

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 DELIBERATION

THE PRESERVE SPECIAL EXCEPTION
FOR OPEN SPACE SUBDIVISION

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2005, 7:35 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
- SALVATORE ARESKO, ALTERNATE MEMBER

ATTENDING STAFF:

- CHRISTINE NELSON, TOWN PLANNER
- KIM MCKEOWN, RECORDING CLERK

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I would like to call the
2 meeting to order. The special meeting Wednesday,
3 January 26, 2005, 7:30, Town Hall, first floor
4 conference room, 302 Main Street, Old Saybrook,
5 Connecticut, Planning Commission.

6 Roll call. We have Kim McKeown, clerk, tonight;
7 Janis Esty, alternate; Stuart Hanes, regular member;
8 Judy Gallicchio, vice chair; Bob McIntyre, chairman.

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: Oh.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You forgot about that.

11 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yeah.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You were vice chair last
13 week again. Dick Tietjen --

14 MR. TIETJEN: Troublemaker.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: -- regular member; and Sal
16 Aresco, alternate. Christine Nelson just went down
17 to get some more chairs.

18 Just so everybody understands where we are at
19 tonight, tonight's meeting starts the first -- the
20 deliberation phase of The Preserve. And that's our
21 order of business is The Preserve Special Exception
22 for Open Space Subdivision, 934 acres total and open
23 space of 542 acres. Ingham Hill Road and Bokum Hill
24 Road, Map 55, 56 and 61; Lots 6, 3, 15, 17, 18.
25 Residence Conservation C District, Acquiifer

1 Protection Area. Applicant: River Sound
2 Development, LLC. Agent: Robert A. Landino, P.E.
3 And I guess tonight's deliberate and act by 3-16-05.

4 During deliberation there is no public comment
5 taken. The only time we are allowed to take any
6 public comment is during public hearings, and that's
7 already happened and is already closed. What you're
8 going to observe tonight is just the board members,
9 the five voting members, discussing what had happened
10 at the public hearing. We may request certain things
11 from our staff, but nothing from outside can be
12 brought in that wasn't brought in at the public
13 hearing.

14 So did you get enough chairs?

15 MS. NELSON: I'll run and get some more when
16 you're talking.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. Tonight Kathleen
18 Smith is not here with us. I will be seating Janis
19 Esty in her place. I think -- this is a new
20 procedure to this commission as far as the way we do
21 a subdivision. So we are going to take it slow and
22 go over a lot of things just to make sure that we
23 cover all the angles of the subdivision and what we
24 want to do.

25 I thought that the -- and as far as the rest of

1 the board members go, I understand that the only ones
2 who can put any comment in are the five seated
3 members.

4 And I think what we should do -- first thing I
5 would like to do is go over the subdivision regs real
6 close. Just breeze over them to see what -- if
7 everybody has a copy of their regulation.

8 MR. HANES: Do you want a copy?

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: No.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I have an extra copy, too.

11 MR. HANES: I have a copy.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The purpose of this is if we
13 get into -- I guess we get to page -- actually,
14 Section 3, which would be page 2 dash -- it would be
15 3-1. That's all the procedural stuff that we have.
16 But actually, it really doesn't apply per se to this
17 thing, because it was a special procedure that we
18 were following which I will go over next, in the next
19 portion of what I have outlined here for tonight.

20 I think if we start on -- we do a -- and if any
21 member of the commission wishes to go back to any
22 pages that I didn't cover, feel free to, you know,
23 say they want to go back. But I think the best place
24 to start would be design requirements.

25 MR. TIETJEN: Where are you starting?

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Design requirements. And I
2 think that the main point that I want to point out
3 here is that a lot of the things that are covered in
4 our design requirements, some of those things we are
5 going to take into consideration now, because this
6 was a conceptual plan, and other things we are going
7 to take into consideration if and when we come to an
8 actual submission of a subdivision within six months
9 from now if there is a favorable approval. So that's
10 what I want to go over.

11 MS. GALLICCHIO: What page are we on?

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We are going to be on page
13 5-1, which will be Section 5.

14 MS. NELSON: Bob, could you give one to Sal.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Sure. It's all single page.

16 MR. ARESCO: Thanks.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Plan of Conservation and
18 Development. That's something we'll get into later
19 on if we, you know -- I don't know how much that
20 applies to the subdivision other than what supports
21 our decision at the end, be it for -- in favor or
22 against.

23 The natural features, that's something that
24 we'll have to take into consideration. You know,
25 avoiding cuts, meets of watercourses, protection of

1 wetlands, retention and protection of isolated trees
2 and forest areas, protection of watercourses,
3 floodplains and other subject of potential flooding
4 through easements, right-of-ways. That kind of thing
5 we are probably not going to get into, easements and
6 right-of-ways, because this is conceptual again and
7 we are not overly sure -- unless there's something
8 specific someone wants to bring up. What do you
9 think, Judy?

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: I have to have you back up,
11 because I'm lost. In terms of procedure --

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- we are not going with the
14 numbers that we had talked about with the questions?

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yes, we will in a minute.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah. I just want to --

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: We are just going through --

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Just so everyone understands
20 what we -- what everything is --

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: What --

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Because there's a lot of
23 things in here that we would normally cover, but
24 because this is a little different application, some
25 of these things we are going to cover in more depth

1 than others. Some are not going to be applicable
2 just because it's only a conceptual plan.

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: Are you wanting us to discuss
4 these as we go?

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No, not yet.

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No. Just so everybody knows
8 what's in here, historical preservation, which will
9 be one of our high points tonight. Building lots.
10 We'll get into building lots. What's acceptable,
11 what's not. You know, issues of lot size, lot
12 numbers, lot frontage. Frontage issues and lot lines
13 may come into play when we get into the density
14 issue. Street layouts is definitely something that
15 we'll be looking at.

16 Classification of streets. You know, we got
17 local residential streets, private residential
18 streets, feeder streets, commercial streets and
19 thoroughfares. I don't think -- things such as
20 getting into the names of the streets, these are
21 things we are not going to have to get into.

22 Flood protection. We'll have to just kind of
23 look at it. Things like flood protection and water
24 runoff, those are things that are normally done
25 during the engineering phase of a project. And it's

1 going to be very hard to -- without having an
2 engineer to go over it. And I don't think at this
3 point in time this type of plan is geared towards
4 having technical engineering, real technical
5 engineering, flooding and that type of thing,
6 drainage, until it really takes effect.

7 MR. TIETJEN: We do that when, after the --

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's when the engineers
9 get into it. I mean we may touch on it lightly, but
10 I don't think we are going to touch on it that
11 heavily. But I could, you know, depending on how the
12 conversation goes. We'll see.

13 Provisions of water and sewerage, that's
14 important. What the applicant is, you know, saying
15 how they are going to provide water and sewage
16 disposal.

17 Open space is going to be another one that we
18 are going to hit heavily on.

19 MR. TIETJEN: Open space, what's that?

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And then we are going to get
21 into fire protection. That's not very equitable at
22 this point in time. I mean they are going to need it
23 once this -- when they come in, but it's not
24 something we'll be looking at, where each and every
25 fire hydrant would be. Pretty much that's everything

1 that we were going to -- then we get into -- if you
2 go into page 6-5, you get into sidewalks. That may
3 be something that we want to take into consideration,
4 which there are sidewalks in this subdivision that we
5 can look at, depending on the layouts. Driveways and
6 things of that nature, utilities, those are the
7 things we can look at. Some we are going to look at
8 are more focused than others.

9 Now, to -- does anybody have any questions of
10 what we just went over? Okay.

11 I think the first thing we really need to focus
12 in on as we go into this is to go over where we can
13 build and where we can't build is going to be the key
14 to getting into this. But our number one, our number
15 one item on the -- we have one, two, three, four,
16 five, six areas that we have to address. We are
17 not going to address -- I don't think we'll get --
18 address them all tonight. The first one is is the
19 site more conducive to open space subdivision in
20 general conformance with the plan proposed by the
21 applicant or is more conducive to development as a
22 conventional subdivision? And we need to make a
23 decision on that. I believe that once we make a
24 decision on that, we make a motion on that also?

25 MS. NELSON: No. You need to resolve as to the

1 number in the second question.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: All right. But you don't
3 have to do each -- the yield is -- once we decide
4 what type of subdivision we're looking for.

5 MS. NELSON: Just a consensus.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Just a consensus. Okay.
7 Just to get a feeling, Janis, on the question number
8 one of open space subdivision versus the conventional
9 subdivision, which layout would you prefer?

10 MS. ESTY: Open space.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Stuart?

12 MR. HANES: I think, in looking at all of the
13 exhibits here, that in the best interest that we want
14 the open space.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The open space.

16 MR. HANES: Not necessarily the layout that
17 they've got, but open space.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. We are not making
19 any commitments to the layout right now. We are just
20 saying in general do we want open space or
21 conventional subdivision. Judy.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: Open space.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Myself, open space. Dick.

24 MR. TIETJEN: Does this preclude any
25 alternatives if we say open space now?

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The only thing it would
2 preclude is conventional.

3 MR. TIETJEN: Sorry?

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The only thing it would
5 preclude is conventional. Which do you prefer,
6 conventional layout or an open space layout?

7 MR. TIETJEN: With qualifications can you? We
8 have been talking or rather we have been talked at
9 about conventional versus open space. And there
10 seems to be some doubt, at least in my mind, as to
11 whether or not a golf course, for instance, is
12 included or not included in the conventional plan.
13 You know, we've got new plans every five minutes in
14 this thing. So I wonder if that has anything to do
15 with what we are committing to if --

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It --

17 MR. TIETJEN: -- if we go for one or another.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You're not committing to
19 anything other than if you prefer an open space plan.
20 What goes into that open space plan will be expressed
21 as we go through the rest of the application.

22 MR. TIETJEN: So if we want to change something
23 in the open space plan, that would be for later.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yes.

25 MR. TIETJEN: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And you're --

2 MR. TIETJEN: Open space.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Open space, okay. Everyone
4 is in favor of an open space subdivision.

5 Now we are going to get into if the site is more
6 conducive to open space subdivision, what would be
7 the proper number of lots to be derived from the
8 yield plan? And what they are discussing there is as
9 the applicant had -- originally there was 200 on the
10 conventional subdivision. That was the way our
11 regulation read, that you get your lot yield from
12 laying out a conventional subdivision. Originally
13 the way it was laid out it showed I think 200, and
14 correct me if I'm wrong -- 298 lots, and the
15 application before us is at 248.

16 MS. NELSON: It was 293 on the conventional.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Two ninety-three.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: It was 298 originally, though,
19 and then it was brought down to 293 --

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- I believe.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We are not going to squabble
23 over it. So I'm going with the 293 and 248. Okay.
24 So right now the question before us is do we feel as
25 a commission that the lot yield presented by the

1 applicant is -- are we in agreement with the lot
2 yield of 248 or do we think it could yield more or
3 less?

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: We have to go with 293 is what
5 they're saying the yield is.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Two ninety-three. Excuse
7 me, 293 instead of the 298, yeah. That's what they
8 are saying. They are proposing 248. I get what
9 you're saying.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: But the yield. So if it ever
11 came back to a conventional subdivision or
12 subdivisions, then that's the maximum that they are
13 saying that this could successfully or reasonably
14 accommodate.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. All right. So we
16 started with the high number. And what's everyone's
17 opinion on that? Do you agree that the 290 -- is it
18 three or eight?

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: Two ninety-three.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Two ninety-three. Is it 293
21 more -- do we agree that's what this lot would
22 yield -- this subdivision would yield, 293?

23 MR. HANES: I have some questions with that
24 number. Our engineers came in with certain areas
25 that they did not feel could adequately be built

1 upon. They had reasons. And I noticed in one of the
2 plans, the conceptual standard plan, they came in
3 with 252. I think it's going to be hard to say
4 specifically how many, but I think you're looking at
5 a range here of something different than the 293.
6 And I would be interested in what the rest of the
7 committee feels about that.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, my opinion on it it is
9 a very hard piece of land to develop. We have had
10 myself, I think Judy, Stuart, yourself, you were here
11 for the original. We have worked this plan before as
12 another plan, so we know -- between site walks, our
13 past experience, we know that -- what the site
14 entails as far as detailed engineering. It's a very
15 hard piece of property to develop. And when we are
16 looking at it from that perspective, we have to look
17 at it I guess from all the different aspects of
18 what -- if in fact there are any lots that we don't
19 agree with with the applicant of the 293, are there
20 certain lots of that 293 that we don't deem would be
21 really -- is that number correct or are there certain
22 lots that couldn't be built on?

23 It's not an easy matter, as you know, what goes
24 in. And this is when we go into a regular
25 subdivision; you're sitting there with engineering

1 drawings; you're sitting there with all these things
2 and you go piece, by piece, by piece. And at this
3 point in time, because it's a conceptual plan, it is
4 much harder.

5 We have before us or been presented during
6 public hearing numerous reports from staff, you know,
7 stating that they didn't think this should go here or
8 that should go here. And a lot of the reasons for
9 why they decided not to agree to those lots were the
10 building constraints, you know, stone walls, cultural
11 resources, wetlands, open space functions, water
12 quality issues, and road lengths and things of that
13 nature. So there's a lot of things that we are going
14 to have to look at here and everyone is going to have
15 to make a decision on where we are going to go as far
16 as the yield. What can this -- on this conventional
17 subdivision is that a good yield. And once we go
18 from there, then we look at the number of what they
19 presented and see if that's acceptable to us, because
20 that's what they base their 248 on is 293. So we
21 need to look at that.

22 Judy, I know you have something to say.

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, I'm not sure when this
24 comes in, but --

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Wing it. It's on the floor.

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: The report that we got from
2 Torrance Downs, senior planner of the Connecticut
3 Region -- Connecticut River Estuary Regional Planning
4 Agency. In talking about the yield -- and I'm going
5 to quote this, because I won't phrase it correctly if
6 I don't. But in terms of establishing the number of
7 lots, said, a question arises regarding the manner in
8 which the conventional layout was developed and how
9 that number of lots relates to the planned open space
10 subdivision. Specifically, the conventional layout
11 did not include the parcel that will be ultimately
12 developed as an 18-hole golf course, while the open
13 space subdivision will include such a use.

14 For instance, if an applicant intended to
15 provide an open space parcel that is 50 percent of
16 the property in Old Saybrook, 446.6 acres, then 100
17 percent of the conventional developable lots are
18 clustered in the other 50 percent of the property,
19 446.6 acres, while the remaining 50 percent is
20 preserved as open space.

21 In this case the conventional developed lots --
22 developable lots are proposed to be clustered on
23 substantially less than 50 percent of the property.
24 The developed is 46 percent of the property, open
25 space proposed is 54 percent of the property, will

1 include the residential development, 229 acres, and
2 an 18-hole golf course, 218 acres, that was not
3 considered in the original lot count calculations.

4 Simply stated residential dwellings said to be
5 accommodated by the total 893 acres located in Old
6 Saybrook are intended to be placed on 26 percent of
7 the property, 229 acres, not 50 percent of the
8 property, 446 acres, as is the case with most open
9 space subdivision proposals.

10 And I think that -- when I was reviewing
11 materials and saw that, it clarified to me something
12 that I think people have talked around, but I don't
13 think with as much clarity. When we are coming up
14 with yield numbers, it's one thing to come up with
15 yield numbers for a conventional subdivision if we
16 are going to be comparing it to an open space
17 subdivision without a golf course. But the whole
18 idea of a golf course changes the percentages
19 dramatically, and I'm not sure how we can deal with
20 that. And Christine, perhaps you can --

21 MS. NELSON: It's been raised in several
22 reports, including -- that issue of whether or not --
23 no. I'm all set. Thanks, Sal.

24 The issue of whether or not the golf course
25 is -- whether or not the golf course should be

1 included. The area of what would be necessary for a
2 golf course should be excluded from the area of the
3 conventional subdivision that would be eligible to
4 yield lots is raised in -- by one of the intervenors,
5 and in the Bikrupa, and by Mark Branse, your legal
6 counsel. And you'll find discussions by each of
7 those in each of those reports. It's a -- it is a
8 use that's permitted in the district. The open space
9 subdivision would yield a plan where 50 percent of
10 the property is to be preserved and 50 percent
11 conceivably is to be developed. And so the golf
12 course would count as development.

13 The applicant has not proposed that as --
14 strictly as open space. It could be argued that it's
15 a recreational aspect of open space, but it is a
16 commercial use. It's not town owned or preserved
17 open space. So it is an issue that the commission
18 should discuss and come to some consensus on.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. You know, I also
20 struggled with that, too, when I looked at it and I
21 kind of thought about it. And I look at it as
22 that -- you know, like the 293 is a number that if in
23 fact they came in and -- some developer could come in
24 and do that, come out with the 293. And we would go
25 through our deliberation process, and we would

1 knock -- you know, knock the ones out, you know. We
2 are doing the whole process. Certain lots would be
3 unbuildable and things would go away and the roads
4 would change, you know, everything would change. And
5 I think the aspect of the golf course throws a
6 special twist into it, but I don't think it's a -- I
7 look at it as if the golf course itself is like one
8 part of the subdivision. And it's kind of a benefit
9 of -- you're getting kind of natural resources in
10 there with recreational and it would be where houses
11 could be built, okay. I mean there could be houses
12 there if you wanted to.

13 So I thought about, well, should this --
14 actually, what could this land yield? It could yield
15 what the conventional subdivision shows. So I'm
16 taking kind of the aspect that the golf course is not
17 a negative and it's not a positive. It's just there.
18 And I don't think -- in my opinion I'm not thinking
19 that it should take away from the yield.

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: That's why I said I wasn't sure
21 when it should come up, because --

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, it's important now,
23 because this is I think the time to discuss it.
24 Because that's going to be one of the biggest points
25 of contention, because it was during the public

1 hearing.

2 MS. NELSON: The enforcement officer also speaks
3 about it in her report to the commission.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's how I've looked at
5 it. You know, to say -- what I'm going to figure on
6 yield, I'm not either holding it for or against. I'm
7 just saying that it's 293 that could have been
8 developed, and I'm moving on from there.

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, from half.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's what I said before.
11 During the -- if you had a real conventional
12 subdivision in front of you, that 293, even if it
13 had -- if it didn't have a -- if it had a golf course
14 in it, it would be less development; is that what
15 you're saying?

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: No. Actually, it more goes
17 toward -- that's why I'm saying I'm not sure where in
18 the process this comes, because I guess it wouldn't
19 be so much in the calculation of yield as much as the
20 concept of open space requiring clustering. And a
21 golf course is in no way clustering.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No.

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: But I'm saying it's -- it's --
24 I don't want to go as far as saying it's the
25 antithesis of clustering, but pretty much. When we

1 developed and when zoning approved the open space
2 subdivisions and the Conservation C District, the
3 focus was on clustered developments whenever
4 possible. And I'm having trouble seeing how a golf
5 course fits into the clustering concept of only
6 putting things in areas -- housing, for example.
7 That we are saying in terms of the yield if the golf
8 course were houses, they wouldn't be there. They
9 would be clustered in various areas which are the
10 prime buildable areas of the --

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Land.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- of the land. Does anybody
13 else get what I'm saying? I'm not expressing it very
14 well.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You're saying that with --
16 where the fairways, and the greens, and all that is
17 there would be houses. So you take those out and you
18 cluster them.

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yeah. And that's why I'm
20 saying, though, I'm not sure whether it comes into
21 play. I've read the reports that Christine mentioned
22 where they talk about the yield. And I guess I'm
23 kind of off in a tangent with that, because in one
24 respect it does seem like it's double counting, but
25 it also in my head seems more of an open space

1 question --

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What do you mean by that?

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- rather than the yield
4 question.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Why do you consider it
6 double counting?

7 MS. GALLICCHIO: That in an open space
8 subdivision where there would be clustering, you're
9 only allowed X number of total -- you know, the total
10 number of units that have been approved or that the
11 yield plan that's been developed but in clustered
12 areas.

13 MR. TIETJEN: PRD.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, not necessarily PRD, but
15 that's an example.

16 MR. TIETJEN: I'm going to ask you how you count
17 the village, for instance. You're talking about
18 numbers of lots or the numbers of bedrooms or the
19 numbers of houses, so on? I think there's a
20 definition missing somewhere here. At least I don't
21 know where it is.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Do we have a --

23 MR. TIETJEN: You're counting 248 what?

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What is the official
25 definition of yield then, Christine?

1 MS. NELSON: The number of lots reasonably
2 likely to be developed in a conventional layout.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It's not based on bedrooms
4 or anything in that. That's not into that part of
5 it.

6 MS. NELSON: No. It's determined by the
7 buildable area of land, minimum area of buildable
8 land, you know, suitability of the site to
9 accommodate transportation systems, and drainage
10 systems, and all the usual elements of design that we
11 look at in a conventional subdivision.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Would come with their
13 application.

14 MS. NELSON: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So no, we are not talking
16 about number of bedrooms.

17 MR. TIETJEN: No. I gather. But what do you
18 call a lot? That is to say, there seems to be two
19 different kinds of lots on these plans, one where a
20 house sits on and then --

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I think there's three.
22 There's three different lots.

23 MR. TIETJEN: Sorry?

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: There's three different
25 lots.

1 M. TIETJEN: All right, three. Of course I'm
2 wondering about the village, because how do you count
3 those tiny little plots the big houses sit on? Do
4 you count them as lots or do you count them as
5 bedrooms?

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No. Each structure is a
7 house and you're counting -- that's considered a lot.
8 That's why you're saying that -- you're basically
9 saying, okay, how many -- and correct me if I'm
10 wrong, Christine. How many -- in a conventional
11 subdivision we've got 293. Now you're going to take
12 this 293 and now you're going to take it and you're
13 going to cluster it together as best as possible and
14 put it where you use less of the land, and you're
15 using -- you're putting those facilities in there.

16 So basically, if this development -- if the
17 developer wanted to, he could have come in with
18 nothing but a village district, villages of 200 -- as
19 his application is for 248, he could have come in
20 with 248 villages and no seven-acre lots and no --
21 what are they, acre-and-a-half lots?

22 MS. NELSON: Three-quarters acre.

23 MR. TIETJEN: No golf course.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I'm not saying no golf
25 course.

1 MR. TIETJEN: And no intrusion on open space and
2 so on, right? Well, anyway, go ahead.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So that's what they have.
4 To answer your question what the village is, it's
5 just each, each house --

6 MR. TIETJEN: Each house sits on a lot.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: -- is a lot.

8 MR. TIETJEN: Those are counted in the 200 odd,
9 whichever plan you're talking about.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right, right.

11 MR. TIETJEN: All right.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, they are not counted
13 in a conventional subdivision, because they are not
14 represented there. They are represented as
15 individual family dwellings on acre lots or acre and
16 a half -- acre lots? Yeah, because it was public
17 water, so it's acre lots. So it's represented on
18 public lots. Acre lots versus being clustered
19 together.

20 MR. TIETJEN: I was looking in this collection
21 of documents here for a discussion of this by Mark
22 Branse. And I seem to have lost it or forgotten to
23 bring it or something or other. He had a slightly
24 different take on all this it seemed to me and
25 particularly in the question of open space. Now,

1 does that ring a bell?

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: Do you want me to read it
3 aloud?

4 MR. TIETJEN: Sure.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: Will that help? I'm referring
6 to his October 12, 2004 letter to Robert McIntyre,
7 Chairman. And it states in Section 4, the golf
8 course's component of the open space subdivision and
9 density calculation. A question is created by the
10 way in which the plans have been drawn. The
11 calculation of total lots in Section 56.4 is by
12 reference, quote, the land proposed for open space
13 subdivision, end quote. The golf course lot is not
14 proposed for open space subdivision development nor
15 need it be. It is not proposed for any type of
16 residential development nor is it proposed as open
17 space and cannot be per Section 56.6.4. It is
18 proposed as a separate use of land which is permitted
19 in the C Conservation District. However, if the golf
20 course land is being dedicated to a separate
21 permitted use, then how can that acreage be included
22 in the conventional subdivision layout and hence used
23 in the calculation of total lots?

24 Basically, these plans seek to count land toward
25 the total lots calculation which is not proposed to

1 be available for either residential development or
2 open space in the ultimate subdivision. It would be
3 as if the applicant were proposing private school,
4 cemetery, house of worship or other use of its land.
5 However beneficial such uses might be, they are not
6 part of a residential subdivision. Can such acreage
7 be counted toward the density determination?

8 And then he says, I'm not rendering any decision
9 on this issue at this time but merely raising it,
10 et cetera, et cetera.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And that's the matter before
12 us, that we can each in our own -- after reviewing
13 all of the materials that are in front of us, each of
14 us has to make up our own decision on how much impact
15 does the golf course have on yield. Do you want
16 to --

17 MS. NELSON: I --

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yes.

19 MS. NELSON: I didn't mean to interrupt you.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's okay.

21 MS. NELSON: I didn't get a chance to tell you
22 that I had asked each of the consultants to submit a
23 report with the status of their concerns, and there's
24 one from Mark that just happens to run through the
25 same questions. And I would just like to hand it out

1 at one point. And the question that Judy raised is
2 in here. It says, should the land to be occupied by
3 the golf course be counted towards residential
4 density?

5 MR. TIETJEN: Be counted what?

6 MS. NELSON: Towards residential density.

7 MR. TIETJEN: So what would you like us to do,
8 Mr. Chairman?

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It sounds like it's
10 pertinent to the discussion at hand, so I think it's
11 worth taking a few moments and everyone reviewing it.

12 MR. TIETJEN: Oh, okay. Once those yield plan
13 numbers are determined, should the proposed
14 preliminary plan be approved as submitted or should
15 it be modified, conditioned, and approved?

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, Dick, I want to get to
17 the part where --

18 MR. TIETJEN: I got ahead of you, sorry. This
19 is page four. But anyway, that's what I meant by
20 what should we do. It may be a little too soon to do
21 it, but --

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Obviously, we are going to
23 have to take this document home and go over it with a
24 fine toothed comb, just like we do everything else.
25 But if -- what page was that on that you were talking

1 about?

2 MS. NELSON: It's on the third page.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Third page.

4 MS. NELSON: Page three under substantive
5 issues, number one. Wait, we answered that one.
6 It's on page four, question number two.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

8 MS. NELSON: If the site is more conducive to an
9 open space subdivision, what is the proper number of
10 lots to be derived from the yield plan, which you
11 started talking about and Judy raised the question
12 which is under the second bullet.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So what Mark's letter -- or
14 Attorney Branse's letter is saying is the commission
15 should refer to the listing of each lot in the
16 conventional layout and the summary of issues raised
17 by each consultant, which (if any) of these lots
18 should be excluded from the yield plan.

19 That's one of the things we are looking at is
20 which lots, if any, should be removed and then should
21 the land be -- occupied by golf course be counted
22 towards residential density. And that's what
23 we're -- that's the point we're discussing right now.
24 We'll be flip-flopping back between these two
25 questions to answer the overall yield. I don't think

1 you can talk about one without talking about the
2 other.

3 And he goes on, once these yield plan numbers
4 are determined, should the proposed preliminary plan
5 be approved as submitted or should it be modified,
6 condition, and approved?

7 MS. NELSON: That goes beyond the initial
8 question of yield.

9 MR. TIETJEN: I can't hear you.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah, we'll wait on that.
11 That's about the impacts, okay. So that's what's
12 before us.

13 MR. TIETJEN: I have another question about this
14 which you can pass or postpone if you want.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: If it's pertinent to yield
16 in counting the golf course, then we'll --

17 MR. TIETJEN: Sorry.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: If it's pertinent to yield
19 and addressing of the golf course, then -- and the
20 yield plan, then it's pertinent.

21 MR. TIETJEN: This is the relationship between
22 the yield and the golf course. There's a question in
23 my mind about the Pianta property. And I'm not sure
24 how -- where that is now, because I've seen some
25 different -- many different explanations.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: From the explanation I
2 remember receiving from the -- during the public
3 hearing from the applicant is that at this point in
4 time there's no development proposed on that
5 property.

6 MR. TIETJEN: So it's not a part of the PRD.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right now it's not. It's
8 there. It's a piece of property that's not proposed
9 to be developed; however, is it a developable piece
10 of land in the future? Yes, it is.

11 MR. TIETJEN: So there are lots there that are
12 not going to be counted.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yes. I would have to agree
14 with that statement.

15 MR. TIETJEN: If --

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yes. It's a piece of
17 property that the applicant owns that at this time
18 they don't propose any development, but it is
19 developable in the future.

20 MR. TIETJEN: So any counting we do excludes the
21 possibility of development on the Pianta property.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I think to answer --

23 MR. TIETJEN: So it has nothing to do with the
24 relationship to the golf course and other things we
25 had talked about.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I don't think I can answer
2 that, but what I would like to do is address this to
3 Chris to address it to our attorney that what impact
4 on the yield does the possible development of that
5 Pianta property have on our decision towards yield.

6 Can we or can we not -- knowing that it is
7 developable land, can we include that in our possible
8 yield of that property? I don't know why -- you know
9 what I mean.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: It's not part of the parcel
11 that's before us.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, it is part of it, but
13 it's not planned to be developed.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: I think just in terms of
15 informational. I don't think in terms of calculating
16 yield at this point.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. But that's the
18 question that I'm asking is not that if -- okay. You
19 have -- it was just like your question the other
20 night. We had seven-acre lots. Can those be --

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: Four. Four-acre.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Excuse me, four-acre lots.
23 Can they be subdivided down later on and that would
24 add to the yield of the property?

25 MR. TIETJEN: Good question.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right? So in turn --

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, no. You still have
3 your --

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Zoning.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO -- original yield that has been
6 set on the property no matter who develops it. Am I
7 correct, Christine?

8 MS. NELSON: Right. That property is actually
9 for the purposes of determining yield. It's
10 considered other land of. It's like if you had a
11 conventional subdivision in front of you, it would be
12 a phase, another phase.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But it is developable land.

14 MS. NELSON: It is developable. And in the open
15 space subdivision layout, there are -- there is a
16 layout for a planned residential development in the
17 future to become -- you know, to come in at another
18 phase.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Just as if the land that's
20 in Essex is developable.

21 MS. NELSON: Um-hum.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So basically what you're
23 telling us is that at this point in time we should
24 not take that into consideration as part of our
25 determining yield; is that what --

1 MS. NELSON: You're determining yield, right.

2 MR. HANES: But later on we would take that into
3 consideration regarding traffic.

4 MS. NELSON: Yes.

5 MR. HANES: Because they have indicated how many
6 buildable lots are in that piece of property.

7 MS. NELSON: When you determine the layout of
8 the open space subdivision, where it should be
9 conserved and where it should -- there be
10 development, that Pianta piece would become part of
11 that design layout.

12 MR. HANES: Now, one thing that I'm interested
13 in here, they give us -- I say the builders have
14 given us a conventional subdivision with a
15 preservation plan showing 252 lots.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Um-hum.

17 MR. HANES: And that's without a golf course.
18 If you overlay the golf course on that, you lose X
19 number of lots.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Um-hum.

21 MR. HANES: And I keep trying to come down to
22 what is the ultimate yield here of possible buildable
23 lots. When they come in with a 252 and you bring
24 your golf course in, you're eliminating quite a few
25 of those buildable lots.

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: But that's one of the questions
2 before us.

3 MR. HANES: Right. How can --

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: Do we remove those that
5 would --

6 MR. HANES: That would impact.

7 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- be a golf course?

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's up to us. There is
9 nothing that says we can or -- that's where we got a
10 lot of latitude, that there is nothing that tells us
11 what we can and we can't do in that aspect. It's
12 what we feel as a commission is appropriate. And as
13 I stated previously I am taking the stance that the
14 golf course is a neutral issue. That's the way I
15 feel that -- I believe, yes, if it's 293 acres -- I
16 mean 293 lots, you can -- that's what this would
17 yield. So I'm saying, okay, that's what I'm starting
18 with even with the golf course.

19 MR. HANES: And I guess I would come in with
20 somewhere under even 248.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, that's possible.

22 MR. HANES: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What Attorney Branse has
24 recommended in this -- the handout in his letter
25 dated -- that we just received dated 25 January 2005

1 is that the commission should refer to the listing of
2 each lot in the conventional layout and summary of
3 issues raised by each consultant, which (if any) of
4 these lots should be excluded from the yield plan.
5 So maybe we are jumping the gun a little bit and
6 maybe we should start there and say, okay, get out
7 the map and see if there's anything -- any of those
8 lots that anybody feels super strongly about that
9 that should be eliminated, you know, for what
10 reasons. And at least we'll have a starting point
11 there, and then we can address where we are going to
12 go with the golf course.

13 THE CLERK: Can you stop.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Stop for the tape, please.

15 (Tape is changed.)

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So the question is going to
17 be which is going to be the best map to do this? I
18 guess that one would be -- is that the --

19 MS. NELSON: This is.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And this is something that I
21 find very hard to do. It's not the easiest process;
22 only based on the fact that there's so many unknown
23 variables to these lots.

24 MR. TIETJEN: One of which is the wetlands on
25 each lot, right?

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

2 MR. TIETJEN: How about how much is actually
3 usable for open space?

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, I believe each one of
5 these lots are laid out according with the wetlands
6 regulations. I believe that's what we received in
7 testimony, that there are -- none of the lot houses
8 are within the -- some of the activity is within the
9 100-foot review zone, but that's not abnormal.
10 That's normal to have a house lot that is within the
11 100-foot. And then normally you go only down to
12 the -- the only activity within 50 feet and you're
13 just protecting. And any type of --

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: A house is often within the
15 100-foot?

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: They can be in there, yeah.

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: The house itself.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yes. And basically it's
19 called regulated activity, because what it does is
20 you have to go in there and -- when they are building
21 and you got dirt piles and you got all this, you take
22 and you put silt fencing around it to protect it from
23 going into the resources you're trying to protect.
24 That's what the whole idea of the review zone is.
25 You cannot go into the wetlands proper, all right.

1 That's not even a true statement either there,
2 because you can fill in wetlands if -- as long as
3 there's mitigating circumstances.

4 MR. TIETJEN: Can you count wetlands as open
5 space?

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yes. We have been doing
7 that forever. So now you're looking at --

8 MS. NELSON: This is the conceptual standard
9 plan revised by the applicant to December 23rd. It
10 shows -- in response to comments by consultants, and
11 municipal agencies, and staff members and so forth,
12 it shows lots that have been recommended to be
13 modified or eliminated or are brand new in response
14 to those comments.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What do these squares
16 numbered one, two, three, four, these big squares,
17 what are these?

18 MS. NELSON: That's an index sheet and so the
19 pages follow it.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: If you wanted to look at
21 this particular one --

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: It's on the back.

23 MS. NELSON: That's at a scale of one inch
24 equals 200 feet, so it's pretty small.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Janis, do you want to come

1 around over here and sit and be able to look at this?

2 MS. NELSON: You should all have copies of this.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: Do we have updates from the
5 town engineer and the wetlands specialist?

6 MS. NELSON: Yes. And I wasn't sure when to
7 hand it out.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I don't plan on making
9 really any decisions tonight. I think we are just
10 getting our feet wet and getting our course of
11 direction. That's all we want to do.

12 MS. NELSON: Identify the issues.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: So you don't want to go through
14 those.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What?

16 MS. NELSON: Lot by lot.

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: You don't want to go lot by
18 lot.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's up to us. I mean --
20 but I mean --

21 MS. NELSON: If you want what I could do is put
22 together a tally of those lots and what the comments
23 were per consultant.

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: That are still outstanding
25 concerns.

1 MS. NELSON: Right. I did get reports and I
2 have more coming in still. I just didn't get them
3 all.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: There were things like in
5 Geoff Jacobson's reports that, based on what I know
6 from experience of being on other commissions and
7 things, that his assessment -- and some of it I
8 didn't agree with, you know, as far as being in the
9 -- you know, when you're dealing within the -- that
10 50-foot -- 100-foot review zone, you got to remember
11 that there's another whole board that takes care of
12 that. And there are seven members on that board with
13 seven different opinions, just as there are five
14 members on this board with five different opinions,
15 okay.

16 So anything really goes, depending on what the
17 board members decide they want to do. But there is a
18 lot of -- there's a lot of - I guess for lack of a
19 better term - wiggle room when you have a real plan
20 in front of you. There's nothing -- as far as
21 anything being really cut and dry, pretty much about
22 the only thing that really is cut and dry, no one
23 goes into wetlands. And I don't think any of this
24 proposal, other than crossings which happens many
25 times, is a -- is proposed into the wetlands. Then

1 you have activity that will occur within the 100-foot
2 review zone, but within that 100-foot review zone if
3 any one of these lots as we go through it, that we
4 have to remember that the wetlands commission will be
5 reviewing those to make sure that they are not
6 intruding on wetlands violations. That's their
7 purview. Ours is to, you know, do lot yield layout.
8 So that's why I say it's very hard, when you know
9 what goes on somewhere else, to say, okay, let's sit
10 here and determine what's good for the wetlands and
11 what's bad for the wetlands when there's a whole
12 other commission.

13 MR. TIETJEN: So every building permit gets that
14 treatment, right?

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. Yes. And every lot
16 gets that treatment.

17 MR. TIETJEN: Well, that's what it shows up when
18 you start to build on them.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So we have to take what
20 the -- we have to take what the public has said; we
21 have to take what the intervenors have said; we have
22 to take what our consultants have said; and we have
23 to kind of bring it all together and come up with
24 what we think is the best plan for the town of Old
25 Saybrook. And that's all we are really doing here.

1 And I don't think it's going to be an easy task by
2 any means. And it's compounded by the fact that we
3 are not dealing with our normal parameters. We are
4 listening to reports that are speculative on
5 everybody's -- every which way. There's no --
6 everything is speculative.

7 They're saying, okay, you know, we have the
8 stone walls issue when we are looking at this. What
9 do we do about stone walls? Well, we know what the
10 applicant said that -- you know, like the Ingham Hill
11 land site historic thing. They are going to preserve
12 that. There are numerous stone walls throughout
13 here, which as a commission we have historically
14 preserved stone walls when we can and even have them
15 move stone walls. But I would think that when you're
16 looking -- and that's one of the things you're going
17 to consider when you consider lot yield. If this lot
18 had several stone walls on it, what are we looking
19 at? We are looking at, well, if it was another
20 subdivision and there were stone walls in there, do
21 we want the stone walls to remain or is it -- or is
22 that -- is the stone wall so valuable that you can't
23 build there?

24 Well, in our past historical dealings there's
25 only been -- depending on the lot layout, we have

1 moved stone walls to other locations. I think
2 they're -- stone walls are symbolic symbols of our
3 past and they represent where at one time there was a
4 lot line. And you don't know if that stone wall is
5 from 100 years ago, 200 years ago or if somebody just
6 recently made it in the 1940s. You don't know.

7 MS. NELSON: It's just one of the --

8 MR. TIETJEN: That's a long time ago, the 1940s.

9 MS. NELSON: And it's just one of the elements
10 of design that you would consider in what should be
11 developed and what should be conserved. And I would
12 recommend that you go -- begin your analysis with
13 what should be conserved, because conservation is
14 what's supposed to drive design in the residence
15 conservation district and it's a process of
16 elimination. You know, what are the building
17 constraints? What do you want to conserve on the
18 land based on various functions of conservation,
19 historic, water quality --

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: Wildlife.

21 MS. NELSON: -- habitat?

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah, we have a whole list
23 of them.

24 MS. NELSON: Not a lot of economics out there.
25 And recreation. I do have reports from our

1 environmental consultants and civil engineer also
2 with the status of how the applicant has addressed
3 their concerns over the various iterations of plans
4 that have been submitted.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

6 MS. NELSON: I can hand those out.

7 MR. HANES: This plan here, does it list the
8 number of lots?

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: On the front page. Stuart just
10 asked if this shows the number of --

11 MR. HANES: Lots.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I thought it did show it on
13 that page.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: It's not on that one.

15 MS. NELSON: There's another index sheet. Is
16 that a better scale? That's one inch equals 400.

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: No. That one that's got the
18 notes on it.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Judy, what do you think of
20 this? Because we want to kind of get everybody on
21 the same page. Let's take a look at a few of the
22 sites and then what we can do is see how everybody --
23 what we should be looking at on each site. And in
24 our own leisure we could, you know, rip into them all
25 and then at our next meeting we could get into it a

1 little deeper, as long as everybody has the same
2 conceptual ideas of what we're looking at when we're
3 looking at each site.

4 MS. NELSON: If you -- for an exercise if you
5 started on page four of your environmental and
6 engineering report, it starts with the question that
7 we are discussing. If the site is more conducive to
8 an open space plan, what is the proper number of lots
9 to be derived from the yield plan?

10 And there's a summary right up front. They say,
11 it's our recommendation that the lot count as
12 determined by the applicant be reduced by a total of
13 55 lots as follows.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Fifty-five lots from the --

15 MS. NELSON: From the 293.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Which would leave it at --

17 MS. NELSON: I can't do that. I'm not good at
18 math. Is it 238?

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay, 238. So what we
20 should look at is look at their reasons for
21 eliminating 98R and 99R.

22 MS. NELSON: Just note on the plan that R
23 indicates that the applicant has revised that lot for
24 one reason or another from what was originally
25 proposed. This report is referring to the

1 December 23rd revised plans.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: R98 would be -- 98 would
3 be -- wouldn't be any one of these numbers, so you've
4 got to find --

5 MS. NELSON: It's just tiny.

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: No, but wait a minute.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I want to find 98. Here's
8 88. This is 80's. Here's 100 right here. So panel
9 21 to 30, somewhere in there.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: We want 90?

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Ninety-eight and 99.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: Here's 97. We're getting
13 there, I think. Ninety-nine and 98.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: All right. This one is due to
16 the 650-foot long shared common driveway located
17 within 50 feet of the vernal pool number ten,
18 identified as a high priority pool. Ten feet from
19 vernal pool 11 and disturbs the connectivity between
20 these vernal pools and vernal pool nine, which is
21 approximately 100 feet from the shared common
22 driveway.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I don't know how you
24 determine that.

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: I don't like these plans.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: This must be a pool here.
2 Here's open space. Stuart, do you want to bring that
3 map over here so we can get a better view of where
4 we're at with it.

5 MR. HANES: This one?

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah, that one there. Is
7 that the same? No. The one -- it has to have the
8 golf course on it. The one with the golf course as
9 the open space.

10 MR. TIETJEN: I don't have the map that would
11 show it.

12 MS. ESTY: The vernal pools.

13 MR. TIETJEN: Negative.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: The vernal pool inventory.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. Give me -- yeah, I
16 actually need the conventional layout. I don't need
17 this one. I was wrong. So you're looking here.

18 I want to get a perspective of what this is, and
19 we'll use these maps to flow it all together. So
20 here we are on map -- I'm trying to figure out where
21 we're at.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: Do you want the other one on
23 this side; the other page?

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No.

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: The front page. I'm saying in

1 terms of -- pull this thing off. No?

2 MS. NELSON: Go ahead.

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: I have mine. I could rip mine
4 apart. Wait a minute. There you go. You're good at
5 this.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: All right. So we found lots
7 100 --

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: Twenty-nine.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Twenty-nine, which is right
10 there. Okay.

11 MS. GALLICCHIO: Where did my vernal pool map
12 go?

13 MR. HANES: Right there.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Must be these two lots right
15 here, right there. It's a hundred something, okay.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: It's these, because these are
17 the changed ones. The ones in gray are the ones that
18 they just revised, so it's got to be these two. And
19 they are talking vernal pools.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Eleven and ten.

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: Ten is within 50 feet.
22 Ten feet from vernal pool 11. And see, here's vernal
23 pool nine right here; isn't it? Yeah.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's all wetlands.

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: And then 11 is up here and ten

1 is here.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It's part of the wetlands.
3 It's not delineated on here. It's either/or, but
4 this is like a wetlands delineation. So here you are
5 right here, ten and 11. So you're dealing with --

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: I'm just looking to see if it's
7 visible on here.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's what I was saying
9 that based on that type of activity, would that be
10 permissible under the wetlands, to have a -- within a
11 vernal pool ten feet.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: Ten feet from a vernal pool and
13 the other is within 50 feet -- I mean within 50 feet
14 of a different vernal pool.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Which being that the lot
16 is -- you know, the lot -- the thing is the lots can
17 be -- a lot can have a vernal pool on it. It's just
18 having the house or any activity within that area. I
19 mean if you have a -- they say dwellings.

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, this is the driveway.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. This is just a
22 driveway.

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: The 650-foot-long shared common
24 driveway that is located within 50 feet of vernal
25 pool number ten.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: And ten feet from vernal pool
3 number 11 and disturbs the connectivity between those
4 two and vernal pool number nine.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. Which you identified
6 vernal pool number nine being to the north here,
7 which is somewhat a distance away.

8 MS. NELSON: There are attachments to the
9 report.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: But you see how they are
11 connected right across this driveway?

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: She just showed us
13 something; attachments to the report.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: Hello.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Here we go.

16 MS. NELSON: At the bottom of the page labeled
17 recommended lot and road eliminations, there are two
18 lots which we're speaking of right now, 99 and 98R,
19 which are colored in yellow, identified in the legend
20 as recommended areas for open space. That maybe
21 illustrates a little bit more clearly a proximity of
22 the proposed improvements to the vernal pools that
23 they are identifying as critical.

24 MR. TIETJEN: What are they recommending, the
25 elimination of all --

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I believe the yellow is an
2 indication of the sites they are discussing as part
3 of an elimination, but I don't see -- we only have --
4 on this little piece of paper there's how many
5 houses, one, two -- the same, 55. But there's only
6 one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine,
7 ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen. And you can see --
8 you know, you've got a road activity within -- I
9 guess within -- if vernal pool number ten is 50 feet,
10 okay, in actuality that would be -- it would be
11 within -- the question is are there other roads in
12 the town of Old Saybrook that have been allowed to be
13 built because they are within -- that would be in the
14 review zone.

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: But you know what, I think that
16 for the purposes of this I don't think we can look at
17 what could possibly be approved. It's what we would
18 typically approve is how I look at it. You know, not
19 what maybe one subdivision eight years ago allowed
20 something but we typically wouldn't nowadays. I
21 think we need to look at what we would -- if we were
22 looking at a subdivision, we would typically say, you
23 know, this doesn't look right or we probably wouldn't
24 allow this or we would allow it. That's how I'm
25 looking at this whole process.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But there's a problem,
2 though.

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: What's that?

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Normally the way we operate
5 is that we say, okay. We sit back; we do our thing.
6 Normally, when the application comes in, it's before
7 the wetlands before it comes to us or sometimes we
8 are looking at it at the same time. And even when we
9 look at it at the same time, we end up passing it
10 back and -- sending the applicant back to the
11 wetlands, because we make a change and it affects --
12 we shift them closer to the wetlands because of line
13 of site or something, you know, road location. So --

14 MS. NELSON: I think it's actually one step
15 before that. This is like if an applicant had come
16 in with a conceptual layout and asked you what is
17 reasonably likely to get approved.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But the way the --

19 MS. NELSON: Before they go to wetlands, before
20 they apply for the permit.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But the way this thing is
22 saying here, you know, it's saying that he wouldn't
23 approve it. He's basically saying I wouldn't approve
24 it because it's within ten feet of the vernal pool is
25 what he's saying.

1 MS. NELSON: They would make a recommendation
2 to --

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Move the road or do
4 something.

5 MS. NELSON: Um-hum.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And to do something or get a
7 a few more feet; maybe put a curve in the road or
8 something along those lines.

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: But you have to remember these
10 are also areas that have been revised. These are
11 areas that Mr. Jacobson has had concerns about.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: And this is what the applicant
14 has revised it to be. So they have had their
15 opportunity to move the road and do those things, and
16 this is what they've given us as their final --

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- this is what you got. Count
19 it. So I think they have had the opportunity to do
20 the shifting of roads if they so wished.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Correct. Oh, yeah.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: So we need to look at it as it
23 is now, not to say, well --

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But from a planning
25 commission's perspective, this house being here and

1 here, it meets the MABL, it meets this, it meets
2 that.

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: But it's -- yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. But we don't know --

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: This is in the Conservation C
6 District.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: We are looking at conservation.
9 One of the things we are looking to conserve is the
10 ability of animals to maintain their habitat. And we
11 have learned from the applicant, as well as other
12 authorities that have spoken before us, as well as
13 members of the public, that wetlands habitats are
14 crucial.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: And ten feet from a vernal
17 pool, I think there's no way that I would look at it
18 and say, oh, yeah, we'll allow it to have -- number
19 one, a 650-foot driveway sounds off alarms to me. I
20 don't think we would allow typically a shared
21 650-foot driveway ever. So I'd knock it out right
22 there. But then to say it's ten feet from a vernal
23 pool separating two other vernal pools, one of which
24 the applicant has said is a priority vernal pool. I
25 didn't know much about vernal pools until we started

1 with this application, but it's been a real learning
2 process for us. And I think no. I think if they
3 came before us for a preliminary review, I wouldn't
4 say go ahead with this. I would say knock those two
5 out.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

7 MR. HANES: That's what our engineers are
8 recommending here.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's why we are talking.
10 This is good; I mean what you're saying.

11 MR. HANES: No. I agree with Judy there. And
12 then they go on to come up with the remaining
13 numbers, to come up to 55 by eliminating lots based
14 on the soil types. And there you're tweaking it a
15 bit, because you're using a percentage based on
16 samples.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah. And what is the
18 purpose of the soil type? What is it saying you
19 can't -- what is the negative factor of the soil
20 types, that you can't have septic systems?

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: Based on the MABL, for
22 completing the MABL to have a septic system.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. But does this take
24 into consideration engineered -- that there could be
25 an engineered septic system?

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: No. But our sanitarian has
2 said there's not enough information for him to
3 approve engineered septic systems on certain lots.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's what I find is a
5 little bit flawed here.

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, no. The applicant has to
7 show us that the MABL has been met on the -- in order
8 to be a buildable lot. One of the ways that they
9 show if the MABL has been met, if the soils -- if the
10 soils don't -- aren't appropriate, it doesn't meet.
11 Because we don't require testing at this point,
12 right?

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Um-hum.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: We haven't required testing of
15 them, so we have to go by soil types.

16 MS. NELSON: If you look at the fifth bullet,
17 those two lots are --

18 MR. TIETJEN: The fifth what?

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Which one are you talking
20 about, the fifth bullet?

21 MS. NELSON: On page five of the Jacobson
22 memorandum, the fifth bullet says, eliminate 25 lots
23 from areas consisting of CRC soil types. And among
24 the lots listed in bold is 98R and 99R.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So it's part of the --

1 MS. NELSON: Does that answer your question?

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: I have in my head already
3 knocked them out, so I didn't need that. But that
4 just reinforces that they are bad lots.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: They are just telling
6 us that -- and also one thing. When you're looking
7 at this lot 11 has a double whammy on it, too. It
8 has more than one thing wrong with it, because they
9 highlighted it. So that must mean what that means.

10 MS. NELSON: Yes. That's what the bold means.

11 MS. GALLICCHIO: But this is bringing us to the
12 issue of MABL, too, which is something else we've got
13 to decide among us and reach some consensus on, and
14 that is how we are interpreting the information that
15 we have on whether or not MABLs are met. And Geoff
16 Jacobson looked at it in one way; the applicant
17 looked at it in a different way. So we need to
18 resolve among us what we think is the appropriate way
19 of deciding. So I'm just saying that's a hole and
20 that's a lot of lots.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, these are all -- this
22 is part of the 50 --

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, that 51 lots is because
24 of soils.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. But there's -- what

1 he's saying right here is 55 total lots, right?

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: But 51 of them are in the --
3 because of the soil types.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: So that's what I'm saying.
6 That's an issue that we've got to resolve.

7 MR. HANES: Well, as Geoff mentions in item two,
8 if a site is more conducive to an open space
9 subdivision, what is the proper number of lots to be
10 derived. And then he brings in all of these that
11 should be X'd out. So it looks like we are coming
12 back down close to that 238.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. Which we -- which
14 could be a possibility. My only problem with this
15 is -- and I agree with you on your 600. Obviously,
16 it's a double rear lot and that alone -- we don't
17 normally go rear lots, never mind a double rear lot.
18 We never go double rear lot.

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. So we've never done
21 that, not that I remember.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, it's something that I
23 don't think we would do now.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No.

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: There are some things that may

1 have been passed ten years ago.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: If this was a conventional
3 subdivision put in front of us, this would -- I'd
4 have to agree 98 and 99, just because of the road
5 length, it's a double -- we might have agreed to one.

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: Maybe. But I'm not even
7 convinced of that because of the --

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. If they could have
9 moved the road a little bit differently or whatever,
10 you know, with one versus -- because they probably
11 had to run the road this way only because they had to
12 make the driveway here where you would go this way.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: See, this is part of this
14 property. We've seen it. We've all seen it.
15 It's --

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Hard.

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: It's a hard property to
18 develop. And when we looked at applications
19 previously for different parts of this, it became
20 real obvious that it's very difficult to get good
21 lots in this area.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: So I think we are going to find
24 that they are reaching on some of these.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I would have to say just

1 from -- based on the engineering report you're
2 absolutely right. The only --

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: Can I write that down?

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah. As a matter of fact,
5 just record it right there.

6 No. The only reason I bring these things up is
7 because of things that we have done in the past and
8 just making sure everybody is aware that just because
9 Jacobson says get rid of 55 lots doesn't mean we are
10 going to get rid of 55 lots.

11 MS. GALLICCHIO: No. I agree with you.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It could be we get rid of 70
13 lots or it could mean we get rid of 30 lots,
14 depending on what we see. This is just a really good
15 starting point to kick this off and get the yield.

16 My question to -- that I would like to have
17 addressed to Mr. Jacobson is in his elimination of
18 these 26 and 25 lots for the HPE soil types and the
19 CRC soil types, is it his professional opinion that
20 possibly some of these lots by the use of engineered
21 septic systems that they could be allowed?

22 MS. NELSON: Look at the last sentence or in the
23 parentheses there there's a detailed discussion in
24 his December 2nd, 2004 memorandum about the
25 methodology that they used to determine what lots

1 would be reasonably likely to be approved based on
2 the information that was given to them.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I understand that, but I'm
4 just saying beyond that if these were real lots and
5 would come in on a subdivision, would some of them --
6 with engineering septic systems could they be
7 approved?

8 MS. NELSON: You'll find the answer --

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: In there?

10 MS. NELSON: Yes. Without asking for another
11 memo. I would just say refer to what's already on
12 the record, because there's a really detailed
13 discussion of it.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And where was that at?

15 MS. NELSON: I'm sorry, I don't have the --

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I've got it at home I'm
17 sure.

18 MS. NELSON: I have an updated exhibit list for
19 everyone.

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: We need a bigger table.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It's in the exhibit list.
22 Oh, the updated exhibit list that you're handing out
23 now.

24 MS. NELSON: It's a report from Jason L.
25 Jacobson & Associates. It's dated December 2nd.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Are these in order?

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: By date when they were
3 received.

4 MS. NELSON: If you want I could run up and get
5 all the exhibits.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No, no, no. We have them
7 all. That's what I want to do tonight is be able to
8 ask the questions and find the answers. And when we
9 come back next week, we'll have a little clearer
10 understanding of where we want to head. That
11 question just comes from maybe because of the fact
12 that I know what we did previously to certain areas
13 and it can be done, but he might have reasons to
14 negate that.

15 MS. NELSON: There was a combination of
16 information that was used in the methodology. There
17 was historical lot testing information and there were
18 also the soil types from the Soil Conservation
19 Service and certain assumptions had to be made.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I'll look for that later.
21 Let's move on.

22 So about -- so should we take a look at lot 11
23 now, just see what that conjures up?

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: Okay.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right now we've got these

1 two lots I think we've got a pretty good handle on.

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: Lot 11?

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah, right here.

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: Oh, you're looking on there.

5 I'm sorry.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Lot 11 is in there. Do they

7 show lot 11 in this, in their -- it should be here.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: No.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It should be in there.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yeah, it was the bottom of page

11 four.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Here it is.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: Location of obtunia humafusa

14 cactus.

15 MR. TIETJEN: What does that mean?

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So you can go through more

17 discussion on that.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: And that also December 2nd

19 discussion.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So I guess that leaves us

21 with -- what we really need to do I think right now,

22 and anybody can disagree with me that wants to, that

23 to go through each one of these lots tonight could be

24 a little much. If we take this report, go through

25 there and come back to our next meeting and come back

1 with whether you're in agreement or disagreement with
2 the engineer's assessment and having supportive
3 documentation for why and why not you're in agreement
4 or disagreement with his assessments, and then based
5 on that when we come back we'll make a determination
6 to the number of lots that we've found. And don't
7 let this engineering report limit you to looking at
8 other areas either.

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: No. But it's not just an
10 engineering report. It's from Jacobson, engineer;
11 Wendy Goodfriend, Richard Snarski, soil scientist.
12 And Goodfriend is the wildlife expert.

13 MS. NELSON: Natural wildlife resource expert.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So we're going to find many
16 different things, but we don't see anything about
17 wildlife in here, do we?

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You've got that?

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes. There are some things
21 about -- top of page four is what caught my eye,
22 which made me look to see about amphibians migrating,
23 juvenile amphibian crossing areas, narrow fairways,
24 et cetera.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I know it raised an eyebrow

1 when Jacobson started talking about plants. I never
2 heard him talk about plants before.

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right. So this is a
4 combination -- this is a report from the three of
5 them.

6 MS. NELSON: And we'll have more reports coming
7 in.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: Do we have the report from you?

9 MS. NELSON: No, no, sorry. I didn't finish it.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: But we did get the one from our
11 attorney.

12 MS. NELSON: Um-hum. And we'll have one from
13 our traffic consultant.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: Oh, yeah.

15 MS. NELSON: Although a lot of them might be
16 just pretty brief, because really they've written
17 more than one report to you already.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah. There's all different
19 ones.

20 MS. NELSON: So you really need to read them,
21 see if what was submitted at the final public hearing
22 satisfies the concerns that have been raised in the
23 documents that you've gotten so far.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But any of these reports
25 that they've written that references this is pretty

1 much everything. Their concerns have been addressed
2 and this is the end of it.

3 MS. NELSON: This is to tell you what's still
4 outstanding --

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. You look at that last
6 report and --

7 MS. NELSON: -- so that you don't have to refer
8 to every other previous report, except that they
9 didn't have --

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: Other than for details.

11 MS. NELSON: Where they made certain long
12 descriptions of reasonings and so forth they
13 referenced these. You might want to refer to
14 previous reports for discussions of methodologies or
15 assumptions or reasonings.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: We also do have staff reports
17 from the sanitarian. I mean not current report, but
18 I mean --

19 MS. NELSON: Previously.

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- previous that will connect
21 in with the MABL and septic systems is why I bring it
22 up.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. Now, what you're
24 saying, Judy, is beyond -- now, wouldn't have this
25 report addressed -- Jacobson would have the questions

1 on the MABL, correct?

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yeah. But I'm just saying if
3 you had a concern about some of them being able to be
4 accommodated septicwise by an engineered system and
5 in order to do that -- and we have in our exhibit
6 list also the information about MABL and what needs
7 to be in MABL. And if we don't have soils types,
8 then what we need to have from a sanitarian in order
9 to say it's met the MABL. So that's why I mentioned
10 that.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Then we get into a catch 22,
12 because he said that he couldn't go out and check the
13 soils or do certain things that he needed to do, each
14 site.

15 MR. HANES: Isn't that why they use the
16 percentage?

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The ledge, the depth and all
18 that.

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, you can't have it both
20 ways. It's like you can't --

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Oh, I know that.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- put the rabbit back in the
23 hat. Once you've provided -- and the applicant has
24 provided us information about test holes that can be
25 used, and I think Geoff used some of that

1 information.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. The ones from the
3 previous applications.

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: But to then say -- no. I
5 disagree with that. But I'm just saying that that's
6 why it's important to look at the sanitarian's
7 report, because it discusses that.

8 MR. TIETJEN: Judy.

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yeah. Is that the rabbit or is
10 that the hat?

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: How does the rest of the
12 board feel about -- on the determining of which lots
13 are permissible and which ones are not according to
14 this report? Is everybody comfortable with kind of
15 putting this to bed right now and taking it home and
16 making a determination or do we need more discussion
17 on this right now?

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: Are you comfortable, Christine,
19 talking about some of the issues that your report
20 brought up?

21 MS. NELSON: I could.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: I just hate to have us leave so
23 early.

24 MS. NELSON: Heaven forbid.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No. I'm just saying that --

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: We don't have all that many
2 nights. And that's why I hate to have us just --

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I wasn't talking about
4 leaving.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: Oh, I thought you did.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No, no, no. I figure
7 there's plenty of other things we could talk about.
8 But I mean as far as this report, does anybody have
9 any questions that's related to this report?

10 We are going to go over these other aspects
11 of -- you know, you were talking about, Christine,
12 stone walls and --

13 MS. NELSON: I just didn't -- I got a chance to
14 look at it, but I didn't get a chance to put it in a
15 memo to you.

16 Well, the first issue that I raised was Ingham
17 Hill Road as a trail system that would likely be
18 identified in approving a conventional subdivision to
19 be an element of open space for the purposes of
20 recreation. And I had suggested in my report that
21 there be a minimum right-of-way width for that
22 travelway as well as some visual buffering through
23 preservation easements on either side. And I had
24 recommended a 50-foot wide travel right-of-way
25 similar to what we'd request for roads, with maybe

1 another 50 feet on either side just based on some of
2 the preservation easements that we have asked for in
3 the past, where we've asked for maybe 100 feet and
4 found that to be somewhat adequate. And the
5 applicant, in their revised conceptual standard plan
6 of December 23rd, brought back a dedicated
7 right-of-way of 25 feet wide. And it's in fee for
8 almost all of the entire way except over lot 26,
9 which I had recommended be eliminated for that
10 reason. So they had recommended a -- they proposed,
11 in response to my comment, a 25-foot right-of-way
12 without any kind of preservation restriction on
13 either side of it for visual purposes.

14 So the question to the board would be is 25 feet
15 adequate? Should there be assurances on either side
16 of that where lots are proposed and residential
17 improvements might be visible; is that adequate? Is
18 that comfortable?

19 For the most part Ingham Hill Road, Old Ingham
20 Hill Road as we are calling it goes through land that
21 is proposed to be dedicated as permanent open space.

22 MR. TIETJEN: I'm sorry?

23 MS. NELSON: For the most part Old Ingham Hill
24 Road travels through portions of the conventional
25 subdivision, that those areas that are dedicated as

1 open space, permanent open space --

2 MR. TIETJEN: Yeah.

3 MS. NELSON: -- how would you treat that if
4 there were a subdivision in front of you.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: I think if we look at Route
6 154, the Obed Heights subdivision, and was that 100
7 feet?

8 MS. NELSON: Hundred feet.

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: One hundred feet buffer from
10 the road. If you look at it this time of year --

11 MR. TIETJEN: It's not very far.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- it's not very far.
13 Twenty-five feet is this room pretty much.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: This room is probably wider
15 than 25.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: Wider. If we are talking about
17 a path that we walked which was -- how wide would you
18 say the path was, ten feet maybe? So you're talking
19 seven feet on either side before people can have
20 sheds, and --

21 MS. NELSON: Lawn.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- lawns, and gardens, and
23 swimming pools. I don't know about swimming pools.
24 They probably have to have them a farther distance.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Stop.

1 MS. MCKEOWN: Thank you.

2 (Tape is changed.)

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We are only going to go
4 through two tapes tonight.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: Twenty-five feet is too small
6 to me. And I don't think we would -- I think if we
7 were going to have any kind of a visual -- an
8 easement or fees -- not fees. A deeded area for
9 visual reasons, we would have minimum 50 feet but
10 probably closer to 100. I'm saying again
11 realistically.

12 MS. NELSON: This is the plan that was proposed.
13 Just for reference it's the index plan for the
14 conventional subdivision dated September 1st, 2004.
15 And I highlighted in purple the Old Ingham Hill Road;
16 and I dotted the lots that I recommended be modified
17 to accommodate a more of a visual buffer; and I
18 X'd -- I put an X over the lots that I recommended be
19 eliminated. And the applicant eliminated the lots
20 that I recommended be eliminated and they did modify
21 the lots that I recommended be modified. So they did
22 address it, but not to the degree that I had
23 recommended.

24 So the commission should make a determination as
25 to whether or not the modifications -- the revisions

1 are sufficient to protect the integrity of that as a
2 cultural resource.

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: And if I'm not mistaken they
4 also did agree to maintaining the stone walls that
5 are currently on either side of that road.

6 MS. NELSON: They would be incorporated into the
7 25-foot right-of-way. This was the only lot that I
8 recommended be eliminated that was simply modified by
9 the applicant.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What number is that, number
11 26?

12 MS. NELSON: Twenty-six. And you can see that
13 they put in an access easement over the corner of the
14 lot to accommodate Ingham Hill Road.

15 MR. HANES: And that's all with a 25-foot
16 right-of-way.

17 MS. NELSON: The 25 feet would be within --

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Twenty-six is also
19 recommended by Jacobson, the soil scientist, lot
20 number 26.

21 I think under a conventional subdivision we
22 would still require open space. And in a property
23 this big, we would pursue vigorously a trail system
24 throughout the entire acreage. And normally what we
25 would -- and this doesn't show it, that under a

1 normal -- if it was a normal conventional
2 subdivision, one of the things we would recommend is
3 that it be tied into our present trail system. And I
4 don't know if that shows on here or not.

5 MS. NELSON: The existing trails on the
6 property, existing on the property are highlighted in
7 the light orange on that same plan.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: It goes throughout the
10 property.

11 MS. NELSON: And there are a whole series of
12 lots that I recommended be modified or eliminated for
13 purposes of taking advantage of the existing trail
14 system, but they are lesser trails than the Old
15 Ingham Hill Road which is really an historical
16 resource and --

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Some people are going to
18 want to walk and see the houses, too.

19 MS. NELSON: Absolutely.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Some people are going to
21 enjoy the total seclusion, other people it's like
22 going up and down the Connecticut River. Some people
23 like to look at the houses, others want to see trees.

24 MS. NELSON: As an issue to begin with Old
25 Ingham Hill Road is an easy one to address. I think

1 the question is that where Old Ingham Hill Road abuts
2 proposed improvements, would there be -- is there
3 sufficient buffer and if not does it need to be
4 revised and if so does it eliminate lots. Because
5 that's what we are doing, yield.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: In your recommendation what
7 would the --

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: How much of a buffer did you
9 allow?

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Or could it fluctuate?

11 MS. NELSON: Well, I recommended a 50-foot
12 swath --

13 MR. TIETJEN: Total.

14 MS. NELSON: -- dedicated for the travel, with
15 another 50 feet on either side. So it would be
16 75 feet from -- for discussion sake 75 feet from the
17 centerline conceivably from the trail itself.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Either side is 150 feet.

19 MS. NELSON: Hundred fifty feet.

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: I think that's really nice, but
21 I think that's more than we probably would do.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We do hundreds real easy.

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, yeah.

24 MS. NELSON: So what would be good for you guys?
25 What would you recommend?

1 MR. TIETJEN: You're talking about 150 feet
2 total from the center, both sides, 75 in each
3 direction.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. What we are looking
5 at -- what Christine's representing to us is that she
6 had said that they wanted to maintain the trail, and
7 it's only 25 feet wide right now. And if -- we have
8 to make a decision is 25 feet acceptable. If not how
9 much wider do we want it to be.

10 MR. TIETJEN: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And when that happens I
12 assume someone other than us is going to decide what
13 houses get knocked out.

14 MS. NELSON: No. That's what we are here to do.

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: That's what we are doing now.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So we are going to just --
17 we'll have to scale this and make a whole thing and
18 see if any other lots get knocked out.

19 MS. NELSON: We can figure it out.

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: What we need to do is give
21 Christine, am I correct, where we are heading and
22 then she can adjust it and see what --

23 MS. NELSON: I can adjust it.

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: But she needs to know how much
25 of it -- she can do that.

1 MS. NELSON: Right now the applicant is
2 proposing in the revised conceptual plan a 25-foot
3 wide right-of-way. So that's 12-and-a-half feet from
4 the centerline, on either side of the centerline. I
5 had recommended 75 feet on either side of the
6 centerline, which includes both a right-of-way and
7 preservation easements to be put over lots that might
8 abut it. So you need to make a determination
9 somewhere between 75 and 12-and-a-half, what you
10 would recommend.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: From the centerline.

12 MS. NELSON: Yes. And it can be a combination
13 of the right-of-way which is proposed to be in feet
14 in the revised conceptual plan except over lot 26.
15 It can be a combination of in fee and easements over
16 any lots that happen to abut.

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: I'm confused, because if we're
18 saying or it could be a conservation easement, then
19 how does that impact lots?

20 MS. NELSON: I can let you know after you tell
21 me how wide it is.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: Okay.

23 MS. NELSON: But the easement, for the most
24 part, it may or may not affect it. For instance, lot
25 26, if you take a look at the one inch equals 40-foot

1 scale, you'll see that that --

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: That little dot. Let me look
3 it up on the real one.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You brought up a good point.
5 Normally when we do a conservation easement, it's
6 normally done in conjunction with allowing -- it's
7 done with an approved lot, making restriction on that
8 lot so that --

9 MS. NELSON: Without eliminating a lot.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Is that eliminating a whole
11 lot?

12 MS. NELSON: Without eliminating a lot.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Why did 26 get eliminated?

14 MS. NELSON: Well, I recommended that it be
15 eliminated. If you take a look at lot 26 -- have you
16 got it?

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: Twenty-six, yes.

18 MS. NELSON: The gray, the shaded area are steep
19 slopes. They are slopes in excess of 20 percent.

20 MR. TIETJEN: Have you got a ruler?

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: No.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I have mine right here. So
23 here's Ingham Hill Road right here, here's 26.

24 MS. NELSON: You can see where the minimum area
25 of the buildable land is located.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The house is over here,
2 right, proposed?

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, possible house.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Possible house.

5 MS. NELSON: So that's an example of where -- if
6 they had -- if the applicant had provided a 25-foot
7 wide right-of-way in fee, it would have eliminated a
8 portion of that lot that would be eligible for
9 minimum area of buildable land and the builder's
10 square.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Because you can't build on
12 the easement. Because when we put an easement on
13 something, does it remove --

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: No, you can't build on an
15 easement.

16 MS. NELSON: Conservation easements are excluded
17 from minimum area of buildable land. They are
18 allowed within --

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The MABL.

20 MS. NELSON: -- the MABL area.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So you could have -- so
22 basically, if this -- well, it is a centerline right
23 here. So if this came over to here, right, it
24 doesn't -- there's still enough land to build a
25 house.

1 MS. NELSON: Yeah. We just answered that
2 question. You could have them, yes. That's why it's
3 an easement. But if it was in fee, if it was --

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right. Then it wouldn't be.

5 MS. NELSON: It would eliminate that lot.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: If this one is in fee, then
7 it belongs to us --

8 MS. NELSON: Right.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: -- and then it's not part of
10 the property -- the deed. It's not part of the deed.

11 MS. NELSON: And that would be the portion of
12 that lot that is the minimum area of buildable land.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: And it really -- if you look
14 here this is pretty slopy, especially right up in
15 here. So this really is the only area that they've
16 got which, again, is just part of this land.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. So in reality if you
18 really look at it, this house is on a hill and the
19 flattest part is where the MABL is.

20 MS. NELSON: So is the septic system.

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: And the septic is on a hill.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And this on --

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: This whole thing is a slope.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: This whole thing.

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: This whole area.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What did you say,
2 20 degrees?

3 MS. NELSON: Twenty percent.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Twenty percent slope all
5 along here.

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: I'm surprised that this even
7 meets the MABL.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, it didn't meet the
9 soil test.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: No. I mean in terms of slope,
11 but okay. It could be the scale, too. It's 40. So
12 we are saying Ingham Hill Road goes along here. If
13 we are talking 40-foot, if we are talking --

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Hundred. Let's go with 100.

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: There we go. Hundred feet.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Twenty-five off each side.
17 Centerline 25.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: Centerline 25?

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I mean 50. Fifty, yeah.
20 I'm not too good at dividing by two.

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: It would go here and here.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And if it was in fee, then
23 this is definitely not.

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And it also brings in --

1 well, this lot --

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: But I guess my question would
3 be why do we -- why is all the rest in fee and then
4 this is conservation?

5 MS. NELSON: Most of it goes through dedicated
6 open space land.

7 MS. GALLICCHIO: Okay.

8 MS. NELSON: It just happens to be adjacent to a
9 few lots, including lot 26 and lots 27, 28, and 30,
10 which I had recommended be revised. So revised,
11 revised, eliminated is 26. These were eliminated.
12 This was eliminated.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: So what are people thinking
14 about in terms of the width?

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I would think 100 feet would
16 be appropriate. I mean, you know, the road itself,
17 the original road itself was probably no more than
18 what, ten, 15 feet wide if that.

19 MS. NELSON: So a 25-foot right-of-way is
20 probably sufficient, right? And to make up the
21 difference you would want easements.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We know that -- to be
23 meaningful I think is the term we are really looking
24 for. If we were looking at this -- and we are really
25 actually looking at it as an actual subdivision. If

1 we were looking at this, we would look at 25 feet
2 would be this narrow little band of trees with no
3 significance at all. You know, there's no real
4 structure to it. You take it, widen it by 25 --
5 50 feet on either side of the center road, then you
6 have the possibility of absorbing in more of the
7 stone walls and the other stuff and it would be
8 preserved in more of its natural state.

9 MR. TIETJEN: I don't know. This is -- there is
10 a precedent of a sort in Middletown where the
11 Appalachian Trail has intruded and there's another
12 area around Sharon I think, too, in Connecticut.
13 There are a couple of places where the fight came
14 after the fact. These things happened -- they didn't
15 happen in time to keep people from building where the
16 trail might go through. This is -- my point is that
17 this is the time to decide. I think go for as much
18 as we reasonably can, because you can't fix it
19 afterwards.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But that's not the case. We
21 are only really deciding yield here. This has
22 nothing to do with the open space plan, which we are
23 not even going to discuss that yet, but it's a total
24 different layout. So all we are doing is saying that
25 because -- if we look at this as a regular

1 subdivision and this natural resource is sitting
2 here, how would we handle it in a normal subdivision?
3 We would say, okay, we want to preserve this
4 resource. How would we do that? We would determine
5 a certain width on either side of that road that
6 would seem sufficient to ensure that it was preserved
7 in some shape or manner for everyone in the future.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: So it would look like Old
9 Ingham Hill Road for centuries forward.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah.

11 MS. NELSON: It's really probably only lot 26
12 that would be affected.

13 MR. HANES: Even if we went the 100?

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: With conservation.

15 MS. NELSON: With the conservation easement.

16 MR. HANES: Oh, I see.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So in other words, part of
18 the easement would be on those people's land.

19 MR. HANES: Right.

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: I think that's reasonable.

21 MS. NELSON: Which does not preclude MABL. And
22 it doesn't preclude MABL, so it probably wouldn't
23 affect those lots. The only one that would be
24 affected is lot 26, because the applicant didn't
25 provide a 25-foot fee strip.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Lot 26 is also in the soils
2 thing, too.

3 MS. NELSON: It's the only -- the 25-foot
4 right-of-way would go right over the place that's
5 most eligible for the minimum area of buildable land
6 on lot 26.

7 MS. GALLICCHIO: But it sounds like we are all
8 in agreement with the 100-foot.

9 MR. HANES: Sounds reasonable.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yes.

11 MS. NELSON: Keep lot 26 or eliminate it?

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I would say eliminate it.

13 MR. TIETJEN: Will do.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, there's a couple of
15 things against lot 26. One, it's on -- it's part of
16 the elimination lots -- eliminate 26 lots from area
17 containing HPE soil types. It's listed there.
18 Looking at the MABL and where it's located in the
19 slope, it indicates that it really is terrible.
20 Well, if that was where the house would have ended up
21 being, that would be -- see, right now this is saying
22 that once we put this easement in here, how far is
23 that going to go.

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: Wait a minute. Let's get it to
25 scale first. I don't know which is easier for you,

1 but I am going to just do it here and then I'll
2 point. Do you want me to mark it?

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah, just mark it. And
4 then on the other side, but it doesn't matter.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: No. It doesn't matter. I
6 don't think it matters.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What I'm looking at here --
8 for those who can't see that well from where you are,
9 if you want to come around. If you look at the --
10 all these lines, the tighter they are to each other
11 means there's more of a slope, okay. And if you look
12 at the MABL where 26R is, exactly where 26R is,
13 that's the widest point of where the land is the
14 flattest or the least slope to it. And to -- if you
15 put your conservation easement in there, you cannot
16 build in that area and it doesn't seem like you would
17 be able to, one. Of course the septic system with
18 the soil types is questionable. Then the house --
19 when you have that flat area such as that, it seems
20 like this house has just been arbitrarily sat right
21 here to make it look good, where in reality if you
22 bought this piece of property and it was only 25-foot
23 on either side, then you would be able to put it
24 within the MABL, shift the MABL a little bit. The
25 house would be situated right here. It wouldn't be

1 over here.

2 MS. NELSON: Can I just correct you on one
3 thing?

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah.

5 MS. NELSON: It wouldn't be an easement. It
6 would be a right-of-way. It would be ownership.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

8 MS. NELSON: That's what would eliminate it as
9 eligible.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. But even if it was
11 an easement, okay, you can't build within the
12 easement, correct?

13 MS. NELSON: Right. You can't build within an
14 easement, but you can locate the MABL in the
15 easement.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But in reality I guess if
17 you really wanted to go nuts and build a house on the
18 side of a hill.

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yeah. It's a 30-foot
20 difference between one end and the other end.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So it's not likely.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: It's not likely.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I would think that that was
24 not developable based on the intrusion of Ingham
25 Hill -- the conservation of Ingham Hill Road, and the

1 layout of the land, and the soil types it eliminates
2 that lot.

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: I agree.

4 MS. NELSON: Okay. So --

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: We're moving right along.

6 MS. NELSON: Three lots down, 290 to go.

7 Another issue that I raised in my original
8 report was the site of the Old Ingham homestead,
9 which, as you know from walking the site, is a stone
10 foundation and a stone pen or gardening area. And I
11 had recommended in my report that it would most
12 likely be identified as an area appropriate for open
13 space in a conventional subdivision and that the area
14 to be set aside for that open space should be at
15 least as large as any house lot that was being
16 proposed out there, but that there should be really a
17 100-foot buffer surrounding the remaining foundation,
18 which eliminated lots --

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: Four and five.

20 MS. NELSON: It is right here, this purple dot
21 on the September 1st, 2004 index plan of the
22 conventional plan. That's the site of the Ingham
23 homestead. And the lots on either side of that are
24 130 and 131 I recommended to be eliminated and --

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Is this it, 130 and 131?

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: No. One thirty-two and 133.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: This is in map 19.

3 MS. NELSON: I am happy to report that the
4 applicant, in their revised plan, did eliminate them.
5 That takes care of that.

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: Your concerns were also
7 confirmed by the archeology report. They said pretty
8 much the same thing you did.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What lots were those?

10 MS. NELSON: Lots number 130 and 131 were
11 eliminated by the applicant in the revised
12 conventional plan.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So they are also in here and
14 they are in the --

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: Are you sure?

16 MS. NELSON: Yeah. I just confirmed it on
17 there. There's two little X's.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: But they are in Geoff's report.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Is that what those X's mean?

20 MS. NELSON: Yes.

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: But there are other X's here,
22 too. That's 130 and 131.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And here's the plans and
24 here's that cul-de-sac right here, number five, and
25 there's 19 and they are not here.

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: Okay. But why are they still
2 listed?

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Administrative error?

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: I don't know. I think that's
5 important for us to know.

6 MS. NELSON: Is it they are still on there?

7 MS. GALLICCHIO: No. They are listed on Geoff's
8 list as things that do not meet his requirements.

9 MS. NELSON: That's interesting.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So his should actually be
11 53.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: So that was 130 and 131 have
13 already been removed.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Um-hum.

15 MS. NELSON: Another issue that I raised in my
16 report that's a little bit less specific is the idea
17 that in approving any conventional subdivision, the
18 planning commission would consider setting aside open
19 space land for parks, and playgrounds, and active
20 recreation which would most likely -- would be on
21 land that's developable. And I don't have my report
22 in front of me, but I recommended that there be a
23 certain amount set aside. And that's something that
24 you might want to discuss.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, that's something I

1 would like to hear from Park and Rec on.

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: We have a report from them.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But this would be a specific
4 thing that based on the -- I know there's different
5 theories with Park and Rec, that one is that they
6 limit the number of ball fields that the town has
7 because of economics, plus they tried to cluster as
8 much of that stuff in one location so families can
9 get together and not have one kid over at this park
10 and one kid over at that park which happens anyway,
11 but they tried to eliminate that.

12 And my question would really be if we were to
13 set aside any of the land in this area for active
14 recreation, be it baseball park or anything of that
15 nature, what would the acreage that they would need
16 to support that with parking and -- because there's
17 got to be a formula. Say okay, you've got a baseball
18 field. When you've got a Little League baseball
19 field, you need so many number of parking spaces. So
20 before I think we can --

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: We have it before you go any
22 further.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

24 MS. NELSON: Do you have my report?

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: In their October 27th letter,

1 Chairman of Parks and Rec, Barbara Gunther, said, the
2 Parks and Recreation Commission would hope that the
3 open space in this subdivision would provide the
4 following for active and passive recreation for the
5 town. One, acreage usable for multiuse playing
6 fields. A complex of seven to ten acres would
7 accommodate two soccer fields, two baseball/softball
8 fields and parking. These would be needed by the
9 town for the increased population of adults and youth
10 in this subdivision.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Where would the parking be,
12 though?

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: They're including that in the
14 seven to ten acres which would have to be level.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It could be open space.
16 Well, it is open space.

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: It is open sapce.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It would be.

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: But it would have to be level.
20 It couldn't be wetlands.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

22 MR. TIETJEN: It couldn't be paved.

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: It couldn't be too sloped.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What, paved parking?

25 MR. TIETJEN: Yeah.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It could be or it doesn't
2 have to be.

3 MR. TIETJEN: Well, I would expect it not to be
4 paved.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I don't think any of our --
6 anyway, so --

7 MS. NELSON: And I had recommended a number not
8 to exceed 10 percent of the buildable area of the
9 entire parcel, something like that. I seem to
10 remember it was like 60 acres or something like that,
11 which would be sort of maybe the top end of the range
12 of what you would consider.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I think the question here,
14 though, at this point in time is that we would -- to
15 be able to consider that as part of our yield
16 reduction, we would have to site it, you know, and
17 where a sufficient piece of land, be it -- and you
18 don't know whether it's going to be current as
19 dedicated on here open space or where this house is.
20 So you would have to kind of --

21 MS. NELSON: Well, it would most likely be where
22 houses were proposed, and that's why it would affect
23 the yield.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But like on Ingham Hill Road
25 we knew what lots we were affecting. And to be able

1 to correctly say, okay, if this is the layout, we
2 would say, no, we don't want this. I'm going to go
3 to map -- to square 46. Say square 46 was the
4 flattest spot. Well, actually, it would be around
5 square 35, 36, and 37 is the flattest spot to the
6 east/west.

7 MS. NELSON: You could choose either an area
8 that would provide the exact amount of acreage that
9 you're looking for or you could acknowledge that the
10 proposed development, according to the applicant's
11 projections, would probably be home to about 150
12 children, and you might have parks and playgrounds
13 throughout the 1,000 acres. And so whatever acreage
14 you determine as necessary might actually be broken
15 up into a couple of little places.

16 So I think it would be okay for you just to say
17 we need ten acres of the developable land, regardless
18 of where it is, and just say if these are
19 acre-and-a-half lots, then that eliminates -- how
20 many times does one-half go into --

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: Seven.

22 MS. NELSON: Ten or 11.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But I don't know if I agree
24 with that figuring.

25 MS. NELSON: It would be defensible.

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: I think that's the only way you
2 could do it, really, unless we come up with an area.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Everything else has been
4 somewhat concrete and I'm able to visualize this.

5 MS. NELSON: I'm just saying that that would be
6 defensible. It doesn't have to be that specific.

7 MS. GALLICCHIO: But we could also look at the
8 areas and say you know what, this looks -- this is --
9 you want -- accessibility is going to be important,
10 so you want an area that's maybe accessible from --

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay, ten-acre -- this is --
12 what scale is this?

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: Forty.

14 MS. NELSON: Forty, yeah.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Forty. So --

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: The little ones are. This is
17 400.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: If we were to take a little
19 piece of paper and cut it out to be --

20 MS. NELSON: I could do that for you.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What would be --

22 MS. NELSON: If you tell me an acreage amount, I
23 could find an area or parcel that's about ten acres
24 that's developable.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I don't care if it's open

1 space or developable. Oh, you mean developable as --
2 not as developable as -- you're not going to look
3 where the houses are. You're looking no matter where
4 it is.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: It's going to have to be where
6 houses would be proposed.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, what if there was --
8 there's open space on here, too.

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yeah, but if you can find an
10 open space area. I'm guessing -- because most
11 developers come in and say this is going to be open
12 space, because it's areas that they wouldn't put a
13 house on. So I'm assuming that they did that here as
14 well.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah.

16 MS. NELSON: On the conventional plan most of
17 the dedicated open space is undevelopable.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And from walking, you know,
19 from walking the different times throughout the
20 years, walking this thing -- actually, 36, 37, 38,
21 that whole area is the flattest area except for --
22 and as you go up this gets pretty steep here. This
23 is the flattest. So we have to figure that out.

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: So Christine will come up with
25 some discussions for us for next time.

1 MS. NELSON: I just need to know somewhere --
2 you know, an amount.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: An amount of what?

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: Land.

5 MS. NELSON: How many acres of land would you
6 want to put aside?

7 MS. GALLICCHIO: Parks and Rec requested seven
8 to ten acres to accommodate two soccer fields, two
9 baseball fields and parking.

10 MS. NELSON: I'll start with that. Agreeable?

11 MS. GALLICCHIO: Seven to ten.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I'm a little uncomfortable
13 with it, but we'll see what we come up with.

14 MS. NELSON: With the concept.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah. Then you get into
16 the -- well, if you have these houses here, would it
17 be just as good to do five acres here, five acres
18 there and come up with two ball parks that are close
19 together? You know, something along those lines.

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: But it's not going to make any
21 difference. If we end up with, just round
22 figures let's say --

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Let's just go for it.

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- 250 lots and they are
25 acre-and-a-half lots, you can figure out how many

1 acre-and-a-halves it would take to come up with --
2 nine -- to make it round numbers you need four,
3 right? Four housing lots. So you would knock out
4 arbitrarily any four housing lots.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: This lot was just knocked
6 out. So make believe in this area here is ten acres
7 and it was flat buildable. We would affect
8 absolutely no housing whatsoever.

9 MS. ESTY: If it was buildable they would have
10 put houses there.

11 MS. GALLICCHIO: Wouldn't you have guessed that
12 they would have put houses there if they could?
13 That's the way of the builder.

14 MS. ESTY: I think we should go with the maximum
15 acreage that's allowable.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I'm talking ten acres.

17 MS. NELSON: The maximum allowable would be --
18 we typically look at a minimum of one acre. That's
19 what the subdivision regulations prescribe. And then
20 it's up to 10 percent of the total lot, honestly, in
21 a conventional layout.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: Janis is saying, though, go for
23 the ten acres for a ballpark type.

24 MS. ESTY: If you can get more, I would go for
25 more.

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: We're also going to want open
2 space for other requirements.

3 MS. ESTY: On normal conventional if you
4 normally go that way to get it, I see no reason --

5 MS. NELSON: Well, it's usually a combination
6 of -- open space is usually a combination of a
7 certain number of functions. The open space that is
8 proposed in this does meet some functions of open
9 space for habitat, for passive. So for active --

10 MS. ESTY: Active.

11 MS. NELSON: Right. You want to temper it a
12 little bit by -- you have to acknowledge that they
13 have provided open space for other functions.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I feel comfortable with --
15 you know, being that Park and Rec asked for ten, go
16 with ten and work it from there.

17 MS. NELSON: Why not just eliminate four lots
18 from the total count.

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: That's nine, right, lots? I
20 mean nine acres -- six. Six that would be.

21 MR. TIETJEN: What kind of recreational
22 facilities would the country club and so on have?
23 Would they have tennis courts up there? Would this
24 be part of --

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No. There's no country

1 club.

2 MR. TIETJEN: What?

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: There's no country club.

4 What we are looking at right now has no country club.

5 There's nothing here but houses.

6 MR. TIETJEN: I thought that was in both plans.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No.

8 MR. HANES: That's down the road.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Down the road.

10 MR. TIETJEN: I don't know why we are wasting
11 all this time on this plan which is not going to go
12 anywhere anyway.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Because you're getting a
14 yield.

15 MS. ESTY: To get a yield.

16 MR. TIETJEN: You're getting --

17 MS. ESTY: So what is their average acreage for
18 a house?

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: One-and-a-half. So it would
20 be -- six lots would be nine acres. So we would need
21 seven lots, really. Almost seven lots to come up
22 with any --

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Now, the question is is
24 that -- just for discussion.

25 MR. TIETJEN: Ten acres sounds fair.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: If in fact you went with
2 what they are suggesting, are you suggesting that you
3 add an additional seven lots to the 55 total?

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: Um-hum. Unless they've somehow
5 shown it on here that we haven't seen it.

6 MS. NELSON: The reason why it would be -- I
7 know you what you're asking. You don't want to
8 double count.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

10 MS. NELSON: And the reason why it would be an
11 additional seven is because the lots that have been
12 recommended to be eliminated so far are being -- are
13 recommended to be eliminated because they are not
14 buildable or, for instance, in the --

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Or they can't have septic --
16 they don't support septic systems. The soils aren't
17 conducive.

18 MS. NELSON: Right. For a variety of reasons.
19 And what you really want to count towards an area
20 that would be eligible for active recreation are
21 buildable lots.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But --

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: And I think we need to look at
24 how much -- what -- in a property like this we would
25 be wanting open space for conservation reasons, open

1 space for historical reasons, open space for active
2 recreation. I think those are the three that we are
3 probably looking at.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We'll address that later,
5 because it may be not even a point.

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: What I was getting at was -- so
7 we'll see how much we've added up when we talk about
8 the historical that we are putting aside. We talk
9 about the open space, ten acres, and then see how
10 much is left. Because typically we don't require
11 more than 10 percent. Usually we stick right around
12 the 10 percent for total open space and see what
13 we've got left. I'm not saying to take more than we
14 need to, but maybe they've put more in conservation
15 than we ordinarily would.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, that's what I said.
17 I'm just going to write it down as seven additional
18 for now as the game plan and then we'll -- like you
19 said as we go along we'll, you know -- my thinking if
20 you just -- if you were to say eliminate these
21 other -- say if you were to eliminate all 55, I would
22 have to say to myself that within these 55 lots that
23 have been eliminated, I'm sure we could put a ball
24 field somewhere, a ten-acre ball field.

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: But we could take this and take

1 the square and find out if there is a doable place.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Actually, Chris doesn't want
3 to go to the square. She wants to just say seven,
4 right? She was trying to make it simplified. That's
5 something we could do. That's open for discussion
6 later on. Right now it looks that we know that to do
7 a ball field, a recreational area, it's going to take
8 seven lots to get a ten-acre area.

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: Six lots plus. Almost seven
10 lots, yeah. So you're saying lots, okay.

11 MS. NELSON: What I'm going to do to put your
12 mind at ease is to look for seven lots already
13 eliminated that are next to each other that are
14 buildable.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, no. There's different
16 reasons for not being buildable. I'm saying that --

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: Not necessarily house
18 buildable, but level enough for a ball field.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. Then again you have
20 to take into consideration if the applicant was
21 giving the -- take this into consideration, also. If
22 the applicant was giving the choice of saying, okay,
23 we want you to build a ball field and it's going to
24 be at his expense, if he picks an area where he has
25 to put excessive -- you know, use fill and stuff like

1 that, that would be what he would do rather than lose
2 a house lot, whereas as long as we got our ball field
3 and it didn't interfere with some other resource, I
4 don't think we would be objectionable to that.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: No. But we don't have --

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We don't have that, but I'm
7 just saying, you know --

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- that luxury of seeing --

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But I could see that could
10 happen. That's what I'm saying. It's feasible.

11 MS. GALLICCHIO: Maybe.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So to take -- do what you're
13 going to do.

14 MS. NELSON: You know, it could be a simple
15 thing. If not I'll come back and tell you it's
16 really not.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What's your feeling on that,
18 Stuart?

19 MR. HANES: I think with the numbers here you're
20 looking at 84 lots. I'm sure you could find some
21 that are going to be eliminated for these soil types
22 that should fit the bill, hopefully.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yes. And if they don't let
24 us know. Continue on, Chris.

25 MS. NELSON: Let's see.

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: Do you want your --

2 MS. NELSON: My memo, that would be great.

3 MR. HANES: What's the date on your memo there,
4 Chris?

5 MS. NELSON: It is November 3rd, 2004.

6 One of the things that I actually put in my
7 report was that in the conceptual open space plan --
8 I'm sorry, in the conceptual standard plan, there's
9 no access proposed to Bokum Road. But if a
10 development came in to the planning commission for a
11 conventional subdivision, it's very likely that we,
12 as a commission, would say there should be access in
13 order to meet some of our goals for east/west
14 connections and so forth. If the commission is
15 agreeable to that concept, it's likely that it would
16 eliminate a few lots next to the Pianta parcel.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right here.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: On this plan 153 is there,
19 right?

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Um-hum.

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: And Barley Hill and two others
22 on Ingham Hill Road.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And I feel -- and looking at
24 this as a conventional subdivision which you have
25 three egresses from it, I think the fact that -- what

1 is the name of that road?

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: Bokum.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Bokum. You know, the Bokum
4 thing I think is kind of irrelevant to this, because
5 you've got -- you're showing an egress here, showing
6 an egress here. I think that's Ingham Hill Road
7 there that connects.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes. This one is Barley Hill
9 off of Ingham Hill. This one is Ingham Hill itself
10 and then another off of Ingham Hill. There were two.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. But this is the
12 beginning of the -- this is the new road and this is
13 where it starts, the old road.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So you have three. I don't
16 know if I would eliminate any lots because of that.

17 MS. NELSON: This is basically on the
18 September 1, 2004 conceptual standard plan I
19 highlighted in where a road would go based on what
20 was proposed in the open space layout, just to
21 identify where it would hit a lot or two in this plan
22 for this.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I know, but -- I understand
24 what you're saying.

25 MS. NELSON: Right.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I just don't know if it's
2 relevant to the plan in front of us, you know, as far
3 as we are looking at -- you know, you have -- the
4 question is do you have egresses from it? You know,
5 how many egresses? You've got to get three. And in
6 many aspects the use of Barley Hill allows for more
7 access to Westbrook proper -- I mean of Saybrook
8 proper than the other going up to Bokum.

9 MS. MCKEOWN: Could you pause for a moment,
10 please.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Um-hum.

12 (Tape is changed.)

13 MS. MCKEOWN: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's my opinion on the
15 road issue. Anybody else can jump right in.

16 MR. HANES: Actually, with those roads you're
17 not impacting any of the houses here.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No. The question -- I think
19 Chris was addressing that when she was saying that
20 using the fact that the open space subdivision is
21 proposed to have a road that goes over onto Bokum
22 Road, that -- is that a factor that should be used to
23 determine if those lots are buildable or not. And
24 I'm saying I don't think so.

25 MS. NELSON: I'm saying that lot number 192

1 would be knocked out if a road went from road 11
2 to -- out to Bokum Road.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: And I would think in a
5 subdivision of this size and in this location we
6 probably would want three different locations for
7 egress. And on this one although there are four,
8 three of them are on Ingham Hill Road.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, one's at lower Ingham
10 Hill Road.

11 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, not all that much lower.
12 And in a space of a mile let's say, you've got the
13 three different egresses. I would see Bokum Road and
14 153 and one -- either Barley Hill or the other Ingham
15 Hill as more appropriate in terms of dividing up
16 traffic if you have 250 to 300 homes.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: All right. Let me throw
18 another twist at it. If right now we noted -- if you
19 were going to use -- this is probably not -- this is
20 good access to Essex, poor access to Saybrook.

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: Um-hum.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: In reality you could even
23 make this -- rather than turning here if -- you know,
24 say if -- because the applicant was -- rather than
25 bought property here and was going to make -- if this

1 was a conventional subdivision, we may request that
2 they go through here.

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: Through where?

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That sandpit area.

5 MR. HANES: Down Connelly Drive.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. Down Connelly.

7 MS. NELSON: That's wetlands.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: This is wetlands, too, isn't
9 it?

10 MS. NELSON: Yeah.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But you could go through it.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: You're going to go across this
13 big wetlands?

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, there must be another
15 way around it.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: That's one of the problems.
17 No. This wetlands goes from the south to the north.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What's this?

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: Wet.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No, no. This road.

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: It's a little trail. No. It's
22 just a little walking trail.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. That's the walking
24 trail.

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: But you can see how big this

1 wetlands is. And somewhere in here is that magical
2 flower.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No. That was here. These
4 are over here.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, the same area.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: These are the Great Cedar
7 Swamp.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: But I don't think that we can
9 ask someone to buy property to get access.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, we already did and
11 they did.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: We didn't tell them to do that.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, we did the last time,
14 basically.

15 MS. NELSON: You couldn't condition that on them
16 getting approval from --

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. But my opinion is
18 that no, I would not be in favor of eliminating a lot
19 based on the fact that there is a proposed road for
20 the open space subdivision there, because then you
21 would have to take that whole road and lay it across
22 here as proposed and say get rid of all those other
23 lots, too.

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: What do you mean?

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, you're saying here

1 that this -- let me make sure.

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: It's the orange.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. So it goes here, but
4 this road doesn't stop here. It goes like this.

5 MS. NELSON: When you're talking try to say
6 north, south, east, west for the record.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah, I know. This and that
8 is not very good. So if you were traveling -- say
9 this road comes in from the east/northeast, travels
10 down here, in the open space subdivision this runs
11 from east to west and comes out over here. So it
12 kind of traverses straight across a lot of these
13 lots.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So to say why would you
16 eliminate this one lot when you're not considering
17 using that train of thought to go straight across.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: But -- I guess.

19 MS. NELSON: But it does go out to --

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Oh, here.

21 MS. NELSON: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But I mean as depicted on
23 the --

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: Open space.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: -- open space. The open

1 space. I'm just saying --

2 MR. TIETJEN: Can't use that. Not fair.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's what I'm saying,
4 Dick. That's what I'm thinking. I wouldn't use that
5 as a fair criteria to -- I wouldn't feel comfortable
6 with it.

7 MS. GALLICCHIO: I would.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It only involves one lot,
9 but the logic behind it doesn't --

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, because to me the whole
11 issue is when you've got a 200 to 300 -- 250- to
12 300-lot subdivision with in essence only two access
13 points, I see that as a problem. See, these are
14 access points, but they all funnel into the same
15 area. So this part of Ingham Hill Road --

16 MS. ESTY: So Ingham Hill will be taking all of
17 the traffic.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- is going to take all of the
19 Saybrook traffic. It's going to take at least half
20 of the traffic. So at least 150 -- 125 to 150 houses
21 are going to take Ingham Hill and the others will go
22 here. I think if we are looking at this as the best
23 plan -- no. I don't even mean best plan. As a
24 subdivision that we would want to see built in terms
25 of circulation.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What you're basically saying
2 then is you want to apply the same logic that we
3 applied to Ingham Hill Road -- Old Ingham Hill Road.
4 Conceptually they are saying 25; we said 100.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So we are saying they have a
7 road here; we want to put a road there.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: And you know, maybe that
9 would -- I know we can't redesign this whole thing
10 and we wouldn't want to. Well, I guess they didn't
11 really do anything over here anyway.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Why don't you --

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: I don't think it would add them
14 any lots. We're removing lots, other than right
15 there.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What lot number is it?

17 MS. NELSON: One ninety-two.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: One ninety-two.

19 MS. NELSON: Or any on either side of it.

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: One ninety-two or --

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: One ninety-two is already on
22 the hit list for -- we are not making any real
23 decisions, you know. We have kind of said this is
24 out, this is out, but we'll finalize it as a final.

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: I think it's helping to

1 clarify.

2 MS. NELSON: It's just a concept and if you have
3 a consensus, you can narrow it down later.

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: Forty-two. Why is there not a
5 42? Did I tear it out?

6 MR. HANES: You're missing 42?

7 MS. GALLICCHIO: Or it's just not in order.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What are you looking for?

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: I'm looking for 42, where this
10 area would be. Oh, that's because that's the Pianta
11 property.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yes.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: So that's why I'm not finding
14 it. So 43 or 50.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I think you have to find 44.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right. Forty-three or 50?

17 MS. NELSON: Forty-four.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Forty-four.

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: All right. I'm just saying if
20 you look at it, it might be helpful.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: One ninety-two -- keep
22 going. They probably go up.

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: Huh-uh. I think it's back one.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Chris, how specific were you
25 when you did that as far as where the lots were you

1 were getting rid of?

2 MS. NELSON: I just said one.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You didn't say what number
4 lot.

5 MS. NELSON: Yes, I did. Lot number 192.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: One ninety-two. Try 51.

7 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yeah. In here somewhere.
8 Here, 191.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So here's the road way
10 over -- that would be over here, because that's
11 north.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: Wait a minute. This is 51.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Is road 11.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: So we are here.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I think you picked the wrong
16 lot, because you want to -- oh, you're talking --
17 you're coming off road 11, right?

18 MS. NELSON: Yes. Off road 11, out to the
19 Pianta piece.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: To the north.

21 MR. HANES: You're talking 192.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: One ninety-three maybe.

23 MR. HANES: One ninety-two.

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: One of these two.

25 MR. HANES: Yeah.

1 MS. NELSON: If you put a road through at the
2 optimum place without, you know, too much width for
3 grading and so forth, a typical road right-of-way
4 would be 50 feet wide. So choose any one lot that
5 would accommodate that, if you agree, for
6 elimination.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: One ninety-two, 193, 194 are
8 on these soil types.

9 MS. NELSON: Okay. Well, then it's gone
10 already.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, no, not yet. We
12 haven't determined that yet.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: If we agree with Mr. Jacobson's
14 methodology.

15 MS. NELSON: You want to be careful not to
16 double count.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So what we're looking at is
18 either to -- what the proposal then would be would be
19 to look at and think about would you be in agreement
20 with either getting rid of lot 192 or 193 - it would
21 be one or the other - to facilitate a road going over
22 the Bokum.

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: I don't know what -- we didn't
24 hear from everybody.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Anybody want to jump in at

1 any moment.

2 MS. ESTY: I agree.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I'm kind of on the fence on
4 it, whether I would eliminate that lot or not for
5 that reason.

6 MR. HANES: You're saying that under the
7 conventional plan we would insist that they have a
8 road going over the Bokum and they would need --

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: I would.

10 MR. HANES: And they would need to --

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We would.

12 MR. HANES: -- tie in --

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And unfortunately, because
14 it is -- under this proposed conventional subdivision
15 they do own the land on the other side of the road
16 even here, because it's lot -- it is square number 42
17 on IP-2, Volume 1B. And so it's there. And then
18 part of lot 50 -- square 50, also. So in reality
19 that might be something that we would request. And I
20 guess from knowing what we know from the -- you know,
21 the meetings that went on, the public hearings, that
22 they are proposing to put a bridge over there now.

23 MS. ESTY: I think for emergency purposes if all
24 these other roads dump onto Bokum Road, we would want
25 an access in some other area.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. Bokum Road -- the
2 access of Westbrook, Bokum Road and Ingham Hill Road
3 even, but you're going to lose -- you know,
4 obviously, under the other open space part you're
5 losing this Barley Hill connection as is proposed
6 currently.

7 MS. GALLICCHIO: What?

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Under the open space you
9 lose this and you get this.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yeah.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: There's no access.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yeah, that's what they --

13 MS. NELSON: Try not to say this and this.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I know.

15 MS. NELSON: Sorry.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, you lose --

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, they also removed the
18 other two accesses on Ingham Hill Road. So they
19 removed on the open space plan all three on Ingham
20 Hill Road other than the emergency.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Where is the other third
22 one?

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: There were three. Remember I
24 asked about it at one of the public hearings, because
25 I couldn't find them. One is Barley Hill.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: On the IP-2 map, 67 square,
2 okay.

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right. Barley Hill Road. And
4 then there's another road that goes off of Ingham
5 Hill further up at 39 square.

6 MR. HANES: It's right close.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Is this an existing road
8 now? That's my question.

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: A little part of it is.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We're talking about square
11 40. There's a little bit of it would be.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: This is -- I'm pointing out
13 Mr. Peckum's property, which is around where we met
14 for the site walk.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So that's further down.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: So you have an idea. Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: This is where we walked in,
18 on square 39.

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: Where we walked in on square 39
20 would be one access off of Ingham Hill Road; the
21 other off of Barley Hill; and the other off the curve
22 just south of where we started the site walk.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And that would be in square
24 40.

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: So it's just north -- just west

1 of Dwayne Road I would say. You can't see it on
2 here.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And it's not depicted on the
4 map.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: It's not depicted on the map,
6 no. But what I'm saying is that -- so in the open
7 space plan you mentioned Bokum is an access; 154 is
8 an access -- 153, sorry. But they've removed any
9 access onto Ingham Hill Road except I believe the one
10 that's on the old -- that starts on the current part
11 of Ingham Hill Road.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Which is in square 39.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: For emergency vehicles.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. Why does this look
15 different here?

16 Chris, when you -- on the map that you presented
17 to us with the colorization on it, the IP-2 map, in
18 lot 43 and lot 51 you made like a rectangle off of
19 the road 11 on lots 188, 187, 189.

20 MS. NELSON: Those were just two different
21 places that that road could come in.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So basically, you got it
23 going through 192 here or cutting across. One way
24 would have eliminated lots 188, 186, and 187. And
25 this way -- going down this way would only eliminate

1 one lot, 192.

2 MS. NELSON: And that's what I recommended in my
3 report.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. All right. So 192
5 looks like it's on the plate. How does everybody
6 feel about 192?

7 MR. HANES: Good.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: I say remove it.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Remove it?

10 MR. HANES: Yes.

11 MS. ESTY: I agree.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. One ninety-two is
13 slated for elimination.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: Did we say 192 or 193?

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No. Because I think if you
16 look at it -- rather than looking at this map, you're
17 looking at IP-2, Volume 1B presented by the town
18 planner with an illustration showing the -- a
19 possible road going through the edge of lot 192; the
20 western -- the western boundary of 192 down to road
21 11, which would in turn eliminate the lot. And just
22 for informational reasons 192 is also on the HPE soil
23 types. There's issues with that on that lot, also.

24 MS. NELSON: Oh, okay.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. Chris, anything else?

1 MS. NELSON: Yeah.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Just another question for
3 the board. Right now it's 10:12. I didn't know how
4 late everyone wanted to go.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: Ten of 12?

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No, 10:12. Yeah, I would be
7 saying adjournment.

8 MR. HANES: Eleven o'clock?

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Eleven o'clock sounds good
10 to me. Eleven o'clock? Eleven o'clock good to go
11 to?

12 MR. TIETJEN: (Nods head)

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. It beats one o'clock,
14 I'll tell you that. Chris, anything else?

15 MS. NELSON: I don't know if you want to keep
16 going through my report or if you've gotten an idea
17 of basically -- do you want me to keep going?

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Might as well. It seems to
19 be productive.

20 MS. NELSON: Okay. It saves me from writing a
21 memo later. Okay. I've got a few comments about
22 some roads in my report. Can you tell from the index
23 plan that you're looking at the road numbers?

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: Can you tell what?

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: She's asking if there's any

1 road numbers on this index IP-2.

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: This is the September 1st one
3 that she's using.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah, but she wants to know
5 if road 11 might --

6 MS. NELSON: That's what my report is based on.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. There are no road
8 number indications on here.

9 MS. NELSON: I wrote in in black the road
10 numbers; some of the road numbers.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: This is row five, row four
12 on lots -- on squares 18 and 19. That's where I got
13 road 11. I got it from CL-51 that we were talking
14 about road 11 adjacent to lot 192.

15 MS. NELSON: Okay. So on the revised
16 conventional conceptual standard plan, the roads are
17 identified; the road numbers.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Um-hum.

19 MS. NELSON: So in my report I spoke about
20 proposed road number five.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Let's go to 18 and 19.

22 MS. NELSON: You might be able to tell from that
23 index plan, Judy, I did write in some of the road
24 numbers.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay, here's five.

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: Nineteen, yes.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Where is four?

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: What?

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Four and 18. I don't see
5 it. Does that make sense that it goes CL-11 to CL-19
6 and no 18? Because your four -- where you indicate
7 your road four --

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: There is a 19.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah, but we don't have 18,
10 if we wanted to go up higher. Unless they are out of
11 order.

12 MS. ESTY: No. They skipped numbers even on
13 these other ones.

14 MS. NELSON: You can look on the index plan and
15 we can talk about it from the index plan.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: We've got 19.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We have 19, so let's talk
18 about road number five.

19 MS. NELSON: Okay. Proposed road number five
20 serves lots located within an area that should be
21 designated for preservation of Ingham homestead and
22 the Old Ingham Hill Road, as does proposed road
23 number four. And I recommended in my report to
24 eliminate both roads and to replace the need for
25 access to the remaining lots by driveways wherever

1 possible. So if the lots around the Ingham homestead
2 are eliminated, then the roads should similarly be
3 eliminated. And if the roads are eliminated, then
4 that might affect a few more lots.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: And did those get eliminated,
6 do you know?

7 MS. NELSON: I thought that elimination of roads
8 number four and five would affect lots number 131,
9 132, and 133 which we already identified.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: One thirty-one.

11 MR. HANES: And 30.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: How long of -- from the --
13 on lot 19 to the junction of road four and five in
14 square 18 on IP-2, how long is that?

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: We are at four-hundredths.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Basically, I'm looking to
17 see if there's a prudent request, you know, based
18 on -- like a driveway should only be so long versus a
19 road. Plus you've got fire access and with the
20 cul-de-sac and stuff like that.

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: We're talking a lot. We're
22 talking 900 feet from road number five to the
23 intersection with road number four. And --

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The road number four I think
25 would come in there, right?

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: No. That's deleted, also.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Chris, on your map IP-2 you
3 have your purple circle that's adjacent to --

4 MS. NELSON: Ingham homestead.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: -- to indicate the Ingham
6 homestead on square 19, but you're saying to
7 eliminate --

8 MS. NELSON: My point was if to preserve the
9 Ingham homestead you're eliminating the lots that are
10 around it --

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

12 MS. NELSON: -- the road that is proposed to
13 access those lots is really a lot more infrastructure
14 than is necessary to accommodate the remaining --

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Thirty-two and 33.

16 MS. NELSON: -- one, two, three lots. It's a
17 lot of road for three lots.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So are you suggesting that -
19 this is lot 129 - that the road maybe come to end
20 here at 129 and then a driveway starts down to these
21 houses?

22 MS. NELSON: No. I recommended that the end of
23 road number five be eliminated, which would eliminate
24 lots number -- I'm sorry, 132 and 133.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

1 MS. NELSON: And that lot number 129 be accessed
2 by a driveway.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. Now, on this -- let's
4 just go to this map here. CL-19, line one, revised.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: We really need 18, don't we?

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No, no. Where is -- to the
7 best of your recollection, where is the Ingham Hill
8 site compared to your purple dot? Homestead.

9 MS. NELSON: They are the same.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But I don't want to -- is
11 this some indication of it or is that some indication
12 of it?

13 Here's my question. Is that -- you said you
14 want to protect 100 -- here's the stone walls.
15 There's some stone walls. You wanted to protect
16 within 100 feet of that, okay.

17 MS. NELSON: This stone wall that runs in a
18 square up here, can you see that?

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah.

20 MS. NELSON: That is the garden area of the old
21 Ingham homestead.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. So it's more than
23 that little purple dot on IP-2.

24 MS. NELSON: Um-hum.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Can we write on this with

1 one of your markers?

2 MS. NELSON: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We'll stick with purple, I
4 guess. I'm going to mark the boundaries of that
5 stone wall. Now, this is one portion that is the
6 Ingham homesite (sic) that we want to -- you suggest
7 we preserve.

8 MS. NELSON: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Now, where is the house
10 foundation?

11 MR. TIETJEN: Just go west from the number 28
12 there. See where the dam is.

13 MS. NELSON: It's not identified on the --

14 MR. TIETJEN: You could guess.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Why would it be on CL-20 and
16 not -- according to this it should be on CL-19. It
17 should be right there. That's where it should be.

18 MR. TIETJEN: We walked all this. See where
19 that X is, that might be a good place for it.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, you can't guess.
21 That's the point.

22 MR. TIETJEN: You're looking --

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, the point --

24 MR. TIETJEN: Sorry. You're looking for
25 something that interferes with the road or vice

1 versa, right?

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No, no, no. What we are
3 saying here is that it looks like one thing Chris --
4 that's that square. Let's just mark that. There's a
5 square on CL-19 that's south of the cul-de-sac on row
6 five and directly adjacent to it is CRC indication.
7 I think that's a soil type, I believe --

8 MS. NELSON: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: -- indication. And it's
10 just a little bit north of Ingham Hill Road. We
11 believe that's the homestead, this square.

12 MS. NELSON: I seem to recall it was clearly
13 marked on the September 1st, 2004 set of plans.
14 Anyway, we've discussed eliminating lots 130 --

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Two.

16 MR. HANES: One thirty and 131.

17 MS. NELSON: One thirty and 131 which the
18 applicant has complied with for the preservation of
19 the old Ingham homestead, which then leaves two less
20 lots that are serviced by road number five. So my
21 point is that you have a whole roadway system.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I'm going back to cultural
23 resources here. You just indicated to us as a
24 commission that lot 132 encompasses the old farm --
25 the farm field.

1 MS. NELSON: Right.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And I think we need to
3 determine whether that's a significant cultural
4 resource we want.

5 MS. NELSON: Well, the applicant eliminated it
6 voluntarily.

7 MS. GALLICCHIO: One thirty-two?

8 MS. NELSON: Oh, not lot 132.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's what I'm saying.
10 You're showing this right here as the field. This is
11 lot 132. Here's the homestead.

12 MS. NELSON: Yes. I did recommend in my report
13 elimination of lots 130, 131, 132 to protect the
14 homestead. And the applicant eliminated 130 and 131,
15 but not 132.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What you're telling us here
17 if we were to go out here, this looks like a farm
18 field -- was a farm field at one time delineated by a
19 stone wall --

20 MS. NELSON: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: -- that runs adjacent to --
22 along the cul-de-sac of lot -- road number five and
23 is bounded by -- indicated by a stone wall that runs
24 along the wetlands to the east and then abuts -- runs
25 along the northern edge of lot 132 and then goes in

1 a -- let's see, that would be a northwest direction
2 back to road five, which is the field that would be
3 referred to as part of the Ingham Hill homestead.
4 And that is lot -- basically, 90 percent of lot 132.

5 MS. NELSON: So my point is that if we
6 eliminate -- we have a road system for which we are
7 eliminating probably half the lots that it services,
8 therefore, the subdivision is -- the proposed
9 subdivision would create a lot of infrastructure for
10 a few number of homes, and it's a very long dead end
11 road for three lots. In my report I just said we
12 would question that as a commission, whether or not
13 that infrastructure was warranted by the number of
14 lots that are eked out of that part of the site.

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: I think also -- I would have to
16 check, but I think 132 would have been recommended as
17 removal from that archaeological report, because I
18 remember them talking about the unusual shape. That
19 obviously was man-made and obviously made as a
20 pen-type area because of that funny angle at the
21 bottom.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, and it's also -- it's
23 in CRC soil types and it is on elimination. It's one
24 of -- lot 132 is part of that elimination.

25 MS. NELSON: If we were doing a buffer around

1 these historic cultural resources, it would eliminate
2 certainly lot number 132 and possibly 133, depending
3 on the commission's feelings about need to go buffer
4 it for open space purposes.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I don't know about 133. I'm
6 thinking if you do this you're going to need -- first
7 of all, what type of access -- if this was an actual,
8 you know, the actual subdivision, what type of access
9 would we -- more than likely we would recommend to
10 this site that there would be public access. And we
11 would probably call upon some sort of a road with
12 some way of parking and walking to it.

13 MS. NELSON: The public access is off of Old
14 Ingham Hill Road.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. But I'm just saying
16 because of the significance of this.

17 MS. NELSON: And there are trail heads.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I know. But I'm just saying
19 I'm thinking as if, not knowing anything else, that
20 if it's a significant -- it's like the Brown --
21 Mr. Brown's thing over there, you know.

22 MS. NELSON: The hay house.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The hay house. There's
24 people that really want to look at it. It's a
25 significant cultural resource. Would you not want to

1 have access to that. I don't know if I would want to
2 eliminate all of road five; would seem like it would
3 say, okay, leave lot 133 and move your cul-de-sac
4 back further and then --

5 MS. NELSON: They access along Old Ingham Hill
6 Road, which is -- which intersects with the existing
7 improved Ingham Hill Road at no less a distance than
8 the road that's proposed.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. But my only thing --
10 just throwing out that a cultural resource like that,
11 is it just left in the woods to sit or would it be --

12 MS. NELSON: You would have to walk to it or
13 bike to it or ride your horse to it along Old Ingham
14 Hill Road.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's what you would have
16 to do. But if you left road number five, you know, a
17 portion of road number five and left one -- lot
18 number 133, you would have an easier -- and it would
19 seem like we would put a public access area right
20 there. I don't know. I'm just throwing that out
21 there. To make it easier for people to get to rather
22 than having it -- so I would say that elimination of
23 road number five, a portion of where you could
24 eliminate road number five up to lot -- well,
25 actually, you could -- it's not permissible, okay,

1 because it's a cul-de-sac, right? You have
2 1,700 feet.

3 MS. NELSON: One thousand.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: One thousand feet?

5 MS. NELSON: There's a 1,000-foot limitation on
6 a cul-de-sac dead end road without a waiver.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So if you were to move -- if
8 you were to put -- actually, I don't know what
9 road -- this must be road number seven. Is that the
10 other one over here on square 17 and 16? It looks
11 like road number seven.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: It looks like one to me.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: There's another one down
14 here, number seven, with a number mark and a seven in
15 front of it. So here, this is the access here. And
16 this probably gives you your 1,000 feet here and then
17 you got another, you know -- how you get your
18 1,000-foot. So if you were to say -- left road four
19 in there and you came down, here's 133 and you
20 terminated the road over here, you can even terminate
21 it up here with a public access and a walkway down to
22 the Ingham Hill farmstead. Food for thought.

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: And have what, a turnaround
24 there?

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, I guess you would have

1 to have a turnaround there or unless you came in from
2 this point here you started. You know, it would have
3 to be a shared driveway by two. Depending on where
4 the driveway comes in here, it may -- but it looks
5 like you've got ledge. You can see the contour lines
6 on lot number 129 I believe it is. It's in square
7 18, to the western side of square 18. It borders
8 lot -- it borders row four and five. I believe it's
9 129. It's hard to read. You know, you could have
10 the driveway access here, but it looks like that
11 might be a little bit ledgey there. And it looks
12 like it's flatter right here and you could probably
13 come in here, then you could probably do some sort of
14 private driveway here.

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: But, you know, go back a little
16 bit. Why do they have a road on that steep a slope?
17 That doesn't look like it's --

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, they could blast and
19 narrow it down. That's what I'm saying. We went
20 through this another time where you blast through and
21 you straighten this out and you get your 12 percent
22 grade or less, right?

23 MS. NELSON: Yes. Way less.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Way less. Well, 12 percent
25 is doable.

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: Ten percent.

2 MS. NELSON: Ten percent is really the maximum
3 of what's reasonable according to the trucks at the
4 Department of Public Works.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay, 10 percent. So if
6 they can get a 10 percent grade out of this, then
7 it's doable. And then those are the things we don't
8 know, but obviously it looks like it gets a lot
9 flatter right here at the southern portion, where the
10 southeast corner of lot 129 you could -- you know,
11 the drive would go in there. Actually, we can look
12 at it.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: You know, we can't. I just
14 looked at mine. Eighteen is not in my set of plans
15 or in this set of plans.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We are missing --

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: We are missing actually a lot
18 of pages.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: CL-19 is here but not CL-18.

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: Or 17.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Or 16.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: Or 16.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We go from 11 to 19.

24 MS. NELSON: I'll look into it.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But I'm really thinking

1 that, you know, keep that one lot. But then again
2 130 -- what's that 130, lot number --

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: You said 129.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's 129. I'm trying to
5 see is that 130 or --

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: Is 129 on any other hit list?

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: One thirty-three. Here it
8 is right here. This is it, 133. It's 133.

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And right now lot 133 shows
11 up on HPE soil types. So it may get eliminated out
12 for some other reason. But I really think that if we
13 were doing this subdivision as it stands, that we
14 would want - and everyone can chime in here, you
15 know - that would we want access -- some sort of
16 close access to the Ingham Hill homestead as an
17 historical/cultural site. Would we want everybody --
18 everybody would have to either bike in or walk in,
19 which would eliminate access.

20 MR. HANES: What's the closest access to the old
21 roadway there?

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It would be -- if you want
23 to look at here, Stuart, it's basically at square 29.
24 You would have to walk -- what did you say these
25 were, 100 squares, 100 feet? It's a long ways.

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, you've got this orange
2 road, too. I mean there's a walkway.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, there's also -- yeah.
4 But there's -- it's a walkway, yeah.

5 MR. HANES: How much longer would it be from
6 this road, this road that you're eliminating?

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right here. Well, if we
8 eliminated this road, it would be from there to
9 there.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: That's road number five.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, actually, here's the
12 field. We are talking about square 19 to the
13 western -- to the eastern side of the cul-de-sac of
14 road five is the field for the old Ingham Hill
15 homestead. Directly south of that is the homestead
16 foundation. So for people to walk in there, it would
17 be only -- you know, if you had this road here, you
18 had -- lot 129 stayed, we would have probably said we
19 wanted something like up in here to --

20 MS. ESTY: Cul-de-sac.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Cul-de-sac right in there.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: That would be about 800 -- no,
23 about 700 feet. And you asked me to measure
24 something else.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, it would be --

1 MR. HANES: It would be double that at least. A
2 long way.

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: Fourteen hundred.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: If we did this like we do on
5 anything, we had different trail heads. We would
6 make trail heads. It could be that your closest
7 location could be anywhere on this map, off one of
8 these trail heads. But normally it was at the
9 beginning of one of these trails that were adjacent
10 to a road we would put parking. So it would either
11 be on -- somewhere on the northern part of square 21
12 there would have to be some sort of -- there is a
13 road. There's a road trail. There's a trailhead
14 there that traverses lot 101 and goes through lot 106
15 and then it goes -- connects into the old Ingham Hill
16 trail which would have access with a much longer
17 distance. I'm just throwing it out there, because
18 that's something that I would think that we would
19 consider.

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, at the farthest if you're
21 talking about at the end of what Christine has marked
22 in purple, the walkway, the Old Ingham Hill Road,
23 you're talking half a mile.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah.

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: I don't know if that's

1 unreasonable.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I don't know. It's
3 something we have to decide. Christine's proposal is
4 to eliminate roads four and five. And I'm looking at
5 it, just throwing a little different twist to it, why
6 you would maybe want to save a portion of road five
7 and use road four as a trailhead to get to the
8 historic cultural site for visitors. I don't know,
9 you know, if we would -- I don't know if we had any
10 plans or, you know, the conservationers or anybody
11 has any plans to -- once that gets identified and is
12 up there and is an accessible part of the trail
13 system, they may want to do something up there.

14 Okay, Chris, what else have you got?

15 MS. NELSON: In my memo there are a couple other
16 roads that have similar concerns. Road number seven
17 serves --

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What is that, road number
19 seven?

20 MS. NELSON: Road number seven.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And that's depicted on your
22 IP map, Volume IV.

23 MR. TIETJEN: Down in the left corner there.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No. It's right here. It
25 traverses from the north to the south, lot 16.

1 Basically goes right through the middle of lot 16 --
2 the square 16 and 17 and it terminates at a
3 cul-de-sac in lot 18.

4 Why do they have -- what is this overlap thing
5 part of right here? You know, they're not really
6 square. They are square here, but if you to go the
7 edges is this overlapping?

8 MS. NELSON: Yes. There's overlap between every
9 sheet.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So that's the overlap area,
11 okay.

12 MS. NELSON: One of the things that's in my
13 report is that there's an existing trail system
14 throughout the property which is highlighted in the
15 light orange on the index plan for the conventional
16 subdivision. And --

17 MS. MCKEOWN: Christine, could you stop for a
18 minute, please. Thank you.

19 (Tape is changed.)

20 MS. NELSON: And road number seven serves only
21 two lots through which runs -- through which runs --

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Which lots are those,
23 Christine?

24 MS. NELSON: Lots number --

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Is this 142 and 143 would

1 you say?

2 MS. NELSON: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay, 142 and 143.

4 MS. NELSON: It's in my report, yes. Lots 142
5 and 143. So road number seven serves only two lots,
6 numbers 142 and 143, through which runs a wood road
7 identified in my report as probably appropriate for
8 intermunicipal connection as a passive recreation
9 trail. It's right on the town line with Essex.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Where are we at now?

11 MS. NELSON: Cul-de-sac number seven. Lots
12 number 142 and 143 have a trail, an existing trail
13 running through them, which is possibly eligible to
14 be incorporated as part of the trail system.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So it's running from the
16 northern cul-de-sac of road number seven, going
17 northwest and then traversing the overlap between
18 maps nine and 16 and into map number eight, in the
19 overlap of map eight and 15, and it goes into -- what
20 is this road? Do you know what road this is, the --
21 what this road is referred to?

22 MS. NELSON: I believe that's road number one.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Road number one. Okay. So
24 that's been identified.

25 MS. NELSON: So those lots were identified in my

1 report as eligible for elimination in order to
2 provide passive recreation along that trail system;
3 therefore, road number seven should be truncated at
4 this intersection.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. Where it intersects
6 the overlap on page -- I mean of square 16 and 17.
7 There's an intersection there.

8 MS. NELSON: The question is would you eliminate
9 those two lots for -- to provide passive recreation?

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Or -- is that the question?

11 MS. NELSON: It is. And then the road would
12 logically be eliminated, also. If there are no lots,
13 there's no need for a road.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You're saying that that road
15 is just there to serve those two lots --

16 MS. NELSON: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: -- which it seems excessive
18 in your opinion to put that much roadway in to serve
19 just two lots.

20 MS. NELSON: Well, if those two are going to be
21 eliminated, certainly.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. Well, 143 is on the
23 HEP (sic) list.

24 MS. NELSON: The soil type list?

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yes. But 142 has good soil.

1 It's not --

2 MS. NELSON: Would you put in a road --

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: For one lot.

4 MS. NELSON: -- for one lot?

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Good question. Or -- now,
6 that would be a -- so technically if 140 -- you could
7 actually relocate lot 142 to the south where the
8 cul-de-sac is it looks like and actually probably
9 maybe provide a private driveway and not eliminate
10 142.

11 MS. NELSON: Possibly, depending on what the
12 soils are.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, that's what I'm
14 looking at here. It's showing -- I'm looking -- lot
15 141 and 143 are on the list; the soil list. Lot 142
16 does not show up anywhere as being a nonconforming
17 lot that I can see, but everybody would have to look
18 through all the different reports.

19 MS. NELSON: We would have to look at sheet 16
20 to see what the soils are at the intersection of that
21 road.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So at this point in time I
23 would say that you eliminate lot 143 and you
24 reconfigure lot 142 with a driveway, and that would
25 be the -- that's at the northern cul-de-sac of road

1 number seven you would eliminate -- depending on the
2 soil and meeting all MABL requirements. If lot 142
3 could be built further to -- basically what you're
4 doing, you're moving lot 142 to the southeast and --
5 by utilizing some of the cul-de-sac area and then
6 building that private driveway out from the
7 intersection of overlapping area between square 16
8 and 17 where the intersection of road seven and the
9 road going out to road one, which is in square number
10 20 -- it's actually in square 16.

11 MR. TIETJEN: Sixteen?

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Um-hum.

13 MR. TIETJEN: They've already zapped that one.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No, no, not 16.

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: Square 16.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Square 16. Totally
17 different. Not lot 16. What I'm doing, Dick, here
18 is I'm using the squares on this map.

19 MR. TIETJEN: Yeah, okay. That's where I got
20 mixed up before. You're talking about squares.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So lot 142 move and resite
22 with driveway conceptually. Does anybody have
23 anything?

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: I'm just looking at the
25 Jacobson report. And there's some discussion on page

1 two about roads, eliminating road number seven and
2 terminating road six at lot 144, et cetera. So
3 that's something we are going to want to review,
4 also.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Where is it at?

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: The last paragraph.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Now we have to identify road
8 six.

9 MR. HANES: Now, that impacts on your lot 142
10 and 143, Bob.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What?

12 MR. HANES: Here's the highlight of it, and it
13 shows the roads you're looking for.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Oh, okay. Now we are
15 looking at The Preserve conceptual standard
16 subdivision which came with our --

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: Recommended lot and road
18 eliminations.

19 MR. HANES: Right.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But it came as part of a
21 supplement to this report, the Jacobson report, dated
22 January 27, 2005 from Jacobson, Goodfriend, Snarski
23 and subject to preserve summary response for planning
24 commission determination questions one and two.
25 Thank you, Stuart. I could have saved a lot of

1 energy here.

2 MR. HANES: Well, I just happened to notice it.
3 I see the homestead there, too.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So we were right about the
5 homestead. Okay. So --

6 MS. NELSON: So it was 140 -- I can't read
7 those. Is that 142 or 143?

8 MR. HANES: Yeah, that's 142 and 143.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's 142 and that's 143.

10 MS. NELSON: And 143 was recommended for
11 elimination because of soils.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It is recommended. It's on
13 the soils list, HPE soil type.

14 MS. NELSON: So maybe 142 could be accessed by a
15 driveway from road number four instead of road number
16 seven and therefore we could keep one of the two.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: One of the two. Either
18 which way we can determine that we can keep one lot,
19 that lot would remain depending on how to get to it.

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: They are suggesting lots 142
21 and 143 would be reached from road four.

22 MS. NELSON: And then I was saying that the two
23 of them --

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Which I think that's a
25 wetland, but it must be right here.

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: Higher up.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

3 MS. NELSON: I had eliminated them for another
4 reason, which is trail -- mostly through 143 but not
5 142. So between the two 142 probably could be
6 reconfigured to save the trail and be accessed by a
7 driveway and eliminate a portion of road seven.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: One forty-two we are going
9 to save and we can save trail. And just to make sure
10 everybody understands, if somebody feels strongly
11 that they think -- you know, if we get into soil
12 types -- now there's lot 143. If it could be
13 reconfigured with the removal of the road, if some of
14 you folks told me that that's possible, too, that 143
15 could remain, would be based on -- you know, have to
16 be reconfigured and the only negative of this site --
17 of that particular plan would be the HPE soil type,
18 which we have yet to determine if that alone is a
19 reason for total elimination. Okay.

20 MS. NELSON: Keep going?

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We have ten minutes.

22 MS. NELSON: Ten minutes, all right.

23 MR. HANES: You've got one more, okay.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Five minutes, because I
25 probably want to do a little summary at the end.

1 MR. HANES: What I was going to mention here is
2 that the lots that Jacobson & Associates list because
3 of the soil types, by us identifying positive
4 deductions --

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Additional.

6 MR. HANES: -- we are taking the eliminations
7 out, so it's going to change your base. So if you
8 take 40 percent of your revised base, you'll come up
9 with probably additional lots if we are going to
10 deduct, not 26. It would probably be the 24 plus the
11 three, to 27. Just a mathematical adjustment here
12 because you're changing your base.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. What do you want to
14 go over now?

15 MS. NELSON: Well, there's a couple more roads
16 or there's the whole inherent trail system if you
17 want. I could just talk about it briefly and then
18 you could look at it when you go home.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Let's do it real quick and
20 then we'll wrap it up with that and we won't make any
21 more decisions tonight.

22 MS. NELSON: So similar to the old Ingham
23 homestead there are proposed lots and associated
24 improvements which interrupt some of the trails that
25 exist. And if this were a conventional subdivision

1 that were in front of the planning commission for
2 approval, you might consider saving some of those for
3 passive recreation, not all of them. I think you
4 need to take a look at what makes sense and what
5 doesn't.

6 Maybe what you could do is take out the index
7 plan that I highlighted, if you've got that in front
8 of you, and I'll just -- I kind of -- I nicknamed
9 them a little bit. Okay. There's a trail from road
10 one near the Westbrook entrance highlighted in light
11 orange that travels south to the Old Ingham Hill
12 Road.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: There it is. It's
14 southeast.

15 MS. NELSON: From here to the old Ingham Hill
16 homestead. So that's one trail that I identified as
17 something that you would want to keep if it were a
18 proposed subdivision. There's a Woods Road from
19 what's previously been referred to as Essex west to
20 road number seven.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: How does this affect the
22 lots? Do you have --

23 MS. NELSON: I'm just orienting you to the
24 trails that are inherent in here. So it comes down.
25 And this one would affect lots 143 and 142 which we

1 spoke of a moment ago. There's a perimeter trail
2 which follows most of the CL&P easement line. And
3 the cart --

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's this.

5 MS. NELSON: And the cart path across the former
6 CL&P property which the town now owns and a Woods
7 Road loop from Essex east. There is a trailhead at
8 Wild Apple Lane.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Is that in Essex?

10 MS. NELSON: No. It's in Old Saybrook.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Way down here.

12 MS. NELSON: Can you show him where that
13 cul-de-sac hits the property line.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: Here it is. Right here.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Pheasant Hill.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: Section 60 at the southern end.

17 MS. NELSON: And that goes to the northernmost
18 tip of the town-owned property on the west. So that
19 trail travels from Wild Apple Hill all the way to --
20 this is town-owned property outlined in green.
21 There's a Woods Road from Old Ingham Hill Road --
22 wait. From Old Ingham Hill Road to the northernmost
23 tip of town-owned property on the east. This is
24 town-owned property from Old Ingham Hill Road. And
25 in my report I identified lots that would need to be

1 modified and then a series of lots that I would
2 recommend be eliminated should the commission agree
3 that those are trails that would be maintained as a
4 part of a passive recreation system.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. So I think what we've
6 got now is -- to just kind of wrap this up a little
7 bit. We have about five minutes.

8 MS. NELSON: Can I interrupt you for a second?

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Sure.

10 MS. NELSON: I should submit that highlighted
11 index plan as an exhibit since we have been
12 referencing it.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. We'll give it back to
14 you so you can hang onto it for us.

15 MS. NELSON: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Obviously, tonight we've
17 gone over this thing site by site, you know, a little
18 bit of hearing. It takes quite a bit of time. What
19 we may want to do -- you're going -- I think one of
20 the things we have to do is each of us is going to
21 have to think long and hard on the Jacobson report
22 based on soil types. How, you know -- because
23 obviously you're not going to go over one of these
24 sites and say look at them, because you're just
25 looking at a soil type. So you're going to have to

1 make the determination whether you feel that that
2 justified -- you know, many of these lots have
3 numerous hits on them that -- numerous things we
4 found wrong with them; why we would not approve them
5 as sites, building sites.

6 The thing we have to ask that the ones that
7 aren't -- normally right now what we have been doing,
8 if it has one or more sites, we say, yeah, we are
9 going to eliminate them. Even for the ones that only
10 have one thing that's wrong with them, basically bad
11 soil types, you have to make a determination, and
12 hopefully by next week, if they are going to be
13 eliminated or not. Because we can't go through each
14 one, because -- I mean you could, but it's
15 irrelevant, because they are all -- you're looking at
16 little flat pieces of paper.

17 MR. HANES: Do we actually have to identify the
18 location or can we just come up with the numbers?
19 Because we are trying to come up with a bottom line.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I would say the numbers are
21 going to come from -- what I'm envisioning here is
22 right now I'm circling which lots on the Jacobson
23 report are -- that we've kind of concurred that they
24 are not doable. They are not going to be allowed.
25 Then we have to come up with how many of these lots

1 listed in these two paragraphs because of the soil
2 types are not going to be allowed.

3 MR. HANES: But can't we use just the percentage
4 of those numbers rather than pinpointing the
5 individual lot?

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: The individual actual lots.

7 MR. HANES: So that we come up with our bottom
8 line buildable.

9 MS. NELSON: I would read Jacobson's letter of
10 December 20 so that you understand the methodology,
11 because they did use some percentages of the soil
12 types in their methodology. So there's some
13 statistical analysis of the soils based on the
14 probabilities of the buildability from the
15 percentages that are in the Middlesex County soil
16 survey which says that for a particular soil type a
17 percentage of it is buildable and a percentage of it
18 is not.

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: But that's Stuart's point, I
20 think, is that if that's in fact true on the ones
21 that --

22 MS. NELSON: But what I'm saying is that you
23 don't have to do that. You just have to agree.

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: Oh, okay.

25 MS. NELSON: The town engineer gave the benefit

1 of the doubt on all the soils data. All the soils
2 data was accounted for if it proved to be buildable,
3 suitable for building. Where there was no soils data
4 they made a statistical determination about
5 buildability based on soils data.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. What we may want to
7 do for the next meeting is invite Geoff so if anyone
8 has any questions.

9 MS. NELSON: And please read his report.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. Bone up on
11 everything and make sure -- you know, we don't want
12 to -- he may only have to be here for a slight
13 portion of it just to answer any questions on this.

14 But let me -- Stuart, so basically what you're
15 saying is my methodology, my methodology of using
16 this as a baseline and, you know, basically wiping
17 out a certain number of these lots as definites.

18 MR. HANES: Yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Then saying -- then
20 determining whether or not you agree that all these
21 lots or some of these lots should be eliminated based
22 on soil type.

23 MR. HANES: The percentage which he has
24 identified is applicable, like 40 percent of the
25 total. He's saying 40 percent of the 65. We are

1 going to come up with a different, because we've
2 already identified three that are positive
3 eliminations regardless of the soil.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I got four.

5 MR. HANES: All right. So that would adjust it
6 and we would come in with then actually more than the
7 26 lots that he comes in here.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I don't know. I don't
9 think --

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: I think you have to ask him
11 about that, too; how he takes that into account.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I would think that if he's
13 saying not have these lots, then these are the lots
14 he recommends deleting. So if we -- for some reason
15 somebody decided lot 18, 16, 17, and 21 could stay,
16 they would stay and everything else. So you would do
17 away with -- that would be the count.

18 MR. HANES: We'll look at his process here.
19 Because as I see it he's just saying that there are
20 65 of this soil type, and they came up with an
21 agreement that 40 percent of those --

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Which came to 26.

23 MR. HANES: -- typically are not buildable. But
24 he's not saying that this, that, and that aren't
25 buildable. He's just saying an assumption, that

1 40 percent.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Basically, what you're
3 saying, too, is that you could say maybe we don't
4 agree with --

5 MR. HANES: Well, we are taking part of his base
6 away, so now 40 percent of a different number is
7 going to give us 100.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. But that's not
9 necessary. We are tweaking the numbers.

10 MR. HANES: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So everybody understands
12 where we are heading. And then on top of determining
13 whether or not the elimination of soil types is which
14 ones you want to do there plus all the other things
15 in Chris's report and the Jacobson report, read those
16 fully. And then I believe we should be able to get
17 through this fairly easy on -- at the next meeting.
18 It should be whether or not we want to do this and
19 then we'll move into determine density and then go
20 from there or yield I should say. Not density but
21 yield. Okay.

22 Is there anything else anybody wants to add?

23 Motion to adjourn?

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: Do we want to set a date --

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Oh, yeah, we have to set a

1 date.

2 MS. NELSON: You can put that in your motion to
3 adjourn.

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: That's true.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I think based on the amount
6 of time that this does take, that I don't think we
7 should -- not until we get a little bit more
8 comfortable with it to -- I think we should -- we may
9 want to add it to our -- depending how big our agenda
10 is -- it's not doable, okay. That takes that out of
11 the picture. It seems like every other Wednesday
12 seems to be working.

13 MR. HANES: It looks like we better stick to it.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The next scheduled meeting
15 would be then the 9th, which is Ash Wednesday.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: And Chinese New Year.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And Chinese New Year. Does
18 anyone have a problem with Wednesday, the 9th, at
19 7:30 at this location, at the town hall?

20 MR. TIETJEN: Here?

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Town hall conference room.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: Here.

23 MR. HANES: Here.

24 MR. TIETJEN: This is it, right, or is it the
25 one across the way?

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No. This one right here.

2 MR. TIETJEN: This is it.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Can somebody make a motion.

4 MR. HANES: I'll make a motion that we adjourn

5 this meeting and continue our discussion regarding --

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Deliberation.

7 MR. HANES: -- deliberation until the next

8 special meeting which would be two weeks from

9 tonight, on --

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: February 9.

11 MR. HANES: -- February 9 at 7:30 p.m. in the

12 first floor conference room at the Town Hall, Old

13 Saybrook.

14 MS. NELSON: 302 Main Street.

15 MR. HANES: 302 Main Street.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Can I get a second.

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: I'll second the motion.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Discussion? Hearing none

19 all in favor.

20 (Affirmative response given by all.)

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Opposed.

22 (No response)

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

24 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at

25 11:08 p.m.)

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 1-159 are a true and accurate transcription of my steno notes taken at the Public Hearing held by the Old Saybrook Planning Commission on the 26th day of January, 2005, at the Old Saybrook City Hall, 302 Main Street, Old Saybrook, Connecticut, in the matter filed In Re: The Preserve Special Exception for Open Space Subdivision.

Certified this 29th day of April, 2005.

Debrah Veroni, RPR, LSR

