

BOR Operations, Parks & Recreation Committee Meeting-20260122_205804-Meeting Recording

January 22, 2026, 1:58AM

18m 18s

● started transcription

JP Johnson, Parker 0:03

Is it was officially ended and there is if we can start the recording again as long as that Council looks like Matt was able to go ahead and restart recording.

So as long as that is OK.

From from a documentation perspective, then it should be good.

HS Hughes, Sheila 0:15

OK.

Yeah. Thank you, Matt.

JP Johnson, Parker 0:18

But the the the live stream portion can't really be restarted.

SD Sandford, Daniel 0:19

Yeah.

Matt. Matt, we'll have a conversation on what kind of magic button you just pressed and maybe maybe you can join the IT club at the at the city, so.

JP Johnson, Parker 0:24

Yeah.

HS Hughes, Sheila 0:25

Thank you.

SD Sandford, Daniel 0:32

Hey, so are we recording now it it shows me recording. So at this time.

We are back in, in, in our public session portion of our meeting.

It is time.

858 we are out of executive session to discuss pending administrative.

Claims against the city.

No votes were taken in case it was not recorded in the previous session due to technical errors.

Myself, Representative Sanford, Representative Finkel, representative Walston Palecia, Bradford Gardner, representative Zachary Johnson, Beckham represent Morrison, didilo Boudreaux.

From the city we had director Quinones, Attorney Robinson, and also Representative Adams.

Were in executive session.

We are now continuing our normal meeting public portion of operations meeting and we will come back to item number.

I don't have it in front of me.

Hold on. Let me bring it back up.

Opr 32.002 our resolution concerning building permit fees on commercial projects exceeding 1,000,000.

We are already.

We are already discussing the item, so at this point I'm gonna go ahead and open it up to the to the floor.

For anyone that wishes to speak on this item or to have any discussion, so at this point I don't see any hands.

DM Didelot, Matt 2:12

I did have one thing if that was OK, I promise to make it quick.

SD Sanford, Daniel 2:16

That's fine, representative delote.

Your floor is yours.

DM Didelot, Matt 2:19

Er kiana's is still in here. If I could ask him a question.

And he'd probably be more familiar.

Is the \$1 million right for the over \$1 million?

Is that for a?

Is that number I want to say for.

Have a purpose for that \$1 million threshold.
You know what's the rationale behind it?
Or is it?
This is the the number that the board has chosen.
Or is there a reason for this?
That's kind of what I'm getting at.



Quiñones, Matt 2:56

I I think that's specific to the discretion of the board.



Didelot, Matt 3:01

OK.
Thank you.



Sandford, Daniel 3:05

Sorry, my mic was representative Zachary.



Andrew 3:09

Yes, thank you.
I was simply saying it's just a percentage really.
It's went from 2 1/2 percent roughly to 3 1/2 percent.
And that's that was the biggest change.



Sandford, Daniel 3:24

Representative finkel.



Finkel, Lewis 3:27

Yeah, my understanding is that up to that \$1 million mark, the percentage that's being charged for the building permit is less.
And then escalates after that \$1 million mark?
Just as a point of information.



Sandford, Daniel 3:46

That that's my understanding as well is that it's actually a lower than the current proposed \$25.

It's. I don't have it in front of me.

I'd have to look it up and then once you get to past the million mark it then increases.

So this resolution would return that feedback to its previous amount for projects over the that \$1,000,000 threshold.

Old.

So I I that that if if that's what the question was I I think that's that's what the question was.

DM **Didelot, Matt** 4:27

Yeah, that.

Thank you.

SD **Sandford, Daniel** 4:30

I don't see any other hands.

I.

I will say this, the process for this resolution.

If it's approved tonight would then go to the full board because it deals with fees.

It would be an approval for a public hearing.

It would then come back to the operations parks and REC committee next month.

For a public hearing. And then it would go back to the board for approval.

So we have a custom tradition in the board for anything that is fees related.

Stated that we have a public hearing on, it would take place at the committee level.

You would hear input from from Members if there's anything. If there any changes to take place, whether that's at the next board level meeting. If it's just cosmetic and you're just kind of changing a the to, you wouldn't need another public hearing.

But let's say it went up and had a public hearing and then got changed completely.

We would have to do another public hearing anytime there is.

A major change.

To to the resolution if, if, if.

That makes sense.

I think it does, but anyway, so we would approve it or not approve it, but we would approve it. Go back up to the board, come back for a public hearing and then go back for a final approval.

So we would take effect and then it would take effect based off of at the very

bottom, it's the first of the next month of the after it's been approved.

So if I don't, if I don't see any.

More hands represent pelecia. Go ahead.

PJ Pelliccia, John 6:01

Thank you, chair.

I did want to bring up kind of one point.

I know it was a thought for the last board as well, but looking to possibly raising the threshold from 1.3 million up.

This way I know everyone has always heard the term the missing middle, but so we can potentially look at addressing, you know building townhouses or or different or condos or different projects like that that provide an opportunity for.

Printers to buy something when they potentially can't afford a house that's, you know, going for \$1,000,000 and they can look into buying something else.

But by if we increase the threshold, that might be, you know, advantageous to that.

So I just wanted to bring that up for discussion, not putting a dollar amount on it, but I think it's something worth talking about here today. Thank you.

Hey yo.

SD Sandford, Daniel 6:58

Representative.

DM Didelot, Matt 7:02

Yeah, that's also kind of my thought process.

Is that \$1,000,000?

Seems like an arbitrary number, especially in the valuation of property today.

You know almost any piece of commercial property is going to meet that \$1,000,000 threshold. If they're doing any sort of work and.

That's my questioning.

Behind it is, I understand we're adjusting those fees, but that \$1,000,000 seems like an arbitrary number and I feel like at this right as of now, personally I don't have that.

Enough information to determine hey, is this where we wanna see these fees landed?

And I know that passed.

Some Members have also suggested kind of having tears to it based on values so that we can incentivize.

That middle housing that John mentioned as well, and I think that could be something that should be brought up as well.

SD **Sandford, Daniel** 8:01

Zachary.

A **Andrew** 8:04

Thank you, representative dietelo.

I was about to mention the same thing.

We could tier this in different ways or have it kind of ramp up marginally so that they more expensive projects get a higher fee and that would be that's probably worth investigating and figuring out rather than voting on this right now, I would recommend or suggest.

That we do a quick study and come up with a slightly richer set of proposals.

For the press to study and present to the full board.

SD **Sandford, Daniel** 8:41

I'm going to come right back, Representative Gardner.

 **Gardner, Felix** 8:44

Thank you, chair.

I'm listening to Representative Boudreaux's original sort of sentiment when he proposed this or brought this to the to the committee, he suggested that the reason he proposes this is he didn't want to see these additional fees be passed on to renters.

My counterpoint would be by adding tears.

It's not really fixing that problem and the additional fees will still be passed on to people that just at different bands, and fundamentally this is about affordability of housing and projects for renters in Stamford and he wants to see a reduction, I believe. Don't let me put words.

In your mouth.

Representative boudreaux.

But he wants to see a reduction on the whole, not.

Administration. He wants to see it reduced across all projects by yield.

SD **Sandford, Daniel** 9:25

No, I appreciate it real, real quick before I get back to Representative Boudreaux and I might have to put my thinking cap on for a second.

I think there's some administrative stuff. So on the resolution on the agenda where it says concerning building permit fees exceeding a million, that was the original from last board and then it was raised.

Typically, like kind of what you're saying in a tier way, it was raised from a million to 1.3 million.

So from my understanding there was an argument made last board to raise it to 3,000,000 so that you know the the someone building a dentist office or a doctor's office or building a build out in a commercial would not have this enormous fee. And then it was raised.

It was lower to 2 million and then they settled on 1.3.

So it is the original resolution.

Was this fee increased after a million and then the new?

Fee schedule.

They settled on 1.3 as a as a quote compromise.

So the idea of kind of a higher threshold has been brought up, but not a a tier.

I will go to represent.

Drove for the second time and then I will come back with my my last comment or thought representative drove.

The floor is yours.

BM **Boudreau, Matthew** 10:54

So addressing reparative gardeners point, I do, broadly speaking, for the 3035. Dollars per thousand limit is too high and so I want to see that come down, but separately from that the the tiered structure can also be implemented as a as a parallel idea.

So you know, for instance, you could have the up to 1,000,000 be \$10 and then one to three million be 15 and then the \$25 rate doesn't kick in until like 5 million or something.

So I don't think there's ideas have to be mutually exclusive and. And so I'm open to doing to doing both.

But yes, I do also think that the current rates are just too high.

SD **Sandford, Daniel** 11:35

With that being said, I don't see any hands, so I'll just I'll take up a little bit more of your time.

There's a couple options we could do.

You could and I can't make the motion for, you know, as the chair, but we could approve as is and send it to the board for approval.

You could recommit back to steering.

In between now and next steering someone.

Works on what a possible.

Compromise would look like and submit that for for next steering so that we have it ready to go.

Make the motion to amend or you know, there's there's a couple of options that that the committee can can choose whether or not you know we want to sit here and figure it out tonight.

You know, I'm. I'm. I'm tending to not want to do that because I think we'll just kind of go back and forth.

I think there's a happy.

Medium I think to put a little bit of thought into it, so that the fees make sense, might be something that you know we put a little bit of of time into. However Representative Didilo go ahead.

DM **Didelot, Matt** 12:51

Yeah, also that I was gonna make a motion to recommit this item, this hearing.

SD **Sandford, Daniel** 12:56

Are you making a motion to recommit?


DM **Didelot, Matt** 12:59


Yes.


SD **Sandford, Daniel** 13:00


Is there a second?


 **Andrew** 13:04
2nd.


 **Sandford, Daniel** 13:05
I have multiple real quick. Before we go to a vote. Director kenona. Sorry, I almost called you representative kenonas.
My apologies, director kenonas, go ahead.


 **Quiñones, Matt** 13:13
No, no worries.
Just, just, just quickly, if the you just want to offer to the committee that in the event that you do recommit between now and next month, we can produce.
Like a historical report on the permitting, with all the values so that you can have a really good perspective on the best guess we can make projecting forward just from a a prior year standpoint in the event that you move towards a tiered system.
So just want to offer that to the committee before you adjourned.

 **Sandford, Daniel** 13:47
Thank you, director. Go ahead, Representative Zachary.

 **Andrew** 13:50
Thank you, representative didilo. If you would like to work with me. I love working with large numbers and this would be kind of fun to do so.

 **Sandford, Daniel** 14:03
We I I am gonna continue on.
We there is a motion on the floor and a second to recommit.
So what I am gonna do at this time is Representative Morrison.

 **Morson, Eric** 14:18
When you call for discussion, that's all.

 **Sandford, Daniel** 14:22
Thank you.

So right now there's a motion on the floor to to recommit, so the discussion is, do you want to recommit?

It sounds like Representative Zachary said.

If you want to recommit, I'll work with you.

And that's kind of where I'm taking that one right there, represent Morrison.

Did you have a question?



Morson, Eric 14:43

If you called for discussion on the motion to recommit, that's all.



Sandford, Daniel 14:49

Yes. Do you? Are you discussing it?



Morson, Eric 14:50

Yeah, I.

Yeah. I sorry.

I think this is a great idea to recommit. I think it's.

Given how the discussion went on when we passed the 1.3.

To my colleagues points the sense that a million, even a million three, is arbitrary.

I can definitely ascribe to that sentiment, and I think doing some real evaluation on where.

A solid point to land on would be.

Well, in ours and the public's best interest.

So if I were on the committee, I'd be voting to to recommit.

Thank you.



Sandford, Daniel 15:28

And then I'll put my last two cents in and we'll take it to a vote to director Kononas. I

I I'm kind of a I'm a lean manufacturing kind of guy by trade.

So I'm always kind of the 8020 rule, so there might be some data that we can look at to where 80% of our projects fall into this range and you know 10% are in this range and that way we don't get a tiered structure that.

Has 17,000 tiers, but we might get.

You know, one to three that that makes sense.

We can actually put something that you know we we can we can we can go to the

public and say this is where we this is where we came up with these numbers. Having said that without any further hands I have a motion to recommit and I have.

A second I will try this by voice vote. If we do not, if we have any nays, I will then do a roll call. Vote. All those in favor of recommitting item.

0 PR 32.002 back to steering say aye.

A Andrew 16:27
Aye, aye.

NB Nicole Beckham 16:28
Aye.

BP Bradford, Phil 16:28
Hi.

SD Sanford, Daniel 16:30
Those opposed?
At this time, this item was 0.
Sorry, OPR 32.002 will be recommitted to steering by a vote of I believe, 900.
I'm sorry I had a hand raised, representative Finkel.

HS Hughes, Sheila 16:45
It it.

FL Finkel, Lewis 16:50
Not raised about the motion, but I'm hand was raised after the motion was settled. I was just with my construction background.
I was going to volunteer to work on the tier structure.

SD Sanford, Daniel 17:01
Hey, I appreciate it.

HS Hughes, Sheila 17:03
Excuse me, chair Sanford.
It was 800.

 **Sandford, Daniel** 17:06

800 my apologies.

That's I I couldn't do it by myself.

Thank you. Represent Morrison.

Your hand is raised.

 **Morson, Eric** 17:14

Yes, thank you. First of all, I think you've done a great job running this meeting tonight with all the technical issues and juggling things.

Chair Sanford I'm. I'm told that it's possible that members of the public still cannot hear the meeting.

 **Sandford, Daniel** 17:22

I appreciate it.

 **Morson, Eric** 17:27

Sammy, can you please see what's going on? So it doesn't happen going forward?

Thank you.

 **Hughes, Sheila** 17:34

Sammy left the meeting, but I will ask him.

 **Sandford, Daniel** 17:37

We'll take a look at it and we'll we'll have a little after action review.

 **Morson, Eric** 17:38

Ah, thank you. Thank you.

 **Sandford, Daniel** 17:44

So I appreciate representing Morrison at this time.

That concludes our agenda and I will take up a motion to adjourn.

 **Finkel, Lewis** 17:53

Motion to adjourn.



Andrew 17:54

Arts motion committee.



Gardner, Felix 17:54

Summit.



Sandford, Daniel 17:55

You're amazing. You guys stay warm this weekend and wish director Canon is luck as he manages the snow storm this weekend.



Andrew 17:58

Yeah.



Sandford, Daniel 18:05

So thanks everybody and.



Didelot, Matt 18:05

Yeah. Good luck.



Andrew 18:06

Right. Can I have a?



Nicole Beckham 18:07

Thank you.



Bradford, Phil 18:07

Good luck.

Yeah, we'll see you next month.




Morson, Eric 18:08

Good night all.





Quiñones, Matt 18:09


Everybody stay home.

 **Didelot, Matt** 18:11
Yeah, yeah.

 **Nicole Beckham** 18:12
OK.

 **Sandford, Daniel** 18:13
Take care, guys. Good night.

 **Quiñones, Matt** 18:14
Take care.

 **Andrew** 18:14
Bye bye.

 **Didelot, Matt** stopped transcription