

## Cost Savings & Revenue Enhancement Committee – Board of Representatives

Frank Cerasoli, Co-Chair Keith Silver, Co-Chair

## **Committee Report**

Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2016

**Time:** 6:30 p.m.

Place: Democratic Caucus Room, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Government Center, 888

Washington Boulevard, Stamford, CT

The Cost Savings & Revenue Enhancement Committee met as indicated above. In attendance were Chair Silver and Committee Member Reps. Fedeli, Liebson, Mitchell, Okun, Quinones and Zelinsky. Absent or excused was Co-Chair Cerasoli. Also present were Reps. McMullen and Ryan; Jay Fountain, OPM Director; Robin Stein, Special Assistant to the Mayor; and Ralph Blessing, Land Use Bureau Chief.

Co-Chair Silver called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m.

Item No.	Description	Committee Action
1. <u>CS29.016</u>	ORDINANCE <u>for publication</u> ; Increasing the fees for applications to the Planning Board, Zoning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals.  05/03/16 – Submitted by Rep. Zelinsky  07/18/16 – Held in Committee	Approved, as amended, 6-0-0
Secondary Committees: Operations and Land Use/Urban Redevelopment		

The Committee members discussed the proposed audinous swith the City staff of

The Committee members discussed the proposed ordinance with the City staff as follows:

- Some of these fees were increased in 2008 and 2010
- It was an arduous task to determine when many of the fees were last changed
- They did not include EPB fees in this ordinance because it was too difficult
- They calculated the cost of living increase since the last time the fees were changed and used that, rounded to the next \$25, to calculate the proposed changes
- The materials provided to the Committee in the <u>current fee listing</u> show the fees, the CPI increase and the proposed fee rounded to the nearest \$5 and the nearest \$25, the anticipated revenue. Reviewing the <u>cost/revenue analysis</u>, they will still be charging less than the total cost for these transactions
- The role of the Board of Representatives in increasing fees, including the need for review and public hearings

 Whether there should be a distinction for residential and commercial projects (e.g. waiving the public hearing fee for residential variances or variances in general, possibly in connection with the Variance 1-3 Family Application)

A motion to include a footnote waiving the public hearing fee in connection with the Variance 1-3 Family application to the Zoning Board of Appeals was made, seconded and approved by a vote of 7-0-0 (Reps. Silver, Fedeli, Liebson, Mitchell, Okun, Quinones and Zelinsky in favor).

Committee members discussed how proposed Section B would work; this would eliminate the public hearing requirement and might not require action by the Board of Representatives

- This creates a precedent in which the Mayor can change fees, which takes legislative power away from the Board of Representatives
- The public hearing process is important because of the input the Board receives
- Changing fees is a laborious process so that a mechanism for increasing fees
  regularly may make sense and the Executive branch is aware of the costs, so
  this may increase the efficiency of the government
- There is nothing to prevent a Mayor from recommending CPI adjustments or any fee adjustment, even without this section, but they recommendation would have to come before the Board
- By design, increases in fees charged to residents are supposed to be cumbersome and transparent in order to protect residents
- This leaves discretion up to a committee chair to act or not to act
- The cost to City government is not tied to CPI

A motion to delete Section B of the proposed ordinance was made, seconded and approved by a vote of 6-1-0 (Reps. Fedeli, Liebson, Mitchell, Okun, Quinones and Zelinsky in favor; Rep. Silver opposed).

A motion to add a new Section B to require "The Land Use Bureau Chief shall review, every year, the fees under this ordinance." was made and did not receive a second.

A motion to amend the proposed fee for Planning Board Subdivision 2 Lots Application from \$275 to \$300 was made, and did not receive a second.

A motion to amend the proposed fee for Public Hearings for all three Boards from \$675 to \$750 (the current fee is \$500) was made, seconded and failed by a vote of 3-4-0 (Reps. Silver, Liebson and Zelinsky in favor; Reps. Fedeli, Mitchell, Okun and Quinones opposed).

A motion to amend the proposed fee for Sidewalk Café Permits from \$250 plus \$3 per square feet to \$250 plus \$2 per square feet (the current fee) was made, seconded and approved by a vote of 5-2-0 (Reps. Silver, Fedeli, Mitchell, Okun and Quinones in favor; Reps. Liebson and Zelinsky opposed).

A motion to amend the proposed fee for Planning Board Change to Master Plan Application from \$350 to \$400 (the current fee is \$250) was made, seconded and failed by a vote of 2-5-0 (Reps. Liebson and Zelinsky in favor; Reps. Silver Fedeli, Mitchell, Okun and Quinones opposed).

A motion to amend the proposed fee for Zoning Board Major Text Change from \$775 to \$1000 (the current fee is \$700) was made, seconded and approved by a vote of 7-0-0 (Reps. Silver, Fedeli, Liebson, Mitchell, Okun, Quinones and Zelinsky in favor).

A motion to approve the proposed ordinance, as amended, for publication was made, seconded and approved by a vote of 6-0-0 (Reps. Silver, Fedeli, Mitchell, Okun, Quinones and Zelinsky in favor).

2. CS29.017 REVIEW; Current city efforts/initiatives with regard to Cost Savings/Efficiencies. 6-0-0 09/07/16 – Submitted by Reps. Cerasoli & Silver

A motion to hold this item was made, seconded and approved by a vote of 6-0-0 (Reps. Silver, Fedeli, Mitchell, Okun, Quinones and Zelinsky in favor).

Chair Silver adjourned the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Keith Silver, Co-Chair

This meeting is on video.