



Land Use-Urban Redevelopment Committee – Board of Representatives

Virgil de la Cruz, Co-Chair

Charles Pia, Jr., Co-Chair

Committee Report

Date: Monday, February 11, 2019

Time: 6:30 p.m.

Place: Legislative Chambers, 4th Floor Government Center, 888 Washington Boulevard, Stamford, CT

The Land Use-Urban Redevelopment Committee met as indicated above. In attendance were Co-Chairs Pia and de la Cruz and Committee Member Reps. Cottrell, Graziosi, Lee, Lion, Michelson, Sherwood and Summerville. Also present were Reps. DePina Di Costanzo, Giordano, Jacobson, Kolenberg, Liebson, Matherne, McGarry, Miller, MOrson, Nabel, Patterson, Pratt, Quinones, Stella and Zelinsky; Katherine Emmett, Corporation Counsel; Ralph Blessing, Land Use Bureau Chief; Zoning Citation Officer; Sue Halpern, Carmine Tomas, Peter Quigley and Bob Katchko, NRZ; William Hennessey and Lisa Feinberg, Carmody, Torrance Sandak Hennessey LLP; and approximately 25 members of the public.

Item No.	Description	Committee Action
1. LU30.025	VERIFICATION; Petition for Appeal of Amendment to the Master Plan for B&S Carting Site (MP application # 432) pursuant to Charter §C6-30-7. 01/18/19 – Submitted by Planning Board 01/30/19 – Failed in Committee 0-8-0 02/04/19 – Held by Full Board	Approved 5-4-0

Mr. Tomas reviewed the [attached presentation](#) with the Committee. He stated that the parcels are intertwined with the application MP-433 submitted by the City and should be treated as one area under the Charter.

Mr. Hennessey stated that there are clear rules in Charter §C6-30-7 regarding the validity of a petition which have not been satisfied as to Application MP-432. He noted that the two applications were separately filed and separately noticed. In the context of the Charter, the existence of the companion application is meaningless.

Ms. Emmett stated that the amendment under application MP-432 has to be considered separately from the amendment under application MP-433. The Charter and state law does not allow considering the amendment with the amendment to neighboring properties.

Committee members discussed this item at great length with Mr. Blessing and Ms. Emmett: Items discussed included:

- The Planning Board could have reached different conclusions on each of these applications separately
- The Court has vacated the action of the board where amendments were put together. The amendment is limited to what is specified
- The Board is a political body and should not be considering land use items; this provision should be revised in the next Charter revision

- The Planning Board considered both applications
- These requirements are confusing to residents
- From a Land Use perspective, these applications could be considered together, but the applications are independent and separate
- This is one amendment
- Citizens should have the right to petition their government
- Each amendment can stand on its own

A motion to approve the petition was made, seconded and approved by a vote of 5-4-0 (Reps. de la Cruz, Cottrell, Graziosi, Sherwood and Summerville in favor; Reps. Pia, Lee, Lion and Michelson opposed).

Co-Chair Pia adjourned the meeting at 8:47 p.m.

This meeting is on [video](#).