Chair Glen Stevens called the meeting to order at 6:33 P.M. All rose and pledged allegiance to the flag.

**Roll Call**

Present: Glenn Stevens
Gregory Russo
John Orzietti
Richard Dunne
Michael Kelleher

Also present: Joseph Coppola, Corporation Counsel

**Additions, Deletions, Corrections and Adoption of Agenda**

Mr. Stevens added an item to the agenda, the election of chair as 4A. Mr. Kelleher motioned to add the item to the agenda with a second by Mr. Russo, all in favor, motion passes.

**Election of Chair**

Mr. Stevens made a motion to nominate Mr. Dunne as chair, with a second by Mr. Kelleher, all in favor, motion passes.

**Public Portion**

Arlene Yacobacci, 10 Lombardi Drive - In today’s Connecticut Post was an article in which Mr. Skolnick and Mr. Small along with their attorney Charles Willinger are trying to get a project approved in Fairfield that does not conform to local zoning laws. Attorney Willinger’s forte is obtaining variances to avoid conforming to local building codes. Will the public be invited to comment on any new concept plans? Mr. Skolnick stated several months ago that the concept plans as it presently stands is not feasible, it is too costly. The plans as presented did not contain nearly enough parking to accommodate the housing and commercial space. Will this board be scrutinizing any new concept plans to conform with our local laws and does not lead to a traffic nightmare? Please also consider the businesses that will be remaining in downtown and allow enough parking to accommodate long time businesses.

Mr. Dunne stated in terms of the process; we will continue to receive conceptual plans. But none of that alters requirements the developers submit and go through the normal site plan approval process with the P/Z commission where they will be subject to the regulations in place for the redevelopment zone. The parking and building regulations take the form of a formal regulation that they will have to meet.
Ed Narowski – 47 Seymour Avenue wanted to know if the feasibility study has been completed.

Mr. Dunne said according to the PDA we’re in a process to review and agree with the developer on the GAP analysis. What the difference is between the cost to build and the feasible scenario of the development. The developer will be submitting all of that required information to our independent consultant who will review and advise this agency. If he believes the numbers are correct, valid, off or in the ball park. Tonight we will see an update on the concept plan and some numbers.

Public Portion closed.

Approval of minutes from 8/8/06, 9/12/06, 10/10/06, 11/14/06
Mr. Russo motioned to accept the 8/8/06 minutes with a second by Mr. Orazietti, all in favor. Motion passes.

Motion by Mr. Russo to accept 9/12/06, 10/10/06 and 11/14/06 minutes with a second by Mr. Orazietti, all in favor. Motion passes.

Meeting schedule for 2007
The second Tuesday of every month @ 6:30 P.M., Derby City Hall. Motion by Mr. Stevens with a second by Mr. Russo, all in favor. Motion passes.

Update from Developer The planner is delayed due to traffic, move to item #9.

Update regarding Relocation Attorney Coppola said the City recently purchased the Meneo building on Friday. There are four properties left. The Relocation report is completed on two of them. He will go in to specifics in the Executive Session tonight. Mayor Staffieri said we purchased the Derby Billiards Center. The developer looked at another purchase of the Porch & Patio building. Demolition is on-going, there is no stalling in any way. 99% of the work is done in the back right now. The debris has to be separated, from brick, concrete, wood, plastic and metal and put into separate bins. We contacted the remediation people to move forward with the Derby Billiard building. The demolition can be continued, now that the common wall is no longer an issue.

Update from the Developer Alan Bietsch, project manager for Stone Ridge has a report of demolition. Had to survey the foundation walls up against Route 34. They moved a crusher to break down the concrete and suitable demolition debris that we could run for future structural type material to be used on the project. They are doing the clean up on the remaining foundations that could be removed and that material is being crushed into usable material to be used to reinforce the slope and retaining walls that have been located by the structural engineers, existing conditions, pipes etc. to locate that and the crushed material is being sloped up to the wall to ensure no structural issues to the
integrity to Route 34. Now that the pool hall is closed there are some utility disconnects. There is also an issue with a water main that we have to work on with Birmingham Utilities to disconnect. The gas company has responded. We are going to keep the electric in service in the pool hall and then terminate that when the asbestos abatement is done. Then we’ll begin to take down the building to the left of the pool hall. Then the remaining piece on the right and then the pool hall.

Mr. Dunne asked if he was aware of a letter from Birmingham Utilities for a utility disconnect that might have affected a different area beyond there. He got a statement for a disconnect for water service that would extend out towards the old Fire School, none of that was a result of what was disconnected over here? Alan said no.

Mr. Skolnick said tonight we are presenting the results of work from the past many many months and the way the prior concept plans have evolved. Lucy from Street Works is here to go through the impacts of studies of existing conditions of the site. We have had a team of engineers studying all available information plus additional information accumulated on traffic, historical river bed boundaries, when the levee was built, geotechnical information and environmental information has been assembled to create a plan that is more realistic, more engineered. We hired a construction manager to estimate the costs for the infrastructure component and to be able to formulate with RDA and the City’s consultants what we call the GAP Study.

Lucy form Street Works had a team which included a site civil engineer, geotechnical engineer, environmental engineer, structural engineer, traffic and architectural and costing. They met on a regular basis, to look at components of the plan from a program stand point but mostly from a physical stand point. They looked at the utility impact, what it meant to have the levee along the edge of the site, understanding the soil conditions on the site, and how that had to be treated for the foundation design. We made a number of changes which are subtle. The parking garage in the center of the development for residential and commercial uses. It was road to road under the buildings, irregular in shape and three levels. The easiest way to reduce the cost is to simplify the garage. Rectangle in shape with more levels, pulled out from underneath the buildings, which otherwise made it a complicated construction and more expensive. It will be more open and will require less ventilation. It still supports all of the uses around it. The elimination of the landscape was also one of the biggest changes, which would have been very costly.

Mr. Dunne asked if the new structure will have air space on the north, east and west sides.

Lucy said it will be partially open. Also, they underground tunnels are being done away with. It is not necessary and too expensive. They met with the Army Corp of Engineers to understand their requirements on the levee. We pulled the development back along the levee, less impact and less costly. Another program change in terms of the residential was the number of units that were reduced and increased the number of retail and office.
Mr. Skolnick said they did a market study and absorption study and determined from earlier public sessions the impact on traffic, impact on school age children and the market factors for absorption over 700 homes. We decided to reduce the residential development to around 300. By reducing the number it made a dramatic reduction in the cost of the package. It made a much better impact on traffic for Main Street.

Mr. Dunne asked if we are looking at less residential with more commercial, can it still be flexible and make changes in the future.

Mr. Skolnick said essentially the retail and commercial are about the same, the residential significantly changed in line of where the market will be, it’s less dense. We looked at the picture of the existing deteriorating buildings. There will be a lot of brick which will include the detailing and will be a strong tie to the industrial roots of Derby.

Mr. Orazietti wanted to know when the ventilation design will be ready.

Mr. Skolnick said the ventilation design will not be part of the concept we are showing tonight. When they start to engineer the individual components then they will be dealing with the ventilation issues.

Mr. Dunne stated that would be part of the building permit.

Mr. Orazietti asked what the 300 units consist of.

Mr. Skolnick stated there will be different styles of houses along the waterfront which they call duplexes and simplexes with lower density and built lower to keep the view card open. There will be 3.5 story, that’s one style. The second is a loft style building – 8 story, full service condominium building in the middle and smaller condominiums. There will be four different styles of living in the downtown.

Mr. Russo asked Mr. Skolnick to go over the public space.

Mr. Skolnick said the market research told us, that by bringing the residential down to a few hundred units to downtown, we would need recreational space for those residents. There will be a fitness center and tennis court, which will be available for residents within the district. The public parts are the upgrade to the river walk. We still need to work out the floating dock with the Army Corp of Engineers, and a public park that connects with the river walk.

Mr. Dunne asked Mr. Skolnick to give an explanation of the interplay between the public land and the private land and the access to the river walk.

Lucy said the access to the river walk connects a sidewalk to the river walk.

Mr. Dunne asked if by setting back from the flood control, would that prevent direct access from the residential units and the river walk.
Lucy said there will be access to the river walk from the residential units.

Mr. Dunne asked how public people’s back yards will be.

Lucy said they need to work on that. The property owners need to have a sense of security.

Mr. Orazietti said prior plans talked about elevating the land to the level of the top of the dikes.

Lucy said the connection of grade between Main Street and the top of the dike, didn’t change. With retail on both sides of Main Street. We’ve separated the residential, being a different character of a public street, but it feels private than a commercial street. We have two points of access to the garage, one for residents and one for retail and commercial customers.

Mr. Dunne asked if coming from Route 8, will we see the backs of buildings or will there be a façade.

Lucy said they will be seen from all sides.

Mr. Dunne asked if you can see the river at the intersection of Elizabeth and Main.

Lucy said yes.

Mr. Orazietti said he cannot visualize going down Main Street, where you will see the river. We have to be able to see the river.

Lucy said you will at Bridge and Main Street, coming down from the hill you will get a view of the river.

Mr. Russo said it is not a drive by development. You will come downtown and walk around.

Mr. Skolnick added that you will be drawn down to the river walk.

Mr. Dunne asked to be told about the circulation patterns.

Mr. Skolnick said a meeting will need to be scheduled with the traffic consultant, Street Works and RDA.

Mr. Orazietti asked if Route 34 has been widened in this plan.

Mr. Skolnick said yes.
Mr. Dunne asked if they will give up the land to State of Connecticut for the right of way of 34 to be widened.

Mr. Skolnick said yes and to the City of Derby.

Mr. Dunne asked if there was more surface parking.

Lucy said yes, it was added after the initial presentation to supplement the parking.

Mr. Dunne said with regards to the river walk between the bridge downtown and the southern edge of the development, will there be changes to improve that.

Mr. Skolnick said significantly. It will be a public place as opposed to a path.

Mr. Dunne said this is the type of development the regions around the State have been encouraging. To create efficient places where people can work and commute from Fairfield and New Haven counties, which allows them to use public transportation.

The board then reviewed the sketches, project description fact sheet, the public infrastructure components and the estimated gap summary. This is on file in the Town Clerk’s office.

The total estimated project cost is $228,500,000.00. The income sources amount to $183,700,000.00 with an estimated gap of $44,800,000.00.

Mr. Dunne said we will work with State agencies to close in that gap. Then the board will return to the developer and adjust the project to close in the infrastructure gap.

Mr. Dunne stated the board will be going into Executive Session. They are not anticipating any action. Mr. Dunne also wanted to publicly thank Glenn Stevens for his role as Chairman.

*Mr. Russo motioned to go in Executive Session and invite Corporation Council and the Mayor to join, Mr. Stevens second, all in favor, motion passes. The board went in to Executive Session at 7:55 P.M.*

The Board concluded it’s executive session and without objection, adjourned the meeting @ 8:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Denise Cesaroni
Recording Secretary