

Special Committee of the RTM
Plan of Conservation and Development
and the Capital Plan

Final Report

December 2007

Table of Contents

Summary Findings and Recommendations	3
Findings.....	6
Charter.....	6
The Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD).....	7
The CIP Process.....	9
Planning & Zoning Commission	11
Recommendations.....	13
Charter.....	13
The Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD).....	14
The CIP Process.....	14
Appendix.....	16
Charge of RTM Moderator	16
Members of the Special Committee.....	17
Schedule of Meetings Held and Individuals Contributing.....	18
Recommendations of the Special Committee Outside of the Charge.....	19

Summary Findings and Recommendations

The members of the Special Committee thank all those who contributed to our discussion and development of recommendations. We were all very impressed with their supportive and constructive approach.

All recognized that the integration or alignment of the capital improvements projects (CIP) budgeting process with the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) will help achieve the objectives set out in the POCD.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations:

1. The Town's Charter assigns primary responsibility for planning to the Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z) and the Representative Town Meeting.
2. The Charter provides for the preparation of the POCD, which it defines as a comprehensive, long-range plan. As a plan, the POCD must have sufficient detail to guide its implementation.
3. The CIP process has been implemented and evolved over the past five years and consists of (a) identifying capital projects, (b) prioritizing them and (c) scheduling them over a 15-year period in a capital plan.
4. P&Z has a heavy workload dealing with zoning matters and lacks sufficient staff to perform its planning role effectively.
5. The Special Committee makes a series of recommendations that would integrate various planning efforts now performed by different Town departments and agencies, and better link the Town's capital planning, with the POCD.

The Special Committee has unanimously adopted this report and proposes that the RTM adopt the following Sense-of-the-Meeting Resolution:

WHEREAS, at its October 23, 2006 meeting, the Representative Town Meeting adopted a sense-of-the-meeting resolution to the effect that the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) currently being prepared by the Planning and Zoning Commission should describe all capital improvement projects required to achieve its goals, that it should be revised and updated with appropriate citizen input at periodic intervals and that the Moderator set up a special committee to consider how best to ensure that the Capital Plan prepared annually in connection with the Town's annual budget be consistent with the POCD, as revised and updated from time to time; and

WHEREAS, the special committee set up by the Moderator pursuant to such resolution has submitted its report; and

WHEREAS, such report contains the following recommendations:

1. that Section 21(b) of the Charter be amended by inserting at the end of the last sentence the following: "which shall include funding of, or a determination not to

- fund, capital improvements required to meet the goals of the Plan of Development, as amended from time to time.”;
2. that Section 92 of the Charter be amended by inserting after “trends” in the third sentence the following: “and of the views of other agencies of town government and of the public”;
 3. that Section 93 of the Charter be amended by deleting “may” in the second sentence thereof and inserting in its place “shall”;
 4. that the description of a project in the POCD demonstrate how the project would implement a particular goal of the POCD and enable the concerned town departments and agencies to make preliminary estimates of the cost and likely public support and/or opposition to the project;
 5. that a structured update procedure be followed pursuant to which a major section of the POCD is reviewed, revised as appropriate and re-adopted each year;
 6. that an implementation committee be created to monitor implementation of the POCD on a regular basis and make periodic status reports to the First Selectman, P&Z, the BET and the RTM;
 7. that all projects considered for funding in the CIP process (other than projects that are required by a court or regulatory order) be derived from, or be consistent with, the POCD;
 8. that requests by Town departments for the funding of a capital project specify the goal of the POCD that would be implemented by such project;
 9. that the Capital Plan include a list of all capital improvements identified to meet the goals of the POCD but not scheduled in the Capital Plan;
 10. that the CIP Committee membership be broadened so that at least 50% of the voting power on the committee be with persons who are not town employees;
 11. that the CIP Committee operate openly, in full compliance with the Freedom Of Information Act, with its meetings noticed appropriately in advance and open to the public and a record kept and made available to the public of any action it takes, including the scoring by the committee of individual projects; and
 12. that all Town departments and agencies affected by the POCD evidence their support for the proposed POCD or any proposed amendment thereto prior to its submission to the RTM;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the foregoing recommendations be, and they hereby are, approved by the Representative Town Meeting to provide guidance to

the constituent parts of Town government to improve the Town's long-range planning and the linkage of the Town's budgeting of capital improvements projects with its long-range planning in the POCD.

Respectfully submitted,

Joshua H. Brown, Chairman, and the members of the POCD/CP Special Committee

Findings

Taken from the meetings and discussion of the Special Committee, the following are findings of the Special Committee:

Charter

The Town's Charter describes the respective roles of Planning & Zoning (P&Z), the Representative Town Meeting, the Town departments, the First Selectman, the Board of Selectmen and the Board of Estimate and Taxation (BET), as they relate to planning and the funding of capital projects. In summary,

- The Charter makes P&Z the planning agency for the Town (Art. 9, Secs. 82-107), requires it to prepare the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) (Sec. 92) and specifies the contents that should go into the POCD (Sec. 94). Certain projects of any Town agency (including the Board Of Education (BOE) and the Housing Authority) must be approved by P&Z as “municipal improvements” (Sec. 99).
- The RTM must approve the POCD and any amendments to it (Sec. 96). The RTM has the final planning authority on municipal improvements; action by P&Z on a proposed municipal improvement may be referred to the RTM, and the RTM has the power either to approve or reject it (Sec. 100). The RTM appoints members of P&Z and must approve the annual budget and all supplemental expenditures by the Town over \$5,000.
- The Town departments are required to prepare "operational plans for the ensuing fiscal year" in connection with preparation of the annual budget (Sec. 21).
- The First Selectman has two principal roles, (i) as chief executive officer of the Town, responsible for the supervision, control and administration of specified Town departments (not including P&Z), and (ii) as a member and chairman of the Board of Selectmen (Sec. 217). As the result of a Charter change adopted in 2003, the proposed budgets and operational plans of the Town departments, including Town departments not under his or her supervision (but not the BOE or the BET), are submitted to the First Selectman for review and possible revision, and the First Selectman establishes priorities for capital spending and develops a long-range capital spending plan (Sec. 21(b)).
- The Board of Selectmen nominates members of P&Z (for appointment by the RTM) as well as members of other Town agencies and acts in connection with the adoption of ordinances and home rule action (Arts. 6 and 7).
- The financial affairs of the Town are the responsibility of the BET (Sec. 1). It prepares the annual budget for submission to the RTM (Sec. 23), levies taxes and fixes the tax rate (Art. 17, Secs. 287-288).

The Capital Improvements Projects (CIP) process (discussed more fully below) is not contained in the Charter except to the extent that Sec. 21(b) requires the First Selectman

to establish capital priorities and develop a long-range capital plan. The CIP process is followed in connection with the annual budget pursuant to which capital projects are funded, and many consider that getting a desired capital project into the CIP process is the key to getting the project implemented. As a result, the POCD is not serving as the Town's long-term planning tool as contemplated by the Charter, P&Z has little or no role in planning many capital improvements projects except in connection with granting municipal improvements status, and (except in connection with any municipal improvements referred to it) the RTM acts only on the end product of the process, the appropriation of funds.

The Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD)

The POCD is prepared and adopted pursuant both to the Town Charter and State law. Section 94 of the Charter specifies the contents of the POCD as follows:

The [POCD] shall show the [Planning & Zoning] Commission's recommendation for the most desirable use of land within the Town for residential, recreational, commercial, industrial and other purposes; for the most desirable density of population in the several parts of the town; for a system of streets and drains, for parks, for the general location, relocation and improvement of public real property and public buildings, including schools; for the general location and extent of public utilities and terminals, whether publicly or privately owned, for water, sewerage, light, power, transit and other purposes; and for the location of public housing projects. Such other recommendations may be made by the Commission and included in the [POCD] as will, in its judgment, be beneficial to the town.

A “plan” is a method or scheme for achieving certain goals, and thus, by definition, it should contain the way in which it is to be implemented. The 1998 POCD did not contain a significant level of detail concerning many of the projects needed to implement its goals; it acknowledged this fact, and the Town Planner undertook to develop an Implementation Plan. However, the Implementation Plan that was developed did not describe how its various recommendations should be implemented; rather, it identified the Town departments and agencies that would implement the recommendations, if they were implemented, without specifying how they might do so. In the resolution adopted by the RTM on October 23, 2006 pursuant to which this Special Committee was formed, the RTM expressed the view that the new POCD should “describe all capital projects required to achieve its goals”.

In connection with the October 23, 2006 resolution, P&Z has expressed concern about the specificity with which a capital improvements project would have to be described. How a capital improvements project is described would depend on the particular goal, whether there are optional ways by which the goal may be achieved, whether or not any architectural and engineering work has been performed and other factors. For example, the description of open space the Town wished to acquire could be quite specific, but

there are different ways by which traffic circulation in the downtown business district might be improved.

State law requires that a POCD be adopted every ten years, but there is no requirement that a POCD be updated before a new POCD is adopted. Sections 92 and 93 of the Charter give P&Z the authority to amend the POCD from time to time, but does not require it to do so. The 1998 POCD stated that P&Z “will review and revise the [POCD] at regular intervals”. When the RTM approved the 1998 POCD at its April 13, 1998 meeting, it also adopted a sense of the meeting resolution to the effect that P&Z would conduct such review biennially in cooperation with the RTM Land Use Committee. Such reviews were conducted and topics requiring revision were identified, but no revisions to the POCD in fact were made.

In its October 23, 2006 resolution, the RTM expressed the view that the new POCD “be revised and updated with appropriate citizen input at periodic intervals”. The consensus of the persons this Special Committee consulted is that the POCD should be kept current – that it should be a more living document, one that guides the direction of Town departments and bodies in their actions in respect of the topics it covers. While P&Z refers to the POCD in connection with actions it takes, other Town departments rarely do so.

The 2006 Shelton POCD¹ provides that a major section of the POCD is updated every year. Following public meetings and a workshop with local boards and other interested persons, the relevant section of the POCD is revised, as appropriate, and re-adopted.

The 1998 POCD was prepared with a substantial amount of public input, derived from two sets of public hearings – (i) in neighborhoods throughout town and (ii) on major topics – as well as from informal meetings with Town officials and citizen groups. The intent was that the POCD reflect public opinion, which is one of the POCD's assets. However, there is no requirement in the Charter that the POCD do so.

Preparation of the 2008 POCD is following a similar procedure. Meetings in and with several neighborhoods and with the RTM leadership and other bodies are or have taken place. P&Z expects to get broad input from the public through additional meetings with neighborhood groups, Town departments, committees and bodies.

¹ 2006 Plan of Conservation and Development, City of Shelton, CT, July 31, 2006 (2006 Shelton POCD). Planimetrics, LLC, a firm of planning consultants based in Connecticut, were the consultants on comprehensive planning in connection with preparation of the 2006 Shelton POCD; the same firm has been retained in connection with the preparation of the Town's 2008 POCD.

The CIP Process

The CIP process determines the major capital expenditures to be undertaken by the Town and the scheduling of such expenditures over a number of years. It does this by a three-stage procedure:

- (i) collecting requests, reviewing and evaluating those requests to determine which capital projects should be considered for funding (Capital Projects),
- (ii) prioritizing the Capital Projects so as to determine which ones can be funded in the ensuing fiscal year and
- (iii) scheduling, over a 15-year period, the Capital Projects that should be funded in future fiscal years.

(i) Capital Projects

Pursuant to Section 21(b) of the Charter, the CIP process is administered by the First Selectman, who determines what projects will be treated as Capital Projects and thus be ranked and included in the Capital Plan. As stated in the budget book, public participation in the CIP process “is through the various neighborhood associations and organized community groups that have expressed their thoughts to the First Selectman”. The First Selectman has held meetings as part of the preparation of and review of the Capital Plan.

Needs recognized in the POCD or otherwise in the community have not in all cases been treated as Capital Projects. For example, the purchase of the Tuchman property, the proposed move of the Board of Education and the proposed King Street fire station were not treated as a Capital Project in the 2006-07 budget. Similarly, the Capital Plan included in the 2007-08 budget did not include a project to deal with traffic circulation in the central business district at any time in the next 15 years, although that need had been identified specifically in the 1998 POCD.

At an early stage in the annual budget cycle, the Town Planner presents to the CIP Committee an assessment of Capital Projects that are being considered and indicates for each whether or not it supports the POCD. It does not appear that any further assessment of whether or not particular Capital Projects support of the POCD occurs as part of the CIP Committee's considerations.

Under its 2008-09 Budget Guidelines², the BET will view Capital Projects as falling into three different categories: (1) new initiatives, (2) expansion of existing initiatives and (3) routine projects (such as asphalt paving and vehicle replacement). Each category will be required to have “a vision statement, a strategic plan and tactics ... to implement that

² Memorandum from the BET to Department Heads, etc., dated September 18, 2007.

plan”. However, these requirements do not appear to assess whether or not a particular Capital Project or category of Capital Projects supports the POCD.

The POCD generally does not deal with equipment and maintenance items specifically. However, equipment or maintenance projects could support a goal of the POCD, for example, that vehicles or other equipment produce low emissions to support the goal of improved air quality.

Additionally, the POCD does not define the criteria that should be used to qualify a project as a Capital Project. The BET in its 2008-09 Budget Guidelines has specified capital threshold levels to be, in the case of equipment, \$10,000 with a life of three or more years and, in the case of capital improvements, \$25,000.

The 2006 Shelton POCD, as an example, contains a description of a capital improvement program, which is defined in section 8-160 of the Connecticut General Statutes. It describes the capital projects to be scheduled in a capital improvement program as those meeting the following criteria:

- creates or improves a community asset;
- requires a significant expenditure (e.g., \$100,000 or more);
- has a useful life expectancy of five years or more; and
- involves the construction, renovation, replacement or expansion of permanent physical facilities (e.g., schools) or infrastructure (e.g., sewers), the purchase of land or the purchase of expensive equipment with a long useful life.

(ii) Prioritizing of Capital Projects

The prioritizing or ranking of the Capital Projects is done by a “Capital Improvements Projects Committee” (CIP Committee) drawn primarily from the Town’s department leadership and administrative staff. The CIP Committee is relatively new and will have completed its sixth year in fiscal year 2008-09. It ranks the submitted Capital Projects on a set of 13 objective criteria.³ Whether or not a project is contemplated by, or would implement a recommendation contained in, the POCD is not clearly one of the 13 criteria.

The CIP Committee is advisory to the First Selectman, who has the authority to change, and on occasion has changed, the priorities established by the CIP Committee.

The procedure by which the CIP Committee applies these criteria is not open and few meetings are held. The CIP Committee that ranked Capital Projects for the 2007-08 Budget met twice and kept no record of how individual members ranked different projects. Most of the documentation is not available. The ranking of Capital Projects, as recommended by the CIP Committee and adjusted by the First Selectman, is shown in the Capital Schedules section of the annual budget book.

³ See Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) Project Evaluation Sheet, which may be viewed at http://greenwichct.virtualltownhall.net/Public_Documents/GreenwichCT_Estimate/budget.

At the beginning of the current budget cycle (before the change of administration with the November election), the CIP Committee consisted of the following:

Jim Lash, First Selectman
Ron Lalli, Special Projects Manager, Office of the First Selectman
John Crary, Town Administrator
Roland Geiger, Budget Director, Finance Department
Peter Mynarski, Comptroller
Diane Fox, Town Planner
Joe Siciliano, Director of Parks and Recreation
Lloyd Hubbs, Commissioner of Public Works
Dr. Betty Sternberg, Superintendent of Schools
Susan Wallerstein, Assistant Superintendent of Business, Board of Education
Don Heller, Chairman, Planning & Zoning Commission

(iii) Capital Plan

An important product of the CIP process is the creation of a Capital Plan, which is the only part of the CIP process called for in the Charter (Sec. 21(b)). It is a prioritized schedule of Capital Projects projected over a 15-year period. While it is in the budget book for each year's budget, only the current fiscal year is adopted as part of the annual budget. Subsequent years of the Capital Plan lack the legal significance of the budget itself, which provides flexibility to re-prioritize or add projects based on changing circumstances or available funding.

The RTM takes no action with respect to the Capital Plan itself except to appropriate funds for the Capital Projects listed in the Capital Plan for the current budget year. Thus the RTM takes no action on Capital Projects shown in the Capital Plan in years beyond the current budget year.

Because of financial constraints, not all capital improvements projects required to fully implement the POCD can be scheduled in the Capital Plan. Those not scheduled are not shown in the Capital Plan. The result is that they are long-term needs or desires that, while they lack the urgency of scheduled projects, are not clearly tracked so they can be kept in mind for possible future funding.

Planning & Zoning Commission

P&Z is composed of five members and three alternates (Charter Sec. 86). It has a staff of ten, five of whom it shares with the Town's other land use agencies (2007-08 Budget). It has an extremely heavy workload, dealing mainly with zoning matters that must be decided within relatively narrow, fixed timeframes. As a result, neither the commissioners nor staff devote significant time to planning, *i.e.*, to ensuring that the town's administration has an up-to-date, comprehensive and implementable plan to guide it in working towards goals that meet the town's needs and reflect public opinion.

P&Z's new chairman, Don Heller, has stated that P&Z and its staff devote only about 20% of their time on planning, but that he wishes to devote greater time and attention to P&Z's planning role. In light of its very full workload, P&Z requires additional staff if it is to do so.

The extent to which zoning matters prevent P&Z from devoting more time and attention to planning raises the question of whether such activity should be separated to another agency (as has been done in some other Connecticut towns). This possibility was considered, and rejected, by the so-called Blue Ribbon Panel, which studied the Town's land use agencies in the 1990s.⁴

But the Blue Ribbon Panel recommended that P&Z place greater emphasis on planning, and it recognized the need for additional staff. Specifically, it recommended that P&Z be reorganized to separate long-term planning from day-to-day operations and that a new position of Assistant Town Planner be created to be responsible for all long-range planning, including the POCD, and for its implementation. The Assistant Town Planner would have the assistance of one and ½ planner. However, the recommendation was not implemented.

With P&Z primarily focused on zoning, planning has gravitated to other branches of Town government. For example, a project to prepare a “master plan” for the central business district was created under an appropriation by the Department of Public Works and more recently has been taken on by the Office of the First Selectman; the Charter does not contemplate planning to be led by either the Department of Public Works or the Office of the First Selectman. Another example might be the “strategic plans” required by the BET in its 2008-09 Budget Guidelines in connection with capital requests by Town departments (discussed above); the Charter contemplates that Town departments only prepare “operational plans for the ensuing fiscal year”. These planning efforts by bodies other than P&Z do not appear to be well coordinated with P&Z and may be in conflict with each other and with P&Z's planning efforts and the POCD.

⁴ See Report of Special Panel to Review Land Use Agencies and Building, June 29, 1998.

Recommendations

The Special Committee makes the following recommendations:

Charter

1. that the last sentence of Section 21(b) of the Charter be amended to read as follows: “In connection with such reviews, the First Selectman shall (1) develop goals and objectives and establish priorities for spending for the ensuing fiscal year; (2) establish priorities with respect to recommended capital spending for all Town agencies; and (3) develop a long range capital spending plan **which shall include funding of, or a determination not to fund, capital improvements required to meet the goals of the Plan of Development, as amended from time to time.**”

Note: Added language in bold.

This would require, that every capital project needed to meet the goals of the POCD either be scheduled in the Capital Plan or a determination be made that it not be in the Capital Plan. For example, a project to deal with traffic circulation in the CBD would be prioritized and scheduled in the Capital Plan (or a determine made that it should not be funded), even if it had not yet been determined precisely what form that project would take.

2. that the third sentence of Section 92 of the Charter be amended to read as follows: “The plan shall be based on studies of physical, social, economic and governmental conditions and trends **and of the views of other agencies of town government and of the public** and shall be designed to promote the development of the Town and the general welfare and prosperity of its people.”

Note: Added language in bold.

This amendment would put into the Charter P&Z's practice of preparing the POCD on the basis of a substantial amount of input from Town departments and the public.

3. that the second sentence of Section 93 of the Charter be amended to read as follows: “The Commission [may] **shall**, from time to time, amend, extend or add to the Plan of Development or parts thereof whenever changed conditions or further studies by the Commission indicate the advisability of such amendment, extension or addition.”

Note: Added language in bold; deletion in brackets []’s.

The effect of this amendment would be to make periodic updating of the POCD an affirmative obligation of P&Z, rather than permissive as at present.

The Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD)

4. that the description of a project in the POCD demonstrate how the project would implement a particular goal of the POCD and enable the concerned Town departments and agencies to make preliminary estimates of the cost and likely public support and/or opposition to the project.
5. that a structured update procedure be followed pursuant to which a major section of the POCD is reviewed, revised as appropriate and re-adopted each year.

If adopted by the Town, such a procedure would not preclude amendment of other sections of the POCD from time to time (as contemplated by Charter sections 92 and 93). Until the Town has had some experience with such a procedure, the Special Committee does not feel it should be incorporated in the Charter. This recommendation is based on a similar recommendation in the 2006 Shelton POCD.⁵

6. that an implementation committee be created to monitor implementation of the POCD on a regular basis and make periodic status reports to the First Selectman, P&Z, the BET and the RTM.

This recommendation recognizes that full implementation of the POCD, as well as implementation of some of its goals, may require multiple years and multiple projects. If the CIP Committee is substantially enlarged, as this report recommends below, the Special Committee recommends that an implementation committee be a separate, smaller committee with representation from P&Z, the BET and the RTM plus citizens at large, all nominated by the Board of Selectmen and appointed by the RTM.

The CIP Process

7. that all projects considered for funding in the CIP process (other than projects that are required by a court or regulatory order) be derived from, or be consistent with, the POCD.
8. that requests by Town departments for the funding of a capital project specify the goal(s) of the POCD that would be implemented by such project.

⁵ 2006 Shelton POCD, p. 7-2.

9. that the Capital Plan include a list of all capital improvement projects required to meet the goals of the POCD but not scheduled in the Capital Plan.

The Special Committee's recommended amendment of Section 21(b) of the Charter requires that the Capital Plan include funding, or a determination that it should not be funded, of capital improvement projects required to meet every goal of the POCD. Requiring a list of unscheduled projects is intended to make the prioritization of projects as visible as possible, and the CIP process as a whole more transparent.

10. that the CIP Committee membership be broadened so that at least 50% of the voting power on the committee be with persons who are not Town employees.

The Special Committee believes that, by including these other members, and giving them an equal voice with Town employees, broader input and assessment would result and would enhance the awareness of the public and other agencies that will ultimately be reviewing the Capital Projects and the discussions leading to their ranking.

11. that the CIP Committee operate openly, in full compliance with the Freedom Of Information Act, with its meetings noticed appropriately in advance and open to the public and a record kept and made available to the public of any action it takes, including the scoring by the committee of individual projects.
12. that all Town departments and agencies affected by the POCD evidence their support for the proposed POCD or any proposed amendment thereto prior to its submission to the RTM.

This recommendation is to ensure that all planning by Town departments and agencies in respect of topics covered by the POCD is tightly linked and integrated with P&Z's planning, and equally that all Town departments and agencies have a major role in the development and amendment of the sections of the POCD of concern to them.

Appendix

Charge of RTM Moderator

Following the passing of the Sense of the Meeting Resolution at its October 2006 Regular Meeting:

RESOLVED, that it is the sense of the Representative Town Meeting that the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) currently being prepared by the Planning and Zoning Commission describe all capital improvement projects required to achieve its goals, that it be revised and updated with the appropriate citizen input at periodic intervals and that, the Moderator set up a special committee to consider how best to ensure that the Capital Plan prepared annually in connection with the Town's annual budget be consistent with the POCD, as revised and updated from time to time.

The Moderator of the RTM appointed members for this Special Committee at the January 2007 Regular Meeting and recognized Joshua H. Brown as its chairman.

Members of the Special Committee

Joshua H. Brown, Chairman

Former Chairman, RTM Finance Committee; Member from District 8

Vincent A. DiMarco

Chairman, RTM Transportation Committee; Member from District 9

Franklin Bloomer

Chairman, RTM Land Use Committee, Member from District 5

Robert Kavee

Chairman, RTM Public Works Committee, Member from District 12

Peter Berg

Former Member, Board of Estimate & Taxation; Member from District 8

Swan M. Grant

Former Member, Planning and Zoning Commission; Member from District 10

Richard Kral, Jr.

Chairman of (and member from) District 8

Randall Huffman

Chairman, RTM Budget Overview Committee; Member from District 7

The Special Committee acknowledges the active participation of Louisa Stone, former Chairperson of the P&Z.

Schedule of Meetings Held and Individuals Contributing

13 March 2007 – Organizational
Members of the Special Committee

12 April 2007 –
Members of the Special Committee

25 April 2007 –
Members of the Special Committee

29 May 2007 – Planning and Zoning Commission
Donald Heller, Chairman, Planning and Zoning
Diane Fox, Town Planner
Suzanne Giess Robbins
Members of the Special Committee

12 June 2007 – Capital Improvement Project Process and League of Women Voters
Jim Lash, First Selectman
Joanne Messina, Greenwich League of Women Voters
Cheryl Dunson
Members of the Special Committee

20 June 2007 – Department of Public Works and Board of Estimate and Taxation
Lloyd Hubbs, Commission of Public Works
Leslie Tarkington, BET
Peter Tesei, Chairman, BET
Art Norton, BET
Members of the Special Committee

13 November 2007 – Report Review
Members of the Special Committee

15 November 2007 – Report Review
Members of the Special Committee

19 November 2007 – Report Review and Approval of Resolution
Members of the Special Committee

26 November 2007 – Report Approval
Members of the Special Committee

Recommendations of the Special Committee Outside of the Charge

The Special Committee has taken no action with respect to these recommendations, which are set forth below for information only.

The following are recommendations that were discussed by the Special Committee which fall outside of the Moderator's Charge. These were brought up by individuals meeting with the Special Committee as well as from Special Committee members.

1. Create a more formal "planning office" within P&Z and specific (additional) planning resources with a lead planner
2. Strive to co-locate, to the best possible way, the various land use agencies with most closely aligned Town departments, *e.g.*, Public Works). The Special Committee recognizes that Town departments have been moving more closely together and desire that to continue.
3. More routine formal and informal discussions between the leadership of those various land use agencies / Town departments to be aware of common challenges and to foster a more close working relationship between and across them.
4. All projects be reviewed by the CIP Committee that relate to the use of land, be formally reviewed by the Planning and Zoning.
5. Add additional enforcement resources with a lead enforcer
6. P&Z has only limited authority to enforce zoning regulations. The Town's zoning enforcement officer does not report to P&Z; he is part of the Department of Public Works. Zoning enforcement also suffers from insufficient staffing, and as a result builders and home owners do work that is outside the permitted standards which often goes undetected. After five years, such work is grandfathered and need not be corrected.
7. Consider a requirement that all actions by P&Z on municipal improvement proposals be automatically referred to the RTM.
8. That a training session be developed, not unlike the education that is given to new RTM members by the Moderator on the RTM, to expand the members understanding of the budget process, planning and municipal improvement actions. This training would provide a more stable footing / foundation to better understand the interrelationships between them.