



TOWN OF OLD SAYBROOK
Planning Commission

Executive Board
Robert J. McIntyre, Chairman
Judith S. Gallicchio, Vice
Chairman
H. Stuart Hanes, Secretary

302 Main Street • Old Saybrook, Connecticut 06475-1741
Telephone (860) 395-3131 • FAX (860) 395-3125

Members
Kathleen R. Smith
Richard R. Tietjen

MINUTES
Wednesday, January 26, 2005 at 7:30 p.m.
Town Hall, First Floor Conference Room
302 Main Street

Alternate Members
Salvatore V. Aresco
Janis L. Esty
James S. Conroy

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman McIntyre called the special meeting to order at 7:37 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present

Robert McIntyre, Chairman
Judith Gallicchio, Vice Chairman
H. Stuart Hanes, Secretary
Richard Tietjen, Member
Janis Esty, Alternate Member, seated for Kathleen Smith
Salvatore Aresco, Alternate Member
James Conroy, Alternate Member

Absent

Kathleen Smith, Member

Also Present

Christine Nelson, Town Planner
Kim McKeown, Recording Clerk

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. “The Preserve” Special Exception for Open Space Subdivision (934 ac. total) & Open Space (542.2 ac.)

Ingham Hill and Bokum Roads (Map 55, 56 & 61 / Lots 6, 3, 15, 17, 18)
Residence Conservation C District, Aquifer Protection Area
Applicant: River Sound Development LLC Agent: Robert A. Landino, P.E.

Robert McIntyre, Chairman of the Planning Commission, stated that the deliberation phase regarding “The Preserve” application has begun. During this phase, no public comment can be heard; and only the 5 voting members of the Planning Commission can discuss the issues/topics regarding the application. Mr. McIntyre reviewed the Town of Old Saybrook’s subdivision regulations, stating that the procedures do not apply since the application requests a special exception. However, the Design Requirements along with other aspects of the Town’s Zoning Regulations do apply to the applicant’s special exception request. Items to be considered now include: natural features, building lots, lot size, number of lots, lot lines, street layouts, classification of streets, provisions of water and sewage, open space, sidewalks, driveways, and utilities. Aspects of the Town’s

Regulations and guidelines to be considered at a later date include: the Plan of Conservation and Development, flood protection, water runoff, and fire protection.

To begin, there are 6 areas that the Commission members need to come to a consensus on: First, is the site more conducive to an open space subdivision in general conformance with the plan proposed by the applicant, or is it more conducive to the development as a conventional subdivision? In other words, would the Commission members prefer an open space subdivision or a conventional subdivision? Janice Esty, H. Stuart Hanes, Judith Gallicchio, Robert McIntyre and Richard Tietjen stated that they are in favor of an open space plan. Mr. Tietjen confirmed that the Commission, although agree to an open space plan, may make changes to the applicant's proposed conceptual plan.

Mr. McIntyre continued by stating that the second area the Commission members need to come to a consensus on is: If the site is more conducive to an open space subdivision, what is the proper number of lots to be derived from the yield plan? According to the application, the site will yield 293 lots in a conventional plan and 248 lots have been proposed in the open space plan. Commission must decide if it agrees with the 293-lot yield.

Ms. Gallicchio clarified that the yield is the number of lots the space will reasonably accommodate.

Mr. Hanes stated that the Town specialists had reasons to think some areas of the proposed development site cannot be built on; thus, a conceptual standard plan would yield 252 lots. Mr. Hanes believes there may be a range of total lots in the yield depending on how the area is developed.

Mr. McIntyre stated that the Planning Commission is aware that the land in the application is a difficult piece of property to develop. The questions are: Are there certain lots of the 293 that cannot be built upon? Do we agree with that applicant that all 293 lots can be built upon? The Commission has received a number of reports from Town staff stating that certain areas on the site should not be built upon due to walls, natural resources, soil, etc.

Ms. Gallicchio referred to a letter received by the Planning Commission from Torrance Downs, Estuary Planning Agency, in which Mr. Downs questions the layout of the conventional plan and yield numbers. The Commission members need to clarify the yield number, and then compare the conventional plan yield to the open space plan yield without the golf course.

Christine Nelson, Old Saybrook Town Planner, stated that the question of yield was raised by several intervenors during the public hearings as well as by the Commission's legal counsel, Mark Branse. The Commission should discuss and consider whether the golf course should be considered when determining the yield. The golf course is an acceptable use of the property per the Town's Regulations. The Town's Enforcement Office also speaks to this issue in her report to the Commission.

Mr. McIntyre stated that if the Commission considers the yield without the golf course, the total yield would change. The golf course is one part of the subdivision, viewed as a benefit for recreational and preservation purposes. Under a conventional subdivision, the site of the golf course could yield more houses. Given the yield of the property at 293 in a conventional plan, if there were a golf course, the yield would be less.

Ms. Gallicchio agreed that the golf course does affect the yield. The Open Space Subdivision Regulations and Conservation C District guidelines require the clustering of homes whenever possible. Is the golf course in the conceptual plan located where houses would be built? Or would the houses be clustered in other areas? Would the golf course be open space rather than add to the total yield?

Mr. Tietjen questioned how the Commission should count the village in the conceptual plan? Does the Commission count the number of lots/buildings or number of bedrooms?

Mr. McIntyre requested clarification on the definition of yield.

Ms. Nelson stated that the yield is the number of lots reasonably likely to be developed in a conventional plan. The yield includes buildable land following the elements of design in the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. McIntyre stated that the applicant's conceptual plan includes 3 different lot types. Each structure in the village is a house and thus, counted as a lot in the yield. In a conventional subdivision, the district would allow for one-acre public lots rather than clustered lots included in an open space subdivision.

Ms. Gallicchio referred to the October 12, 2004 letter the Commission received from Mark Branse, in which he questions the consideration of the proposed golf course land as residential density in calculating the total yield of the site under a conventional subdivision.

Mr. McIntyre stated that this issue, as read by Ms. Gallicchio from Mark Branse's letter, needs to be addressed and determined by each of the Commission members.

Ms. Nelson stated that the Commission had received a follow up letter from Mark Branse, dated January 25, 2005, in which this issue is re-addressed. Letter submitted for the record to the Commission.

Mr. McIntyre referred to Mark Branse's letter dated January 25, 2005, stating that the Commission has the authority to answer the question of total yield, as well as which lots in the proposed subdivision plan should be counted and which should be eliminated. Mr. McIntyre stated that Mr. Branse's letter also refers to the impacts of the yield and the golf course.

Mr. Tietjen raised concerns about the impact of the Pieta property on the yield. Should the lots on this piece of property be counted in the total yield?

Mr. McIntyre stated that there is no proposed development on the Pieta property. Since the property can be developed in the future, what impact does the Pieta property have on the yield? Should the Commission consider this property in the total yield?

Ms. Gallicchio stated that the Pieta property is not part of the application before the Commission, thus should not be counted in the total yield.

Ms. Nelson confirmed that the Pieta property is developable and that, residential development is planned by the applicant in the future during another phase of the development.

Mr. McIntyre stated that the Pieta property should not be considered by the Commission in determining the yield of the property in the application.

Mr. Hanes raised the question again whether the Commission should consider the land that would be part of the golf course in determining the yield of the site. If the Commission were to overlay the golf course over the conventional plan, lots would be eliminated.

Mr. McIntyre stated that the Commission must determine what is appropriate regarding the counting of the land that is proposed as a golf course in considering the yield. Mr. McIntyre stated that the yield of 252 with the golf course might be a place for the Commission to begin.

Mr. Hanes stated that the Commission should start with a yield of 248.

Mr. McIntyre referred to Mark Branse's letter dated January 25, 2005, which suggested that the Commission consider which lots, if any, should be eliminated for various reasons. There are many unknown variables in considering each lot. The Commission assumes the lots are laid out following wetland regulations, which limits activity within 100 ft. of wetlands in a reserve zone.

Mr. Tietjen requested clarification on the counting of wetlands as open space.

Ms. Nelson recommended the use of the applicant's revised maps, dated December 23, 2004, which modified, eliminated or added lots recommended by the Town's specialists.

Ms. Gallicchio requested updated from the Town's consultants.

Ms. Nelson stated that updated reports had been received by the Commission from the Town's consultants. A memorandum from Geoffrey Jacobson, Wendy Goodfriend and Richard Snarski was submitted to the Commission for the record.

Mr. McIntyre reminded the Commission members that that Inland Wetland Commission would review the application to consider the conservation of the wetlands. The Planning Commission is charged with considering what the public, intervenors, consultants and applicant have said and determining what is best for Old Saybrook. The Commission cannot follow normal procedures as some aspects of the application are speculative;

however, the Commission should consider usual aspects of the application, such as the preservation of historical sites, for example the stonewalls.

Ms. Nelson reminded the Commission that conservation drives development. However, conservation of various aspects of the property is just one element of design. The Commission should consider what it wants to conserve in light of the reports received from the Town's environmental consultant and engineers. An exercise to begin with would be the consideration of the report dated January 27, 2005 from Geoffrey Jacobson, Wendy Goodfriend and Richard Snarski, in which several lots are identified to be revised or eliminated.

Mr. McIntyre, referring to the applicant's revised maps, dated December 23, 2004, directed the Commission to consider lots 98 and 99.

Ms. Gallicchio referred to the Jacobson letter, dated January 27, 2005, in considering lots 98 and 99, compared the applicant's map to the vernal pool inventory map. The applicant's plan includes a driveway within 10 ft of a vernal pool.

Mr. McIntyre questioned whether the road was acceptable to have near the wetlands based upon the type of activity that will occur on the road.

Ms. Nelson pointed out the attachment to the Jacobson letter, which maps out lots 98 and 99 and illustrates the proximity to the vernal pools.

Mr. McIntyre stated that the map shows road activity within in 50 ft of vernal pool number 10. Are there other roads in Old Saybrook that have been allowed close to wetlands? Jacobson suggesting his letter that he would not approve the lots.

Ms. Gallicchio stated that the Commission should consider what could be approved today, not what was the exception many years ago. The map the Commission is viewing has been revised. The applicant has had an opportunity to change the road location. The property in the application is a conservation district. The Commission knows, from the hearings, that vernal pools are key aspect of property. The Commission would not typically allow a 650 ft driveway with a road 10 ft from vernal pools. The Commission should consider what would typically consider and approve.

Mr. Hanes stated his agreement with Ms. Gallicchio. Lots 98 and 99 could be eliminated based upon soil type as well.

Mr. McIntyre requested clarification on the purpose of soil type in relation to septic systems.

Ms. Gallicchio stated that the applicant must show the Commission that the Mable has been met. The Town Sanitarian has reported to the Commission that there is not enough information for his approval of the application. Referring to the Jacobson letter, Geoffrey Jacobson looked at soil type and lots differently than the applicant. The Mable issue should be considered and resolved by the Commission.

Mr. Hanes stated that if the Commission considers Geoffrey Jacobson's recommendations, the yield would be close to 238 lots.

Mr. McIntyre stated that those lots that are double rear lots would not be approved by the Commission today. Regarding lots 98 and 99, and the road length, if the road was moved, the Commission may approve it.

Ms. Gallicchio stated that the property is difficult to develop. The Commission has reviewed the site under previous applications. It is difficult to find good lots. The applicant may be reaching on some of the lots in the proposed design.

Mr. McIntyre stated that just because the Town's consultant suggested the elimination of 55 lots, does not mean that the Commission would agree. In considering the lots proposed to be eliminated by Geoffrey Jacobson due to soil type, would the lots be allowed if the applicant used an engineer septic system?

Ms. Nelson referred the Commission to the December 2, 2004 Jacobson letter in which questions regarding methodology, soil types, historical information and assumptions made are addressed.

Mr. McIntyre stated that the Commission members need to review the reports of the Town's consultants and the applicant's revised maps, then come back to the next deliberation meeting with a determination of agreement or not, and then based upon those determinations what the yield should be.

Ms. Gallicchio clarified that the Jacobson letter dated January 27, 2005 is a report from not only Geoffrey Jacobson, but also Wendy Goodfriend and Richard Snarski.

Ms. Nelson stated that a report from the Town's traffic consultant would be presented to the Commission.

Mr. McIntyre requested that the Town Planner, Christine Nelson, address her concerns regarding the application, specifically any lots that should be included or eliminated, to the Commission.

Ms. Nelson stated that in her original report to the Commission, she raised the issue of a minimum 50 ft right of way along Ingham Hill Road to provide a visual buffer. The applicant has proposed a 25 ft in fee dedicated right of way. Does the Commission consider the 25 ft right of way adequate?

Ms. Gallicchio stated that Obed Heights has a 100 ft buffer. One hundred feet does not seem that far, especially during this time of year. A 25 ft buffer is too small, which would provide only 7 ft on either side.

Mr. Nelson referred to an applicant's map, which she highlighted to show the areas of concern. The applicant eliminated and modified lots in the last revision, but not to the degree recommended by the Town Planner. The Commission should determine if the 25

ft buffer, which includes the stonewalls, is sufficient or if lot 26 should be eliminated to provide a larger buffer along Ingham Hill Road.

Mr. McIntyre stated that lot 26 was also recommended by Geoffrey Jacobson to be eliminated. In a conventional subdivision, the Commission would pursue the preservation of the trail system and require that the open space be tied into the present trail system.

Ms. Nelson stated that the highlighted map shows the existing trails and Ingham Hill Road. The Commission should consider if the applicant's buffer of 25 ft is sufficient and if not, how should it be revised and then what lots should be eliminated? The Town Planner recommended a 50 ft buffer dedicated for travel with another 50 ft buffer on each side.

Ms. Gallicchio stated that 150 ft seems in access of what the Commission would typically recommend.

Mr. McIntyre, Ms. Gallicchio and Ms. Nelson discussed the elimination of lot 26 as an in fee space under conservation easement. This would provide a 100 ft conservation easement, with 50 ft at each side of the centerline of the trail.

Ms. Gallicchio requested clarification on the why lot 26 is in fee rather than under conservation.

Ms. Nelson stated that lot 26 would become dedicated open space land. Continued to discuss with Commission other lots recommended to be revised, including lots 27, 28, and 30.

Mr. McIntyre stated that the original road is 15 ft wide. The Commission typically considers buffers that are meaningful. If the Commission widens the buffer to 50 ft, then the area would be preserved in a more natural state.

Mr. Tietjen stated that a president for the preservation of the trails in Middletown. The Aplelachene trail has been intruded upon by development. Now is the time to preserve the area rather than after the fact.

Mr. McIntyre stated that the Commission members should be considering how to handle the preservation of the resources in a conventional plan in order to determine the yield.

Ms. Gallicchio questioned the Commission members on whether they were in agreement with a 100 ft easement.

Mr. Hanes, Mr. McIntyre, and Ms. Esty agreed with Ms. Gallicchio on the 100 ft easement.

Ms. Nelson clarified that the Commission recommended the elimination of lot 26 as a result of the 100 ft easement.

Mr. McIntyre stated that lot 26 should be eliminated. The lot is not buildable due to the slope, the soil type and the conservation easement for Ingham Hill Road.

Ms. Nelson clarified that the area would be a right of way rather than an easement. Ms. Nelson addressed the Commission with another issue raised in her report, regarding the Ingham Hill Homestead, including the foundation and gardening area. The Town Planner recommended that 100 ft buffer be set aside to preserve the area, which would eliminate lots 130 and 131. Ms. Nelson reported that the applicant eliminated lots 130 and 131 in the revised plan.

Ms. Gallicchio stated that the archeological report agreed with Ms. Nelson's recommendation.

Ms. Nelson continued to address the Commission with another recommendation regarding active recreation land. In a conventional subdivision, the Planning Commission would typically set aside land for development of active recreation areas.

Mr. McIntyre requested to hear from the Parks and Recreation Department on the space they would request? If the land set aside for active recreation should be clustered in one area or spread out? And how much parking the Department would require.

Ms. Gallicchio referred to a letter the Commission received from the Parks and Recreation Department, in which the Department recommends 7 to 10 acres be set aside for active recreation, including parking.

Ms. Nelson stated that she recommended property not to exceed 10% of the buildable acres.

Mr. McIntyre questioned whether the land set aside for active recreation would affect the yield. The Commission does not know which lots will be affected.

Ms. Nelson stated that the active recreation space would affect the yield because it will be located where houses could be built. The Commission can request 10 acres be set aside regardless of the location. Ms. Nelson requested that the Commission decide on the total acres to be included in the active recreation area and she will suitable areas on the map.

Ms. Gallicchio stated that Parks and Recreation Department requested 7-10 acres in the report and suggested that 10 acres would be a good place to start.

Mr. McIntyre stated his discomfort with placing active recreation where homes may be built. The Commission may find land in proposed open space.

Ms. Esty suggested that the Commission should request the max space allowable.

Ms. Nelson stated that under subdivision regulations, the Commission could request one acre up to 10% of total space for active recreation. Ten acres for active recreation seems reasonable with the remaining open space use for other functions.

Ms. Gallicchio stated that 7 lots would be eliminated to come up with 10 acres.

Mr. McIntyre stated that those 7 lots would be in addition to the 55 lots listed in the Jacobson letter.

Ms. Nelson stated that the 7 lots would be additional lot to be eliminated because the 55 lots listed in the Jacobson letter are not buildable. According to the regulations, the Commission should count buildable lots for active recreation.

Ms. Gallicchio stated that the Commission will determine the yield after consider the open space to be used for conservation, historical preservation and active/passive recreation.

Mr. McIntyre stated that he believed the Commission could find 7 lots to build ball fields on in the 55 lots listed by Jacobson to be eliminated.

Ms. Nelson stated that she would look for 7 lots already being considered for elimination that are next each other and are buildable for active recreation.

Ms. Nelson, referring to her November 3, 2004 memo to the Commission addressed another concern regarding the access to Bokum Road that is not proposed in the conceptual standard plan. The Commission should consider access to Bokum Road to meet the east/west traffic goals. Creating an access to Bokum Road would eliminate lots next to the Pietas parcel. Referring to September 1, 2004 conceptual standard plan, lot 192 would be eliminated.

Mr. McIntyre stated that other roads lead to Old Saybrook proper. With 3 egresses in plan, the Commission may not request access through Bokum Road.

Ms. Gallicchio stated that due to the size of the development, the Commission would want 3 egresses in different areas to divert traffic flow. Currently 2 egresses planned on Ingham Hill Road.

Mr. McIntyre and Ms Gallicchio discussed options for egress locations to Bokum Hill Road that would not require the elimination of a lot. The location of wetlands limited the egress location.

Mr. McIntyre questioned why the Commission would eliminate one lot and not others that the road to a Bokum Hill Road egress would cut through.

Ms. Gallicchio stated that the issue is in a 200-300 home subdivision with only 2 access points. At least half of the traffic would funnel onto Ingham Hill Road. When looking at the circulation of the traffic within and around the subdivision, the Commission would want another access point.

Mr. McIntyre clarified that lot 192 would be eliminated with the addition of an access point at Bokum Road. Lot 192 is already on Jacobson's list of lots to be eliminated due

to soil issues. I would agree with the elimination of lot 192 or 193 to accommodate an access road to Bokum Road.

Ms. Esty and Ms. Gallicchio agree with the access to Bokum Road and elimination of a lot.

Mr. Hanes clarified that the Planning Commission is considering requiring an access road to Bokum Road under a conventional plan.

Ms. Esty stated that an additional access point is needed for emergency purposes.

Mr. McIntyre and Ms. Gallicchio discussed the access points proposed in the open space plan by the applicant at Route 153, Bokum Hill Road and Ingham Hill Road, for emergency access only.

Mr. McIntyre clarified were Road 11 is located on the maps and were it could connect to Bokum Road through lot 192.

Mr. McIntyre, Ms. Gallicchio, Mr. Hanes and Ms. Esty agree with adding an additional access point off Bokum Road and thus, eliminating lot 192.

Ms. Nelson referred to her report concerning other roads she recommended to be modified or removed, including roads 4 and 5, which serve lots 131, 132 and 133, all designated for preservation of the Ingham Homestead and Ingham Hill Road.

The Commission members discussed the Ingham Hill Homestead and garden area with the stonewall boundaries, which were not identified on the applicant's revised maps.

Ms. Nelson stated that the applicant has complied with the elimination of lots 130 and 131, thus road 1 should also be eliminated.

Mr. McIntyre confirmed that lot 132 encompasses the farm fields delineated by the stonewalls on Ingham Hill Road.

Ms. Nelson clarified her recommendations to eliminate lots 130, 131, and 132. Lots 130 and 131 have been eliminated by the applicant in the revised plan; however, 132 had not. Also, road 5 is still in the revised plan, which is a lot of infrastructure for so few lots.

Ms. Gallicchio stated that the archeological report also suggested the elimination of lots recommended by Ms. Nelson.

Mr. McIntyre stated that the Jacobson letter also lists the lots under discussion for elimination.

Ms. Nelson stated that eliminating lot 132 would provide a buffer around the cultural resources.

Mr. McIntyre wondered if the Commission should eliminate all access to the cultural resource or leave a portion of road 5 to give additional access to the Homestead area by creating a public access way at the end of the road.

Ms. Nelson stated that currently, access is through Old Ingham Hill Road and Ingham Hill Road.

Ms. Gallicchio clarified Mr. McIntyre's suggestion by questioning the idea of a turn around at the end of the road and why the road is on such a steep slope?

Mr. McIntyre clarified that he envisions a turn around at the end of the road with driveway access for those lots in the area. The slope would be blasted to a less than 10% grade.

The Commission members discussed the missing maps, numbers CL 12-18. Requested the maps for review.

Ms. Nelson stated that she would look into the missing maps.

Mr. Hanes questioned how far the Homestead is from other access points.

Mr. McIntyre and Ms. Gallicchio measured the distances on the map and stated that the Homestead could be walked or biked to from Ingham Hill Road, which is about ½ mile. The access from Ingham Hill Road is about 1400 ft compared to the eastern side of road 5, which is about 800 ft. Mr. McIntyre continued, suggesting the use of road 4 for access to the trailhead and thus, eliminate the need for a portion of road 5.

Ms. Nelson suggested that there are other roads with similar concerns, such as road 7. There is an existing trail system throughout the property. Road 7 only serves 2 lots, 142 and 143, through which existing trails run through. These trails are eligible for inclusion in proposed trail system to provide passive recreation.

Mr. McIntyre stated that lot 143 is on Jacobson's soil list to be eliminated; however lot 142 has good soil.

Ms. Nelson questioned whether a road should be allowed for just one lot.

Mr. McIntyre stated that lot 142 may be relocated to the southern end of the cul-de-sac and accessed through a private drive.

Ms. Gallicchio stated that the Jacobson report suggests the elimination of road 7 and to terminate road 6. The Commission should review this suggestion.

Mr. Hanes suggested that the Commission review the map included in the Jacobson report, which shows the Homestead and the roads.

Mr. McIntyre, Ms. Gallicchio and Ms. Nelson discussed the recommendation to eliminate lot 143 due to the soil and the trails. Also, included in the discussion was the access to

lot 142 from road 4, which would eliminate the need for road 7. Lot 142 could also be reconfigured to save the trail.

Mr. McIntyre stated that the Commission has yet to determine if soil type is a reason for elimination of lots.

Mr. Hanes referring to the Jacobson letter stated that with the elimination of lots, the lot base number has changed, thus a mathematical adjustment must be made.

Ms. Nelson continued presenting her recommendations to the Commission regarding the existing trail system and proposed lots that may need to be eliminated if the Commission desires to preserve the trails. The trails that would be interrupted with proposed lots include: road 1 near Westbrook entrance (travels so to Old Ingham Hill Road); Woods Road near Essex West to road 7 (lots 142 and 143); the perimeter trail; the cart path; Woods Road loop from Essex east; Wild Apple Lane from northern most end of Town owned property; and Old Ingham Hill Road to Town owned property east. Should the Commission agree that the existing trails should be part of the passive trail system, then several lots will need to be modified or eliminated.

Mr. McIntyre stated that each Commission member should think about the Jacobson report and consider whether lots should be eliminated based on soil type only. Several lots have more than one reason to be eliminated; however the Commission needs to make a determination as to whether bad soil types justify elimination of lots.

Mr. Hanes questioned whether the Commission members needed to determine the exact location of the lots to be eliminated or if a percentage of lots would be sufficient.

Mr. McIntyre stated that percentages would not work. The Commission must determine a yield number.

Ms. Nelson suggested that the Commission review the December 20, 2004 Jacobson report for information on the statistical determination of the soil types of the lots.

Mr. McIntyre suggested that Geoffrey Jacobson be invited to attend the next deliberation meeting to address any of the Commission's questions.

Mr. Hanes stated that the Jacobson report assumes 40% of the lots are not buildable. The Commission should discuss the percentage of the base in the Jacobson report if the base number changes.

Mr. McIntyre requested that the Commission members review both Jacobson reports so they can discuss them and the lots to be eliminated, if any, at the next deliberation meeting, in order for the Commission to determine the yield and move forward from that point.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION to adjourn the meeting at 11:00 p.m. and to continue deliberations of “The Preserve” Special Exception for Open Space Subdivision & Open Space at the next special meeting, scheduled for February 9, 2005 at 7:30 p.m. at Town Hall, First Floor Conference Room located at 302 Main Street; **MOVED** by H. S. Hanes; **SECONDED** by J. Gallicchio; **APPROVED** by R. McIntyre, J. Gallicchio, H. S. Hanes, R. Tietjen, J. Esty; **ABSTAINED** by none; **OPPOSED** by none.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kim McKeown, Recording Clerk