) implies that partial funding is already available. Have the various state, regional, and local boards and commissions weighed in on any additional municipal development in this area? Have costs been laid out for this additional parking lot? Do these costs include the construction of pervious paving and tree box development as specified in the watershed plan?

Concerning the new trail head and trail development. Our Plan of Conservation and Development specifically marks the properties along Church Hill Road, Old Church Hill Road, and South Edgewood Avenue as "Maintain Residential Character and Use" and

that crosswalks and additional sidewalks be established in the area (attached). Our PoCD also marks several new trail head locations at the end of Val-de-Mere and in the Broadway area. There is zero mention of expanding the municipal campus or non-residential development in this neighborhood.

Have costs been laid out for these new crosswalks, sidewalks, and other trail head locations. If the town is abandoning these other plans laid out in the PoCD, have all of the various boards and commissions that worked on the original PoCD had the chance to weigh in on these changes?

The slope or grade behind these four properties, directly down to the Pequonnock trail is very steep. Development of a new trail is not as simple as sending a Boy Scout Troup out to mark and clear a few trees. Switch backs and proper foot bed will need to be established and there are two small creeks just north of this area that will need to be avoided. I believe this is why our PoCD was looking to develop other areas and not near Old Church Hill Road and South Edgewood Avenue in the first place. Is this to be a steeper mountain bike only trail, wider trail for strolling, or for mixed use? Have costs been developed for this new trail?

I have joked for years that I live within ¼-mile of our wonderful trail, but it is unusable at 400 feet down. Meaning, developing parking for a very steep sloped trail head is useless if you can't easily return to your car.

The Pequonnock River Watershed Plan outlines several suggestions for the town, especially at the Highway Department, have any of these been implemented?

Has the Historic Commission weighed in on the destruction of four buildings, has the Tree Warden weighed in on the removal of trees, has the Conservation Commission weighed in on development within the watershed and in an area of steep slope, have the various state and regional planning, conservation, and development commissions even been given a heads up on this plan?

Concerning the development of these four residential parcels. I do not see anything specific about these four parcels that doesn't exist with any other four residential parcels in town. They aren't subject to Adaptive-Reuse and each parcel is clearly zoned as residential. Is our P&Z Commission so weak that it can't protect the nature of our town from unwanted development especially when our newly approved PoCD clearly marks that these four properties be maintained for residential use? Is the town to buy up every four parcel cluster in town? No, this is a ridiculous concept. Is the town to buy up every four parcel cluster adjacent to parcels that do fall under Adaptive-Reuse? No, this is a ridiculous concept. Is the town to buy up every four parcel cluster adjacent to town controlled land? No, this is a ridiculous concept. Why has this concern even been mentioned?

Finally, this entire plan seems half-baked and rushed with very little notice given and charter requirements with regard to agenda, supplementary documents, and minutes ignored. If you move forward with this plan, I'd ask the Town Council to put in place several restrictions and limitations. First, that the town request input from all state, regional, and local boards and commissions with regard to the new development of these four parcels. Second, that the town limit future development of these four parcels to municipal parking and trail head development. And third, that the town notify all property owners within 1,000 feet of the parcels with all aspects of future development in this area.

Process, how is the public to weigh in on these matters without proper notice, agenda, supporting documentation, or minutes as required by both state and town requirements? How is this town council expected to hear my and other public comments, check our references and facts, review our maps and drawings, and then vote not minutes later on the resolutions that the public is invited to address?

Thank you for your time and service,

Richard W. White

References

[http://www.trumbullct.gov/filestorage/7112/7187/Plan\\_of\\_Conservation\\_%26\\_Development\\_\(2014\).pdf](http://www.trumbullct.gov/filestorage/7112/7187/Plan_of_Conservation_%26_Development_(2014).pdf)

<http://www.ct.gov/deep/lib/deep/water/tmdl/statewidebacteria/pequonnockriver7105.pdf>

[http://www.ct.gov/deep/lib/deep/water/watershed\\_management/wm\\_plans/pequonnock/pequonnock\\_wbpfinal.pdf](http://www.ct.gov/deep/lib/deep/water/watershed_management/wm_plans/pequonnock/pequonnock_wbpfinal.pdf)