

RECEIVED FOR FILING  
AUG 12 2019  
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE  
EAST HAVEN, CONN.

EAST HAVEN TOWN COUNCIL  
PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES  
TUESDAY, AUGUST 6, 2019

*Stacy Gravano, CTC*  
TOWN CLERK

In accordance with Chapter III, Section 6 of the East Haven Town Charter, the East Haven Town Council Hearing Committee held a public hearing meeting Tuesday, August 6, 2019, at 7:00PM at the East Haven Senior Center, 91 Taylor Avenue, East Haven, CT 06512.

Chairman Ken McKay calls the meeting to order at 7:00PM.

**Item #1**

Roll Call for Hearing Committee-13 present- 2 absent (Badamo and Butler III).  
A quorum is present.

**Item #2**

To conduct Public Hearing #1 regarding an "Ordinance approving a transfer of \$210,000.00 for the Legal Services Department."

**AUTHORIZING ORDINANCE OF THE  
East Haven Town Council**

**An Ordinance approving a transfer of \$210,000.00 for the Legal Services  
Department**

**WHEREAS**, the Town Council of the Town of East Haven, upon recommendation of the Board of Finance, must approve transfers of monies in excess of \$50,000.00 in any given fiscal year;

**AND WHEREAS**, the Board of Finance, on June 19, 2019, approved and recommended the following transfer to the Town Council:

**Legal Services**

|              |                  |                     |
|--------------|------------------|---------------------|
| <b>To:</b>   | <b>For:</b>      |                     |
| 01-113-0668  | Legal and Lawyer |                     |
|              | Fees             | \$210,000.00        |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |                  | <b>\$210,000.00</b> |

**From:**

|              |                |                     |
|--------------|----------------|---------------------|
| 01-881-8950  | Self Insurance | \$150,000.00        |
| 01-885-0689  | Contingency    | \$60,000.00         |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |                | <b>\$210,000.00</b> |

**Reason:** Funds needed for complex litigation - to close out FY 2018-2019.

**NOW THEREFORE**, be it **ORDAINED** by the Town Council of the Town of East Haven that said transfer is approved.

This Ordinance shall be effective in accordance with the provisions of the East Haven Town Charter.

|               |                               |             |
|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Submitted by: | Danelle Feeley, Council Clerk | Date: _____ |
| Approved by:  | Joseph Maturo, Jr., Mayor     | Date: _____ |
| Received by:  | Stacy Gravino, Town Clerk     | Date: _____ |

Public comment:

- Robert Sand- 501 Thompson Street, East Haven- Mr. Sand asks with the \$60,000 coming out of contingency, what is the balance in the contingency after the transfer.
- Finance Director Paul Rizza says right now before this transfer there is \$490,000.
- Joshua Balter- 35 Red Bluff Road, East Haven, CT- Mr. Balter says they are hearing a blank transfer for extensive litigation, we just heard there was \$550,000 in the contingency fund and the Town is saying we are having fiscal problems. What exactly is the complex litigation that the Town is asking for this additional \$60,000 for?
- Town Attorney Joseph Zullo explains that he has a full presentation to give and it will answer that question as well as a lot of others. He indicates nothing he speaks about will be in relation to the self-insurance aspect, if at any point it needs to they can go into executive session to discuss those substantive parts of the litigation but his comments will be confined to legal fees which is the substance of the transfer. This originated last meeting when the Council authorized a public hearing for tonight and last meeting they were presented with a packet of legal fees and there was a bit of a heated exchange regarding that packet but he only had about 90 seconds to look at it that night so he took it home and dissected it. The first thing he noticed was half the names of the law firms were spelled wrong, it looked like a kindergartener had written it and second he noticed that the reports attached to it were accounting reports which contain debits and credits. If you don't know how to reconcile that, it would give a very inaccurate picture of what it actually says. He references the first page at the very bottom where there are four lawyers listed such as himself, Attorney Al Zullo, Attorney Frank Kolb and Attorney Hugh Keefe. It has those attorneys receiving payments on July 26<sup>th</sup> of \$56,000, \$44,000, \$37,000, \$40,000 and he can assure them he did not receive a check on that date for that amount. Above it, it references a week later they received checks for 1/12 of that amount and that's interesting because that 1/12 amount is their monthly retainer that they are paid every month for their services. It is pretty obvious once you go through the

report that was given that whoever reconciled it accounted for not only what they are paid monthly but also what they are paid yearly and in doing that grossly overstated the amount of fees incurred by legal department and paid to each of the Town Attorneys. It was represented by the Council member that presented this that the information was provided to the Council by a Town Hall whistleblower, that it was all true from a concerned finance department whistleblower. He indicates he researched exactly where they came from, the initials of the person who generated the reports are FED, which stands for Feeley, D, which is his fiancé. He asked her where they came from and found in his emails they were requested as part of a freedom of information request that came in on October 9, 2018 at 11:53AM and within an hour the reports were compiled and provided to the requestor. The clear chain of custody was from her office, to his office and to that requestor and what that person or firm did with them after he doesn't know. A kind way to say it is this was a material misrepresentation, it is a falsehood to say they were sent by a finance department whistleblower and that they came from a concerned town hall whistleblower; they came from a third party pursuant to an FOI request that we complied fully with and had no reason to hide anything. Unfortunately whoever compiled this information did a very poor job of reconciling it and he provides a packet, which gives the true story; it is an accounting of every legal fee paid during those 3.5 years down to the penny. The reason he knows it is correct is because unlike that other report, it references check numbers and check dates. It was indicated to the Council in these exact words "Attorney Zullo made \$1 million dollars in three years." He ran the vendor report and it says that he was compensated over 3.5 years \$269,000. That's almost \$750,000 in discrepancy, which is shameful.

- Councilman Nicholas Palladino asks what all this has to do with this.
- Attorney Zullo says he was asked for an accounting of all legal fees to justify this transfer and that is what he is supplying. He adds that he found his partner made \$147,000 as the land use Attorney and they billed about \$190,000 outside of their retainer. They also billed and requested reimbursement for \$19,000 in fees that they paid for entry fees and things like that. In total the amount of checks received for all of their services was \$588,000, which is half of a million dollars less than what was given to them last month. He says he understands to members of the public these fees may still seem high so he looked at how they are funded for the legal services department and this Council and the Board of Finance and Finance Director authorized appropriations of \$2.29 million dollars during this period. The records he provided indicate they spent \$2.16 million dollars so that's \$122,000 left over. Although it was represented that these fees are absorbent, they are exactly within the authorization that the Board of Finance and this Council approved. There isn't a single aspect of the report that was given to them that is accurate, they don't know who generated it or who summarized it or anything else about it. He thinks it is terrible that it was given to the Council last month, represented to be fact and represented to be reliable, when it is none of those things. He provides the Council with an accounting of what they have incurred this year showing every purchase order he has cut and it shows the largest piece of complex litigation is the Ferrara matter and they have spent \$135,000 defending that matter in this fiscal year alone. They expended

\$94,000 on a duo of federal and state cases regarding Ms. Carbone, \$42,000 on the quarry. He references the bottom which lists the matters that were most complex and proceeded further than they thought they would which are the Ferrara matter, Quarry matter, Frank Biancur matter, and an appeal to the appellate court so if you add those up they total \$209,000 which is just shy of the \$210,000 he is requesting tonight. This answers the question that was posed of what the complex matters were. He explains they get two chunks of money in the legal department, one for legal/lawyer fees and one for settlements of claims and some years they spend more in claims than on legal fees and some years they spend more money on legal fees than claims. This is one of the years where they have spent more on legal fees. He adds that they had almost the entirety of the balance needed tonight in the self-insurance line item to fund it, so that tells him they are being aggressive and proactive with litigation and they have saved money and with their support tonight will be able to reallocate it in order to continue vigorously fighting these claims. Lastly, he explains that the legal services department collects delinquent taxes and he pulled the audit reports and determined that the Council and Board of Finance have projected the goal for his department to collect \$4.35 million dollars in delinquent taxes since 2011 and they have collected \$5.41 million dollars; so they beat the target by almost \$1.1 million dollars. If you look at the four years prior to that there was a projected target of \$3.3 million and \$2.5 million was collected which is a shortfall of almost \$200,000 per year. So they were successful in their term by redistributing the 421 foreclosures and staying on top of people and following up so they took a \$200,000 per year shortfall and made it a \$150,000 per year surplus; that's a \$350,000 swing each year. He understands nobody likes paying for legal fees especially when they involve complex litigation but he wants to make them aware they spend every dollar cautiously and in the best interest of the Town. For all of these reasons he is asking for their support in this transfer tonight.

Council comment:

- Councilman Nicholas Palladino asks if this money is needed to reconcile last year's budget. He asks if they spent a little more than anticipated last year and this isn't for anything going forward.
- Attorney Zullo says he hasn't spent anything, he will not ask the Finance Department to cut a check for legal fees if the money is not there as that would be a disservice and disrespect to the Council. Even though the bills are in, the money has not been cut. The line item now shows about \$100 in the account so this is to close out the old year; it is not for the new year.

**Item #3**

Adjournment of Public Hearing #1.

Councilman Robert Parente makes a motion.

Councilman Joseph Santino seconds the motion.

Voice vote: all in favor-none oppose-none abstain. Motion carries.

**Item #4**

To conduct Public Hearing #2 regarding an "Ordinance approving a transfer of \$225,000.00 for the Public Services/Sanitation Departments."

**AUTHORIZING ORDINANCE OF THE  
East Haven Town Council**

**An Ordinance approving a transfer of \$225,000.00 for the Public  
Services/Sanitation Departments**

**WHEREAS**, the Town Council of the Town of East Haven, upon recommendation of the Board of Finance, must approve transfers of monies in excess of \$50,000.00 in any given fiscal year;

**AND WHEREAS**, the Board of Finance, on June 19, 2019, approved and recommended the following transfer to the Town Council:

**Public Services/Sanitation**

|              |                                |                     |
|--------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>To:</b>   | <b>For:</b>                    |                     |
| 01-226-0676  | Waste Collection - Disposal    | \$200,000.00        |
| 01-226-0674  | Waste Collection - TrashMaster | \$25,000.00         |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |                                | <b>\$225,000.00</b> |

|              |                  |                     |
|--------------|------------------|---------------------|
| <b>From:</b> |                  |                     |
| 01-224-0110  | Regular Salaries | \$200,000.00        |
| 01-229-0201  | Electricity      | \$25,000.00         |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |                  | <b>\$225,000.00</b> |

**Reason:** Funds needed to close out FY 2018-2019.

**NOW THEREFORE**, be it **ORDAINED** by the Town Council of the Town of East Haven that said transfer is approved.

This Ordinance shall be effective in accordance with the provisions of the East Haven Town Charter.

Submitted by: Danelle Feeley, Council Clerk  
 Approved by: Joseph Maturo, Jr., Mayor  
 Received by: Stacy Gravino, Town Clerk

Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Public comment:

- Donna Perrone- 43 Hoop Pole Lane, East Haven- Mrs. Perrone asks about the money coming out of salaries, does that mean they over budgeted by \$200,000 for salaries?
- Chairman Ken McKay says it wasn't spent, not over budgeted. They are keeping it within the same public works budget. There are other line items that have money left over as well.
- Mrs. Perrone says she is surprised that salaries would have any overage.
- Joshua Balter- 35 Red Bluff Road, East Haven, CT- Mr. Balter seeks clarification as he may have his fiscal years wrong but didn't public works recently return half a million dollars to the Town. Is that the same fiscal year they are now asking for a transfer of a quarter of a million dollars back? Or was that the previous year?
- Mr. Rizza says this is to close out the last year ending June 30, 2019. These accounts have excess money within public services or sanitation. The from accounts are regular salaries and electricity so there were savings there and there were additional expenditures for waste collection disposal.
- Mr. Balter says so he is saying public works did not give back half a million dollars to the Town in the same fiscal year they are asking for \$225,000 to go back.
- Mr. Rizza says no, he is not aware of a \$500,000 transfer or monies unspent in public works.
- Mr. Balter says his question is still not answered, is he saying a half of a million dollars was never transferred from public works back to the Town?
- Mr. Rizza says right.

Council comment:

- Councilman Louis Pacelli asks about the \$200,000 in salaries where they had an overage, does that mean they are not filling all of the positions?
- Mr. Rizza says no, over the course of the year there were unspent monies for people in and out, 2-3 positions weren't filled so it did build up a surplus.
- Councilman Louis Pacelli asks if they still have open positions that they are not filling.
- Mr. Rizza says right now probably not, there may be 1-2 in the beginning of the year and people leave but it's not a matter of not filling the positions for the year it is people in and out.
- Councilman Robert Parente says people retired.
- Mr. Rizza says people are also out on worker's comp so they are paid under worker's comp and they do have people transitioning in and out.
- Councilman Joseph Santino indicates the transfer says TrashMasters and it is now Affordable Waste so it has to be amended.
- Attorney Zullo indicates that it requires an update in the budget services report; the line item in the budget still reads Waste Collection-TrashMaster. He indicates they still have outdated names in his legal budget as well; it just needs an update in the budget services report.

**Item #5**

Adjournment of Public Hearing #2.

Councilman Joseph Santino makes a motion.

Councilwoman Loria Jaffe seconds the motion.

Voice vote: all in favor-none oppose-none abstain. Motion carries.

**Item #6**

To conduct Public Hearing #3 regarding an "Ordinance approving a transfer of \$154,000.00 for the Police Department."

**AUTHORIZING ORDINANCE OF THE  
East Haven Town Council**

**An Ordinance approving a transfer of \$154,000.00 for the Police Department**

**WHEREAS**, the Town Council of the Town of East Haven, upon recommendation of the Board of Finance, must approve transfers of monies in excess of \$50,000.00 in any given fiscal year;

**AND WHEREAS**, the Board of Finance, on June 19, 2019, approved and recommended the following transfer to the Town Council:

**Police Department**

|              |                |                     |
|--------------|----------------|---------------------|
| <b>To:</b>   | <b>For:</b>    |                     |
| 01-332-0190  | Overtime Wages | \$50,000.00         |
| 01-332-0190  |                |                     |
|              | Overtime Wages | \$104,000.00        |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |                | <b>\$154,000.00</b> |

|              |                  |                     |
|--------------|------------------|---------------------|
| <b>From:</b> |                  |                     |
| 01-332-0192  | Repl. Vac. Days  | \$50,000.00         |
| 01-332-0110  | Regular Salaries | \$104,000.00        |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |                  | <b>\$154,000.00</b> |

**Reason:** Funds needed to close out FY 2018-2019.

**NOW THEREFORE**, be it **ORDAINED** by the Town Council of the Town of East Haven that said transfer is approved.

This Ordinance shall be effective in accordance with the provisions of the East Haven Town Charter.

Submitted by: Danelle Feeley, Council Clerk  
 Approved by: Joseph Maturo, Jr., Mayor  
 Received by: Stacy Gravino, Town Clerk

Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date: \_\_\_\_\_

No public comment.  
 No council comment.

#### **Item #7**

Adjournment of Public Hearing #3.

Councilman Robert Parente makes a motion.  
 Councilwoman Loria Jaffe seconds the motion.  
 Voice vote: all in favor-none oppose-none abstain. Motion carries.

#### **Item #8**

To conduct Public Hearing #4 regarding "An Ordinance Conveying the property located at 70 Elliott Street (AKA 82 Elliott Street) to Ralph Mauro, or his Designee."

### **AUTHORIZING ORDINANCE OF THE East Haven Town Council**

#### **An Ordinance Conveying the property located at 70 Elliott Street (AKA 82 Elliott Street) to Ralph Mauro, or his Designee**

**WHEREAS**, the Town of East Haven is the present owner of real property located at 70 Elliott Street, East Haven, Connecticut (AKA 82 Elliott Street, East Haven, Connecticut) and identified by the following map, block, and lot number: "100/0918/001" (hereafter, "the Property");

**AND WHEREAS**, the property's use as a school was discontinued by the East Haven Board of Education in April of 2016;

**AND WHEREAS**, following the discontinuance of the use of the property as a school and the reversion of the property to the Town, the Town identified the sale and private redevelopment of the property as single-family housing as the highest and best use for the property;

**AND WHEREAS**, on October 5, 2016, the East Haven Planning and Zoning Commission issued a favorable 8-24 Referral to the Town Council in connection with the proposed sale and redevelopment of the property;

**AND WHEREAS**, the Town of East Haven has solicited competitive bids from prospective purchasers in connection with the proposed sale of the property;

**AND WHEREAS**, the Town has awarded the bid to Ralph Mauro, subject to the approval of the Town Council and issuance of a disposition ordinance approving the proposed sale;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED** by the Town Council of the Town of East Haven that the conveyance of 70 Elliott Street, East Haven, Connecticut (AKA 82 Elliott Street, East Haven, Connecticut) to Ralph Mauro, or his designee, is hereby approved for a sales price of \$410,000.00;

**BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED** that the Town, acting by and through its Mayor or his designee, is authorized to enter into any agreements and execute any and all related deeds, easements, (including construction easements), and sales-related documents in order to effectuate the contemplated conveyance and development of the Property.

This Ordinance shall be effective in accordance with the provisions of the East Haven Town Charter.

|               |                               |             |
|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Submitted by: | Danelle Feeley, Council Clerk | Date: _____ |
| Approved by:  | Joseph Maturo, Jr., Mayor     | Date: _____ |
| Received by:  | Stacy Gravino, Town Clerk     | Date: _____ |

Chairman Ken Mckay states he thinks there will be a lot of public comment on the sale of this property and he will limit speaking to 3 minutes per-person, as there are a lot of people that want to speak. They can think about the old high school, which took 22 years to sell and now it is a beautiful building and the neighborhood is getting cleaned up.

Attorney Zullo indicates that this was in his initial letter to the Council 7.5 years ago; his firm has represented Ralph Mauro and the Mauro family in the past. They do represent them in pending matters but none before the Town of East Haven; he has separate counsel with respect to this development and project. If for some reason there is something that goes beyond plain old facts he can get them separate counsel.

Sal Brancati-Director of Administration & Management- Mr. Brancati is there to propose for the Council's consideration the disposition of 82 Elliot Street to the developer Ralph Mauro. He wants to point out this presentation is based on the disposition of the property. The zoning issues that may or may not pertain to the project will be discussed if it gets to that point at the planning and zoning commission which would be for setbacks, lot coverage, design to an extent and wetlands if they are intruded upon which they don't think they are based on the map David Ward has done. He indicates there are 14 lots in the subdivision, which is what the Town asked for and the developer agreed to. The Town has put out a little over \$100,000 over the last three years in

maintaining the building which means paying the electric, gas, water and sewer. That does not include the break-ins to the school that required repairs as well. The benefit to this if and when it is developed as 14 single family homes will be new revenue to the Town of about \$100,000-\$105,000 which is a \$200,000 swing by having the development take place. He explains another benefit which is the Greenway Trail that currently comes along the bottom section and a small spur that would come out to Elliot Street. They placed an easement that their Attorneys have filed on the land records for the Greenway Trail to cross this property and the developer has agreed to it. The exact location of the trail is in discussion with Mr. Mauro but they believe the trail will be connecting to Elliot Street through the back of one of the lots as it was proposed a few years back. They are not infringing on the wetlands, David Ward has flagged them there is a 50ft review area there. He references a poster board with the design that has been submitted by the developer, which planning and zoning will determine if it works. The sale price of the property is \$410,000 and there was a previous bid on the property for approximately \$375,000 that was declined for a variety of reasons. They went out and rebid the project again and there were two proposals but one came in 1.5 hours late so they couldn't accept it but it came in for \$325,000. On top of the \$410,000, the developer will spend probably in excess of \$300,000 to demo the 40,000 sq. ft. building on the site coming to a total price of \$710,000. If we decided to keep this site and make a park out of it, the Town would pay the \$300,000 plus and get no revenue out of it. He's not saying that is a bad idea but this looks like a better proposal, the Town pays no money to demo it and gets a revenue stream on the opposite side. He indicates he has lived with 200 Tyler Street for 5 years and the Town has spent over \$6 million dollars on that property in 22 years and he isn't saying this is a remake or redo of 200 Tyler Street since it's not of the same magnitude but it is a vacant building that you don't have a legitimate use for. He thought about putting public works in there because it has 14 acres of land but it's not the right place for public works and in addition there would be an abandoned property where public works is on North High Street that they cannot dispose of. This property has marketability to make some money for the Town and put it back in the general fund. As a point of reference, there are 86 acres of parkland in East Haven right now plus 321 acres of open space which is designated as never to be built on. In his opinion that is a lot of property and parks for a population of 30,000 in the Town of East Haven. He indicates someone mentioned to him what if the houses get foreclosed on. First of all to get foreclosed on they have to be sold and neither he nor anyone here can tell him who will or will not get foreclosed on. People get sick, lose their jobs, etc. it happens all the time so someone can get foreclosed on in this development or anywhere else in Town. This by far is the highest and best use for this site; it provides for the greenway trail that many people want to see happen, it puts a nice new community in a neighborhood. The developer is proposing attractive single-family homes that will generate revenue for the Town. There are houses surrounding this property, it's not an all wooded area. This is not a detriment to the neighborhood; it is an improvement to the neighborhood. He thinks the price is extremely fair when you

take into consideration that he has to demo the building at his own expense so a \$710,000 sale price is more than reasonable. If you look at unfinished lots there is demo, road-work, utilities, etc. their appraiser says an unfinished lot is about \$35,000-\$40,000 so add that to what he is paying for the property and demo, he is paying more than \$35,000-\$40,000 to make this a subdivision.

Public comment:

- Donna Perrone- 43 Hoop Pole Lane- East Haven, CT- Mrs. Perrone states that she doesn't think 3 minutes is fair considering the importance; she lives across the street and has many concerns. She asks who made the decision that a park wouldn't be appropriate. When she spoke with Joe Maturo and Sal Brancati a year ago, they assured her that anything that went forward in the form of housing, the builder had to blend it to be made comparable to the houses that are there now. There are 5 houses on Hoop Pole Lane and Elliot Street and a few on the other side; it's not a huge community by any means. The sizes of these houses on the board being shown to them are tiny houses and no disrespect to anyone with a smaller house but the houses there now are between 2800 and 3200 sq. ft. If you put in smaller homes, it will destroy their property values and they are also trying to shove in 14-16 new houses, which will destroy their quality of life. They have lived there and they have woods across and behind where animals run through, she doesn't want 16 houses or any houses over there. She was told a survey went out to neighbors last year, she asks if that is correct.
- Council members indicate there were no surveys sent out.
- Mrs. Perrone states that the houses do not blend in with their neighborhood; they are tiny houses and are going to destroy their property values.
- Mr. Brancati says the developer told them that these houses would range from 2400 sq. ft. to maybe 2800 sq. ft. which is consistent to the majority of the houses in the neighborhood.
- Mrs. Perrone says the houses on Hoop Pole Lane are 2800-3200 sq. ft., she indicates she pulled all of the assessor's field cards.
- Mr. Brancati says nothing will be exact but a house in the range of 2600-2800 is consistent with houses that are 2500-3000 sq. ft. it's not like he is building a 1200 sq. ft. home. He adds that every lot is .5 acres, and every lot is bigger than her lot. Every lot that fronts Elliot Street and Hoop Pale has 110 ft. of frontage and she requested they have a minimum of 105 ft. some of them have 150 ft. of frontage.
- Chairman Ken McKay says he understands her concerns but they are looking to sell the piece of property and then it goes to planning and zoning for the project. They will decide if they can build that many homes on that piece of property. They don't want another vacant school for 22 years. He wishes he had a park

across from his house but he doesn't and it's not fair to all the taxpayers of the Town to have a park on every corner.

- Mrs. Perrone says Hoop Pole is a cut through from Cosey Beach over to Short Beach Road, do you know what the traffic is going to do to that street with that number of houses.
- Chairman Ken Mckay says it is going to be neighborhood people that go there.
- Mr. Brancati says to the east of this property the Town still owns another 18 acres of open space. The land trust owns approximately 20 acres to the north west of this site so that is approximately 38 acres of open space for the animals or whatever else that will remain open and not developed.
- Mrs. Perrone asks if this is a done deal to sell it to Mr. Mauro.
- Chairman Ken Mckay says it hasn't been voted on has it? This is the procedure for the Council to vote on the sale of the property. If the Council votes yes, it will be sold if they vote no, it will not be sold.
- Mrs. Perrone says asks if they are considering the people that live across the street that will be impacted by this when making their decision.
- Chairman Ken Mckay says they consider everything; they have all been reviewing this project for a while.
- Mrs. Perrone says none of the neighbors want this to happen.
- Chairman Ken mckay says he understands, they don't want change in their neighborhood. He doesn't want a new store in his neighborhood either, but then they built a Dunkin Donuts on Main Street and he can't stop it. They have the right and they own the property. You can't stop a piece of property from being developed once someone buys it. Just like she has to right to sell her house and build a new one.
- Mrs. Perrone says putting in 14 houses is going to destroy their property values.
- Chairman Ken Mckay says the lots are going to be larger than what she has now; they are going to be a half acre or more.
- Mrs. Perrone says look at the sizes of the houses they are going to be putting there. She says she votes no.
- Allan Shaul- 22 Elliot Street, East Haven- Mr. Shaul asks if planning and zoning takes care of all the traffic and city busing that will be coming through there.
- Chairman Mckay says he doesn't know if a city bus will go through there but that is up to the State. Planning and Zoning takes care of traffic issues.
- Mr. Shaul says there is only one street that accesses this, if you get fire or traffic in the area there is a problem because there is not another exit out of the area except the one street. There are 6 houses there already they are looking at putting in 14 others and there are two at the end already so the access for fire and safety is going to be an issue.
- Jean Edwards-Chieppo- 173 Henry Street, East Haven- Mrs. Edwards-Chieppo says she is the corner house on Elliot and she brought photographs of all of the

water down on the property. You cannot walk on it, it is so wet and her dog's legs have sunk into the grass and they had to be pulled out. It is insane to think it will be an easy job up there. They closed the school because the carpets were like sponges full of water. Someone made a comment that rabbits and deer don't pay taxes, well they like the rabbits and deer which is why they bought over there. It's unfair and giving away land again just like Town Fair Tire.

- Karen Martin- 15 Oak Grove Road- Ms. Martin says her property abuts the Bradford Reserve which is about in the middle of all of the wetlands they are talking about building on. Whatever is happening, nobody in their neighborhood was aware of until just recently. Something was pushed through and some people are trying to make money somewhere without the advice and consent of the people that live in that area; she thinks they should have some type of say on it. Talking about the size of the lots being .5 acres in comparing them to the lots already there and the houses already there, there is no comparison. If you think those houses will be just as good, they are not. She means no disrespect to the people that live around and near 200 Tyler Street but this is not that, take a ride and see what they are talking about. It's a park over there and she knows they will be losing income but there was no income anyway, it was a school with nobody paying taxes on it. We aren't losing any more if we use it as a park/public space. She says Mr. Pacelli talked all about Sperry Lane and how the Girl Scout camp was being taken over for no good reason; the same thing is happening here it is going on for no good reason. We aren't losing money by keeping it as our own property; this is not 200 Tyler Street. Someone said nobody wants change; they want change for the better and putting in 14 houses in that small area where there is no access for fire trucks or two ways out is not the way to handle this. We have the right to keep property for ourselves to enjoy, she tells them to go take a look at it for themselves.
- Mary Varunes- 123 French Avenue, East Haven- Ms. Varunes says she lives right behind 200 Tyler Street but she worked at DC Moore School for 10 years. It was built on shale, they would take the kids out to plant and they couldn't dig into the dirt because it was all rock. They said they built that school on wetlands and shale. If they are going to start digging they better be sure there isn't a bunch of shale underneath because they won't get through. When it rained the water would come up through the carpet and there would be large fans in the hallway blowing everything dry. That's because it was on shale and there was no basement. There were a number of teachers that health wise it wasn't a good thing for.
- Kristy Turcio Porter- 93 Austin Ave, East Haven- Mrs. Porter asks if a bid went out just for the demolition. Mr. Brancati says they met with a demo contractor and based on the square footage of the property and location they estimated \$300,000. It was an estimate, not a detailed bid but they felt \$7.50 per square foot for 40,000 square feet was reasonable.

- Mrs. Porter says she was told 15 houses so she will use that number; it costs approximately \$200,000 to educate one child for 12 years in the Town of East Haven, not including special education or kindergarten. Hypothetically speaking if there is one child per 15 houses that comes out to about \$3,000,000 over a 12 year period. She doesn't think that is the amount of money they are going to collect in taxes. We currently have 237 active foreclosures in the Town and over the past 5 years we had 338 foreclosures go to judgement. That is over 500 residential foreclosures, not commercial property. We do not need any more houses; there are plenty to go around if people want to live here. She agrees that 14-15 houses are too many; if someone said they were going to put 5 or 6 houses she might not feel the same as she does about 14-15 houses. It's about a quality of life for them, she doesn't know where 86 acres of land is but it's not anywhere near here or in Momauguin. They all walk over there and take their animals and they like the deer and rabbits. There's no guarantee people will pay the taxes and it will cost \$3,000,000 to educate 15 children over 12 years. She appreciates their time and asks them to vote no and consider putting a committee together to explore other options, she will be the first to volunteer.
- Gary Chieppo-173 Henry Street, East Haven- Mr. Chieppo mentions the 86 acres of parks and he asks how much of that is soccer and baseball fields, it's not really parks. He asks about the Council recently passing an ordinance about dogs on the beach and now the parks. He was aware they weren't allowed on the beach and now they are no longer allowed in public parks.
- Attorney Zullo clarifies that before last month pets were not allowed on the Town Green when there was an event which had more than 100 people such as Sunday concerts and the Fall Festival; any other time you are free to bring pets to the green and that didn't change you are still allowed to do that. What changed is pets are no longer allowed on the beach regardless of what is going on at the beach.
- Mr. Chieppo reiterates that he is there in opposition to anything being built on the DC Moore property. It is part of the set side and the greenway and should remain that way. It should be open space for the people down there because they really don't have a lot. He hopes their consideration would be to vote against this. He understands in order to draw up the diagram some sort of measurements had to be made or surveying had to be done. He saw on a number of occasion's surveyors out there putting flags out and taking measurements. He asks who paid for that.
- Mr. Brancati says the developer paid for it.
- Mr. Chieppo says it is still Town property and on Saturday the Board of Education was there and two guys were mowing the lawn and he assumes it was at time and a half. Perhaps they can do it during the week to save some money.

- Chairman Ken McKay says they do cut it Monday through Friday but there is so much that has to be cut.
- Councilman Robert Parente says there are 125 acres that they cut over the course of the year. Right now guys are in Friday, Saturday and Sunday for four hours to prepare the baseball fields for league play. If there is time left over after the fields are done they do other properties. He says the Board of Education has never cut the grass for Town property. They don't own any lawnmowers.
- Mr. Chieppo says he can show him pictures there was a Board of Education truck with two guys on riding mowers cutting the grass at DC Moore School, he observed it.
- Councilman Joseph Santino says the parks department uses the gold truck from the Board of Education so he thought it was a board of education truck.
- Lorena Venegas- 73 George Street, East Haven- Ms. Venegas says she is opposed to any development of this property. She says she worked at DC Moore in 2014 and heard all of the stories from the retired teachers that had breathing issues. She is concerned about demolition; she doesn't care where the wind blows it is going to harm adults, pets and children. She is concerned about the environmental concerns of demolition especially in the swamp area. She asks what the timeline to build is if they were to.
- Mr. Brancati explains that there is a schedule which shows needing a month or two to go to zoning, then they need to work on the greenway trail design, two months for engineering, another month for wetland/zoning approval, one month for demolition, three months for road construction; some may be able to be constructed that face the road and 8 months after that for completion. This is a total of 17 months from beginning to end.
- Ms. Venegas asks Attorney Zullo as to how to do this an alternate way through a public referendum. Other cities ask their residents what they want and make sure each representative talk to each one of their constituents in their districts.
- Chairman Ken McKay says they would need to get enough people to sign a petition; you need a certain percentage of the voters.
- Attorney Zullo says the issue of referendum and the initiation of it are available on the Town website 24/7. Section 11 is the power of initiative and 10A is the power of referendum. It explains the timeline, number of signatures, etc. East Haven is not unique in that the Town Council is vested with the power to convey real property; that is something that is very common across the State. Some Towns require certain conveyances over a certain amount or types to go via referendum. Based on East Haven's model of government which is the predominant model in the State of Connecticut, the Council is vested with the jurisdiction to sell real property.
- Ms. Venegas says she is concerned that because we have a small number of residents in Town and already have a bad history of land development we need

public comment to make a correct decision. Now that we are in an election year, we need to postpone this.

- Mrs. Edwards-Chieppo mentions that she provided photos that she wanted to have passed around which shows all the water on the DC Moore property.
- Donna Richo-67 Charnes Drive, East Haven- Mrs. Richo says there are a number of unanswered questions one is the number of square feet. She asks Mr. Brancati if the sale is contingent on zoning approval.
- Mr. Brancati says that has not been made a stipulation.
- Mrs. Richo asks if the developer is here and asks him if the houses will have basements.
- Mr. Ralph Mauro says yes they will have basements.
- Mrs. Richo says there is a water problem there and her concern is if you build these houses they will end up with moldy sick houses that will go into foreclosure. He may have a way to resolve it but he is taking on an awful lot.
- Mr. Mauro says they had a land expert there and they know where the wetlands are. There was also an elaborate drainage system put into that place so they will do whatever it takes to bring the houses to the level above the water. All the houses will have a footing drain that will go into the drainage system. They won't know exactly what to do until they do some further engineering work. Right now they expended a ton of money doing what they did. Also the question comes up about how big the homes are going to be and it's all what the market can bare. If they can put a 5,000 sq. ft. house and be able to sell it, they will.
- Mrs. Richo says they all know he won't be able to sell a 5,000 sq. ft. home there.
- Mr. Mauro says right, so they will probably start with a 2200-2300 sq. ft. house on one of the lots and see what happens. When putting the plan together they took into consideration the portion where you come into Elliot Street and it will remain open space. It isn't wetlands, it is a grass area that will remain open for people to walk or bring their dogs. Obviously the numbers only work if they can build so many homes otherwise it's not worth the amount of work that has to be done. He states he has just done another development in East Haven which he brought pictures of, there were 12 houses and they did it in less than two years and they are completely sold and the houses are really nice. If the market brings bigger homes, they will build bigger homes.
- Mrs. Richo says so he doesn't really have a plan for the size of the homes.
- Mr. Mauro says yes they do but it's almost impossible to give an exact of what they will build the sizes depend on what the market will bare.
- Mrs. Richo asks what he thinks he will sell them for.
- Mr. Mauro says for East Haven in that area they think they will sell them for around \$380,000.
- Mrs. Richo says to Mr. Brancati that he quoted \$200,000 in revenue to which Mr. Brancati said no approximately \$100,000-\$105,000 in revenue and \$100,000 in

savings for what we are paying for DC Moore right now for electric, gas, water and sewer.

- Mrs. Richo says she is afraid our zoning doesn't keep in character with our neighborhoods. Recently on Foxon Hill/Thompson we had a development of 9 two-family houses. It's a neighborhood of half acre lots or better and they were said to be sold and are now being advertised as rentals. When we don't keep the character of our neighborhoods, when Town representatives disregard their life style for the benefit of a developer, they are not acting in their best interest.
- Andy Perrone- 43 Hoop Pole Lane, East Haven- Mr. Perrone says he believes before Sal said the houses were going to be between 2500 and 2800 sq. ft. and he just heard Mr. Mauro says 2200. They are killing their property values like his wife said before every house on the street is 2800 and above up to 3200 which is a far cry from 2200 sq. ft. Also during the demolition, there is probably asbestos, and mold will be airborne affecting the people in the area. He is against this as well and if it is costing us \$100,000 per year then bite the bullet, demolish the school and be done with the expense and then it's open land. He hasn't heard one person come up and say it is a great idea.
- Ronald Toothe- 61 George Street, East Haven- Mr. Toothe asks how much shoreline they have. Mr. Brancati says it has to be a couple miles; West Haven has 4 miles of beach.
- Mr. Toothe asks how much is accessible to the public to which Mr. Brancati says the beach and probably 300 ft. in front of Victoria Beach and all along the property line. There is some access to the beach at Morgan Point. Also by the beach house on Cosey Beach Ave.
- Mr. Toothe says it doesn't make sense to call us a shoreline Town. We have to stop giving away Town property. Throughout the years, not just under the Mauro Administration, we need money and we sell property. We are going to be left with no property to do anything with. The people are going to go home, go to work and then go spend their money and have fun in other communities like Branford and West Haven because there is going to be nothing to do here. To say we have 86 acres of parks, it's a far cry from that. Most people wouldn't take their kids to our parks with needles, broken glass, unfixed things, etc. He thinks this Council and future administrations have to consider not giving anything else away, you fix today's problems and create a bigger one down the line. As far as Ralph goes, he has no doubt he will put a good product out because he is a good builder but the problem is do we need to build? That's for them to decide tonight.
- Robert Sand- 501 Thompson Street, East Haven- Mr. Sand says bird's eye view of DC Moore School is right in the middle of a neighborhood from State Highway 142 right on down to the Bradford Preserve. There is a small sliver of land from Piscitelli Circle that allows the upland area to drain in a normal fashion. The lower end of DC Moore School on the May 16, 2017 FEMA Map is wetlands; it is 12 ft. above sea level and the land is by their definition a minimal flood area. Building a

house in there with a foundation, to him, would be talking about suing the Town. It would be crazy to do that; a slab would even be difficult. Doing what they do on the beach with pillars would be more realistic in that particular area. The plan he saw has 12 lots where the school is, it is on the uphill side, which would be difficult to put houses in that area as well. We all know the Board of Education complained about a mold problem and the Town spent thousands of dollars correcting it and building a network of piping going through it. Mr. Mauro said they would address and take care of that, he can only see sump pumps in every one of the houses if they have basements. He is opposed to this; he thinks they should bite the bullet, demolish the school and then sit on it. They have 18 acres to the side of it that takes you into the Bradford Preserve. Again, looking at the bird's eye view from 142 down, the reason it is still open is because it is the only location for the waters to flow. If you want to fill it all in at some point, have at it, but it is open space. He thinks the Council should deny the sale and sit on it and there is no rush to this, the deal goes until October 15<sup>th</sup> until it is null and void. There is no rush because there will be another Council meeting or two before that so he would appreciate them taking their time, deliberating and giving consideration to the Town in this respect.

- Nikki Whitehead- Ms. Whitehead references the 2016 town wide school reuse initiative when two schools were turned back to the Town and the old high school was up for discussion. The Mayor went on the record through a press release stating that there would be a transparent thoughtful process with public participation and pointing out the impact it will have on generations to come. He alluded to a process where there would be a reuse proposal for those two vacant schools, Tyler Street took the attention but it did go forward to planning and zoning. Planning and Zoning had the opportunity on October 5, 2016 to make a report as they are required under state statute, on the sale of Town property, to the Council to give them the benefit of a planning perspective. The Ordinance before them is relying on the October 5, 2016 referral that came to planning and zoning then onto the Council; at that point in time there was no highest and best use determined; the only thing in front of them was the sale of DC Moore, the lease of Hays and the sale of Reggie Hatch there was no plan given. We are relying on the Council to now think from a planning perspective, she heard the Chairman rightfully say that zoning decisions will be deferred to later but we just saw a plan with a subdivision and the details will be in front of planning and zoning not from a planning perspective but for a zoning decision. If that plan matches the regulations then they cannot disapprove it and if they were to, then it would be appealed. She says her first suggestion is this needs to go back to planning and zoning with a proper presentation so they can make a report to the Town Council as part of their function. She discusses that it is difficult for the members of the public to obtain copies of the packets in front of the Council prior to the meetings because there is no mechanism for it. She discusses going on

Friday to get a copy of the ordinance and she asked for Mr. Mauro's response to the 7 questions that went along with the bid and the Finance Director was willing to provide it as it is public record and there was nothing in the folder and she got the packet on Monday at about 4:15 and it's Tuesday evening which makes her unable to give meaningful comment on the planning aspect that is before them tonight. The plan in the offer shows a discrepancy that Mr. Mauro pointed out and brought it to whomever looked at the packet; the discrepancy is between the assessor's map description of the property and what the survey showed so he took a conservative view which is the assessor's map showing that it is smaller-10.1 acres and he did his layout on that with 13 lots. It also appeared in the packet that the bid was based on more lots than the 13 presented there. The last time this was spoken about to Town Council was in January of 2017, Mr. Brancati informed the Council that DC Moore was being looked at for condominiums, there was no mention of single family homes being the highest and best use and according to the minutes he mentioned that some type of Tech Center taking over the building would be the highest and best use. So they don't have the foundation to look at it with a planning perspective and the public can't fully help them, if they did decide to act they are acting on imperfect information because the highest and best use has not been determined by the land disposition committee or the school reuse initiative as far as she can tell. She suggests the public needs the proper information because the plan she just saw there is different from the one she has because they have put more lots in. There was a timeline in the packet and Mr. Mauro said for them time is of the essence and they expect to move fast and would only be interested if the Town moves quickly and there is only one month for zoning and inland wetlands. Sharon Drive is shown on a map tonight that recently went through planning and zoning and she remembers it was multiple months, not wetlands and zoning in one month. She indicates it says that the Council has until October 17<sup>th</sup>; we can't be on these expedited timelines in her opinion. She asks if the Council has the information that she has, or if they have different information and how long they have had the information from the 8-page proposal.

- Councilman Joseph Santino says she has more in her packet than they have, they are only there to sell the land, the zoning and all of that has nothing to do with them.
- Chairman Ken McKay says they are looking to sell a piece of property; the developer will then have to go through the proper channels. We are looking to rid the Town of an unnecessary expense keeping the school going, police presence, etc.
- Ms. Whitehead says she doesn't think that is what they are here to decide; she thinks that might be what they end up deciding. Highest and best use is something that needs to be determined and it can't happen with them making a planning decision.

- Mr. Brancati says she makes reference to no planning being done but they are developing something, which is within the zone, for example, R3, and they are consistent with the plan for an R3 half-acre zone. They will be building in that half-acre zone. Isn't that already a plan if that is what planning and zoning has already created as the plan? It is residential, half acre zoning, so someone 100 years ago made that plan so why is she saying there is no plan?
- Ms. Whitehead says they have an opportunity to make that distinction that this is Town owned property so they can decide from a planning perspective how to dispose of the property or if they will keep it. The R3 zone can apply to all of it, a portion of it or none of it. If they decide to sell it for single family houses because that is the highest and best use, which has not been determined by them it seems it is coming from elsewhere, then they are going to end up with the R3 zone governing what can happen there. Therefore, if you can fit 16 houses like Mr. Mauro says in his packet, then that is what will be done. She agrees with Mr. Brancati that if it is sold as R3 then a developer can come and develop it to the max and leave no reservations for open space. She adds that there are still differences in the layouts and questions on the size of the property and she thinks a decision is premature.
- Mr. Brancati says the developer already agreed to the greenway trail, that is open space.

Council comment:

- Councilman Joseph Carfora says on the survey map, they are saying it is going to be 14 lots, but what are the two lots at the end?
- Mr. Brancati says those are two lots at the end of Austin Street that cannot be built on. Austin Street is not an approved Town road; you cannot build on an unapproved road so the lots do not exist. If at some time in the future someone wanted to build Austin Street to the end and apply for two lots they could but right now it is an unapproved Town road and can't be built on.
- Councilman Joseph Carfora says the school was closed down because of mold right?
- Mr. Brancati says there were tests done after the children left the school and he doesn't recall them having a final determination that there was mold or that it tested positive for mold.
- Councilman Joseph Carfora says there was a woman up here earlier that said the school was loaded with mold and the carpets were wet. He has nothing against Ralph personally, he knows he does a great finished project, but his biggest concern is if he builds these houses and there is a mold issue down the road, who is going to be legally responsible if people are getting sick or their basements are flooding. We have issues in district 2 and 4 with roads flooding and on Facebook there was a post of someone's garage flooding right out. He

asks what the legal responsibility down the road is if these houses start flooding. Is this going to come back on the Town to make restitution after Ralph is all done and sold them and is gone. If we have health issues, flooding issues, rats, is the Town going to be responsible for this down the road?

- Attorney Zullo says once we relinquish ownership of the property, we relinquish our responsibility for it. It's no different than if we sold it tomorrow to someone and they left it how it is and someone slipped and fell, it wouldn't be our problem it would be the new owner's problem. We owe certain title warranties to whomever we sell it to but those are unique to the person, regardless of who we sell it to. He would say our legal responsibility to the property ends when we sell it and any warranties the builder has would be specific to the owners when they sold them. He disclosed a potential conflict at the beginning, he would consider the last question general law and he is happy to give an opinion on that but to the extent that he will be more specific to this, he prefers he have separate counsel give an opinion to that as he doesn't want to put himself in a position where someone later claims a conflict.
- Councilman Joseph Carfora says there are wetlands under there, is it legal to fill in the wetlands? He said he is going to raise the level up.
- Mr. Brancati says it is his understanding that he has no intentions of touching the green areas highlighted and flagged as wetlands. There will be no developments taking place within that green outlined area on the map.
- Councilman Louis Pacelli says all due respect to Mr. Mauro he is a great builder and has done a lot in Town, but he made a statement when asked about the drainage problem that he doesn't know what he will undertake. He served on the Board of Education when those schools were closed and there was a water problem there. The school was damp and he heard that there was mold in there and some possible illnesses. If he goes in there and finds a drainage problem that he can't handle, what does he do? Does he change the size of the houses? Change the plan? Abandon the project? As council members for their constituents, they need to not only think about the decision they make today they also need to think of the future which is important for our children and he thinks the Town can use some real parks. He isn't saying we don't need to sell buildings but in such a short period of time as Mr. Sand said, they need to think about it because it is an impact that will go down the road. He asks the builder what happens in that case.
- Mr. Mauro says they had engineering work done already on laying out the subdivision and they will do more extensive work and test pits to figure out exactly how the road has to be raised. They are staying away from the wetlands and will direct any of the water towards the wetlands to recharge the wetlands, which is what you would want. They won't build anything that is going to come back never mind to the Town, but to them. They aren't in the business of building houses where they will have a problem; they will do them in a fashion where the

problems are taking care of. The building itself lays low on the land and the engineer took into account the upper portion of it and the lower portion will all probably be filled in but not anywhere in the wetlands. On the side as you come down Elliot the whole grass area on the left is staying open.

- Councilman Louis Pacelli says talking about demolition of the building, if they find a problem with the materials and say they are contaminated, where will he bring those?
- Mr. Mauro says they looked at the building and it is mainly cinderblock and steel, there is no real wood in there.
- Councilman Louis Pacelli says there is no asbestos in the building?
- Mr. Mauro and Mr. Brancati say no. Mr. Mauro says they would crush it and use it as base material and things like that. The rest of it would be carted away in dumpsters to a company that does this all the time.
- Councilman Louis Pacelli says to Mr. Brancati he is asking them to make this decision tonight and he doesn't feel comfortable doing that as a Councilperson. A gentleman brought up the one exit, has a traffic study been done? What is the impact on fire services?
- Mr. Brancati says with all due respect, there was a school there with 300 children, was that not a fire concern then?
- Councilman Louis Pacelli says yes for 8 months out of the year and they were bussed in in the morning and bussed out in the afternoon; this is 24/7 with people living there.
- Mr. Brancati says planning and zoning can certainly call for a traffic study to be done there based on a 14-unit subdivision and the number of cars, hours of day, etc.
- Councilman Joseph Carfora says Ralph said he will direct the water back into the wetlands, is there any kind of inland/wetland study from the water table there? Is it going to affect any existing houses in the neighborhood in terms of flooding?
- Mr. Mauro said no it shouldn't, right now the drainage system flows into the meadow. He calls upon his engineer Jim Pretti from Criscuolo Engineering who has done the subdivision map. Mr. Pretti says at this point they have done a set or surveys to determine the number of lots and road layout. The engineering for the drainage has not been done at this point as there is a progression of how you spend money on these projects and they are not at that point yet. There is an extensive drainage network that goes through the property right now that deals with all the pavement areas and collects the water and puts it into the wetland area now. In the future when the pavement and roofing is all gone, there will be much smaller roof areas and smaller road area so the ratio should actually go down at that point. There won't be as large of a parking and roof area it will be much smaller and there will be individual storm water treatment systems to contain the water for each house.

- Councilwoman Loria Jaffe says as far as wetlands, after it goes through planning and zoning it then will have to go to inland wetlands to be approved and they will take a look at the drainage and how it affects the wetlands. She happens to know someone on the inland wetlands commission who will probably not allow anything bad to happen to the wetlands. As far as she knows, they are there tonight just to approve the sale of the property they don't have anything to do with the drainage or the number of houses or sizes. It is a matter of conveying the sale of the property, we all like to keep our taxes low and tax base there and she thinks it is something they should approve.
- Councilman Joseph Deko says being a representative of the district this affects, it has nothing to do with Ralph Mauro; he obviously builds a great product. He will talk about the quality of life for the people that live in that neighborhood and it is very evident the neighbors do not want that. The school has to get demolished, so the comments about mold in the air, whether we demo it or a developer does, it is going to happen. He would like to see that property be public space, not developed, as the people that live on that street and in that neighborhood do not want it. They spoke about their property values and their main issue is quality of life and he doesn't think they would be doing a justice to anyone in Town by selling this property to a developer whether it is Ralph or anybody else for development of a lot of houses.
- Councilman Nicholas Palladino says he came in with a very open mind on this; he spoke extensively to Sal Brancati. He does like projects and likes to see things happen and see us get more people, younger families into the Town, etc. However, seeing what his constituents are saying, they are so dead set against it; he was hoping 50% would say they like it and 50% would say they don't but it is obvious as a representative of district 2 that they do not want this done. He does not want to see it become another 200 Tyler Street, he doesn't want to hold onto it for 22 years and spend \$3 million dollars on it over the course of 22 years. Maybe we can find something else to do with it, maybe utilize the building for something that won't affect the neighbors and people would be happy with. He knows Ralph personally, he is an excellent builder but he thinks it is a very big project and at this point he thinks we need to pass on it for a while and see if they can find another idea for it.
- Councilman Joseph Deko thanks the people for coming out, usually only 1-2 people come so he applauds them for sharing their opinion on the matter.
- Councilman Joseph Santino thanks everyone for coming out, last year when this project came before them the offer was \$280,000 and thank god the Council stopped it then because there was nobody there to oppose it. They were talking about drug rehab center, halfway house and it was crazy. As far as a mold problem in the building, there was a mold problem, his children were in there and he fought hard to get the building closed. Ralph is in a tough predicament that he doesn't want him to get stuck with also if it's a bad project and he will put out a lot

of money and not be able to do anything with it; it wouldn't be fair to him or the people there. He knows the Town has the money to demo the building, we don't want to see a convalescent home there which there was rumor about also. He is happy the Council stopped it then and we will see where it goes now.

- Councilwoman Judy Sittnick says she is in District 1 but does feel for them, but half of the people say that it floods, it is muddy, their dogs are sinking in it, etc. That is not open space for them. If they want a park there is a lot of work that would have to be done for that.
- Councilman Big Steve Tracey says he doesn't think we need another park; we need to fix the ones we have. He doesn't know what we will do over there but a park is definitely not something else we need because we don't take care of the ones we have.
- Councilwoman Linda Hennessy says in listening very carefully to the public comment, those who spoke about a park, the next meeting they will be complaining about it because that is what is done now. They complain about the drug use and whatever is left behind. How many times has Councilman Parente left here to go to a police call down there for mischievous activity and if there is another park they will be coming to complain about that. The first woman spoke about the size of the homes, if you read between the lines she was saying they would be lower square footage, was she thinking they were going to get a different quality of people to come in? She takes offense to that because she said it devalues their properties and that is not fair. That development is very similar to one that her son lives in and they range anywhere from 1800-2500 sq. ft. and most of the people that live there are single, or couples, professional people that have left homes in Guilford or Madison because they wanted to downsize from 4,000 sq. ft. houses and they don't have to pay so much in taxes but don't have to go into an apartment or condo they can still have a home. Ralph, as an experienced builder, she would imagine a piece of property he is purchasing, he knows what he is getting into and he would do the best he can for himself as a developer to put up homes. Knowing there is a water problem he would deal with it, develop it and do a lot. The issue tonight is selling this piece of property, it is up to the developer to go through planning and zoning and wetlands where they can also go and voice their opinions. The Council is looking to eliminate a piece of property that they don't need to hold onto anymore and have it turn into another 200 Tyler Street as an eye sore for 20+ years that leads to vandalism. It looks like a very nice complex she doesn't undermine Ralph's ability to put up anything but. If they feel their dogs are swimming in the land now, we are aware of the property and what has to be done to make these homes and a nice property. People also mentioned deer and animals, she has another son that lives on the other side on Piscitelli and she has pictures of turkey, deer, birds, etc. and their land abuts Elliot Street. It is a wonderful place to live, what is wrong with bringing in families and more children to East Haven.

**Item #9**

Adjournment of Public Hearing #4.

Councilman Joseph Santino makes a motion.

Councilwoman Loria Jaffe seconds the motion.

Voice vote: all in favor-none oppose-none abstain. Motion carries.

**Item #10**

Hearing Committee report(s) to the full Town Council and recommendation of action on Public Hearings #1, #2, #3, and #4.

Councilman Nicholas Palladino makes a motion.

Councilman Joseph Santino seconds the motion.

Roll call vote: all in favor-none oppose-none abstain. Motion carries.

**Item #11**

Adjournment of Hearing Committee.

Councilman Nicholas Palladino makes a motion.

Councilman Joseph Santino seconds the motion.

Voice vote: all in favor-none oppose-none abstain. Motion carries.

Meeting is adjourned at 9:24PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Danelle Feeley*

Danelle Feeley, Clerk, East Haven Legislative Town Council