

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD - REGULAR MEETING #3348  
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 2002  
4<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR CAFETERIA, GOVERNMENT CENTER  
888 WASHINGTON BLVD., STAMFORD, CT

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

The Chairman, Mr. Hill, opened the meeting at 7:05 PM.

Pending Subdivision:

**Subdivision Appl. #3823, Designs By Lee, two lots Interlaken Road.**

Mr. Stein reviewed the application and the reports from Environmental Protection Board and the Health Department. He also explained that a branch of the Rippowam River went through the property and that the property was a key link in a river trail system between North Stamford Reservoir and the Merritt Parkway. The Planning Board agreed to include as a condition the provision of a river trail easement within the conservation/open space area. Mrs. Laurie moved to recommend approval subject to the following conditions:

1. Delineation of "Open Space Preserve/Conservation Area - to be maintained in a natural state except as may be authorized by the Environmental Protection Board;" the area so designated is 5.7 acres and is shown on a map dated revised October 30, 2002 on file in the Planning Board office.
2. Filing of a conservation easement to include the area designated as Open Space Preserve/Conservation Area. At the time of filing of the final subdivision map, this Area shall be field staked with iron pipes at all property boundaries and turning points of the easement boundary.
3. Filing of a "River Trail" easement to be located within the open space/conservation area, excluding the area along the easterly boundary of the pond.
4. Conditions set forth in a letter from the Health Department Inspector to the Land Use Bureau Chief, dated November 29, 2001.
5. Significantly sized trees shall be preserved to the greatest extent feasible (Note to appear on final map).
6. In-ground fuel tanks shall be prohibited (Note to appear on final map).
7. Site development shall not begin until a soil erosion and sedimentation control plan is approved by the Environmental Protection Board and those control elements scheduled for installation are in place and functional (Note to appear on final map).
8. In accordance with CGS 8-26c, approval shall expire on November 29, 2007, unless all "work" as said term is defined in CGS 8-26c(b), has been completed by said date (Note to appear on final map).
9. Subdivision reference number to be placed on final map.

Mrs. Grosso seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

### **Capital Plan & Budget 2003/04-2010:**

Capital Plan & Budget 2003/04-2010, Board of Education. Mr. Hickey, President of the Board of Education made the initial presentation. Kim Olds, Board of Education member, presented a series of alternative plans for dealing with the increasing enrollments at the secondary school level.

Ms. Olds reviewed the pros and cons of each of the four options.

Mr. Hickey and Ms. Olds explained that the Board of Education clearly favors the third high school option. Ms. Olds explained that the capital costs associated with the other options appeared to be too low and did not include all the required facilities. She said that it was not clear how the common use facilities such as the gym, auditorium, media center and cafeteria, could be feasibility utilized in the case of the 9<sup>th</sup> grade campus option.

Mr. Hickey said that the 9<sup>th</sup> grade campus option would create two “mega” high schools, which, educationally, was not sound. Antonio Iadarola, City Engineer, said that he would provide the Planning Board with the cost estimates.

The Board members asked how potential growth at the AIT and Wright Tech had been figured in. It was explained that if the third High school alternative was selected that the AIT would be housed within Rippowam and enrollment capped at 300. The application for a regional magnet AIT to the State would have to be amended.

Mrs. Laurie asked about equity between the proposed three high schools in light of Mr. Hickey’s statement that educational success was based on school size.

Mr. Hill expressed concern that the school “plan” was being driven by facility issues and not in conjunction with an overall educational strategy. He felt that the issue of equating size with quality was being overworked.

Mr. Barbarotta, of school facilities, explained that the code work for Stamford High School was based on bid contract figures.

The Board asked for additional information regarding facility priorities within the District-Wide Programs; updated charts on Technology programs; and a breakdown of athletic fields.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 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.