

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD SPECIAL MEETING #3349
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2002
7th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM, CONFERENCE ROOM
888 WASHINGTON BLVD., STAMFORD, CT

Present for the Board were: Duane Hill, Chairman; John Garnjost; Rose Marie Grosso; Marggie Laurie; Theresa Dell; Claire Fishman; Helane Rheingold. Present for staff: Robin Stein, Land Use Bureau Chief.

The Chairman, Mr. Hill, opened the meeting at 7:30 PM.

Capital Plan & Budget 2003/04-2010

Capital Budget & Plan 2003/04-2010. Mr. Barnes, Director of Public Safety reviewed the schedule of fire apparatus replacement. He stated that the objective was to provide each fire company with a modern frontline piece of apparatus. He said that the basic pumper apparatus can be customized to meet different needs and that the base price had declined in recent years. He added that another objective was for the City to own each fire vehicle to maximize flexibility and efficiency.

Regarding a request for additional radios, Mr. Barnes stated that a study of the entire radio system was being studied and would be complete next year. Mr. Barnes also stated that the net cost of the parking garage space for the police could be reduced to \$600-800,000.

Zoning Board of Appeals Referral:

ZBA Appl. 186-02 Waterside Power, LLC requesting a Special Exception to allow an electric power peaking facility at 17 Amelia Place in a M-G District. Mr. Lema, Mr. Roberts and Mr. Atkins presented for Waterside Power LLC. The Board also reviewed a letter submitted by the ABBDS Block Association, which contained suggested conditions. Mr. Atkins stated that Waterside Power was supportive of most of the requested conditions. After further discussion, Mr. Garnjost moved to recommend approval and cited the following conditions for the Zoning Board of Appeals to consider:

- Utilization of the Betts Avenue/Amelia Place entrance for emergency traffic only.
- Provision of additional landscaping as shown on plans (Landscape and Lighting Plan for Waterside Power Project).
- Provision of a Landscape Maintenance Agreement to cover the landscaping above.
- Installation of mufflers on the three generators.

Mrs. Dell seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Voting were the regular members.

Capital Plan and Budget:

The Board members had a number of questions relating to the Board of Education capital requests. They were as follows:

- In the State Department of Education table, provided on December 4th, include the current enrollment figures for the Stamford schools.
- A comprehensive schedule of enrollment projections for the next three years by elementary, middle and high schools coupled with capacity figures. This should include projections for the AIT and Alternate HS.
- Related to the above, the Planning Board remains concerned over your future plans for the AIT. Clarification of the future of the AIT both as to enrollment projections, facility to house the program and State reimbursement is needed. (Part of the concern relates to the concept of capping the AIT enrollment as part of the 3rd High School option, which suggests less than a total commitment to this program)
- We would like clarification on the sharing of facilities in both the 3rd High School option and the 9th Grade Expansion plans. In the first option, what facilities would the middle school and high school students share on the Rippowam campus? In the second option, what facilities would the ninth graders and the rest of the high students share at the Westhill and Stamford HS campuses?
- Is there now consensus that the capital cost numbers submitted by the Engineering Bureau for the 9th Grade Expansion option at Stamford and Westhill HS are acceptable for comparison purposes? Please provide the Planning Board with schematic plans of the two schools. Related to the Stamford HS 9th Grade Expansion, if the new building were placed on “stilts” to allow parking underneath, how would this impact the overall capital costs.
- With respect to the “District Wide Programs,” please provide a schedule showing capital costs by school and year for the seven-year capital plan. A replacement schedule for facilities equipment is also needed.
- With respect to Athletic Fields Renovation, please provide a complete list of fields and schedule for replacement. Are there plans for the renovation and maintenance of existing grass fields?
- With respect to the AIT Portables and Rippowam Renovation project, please be more specific as to which will be used for the AIT and which for Rippowam and whether or not this project will be impacted by the Alternative chosen (either 3rd HS or 9th Grade Expansion).
- In the 3rd HS alternative, were the start-up costs included in the budget numbers provided and if not what are these costs?

In addition, Mrs. Laurie asked if there was a correlation between school size and success t the elementary and middle school levels? She also recommended that the Board consider the Master Plan implications of the Board of Education’s facilities plan. There was considerable discussion regarding the overall objectives of the AIT program. Mr. Hill agreed to contact the new President of the Board of Education, Dudley Williams and the Mayor regarding the need to bring the various parties together on a facilities plan for the schools. He stated that the perceived quality of education is a critical issue for the city. Mrs. Grosso stated that the Board of Education presentation had failed to make a compelling case for the third high school and that a lot of questions remained unanswered.

It was agreed to forward the following questions to the Board of Education for their responses:

- In the State Department of Education table, provided on December 4th, include the current enrollment figures for the Stamford schools.
- A comprehensive schedule of enrollment projections for the next three years by elementary, middle and high schools coupled with capacity figures. This should include projections for the AIT and Alternate HS.
- Related to the above, the Planning Board remains concerned over your future plans for the AIT. Clarification of the future of the AIT both as to enrollment projections, facility to house the program and State reimbursement is needed. (Part of the concern relates to the concept of capping the AIT enrollment as part of the 3rd High School option, which suggests less than a total commitment to this program)
- We would like clarification on the sharing of facilities in both the 3rd High School option and the 9th Grade Expansion plans. In the first option what facilities would the middle school and high school students share on the Rippowam campus? In the second option what facilities would the ninth graders and the rest of the high students share at the Westhill and Stamford HS campuses?
- Is there now consensus that the capital cost numbers submitted by the Engineering Bureau for the 9th Grade Expansion option at Stamford and Westhill HS are acceptable for comparison purposes? Please provide the Planning Board with schematic plans of the two schools. Related to the Stamford HS 9th Grade Expansion, if the new building were placed on “stilts” to allow parking underneath, how would this impact the overall capital costs.
- With respect to the “District Wide Programs” please provide a schedule showing capital costs by school and year for the seven-year capital plan. A replacement schedule for facilities equipment is also needed.
- With respect to Athletic Fields Renovation, please provide a complete list of fields and schedule for replacement. Are there plans for the renovation and maintenance of existing grass fields?
- With respect to the AIT Portables and Rippowam Renovation project, please be more specific as to which will be used for the AIT and which for Rippowam and whether or not this project will be impacted by the Alternative chosen (either 3rd HS or 9th Grade Expansion).
- In the 3rd HS alternative, were the start-up costs included in the budget numbers provided and if not what are these costs?

There being no further items, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Duane Hill, Chairman, Stamford Planning Board

Note: These proceedings were recorded on tape and are available for review during regular business hours.