



Land Use-Urban Redevelopment Committee – Board of Representatives

Virgil de la Cruz, Co-Chair

Charles Pia, Jr., Co-Chair

Committee Report

Date: Wednesday, February 27, 2019
Time: 7:00 p.m.
Place: Democratic Caucus Room, 4th Floor Government Center, 888
Washington Boulevard, Stamford, CT

The Land Use-Urban Redevelopment Committee met as indicated above. In attendance were Co-Chairs de la Cruz and Pia and Committee Member Reps. Cottrell, Graziosi, Lee, Lion, Sherwood and Summerville. Absent or excused was Rep. Michelson. Also present were Reps. Adams, Fedeli, Figueroa, Lion, McMullen, Morson and Patterson; Katherine Emmett, Corporation Counsel; Cynthia Anger, Assistant Corporation Counsel; Ralph Blessing, Land Use Bureau Chief; David Woods, Deputy Director of Planning; William Hennessey and Jason Klein, Carmody, Torrance Sandak Hennessey LLP; John Cannavino, Cummings & Lockwood; Sheila Barney, Susan Halpern and Carmine Tomas, NRZ; and approximately 40 members of the public. (See [public hearing sign-in sheet](#))

Co-Chair de la Cruz called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.

Item No.	Description	Committee Action
1. LU30.027	REJECTION <u>and public hearing</u> ; Amendment to the Master Plan under MP application # 432 pursuant to Charter §C6-30-7. 01/18/19 – Submitted by Planning Board	HELD 7-1-0
2. LU30.028	REJECTION <u>and public hearing</u> ; Amendment to the Master Plan under MP Application # 433 pursuant to Charter §C6-30-7. 01/18/19 – Submitted by Planning Board	FAILED 3-5-0

The committee discussed Item Nos. 1 and 2 together.

A motion to go into executive session to discuss the [letter from Cummings & Lockwood](#) as a claim against the Board, was made and seconded. Ms. Emmett stated that it was appropriate to go into executive session as the letter contains an imminent threat of litigation. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-0-1 (Reps. de la Cruz, Pia, Graziosi, Lee, Lion and Sherwood in favor; Rep. Cottrell abstaining).

The Committee members, additional Board members present, Ms. Emmett and Ms. Anger went into executive session at 7:15 p.m.

The Committee returned from executive session at 8:20 p.m. Co-Chair de la Cruz stated that no votes were taken in executive session.

Co-Chair de la Cruz first asked for a presentation by the Law Department regarding the process to be followed.

Ms. Emmett reviewed the [memo](#) she provided regarding the procedures the Board is to follow. She noted that the procedures are the same as those followed for an appeal of a Zoning Board decision except that planning standards should be applied. The Board is not required to take testimony, but can. The Board must:

- Accept or reject the amendments to the Master Plan without amendment
- Apply the same standards as are prescribed for the Planning Board in Charter section C6-30-3
- Review the Planning Board's actions based on its written findings, recommendations, and reasons
- Exercise independent judgment and discretion without deference to the Planning Board's actions.

Ms. Emmett further noted that the two applications must be voted upon separately.

¹Co-Chair de la Cruz then asked for a presentation from the petitioners. The petitioners distributed the [attached materials](#)

Ms. Barney read the following statement into the record:

Back in 2005 The South End Neighborhood Revitalization Zone was introduced to Antares the new developer who was to develop Admirals Wharf the old North East Utility Site. There was excitement for this development since the NRZ & Antares had started a respectable working relationship to revitalize the South End. Antares was given a copy of the South End Strategic Plan which outlined proposed long term development for the South End. The Strategic Plan was adopted by the Board of Representatives in 1998 and approved by the then Mayor Dannel Malloy. 4 years after the South End Strategic Plan was adopted The Master Plan 2002 General Land Use Plan was approved and supported the long term vision of the South End Strategic Plan. Throughout Antares reign they would come to the community meetings and share their ideas with the community as well as invited the NRZ members to their headquarters to see their renditions of development proposed for the South End. Antares would always ask the community for input "as it was often said if the development is done right then it would be a WIN WIN for both the community and the developer". Antares faltered and BLT appeared.

The NRZ and BLT started off with a good working relationship with John Freeman the counsel for BLT who was also given a copy of the Strategic Plan. John Freeman would often come to the NRZ meetings and do extensive presentations and once done he would ask for community input which made the residents feel like they had some say in the ongoing development of the community. BLT would frequently invite NRZ members to their offices to discuss community issues, the NRZ wrote letters on their behalf to the zoning & planning boards and residents spoke at hearings all in support of their development on the old Northeast Utility Site since they were not displacing families and the site needed development. Five years ago Karl Khunert attended a small community meeting at CTE and told a handful of residents that they would not tear down the houses on Garden Street & Henry Street and that BLT would propose an alternative plan that would save these structures since the residents feel so strongly about Historic Preservation. All of this has now changed;

- BLT is now encroaching into the community tearing down houses & displacing residents in particular the residents that were on Henry Street & Garden Street

¹ Video Time Stamp 00:02:58

- BLT no longer does extensive presentations at the NRZ meetings to keep the residents updated even though our Strategic Plan speaks to long term development that is consistent with the Master Plan
- There is no longer a good relationship between the NRZ & BLT because they do not respect nor take into consideration the input of the community; The WIN WIN strategy that was for both the community and the developer is now just a WIN for the developer and not the community.

Sensible development has now turned into high risers proposed throughout the South End that will take away the face of the community and forever change the look and feel of a significant district in the City of Stamford. The members and residents of the South End NRZ are very appreciative of the changes and amenities that BLT has brought to the commercial sites but in no way are we in agreement with all the extensive build-outs in such a small-- - area that will definitely have an effect on our quality of life. As a result of our disenchantment we have been meeting with Ralph Blessing expressing our concerns about this extensive development in which he in turn ordered the \$100,000.00 South End study in an effort to guide and implement sensible development. That South End Study along with the Strategic Plan are clearly not being reviewed or adopted since the planning board is writing recommendations on behalf of the developer and not taking into consideration the intrusion and adverse effect this project will have on the South End Historic District. Myself and other South End residents are here in front of the Board of Reps requesting an appeal which we hope you will strongly consider.

Mr. Tomas then reviewed slides 4 through 11 of the [attached presentation](#).

Ms. Halpern, the Vice President of the NRZ, then read the following statement into the record (and reviewed slides 12 through 15 of the [attached presentation](#)):

I grew up in Stamford, my grandparents worked at Yale and Towne, which dates back to 1868, my aunt and uncle lived in an old Victorian on Pacific St and worked at Pitney Bowes. The South End holds a lot of memories for me .

I bought a condominium on Elmcroft Rd 35 years ago with an outlook that the South End had great potential. Canal St was being re-developed, the new train station was being built, and now when I look out my windows, the sunset is gone, and what I see are the lights from the high rise apartments. The Master Plan 2015, The 1998 NRZ strategic plan, The South End Neighborhood Study 2018, and the 1986 National registry of Historic neighborhoods, all emphasize the need to preserve the city's dwindling historic fabric.

We are losing the sense of community, the small-scale, pedestrian oriented streets that have made the South End a unique place to live and work. There are still some homes over 100 years old, that our ancestors lived in and industrial buildings from the late 1800's that still exist. Like the Pacific Plumbing building.

Changing the zoning to Cat 5 would allow building more high rises on the B and S carting site. The current Master Plan and the Master plan from 2002 both designate the area as Cat 4 medium density multifamily. The area of change is within the boundaries of the South End historic district. [Slide 12]

High Rises on that property will diminish the value of the historic neighborhood. The neighborhood study completed 2018 recommends saving all buildings still standing in this historic neighborhood and any new development be organized and integrated into

historic low rise buildings without towering over longtime residents homes, churches and the community center. [Slide 13]

The Stamford Historic Preservation Advisory Commission was formed by city charter revision in Nov. 2012 to review, evaluate and advise officials, boards, and departments regarding historic preservation of districts and properties. [Slide 14]

However, this commission was not consulted on the Master Plan change application for B and S carting site. The Chair Lynn Drobbins did communicate with the Land Use Bureau. [exhibit 5]

This is the greatest opportunity for the Mayor, the city planning and zoning boards and the Board of Reps to do something to prevent the elimination of our historic roots. Please grant our appeal and revert this area back to categories 4 and small area of cat 6 as designated in master plan 2015. The identity of our neighborhood is disappearing as well as the history of Stamford.

Mr. Tomas then reviewed slides 15 through 21 of the [attached presentation](#).

Co-Chair de la Cruz then asked for a presentation from the applicants.

²Mr. Cannavino stated that:

- the authority of the Board is strictly confined by the Charter and the petition does not contain sufficient signatures for the Board to have considered the petition as to MP Appl 432
- the vote by 17 members of the Board to accept the petition for MP Appl 432 does not satisfy the Charter, which requires that a majority of the entire membership of the Board vote in favor of any matters under this chapter
- Consequently this committee does not have jurisdiction to consider this petition
- Mr. Hennessey's presentation is made under a reservation of rights to contend that the Board and committee have no jurisdiction

Mr. Hennessey distributed the [attached materials](#) and discussed the following relating to Agenda Item No. 1:

He is appearing on behalf of the entities for MP App 432. They have no opinion as to MP App 433. There are 4 different entities on the application, but ultimately; the common controlling entity is Building and Land Technology. With regard to Application MP-432 no entity other than a BLT entity owns any of the land involved in the application.

The action of the Planning Board was correct or correct enough not to turn it over. BLT is somewhat conflicted because we are rather disappointed with the action of the Planning Board because they sought a Cat 9 designation, which would match the MP category on the South End of the block.

The Planning Board modified the application to a Category 5 which diminished the requested Master Plan density by about 1/3 (approximately 200 units). After considering its alternatives, BLT decided to accept the Planning Board decision.

² Video Time Stamp Pt. 2 00:32:10

The Planning Board considered this for almost two years. No specific development model was before the Planning Board. Models were shown for demonstration purposes regarding different ways to develop the block. There are no development plans .

The Master Plan describes the City's long-term aspirational vision for the future and establishes goals, policy recommendations and implementation strategies to guide growth and development. In Connecticut, municipalities must revisit their Master Plans every 10 years to ensure plans continue to accurately reflect the City's planning objectives. Stamford adopted its most recent Master Plan in 2015 so we are almost at the halfway point. The Charter contains provisions for changing the Master Plan, which is intended to be changed. Unlike zoning regulations which dictate specific uses and development parameters for a site, Master Plan categories are far more general in nature. A change to a Master Plan does not impact any legally existing use or building on a property – it simply provides the opportunity for change in the future.

And the City has long identified the properties that are the subject of App MP 432 as worthy of change.

Mr. Hennessey asked the Committee to look at the [presentation](#) regarding general location background,

- Page 2 shows the larger block where all of the subject properties are contained
- Page 3 shows the BLT properties – Yale & Towne is on the bottom and Harbor Point is on the top. To the north of the Harbor Point is the undeveloped area being discussed
- Page 4 shows the portion of the block owned by BLT entities looking north
- Page 6 is photo of what the area looks like now, including a driveway put in by BLT, which connects Lathon Wider with Commons Park
- Page 7 shows the BLT owned properties in the MP change; the piece on the South is already in Category 9 and was not included in this application

The BLT parcels consist of 11 Parcels on this block, for a total of 7.3 Acres. Different parcels were acquired by BLT at different times, dating back to the original Antares / Pitney Bowes purchase, which would be the southern end. That portion is actually part of the approved Harbor Point General Development Plan. But the central, most important parcel is the so-called B&S Carting Parcel (shown on Page 9)

B&S Carting was on the site of the original Excelsior Hardware factor and was one of the original “transfer stations” established in the early 1980's when the refuse collection laws were changing. Carters and refuse collectors needed places to sort garbage. Pages 9 and 10 show what the area looked like. It was used as a central point of refuse collection separation, storage, transport. The operations were both indoors and outdoors. It required huge amounts of truck traffic, sometimes idling throughout the night on City streets. Everyone will agree it was not a great neighbor.

Thus, when Antares and then BLT began the redevelopment of the South End, it was continuously asked to purchase the site, remediate the site and turn it into something attractive and productive for the city. This parcel had been on the City's wish list for decades. The recently completed South End Neighborhood Study prepared by Collective for Community, Culture and Environment speaks to what the redevelopment of the site could look like – it calls for densities above Cat 9.

Prior studies spoke to the need to address the B&S Carting Site. The City's study, “*A Plan for the Stamford Enterprise Zone: Waterside and South End Neighborhoods*”:states: “By far the

greatest complaints were registered about the recycling firms, and of the recycling firms, about B&S Carting in the South End. ... [It] was felt these firms create unacceptably high level of traffic, trash and air pollution. ... The City should consider zoning “amortization” clauses, real estate tax abatements, use of Industrial Revenue Bonds (IRB), and/or other steps to encourage existing carting/construction firms to relocate. ... In particular, the City should assist B&S Carting with finding another site from which to operate.”

The southern portion of the block was already designated Cat. 9 when the PB completed the 2015 Master Plan. The Planning Board asked to reconsider the Category of the B&S Carting site in the future. Once BLT purchased a site large enough to be redeveloped, BLT asked them to put the balance of their holdings on the block into Cat. 9. This was withdrawn so the South End Study could be completed.

The application was resubmitted after the South End Study was completed. The Planning Board, probably because of the input of the community, chose to redesignate the properties as Category 5 rather than Category 9.

The goals of the Master Plan the Board should be considering are:

- Allow higher-density residential development in close proximity to transit (this is less than ½ mile from a transportation center)
- Encourage revitalization of the existing residential streets in the South End
- Improve connectivity among the Downtown, the Stamford Transportation Center and adjacent neighborhoods
- Promote quality urban design and enhance streetscapes (this is at the Zoning Stage)
- Encourage quality urban design Downtown and in the South End that relates well to streets and people (you need density to get the things people want, like retail)
- Revitalize existing residential streets

The challenge to redeveloping this site is shown on Pages 15 and 16 - there are 3 different Master Plan Categories (4,6 and 9) and 4 different Zoning Districts (M-G, C-B, RMF and SRD-S). M-G zoning should not be allowed in this area.

Change is necessary in order to accomplish the City’s goals. The Master Plan needs to be organized for the block. BLT continues to believe that Cat 9 is the correct category but will work with Cat 5. The Zoning needs to be reorganized so sensible development can occur.

- MP-432 was the culmination of significant thought over a number of decades
- BLT Bought the property in January 2015 and discussed the potential redevelopment for two years
- Filed an application (MP-424) in April 2017 and withdrew it at the request of the PB so that the neighborhood could be studied in connection with the South End Neighborhood Study
- Actively participated in that study
- It refiled the application with the benefit of that study in October 2018 and received and accepted modified approval in January 2019
- The result will be a neighborhood and a neighborhood that will do more for the City, including a convenient location for future residents to live

³Mr. Blessing then discussed the following relating to Agenda Item No. 2:

³ Video Pt. 2 Time Stamp 01:03:26

These properties are those on the block not owned by BLT. And would afford the same density for the other properties on the block. The Planning Board considered this application to be sound policy.

The Master Plan only sets guidelines it does not allow anything to be built. The Master Plan, if changed, would still permit an industrial use on the B&S site. What changed on this site was not just the acquisition by BLT, but the departure of B&S Carting.

In many decisions, the PB reserves its right to put a place holder on specific Master Plan sites when there is a development proposal. To consider those changes, the LU Bureau and Planning Board have two tasks, look at the national and regional trends and what is happening in the neighborhood.

One of the considerations that guided the Planning Board is the housing crisis in the region. There is a lack of housing and so housing is getting more expensive. Therefore there is a need for more housing. The Planning Board wants to both increase housing and preserve grown neighborhoods and is well aware of the tension between the 2 aims. Resolving this tension was one of the goals of the Planning Board.

There is also a change in preferences – there is increased desire for more urban living, around the train station, rather than suburban living such as North Stamford.

Connecticut has the 2nd largest percentage of grown-ups living at home because there is not enough affordable housing stock. The question then becomes where to put housing. Stamford is very built up. One strategy is to develop brownfields sites, such as B&S. This is expensive and often have significant environmental problems and have long, expensive approval processes and long clean-up times.

The other consideration is transit-oriented development. Stamford has a heavily burdened road structure, so the goal is development doesn't burden that infrastructure. 75 units per acre is a minimum number needed for successful TOD. While the study is based upon the Twin Cities, it is a national number.

Preserving the historic district in the South End is also a goal as well as to achieve the densities needed for TOD (and to support the retail to permit people to not use their cars), that only works with increased densities.

Both the Master Plan and the South End Study seek to balance growth and preservation. Former industrial sites are good sites for development. The South End contains land use recommendations, including preservation and growth areas. The South End Study recommended medium-high density for the B&S Carting site. The rendering shows 12 story buildings on the site. The Planning Board has followed its plans for the South End

They are working on a preservation piece, including having fee-in-lieu money be used by having historical houses as workforce housing, as well as having BLT to preserve historic houses to be affordable housing units on a permanent basis at 50% AMI. He is making a proposal for a historic preservation trust fund. The Master Plan does not condone demolition and no historic buildings are proposed to be demolished on this site.

Both the City and the State have been investing in infrastructure improvements in and around the South End, such as the Urban Transitway, the Atlantic Street Bridge, the trolley to enable all residents to get to the train station.

In Stamford, every developer of property of more than 10 units, must set aside 10% of the units as permanently affordable housing. There are approximately 400 units of BMR housing in the South End. Home ownership is not common in the South End. More than 90% were renters before the development began and continue to be renters.

There were 7 public meetings for the South End Neighborhood study. In addition, the consultant had interviews with various stakeholders, Since October, 2018, he met with the neighbors 8 times to discuss the Master Plan. They may not have agreed, but they did discuss it.

With vastly improved infrastructure, such as Yale & Towne, comes increased tax revenue. There are very few school children there and 32% of the residents don't use cars. This is below the average for Stamford for a whole. In other parts of the City up to 90% of the people use their car. Development also brings in conveyance fees and other fees charged by the Planning Board and Zoning Board and other charges imposed for infrastructure improvements.

This Master Plan change is appropriate. It follows long standing plans and policies and will benefit not only the neighborhood but the City as a whole.

Committee members then began to discuss this item with the presenters:

- Car ownership is likely higher than 68% but the people who move into those new building move there because of the train and commute into New York
- Much of the existing population in the South End probably has wider commutes
- There is a parking problem in the South End, which is mostly in the grown, historic areas of the South End because there were no parking requirements then. The new buildings have higher parking requirements
- While the South End called the Transportation Oriented District does not include this site, the whole South End is ripe for Transit Oriented Development because it is so close to the Train Station. The City is trying to implement a bike/pedestrian plan. The distance for TOD for heavy commuting is 1 mile
- Other activities may require a car, but

⁴The Committee decided to hear comments from the public and then resume questioning by the Committee. Co-Chair de la Cruz opened the public hearing.

Elizabeth McCauley read the [attached statement](#) into the record in opposition to the Planning Board's decisions on Applications MP-432 and MP-433.

Estelle McCauley read the [attached statement](#) into the record in opposition to the Planning Board's decisions on Applications MP-432 and MP-433.

Peter Quigley read the [attached statement](#) into the record in opposition to the Planning Board's decisions on Applications MP-432 and MP-433.

Marlene Rhome had left the meeting, but gave Co-Chair de la Cruz the [attached statement](#) into the record in opposition to the Planning Board's decisions on Applications MP-432 and MP-433.

Mike Battinelli, of the Stamford Neighborhood Coalition, read the [attached statement](#) into the record in opposition to the Planning Board's decisions on Applications MP-432 and MP-433.

Bob Katchko spoke in opposition to changes to the Master Plan and overdevelopment in Stamford.

⁴ Video Pt. 2 Time Stamp 01:38:20

Chris Woodside spoke about preserving the forgotten history of Stamford.

Wes Haynes spoke about the need to take into account that ½ of the site covered by the MP Amendments is on the National Register of Historic Places. The historic buildings on the site are no longer there.

Fran Gerety spoke about environmental health issues caused by change and the need for fresh air and sunshine.

There being no further speakers, the public hearing was closed.

⁵The Committee continued to discuss this item with the presenters:

- This type of development has less of an impact on schools because most of the units produced in the South End have been studios, 1 bedrooms and 2 bedrooms; town houses and multi-family buildings tend to support larger households
- There is no requirement that the building include larger apartment sizes, there is no limit in the Zoning Regulations regarding the size of the units;
- Developers focus on the most lucrative part of the market, which tends to have a smaller family size;
- If people like Stamford and then decide to raise a family, they may move to North Stamford, where the real estate market is currently flat
- The Master Plan is not intended to be written in stone. It is intended to be updated and revised
- 36% of the City's tax base comes from commercial buildings; this commercial base keeps taxes lower for City residents; higher density supports retail
- Higher density makes sense near the train station because people can commute into NY; a ½ mile walk to the train station is not far for someone moving from the City; these people will most likely drive on weekends only
- Renters pay property taxes indirectly through their rent; the owner will pass on the property taxes
- Newer buildings use fewer resources; and are safer; they use fewer City resources
- The City needs to raise revenue in order to address the mold crisis
- The Planning Board makes the Master Plan for the whole City, although the City does not own most of the parcels; the City has the right and the duty to plan
- A developer should not be the only party to benefit from a Master Plan change; increasing the density permitted for the parcels covered by MP-433 will increase the potential value of these properties. The Planning Board felt that these other properties should have the same advantages as the other parcels in the block if they want to develop it themselves, sell it to a developer or do nothing; the Planning Board thought it was appropriate to do the same for these parcels;
- The Planning Board thought that a higher density was appropriate near a transit center
- It is unlikely that these owners will be able to develop these properties into higher density
- The housing crisis will not be met by building these buildings because the apartments are too expensive
- Much of the area being considered is vacant; there is a very intact neighborhood on the other side of Pacific Street; the industrial use was demolished;
- The study recommended high density for the vacant part

⁵ Video Pt. 2 Time Stamp 02:08:36

- When the proposal comes before Zoning, the Zoning Board will need to ensure that the development is respectful of the neighborhood
- The Master Plan change does not require the current owners to make any change; they could also sell any development rights to another development
- This development generates taxes
- The NRZ objected to this proposed development and did not work in conjunction with the Planning Board or BLT on this application; the minutes of the NRZ meetings do reflect that John Freeman came to the NRZ to discuss their B&S Carting site plans; Mr. Blessing also came to NRZ meetings; the NRZ objected to the BLT plans
- The tax revenue for a unit in the South End is approximately \$5000/year

⁶The presenters were then given an opportunity to respond to what had been discussed so far:

- The B&S Carting site is not in a TIF; the southern portion that is already Category 9 is in the TIF, but it will probably come out of the TIF or the TIF will be moved; all tax revenue from the B&S Carting site will all come to the City
- Over the years, the environmental situation in the South End caused by industrial uses of the properties has improved
- He met with the neighbors at least 8 times between October and January of 2019. This does not mean that they agreed between what the City was proposing and the neighbors were proposing, but there was consultation; he did meet with the NRZ several times;
- The application was not originally referred to HPAC because there were no historic properties on the site and they did not realize they needed to; after they reread the ordinance, the application was referred to HPAC, which did not want to consider the application because there are no historic properties on the site
- Whether or not there will be high rise buildings on the site is not part of the Master Plan discussion by the Planning Board. This will be part of the Zoning Board discussion.
- There is a misconception about the displacement of property owners; more than 90% of the residents in the South End are renters (this goes back to the 2000 census); the City does need to develop strategies for long-term affordability

Mr. Quigley (on behalf of the NRZ) stated:

- Planners need to listen and collaborate
- Successful models are Boston's North End, Dumbo

Mr. Hennessey stated:

- The density requested by BLT was 162 units per acre; what was approved is 108 units per acre; this was in response to input from the community
- The densities allowed downtown are far greater, approximately 260 units per acre
- He was at NRZ meetings for other items and these applications were discussed; this was not a secret; studies were brought in over 2 ½ years and were changed based on responses
- The areas being discussed no longer have any historic buildings (see page 7 of the [Carmody materials](#)); they were demolished
- HPAC deferred on it because the only issue was a Master Plan change, not a development plan and because there is no building on the site
- At the time there is a development plan; it will have to be evaluated in the context of the historical nature of the site
- Every unit in the South End pays an average of \$7000 per year – a significant portion of rent goes into the City's revenue; this is how the City will pay for schools, roads, and pension liabilities

⁶ Video Pt. 2 Time Stamp 02:41:56

Ms. Halpern then stated:

- Mr. Blessing and Mr. Freeman came with plans; the NRZ stated that they wanted a more historic site, including a bowling alley

⁷Committee members continued to discuss this item:

- BMR units are too expensive; increasing density won't address this issue
- BLT purchased the property as a Category 4 property
- This parcel is not in the TOD specified in the South End Study
- The Planning Board did not want to put this property at the higher density at the time the Master Plan was adopted

A motion to hold Item No. 1 until Monday at 5:30 p.m. pending further advice from Corporation Counsel was made, seconded and approved by a vote of 7-1-0 (Reps. de la Cruz; Pia, Cottrell, Graziosi, Lee, Lion and Summerville in favor; Rep. Sherwood opposed).

A motion to approve Item No. 2 (rejecting the decision of the Planning Board), was made, seconded and failed by a vote of 3-5-0 (Reps. Cottrell, Graziosi and Sherwood in favor; Reps. de la Cruz, Pia, Lee, Lion and Summerville opposed).

Co-Chair de la Cruz announced that the meeting would continue at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, March 4, 2019.

Respectfully submitted,
Virgil de la Cruz, Co-Chair

This meeting is on [video](#).

⁷ Video Pt. 2 Time Stamp 02:58:35