

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE MIDDLETOWN REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY HELD ON JUNE 4, 1974.

PRESENT: Messrs.: Achenbach, Chairman
Reier, Vice-Chairman
Davis
Kelsey
Misenti
Novicki
Sneed

ALSO

PRESENT: Haze
Guy
Snow, Legal Counsel
Matteo, Common Council
Garafalo, Common Council
Beinhorn, Middletown Press
Katz, Hartford Courant
Didato & Poliner
DeRing, Chamber of Commerce

ABSENT: Dawson
Gionfriddo

approved
7/9/74

The regular meeting of the Middletown Redevelopment Agency was called to order by the chairman at 6:00 P.M.

Mr. Guy stated that he had inadvertently included Mrs. Matteo's entrance into the meeting with that of the Housing Authority members, but that Mrs. Matteo had actually entered the meeting during the discussion of the Synagogue parking request. He asked correction of this portion of the minutes of the previous meeting.

Mr. Sneed requested that Paragraph 9, Page 3 of the regular session be struck from the minutes because he stated that he had made no such statement at the meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Davis, seconded by Mr. Misenti and passed by all present to approve the minutes as corrected.

Mr. Achenbach then reported a reorganization of two subcommittees as follows:

- 1) Planning and Development:
 - a) Dave Reier
 - b) Mike Misenti
 - c) Dick Dawson
- 2) Acquisition and Relocation Procedures Committee:
 - a) Wally Kelsey
 - b) John Davis

The Agency was then brought up to date concerning developer interest.

Mr. Achenbach stated that two major developers would submit packages by the month's end and perhaps as many as three or four.

There are also 3 - 4 minor developers preparing their plans for smaller parcels. He is very optimistic on there being substantial interest.

At a previous meeting, there was discussion of a Developer Assistance Group, and at that time Mr. Achenbach asked for names. Several were submitted to date. The deadline for further names to be a part of the group would be June 18. The makeup of the group will be finalized by July 2, 1974.

Mr. Reier stated that dates would be arranged for each developer submitting a package to come in and speak to the Planning Committee.

At that time, members of the Commission on Planning and Zoning would be asked to have three members attend the meeting with Council members if they wished to be present.

At these meetings, full information concerning needs and desires for development input would be discussed with the developer for final submission.

Mr. Achenbach stated that the Agency had previously discussed the need for a major recreational and convention facility downtown.

He stated that new bills concerning rebate to the municipality on 50% of the State amusement tax, tax increment bonding for development, and allowable investment by banks in municipal activity should be fully investigated to see if any of this might be an aid to our development program downtown.

Mr. Achenbach asked that the Agency request the Mayor to form a task force composed of three bankers and three businessmen members of the Chamber of Commerce to investigate these new acts and try to tie them together for use by the developer and the City.

He stated that there may be other angles that could be considered and used and the special task force might be able to package a proposal of some sort at less than "normal" cost.

Mr. Reier stated that one developer feels that a skating rink would be a viable interest for private development.

Mrs. Matteo felt that Council and Agency members should be included in the group but Mr. Reier stated that we don't want to weigh down the committee. Let the financial experts work it out in full contact with the Agency.

Mr. Davis felt that at least one Agency member be included.

Mr. Achenbach replied that this would be up to the Mayor and Council. He felt that the public should understand the application of the acts previously mentioned.

He felt that this may provide a way of achieving the objectives of the old MAC program in a substantially different form and asked for unanimous approval to present the request to the Mayor.

Following due discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Novicki, seconded by Mr. Misenti and approved unanimously to propose the idea to the Mayor.

Mr. Reier then made a motion that the Agency request Planning & Zoning to review the parking requirements for the commercial block area in light of the new Bunce parking lot use.

He felt that we should let potential developers know immediately of any

forthcoming changes and not have to haggle later.

Mr. Sneed asked whether this action would be right to change the "dimensions of the ball park" at this time.

Mr. Reier stated that he would only be requesting a review, not a change.

Mr. Achenbach felt that the logical position would be to recognize the need and be open for change as necessary with the supporting submission of studies and feasibility.

Mr. Reier stated that he would broach the subject at the subsequent meeting with the Council and Planning.

Mr. Sneed stated that a change is necessary but that some may be unhappy.

Mr. Haze then reported that we had received information from HUD indicating that there were allocations available to LPAs for increased private market interest costs, and that staff had put together an application to HUD for an amendatory budget increase of \$272,000 to take advantage of the allocation.

Following due discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Novicki, seconded by Mr. Sneed and passed by all present to approve the following entitled resolution:

"RESOLUTION OF THE MIDDLETOWN REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AUTHORIZING THE AMENDING OF AN AMENDED FINANCING PLAN FOR THE PROJECT CONN. R-105."

See full copy in book of original minutes.

Mr. Haze then reported that the ad for demolition had brought in five bidders with Stamford House Wrecking low at a \$48,660 bid. He requested approval of the low bidder and authorization to execute the contract subject to HUD concurrence.

A motion was made by Mr. Reier, seconded by Mr. Davis and passed by all present to approve Stamford House Wrecking Company as low bidder at \$48,660.

Mr. Haze then reported on the status of the former Davis Lumber main structure, a Butler Building, that is capable of being disassembled, moved, and reassembled on another site.

He stated that several offers to purchase the building have been received and that he was gathering information to assess a "cost of the right to remove" in order to offer the building to the City without competition.

If the structure was to go to a private individual or company, public offering would be necessary.

Mr. Haze suggested that while the structure was still on site, it might be made available to business in the area being displaced, for their temporary use.

Following due discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Davis, seconded by Mr.

Novicki and passed by all present to approve the Davis structure for temporary use of displacees as necessary with ultimate sale of the structure to the City with HUD concurrence.

The next item on the agenda concerned an update on the status of the Eagles. Mr. Haze stated that he had received notification from HUD instructing the Agency to explore the alternatives toward the restoration and preservation of the Eagles. We have 90 days to prepare cost information for the various alternatives and to receive firm proposals for the restoration and reuse of the structure.

At this time, Attorney Robert Poliner presented a partial plan of rehab on the Didato parcels.

He stated that some time ago the major portions of the Didato parcels were removed from acquisition and added to the rehab area.

A plan had been submitted to Mr. Haze reflecting the connection of the Page & Warner structure and the gas station with new facades as the start of a rehabilitation program.

As of July 1, 1974, new requirements as to gasoline, and especially unleaded gas, will require excavation for the installation of new underground tanks. It was stated that the gas station is in a state of disrepair due to the acquisition status having been up in the air for some time.

Mr. Didato is now asking the Agency for permission to start his rehabilitation program and make initial renovations to the front of his structures while the underground tank work is being accomplished.

Attorney Poliner stated that they are not asking for any rear area commitment at this time, only for the front.

Mr. Haze stated to the Agency that in other situations, such as Huntington's and Color Mart, the Agency entered into agreements requiring conformance to the Urban Renewal Plan, and these agreements became part of the official land records.

Attorney Poliner stated that this stipulation was acceptable to his client.

Mr. Achenbach stated that in view of the urgency of the request, it would be taken up in the ensuing executive session.

Mr. Reier stated that the structures were no longer in the acquisition area and that the Agency was approving conformity with the regulations.

Mr. Kelsey inquired as to whether a decision had to be made before the building permit would be allowed and he received an affirmative answer.

Attorney Poliner then asked if Mr. Didato should file an application of any sort as a developer for the rear area parking with others.

Mr. Achenbach replied that plans for the area would be formulated shortly following a decision pertinent to the Synagogue expansion being studied by the Planning Commission.

The next item on the agenda concerned a report on the five sub-tenant claims approved by the Agency at the last meeting subject to HUD concurrence.

Mr. Haze reported that a letter was received from HUD denying the waiver of the August 17, 1972 cut-off date, stating that waiver is granted only for rental and housing commitments made that caused hardship.

Three of the five cases in question have been denied based on the HUD action; while one, Mrs. Cain, was paid \$1,488 and another is awaiting completion of her claim.

Several other sub-tenant waivers of the August 17, 1972 filing time were denied by HUD.

Mr. Sneed suggested that these claims be held in abeyance. They will be straightened out in Washington. He stated that the claims had been approved by HUD initially and when returned to HUD for concurrence, were then turned down. This will be straightened out in Washington.

Mr. Sneed further stated that there was too much maneuvering, that the claims were sent back to HUD and then three were knocked out while two would get something. He was waiting to hear from Mr. Thompson. He stated that there will be changes made.

Mr. Haze stated that he had followed the Agency recommendation to submit the claims to HUD for concurrence and had received a letter from HUD stating that our computations were correct.

At this time he ordered checks to be drawn on each claim, but he then received a call from HUD to put the claims on hold, pending a waiver of the August 17, 1972 amendment to the Uniform Relocation Act.

Mr. Achenbach stated that the Agency was in favor of paying claims to all who are eligible.

Mr. Sneed replied that no, the Agency was not in favor of paying.

Mr. Achenbach replied that there was lots of money involved and that it is the intention of the Agency to pay what is due, but in the correct amount, to all eligible. We want them paid, but there is red tape involved and the Agency has the responsibility to be correct.

Mr. Sneed stated that Mr. Achenbach does not spend enough time at staff level and that the staff is bumbling up everything. He said that Mr. Achenbach only states that staff is doing an excellent job, and that he feels they are not.

He further stated that the Agency voted at the last meeting to pay the claims in question but that Mr. Novicki suggested that they be submitted to HUD for approval and that he will not quiet down until they are all paid.

Mr. Sneed stated that Mr. Achenbach is endorsing the lack of staff competence.

Mr. Achenbach stated that if there are claims that are deficient, pick them out for correction. Be specific.

Mr. Sneed then raised the question of Mrs. Pope receiving only \$19,000 for her property and only \$5,000 in RHP-O. He stated that he raised hell over the \$5,000 and Mrs. Pope then received another \$10,000. He further stated

that he was told later that she only received \$17,000 for acquisition.

Mr. Sneed reiterated that Mr. Dean's claim had been presented for several thousand dollars but he was only paid approximately \$600 and that he was cheated.

Following further discussion and upon motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was moved to executive session at 7:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard T. Dawson, Secretary

ad