

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING – AGENDA
MONDAY, September 29, 2014 – 7:00PM
NEW HARTFORD TOWN HALL – 530 MAIN STREET
MINUTES**

PRESENT: Chairman James Steadman, Ted Stoutenberg, David Krimmel, Dan LaPlante, Alternates Martin Post and Bob Moore; Land Use staff Steven Sadlowski and Glen Chalder, Planimetrics.

ABSENT: Gil Pratt, Alternate Peter Ventre.

Chairman Jim Steadman called the meeting to order at 7:00PM. All regular members present were seated for the meeting. The proceedings were recorded digitally and copies are available in the Land Use Office.

1. Discussion of Plan of Conservation and Development with Planimetrics.

Mr. Steadman welcomed Glen Chalder of Planimetrics and explained that the commission had been working on the update to the Plan of Conservation for the town of New Hartford and making real progress up to the point in time when the former land use officer, Ms. Rista Malanca, resigned. He continued that the intent of the commission was to follow what was done by Mr. Glen Chalder and his company ten years ago. Mr. Ted Stoutenberg explained that he and two other commission members had met and went through Sections 1, 3, 4, and 5 and the primary obstacle was obtaining the demographic portion of the plan.

Mr. Chalder inquired about the progress made with the updated plan by the former land use officer and whether Section 1 was edited or revised and whether she had made notes in the margins. Mr. Martin Post recalled that she had and had distributed information with possible action items included. Mr. David Krimmel indicated that he had made notes on each paragraph of the pages of the plans that were reviewed with her, designating each paragraph as okay, rewrite, explain, delete, update, etc. He also recalled that as the group had gathered for purposes of updating the plan, the general consensus was that the Planning & Zoning Commission had spent a lot of money, collected a lot of information, and that a great plan had been put together but that no one had implemented it. He continued that the question at the time was, "Why should we spend a lot of town money going to all this trouble to rewrite another plan if no one is going to implement it?" He summarized that the thinking of the group with regards to the required update was in reviewing the existing plan, parts of it were still applicable and could be used again and the other parts that might not be up to date should be the ones that are rewritten.

Discussion followed regarding which sections had been worked on by Ms. Malanca.

Mr. Stoutenberg addressed Mr. Chalder stating that a complete review is not necessary but the assistance that is being sought from Planimetrics is with the Demographics aspect of the plan. Assistance is also being sought from Planimetrics in putting together the future land use plan and the implementation according to Mr. Stoutenberg. Mr. Chalder reported that the changes in economic conditions since 2008 and a drop in birth rates will have a significant impact in what will happen in the future. He concurred that therefore getting a handle on what the trends are indicating

are both useful and important aspects of the demographic information the commission is seeking help with.

Mr. Chalder explained that many towns in Connecticut are facing a July 1, 2015 deadline in updating the Plan of Conservation and Development or risk becoming ineligible for state discretionary grants. These grants are often sought by Open Space Commissions or Water Pollution Control Authorities. Mr. Chalder opined that the most effective way he could aid the commission in the update process would be to work with Mr. Sadlowski, to do the Demographics work for the plan, to coordinate mapping unless Mr. Sadlowski would be doing so, and can attend some meetings.

Mr. Post discussed the Demographics portion explaining that there were contradictions between what was presented by the census and what was presented by the other information source. Mr. Post asked what the source is that Mr. Chalder would be using in preparing the Demographic part of the plan, whether it would be census data or projections. Mr. Chalder explains that Planimetrics relies on the census data because he deems it the best source available but that this also depends on what is being done. In terms of population projections, Mr. Chalder explained that they have their own model that is based on a community's birth rates, and what has been going on with the number of women of child bearing age, calculating migration rates based on that. He said they also compare their information with two other data sources, one being from UCONN, called Connecticut State Data Center, which prepares population projection. He is skeptical of this source alone though because of migration estimates. He directed commission members to Section 2-4's chart which shows how migration changes in New Hartford by age groups. New Hartford is attracting young families, aged 30-45 bringing with them school age children, but losing people over the age of 45-50.

Mr. Chalder reported that he could do a lot of work on the demographic projections but would like a menu from the commission of what they need from him. In response to a question from Mr. Steadman regarding the absolute deadline for the revision, Mr. Chalder strongly advised to have a draft approved by March, 2015. There is a sixty five day period between the commission's adoption of the proposed plan and the public hearing date. Mr. Sadlowski pointed out that New Hartford's date to have a revision submitted to the State of Connecticut is September 4, 2015 and Mr. Chalder agreed as the previous plan was adopted July 20, 2005 with an effective date of September 4, 2005. Mr. Stoutenberg stated that he continues to agree with wrapping up the process by March, 2015 given the work that has already been done.

Mr. Chalder inquired about the mapping. Mr. Sadlowski opined that outsourcing the work would be his inclination and Mr. Chalder advised this route, too. Mr. Chalder recommended GIS mapping from New England GeoSystems. Mr. Sadlowski indicated that this is the company that was previously used. Mr. Steadman asked for a guess on an estimate on the cost of the mapping work. Mr. Sadlowski indicated that it would be about \$3,000.

Mr. Sadlowski reported that he envisions a couple of meetings needing to be commenced in this process, one for the conservation side and one for the development side. Mr. Stoutenberg indicated that the demographics information should be in hand before a development meeting is called.

Mr. Post said he was inclined for the commission to draft a plan and after that to invite the public to review and modify. Mr. Stoutenberg and Mr. Moore agreed. Mr. Sadlowski asked how soon Mr.

Chalder could have ready the demographics. He responded that he could return within a month with the information sought.

Sequence of public meetings and how they relate to the drafting of the revisions was part of a discussion that followed by commission members.

Mr. Krimmel explained that the support of the town regarding the implementation of the plan is only going to be effective as the commission is in soliciting their input and their objectives. He outlined the boards and commissions that he thought should have letters mailed to them seeking their input as they meet in their respective groups to discuss their priorities and goals. Among the boards and commissions identified that should have requests sent were: Open Space Committee, Land Trust, Inland Wetlands Commission, Historical Society, Conservation Commission, Water Pollution Control Authority, Public Works Department (for infrastructure), Board of Education(s), Business Council, and Economic Development Commission. Mr. Moore agreed that these various boards are implementers of the plan and therefore very important in reaching out to them. Mr. Stoutenberg agreed and thought that even sending Chapter 4, as is, written ten years ago, and ask them for their thoughts by a reasonable date.

Mr. Chalder agreed with this approach. He expanded upon this idea and suggested that all the various boards and commissions still be invited to one meeting wherein each group gets five minutes to share and express their thoughts and opinions. He explained that this is a valuable approach in allowing each group to hear the thoughts and goals of every other group so that more understanding is had at the eventual end product of the Planning and Zoning's plan and their attempts to balance all goals.

Mr. Steadman inquired about the fee structure of Mr. Chalder and Planimetrics. Mr. Chalder indicated he could be as involved as the commission would like but that he notes that the commission has already begun the undertaking of a big part of the work. Mr. Chalder asked if Mr. Sadlowski would be handling the map portion of the plan. He confirmed that he would contact New England GeoSystems. Mr. Chalder asked about the cd-rom that was provided from Planimetrics from 2005. Mr. Sadlowski indicated that the location of the cd-rom is uncertain. Mr. Chalder indicated he would prepare another copy. The maps, shape files and project files should be on the cd-rom, according to Mr. Chalder. He indicated that this could be just given to GeoSystems for updating.

Mr. Chalder referenced Canton's Plan of Conservation and Development. He addressed the comment made by Mr. Krimmel at the beginning of the meeting that a plan was developed for the town of New Hartford ten years ago but then did not get implemented. He described Canton's approach to address this very issue. He suggested that the New Hartford Planning and Zoning Commission review Canton's plan and their creation of an Implementation Commission. According to Mr. Chalder, Canton adopted a two volume plan. One reason was the sixty-five day requirement for even the slightest word change in a plan. Canton decided to split out its implementation part from the strategic part. Mr. Chalder explained that the strategy is not likely to change a lot but the tools to make the plan happen might.

Mr. Chalder suggested members review the implementation plans from towns that have them: Canton, Norwich, or Waterford. Mr. Krimmel clarified that an implementation plan is not part of what needs to be submitted to the state of Connecticut. Mr. Chalder agreed that it does not need to be submitted. He stated he has spoken to a representative at the Office of Policy and Management and that they appreciate the distinction and the process.

Mr. Chalder explained that a person needs to be designated to handle a database that has changing variables, with action items that get updated and revised as needed. He noted the town of Southbury, wherein the Board of Selectman are taking the implementation component of the plan and making it the strategic plan for the town resulting in it driving the capital budget and the operating budget.

Mr. Chalder reviewed the areas the commission is seeking his services with to include the demographics, a meeting date in November, as well as coaching and aiding Mr. Sadlowski with the mapping portion of the plan. He indicated that any additional services after these would be priced on a lump sum basis. So long as the scope of work is defined, Mr. Chalder said he'd prefer to price the work on a lump sum basis rather than on an hourly basis.

Discussion followed about who would draft the document as an electronic, modifiable version is not necessarily available. Mr. Calder was unsure whether a word file is on the only cd-rom that exists. Mr. Moore asked about the possibility of OCR. Mr. Chalder said that if the commission is responsible for content, he would be able to provide a lump sum price on the formatting.

A date for a future meeting with Planimetrics regarding the demographics data will be worked out between Mr. Chalder and the rest of commission members through Mr. Sadlowski.

A meeting date designated to invite representatives from the various commissions and boards was set down for December 1, 2014.

Additional suggestions to the list of groups that Mr. Krimmel proposed seeking comment from include: Commission on Aging, Board of Selectman, Board of Finance, Fire Districts, and Recreation Commission.

Mr. Chalder made various suggestions to Mr. Sadlowski for inclusion in his letter seeking input from all these various boards. Among the suggestions were to request a draft of the comments one week prior to the meeting, and that each designated speaker from each group keep their comments to within five minutes in order to allow enough time for all the various groups to be heard.

MOTION: Mr. Stoutenberg, Mr. Post second, **to adjourn at 8:07PM; unanimously approved.**

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela A. Colombie
Recording Clerk