

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

OLD SAYBROOK PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATION

THE PRESERVE SPECIAL EXCEPTION
FOR OPEN SPACE SUBDIVISION

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2005, 7:39 P.M.

OLD SAYBROOK TOWN HALL
302 MAIN STREET
OLD SAYBROOK, CONNECTICUT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

- ROBERT MCINTYRE, CHAIRMAN
- H. STUART HANES, SECRETARY
- JUDITH GALLICCHIO, REGULAR MEMBER
- RICHARD TIETJEN, REGULAR MEMBER
- JANIS ESTY, ALTERNATE MEMBER

ATTENDING STAFF:

- WENDY GOODFRIEND, NATURAL RESOURCE SCIENTIST
- RICHARD SNARSKI, SOIL SCIENTIST
- GEOFF JACOBSON, TOWN ENGINEER
- ANDREA DeDOMINICIS, RECORDING CLERK

- MARK BRANSE, LEGAL COUNSEL

1 * * *

2 (The following is an excerpt from the
3 proceedings.)

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I would like to reconvene.
5 Is there any -- where I think we are at right now, we
6 all heard what Mark had read and we've kind of got
7 all of that summarized. We do -- and I guess
8 everyone's in agreement with -- I want to find out if
9 people are in agreement with the -- I guess what Mark
10 said about the road improvements on Ingham Hill Road
11 and Road H and everybody would be in favor of that.
12 There's no issue with that?

13 (No response)

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And on the rest of the map
15 of RD-0, the remaining roads that are depicted as
16 private and private residential, they will remain the
17 same as depicted on the map other than Road H.

18 MR. TIETJEN: How about the one over --

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You have to look at that.

20 MR. TIETJEN: The one we talked about over here.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

22 MR. TIETJEN: Road C.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, I was just saying we
24 want to leave it at that right now.

25 MR. TIETJEN: Oh, okay.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: At least we have a point.

2 MR. TIETJEN: I'm sorry, I thought --

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Then when we get back we are
4 going to kind of roll this around in a barrel for a
5 while, and we may get back to Judy's suggestion when
6 she was talking about Road J, and Road K, and
7 changing some sort of access or activity that way.
8 And I guess we should go there right now. Road A as
9 it exists on this map, do we feel that Road A should
10 go through like that or should there be some
11 alternatives to it, possibly one as Judy had
12 suggested, to give more contiguous open space or just
13 leave Road A?

14 I guess the point is should Road A -- I am
15 uncomfortable with taking Road A and not making it go
16 all the way through.

17 MR. HANES: Could it be revised, though, to
18 eliminate --

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's what I'm saying. Do
20 we all kind of agree that Road A should go all the
21 way through or do we want to have the possibility of
22 isolating some lots and having services having to be
23 provided from -- you know, you have to go to
24 Westbrook to get to Saybrook?

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: That doesn't make much sense.

1 MR. TIETJEN: I didn't know that that's what she
2 said.

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yeah, it is.

4 MR. HANES: She was going to have a pocket here.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: This road would be gone, so
6 these lots on the western part would be only accessed
7 from Route 153. They would not be able --

8 MR. TIETJEN: You were going to take Road C out
9 altogether then.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes. Road A.

11 MR. TIETJEN: I mean Road A.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: This part of Road A.

13 MR. TIETJEN: I thought you were just going to
14 straighten it out.

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: But that would make a big
16 difference in terms of access and school buses.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And access to whatever is
18 going to happen up to the town property. Who knows
19 what kind of facility is going to end up there.

20 MR. TIETJEN: I thought you wanted to just
21 remove the road.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Is everybody in favor of
23 keeping Road A a through road?

24 MS. ESTY: Yes.

25 MR. TIETJEN: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Road A is going to be a
2 through road. And what I'll say as we go through the
3 rest -- as it stands at this point in time, all the
4 rest of the roads as depicted on the map will remain
5 unless we do our moving of stuff around, eliminate a
6 road because we eliminate some housing.

7 MR. TIETJEN: Juggling we call that.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Is there anything else that
9 anybody feels that we need to discuss on the roads at
10 this point?

11 MR. HANES: You mentioned the houses that front
12 on Road H, whether or not they should or should not.
13 Because those are --

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You know, I think if Road
15 H -- my feeling is Road H is going to be built to
16 road standards anyway. So it's going -- no matter
17 what it does it's going to receive as much traffic as
18 it would before and it may get a slight bit more. My
19 feeling is it's good to have the third egress for
20 many reasons, but just by the layout of the property
21 that you're probably going to find -- you're going to
22 find that dividing up, you know, this majority it's
23 going to use this as their main access; this majority
24 main access. There's only going to be these few
25 houses that really will, you know -- because by the

1 time you go this way and down and around up to --

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: Up Bokum Road.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No, not Bokum Road, but up
4 to 9, down into Saybrook and you're there. Same
5 thing with going out Westbrook. You could just say
6 go to Westbrook and come around that way. So you're
7 not really looking at a -- I'm not seeing that
8 everybody is going to flock to come down Ingham Hill
9 Road.

10 MS. ESTY: Road H, though, did that have bike
11 paths and things that would be impeded if we made it
12 a public road that they had as part of a private?

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: Sidewalks.

14 MS. ESTY: Isn't there a bike path that goes
15 down to Ingham Hill? Well, they couldn't have,
16 because they cut that off.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, there could have been.
18 I don't think we discussed bike paths.

19 MS. ESTY: Making a public road wouldn't impede
20 any of that; wouldn't take any of that away?

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No, I don't think so.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: No, I don't think so.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Geoff, the Road H as
24 depicted now, that's a private road. What would be
25 the specifications for a public road versus a private

1 road are what, different than --

2 MR. JACOBSON: I think for Road H they would
3 basically be the same. The only thing that it could
4 possibly impact is I believe the applicant had
5 proposed some parallel parking along Road H, but,
6 again, we are starting to kind of get into some of
7 these final design details.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's something that you'll
9 have to deal with. We say we want it public and he
10 has to figure out how to make it work for him.

11 MR. JACOBSON: There's certainly no reason why
12 Road H, in my opinion, could not be constructed to
13 public road standards.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

15 MR. TIETJEN: Question about that if I may.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yes.

17 MR. TIETJEN: I mentioned the business about
18 grade awhile back, because it is a fierce situation
19 gradewise.

20 MR. JACOBSON: Down at this end, yes.

21 MR. TIETJEN: I wonder how close we could come
22 to the dictates of the town as to the grade and to
23 the specifications for a road like that.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's the board of
25 selectmen's call.

1 MR. JACOBSON: It would be a good cut down at
2 the end. I believe the first phase that was approved
3 back five years ago actually was this.

4 MS. DeDOMINICIS: Tape change, please. Excuse
5 me. Thank you.

6 (Tape is changed.)

7 MR. JACOBSON: I think the first phase that they
8 came for approval on the Tim Taylor plan was this off
9 of Ingham Hill Road.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Correct.

11 MR. JACOBSON: They designed it to town
12 standards. It did involve a considerable cut at that
13 end.

14 MR. TIETJEN: It's a short road.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I'll restate it. Wouldn't
16 the first one -- it was the only one they got.

17 MR. JACOBSON: You're right.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We tried several different
19 things. Finally, we got to whatever section we ended
20 up calling it -- it finally went through. That was
21 the only section.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: I don't know if that was a
23 public road or a private road.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It was a public road up
25 to --

1 MR. JACOBSON: I believe it was a public road.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Up to the entrance where it
3 started to go to the country club, remember?

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: That's right. Okay.

5 MR. JACOBSON: Correct.

6 MR. TIETJEN: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Janis brought up the issue
8 of a bike path. I believe the Road A has a bike path
9 along it or was it that's been proposed? Do we want
10 to continue the bike path on Road H now that it is a
11 public road?

12 MR. HANES: I think so.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We can make that
14 stipulation.

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes.

16 MR. HANES: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Road H, extend bike path.
18 Don't anybody hold their breath in our lifetime the
19 bike path will go down Ingham Hill Road. It will
20 take a lot, a lot of work. As much as we would like
21 to see that, I think it's a major safety -- you know,
22 I joke about it, but if you envision going down
23 Ingham Hill Road, Janis, to anything, the safety
24 issues would be --

25 MS. ESTY: I understand.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But you could make it so
2 there's more bicycle path in there, and I think
3 that's a valid point.

4 MS. ESTY: And that also brings up can the
5 developer also make improvements to Ingham Hill Road
6 at certain portions that may be too narrow for the
7 flow of cars that may be coming out of Road H?

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I would just say this, and
9 as I mentioned to Mark earlier, that from past
10 experience there's mixed reviews legally on the -- of
11 what a developer can do -- what a town can force a
12 developer to do down -- it normally deals with
13 frontage. And the frontage is no question yes, we
14 can have him make improvements on frontage. It
15 becomes a gray area the further we get away from the
16 development and his frontage. And they can do that
17 on their own accord. We can ask them during the
18 regular process and if they agree to it, but then we
19 have to get the people that live on that road to
20 agree to it, which can be --

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: But I think that part of it is
22 showing that there is a nexus or a cause, as Janis
23 said I think very well, that if you have another 200,
24 300 --

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Trips a day.

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- vehicle trips on Ingham Hill
2 Road and on Bokum Road, that that is going to make a
3 difference in terms of the safety of the road and
4 that there are certain areas that would be more
5 difficult with more traffic. So I think that there
6 is a point to be made for requesting or requiring the
7 applicant to make some changes down the road.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. I would say,
10 speaking as a board member and only as a board
11 member, one of the things that I would do during the
12 main application is to get as many down-road
13 improvements as we can. That would be something in
14 the best interest of the town and something we
15 should -- I would pursue as a board member.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: Because I think everyone would
17 acknowledge --

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But to answer you we can ask
19 for something, but legally I don't know if we are
20 going to get it.

21 MS. ESTY: And we may be too early in asking for
22 it.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I think it's good to put on
24 the record that we would be asking for that.

25 MS. ESTY: Because both Ingham Hill Road and

1 Bokum Road --

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: There are some major safety
3 issues on Bokum and Ingham Hill Road that would need
4 to be addressed for safety issues and that we would
5 be looking to the applicant to help in remedying
6 these situations.

7 MS. GALLICCHIO: Because the difficulty would be
8 increased with the increased traffic.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. The impacts of his
10 development would be on those two roads. Okay.

11 Anybody have any other issues on the roads? We
12 have bicycle paths, which is the same thing as a
13 pedestrian path.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: I'm not sure if we want to
15 discuss Road G and the cul-de-sac now or if we would
16 wait until an application comes before it. It's
17 where the estate homes are is that funny looking --

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah, that hot dog looking
19 thing.

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: Um-hum. That I think in
21 Mr. Hillson's report he --

22 MR. TIETJEN: We took the lots out in there.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Excuse me?

24 MR. TIETJEN: Did we take the lots out, several
25 lots out there and have a recreation laid out last

1 time?

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No. I don't recall that.

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: That was down in the lower
4 part.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That was an exercise.
6 That's all it was was an exercise, that whole of
7 getting the yield.

8 MR. TIETJEN: Right.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It was all -- you know, some
10 was based on formulation of what lots would be
11 removed, and on the basis of that we used that as one
12 of the criteria of wanting to have some active
13 recreational area in that area.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: Which is an issue that someone
15 might wish to bring up with this application.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I want to get through with
17 the roads. I think we are close.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: I don't know if this is
19 something we want to discuss now, but Mr. Hillson, on
20 page 6 of his December 1st report, had mentioned
21 it's uncertain whether Road G is a cul-de-sac or a
22 local street. In either case the geometrics do not
23 meet the town's standards. He's talking about the
24 radius of the curve.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And it would have to before

1 it could get approved.

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: Geoff, I don't know if that's
3 something you think we need to discuss in terms of
4 roadway out.

5 MR. JACOBSON: Maybe just mention it. In terms
6 of details that's at a later date.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Any road that we see on here
8 has to be a doable road. I mean right now it may not
9 be as it's depicted on here, but it's going to have
10 to shift left, right, up and down one way or the
11 other to make it, you know -- because if you get into
12 a situation where you have a subdivision application,
13 the roads have to meet the standards, period, or the
14 subdivision doesn't get approved. So to worry about,
15 you know, this thing here, that can be addressed. It
16 will be addressed as just another issue of probably
17 hundreds of other road issues that will be, you know,
18 taken up by engineers.

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: Okay. Then I have nothing
20 else.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: At least 100.

22 MR. JACOBSON: It is an obvious one that might
23 be good just to give them a heads up on.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: In his report.

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, he's saying that it needs

1 to not be discussed necessarily by us, but that the
2 applicant would need to discuss it with the board of
3 selectmen, because it's --

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And they have probably at
5 these meetings.

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: In terms of alternative road
7 standards, because it's -- it's a more aesthetically
8 pleasing look, but not as --

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Functional as maintenance.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: Is that doing maintenance?

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Maintenance, oil,
12 construction, garbage trucks; it's moving vans. You
13 just can't get them around those tight radiuses.
14 School buses.

15 MR. JACOBSON: School buses.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Fire trucks. The biggest
17 vehicles are the school buses and the fire trucks.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: It is a public road.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah. So there could be
20 possibly one or two kids that live down there. All
21 it takes is one.

22 Any other issues on the roads that we need to
23 discuss tonight? It doesn't mean you can't bring it
24 up later on. I just want to make sure nobody has
25 strong outstanding feelings on the roads that we

1 haven't discussed yet.

2 MR. HANES: Well, the only thing, and we
3 discussed it before, is straightening this out and
4 eliminating some of your bridges here.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, I think if you look
6 here --

7 MR. HANES: That's our land.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: They have to go here. And
9 they brought that road purposely there, and I think
10 at the suggestion of the board of selectmen. So we
11 would -- if in fact when we wanted to have access to
12 our property, when we built our road going into that
13 property, that it would have to be the shortest
14 distance.

15 MR. HANES: Is there any reason why we couldn't
16 insist they put that roadway, Geoff, through part of
17 our town property?

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I would leave that up to the
19 board of selectmen. You correct me if I'm wrong, but
20 didn't the selectmen basically kind of direct them to
21 put that road there for that access to that property?

22 MR. JACOBSON: Yeah. I think what we would
23 probably do is just make sure that that little sliver
24 of land between the road right-of-way and the town
25 was deeded over to the town to provide the frontage

1 for access into -- but I mean not knowing what the
2 use is now, it would be hard to plan an access.

3 MR. HANES: What I'm thinking of if this piece
4 of property were fairly level, I don't know how -- I
5 can't tell there. Would it be worth our while to
6 have the roadway go through there to straighten it
7 out and to make kind of a park-like area?

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: But then let's say this is a
9 level area that could perhaps be a ball field, so you
10 don't want a road cutting through it.

11 MR. HANES: Well, true.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: You could have a driveway or a
13 road coming at another angle.

14 MR. HANES: Having like a boulevard through a --
15 you know, public land.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I don't think the board of
17 selectmen are ready for that yet.

18 MR. JACOBSON: I think with the roads along
19 parallel both property lines, there's all kinds of
20 opportunities for access, wherever they might want
21 it, for whatever they might put in there. It's a
22 fairly steep drop-off down towards the wetlands up in
23 the corner. There might be an area for possibly a
24 ball field or something like that. But, again, I
25 have no idea of what the selectmen, you know, have

1 ideas for for that property. I have no idea.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Is there any other concerns
3 about the roadways?

4 MR. TIETJEN: How about runoff?

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No.

6 MR. TIETJEN: From the roads I mean.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I don't think so, not at
8 this time. Unless you see one that -- it's the
9 question to Geoff. Any road that you're going to
10 approve to build is going to have to have the runoff
11 managed --

12 MR. JACOBSON: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: -- at final design or else
14 the road won't get built.

15 MR. JACOBSON: Correct.

16 MR. TIETJEN: That connector to Ingham Hill Road
17 would be an important one I should think.

18 MR. JACOBSON: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: If we had a road running
20 right through Pequot Swamp, we would say move it out
21 of Pequot Swamp.

22 MR. TIETJEN: Surely you're kidding.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, it could be a big
24 bridge. But running out this way to Bokum you got
25 your bridges and everything and --

1 MR. TIETJEN: I'm mostly worried about that one
2 connection.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Our concern's with the road
4 as access. We took care of three points of access.
5 We have a bicycle path going down all public -- you
6 know, A and H. H is open to Ingham Hill Road. And
7 like I said, as we go along -- obviously, there's 26
8 houses -- 27 houses eliminated from this design here.
9 This brings us back to the point of one of the things
10 I brought up during the public hearing; you were just
11 bringing up about active recreational area. I still
12 feel strongly that there should be some of this land
13 set aside for active. I'm not sure where I want to
14 have that. I would just say I want a levy
15 requirement of at least a seven-, eight- or ten-acre
16 parcel for active recreation and then when we get
17 into the final deliberations later on, if we get that
18 far - this is all still just talking - that we be
19 back -- then we would be back in the public hearing
20 and get some input from park and rec what they would
21 like to see there ball fieldwise, soccer field,
22 whatever they want want to see.

23 So is everyone agreed that we would like to see
24 at least a ten-acre active recreation area?

25 MS. ESTY: Yes.

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And there shouldn't be any
3 problem doing that with 27 houses being removed from
4 there. They should be able to manipulate this map
5 for doing that. Before there was no room for it
6 other than using the active -- the open space that
7 had already been dedicated as passive open space, and
8 they said there weren't any good flat spots.

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: Just to remind you we have some
10 open space for historical reasons as well.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. Right there. Now,
12 where is that? Where is -- on this map where is --

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right here.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right there?

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: No, I'm sorry.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's 13. It's got to be
17 this section right in here or over here. It has to
18 be over here, because the field has to be over here.

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: Look on the bigger map.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What we are asking about is
21 where is old Ingham homestead?

22 MS. GOODFRIEND: On the enclosed map it has it
23 right in the center, next to the green. The bottom
24 of Pequot Swamp to the west.

25 MR. SNARSKI: West.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Between 11 and --

2 MS. GOODFRIEND: Fifteen.

3 MR. JACOBSON: There's an arrow leader that goes
4 to a little dot. Do you see the arrow leader that
5 goes through the wetland and then it goes -- it's
6 actually the yellow area there.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So it's to the north of hole
8 13.

9 MS. GOODFRIEND: Correct.

10 MR. JACOBSON: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That little dot right there.
12 And it's just adjacent to where it says Old Ingham
13 Hill Trail or whatever that wording is right there.

14 MR. JACOBSON: Yep.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. And the Ingham Hill
16 homestead will be protected. I don't know to what
17 extent right at the moment.

18 Is there anything else anyone needs -- that we
19 want to discuss tonight? Do you feel strongly
20 about --

21 MR. HANES: I think there was one comment made
22 by --

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Go ahead, keep talking.

24 MR. HANES: There was comment made about the
25 workshop, the maintenance shop for the golf course.

1 It was in an area that drains down to the swamp.

2 MR. SNARSKI: To the vernal pool.

3 MS. GOODFRIEND: It is shown in this plate,
4 graphic plate two. We don't have the full set of
5 plans, but I believe you look at the graphic plate to
6 the north where it's unconserved vernal pool 24-1 of
7 those buildings. Just to the east is the maintenance
8 for the golf course, maintenance job, which you can
9 see on the 40-scale plans. All those are
10 facility-type structures.

11 MR. HANES: And they drain toward that.

12 MR. SNARSKI: Yes.

13 MR. HANES: I think your recommendation was that
14 they should be relocated.

15 MS. GOODFRIEND: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I agree on that. The
17 problem is -- the other thing is what -- you know,
18 you have this maintenance area. It sounds like it's
19 not in the best location. There are 27 houses that
20 are going to be -- lots that are going to be removed
21 which will give the developer some wiggle room to
22 relocate things, but there's only so much wiggle
23 room. I don't want to use that trump card too many
24 times. You can only use them for 27.

25 MS. ESTY: But if we don't like it, it's up to

1 them to figure it out.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's the other side of the
3 coin. As Mark said you can be specific or you can be
4 general, and that's how we are going to have to stay.
5 If we want to stay general, we can't be specific and
6 general at the same time. He said to stay away from
7 that, that gets oddball. But if you say move -- you
8 know, move to -- the golf course's maintenance
9 facility to a better location, not where it's
10 running -- so that it's not running downhill into a
11 vernal pool area or into a wetlands.

12 MS. ESTY: That makes more sense, otherwise we
13 are going to try to squeeze all of these little
14 widgets in.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Everywhere you're going to
16 go, wetlands, maintenance facilities, that has a
17 higher standard. That's where everything is being
18 stored. There's oil, gas, fertilizer, pesticides,
19 all of these things that are going to be stored there
20 that it does mean we should focus on that.

21 MS. ESTY: I agree. I'm saying maybe it's the
22 direction. I don't think I want to be telling the
23 developer where to put these things. I want to tell
24 the developer what I don't like and he can figure it
25 out.

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: Absolutely, yes.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's the way we should
3 proceed with everything. We don't like this, but how
4 does everybody feel about the 27 lots? Should we
5 leave -- you know, make our recommendations and allow
6 the developer to use the removal of 27 lots for him
7 to be able to do these changes that we want or do we
8 want to say we don't want this one; we don't want
9 that one?

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: Let me just speak kind of in
11 general that -- something that has disturbed me and I
12 mentioned it at public hearing is the concept of
13 estate lots in a Conservation C District. To me the
14 Conservation C District is to conserve areas and
15 provide more open space by clustering. And one of
16 the things we wanted to avoid was having one house on
17 acreage with its own driveway, et cetera, and which
18 does not provide contiguous open space just by nature
19 of driveways and houses that are far apart and have
20 perhaps manicured lawns, et cetera.

21 MR. TIETJEN: Touché.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: So I think that that's one
23 possibility is that if the other commission members
24 felt as I do, that I'm uncomfortable with those
25 type -- the estate type lots of four acres, that they

1 could -- the houses in that area could be clustered
2 more.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Lot size reduced.

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: Lot size reduced, more closely
5 clustered lots and that would open up spaces for more
6 contiguous open space in other parts of the plan and
7 for moving some of the golf course to different
8 locations. I say that as one alternative.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So basically what you're
10 saying you want to see -- what do they call these
11 other things? What are they calling these?

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: Single family.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Single-family resident lots
14 versus the estate lots. You would like to see the
15 estate lots condensed more.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And make it --

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: Using less infrastructure.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Make it be more of a lot
20 size like the single-family residence home.

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yeah. If you think of -- how
22 many estate lots are there? Anybody know off the
23 top --

24 MR. TIETJEN: Forty.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Approximately 24 best count.

1 MR. TIETJEN: That's all?

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: All right, so 24.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's what I counted. I
4 may be wrong.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: If they were even in areas half
6 the size, which isn't really even clustering.
7 Theoretically you could fit 80, 96 houses in the area
8 where you've got 24 and then allowing you -- I mean
9 to me that's the whole concept of a Conservation C
10 District is you use the best land for developing --
11 to develop and you leave the rest alone.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You could still -- okay.

13 MR. TIETJEN: I think if you have one house
14 sitting and a garage sitting on four acres, that's
15 going to exclude a large part of the -- what would
16 otherwise be open territory for the animals, and the
17 birds, and the bees.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: Definitely more expensive,
19 because it's more land.

20 MR. TIETJEN: To concentrate it a bit more.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Another way to handle that
22 is also to put it into conservation easement.

23 MR. TIETJEN: Contiguous open space. This is
24 what you say. It's one of the things the plan is
25 supposed to be talking about and we are supposed to

1 be talking about. Great idea.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What the developer, when he
3 gave his proposal to us that these lots would make --
4 this is what he was looking for to make this thing
5 work, okay, which not a whole lot of weight needs to
6 be thrown on that, but the statement was made. You
7 could -- and I believe this was discussed during --
8 when we talked I think you might have brought this
9 up, that what can happen on these 20 some odd lots is
10 that a lot of this land can be put into conservation
11 easement.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: But it's not the same.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I'm saying that's another
14 route to -- because I think all this little dark
15 area --

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: The gray areas, you'll see it's
17 around the edges.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: It's not. And theoretically
20 it's contiguous because it's connected, but it's not
21 meaningful. It's not as meaningful as an area.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You would like to see this
23 clustered a little bit tighter.

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: I would like to see it
25 clustered a lot tighter.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The thing is I think -- I
2 don't mind telling them what we want to do. I want
3 to be able to tell them what we want them to do, that
4 right now these are probably some pretty hefty square
5 footage houses.

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: I would guess.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So, in turn, that I'm not
8 sure we allowed to put these together here and I
9 don't know whether there's any square footage
10 regulation here. Could you almost cluster these like
11 this. I've seen it done. You go down to Long Island
12 and you see it, you know.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: I think about other pictures,
14 et cetera that I've seen of golf course communities
15 in the Carolinas, et cetera.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: They are very on top of one
17 another, but they are big, 300.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: But they are not necessarily
19 estate -- what we think of as an estate home, a
20 four-acre parcel.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's what I'm trying to
22 get at. When we say this are we saying we don't mind
23 them being -- the size of the homes can remain the
24 homes as anticipated by the developer; we just want
25 to see them clustered. And how much clustering do

1 you want to see? I mean do you want one -- each one
2 of them one acre and then the rest be -- do you want
3 them on one-acre parcels, two-acre parcels, an
4 acre-and-a-half parcel?

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: I'm not sure.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's something we would
7 have to direct them so he knows what we are asking
8 him to do. You have to be able to tell him what we
9 want to do.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: I'm not sure if the other
11 commissioners are comfortable with that. It does
12 afford a variety of housing style.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: It may be of some benefit.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I would say to the
16 developer, yes, it is.

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes, it is what?

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Beneficial to him to have --
19 you know, by marketing techniques and everything.
20 They realize that they would be presenting this as
21 what they thought was the most marketable, but that's
22 not what our main concern is. Our main concern is
23 the environment and the layout of the subdivision.
24 It doesn't conform to the Conservation C District,
25 does it? Does it?

1 MR. HANES: I think it would make sense if we
2 can have more of this land dedicated to open space by
3 bringing them down to a smaller neighborhood, so to
4 speak; maybe not clustered quite this thick.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But don't we run into --
6 what is the amount of open space that is presently --
7 we have so much open space being presented to us now.
8 Do we go -- do we start going on to that other -- are
9 we on the positive -- we are pretty well at our
10 requirements right now, correct? I can't remember.
11 It's getting late. So why don't we check that out.
12 That's one thing we need to do.

13 My question is is that when we start saying we
14 want more open space here, okay, are we now -- say we
15 brought this down into five acres. This is four --
16 whatever that multiplication is. You would end up
17 with having a significant additional acreage of open
18 space.

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: Not necessarily there I guess
20 is my point. Does it have to be -- I don't believe
21 it has to be abutting these particular properties. I
22 think it could be somewhere else on site.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: All right. Why don't you
24 think about that and bring that back at the next
25 meeting. I'm not being able to grasp it right now.

1 MR. TIETJEN: It sounds like we are getting a
2 little closer to our justification for the clustering
3 and so forth is all about. Open space is accessible
4 to people and they don't have to walk ten miles to
5 get somewhere or cover an acre with a driveway. It's
6 nuts.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Is there anything anybody
8 has to discuss tonight? Okay. Then we get back to
9 our little -- okay. Once again, so we are at the
10 point of there was -- once those plans, those yield
11 plan numbers are determined, should the proposed
12 preliminary plan be approved as submitted or should
13 it be modified, and conditioned, and approved? I
14 think we are at the modified, conditioned, and
15 approved stage right now. We are -- basically, we
16 are not as submitted, correct?

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. So we are at the
19 modified number four. If modified, conditioned in
20 what way? And that's the process we are in right
21 now, and that's a continual process. After we get
22 done with that process, is the open space subdivision
23 as proposed by the applicant - we are going through
24 that phase right now - unlikely to reasonably impair,
25 pollute as I stated earlier?

1 Number six, last thing, are there feasible and
2 prudent alternatives that would reduce and eliminate
3 adverse impacts? So basically, we are going to just
4 continue this to the next meeting.

5 I would say this to the board members, that we
6 have -- as we have been holding these meetings, they
7 have been going to every other Wednesday opposite our
8 regular planning meetings. I don't know how the
9 other board members feel about how close we are to
10 getting to a final conclusion on this, but keeping in
11 mind that we should try to get it closed up by the
12 next meeting. And I'm not feeling comfortable with
13 what I'm hearing right now that that's going to be
14 doable. So in that turn that we may have to have one
15 more special meeting before the 16th to finalize and
16 that may be necessary.

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: How much time -- do we have any
18 time left that we could ask for an extension?

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Don't know. We'll have to
20 ask at the next meeting. I don't think so. I think
21 it says --

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: We used it all up on public
23 hearing.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah, yeah. As a matter of
25 fact, that's what happened. We kept going and going

1 and going. That's the 65 days. We might have a
2 couple of days.

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: We might have a week or so. I
4 don't know.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But I would have thought
6 that Christine would have built that into the -- we
7 need to find that out.

8 Now that -- I know there's three people
9 wondering whether they need to be here at the next
10 meeting. I would think yes, we would like to -- if
11 you can come to our next meeting that we have, and
12 that will be the -- what's this -- next Wednesday
13 is --

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: The 2nd is our regular planning
15 commission meeting.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So it's the 9th is our next
17 meeting. That's when we would like to see you again,
18 on the 9th, and then we'll get a motion here in a
19 moment to continue. I just want to get the other
20 portions done. Okay.

21 MR. TIETJEN: So it would be what, March --

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: Ninth.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Stu, why don't you make a
24 motion.

25 MR. HANES: I make a motion that we continue our

1 deliberation on The Preserve to our next special
2 meeting on March 9th at 7:30 at the town hall, first
3 floor conference room.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: At 302 Main Street.

5 MR. HANES: 302 Main Street.

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: I'll second.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Motion was made by Stuart
8 continued to March 9 at the town hall, second by
9 Gallicchio. Any discussion?

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: All in favor, aye.

12 (Affirmative response given by all.)

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Everybody is in agreement.
14 Our staff should come. Maybe we can invite Christine
15 again and she'll show up for us. She's sick. I
16 shouldn't do that to her.

17 Thank you very much for your time tonight and
18 your input. Is there anything I missed before we
19 adjourn that we normally do?

20 Are we out of tape?

21 MS. DeDOMINICIS: No. I'm sorry.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. Motion to adjourn.

23 MR. HANES: Motion to adjourn.

24 MR. TIETJEN: Second.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Motion made by Stuart,

1 second by Dick Tietjen. Any discussion?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: All in favor, aye.

4 (Affirmative response given by all.)

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Opposed.

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

8 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at

9 10:44 p.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Debrah Veroni, Registered Professional Reporter, do hereby certify that the within and foregoing pages 1-35 are a true and accurate excerpt of my steno notes taken at the Deliberation Hearing held by the Old Saybrook Planning Commission on the 23rd day of February, 2005, at the Old Saybrook Town Hall, 302 Main Street, Old Saybrook, Connecticut, in the matter filed In Re: The Preserve Special Exception for Open Space Subdivision.

Certified this 3rd day of March, 2005.

Debrah Veroni, RPR, LSR

