



## ***Land Use-Urban Redevelopment Committee – Board of Representatives***

Harry Day, Chair

# **Committee Report**

**Date:** Wednesday, November 30, 2016  
**Time:** 7:00 p.m.  
**Place:** Republican Caucus Room, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Government Center

The Land Use-Urban Redevelopment Committee met as indicated above. In attendance were Chair Day and Committee Member Reps. Heaphy, Hoch, McGarry, Okun, Patterson and Ryan. Absent or excused were Committee Member Reps. McNeil and Summerville. Also present were Vikki Cooper, Deputy Corporation Counsel; Michael Pollard, Chief of Staff; and Ted O'Hanlan, Robinson and Cole.

Chair Day called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Committee Action</b>
<sup>1</sup> 1. <a href="#">LU29.072</a>	ORDINANCE <u>for publication</u> ; Restructuring the Urban Redevelopment Commission (URC). 07/06/16 – Submitted by Mayor Martin 07/20/16 - Held in Committee 08/24/16 – Held in Committee	<b>Approved, as amended, 7-0-0</b>

Mr. Pollard explained that:

- The City looked at restructuring of the URC as part of the request to provide assistance to the URC
- This restructuring will give the City more control and make the URC more directly accountable to the Administration on a day to day basis

Mr. O'Hanlan, as counsel to the City, reviewed the changes in the current draft as compared to the previous draft:

- There were 2 overriding concerns: keeping the URC under the supervision of the City and avoiding reinventing the wheel since there are transactions to be accomplished
- The URC continues to play a development role in the City, e.g. the Mill River
- The director of the EDC will serve as the director of the URC; if the URC and the EDC must be separated in the future, the URC would be able to reconstitute itself because the EDC Director would resign
- Nothing has changed as to the URC's powers, but the URC will continue to have to meet as legally required
- Two entities are needed because the EDC and URC serve complementary roles regarding development, but the URC has additional powers, such as eminent domain and negotiation
- The URC is required to amend its bylaws to reflect this reorganization to require prior consultation with the Mayor and attorney from the Corporation Counsel's office for any proposed transaction
- The URC is organized under State enabling statute, but exists by virtue of City ordinance as consistent with State statute
- In the event of a conflict, the URC would be able to hire outside counsel

---

<sup>1</sup> Video Time Stamp 00:00:02

Representatives noted that the word “he” in 6-16a is archaic and should be changed to “the Mayor.” There was no objection to these changes.

A motion to approve this ordinance for publication, as amended, was made, seconded and approved by a vote of 7-0-0 (Reps. Day, Heaphy, Hoch, McGarry, Okun, Patterson and Ryan in favor).

- <sup>2</sup>2. [LU29.074](#) ORDINANCE for publication; Amending Code **Approved 7-0-0**  
Section 88, Buildings, Demolition of, to add a new  
Section 88 – 5.D.  
10/19/16 – Submitted by Rep. Day

This addition is the result of a change in the State statute and tracks that language.

A motion to approve this ordinance for publication, as amended, was made, seconded and approved by a vote of 7-0-0 (Reps. Day, Heaphy, Hoch, McGarry, Okun, Patterson and Ryan in favor).

***As a Secondary Committee:***

- <sup>3</sup>1. [CS29.016](#) ORDINANCE for public hearing and final adoption; **Failed 1-6-0**  
Increasing the fees for applications to the Planning  
Board, Zoning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals.  
05/03/16 – Submitted by Rep. Zelinsky

Chair Day noted that these fees are increased based on cost of living increases.

Committee members discussed:

- whether these increases are too large for one year and should be spread out over several years
- whether these fees should be raised this much for “core government functions”
- whether this incentivizes development or non-compliance
- whether increases that affect homeowners should be lower
- whether there is any way to separate a homeowner from a commercial developer (homeowners are more likely to appear before the Zoning Board of Appeals)
- The fees are lower for single family homes
- Whether these fees are unreasonable on their face

A motion to approve this for final adoption was made, seconded and failed by a vote of 1-6-0 (Reps. Heaphy in favor; Reps. Day, Hoch, McGarry, Okun, Patterson and Ryan opposed).

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

Respectfully submitted,  
Harry Day, Chair

This meeting is on [video](#).

---

<sup>2</sup> Video Time Stamp 00:38:08

<sup>3</sup> Video Time Stamp 00:42:00