

STAMFORD PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING  
MINUTES, TUESDAY, AUGUST 27, 2013  
WESTOVER MAGNET ELEMENTARY  
SCHOOL AUDITORIUM  
412 STILLWATER AVE., STAMFORD, CT

---

Stamford Planning Board Members present were: Theresa Dell, Chairperson, Claire Fishman, Roger Quick, Dudley Williams, and Jay Tepper. Present for staff was Norman Cole, Land Use Bureau Chief and Erin McKenna, Associate Planner

Mrs. Dell called the regular meeting to order at 6:07 p.m. and seated Mr. Tepper.

**REGULAR MEETING (6:00 PM)**

***Request for Authorization:***

1. **Boys & Girls Club concept plan**, to increase the shared parking from 4,824 sf to 20,565 sf and add park amenities in Lione Park in conformance with the terms set forth in the amended 2013 lease agreement and with Stamford Charter Sec. C6-30-13. The Boys and Girls Club is located on 347 Stillwater Ave., with Lione Park adjacent south of the property line.

Mr. Cole explained that according to Stamford Charter Sec. C6-30-13 and State Statute 8-24, significant public works projects proposed on City property must be reviewed by the Planning Board for a recommendation. The PB is already well aware of the details of this project, having reviewed the proposed lease amendment for the Boys and Girls Club of Stamford during their July 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

After further discussion, Mr. Quick moved to approve the concept plan. Mr. Williams seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously with eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Dell, Fishman, Tepper and Williams).

***Planning Board Meeting Minutes:***

2. Meeting of 8/6/13 and 8/13/13

Mr. Tepper moved to approve the 8/6/13 meeting minutes. Mr. William seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously with eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Dell, Fishman, Quick, Tepper and Williams).

Mr. Williams moved to approve the 8/6/13 meeting minutes. Ms. Fishman seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously with eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Dell, Fishman, Quick, Tepper and Williams).

***Old Business***

3. **Supplemental Capital Project Appropriation** to apply to capital accounts as follows:  
Seawall Replacement/Repairs \$758,000

Amend the Capital Project Appropriation into five separate accounts in conformance with FEMA requirements as follows:

Kosciuszko Park Revetment Stabilization	\$249,900
Quigley Beach Revetment Stabilization	\$107,100
Cove Island Masonry Wall Repairs	\$130,000
Cummings Retaining Wall Construction	\$156,000
Holly Pond Seawall Repairs	\$115,000

Mr. Quick moved to approve the amount of \$107,100 for Quigley Beach Revetment Stabilization. Mr. Williams seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously with eligible members present voting, 5-0 (Dell, Fishman, Quick, Tepper and Williams).

### ***New Business***

- Mr. Tepper reported that Floyd Lapp has agreed to stay on temporarily as the Executive Director of the South Western Regional Planning Agency. The position remains unfilled, as the person selected to replace Mr. Lapp subsequently declined the position.
- Mrs. Dell announced that the Planning Board meeting on September 3<sup>rd</sup> would be a regular meeting. She also announced that since September 10<sup>th</sup> is the mayoral primary, the PB will not meet on that date. She announced that the Board would begin deliberating on the License Agreement on September 17, 2013. Mr. Williams asked if the Board could consider imposing modifications to the License Agreement or could only vote it up or down. Mr. Cole commented that he had no legal guidance or precedent, but that with the applicant's consent it might be possible to require changes to the Agreement. Mrs. Dell said that legal guidance should be sought on this question.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mrs. Dell adjourned the regular meeting at 6:30 p.m.

### **PUBLIC HEARING (7:00 PM)**

Mrs. Dell called the public hearing to order at 7:08 p.m.

### ***Subdivisions:***

1. **Subdivision #4009, The Greyrock Companies, LLC** for subdivision of the property into three parcels on Newfield Ave.

Mrs. Fishman read the public notice into the record.

Leonard D'Andrea, of Rocco V. D'Andrea, Inc., presented the subdivision application. He stated that this is a four+-acre property in the one-acre, RA-1 Zoning District. He explained that this was essentially a re-application. The subdivision received Planning Board approval in July 2011, but the applicant never filed the subdivision map. They have recreated exactly the same subdivision. There is an existing house with two rear lots with a side-by-side driveway design, and a full septic system. The only difference between the two applications, explained Mr. D'Andrea, is that the house in the subdivision approved in 2011 on Lot B-2 was conceptual - now there are construction drawings. The septic had already been reviewed by the Environmental Protection Board (EPB) and the Health Dept. in 2011, so now it has been

reviewed and approved twice by them. The septic systems are quite small, because the soils are very well drained. In addition, the gas company, which has an easement on the property, has met with the applicant and approved the utility configuration. Mrs. Dell asked whether there was anything since the property was purchased that was not in the original subdivision. Mr. D'Andrea replied that the only change is that they tweaked the driveway design slightly to accommodate the utility layout and site conditions. The open space is the same, the lot lines are the same. Mr. Tepper asked if the setbacks were all being met. Mr. D'Andrea replied yes they are. Is there a 50-foot wide driveway? Mr. D'Andrea explained that there are two 25 foot wide accessways but that the shared driveway will be 18-feet wide, with two 9-foot lanes and proper site lines. Mr. Quick asked whether the EPB had requested a planting plan for the wetlands. Mr. D'Andrea said yes, and it was prepared by Environmental Land Solutions.

After the presentation by Mr. D'Andrea, Mrs. Dell informed him that the Planning Board members would review the application at either the September 3<sup>rd</sup> or the September 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. She then invited the public to speak first on behalf of the subdivision, and then against the subdivision. Mr. Griffin Handley of 1839 Newfield Ave. spoke of his concern that the applicant's new driveway will be next to the play area on his property and requested screening. The developer, Jerry Effren of Greyrock Companies, LLC, explained that he cannot plant a screen along the driveway on his property, because it would be in the gas utility right-of-way. But he offered to plant 12, 6-foot arborvitaes on Mr. Handley's property to create a screen. Both parties agreed. Mrs. Dell suggested adding the installation of the screen to the list of Planning Board Certificate conditions, should the subdivision be approved.

There being no further comments or questions, Mrs. Dell closed the public hearing.

2. **Subdivision #4007, Boris & Helen Miloslavsky**, for subdivision of the property into four parcels on Berrian Rd.

Mrs. Fishman read the public notice into the record.

Ray Mazzeo, of Redniss & Mead, presented the subdivision application. He explained that the subdivision design was consistent with both Master Plan Category 2 and the R-10 Zoning District in which the property is located. This is a 51,085 sf lot, and it could legally be subdivided into five lots, although they are asking for only four. The two lots that would be accessible from Woods End Rd. are across the street from a Stamford Land Conservation Trust (SLCT) property that is not eligible for development, and therefore this is one of the most underdeveloped areas in the neighborhood. The existing houses and proposed dwellings meet all setback and coverage requirements, and they are served by City water, sewer, and gas. There are existing overhead utility wires, although another pole will have to be added to serve the properties on Woods End Rd. They have received unanimous EPB approval for the subdivision and approval from the Engineering Bureau. Mr. Mazzeo said that the applicant has no objections or issues with the conditions recommended by EPB and Engineering. Mrs. Dell asked if the original houses and driveways will remain the same. Mr. Mazzeo said that there are no current plans to changes them, except for a reduction in the size of the driveway at 35 Berrian Rd. and screening between the two existing houses and Lot C. Eventually, there will be a planted screen between Lot C and Lot D, and between Lot D and the adjacent neighbor and there is open space preserve adjacent to 27 Berrian Rd. Mr. Tepper asked whether the planting would be installed between Lot D and the adjacent neighbor, even though it would not be developed at this time. Mr. Mazzeo replied no. Mrs. Dell suggested that the installation of the screen at the time of the development of Lot D be added to the list of PB Certificate conditions, should the subdivision be approved.

After the presentation by Mr. Mazzeo, Mrs. Dell informed him that the Planning Board members would review the application at either the September 3<sup>rd</sup> or the September 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. She then invited the public to speak first on behalf of the subdivision, and then against the subdivision.

Ms. Caroline Karron of 27 Berrian Rd. spoke of her concern about the size of the new lots. Her lot is 0.49 acres, and she enjoys the privacy and quiet in the neighborhood afforded by what she regards as amply sized lots. She is also concerned about the impact of pesticides and nutrients of the landscaping upland along Woods End Rd. on the SLCT property across the street and the wetlands below. Another concern is drainage.

Chris Psychopedas of 52 Janice Rd. spoke of his concern about drainage as well. He repeated that adjacent properties have poor drainage and water problems and wanted to hear about how the proposed drainage system will work. The subdivision is on a hill, and the basements of the neighbors accumulate water in their basements as it is.

Maria Carlucci of 58 Janice Rd. stated that she was concerned about maintaining property values being compromised by reduction in privacy and clearing of woods. She is also worried about the impact of the landscaping on the wetlands on the SLCT property. There are a lot of invasive species as it is, and additional nutrients will exacerbate the problem.

Patricia Rattray of 140 Grove St. asked whether the Planning Board members would be considering the prevailing size of existing lots, "curb appeal," and how the development would fit into the neighborhood in the course of making their decision. Mr. Cole responded that it is not within the authority of the Planning Board to consider contextual issues, but rather to look at whether the proposed lots meet zoning requirements and subdivision standards.

After the questions were all heard, Mr. Mazzeo stated that in the R-10 Zoning District, 10,000 sf is the minimum lot size, and all four lots exceed that size, and reiterated that the subdivision was limited to four lots when it could include five. The existing neighbor's house is closer to Ms. Carlucci than the proposed dwelling will be. The proposed drainage plan decreases run-off overall with a significant in-ground infiltration storage system. Ted Milone of Redniss & Mead explained that to mitigate run-off from the roofs, driveways, etc. from Lots C & D they are proposing an infiltration system that will collect the water, allow some of the water to infiltrate into the ground, while metering it out into a drainage pipe in Woods End Rd., which will ultimately bypass most of the wetland areas. Lot C has about 120 linear feet of infiltration, and Lot D has 32 linear feet. The infiltration systems also allow the storm water to cool before entering the regulated areas. Mrs. Dell asked how drainage will impact the wetlands. Mr. Milone responded that there should be none. He pointed out that the area between the curb and tree lines is already lawn along Woods End Rd. He also remarked that the elevation of the new house on Lot C is about ten feet lower and would not be very visible from the uphill areas. Mrs. Dell remarked that renovation of the existing houses would affect the neighbor the most. Mrs. Fishman asked whether it would affect the water table. No, it is designed to recharge the groundwater, which will then travel downhill as previously described. What about the basements of the neighbors, asked Mr. Tepper? If anything, replied Mr. Milone, it will improve any existing problems. Groundwater will be collected in a footing drain system that will draw the water into a pipe and out, and not affect the adjacent properties. Will the drainage system for Lot D be installed before the lot is developed, asked Mrs. Dell? No, the plan is to leave Lot D as is, with the exception of some regrading to accommodate the infiltration system on Lot C. Mr. Quick asked about the utility easements that show water and gas crossing Lot B to serve Lots C

& D. Mr. Milone replied that for Lot C they are proposing that the water come from Berrian Rd and that for Lot D, the water come from Janice Rd. They are currently asking for a water main extension from the water company. And for gas, they are asking for both lines to come from Berrian Rd. So, you have an easement across Lot B for gas to get to Lot C, remarked Mr. Quick, who then pointed out that there should also be an easement across Lot C to get to Lot D? Mr. Milone replied yes, that is correct – we should add that. Mrs. Dell said that a condition will be added to the Planning Board Certificate, if the subdivision is approved, to add this easement. Ms. Karron returned to state that the pattern in the neighborhood is the renovation of older ranch-style houses into two-story homes. Mr. Cole responded that property owners are allowed to build what Zoning allows, including Ms. Karron. Mr. Psychopedas returned for clarification about the reduction of the driveway on 35 Berrian Rd. Mr. Milone repeated that they would be reducing impervious cover on this lot in order to enhance infiltration. Along Woods End Rd., the drainage from the properties goes into the storm pipe in the road, and travels southwest along the road to the river.

There being no further comments or questions, Mrs. Dell closed the public hearing at 8:15 pm and called a 10 minute recess. Mrs. Dell resumed the public hearing at 8:28 p.m.

3. **License and Public Improvements agreement between the City of Stamford and Waterfront Magee LLC and the Strand/BRC Group LLC** for the licensing of City-owned land in connection with the development and operation of a proposed boatyard at 205 Magee Ave. According to the agreement, in exchange for the granting of property rights by the City, Waterfront Magee and Strand/BRC Group would be responsible for certain proposed public improvements to City-owned parks and facilities.

Mrs. Dell opened the public hearing, noting that it was a continuation of the public hearing started on August 6, 2013 and continued to August 13 and August 20, 2013. She said that the hearing would be continued to September 3, 2013 if necessary. Mrs. Dell announced that the hearing would be limited to questions from Board members and responses from the applicant, and invited questions from the Board.

Mr. Williams asked what would happen if BLT stopped operating the boatyard. Attorney Capalbo replied that if they default, that the City can withdraw the \$1.0 million in escrow funds and exercise the option to buy BLT's property at 50% of fair market value, valued as a boatyard.

Mr. Williams asked if the Board could revise and approve the License Agreement. Att. Capalbo yes, but that any changes would then have to be ratified by both parties.

Mr. Tepper noted that he disagreed with Ms. Aubuchon's comment that the City would never construct a new Animal Shelter. He said that OPIN had requested \$4.0 million in the Capital Budget but didn't have a site identified, so the Planning Board put \$300,000 into this year's Capital Budget and \$1.7 million in next year's budget because OPIN had said that it could raise half of the funds through private donations. He asked if Ms. Aubuchon still thought that without the License Agreement that a new Animal Shelter will never be built. Ms. Aubuchon replied she didn't mean to say it would never be done, but that the License Agreement would insure that the new facility was built in the next 12 months.

Mr. Tepper asked if the City has determined all of the costs associated with removing, storing and reconstructing the WPCA buildings on a new site. Ms. Aubuchon replied that all costs had

not been estimated, but that under the Agreement BLT was only responsible to remove and place the building in a storage location, but not to reconstruct them on a new site.

Mr. Tepper noted that the Agreement required the plans for the Animal Shelter to be “mutually agreed upon” and asked what happens if there is no agreement. Att. Capalbo replied that preliminary drawings have already been prepared, but that a lack of consensus would mean that there would be no License Agreement. Mr. Tepper asked then who would build the boatyard. Att. Capalbo replied that the performance bond would insure that the boatyard is built. Mr. Freeman added that they already have preliminary plans for the Animal Shelter and for Kosciuszko Park improvements.

Mr. Tepper directed a question to Mr. Cole and asked if he agreed that the 60 acre Harbor Point development was entitled to 3,000 residential units, of which 700 were attributable to the 14 acre former boatyard site. Mr. Cole answered yes, this was correct. Mr. Tepper asked if BLT would be able to build 3,000 units of housing on the Harbor Point site. Mr. Cole answered that the SRD-S zoning permitted 50 housing units per acre and 0.2 FAR of commercial development which equals roughly 500,000 square feet of commercial floor area, and that the 14 acre boatyard accounted for 700 housing units and 122,000 square feet of commercial floor area. The 500,000 square feet of commercial has already been built out in Harbor Point so that they have exhausted the commercial that is permitted under the SRD-S regulations. Mr. Tepper commented therefore that BLT is not currently able to build an additional 800,000 square feet of commercial. Mr. Cole agreed and said that BLT has submitted a proposed amendment to the SRD-S regulations to permit them an additional 1.0 million square feet of commercial use. This text amendment has yet to be heard by the Zoning Board.

Mrs. Fishman questioned the \$5.0 million compensation for use of the City’s property and said that it was too low. She questioned whether Bridgewater was really committed to moving to Stamford. Ms. Aubuchon explained that the \$5.0 million amount was determined by calculating the average land values for similar properties.

Mrs. Fishman asked why the City should buy back BLT’s property at current commercial values. Ms. Aubuchon answered that the Agreement provided for the City buying only BLT’s 3.5 acres at the value of a “boatyard”.

Mr. Quick asked why the agreement was structured as a license instead of a lease. Att. Capalbo answered that a license was in the City’s favor and granted fewer rights than a lease. Mr. Quick commented that by Charter a license lasting longer than three months requires the same approval process as a lease. He said that the Charter requires a lease of parkland over 20,000 square feet in size to be approved by public referendum and that the Board has received a map showing upland and littoral parkland totaling more than 20,000 square feet. Att. Capalbo replied that land area, as the term is used in deeds, begins at mean high water line and does not include littoral area.

Mr. Quick noted that the Harbor Management Commission thinks that it has jurisdiction over the License Agreement. Att. Capalbo said that he disagreed and said that the Harbor Commission doesn’t have any authority to review and comment on real estate transactions. They do have jurisdiction over the site plan for the project.

Mr. Quick asked why the Bridgewater development was not supposed to be considered in determining the value of the License Agreement, and yet the value of the taxes and fees generated by Bridgewater were stated as benefits of the License Agreement. Ms. Aubuchon

replied that in order to look at the value of the License Agreement it is necessary to consider all of the benefits of the total project to the City.

Mr. Quick questioned the comparable sales and assessed values used in determining the \$5.0 million value and asked why the City didn't simply get an independent appraisal of the WPCA property and the water frontage property and of the increase in value if the 14 acre peninsula were rezoned for commercial development. Ms. Aubuchon replied that some of the land values used were based on appraisals and to value land to be used as a boatyard it was important to look at values of similar boatyard properties.

Mr. Quick asked if there was a contingency plan to move the animals during the time the Animal Shelter was being constructed. Mr. Freeman said that he had discussed this question with the staff of the Animal Shelter and they told him that the normal practice was to adopt out the animals to veterinary hospitals in the vicinity.

Mr. Quick asked how expenditure of the \$5.0 million would be monitored. Ms. Aubuchon answered that the City Engineer would handle this task.

Mr. Quick asked Mr. Freeman about his statement in the newspaper that there was no agreement to receive additional development rights in exchange for preservation of the former boatyard. Mr. Freeman replied that there never was an agreement or a "quid pro quo" that if a bonus was granted that Antares would preserve the boatyard. He acknowledged that BLT was requesting an amendment of the SRD-S regulations to increase the permitted commercial FAR. Mr. Quick asked if the currently permitted 3,000 dwelling units have been constructed. Mr. Freeman replied no. Mr. Quick asked if BLT had considered other alternative sites for relocating the boatyard. Mr. Freeman replied that alternative sites had been studied as early as 2005 -2006.

Mr. Quick referred to the independent consultant's comparison of the former boatyard and proposed boatyard that found that the capacity for winter boat storage would be significantly reduced, particularly for larger boats. Mr. Freeman responded that they had revised their storage plan and now meet 100% of the boats stored at the former boatyard for each size range.

Mr. Quick asked about concerns expressed by barge operators that the proposed boatyard docks would create a navigational hazard. Mr. Freeman replied that they had modified their design and that O&G now supported their proposal.

Mr. Quick said that he was concerned with the amount of local employment that would be created and asked if a minimum of 20% of local labor would be used in the construction of Bridgewater. Mr. Freeman commented that BLT's record showed that they hired a lot of local workers.

Mr. Quick asked if BLT has posted the required completion bond yet. Mr. Freeman answered no, that it needs to be posted before the start of the Zoning Board public hearing and that is true of the other bonds in the Agreement.

Mr. Tepper commented that it was stated that plans for the Animal Shelter had been submitted, but that the Board didn't have any plans. Mr. Freeman answered that the plans had been displayed in the power point presentation on August 13, 2013.

Mrs. Dell commented that it appeared that all of the development rights from the 14 acre boatyard had been transferred and used in other parts of the Harbor Point development. There's nothing you can build on the former boatyard site because you've used all those rights elsewhere. You've taken down all the boatyard structures. You need to replace these buildings because they're the only thing permitted on that property.

Mr. Freeman replied that you are referring to my comments in the newspaper when I explained that the regulations have 4 criteria for eliminating the boatyard. You need DEEP review and approval, you need a market study, you need to show that appropriate services are provided elsewhere subject to the Zoning Board approval of relocating those uses. He said that they had carefully studied the former operations at the Brewers Yacht Haven Boatyard and consulted the former boatyard manager, Bruce Formier, and said that they will build a 6 acre boatyard that is equal to the former boatyard on the 14 acre parcel. He read from a letter submitted by Bruce Formier.

Ms. Dell commented that the Executive Director of the WPCA has stated that the current facility is adequate to 2025 but that the License Agreement extends to 2053. How can the WPCA be confident that it won't need the use of the 2.4 acre property? Mike Handler, Director of Administration passed out copies of a chart projecting the increase in average daily sewage flow based on population growth showing that the WPCA plant will hit its design capacity in 44 years when the population reaches 157,000.

Mrs. Dell asked if arrangements had been made to relocate the Sea Cadets and other users of the buildings to be displaced. Mr. Freeman described a plan being developed to move the Sea Cadets to Stamford High School.

Mr. Quick stated that the sewer treatment plant already overflows with raw sewage into the Harbor when it rains. Mr. Handler agreed that there have been 22 documented peak flow exceedances, but explained that DEEP regulates the WPCA based on average daily flow versus design flow, and does not use peak flows.

Mr. Williams commented that a new location for the Sea Cadet program has been found at Stamford High School and asked if their program would be subject to any new fees. Mr. Freeman said that their goal was to protect the program from any new fees.

Mrs. Dell asked how public access would be provided through the working boatyard. Mr. Freeman replied that a system of gates would be installed and that it would be no more difficult than crossing a street.

Mrs. Dell commented on the \$5.0 million in improvements referenced in the Agreement and that there were no details or budgets. Ms. Aubuchon explained the order of priority for applying the funds. Mrs. Dell said that BLT should commit to completing the actual projects. Mr. Freeman said that they agreed, even if it meant that their costs exceeded \$5.0 million. Mrs. Dell asked about plans for BLT to operate Czescik Marina and asked if they would fix the bathrooms and how many slips BLT would take for their own use. Mr. Freeman answered that they weren't planning to repair the bathrooms and that they would pay the City for use of any boat slips.

Mrs. Dell asked how the new marina at 205 Magee Avenue would work from the boat owner's point of view. Mr. Freeman said these details would be presented when the site plan is under review and went on to describe parking, pedestrian walkways and ramps, and procedures for requesting a boat to be taken from the racks and launched for the owner.



Mrs. Dell said that the City had dedicated the property at 205 Magee Avenue as a waterfront park and that it didn't seem right to put in the boatyard. Mr. Freeman disagreed and said that the property was never dedicated as a park and that the deed restrictions all run in favor of BLT and can be modified by BLT.

Att. Capalbo addressed this issue and said that he had retained independent outside counsel to examine this question and had determined that the City property was a "park". He noted however that the BLT owned property was zoned MG and that there were a lot of other uses that could be located on the property.

Mrs. Dell asked whether there shouldn't be some guarantee that the replacement boatyard will exist forever, and not just for 25 to 40 years. She also asked whether we want the City running a boatyard. Att. Capalbo replied that the provision for the City to take over the operations was part of a number of strategies to insure that a boatyard was in operation on the site. Mrs. Dell asked whether the three 5 year extensions are BLT's option, and not a requirement. Att. Capalbo agreed that this was true.

Mrs. Dell pointed out that the Master Plan specifically calls out the protection of the former Brewer's Yacht Haven Boatyard. Mr. Freeman replied that the Master Plan is a flexible, living document and that preservation of the former boatyard is not feasible. Times change.

Mrs. Dell asked how the new dock structures would work given the navigation issues and barge traffic. Mr. Freeman responded that the Army Corps of Engineers has approved the plan and concluded there are no navigational issues.

Mrs. Dell asked whether BLT has looked at alternate sites for their boatyard. Mr. Freeman answered that they were satisfied that their boatyard plan will work on the current site.

Mrs. Dell noted that the Board had concluded its questions and invited Mr. Freeman to make any concluding remarks.

Mr. Freeman said that he had examined the emails and letters received by the Board and counted 116 in support and 18 against. He noted that the Bridgewater project is worth \$445 million over 40 years, in terms of taxes and fees payable to the City. He said they had found a suitable place for the Sea Cadet program. He said that the City property was never dedicated as a "park" and that a license is less than a lease and that no super majority of the Board of Representatives is required.

Mr. Freeman introduced John Harter, the proposed operator of the boatyard, who presented aerial photos and property information regarding existing boatyard/marinas in Connecticut. He stated that 6 acres is adequate. He illustrated how boats would be placed and retrieved from the water at low tide and said that a negative lift fork lift can extend up to 17 feet to reach the water. He explained that boats can be placed close together with a hydraulic trailer.

Mr. Freeman introduced Gerard McDonough of Integra Realty Resources who commented on the design and location of the boatyard, saying that it would be protected by the hurricane barrier and would have a channel with a depth of 12 feet at mean low water. He said that 6 acres is more than most other boatyards in Connecticut, which average 2.1 acres of upland area.

Ms. Aubuchon testified that the existing Sound End TIF boundary does not include the 14 acre boatyard site.

Mrs. Dell asked where fuel will be provided at the boatyard. Mr. Freeman replied that fuel will be available on the opposite side of the channel at a fuel dock that is scheduled to be put back into service.

Mrs. Dell closed the public hearing at 10:55 pm and announced that the Board would begin deliberations on this agenda item on September 17, 2013.

Respectfully Submitted,

Claire Fishman, Secretary  
Stamford Planning Board

**Note:** These proceedings were recorded and are available for review in the Land Use Bureau located on the 7<sup>th</sup> floor of Government Center, 888 Washington Boulevard, during regular business hours.