

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

OLD SAYBROOK PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATION

THE PRESERVE SPECIAL EXCEPTION
FOR OPEN SPACE SUBDIVISION

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

OLD SAYBROOK CITY HALL
302 MAIN STREET
OLD SAYBROOK, CONNECTICUT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ROBERT MCINTYRE, CHAIRMAN
JUDITH GALLICCHIO, VICE CHAIRMAN
H. STUART HANES, SECRETARY
RICHARD TIETJEN, REGULAR MEMBER
JANIS ESTY, ALTERNATE MEMBER, SEATED FOR KATHLEEN SMITH

ATTENDING STAFF:

WENDY GOODFRIEND, NATURAL RESOURCE SCIENTIST
RICHARD SNARSKI, SOIL SCIENTIST
GEOFFREY JACOBSON, TOWN ENGINEER
ANDREA DEDOMINICIS, RECORDING CLERK

MARK BRANSE, LEGAL COUNSEL

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It's a little bit after
2 7:30. I would like to call the meeting to order.
3 Wednesday, February 23rd, first floor conference
4 room, 302 Main Street, Old Saybrook. Call to
5 order -- roll call. I just accomplished roll call.
6 We have one, two, three, four, five voting members.
7 For the record Christine Nelson is absent. She may
8 come in a little bit later or she may not show up.
9 She wasn't feeling well.

10 Old business, A Preserve Special Exception for
11 Open Space Subdivision, 934 acres total and open
12 space of 542 acres -- .2 acres. Ingham Hill Road and
13 Bokum Road, Map 55, 56, and 61; Lots 6, 3, 15, 17,
14 18. Residence Conservation C District, Aquifer
15 Protection Area. Applicant: River Sound
16 Development, LLC. Agent: Robert A. Landino, P.E.
17 Action: Deliberate and act by 3-16 regular meeting.
18 No later than 3-17. Okay.

19 Where we left off last time --

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: Did you want to seat Janis?

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Janis needs to be seated for
22 I guess Kathleen Smith.

23 I'd just like to just summarize where we left
24 off last week. We came up with a yield of 221
25 houses, so that left us with a few more questions to

1 answer. The three questions remaining, one, two,
2 three, four, are once yield plan numbers are
3 determined, should the proposed preliminary plan be
4 approved as submitted or should it then be
5 modified/conditioned or -- and approved?

6 The next question: If we go -- if
7 modification/conditions, in what way?

8 And then we'll move into is the open space
9 subdivision as proposed by the applicant, i.e., golf
10 course, road patterns reasonably likely to
11 unreasonably impair, pollute, or destroy the public
12 trust in the air, water, or other natural resources
13 of the state as compared to a conventional
14 subdivision?

15 Are there feasible and prudent alternatives that
16 would reduce and eliminate any unreasonable adverse
17 impacts that are found to exist?

18 So that's -- basically, we have two more
19 meetings that we would normally schedule to make the
20 determinations here. I think it should go a little
21 bit easier, because we don't have to figure
22 calculations or anything. But what I would like to
23 do before we move into getting into this is check
24 with staff, see if they have any input that they
25 would like to -- that we requested last week or at

1 the last meeting and see what they have. Mark.

2 MR. BRANSE: Before we get into the -- for the
3 record, Mark Branse. I understand from Christine
4 Nelson that, first of all, there have been some
5 newspaper articles about The Preserve. I guess
6 there's been some ads in the newspaper from
7 proponents and opponents. I also know, just because
8 I know what local zoning is like, that people don't
9 understand when a public hearing is closed, and they
10 have the natural propensity to want to mail you
11 things or call you or stop you in the supermarket and
12 give you their opinion. And I just want to remind
13 you that you really can't stop people from doing
14 that; you often can't help reading the paper, but you
15 cannot consider anything of that kind that you may
16 have seen or heard since the public hearing closed.

17 In that regard there is a report that was
18 submitted to you tonight that I have reviewed that I
19 am not going to give you. It is way too late and
20 really could have and should have come in during the
21 public hearing. And I don't want it to -- I believe
22 it would clearly prejudice any decision that you made
23 to the -- that would be an injustice to the parties,
24 to all the parties.

25 I'm going to ask each of you -- each of the

1 voting members to just state for the record whether
2 you're prepared to continue your deliberations and
3 ultimately vote without respect to any of these kinds
4 of articles or conversations and materials that you
5 may have received. And of course if you've heard
6 something you cannot disregard, then you have an
7 obligation to excuse yourself. Start at one end.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: I have nothing that would keep
9 me from rendering a decision on this application.

10 MR. BRANSE: Anything that would bias you --

11 MS. GALLICCHIO: Anything that would bias me.

12 MR. BRANSE: -- or any ex parte communication.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I have no ex parte
15 communications that would bias myself, so I feel I
16 can vote on this fairly.

17 MR. HANES: I have heard nothing that would bias
18 me in my deliberation.

19 MR. TIETJEN: I haven't heard anything since the
20 public hearing was closed, but I certainly -- I hear
21 stuff from the outside about what do you do; what do
22 we do and so on. So I have to confess that I have
23 explained to people that we have -- in effect we have
24 blinders on. We are to choose a plan and then see it
25 through when it's over. Not everybody gets that and

1 they still want to lean on me. So I'm aware of what
2 you're talking about, and I have certainly been
3 exposed to it, and I have told them lay off.

4 MR. BRANSE: It's the right thing to do.

5 MR. TIETJEN: Another thing. So you can kick me
6 out if you want to. But the phone rang tonight as I
7 was getting my act together and somebody -- my wife
8 took the call. And somebody called about a posse
9 going up to the legislature on what, Friday. And
10 I -- of course I'm not even slightly interested in
11 that. Now, whether my wife goes or not is another
12 problem, and there is a division of opinion about
13 that. I'm not planning to go. I have no intention
14 of going up there, and I doubt even if I did go I
15 would hear anything that I hadn't heard before. So
16 that's me. I'm sorry to be so wordy about it, but
17 this has been bothering me for a long time. You go
18 to the supermarket and, you know, how's it going and
19 that kind of stuff.

20 So anyway, well, they don't know where I stand
21 on this and they may be surprised, but that's their
22 problem, not mine.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Fair enough.

24 MR. TIETJEN: Is that all right?

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's fine.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Janis.

2 MS. ESTY: I have not heard or read anything
3 that would bias my opinion, but I have to admit that
4 my family members or members of my family this
5 evening told me there was a trip to Hartford, and it
6 is unclear whether they will partake of it or not.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: As long as each of you can
8 disregard whatever the opinions of family and friends
9 may be, that is what matters.

10 MS. ESTY: Yes.

11 MR. BRANSE: You both had indicated in the
12 affirmative.

13 MR. TIETJEN: I doubt there'll be anything new,
14 anything we haven't heard.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Anything else you need to
16 discuss, Mark?

17 MR. BRANSE: No. That's it. The only other
18 thing is somewhere in all of this -- and I don't know
19 which of these -- in my letter of January 25th - I
20 think I grouped it under item -- under item one - I
21 asked if the application was complete. And there's
22 some issues that are there. There are several of
23 them. And they also came up, again, I think under
24 number four regarding access to Bokum Road and access
25 to 153. And where you address those isn't as

1 important, as long as somehow before you finish you
2 talk about those topics.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. I plan -- I think
4 there's -- I've got an outline here for the questions
5 that I read off at the beginning of the meeting.
6 Number five I think is where it talks about roadways
7 and things of that nature.

8 MR. BRANSE: That's fine.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We'll get into it there.

10 Rich, do you have anything that you wanted to --
11 that we asked or that we forgot we asked you that you
12 want to --

13 MR. SNARSKI: No. From the last meeting?

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yes.

15 MR. SNARSKI: No.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Geoff, nothing?

17 MR. JACOBSON: Nothing.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right now we have no other
19 staff reports. Is there anyone on the commission who
20 feels that we were due a staff report and we have not
21 received it yet or, you know, some sort of staff
22 guidance? Is everyone comfortable?

23 MR. HANES: One question I have. I'm under the
24 impression that the alternative road standards were
25 approved by the selectmen. Did I hear something to

1 that effect?

2 MR. JACOBSON: Not that I'm aware of. There was
3 a meeting last -- when was that? It was last week.
4 Last Monday I believe in which the board of selectmen
5 discussed the alternative road standards. The
6 applicant made a presentation to the board of
7 selectmen. And the way it was left was that
8 Christine and Mike Pace were going to basically write
9 down what was discussed at the meeting and kind of
10 put it into a written format that the board could
11 later take action on. I'm not aware of anything new
12 since that.

13 MR. BRANSE: I spoke with Christine yesterday,
14 and she said that they have not acted at this time.
15 Have not acted. And one of the questions that I
16 guess I may have to face ultimately is if they do
17 act, I'm not sure whether that is too late to reach
18 you again or not, even though it's another town
19 agency. It is extremely substantive.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Let me ask you this, Mark.
21 In reality we are looking at this -- the proposed
22 open space subdivision. When we look at the roads,
23 whether we go with town road standards or, you know,
24 the road standards -- well, I guess there's
25 subdivision road standards and then there's the

1 alternative road thing. It really doesn't matter,
2 because the ultimate decision about how the roads are
3 built is at the discretion of the selectmen. It
4 would be further on into the main deliberation
5 period.

6 Basically, what we'll be looking at is do we
7 agree that the way in which the roads run and go back
8 and forth or how they are, what we would like to see
9 saved. There's one road that we'd like to see
10 changed from a private road to a public road. Things
11 of that nature are more substantive than the fact of
12 how wide is this road really going to be. We could
13 say we would like it built -- even if we said right
14 now here at this meeting, if we said we wanted to
15 build that road to subdivision road standards, once
16 you got into the other -- into the main application
17 six months down the road possibly, that the selectmen
18 could bring those alternative road standards to bear
19 after that and during that time period.

20 MR. BRANSE: That's correct. And in one of his
21 reports Mr. Hillson indicated to you that what was
22 being considered by the board of selectmen - and,
23 Geoff, chime in on this if I misspeak on anything -
24 would change the grading of what you're seeing in
25 some substantive ways. The problem is that you

1 haven't seen that. And you're right, the grading may
2 or may not be substantial enough of a change to
3 change how you feel about the road pattern at this
4 stage, and it may be a problem at the subdivision
5 stage. It may be that if the board of selectmen
6 approve alternative road specifications, depending
7 what they approve, and if the applicant revises their
8 plans accordingly, it is possible that you won't like
9 what you see, in which case you won't approve it.
10 But those sorts of detailed grading plans would
11 typically occur at the subdivision stage anyway.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And that brings another
13 issue. We came up with a yield of 221 lots. Now,
14 what we are going to look at tonight is an open space
15 subdivision. We are looking at the open space
16 subdivision now, because we have gotten past the
17 conventional. So all those lots may or may not -- as
18 we see them on the open space subdivision, may or may
19 not be buildable until we get in there and do the
20 fine tuning of it. So then again -- I mean you
21 may -- I'm going to just pick lots out of my head.
22 We may find right now we are looking at and we say,
23 okay, we want to do some things here and there, but
24 then when you get to the main application months down
25 the road, you may find that that lot isn't buildable

1 or you find some lots that aren't buildable. And
2 then it would be I guess up to the applicant's
3 discretion in conjunction with the board on where --
4 because they have other land that might be more
5 suitable for building that didn't show up on this
6 subdivision application now where a house could
7 actually go.

8 MR. BRANSE: Well, that's true. And for
9 example, what's been proposed to you involves three
10 different types of dwelling units. The plan that has
11 been presented to you has some high density village
12 housing that's really multifamily; it has small lot
13 housing and then it has what they call the mini
14 estate housing. The large lot zoning, large lot --
15 large parcel, large square footage lots. Excuse me.
16 Make that sound right. And the applicant may,
17 depending on all sorts of factors, shift between
18 them. So, for example, they may reduce the number of
19 large lot lots and make them multifamily or vice
20 versa, depending on their sewer, their water, their
21 road pattern, all those other kinds of things. So
22 you're right. There's a lot of variables that could
23 happen there.

24 MR. TIETJEN: Without changing the yield or --

25 MR. BRANSE: That's right.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The yield would never
2 change.

3 MR. BRANSE: They may find they can't reach 221,
4 but all I'm saying is they may also reallocate among
5 the 221 what kind of unit they are based on soil and
6 other factors.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So the only given right now
8 is that we have come up with 221, and that's the
9 maximum yield that they are going to be able to get
10 with this application.

11 MR. BRANSE: Right.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. Question number three
13 that we are on right now is once the yield plan
14 numbers are determined, should the proposed
15 preliminary plan be approved as submitted or should
16 we modify/condition and approve?

17 There's a couple of things that everyone should
18 be looking at. How does everybody -- you know, we
19 have the issue of the golf course. We have the issue
20 of the roads. We also discussed at the last meeting
21 that we kind of laid the framework to say, okay, if
22 we look at the open space subdivision and where the
23 houses are laid out right now, do we have any real
24 problems with where they are laid out right now?

25 This is the time to kind of suggest that we

1 would like to see them in different locations if
2 possible. It doesn't mean they have to be. I mean
3 this is all just things that we should discuss and
4 everybody should be thinking about so that we can
5 come to consensus and then some sort of formalized
6 vote tonight as we get through each one of these
7 steps so we can wrap this up.

8 Right now we have two scheduled meetings,
9 tonight and two weeks from tonight, which would be
10 right -- because on the 16th is our regular meeting.
11 So we need to kind of stay on track and focus tonight
12 on what we want to talk about.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: Can I ask a quick question of
14 Mr. Branse?

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Sure.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: On number three is there, as
17 the CFE noted, also the possibility of denying
18 outright?

19 MR. BRANSE: Yes, yes. You could decide -- I
20 always call this the to fix or not to fix dilemma.
21 When you review the plan, you may be able to identify
22 particular things that you want modified in it. But
23 if you find that the things you want changed are too
24 difficult to envision what they would really look
25 like when they were implemented or if they are too

1 numerous or if you think they are too substantive,
2 you may simply deny this plan. And I would suggest
3 that you articulate why so that the applicant has
4 guidance as to how they need to change that plan.
5 But yes. And that does happen where you just can't
6 get enough of a handle on those changes, that you
7 just can't formulate specific change this, change
8 that, change that, and you just feel you can't
9 articulate that well enough.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: And my other thing is it was my
11 understanding last time that we were going to start
12 with conservation issues or would you prefer that we
13 go in another direction?

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I think the biggest issue we
15 have here, our biggest hurdle is going to be the golf
16 course, which involves the conservation issues at
17 hand and probably 60 to 70 percent of the
18 development. We need to come to some kind of
19 conclusion amongst all of us on -- and that question
20 here of -- where it asks is the open space
21 subdivision as proposed by the applicant reasonably
22 likely to unreasonably impair, pollute, or destroy
23 the public trust in air, water, or natural resources
24 of the state as compared to a conventional
25 subdivision? And if you notice that's the question.

1 It's not whether or not there's any building. If
2 there was a conventional subdivision to be there, is
3 this a better subdivision -- is it less likely to
4 pollute or do those things than a conventional
5 subdivision? That's the question before us.

6 MR. BRANSE: Or by comparison to some other open
7 space plan. So it's a comparison to conventional or
8 some other open space. If you think that this plan
9 can be modified -- first of all, if you think there
10 are aspects of this plan that are reasonably likely
11 to unreasonably impair, pollute, or destroy the
12 natural resources and so on, if you reach that
13 conclusion, then the question will be are there ways
14 you can change this plan to address them? So you've
15 really got three. How does it compare with
16 conventional? How does it compare with changes that
17 you might want to see in it?

18 And really, you asked if you should start with
19 natural resources issues. Those seem to be central
20 to those types of questions. And you've got those
21 three people here tonight, so certainly it's a good
22 time to be talking about that.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. I guess I'll kick
24 things off. Does everybody agree they would like to
25 discuss the golf course first?

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: That's fine.

2 MR. HANES: Yes.

3 MR. TIETJEN: Pardon?

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Discuss the golf course
5 first.

6 MR. TIETJEN: Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. I'll just jump in
8 here to get the dialogue started myself, and that of
9 an open space subdivision and a conventional mode and
10 any other open space subdivision with a golf course
11 in it. I feel that the testimony that was given to
12 us during the public hearing has me to believe that
13 because of the controls of the program, the pesticide
14 programs and all those programs of that nature, that
15 the golf course as proposed on this application would
16 not be any more detrimental to the natural resources
17 than that of a conventional subdivision, if that
18 conventional subdivision was built within the same
19 area as the golf course.

20 And the reason I say this is that I believe that
21 an organizational -- one organization that's in
22 control of that much land is much easier to control
23 and make sure that things are done correctly than to,
24 say, 25, maybe 30, 40 homeowners who have houses
25 plotted out right next to these same resources. We

1 do see a lot of problems within our own town of, you
2 know, pollution and things and violations of this and
3 violations of that, you know, when it comes to
4 natural resources, be it vernal pools or, you know,
5 invasion into wetlands. So that's my reasoning why I
6 feel that the golf course would be -- it would be
7 good. It's an allowable use. It doesn't meet --
8 right now as I look at it I don't see -- during the
9 testimony we were given -- told that everything will
10 be done within the regulations of the Inland Wetlands
11 Commission, which I happen to be a member and I know
12 they are a very good organization and they'll do a
13 good job once this program -- if this application is
14 brought before them. We have a very good board over
15 there that will do a good job to ensure that
16 everything is met to make sure that everything is
17 safely maintained and run according to the -- I guess
18 the best science of today for golf course management.

19 We did hear a lot of testimony saying there
20 was -- you know, golf courses pollute, but then we
21 heard that, you know, where is the scientific
22 evidence? I don't think we were ever presented any,
23 in my belief -- that we were ever presented any firm,
24 concrete evidence that if you have a golf course,
25 you're going to have groundwater pollution from that

1 golf course. What I did hear is that there's been a
2 lot of -- there was a lot of speculation made about
3 golf courses polluting.

4 I'll use the typical example. During the public
5 hearing was Long Island, and then we heard testimony
6 and never got any -- but there was never any
7 concrete -- it was news articles and we had that one
8 scientist - I forget his name - who had worked down
9 there and represented that -- stated that they never
10 came to a conclusion that those golf courses actually
11 did in fact pollute the water in Long Island. So
12 that's my reasoning and that's why I say I would like
13 to see the golf course along with -- incorporated
14 into this subdivision. I think it would be a plus
15 for Old Saybrook. And I will leave it open to anyone
16 else who wants to talk about it.

17 MR. HANES: I'll comment about the golf course.
18 I have no objection to per se a golf course. I do
19 feel that our scientists have stated in a number of
20 areas there that it conflicts with some of our vernal
21 pools. And I think there might have to be some
22 rearrangement of certain holes on the golf course to
23 rectify that situation. I agree with you that the
24 evidence that we heard about pollution on Long Island
25 was not substantiated, because it was further stated

1 that the pollution that did occur there could have
2 been created by prior years of farming with the
3 potato farmers there on Long Island. So I don't
4 think that was conclusive evidence that the golf
5 course had polluted the water in those particular
6 communities. But I do feel that we may have certain
7 areas that the golf course might have to be changed,
8 the design of it, the actual holes. That's what I
9 think.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Can I just ask you a
11 question, Stuart?

12 MR. HANES: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: When you say it might have
14 to be changed, now, are you saying that -- is that an
15 action that you believe should be undertaken by the
16 Inland Wetlands Commission when it's brought to them
17 or is that -- I myself personally don't see how we --
18 the regulations that these things are based on -- you
19 know, how vernal pools are protected are by state
20 statute. They say that within 100 feet of a vernal
21 pool you can't have any, you know, any building. You
22 can't go into a vernal pool, whereas -- and if
23 anybody here, my staff here thinks that that's wrong,
24 please speak up.

25 MS. GOODFRIEND: Are you suggesting that by

1 statute there's a 100-foot no build offset for a
2 vernal pool?

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No. There's a
4 nondisturbance area if it's within 50 feet of a
5 vernal pool.

6 MR. SNARSKI: There's no law that says you
7 can't.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What?

9 MR. SNARSKI: There's no statute that you can't
10 fill -- even fill a vernal pool.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. You could
12 technically fill a vernal pool.

13 MR. SNARSKI: Right. You could if you got a
14 permit from the wetlands.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That could happen.

16 MR. SNARSKI: Right.

17 MR. BRANSE: There's no statute on it. And the
18 only thing I would correct you on is that the
19 wetlands commission has its jurisdiction to be sure
20 and its powers, whatever they may be, but as part of
21 your review of this plan, your regulations require
22 that you examine whether the application furthers the
23 conservation goals that are articulated in your
24 regulation. So although it is not within your
25 authority to review particular wetlands impacts as a

1 planning commission - just as you look at road
2 pattern; just as you look at desirable land uses in
3 general; just as you look at all the other planning
4 aspects of this design - one of the things I believe
5 you can look at is environmental impact, which
6 includes vernal pools or wetlands in general. So
7 if -- as Mr. Hanes said if you feel the particular
8 elements of this plan need to be rearranged or
9 altered in some way to achieve articulated
10 conservation goals, I think that's something you're
11 empowered to do if you wish.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. Thank you, Mark.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: I agree with Stuart that the
14 concept of a golf course is okay. However, in this
15 situation I think we need to give protection to the
16 Pequot Swamp more than is indicated on the plan that
17 we have before us. I think that the golf course
18 holes, a number of them would have to be
19 reconfigured. And I don't know if it's something
20 that is doable or not, not being a golf course
21 expert, obviously. I have made that pretty clear, I
22 think. But there are certain things conservationwise
23 that we do need to protect.

24 And I think even in the inland wetlands report
25 that we got dated October 29 talks about minimization

1 of disturbance in the 750-foot vernal pool envelope,
2 less than 25 percent of the area. And I think in
3 some of these cases that is not met. Provision of
4 increased wetland buffers and open space, providing
5 habitat and migration, species of -- in areas of
6 species of special concern and rare vegetation,
7 et cetera, some of those things have been met. But I
8 think we need to look really carefully at
9 conservation issues. This is a Conservation C
10 District. That's what needs to drive this. The idea
11 of a golf course in itself I don't have difficulties
12 with, if it can be done in a way that does not
13 infringe on the vernal pool and wetland areas, and
14 also -- and it protects them, and also that isn't as
15 fragmented in terms of open space.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Dick, do you have anything
17 you want to add?

18 MR. TIETJEN: Ladies first.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Janis.

20 MS. ESTY: I was concerned about the golf
21 course. I'm not opposed to golf courses per se. I
22 want to say that. But the golf course seemed to
23 traverse just about every wetland area and vernal
24 pool area, and I was concerned with the fragmentation
25 of those areas. And if some of this could be

1 somewhat rearranged; the part down by Pequot Swamp
2 and over even by the Red Maple Swamp where that
3 wetland -- it's not labeled here what exactly it's
4 called, but it says Red Maple Swamp.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Which map are you reading
6 off of, Janis:

7 MS. ESTY: Oh, I'm sorry. Preserve Preliminary
8 Open Space Subdivision Plan, Graphic Plate Number
9 Two.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's the same one I have
11 in front of me. Where are you pointing to on the
12 map?

13 MS. ESTY: To the right side, vernal pool -- I
14 guess vernal pool 18.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Eighteen, okay. That
16 highlighted, colored area.

17 MS. ESTY: Right. And in the center, vernal
18 pool 12. I don't know how you would identify it
19 unless I point to it. That one where you see the
20 golf course by Pequot Swamp.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. And that would be --
22 I guess that's hole number six.

23 MS. ESTY: Twelve, 13, 11, if I'm reading them
24 right, 14. Am I reading the wrong --

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You're on the wrong -- yeah.

1 That's the front nine, which I think is --

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, she's doing Pequot.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Oh, you're over here now.

4 You're over on the other side now.

5 MS. ESTY: I was over here and moved to this one
6 here.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Sorry.

8 MS. ESTY: There was just two areas that I was
9 particularly concerned with. And I understand the
10 tactical aspect of how they were applying pesticides,
11 but I was just -- just around it I was particularly
12 concerned.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. Dick.

14 MR. TIETJEN: Well, you probably all know that I
15 have a bias against golf courses as a social and
16 economic factor. And I'm not sure that that's
17 anything we have much to say about. We have been
18 informed indirectly, I think, that if we don't put
19 the golf course there, something else will go in
20 there. And I think -- I agree with you that the golf
21 course would be less problematic than a subdivision
22 in the same area. But I don't know about the whole
23 area, but I certainly agree that the area right along
24 the Pequot Swamp is crucial and we shouldn't mess
25 with it there. It's too close. There's the sharp

1 declivity to the east in the presence of that village
2 up there and so forth. It looks like a very bad
3 spot. It's too close to civilization as it were.

4 We talked about this once before, and they gave
5 me an answer which was I thought a little bit dusty,
6 about the danger of golf balls flying in the wrong
7 direction and so on. It's a very narrow piece. And
8 at the same time such a very narrow piece is bound to
9 have I think some effect on the swamp. And you may
10 not like swamps, but it's there. It's a major
11 natural resource, and we cannot mess with it. It's
12 just ridiculous. Somebody intends to, I'm sure.

13 So I think there's a case where the possibility
14 of pollution is serious and also potentially other
15 constructor's factors. So if you could keep the golf
16 course away from the swamp, then I probably wouldn't
17 object to it. But the -- and the thing is -- as the
18 chairman said about the difference between a
19 subdivision and a golf course I think is a
20 significant factor.

21 Now, what else happens? Well, I suppose the
22 golf course will go somewhere else, right, if it was
23 removed from this particular juxtaposition with the
24 swamp? And I guess we have to think about that, if
25 we are going to keep the golf course.

1 The other alternative of course is no golf
2 course. And as I said we have been pretty well
3 brainwashed or something about what would happen if
4 there were none. So there is an economic argument.
5 And I guess we have to face that somehow, because the
6 economic argument would probably lead to subdivisions
7 subpar, which could be even more threatening. I'm
8 thinking about the whole golf course now, not just
9 the part along the swamps.

10 In mulling this over I don't know much about the
11 procedures in these cases, but I know there is one
12 trick that you can pull, and that is to deny an
13 application without prejudice and let them come back,
14 knowing what our limit -- what limitations we would
15 put on this plan would be, then they could come back
16 with an alternative. But I guess we don't have to do
17 that if what you say is true. That is, if they would
18 modify it according to our reasoned appeals.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Did you kind of ask me a
20 question there?

21 MR. TIETJEN: Yeah, yeah.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I would think that with the
23 application as proposed, the -- you know, basically,
24 they put all the houses up on the highlands and then
25 they brought all the golf courses into the lowlands

1 there. And that was one -- and I addressed this
2 during the public hearing and I think the applicant
3 did, that if the golf course would be to move -- you
4 moved the golf course to any other location, then
5 where would you move it to and what would you do with
6 the houses? I mean would you put it where the houses
7 go now and then move the houses into where the golf
8 courses go or, you know, it's that kind of a
9 question.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, one possibility.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. Go ahead. Let's
12 have a little bit of a discussion.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, one possibility is for
14 the applicant to do away with the estate lots and
15 make smaller lots in this area and use an area where
16 there are houses for part of the golf course. Now,
17 as I say I don't know if it's doable, but that's an
18 alternative that the applicant would have. I don't
19 think it necessarily follows that if an area -- if we
20 are concerned about protecting a specific area such
21 as the Pequot Swamp and the environs, that we would
22 then permit in a Conservation C District an
23 application to come before us that has a significant
24 amount of homes in that same area as the golf course
25 was.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: I think we would follow the
3 same logic.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Logic, okay.

5 MR. TIETJEN: A lot of things being equal as far
6 as the effect that the substitution would have on
7 another area, that is, putting houses, a lot of
8 houses probably in another part of this piece of
9 land, that we would have to study that, too, I think,
10 right?

11 MS. GALLICCHIO: Absolutely.

12 MR. TIETJEN: You can't just put them there and
13 say, well, there they are and throw them out.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right.

15 MR. TIETJEN: Cast them like pebbles.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So basically -- and Mark,
17 you can jump in any time once I lay this out on the
18 table. If -- I believe if we start eliminating major
19 lots and doing away -- coming up with some major
20 modifications, major modifications to that plan, that
21 the problem being that we would be faced with the
22 dilemma of we really don't know what impact that
23 those modifications would really have.

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So in turn, you're kind of

1 left with not being able to make a decision on this.
2 Because we are here to make a decision on this plan
3 here, looking at this plan. And as Mark said
4 earlier, you know, if you get to the point where the
5 number of modifications that we want to make to a
6 plan doesn't seem doable and then we get to that
7 point where we say, no, we don't feel this is the
8 right subdivision for a Conservation C District.

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: I think it's real hard to go
10 point by point, because I think we have to look at
11 the whole picture. And I think it will be important
12 to hear what the other commission members think about
13 other issues as well, because we could say -- let me
14 just throw this off the top of my head. We could say
15 golf course is okay if holes are reconfigured in
16 areas where we have concern. We want to have a
17 roadway that is a public roadway that goes from this
18 area to this area, with this -- entrances in this
19 area, this area, and this area. That's the kind of
20 thing I'm thinking of. Then we can look at it and
21 say, okay, are those things -- and maybe there's some
22 other things as well.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: For safety, in terms of golf
25 course, maybe there are certain areas where there

1 shouldn't be houses so close or we want to make sure
2 that when the cart paths are determined, that they
3 need to go around trees, not make a straight cutaway.
4 But I'm saying I don't know if we can at this point
5 say that modifications would be too substantive in
6 order to make them --

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: At this point, yes.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- you know, until we have more
9 discussion among the commission members.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. And I think, Judy,
11 when you say -- just to stay on the golf course
12 portion of it, when you say -- and right now you
13 basically said around the Pequot Swamp.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: That's my biggest concern.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right, right. What I would
16 say if we get into a modification there that you
17 wanted to present -- right now there's 100-foot
18 buffer. So to have some substance to what we say,
19 now are you looking for a 200-foot buffer or
20 something in between? What are you looking for?

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, we have a golf course
22 hole that goes over the swamp. I think that's
23 ridiculous. This hole number 11 -- no. I'm sorry.

24 MR. TIETJEN: You mean the wetlands down
25 farther.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right there.

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yeah.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: This is it. And you tee off
4 here. And we are talking about hole number 12.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: Number 12, number 11, and
6 number 13.

7 MS. ESTY: Thirteen, 14.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: I think it's a real problem.

9 MS. ESTY: You've lowered your density to 221
10 houses.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

12 MS. ESTY: So there may be room for this golf
13 course to be reconfigured eventually somewhere.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah.

15 MS. ESTY: Because we don't know where those --
16 can we say where we want the reduction to occur so
17 that you could move things?

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I think we could suggest a
19 modification where they would go.

20 MR. BRANSE: Absolutely.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Like you say if you're
22 looking at the entrance over here, I'm looking at the
23 map, graphic plate number two, Road C I believe it
24 is. It's that little cluster to the -- this would be
25 the west of the village. You see the next cluster

1 over. Everybody see that? If you were to -- one,
2 two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten,
3 eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, sixteen,
4 seventeen, eighteen, nineteen. There's 19 homes
5 there or sites there. And if you were to shift some
6 of the golf course over to that area, you might be
7 able to move it out.

8 MS. ESTY: Where is your road? I see A, B.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: C.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: J.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: C.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: C, okay.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You might be able to shift
14 some of that. I mean you could, not might. You
15 could shift it. And I don't see as much -- and I
16 would have to ask staff, being that they've done a
17 little bit more looking at it there, by moving the
18 golf course say to the west, in that particular area,
19 are there other things that we are going to bump into
20 that we just don't see on the map?

21 MS. GOODFRIEND: Which holes are you referring
22 to?

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Fourteen -- 14, 11.

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: Eleven is the one that I was
25 speaking of.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay, 11.

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: That's the one that I said it
3 goes right over the Pequot Swamp Pond.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Where?

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right here.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Oh, right here.

7 MR. HANES: The tees are on one side.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: This map I can see better on.
9 I'm looking at Open Space Subdivision Master Plan
10 Sheet, S.B.A., Volume II, revised December 23rd.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So basically, if we said
12 something along the lines of reconfigure golf course
13 by moving -- making hole 11 not pass over the Pequot
14 Swamp by possibly eliminating some of the sites,
15 moving that portion of the golf course further to the
16 west by eliminating some of those home sites, that's
17 kind of a generalized statement that the developer --
18 or the applicant could use to understand what we are
19 trying to ask him to do. Because I mean that's the
20 key. Anything that we come up with, it's got to be
21 something that he can understand what we are asking
22 him, the applicant, to do.

23 MR. HANES: But we don't have to pinpoint where
24 he would make the change. He could come back in and
25 make wherever he sees an open area that would not

1 impact the swamp.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. Then you get into
3 issues of open space, contiguous open space,
4 roadways. Judy was trying to say as we shift this
5 stuff around, you know -- when you get on that
6 contiguous open space, my understanding -- I guess
7 I'll just go one step further here. My
8 understanding, you know, to add into the building
9 block here, that when we looked at this conventional
10 subdivision, there is none. There was no contiguous
11 open space at all. What the developer here I believe
12 has tried to do is place his development within this
13 land parcel to give -- and by using his scientists
14 and everything, to give us the best possible open
15 space, meaningful open space that's as contiguous as
16 possible. Because I find that -- and I find that
17 when we move everything -- keep moving everything --
18 you know, you're never going to have total contiguous
19 open space. And I guess everybody has to come to a
20 conclusion where they are at with that, you know,
21 because that's another part. If you move the golf
22 course over here, you may have more open space over
23 here, but then you're cutting things off over here.

24 MR. TIETJEN: Also, another consideration which
25 I was going to get to but very briefly, and that is

1 no matter what we do, the chances are we are going to
2 be cutting a lot of trees down. Now, this is one of
3 the reservations that I have about having a golf
4 course in the first place is the disturbance. It
5 isn't just cutting trees, but that's the part that
6 everybody would notice. So this is a caution that
7 I'm imposing on myself in fact. I want something
8 done to improve on the -- this problem next to the
9 swamp, but I also don't want this to lead to
10 destruction of good woodland and so on.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, I think any
12 development involves the removal of large, you
13 know -- of this size would involve removing a large
14 number of trees. Would it be more or less than with
15 a conventional subdivision, you know, that's what we
16 are looking at, or is this a better layout? You
17 know, we are looking to preserve -- we are going to
18 preserve probably more open space in this parcel than
19 we pretty much have in -- I know in any other
20 subdivision we have ever done.

21 THE CLERK: Wait.

22 MR. BRANSE: Tape change.

23 (Tape is changed.)

24 MR. TIETJEN: I think we are all in agreement on
25 that.

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: But that's the reason that we
2 now have a Conservation C District is because we saw
3 that in the northern part of the town. And when we
4 discussed it with the planning commission, we weren't
5 just talking about this parcel. We were talking
6 about other large parcels as well that we could see
7 that we need to be more conservation oriented.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And that was any parcel over
9 50 acres.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right. And so I think to say
11 that this has contiguous open space or some but a
12 traditional development would have less, yeah, but I
13 think it's obvious that we wouldn't accept a
14 traditional subdivision in this kind of an area.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. But I think the
16 problem that we have to wrestle with is that they put
17 the houses and things of that nature where they could
18 better be suited for development.

19 Now, if you start -- where do you want to --
20 where do people want to move things to or change on
21 this plan? Is there anything like the roads, because
22 as soon as we move -- you know, other than when we
23 get into roads -- now we are looking at the roads.
24 If you move this here, what do you do with these
25 roads?

1 Now, as far as the roads go, I have concerns.
2 Can we move on to roads a little bit to -- just to
3 throw it into the mix?

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: You're the boss.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I don't want to get too far
6 ahead. The way the road -- the way the roads lay out
7 now, we have always wanted to have that east/west
8 connector we talked about. And road number --

9 MR. HANES: A.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: -- A would provide that to
11 some extent. The only concern I have right now with
12 the road is to -- is the road that runs -- the Road H
13 that runs and ends at the end of Ingham Hill Road, I
14 believe that that would -- and that Road H I believe
15 is supposed to be a private road. I'm not too sure.
16 I believe that should be a private road, because this
17 I feel is part of Old Saybrook, is going to be a part
18 of Old Saybrook, and, too, I think it should be
19 connected. And you should have at least three
20 entrances and exits, and that the end of Ingham Hill
21 Road should be just another entry or exit.

22 MR. HANES: No. I agree with you.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And that that should be a
24 public road. Now, as far as when we get into
25 determining the number of -- you know, where there's

1 26 lots -- I believe that's the number. Twenty-six
2 lots that we wiped out by doing -- you know, from
3 this plan here.

4 MR. BRANSE: Twenty-seven.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Twenty-seven lots we wiped
6 out from this plan. So somewhere as we look at these
7 little parcels of land that is sited for houses,
8 there's 27 of these that do not exist any longer.
9 Which 27 is that? I'm having a real hard time with
10 that, because you have the environmental issues
11 with -- you know, is this -- are these 20 -- this
12 group up here on Road J in a worse area than those in
13 Road C or is it better to get rid of ones on road D?
14 There's all of these -- you know, where do you get
15 rid of these lots?

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: This is the preliminary open
17 space subdivision plan. This is not the one that we
18 took things out of yet; am I correct?

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: This is what's proposed to
20 us.

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So --

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: The ones that we removed,
24 though, were from the other plan, the conventional
25 subdivision.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: In essence we removed 27
2 from this drawing.

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: Twenty-one.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Twenty-seven.

5 MR. BRANSE: They were asking for 248, if I
6 recall, and you're down to 221. Did I do that right,
7 27? Math was not my strength.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: Oh, okay.

9 MR. TIETJEN: One thought I want to throw in,
10 just this one you're thinking about, space, available
11 space. The village perhaps doesn't have to be
12 perhaps quite as big as it is, but the driving range,
13 all that complex of stuff there may be better
14 somewhere else or not necessary at all. That's kind
15 of a honky-tonk.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I know for a fact we did
17 hear during the testimony --

18 MR. TIETJEN: Sorry?

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We did hear from the
20 applicant during testimony that the driving range was
21 an intricate part, accessory part of the golf course.
22 When you have a golf course, you have a driving
23 range. It wouldn't make any sense not to have a
24 driving range.

25 MR. TIETJEN: You know more about golf courses

1 than I do, I guess, but I don't know what you're
2 talking about. To me a golf course is a golf course
3 and a driving range is something you have out in the
4 country where people who can't afford to play golf or
5 don't want to go practice their driving.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No. You're absolutely
7 right. They have the ones like at -- in Old Lyme
8 there next to the restaurant Cherry Stones. That's
9 the type of golf they have. There are many
10 enterprising people that have set up driving ranges
11 so that people don't have to go right to the golf
12 course, and there's money to be made. But in
13 general, golf courses in a good golf course, a
14 quality --

15 MR. TIETJEN: No driving range, no golf course?

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I don't know of any golf
17 course that I've ever been to that doesn't have a
18 driving range.

19 MR. TIETJEN: Well, that doesn't make it
20 necessary. And that's why I'm raising this issue,
21 because that is space. And if the object of this is
22 to play golf, then there's someplace to do it. But
23 that's up to somebody else.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's your opinion and we
25 respect that, and we'll take it into consideration.

1 MR. TIETJEN: But some other part of the county.
2 If we decided against the more -- couple more holes
3 somewhere else, how many would that be? I don't
4 remember now.

5 MR. HANES: Isn't that up to the developer to
6 come back in and decide where he's going to rearrange
7 his golf course?

8 In other words, if we state 11, ten, and say
9 three or four other holes are not suited because they
10 impact on the vernal pools or the conservation, then
11 they would rearrange.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

13 MR. BRANSE: Mr. Chairman, maybe I can help you
14 with this. I think there's two different ways you
15 could go at this, and they are both correct. One way
16 would be what Mr. Hanes was just saying is to
17 identify what aspects of the plan you consider
18 unacceptable and let them return with a plan that
19 addresses those concerns. The other way to address
20 it would be to say move this hole, move this cluster,
21 you know, specific changes in the plan. Either one
22 works. But I want you to understand -- I don't want
23 you to mix those two approaches, because you're going
24 to have a hard time using both, all right. So you're
25 going to need to sort of decide whether you want to

1 actually state the change you want or merely identify
2 what it is you don't like, that they have to design
3 around however they have to do it.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What I'm hearing from all
5 the board members is that you want to provide -- the
6 one thing you want to provide is more protection to
7 the Pequot Swamp. To do that, if we were going to be
8 fair to the applicant, you would have to give him a
9 distance that we consider being a distance suitable
10 to provide nothing to be built within 150 feet of the
11 Pequot Swamp. You know, no development within
12 150 feet of the Pequot Swamp. And then nothing --
13 you know, in general we don't want to see any holes
14 where the golf course goes over the wetlands. That's
15 what I'm hearing right now.

16 That's the two concerns, the protection of
17 Pequot Swamp and not having a hole such as hole 11
18 where you start off on the west side of Road H, down
19 by the last lot down there heading to the less
20 southerly lot. You've got your tee boxes. There's
21 one, two, three, four, five. I believe that's five
22 tee boxes. And there may be a sixth on the other
23 side, another circle over there. Maybe the -- yeah,
24 the lady's tee box. I didn't want to say that. I'm
25 probably getting stares right now. But I think

1 that's one of the concerns right now, that hole 11,
2 that we would rather not see them going right over
3 the Pequot Swamp with hole 11. And they need to
4 redesign it so that you don't go over Pequot Swamp
5 with hole 11.

6 MR. TIETJEN: Well, over or even next to it.
7 That's what we are talking about.

8 MR. BRANSE: That's a different question. The
9 buffering of Pequot Swamp is not the same as the
10 question of crossing Pequot Swamp. That's another
11 topic.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. You're breaking into
13 the protected area by overflight.

14 MR. BRANSE: Right.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You want to stop any
16 overflight.

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes.

18 MS. GOODFRIEND: It might help to direct your
19 conversation in our report February 16, 2005, in the
20 response to question four. Response number one lists
21 the golf courses in particular that are on the west
22 side -- west and east side of Pequot Swamp. And on
23 the backside answer number four on the second page
24 talks about which of the golf courses have clearing
25 adjacent to vernal pools. That might help focus on

1 the pools we have identified as having issues.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Did you identify which
3 letter this was, Wendy?

4 MS. GOODFRIEND: February 16, 2005 response to
5 questions three, four, five, and six. And in this
6 particular golf course that we feel golf course holes
7 with particular issues are identified.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: How many pages is this
9 report?

10 MS. GOODFRIEND: Two.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It's signed by -- from,
12 okay, Wendy Goodfriend, Geoff Jacobson, and Rich
13 Snarski.

14 MS. GOODFRIEND: That might help. There's 18
15 holes, so this may help guide you.

16 MR. HANES: So what they've recommended then is
17 in particular holes ten and 18 on the east side of
18 Pequot Swamp.

19 MS. GOODFRIEND: Absolutely.

20 MR. HANES: Holes 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 17 on
21 the west side and hole seven on the west side of
22 vernal pool 18 you recommend elimination or
23 reconfiguration of those proposed holes. And that's
24 to address the four natural resource protection
25 criteria.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So when you say in your
2 report, Wendy, point number three --

3 MS. GOODFRIEND: On page two.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: -- on page two of question
5 four, point number three, it says, no development,
6 clearing, or grading within 100 feet of a vernal
7 pool. Then I go down to number four, no clearing in,
8 over, or directly adjacent to vernal pools. And when
9 you say adjacent to vernal pools, you're meaning
10 within 100 feet again.

11 MS. GOODFRIEND: Correct. Those two are a
12 little bit duplicitous; however, we wanted to list
13 the vernal pools that have golf course -- that have
14 clearing for the golf course near them.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What you've done is taken
16 the Saybrook guidelines, the Inland Wetlands
17 Commission, and using their 100-foot buffer zone or
18 no disturbance zone as a guideline.

19 MS. GOODFRIEND: No.

20 MR. SNARSKI: Hundred feet is the critical air
21 to preserve a vernal pool. Best management practices
22 you don't recommend within 100-foot.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Under the wetlands
24 regulations you could have some disturbance within
25 that 100-foot.

1 MR. SNARSKI: Right. It's regulated.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You're saying take that
3 regulation out of that particular 100-foot of the
4 vernal pools.

5 MS. GOODFRIEND: The recommendation is to not
6 allow disturbance or clearing within the 100 feet
7 around the vernal pool to protect the most critical
8 habitat for amphibians that collect at the vernal
9 pool and stay there. Also protects the water quality
10 and the quantity of water in the vernal pool. Has
11 multiple functions, that first 100 feet. So while it
12 is critical for your wetlands commission, this would
13 be more of a conservation issue to best preserve the
14 pool to the greatest extent possible. So that's our
15 recommendation.

16 And just to answer Miss Gallicchio -- I don't
17 know how to say your name.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: Close enough.

19 MS. GOODFRIEND: Your question earlier, the
20 wetlands commission asked that the 25 percent or less
21 disturbance around in the 750-foot critical habitat.
22 I went through the chart provided by Mr. Klemens and
23 identified seven vernal pools which have more than
24 25 percent disturbance by the golf course alone.
25 There's others that are disturbed by houses and golf

1 course. It gets kind of confusing. So there's at
2 least seven that have more than 25 percent
3 disturbance just due to the golf course.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

5 MS. GOODFRIEND: I can't identify those for the
6 record, but that goes to the wetlands commission's
7 letter.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: In essence, other than this
9 new 700 -- this new revelation of this 750 feet,
10 there is no state guidelines that even infers
11 750 feet. Right now is the 100 or 50-foot buffer
12 zones around the wetlands.

13 MS. GOODFRIEND: I would defer that question to
14 Mr. Branse.

15 MR. BRANSE: What was that?

16 MS. GOODFRIEND: State guideline --

17 MR. BRANSE: There is no state statute on the
18 subject. You've heard a lot of information about
19 what is recommended both from the applicant's experts
20 and from your own as to what is recommended to
21 protect vernal pools, but those are not -- those are
22 not state statutes. And I think everyone recognizes
23 that you won't be able to achieve the recommended
24 standards in every case, and so it's a question of
25 balancing.

1 What is achievable -- and I mean you have this
2 report of February 16 that recommends things that
3 should be attempted, and you can take or leave those.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Geoff, in your opinion, if
5 you were to take from an engineering standpoint --
6 and I am going to kind of put you on the spot here.
7 I don't know if you can answer it. Unless someone
8 else on the staff can answer this better, but I think
9 Geoff can be the one. If you were to go with that
10 100-foot around vernal pools of 3, 9, 12, 21, and 27,
11 within -- where those holes are presently located,
12 could those holes be relocated effectively within
13 that immediate area?

14 MS. GOODFRIEND: That's putting him on the spot.

15 MR. JACOBSON: Where is three?

16 MS. GOODFRIEND: That's three, that's nine.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I don't want to make a
18 recommendation to something that's not doable.

19 MS. GOODFRIEND: Twelve is I don't know where.

20 MR. JACOBSON: I don't know is the plain and
21 simple answer. There's areas that may be more
22 suitable to golf course development. You had
23 suggested one area in the vicinity of Road C, for
24 instance. That one is areas much more removed from
25 the vernal pool and the Pequot Swamp. And some of

1 the more sensitive environmental resources from a
2 topographic standpoint would probably lend itself to
3 golf course development. Whether it would work or
4 not I have no idea, because there's a lot more than
5 just being able to site a hole. There's the routing
6 of the holes and how they interrelate. And I'm not a
7 golf course architect, but there are certainly other
8 areas that would be suitable.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I figured if we were going
10 to put anybody on the spot, the best would be you.

11 MR. JACOBSON: That's fine.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Thank you. So I think we
13 need to come -- start gathering some of this up. I
14 think we have a lot of information.

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, you talked about roadways
16 a little bit ago. And nobody else has talked about
17 that, but I believe it's important for most of the
18 roadway to be public. I believe that it's important
19 to have an access to Ingham Hill Road, full access.
20 In order to -- one possibility, in order to provide a
21 more contiguous open space, would in essence change
22 the spine road dramatically. But I'm going to throw
23 it out anyway for consideration and that is if the
24 areas around Road J -- I have them circled. Excuse
25 me with the candy. On my map, the northwest section,

1 there are 11 houses in Road J. There are five houses
2 off of Road K and another four off of Road K.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What map are you using?

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: I'm sorry. Open Space
5 Subdivision Master Plan, S.B.A., Volume II, Revision
6 12-23.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Which is reflective of the
8 other ones we are looking at, Graphic Plate Two, but
9 it's a little bigger.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: Easier for me to see, because I
11 can see the numbers.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The scale is bigger.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: But, for example, if Road A --
14 let's say just near the access easement that's right
15 at the corner of the Old Saybrook -- the spot that
16 the town owns, this area. If Road A were
17 discontinued there so that entrance from Westbrook
18 only serviced the areas of the first two subdivisions
19 that we come to, Road B and Road C, and Road C would
20 have to be made a through road to Road A. You see
21 the red lines I've drawn, everybody?

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Why don't you lay it out and
23 everybody get around it.

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: It's too long to be a
25 cul-de-sac road. But if Road A stopped right around

1 this access easement that's on the western part of
2 the town above the subdivision off of Road C, at the
3 Road C cul-de-sac, it would have to cease to be a
4 cul-de-sac. It would have to somehow connect and go
5 around again in order for us to approve it. I'm
6 thinking. I don't know if that still would be
7 considered a big cul-de-sac.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So what you want to do is
9 get rid of -- from the beginning of Road C right here
10 to where you marked it to the --

11 MS. GALLICCHIO: Actually, no. I think we have
12 to keep that. I'm thinking north of there, removing
13 Road A, Road J, Road K down to the firehouse or this
14 substation, whatever this building is that's off of
15 Road K.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Come across this way.

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: This allows and gets rid of
18 these. The Road J and K subdivisions or lot areas.
19 I'm just saying then you would have a contiguous open
20 space to the north.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You want to cut this off
22 here.

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: Um-hum.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The only thing I find
25 problems with is to get bus service and everything up

1 into here and all this and fire protection, you have
2 no -- everything has to come from Westbrook.

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: No. I'm saying -- again, this
4 is food for thought here. Removing this whole part
5 of the road, this whole part of the development, in
6 essence having this be open space. I'm not sure
7 about the golf course.

8 MR. BRANSE: This whole portion referring to the
9 clusters served by Roads K and J.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: Thank you. An entrance from
11 Ingham Hill Road, a complete entrance, which would
12 connect with Road H, which would become a public
13 road. This whole thing would be a public road. The
14 intersection of Road H and A would continue to the
15 east along Road A, have an exit at Bokum Road,
16 service the areas still Road D, E, and G. I'm saying
17 if we wanted to have more contiguous open space,
18 that's a possibility in decreasing roadways. And
19 also, taking away that would remove 20 lots off of 27
20 that we talked about. I'm not sure if this is
21 doable. This would be an entrance from Westbrook.

22 MS. ESTY: You would have no way of getting
23 Saybrook apparatus here. You would have to rely on
24 Westbrook.

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes. Or Saybrook coming from

1 the Westbrook end. Again, it's a thought for
2 discussion. What happens is when we think of -- we
3 have to think of our priorities. If we want
4 contiguous open space, that's one way of getting it,
5 but it changes the configuration of the spine road in
6 a way that I don't know if we want to do. We would
7 still have an east/west connector, in essence, of
8 connecting Bokum and Ingham Hill Roads.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I'm listening.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: I'm just saying. It may be a
11 stretch.

12 MR. BRANSE: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. The tape
13 is going to pick up this chatter. So if you need to
14 talk, you need to do it in the hall. Thank you. Go
15 ahead.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: So I throw that out for
17 consideration.

18 MR. TIETJEN: Even get a little more contiguous
19 golf course, too.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I give Judy's idea some
21 merit. I'm not comfortable with -- my idea -- this
22 road going through, I thought this was a much better
23 idea to go through. And I think it's important that
24 we look and -- we have to look at this, if there are
25 ways to get more contiguous open space. Let's look

1 here. Right now you're looking if you did away with
2 these roads, you're going to get from here to there.
3 That's what you end up with. So it goes from here to
4 there and then comes down into here. Is that what
5 you were envisioning? Let me rephrase myself.

6 By doing away with Road J and K and the lots
7 that are assigned to those roads, you would do away
8 with the Road A at the access easement road. As
9 indicated on the map, it's to the northeast.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: Northwest.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Northwest -- no east.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: I'm sorry. Northwest of the
13 property.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It's northeast of the
15 property, that the road would end in that area right
16 there. And you would do away with Road A from there
17 to basically somewhere up by the firehouse.

18 MR. HANES: Judy, the reason you want to get rid
19 of this, because it's crossing the wetlands there.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, it would do away with
21 two of the bridges, I believe.

22 MR. HANES: Did you assume that this was town
23 property?

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes.

25 MR. HANES: No, it's not. There's the piece

1 over there.

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: The easement is what threw me
3 off. What that would do is connect not only to the
4 south in terms of open space, but also the town-owned
5 property to the -- a little bit to the east. And
6 then on the Essex side, although we don't know what's
7 going to go in there just to the north of the J and K
8 areas on the Essex side, the slope looks to me like
9 it would be very difficult to put a significant
10 amount of housing. So I would guess that that's
11 going to pretty much be open space in the future. I
12 don't know.

13 MR. HANES: Doesn't that present a problem with
14 the bringing in of the water lines?

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: I don't know.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: They are following the road.

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: Could very well.

18 MR. BRANSE: This might be a good time to ask
19 Mr. Jacobson to sort of react to what he's heard.
20 It's an engineering question.

21 MR. JACOBSON: It's a very interesting concept,
22 because it does eliminate a lot of the problem. I
23 shouldn't say a lot, but it certainly gets rid of a
24 number of the problems with Road A, with the bridges,
25 with the fragmentation of open space. Probably gives

1 more area to work with for the golf course in
2 shifting some of that. It's a very interesting
3 concept, I think.

4 Now, the issue of coming in from Westbrook in
5 terms of providing emergency service is something --
6 I can't answer that. I don't know the answer to
7 that. That's something you would have to talk with
8 your emergency services people on. It may be
9 problematic in terms of it's still a dead-end road,
10 but there are provisions for waiving some of these
11 standards for good reasons. This may be a very good
12 reason to do something like that. Whether Road C
13 could loop back, certainly horizontally you could
14 make it work. I don't know vertically, without
15 looking at the profile, whether it would work or not.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: What about the water issue?

17 MR. JACOBSON: The water issue I don't think is
18 that much of a problem, because I think that Bob is
19 right that I think that water company would want a
20 loop through the property, but that could be done
21 through a utility easement. It could be done through
22 golf course holes. It doesn't necessarily have to
23 follow a roadway.

24 MR. HANES: What about the question of school
25 buses accessing these homes in this particular area?

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: They would have to go to
2 Westbrook.

3 MR. JACOBSON: That's something I don't know the
4 answer to. The two emergency services organizations
5 would have -- there are mutual aide. I know in other
6 towns we've worked there are agreements, but whether
7 that would be something that would be acceptable to
8 Old Saybrook and Westbrook I don't know. And I
9 certainly don't know the answer to the school bus
10 issue, how that would work.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Judy, I think you're trying
12 to kill two birds with one stone here. One, you're
13 trying to cut down on the infrastructure of
14 roadways --

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: -- and contiguous open
17 space.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I think what you would in
20 essence be doing -- I roughly counted the lots from
21 Road B and Road C to be approximately 25. If you
22 cut -- basically, what you would in essence be doing
23 is cutting them off from all -- if this ever became a
24 town park or anything of that nature, to get to it
25 they would have to drive all the way around.

1 Now, to get -- I understand the merit of trying
2 to do away with the extra bridges, which is
3 noteworthy. But if -- I would think that if you
4 could get your contiguous open space, basically the
5 same acreage, if you did away with these 25 lots, and
6 that would all --

7 MS. GALLICCHIO: The Road C area lots.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And the only thing you would
9 have there would be possibly running the road more,
10 you know, closer to this edge like here. And I don't
11 know what happened between -- and this is the
12 problem. I don't know what happens between Road B
13 and Road C. Actually, between lots five and -- lots
14 five, three, seven, and ten, what --

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: There's a space.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Why there's a space there
17 that would not permit the road to kind of follow
18 along that edge and then leave that -- you know,
19 leave all that open to contiguous open space. The
20 only problem is I just find --

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: That's why I say I throw it out
22 for consideration, because it's not a cure-all by any
23 means. It's just something to think about. And I
24 think we've got to think in kind of creative ways.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Out of the box a little bit.

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: If we are going to come up with
2 something that's going to have a golf course and the
3 space that that entails but provide what we think are
4 important.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Because right now I see
6 what -- all these things that we are coming up with
7 here are basically -- like some of my ideas are being
8 like conflicted upon with what Judy wants to do and
9 what other people have suggested being conflicted
10 upon. Because earlier I had said possibly doing away
11 with these and moving the golf course further to this
12 side, which in turn may or may not give you more
13 contiguous open space, even though the golf course is
14 defined as it could be kind of open space is open
15 space.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: Rather fragmented but open
17 space.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. It is open space.
19 So if you were to take these portions of the certain
20 holes -- if we want to move them out of this area,
21 you kind of have to give them a place to put them.
22 So if you took this here and then maybe you would
23 have more contiguous open space right -- undisturbed
24 right around the swamp itself on the westerly side,
25 you could get more open -- moving this whole thing

1 over this way, like this group of holes come down
2 around like this. The problem is I still see you
3 have this much -- you have hole 11. If you were to
4 move it up here, you've still got to get back and
5 around.

6 MR. HANES: Somehow you've got to get back to
7 the clubhouse.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Once again, I think Geoff
9 kind of said it the best. The people that lay this
10 thing out, we have to make the assumption that this
11 is the best from their point. I understand it's
12 their point of view, but this is the best layout for
13 the golf course as they see it with the way this
14 thing is being built. For us to -- and I agree that
15 this hole number 11 is an issue going right across.
16 I don't mind it going along the edges, but when you
17 start going directly across it, that's another issue.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: I would like to hear what other
19 people think about roadway configuration and whether
20 we want roadways to be primarily public or private,
21 whether we want -- how many access areas we want and
22 where --

23 MR. JACOBSON: May I just provide this for your
24 information. This is the applicant's response number
25 four, and it identifies there was some discussion

1 what are public and private. And I think it may --
2 actually, it's a little confusing to me, but there's
3 a text here in which they have identified which ones
4 are private and which ones are public. There's a
5 plate they referred to. And I'm not sure they are
6 entirely consistent the way I read it, but this is
7 what the applicant provided. You can just take that.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Thank you, Geoff.

9 MR. JACOBSON: Yep.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: This is in response number
11 four from The Preserve dated December 23rd, 2004.

12 MR. TIETJEN: Twenty-third.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: When I had asked at public
14 hearing if there was in fact a plan, they referred --
15 or it said, yes, that it was on the one that's in
16 this book RD-0, Volume I-A.

17 MR. JACOBSON: If you look at the text, Judy,
18 unless I'm misreading it, in particular Road H, if I
19 read the text there --

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: You know, I want to pull this
21 out if we can.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The map.

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: The map. I think it will make
24 it easier, but I'll keep my hand there.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You'll never see it again,

1 Geoff.

2 MR. JACOBSON: That's okay.

3 MR. BRANSE: I've got one.

4 MR. JACOBSON: The one thing that's confusing to
5 me -- and, again, I may be misinterpreting what they
6 are writing, but it looks to me - and I have it
7 highlighted in orange there - that they have
8 indicated that Road H, just as an example, is to be a
9 public road.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I remember during testimony
12 that it was decided that that is a private road.

13 MR. JACOBSON: If you look at the plate that
14 they refer to, it's a private road.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: There is some contradiction.

16 MR. JACOBSON: I'm not really sure what the --

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: In the plate all the roads that
18 are anywhere near the multifamily housing are
19 private. So Road H, Road I down to Ingham Hill.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. There's blue roads
21 and red roads.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: Red roads are private; blue
23 roads are public.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Private residential streets.
25 There's green ones somewhere on here.

1 MR. JACOBSON: There's one small one there.

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: B.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: B. And then there's -- all
4 the blue is public road.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: But as Geoff is saying on here,
6 it says public roads are A, C, D from Road F to Road
7 E.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Which shows on here. The
9 only thing I think is contradictory is H.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: E, F, G, H, I, J, and K.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I is identified as a public
12 road, I believe.

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: No. I is private, also.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I, okay. So what you're
15 proposing is H become -- using this map as designed
16 here for verbiage on page 14 is in disagreement with
17 the plate.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But from our perspective --
20 let's look at this. Rather than going with the
21 verbiage, let's go with this as our base and see how
22 we feel about these roads as laid out here.

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: Okay.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Rather than try to jostle it
25 back and forth. Do we want Road A as a public road?

1 I would say yes.

2 MR. HANES: Yeah. I would say yes.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. How about Road H.
4 Would we want that as a public road? That's the one
5 that runs from the -- off of the northern section of
6 Road H down to the end. Where the emergency access
7 is recommended by the applicant is Road H to the
8 southerly end of that road. I would think that
9 should all be public road and opened up as an access
10 point.

11 MS. ESTY: If Ingham Hill Road is going to be
12 continuing through, yes. I agree.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That would give full access
14 to that whole area by the public without any qualms
15 about if it's private or public, and it opens it up
16 to the town as a town area.

17 MR. TIETJEN: H.

18 MR. HANES: H.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: H. And then I don't
20 understand about Road B, the private residential
21 street. Mark, what would be the benefit of one --
22 what do you think is the benefit of Street B? It's
23 just a little cul-de-sac with three lots -- three,
24 four lots on it, and they've got it down as a private
25 residential street.

1 MR. HANES: Where is that?

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right there.

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: In the southwest part, right
4 near the west block border.

5 MR. BRANSE: Road B.

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes.

7 MR. BRANSE: It's probably easier on this one.
8 From a legal standpoint I couldn't give you advice
9 one way or the other. Typically the pattern in this
10 seems to be that the road serving lot clusters are
11 private. Anything that is or could be through road
12 should be public. So they are showing B as public.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: B is private residential.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: Private residential.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And the blue is public. Why
16 do they have road -- what is road --

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: J.

18 MR. BRANSE: So J is public.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yes.

20 MR. BRANSE: I'm confused by that only because
21 it seems you've got -- let me bring it a little
22 closer. You've got Road K, Road J, and Road D,
23 right? Is that D?

24 MS. GALLICCHIO: I can't tell if it's D.

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: C.

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: C.

2 MR. BRANSE: C. All residential cul-de-sacs all
3 designated as public and then Road B as private. I'm
4 not sure I see the pattern there.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, I think it's because of
6 the number of lots perhaps that we can't -- our
7 regulations don't allow a private road for more than
8 four --

9 MR. JACOBSON: This would be similar to College
10 Point subdivision. It's almost like a common
11 driveway when you get to that number of lots.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: I see others that are larger.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I put Mark on the spot and I
14 should have put you on the spot.

15 MR. HANES: There's another interesting thing
16 here. I notice that they have directly at the end of
17 Road B access to 153.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I don't know what that is.

19 MR. HANES: See, they've got --

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It ends right here. The
21 road's here. They have a lot here.

22 MR. HANES: There's a roadway.

23 MR. BRANSE: They are not showing a right-of-way
24 through lot five or lot four, so it doesn't appear
25 that they are proposing a connection there.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We do have contradictory
2 information, but I don't think that's a show stopper.
3 Like I said, if we go with RD-0 design plan and use
4 this as our benchmark of which ones -- do we agree
5 with it or not, and when we tell the applicant this
6 one we agree with and this one we don't agree with.

7 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It looks like that is
9 property of The Preserve; however, there is no access
10 to 153.

11 MR. BRANSE: Let me ask the question. Would the
12 commission want access through the rear of lot five
13 into land to the north of lots ten, 11?

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Myself I don't see the need
15 being that they already have access. And this may
16 be, you know -- actually, you've got a good line of
17 sight on either location from looking at this map.
18 They are both a long, straight piece of road. And
19 this is your line of sight right here on 153 from the
20 proposed access then. I think that's sufficient.

21 MR. HANES: Is this for development of this
22 private piece of property later on?

23 MR. BRANSE: That's my question. I don't know
24 if that's the intent or not or if we are just
25 misreading the map. And I guess my question is

1 regardless of what it really shows, is that something
2 you want?

3 MR. JACOBSON: Which strip is that?

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: There's a strip of land. We
5 were looking at Road B. And just west of Road B it
6 looks like the property line runs out towards 153,
7 then runs south and comes back again, and then goes
8 back, and then goes to the proposed entry point from
9 153. Just looking at this cluster, this looks like
10 it's not land owned by the applicant.

11 MR. JACOBSON: That's correct.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And the discussion is would
13 this be something we would want them to have access
14 to, but I don't know. Oh, you know what that is.

15 MR. HANES: This is the power.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's the power thing that
17 runs -- that might be a service road.

18 MR. HANES: See how this --

19 MR. JACOBSON: I haven't been on that road, so I
20 don't really know.

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: I can't see that one would be
22 beneficial over the other, really.

23 MR. JACOBSON: As far as I know, there's no
24 intent to utilize this, whatever it is currently used
25 for, to access any of these lots in here. There was

1 some proposal to include a little driveway in here.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's the problem. It's
3 hashed out. It's a wetlands, so you wouldn't go
4 there, okay.

5 MR. BRANSE: So the commission is assuming that
6 that area is not intended as an access strip. It's
7 labeled as a wetlands. The applicant never said that
8 that was their proposal.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right.

11 THE CLERK: Tape change.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Tape change.

13 (Tape is changed.)

14 THE CLERK: Okay. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Maybe we can take care of
16 this road issue. As proposed on the RD-R-0 -- RD-0,
17 are the board members comfortable with the public
18 roads as depicted on this map, with the addition of
19 Road H becoming a public road? I'll pass that
20 around, take a look. This is Road H right there.

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: And continuing Road H to Ingham
22 Hill as a complete entrance, is that part of our
23 discussion?

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yes, yes.

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: Okay.

1 MR. HANES: Did you see that?

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Did you see it, Janis?

3 MS. ESTY: Yes.

4 MR. BRANSE: Road H. Is that H?

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: H.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: H, as in hotel. Sometimes
7 when you read letters everybody gets little things
8 out of them.

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: Let me throw out, too, when I
10 mentioned about saving two bridges, it actually would
11 save three bridges to make the change I was talking
12 about.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, you could get rid of
14 the bridges just by not having the requirement to go
15 over the wetlands and just make a different type
16 of -- I mean you could. I'm just saying that is
17 doable. I mean it's probably not the most desirable
18 condition, but I mean you could.

19 MR. SNARSKI: The applicant, you know, they
20 avoid any wetland fill there for the purpose they
21 want to avoid probably any federal permits. And I
22 feel in some cases bridges are being put in where the
23 wetlands don't warrant a bridge, but they are going
24 for zero wetland fill. If they put any fill in a
25 wetland - and, Mark, please correct me, but it's been

1 my understanding on every job I've worked on - the
2 Corps of Engineers will get involved, because it
3 considers golf courses in a clearing over wetlands
4 secondary impacts, then they would have to go and get
5 a Federal Corps of Engineers permit. That's why most
6 golf courses, at least that I've worked on, they go
7 to extreme cases not to put any fill in the wetlands.
8 And they'll bridge them, even though -- if it was a
9 road under a normal situation, some of these water
10 courses that the crossing don't warrant a bridge and
11 are that sensitive that you need to bridge them.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: What would be the reason that
13 they would not want to go, timewise or that they
14 might not get approval or --

15 MR. SNARSKI: Both.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- or any of them?

17 MR. SNARSKI: Both.

18 MR. JACOBSON: I think, also, Judy, and I don't
19 know at what point, they call the sister agencies,
20 which would be the U.S. Fish and Wildlife and some of
21 those other organizations. At some point when you
22 make an application to the Corps, those other
23 agencies get involved, and that opens up --

24 MR. SNARSKI: A lot of people get involved, DPA
25 gets involved, Fish and Wildlife.

1 MR. JACOBSON: Environmental Reviews get
2 involved in areas that they may not want them to get
3 involved in.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But you weren't talking a
5 complete fill. There are a lot of wetlands have been
6 traversed by using the square --

7 MR. SNARSKI: Called box culverts.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah, box culverts, which is
9 less inexpensive to maintain and repair than that of
10 a bridge.

11 MR. JACOBSON: I can tell you that the bridges
12 are -- were a real hot topic of discussion at the
13 board of selectmen's meeting on the alternative road
14 standards, you know, as it was during the testimony
15 at the public hearing.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right.

17 MR. JACOBSON: So that is I know an issue that
18 they are struggling with and have been for a while.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The only place you would
20 really need the bridge is at the railroad crossing.
21 You're not going to get --

22 MR. BRANSE: The box culvert won't work there.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No. So there's some more
24 food for thought, that basically the -- you know, the
25 bridges could be done -- if part of the board's

1 concern is the bridges and the issues they raise as
2 far as maintenance and things of that nature, that
3 you can -- and anybody jump in here if I'm wrong.
4 You can keep the -- what's to either side of that
5 proposed fill or box culvert area, you can keep that
6 vital, keep it alive. You're just going to lose that
7 little small portion of wetlands.

8 MS. GOODFRIEND: Are you asking the question as
9 though are there long-term impacts of some sort of
10 crossing structure, not a spanning bridge but other
11 kinds of crossings?

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, there's going to be a
13 heck of a lot more impact. I understand that. But
14 I'm just saying that if the impacts were there, it's
15 only going to kind of impact that immediate area.
16 And if you have -- and that depends on water flow,
17 you know, as long as you keep the water flowing
18 between the two. And there's always mitigation.
19 They could make more wetlands somewhere else on the
20 property.

21 MR. BRANSE: How would you react to that?

22 MS. GOODFRIEND: My reaction would be we don't
23 have details yet, because we are not at that stage of
24 what kind of crossing, how much fill, and how big the
25 structure would be. But my own personal feeling is

1 that culverts and crossing of wetlands, whether it's
2 open, bottom or box culverts, have short-term impacts
3 and they have long-term impacts. I think in most
4 cases there will be some alteration. It might be
5 minor to the wetlands or water course itself. At
6 least that's how I feel. Even a spanning structure
7 is going to have some impact, but --

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Shading and things of that
9 nature.

10 MS. GOODFRIEND: Correct. But I think -- I
11 don't have enough detail to make that recommendation
12 about whether they would be impact free.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: One of our options here
14 would be to say that we would like to see, when the
15 plans come back to us, that we see it with the bridge
16 and with the box culvert and have environmental
17 impact statements on both.

18 MR. BRANSE: I think that's something you could
19 do.

20 MR. JACOBSON: They've indicated what they
21 intend to construct, if they get the permits, would
22 be a three-sided culvert where it's a precast. It
23 just has the ends and then comes across. The
24 proprietary name is Conspan. It's like an arch. But
25 they would put abutments on each side and then they

1 would drop these precastings.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So it's just like a square
3 box.

4 MR. JACOBSON: It would not have a bottom.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: There's no bottom to these.

6 MR. JACOBSON: No bottom. It's just a
7 three-sided, you know. They -- it's like this.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

9 MR. TIETJEN: An upside down U.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And it's a suspended thing
11 rather than being a square box.

12 MR. JACOBSON: It just sits on footings on
13 either side with the stream running through here.
14 That's what they indicated that they most likely
15 would provide.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: From a maintenance
17 standpoint over time, and we have environmental
18 issues and maintenance issues here. It seems like
19 the bridge with a bottom not being touched is less
20 intrusive than a box.

21 MR. JACOBSON: Definitely less intrusive.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So now maintenancewise down
23 the road would a -- would there be a significant
24 maintenance reduction if you used the boxes versus
25 the proposed bridge spans?

1 MR. JACOBSON: Of these precast units? No, I
2 don't believe that there would be a significant
3 difference. There would be a significant difference
4 if they constructed a cast in place or, you know,
5 steel strainers and that type of stuff where there's
6 a lot more maintenance.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Both of these are -- both of
8 those are precasted --

9 MR. JACOBSON: They are both precasted.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: -- off site, you drop them
11 in.

12 MR. JACOBSON: Exactly.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: There's really not that much
14 difference. Scratch that idea.

15 I don't think you'll gain much by using either
16 one. I think environmentally you would do more
17 damage dropping a whole box in versus just trying to
18 span it, because it would be just as much disturbance
19 to build the footing, making -- preparing the road to
20 accept that, a square box, as it would for the span.

21 MR. BRANSE: Is that correct, Geoff?

22 MR. JACOBSON: I'm not sure I understood your
23 question.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You said there's going to be
25 footings on either side --

1 MR. JACOBSON: On either side, correct.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: -- to put in for the span;
3 the one with the open bottom.

4 MR. JACOBSON: Right.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Now, there would be some
6 disturbance when you do that.

7 MR. JACOBSON: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. Now, even when you
9 put a square box in, your disturbance would be
10 significant also on the edges, because you've got to
11 make the road all meet up there to the box.

12 MR. JACOBSON: The box you would basically be
13 taking, you know, everything that you do for the
14 other one plus the whole middle -- the whole middle
15 would be dug out.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. So it would be
17 significantly more disturbance.

18 MR. JACOBSON: You would have to drop it down
19 and there would be significantly more disturbance
20 with a box as compared to an arch.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. Always trying to save
22 a dollar. Okay.

23 I think this is something we can actually maybe
24 come to some consensus on tonight and then continue,
25 because we have to get back to the golf course issues

1 and all that. I know it's mind boggling. I know my
2 head spins when I'm thinking about it.

3 Let's look at the roadways. It's something that
4 we can come to some consensus on and at least feel
5 we've accomplished something tonight, if this is the
6 only thing. Hopefully not, but at least we'll get
7 one thing accomplished.

8 Now, and I think this -- no matter what really
9 happens, whether we shift the road to the right, to
10 the left, do away with the road. And if we do away
11 with the road, it's not an issue whether it's public
12 or private. So in general if we can come to a
13 consensus of this map with -- as depicted -- this map
14 being RD-0 by making Road H a public road and making
15 the entrance at Ingham Hill Road where it connects to
16 Road H full access, is that something that the board
17 would be in agreement with on the road perspective?

18 MR. HANES: Yeah. I think -- didn't Geoff make
19 some recommendations or Mr. Hillson about that
20 connection with Ingham Hill Road, that that should be
21 straightened out? Because I think there was a
22 problem.

23 MR. JACOBSON: Yeah. Bruce Hillson did make
24 that recommendation, yes.

25 MR. HANES: I think that's something we should

1 consider.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So H to public. Does
3 anybody have that report handy from Bruce Hillson?

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: I do.

5 MR. HANES: Was that the January 27th?

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Or is that something, Mark,
7 that can be said in general? Because that would be
8 something we would look at anyway, how the road
9 terminates later on during the main --

10 MR. BRANSE: It could just be a general -- the
11 only other question would be if you wanted it to be a
12 through road, do you want the village reconfigured so
13 that units do or do not front on it? And again,
14 neither one is wrong.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I'm worried about, you know,
16 the --

17 MS. ESTY: Is it that one?

18 MR. BRANSE: I think he said a couple of points,
19 frankly.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The intersection at Road
21 One, which I think -- Road One. I don't know if
22 there's a Road One.

23 MR. JACOBSON: There's not a Road One that I'm
24 aware of. There's a Road I.

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: I've got the December 1st

1 memo from Mr. Hillson. And on page seven he says, if
2 this connection - and that is the full-time
3 connection - full connection to Ingham Hill Road. If
4 this connection is desired by the commission, they
5 should include wording in any approval indicating
6 that the connection to Ingham Hill Road be made and
7 the existing Ingham Hill Road be realigned at the
8 north end across the lots 73 and 79 as shown on the
9 conventional subdivision plan to eliminate the sharp
10 curve on Ingham Hill Road.

11 MR. JACOBSON: That would be on the inside of
12 that curve there, right.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

14 MR. BRANSE: Judy, can I see that for a second?

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: H public, improve
17 intersection between Ingham and H.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: Now, you want a consensus.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: But I'm wondering if either
21 Mr. Snarski or Dr. Goodfriend have information they
22 would like to share with us in terms of negatives in
23 completing the Ingham Hill Road access to a full
24 access, in terms of vernal pools or anything like
25 that.

1 MR. BRANSE: And I just might add to that
2 question you might recall that there was testimony by
3 Professor Klemens indicating that such a
4 connection -- that the traffic produced by such a
5 connection would have an adverse impact on vernal
6 pools along Ingham Hill Road. That was his -- and so
7 while you're addressing that, you can address that,
8 too.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: He was talking about -- when
10 Mr. Klemens was talking about the critters running
11 across the road.

12 MR. BRANSE: Critters running across the road,
13 precisely.

14 MR. SNARSKI: That was because right now there's
15 two vernal pools on Ingham Hill Road and there's
16 no -- there's only a couple of houses past those
17 vernal pools, so there's not much traffic there. So
18 I recall Dr. Klemens's comment that there would be
19 more traffic on that road.

20 MR. JACOBSON: I think he may have been
21 referring to along the -- I think what Mark may be
22 saying along the existing section of Ingham Hill
23 Road.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right, right. The same
25 thing that was happening on Bokum. It was the same

1 issue on Bokum.

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: I guess my question is is that
3 something that to either of you would have such
4 significant impact that we should avoid that full
5 access?

6 MR. SNARSKI: Would you give us a second and see
7 what the quality of those two pools are.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: Sure.

9 MS. GOODFRIEND: Vernal pool 16 is the southern
10 vernal pool on Ingham -- that exists adjacent to
11 Ingham Hill Road currently. There are -- across the
12 street to the northeast there are houses and roads,
13 subdivision type residential. They found that there
14 were 230 spotted salamanders. And he ranked it as
15 high priority with having three existing species. So
16 there is the potential that amphibians in there are
17 crossing the road during the breeding season. So --
18 but it is already adjacent to an existing road,
19 albeit the road ends beyond there. So --

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: Now, you're speaking of --

21 MR. BRANSE: Can you complete that sentence.

22 So --

23 MS. GOODFRIEND: There is already traffic
24 passing the vernal pool. I guess the answer is
25 additional traffic could cause some impacts during

1 the breeding season when amphibians are migrating.

2 I guess this is the question for Rich. If I
3 look at the location of vernal pool 16, I see that --
4 which is the southernmost vernal pool right on Ingham
5 Hill, I see that open upland habitat is currently to
6 the south and west. And so hopefully for their sake
7 they are not using --

8 MR. SNARSKI: Who knows where they are going.
9 They're moving 2,000 feet around the area. You don't
10 know where they are going. More traffic, more --

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And in essence, though,
12 that -- as Dr. Klemens has said, that that little
13 section -- is this the pool we are talking about
14 right here? This one right here; is that 16?

15 MS. GOODFRIEND: Correct.

16 MR. SNARSKI: No, No.

17 MS. GOODFRIEND: Yes.

18 MR. SNARSKI: It's the one below that.

19 MS. GOODFRIEND: Oh, no, above.

20 MR. JACOBSON: Further along.

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: Or is it the one even further
22 down?

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Just let me ask this,
24 because both of them all fall into the same question
25 I was going to ask. When you get to that

1 25 percent -- so if that's the 25 percent of the
2 disturbance that he said that would allow -- is
3 allowed, that that vernal pool probably has a
4 significantly good chance of staying active.

5 MR. SNARSKI: I think it was a traffic concern.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. But what I'm saying
7 is that yes, there is -- obviously, if that's the
8 way -- they are not all marching in the same
9 direction, I assume. They all want to get their own
10 little places to live. And so you end up where that
11 25 percent which could be cut out of that 750 circle
12 and still have an active vernal pool. And that
13 roadway basically shows that we did. We put a road
14 right there, and the pools are still active.

15 MR. SNARSKI: Right.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The only thing that's going
17 to happen, you might have a little less activity
18 heading east to west.

19 MR. SNARSKI: There's fatalities.

20 MS. GOODFRIEND: What will happen is that if you
21 have additional traffic on Ingham Hill Road during
22 the breeding season in the evening, you would
23 potentially have additional fatalities. If you go
24 there now in the spring, you might see some smashed
25 individuals. If you have additional traffic, you'll

1 increase the risk that you'll have more smashed
2 individuals.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And I understand that. I'm
4 saying according to Dr. Klemens's figuring that that
5 pool would stay active. Maybe less population, but
6 you're not going to totally annihilate a pool.

7 MS. GOODFRIEND: Dr. Klemens testified that it's
8 his opinion that pools would have a critical
9 terrestrial habitat, which is the 750 feet buffer
10 around the pools. Pools that have at least
11 75 percent of that critical terrestrial habitat
12 preserved as intact would remain active pools and
13 that that would support active vernal pool breeding.
14 That's a decent recommendation. In the way that it
15 plays out, we've tried to demonstrate that in this
16 plate two. Sometimes the way that plays out for this
17 example, you know, on this site is good; sometimes
18 it's not so good. The example pool 12, which is to
19 the west side of Pequot Swamp, this is a pool that's
20 going to be conserved. And by his estimation it only
21 has 32 percent of the upland critical threshold
22 habitat disturbed. But when I look at that, even
23 though there's 32 percent undisturbed, it's
24 absolutely fragmented.

25 So I don't think that we can just look solely at

1 the amount of land left, not cleared or disturbed,
2 and make a judgment that says, well, that vernal pool
3 should continue to be productive. Because it's -- if
4 you read closely his book, he says that it should be
5 unfragmented, contiguous, undisturbed critical
6 terrestrial habitat. There are very few vernal pools
7 on this property that will have unfragmented,
8 undisturbed 75 percent of the critical terrestrial
9 habitat. Rich can speak to this. I'm sure that
10 there are examples of vernal pools that are in areas
11 with houses that do great and there are some that are
12 annihilated.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So there really is no yes or
14 no answer to Judy's question.

15 MR. SNARSKI: Not positively.

16 MS. GOODFRIEND: To do the best you can would be
17 nice to have contiguous, undisturbed terrestrial
18 habitat. Some amount. Maybe you don't achieve
19 75 percent, but it would be nice to have some amount
20 undisturbed.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And I think Judy's question
22 is that, I think -- is by opening up that road going
23 to be a major detriment to that -- to those vernal
24 pools?

25 MR. SNARSKI: I would answer that by opening up

1 that road and doing that preserves other areas. I
2 would say let that road go through there if it's
3 helping out conserving other land by doing that.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I don't know if it's doing
5 that right at the moment.

6 MR. SNARSKI: Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Just by the statement that
8 we want to open up these roads is not -- we can't say
9 that right at the moment.

10 MR. SNARSKI: Right. This is just for --

11 MS. GALLICCHIO: I think one of the issues in
12 terms of the full access at Ingham Hill is health and
13 safety of humans.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: And I think that when push
16 comes to shove, that has to take priority. But it's
17 certainly -- and I mean obviously I'm concerned --

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Something to think about.

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- about the vernal pools. One
20 of the concerns that I have had since the -- maybe
21 1978 when we had a tremendous amount of water and --
22 where the ice house is on Ingham Hill Road. The old
23 stone building that was all underwater, the roadway.
24 And the people living north of that area on Ingham
25 Hill Road had no --

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Egress.

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: No egress and no way of
3 emergency vehicles getting in. And that's one of the
4 things I think is a benefit in terms of having some
5 kind of east/west connector or some connector in that
6 area is health and safety.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

8 MR. TIETJEN: So sketch out with a pencil or
9 something where you want this thing to go exactly.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The red line.

11 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, Ingham Hill Road is here.

12 MR. TIETJEN: I know where Ingham Hill Road is,
13 but how are you going to connect -- there's a
14 terrific declivity there. There's a swale or
15 whatever you want to call it. There's a terrible
16 dropoff. Not just up here, but to the right there.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What you're shown here, that
18 they were going to build a road up to this point
19 within road standards. And they were just going to
20 put a gate there. That's all they were doing for
21 emergency access. So what the traffic consultant
22 Bruce Hillson said -- is that his name, Hillson?

23 MR. JACOBSON: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Bruce Hillson said is that
25 this -- if you are going to open this up --

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: Which he recommended.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: -- which he recommended, is
3 that you need to look at how you're going to connect
4 that roadway to Ingham Hill Road. And he's just
5 saying as depicted on S.B.A., Open Space Subdivision
6 Master Plan, that is not the best configuration. It
7 might not be a bad idea if it's an emergency road,
8 but it's not good as an open road, full access road.

9 MR. TIETJEN: So I know you would like to get
10 down to that curve. That would be sensible.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No, no, no. Obviously, this
12 road here, Mr. Hillson didn't have any issues with
13 this portion of the road. It's just how it connects
14 right here at the intersection, if there's different
15 ways of connecting it.

16 MR. TIETJEN: So you don't mind just connecting
17 it there and not straightening it out somehow.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. Because you can't go
19 any further than right here. You only have this much
20 space to play with. And this is the furthest away
21 from the vernal pool that you can get.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: But he's saying that this would
23 have to be realigned in order to make it work.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. It might have to
25 come like this more.

1 MR. TIETJEN: Yeah. It's terribly steep there.

2 MR. JACOBSON: I think this was the curve he was
3 talking about here, because they own this property
4 here.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So they can --

6 MR. JACOBSON: Judy, do you have a conventional
7 plan?

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: No.

9 MR. TIETJEN: Also the grade.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I didn't bring mine I don't
11 think either.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, maybe I do.

13 MR. TIETJEN: That's probably why they wanted a
14 gated --

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Jeff, we have a small
16 version here.

17 MR. TIETJEN: Boy, I sure brought the wrong
18 maps.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I don't know what this big
20 blotch is right here. Okay. That's what's his
21 name's property. So it comes down like this, comes
22 around. So this is this portion right here. Here's
23 Ingham Hill Road right here. This black line goes
24 down around here like this. Ingham Hill comes up and
25 goes into that gentleman's name's property. That's

1 that right here. So this open space is here. And so
2 he's saying that this could come in like this more
3 just to make it more of a natural curve, which in
4 fact is something we've already done once before.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: I can't talk to you, Claudia.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So the thing is obviously
7 if --

8 MR. JACOBSON: We are getting into final design
9 stuff.

10 MS. GALLICCHIO: We are more conceptual right
11 now.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Our traffic engineer said it
13 needs to be improved. We recommend that we open that
14 road up and improve that intersection, and then they
15 have to come back with that.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right.

17 MS. GOODFRIEND: Mr. Chairman, I just recall
18 that we had discussions when we had staff meetings
19 with Mr. Hillson and that when we had looked at what
20 he was recommending, that we felt like he could have
21 come -- the road could be put through accommodating
22 to the best ability those two vernal pools. You
23 would have an increase in traffic potentially in the
24 spring, increased death. But we had a discussion at
25 the staff level about that.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And there was also -- then
2 you had that other road. So in straightening out
3 that curve further south.

4 MS. GOODFRIEND: Correct.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. And then
6 straightening out the curve further south on Ingham
7 Hill Road.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: In his report he continues,
9 additional improvements may also be desirable such as
10 providing a bicycle/pedestrian way along Ingham Hill
11 Road and widening and/or increasing radii at curves
12 where possible. Section 5.3.6(b) of the subdivision
13 regulations allow the commission -- allows the
14 commission to require improvements to existing town
15 roads to assure the safety of the residents of the
16 new subdivision.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We know what we went through
18 last time and we know that some people believed it
19 and some people don't.

20 MR. BRANSE: I may have to leave you shortly.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

22 MR. BRANSE: Let me read you one -- I've got a
23 lot of text here, but it's not things you've reached
24 full consensus on, so I am not going to read you
25 that. Where I did hear some consensus -- let me just

1 read to you what I've got and see how that sounds.

2 The Preliminary Open Space Plan; Compliance with
3 Standards. The commission finds that the following
4 aspects of the preliminary open space subdivision
5 plan do or do not conform to the standards and
6 criteria of its regulations.

7 A, The Golf Course as an Element of the Plan.
8 The commission finds that a golf course is a valid
9 recreational use that should be included in the final
10 plan. The commission is not persuaded that a golf
11 course must or inevitably will produce adverse
12 impacts on groundwater, wildlife habitat, or other
13 natural resources. The fact that some golf courses
14 may have produced adverse impacts does not
15 necessarily mean that any golf course will have such
16 impacts. In any event, the commission finds that a
17 golf course would generally have less impact than
18 conventional subdivision lots in the same area as
19 yours, and that the golf course does create some new
20 wildlife habitat for certain species.

21 And then I've started to say -- the next bullet
22 is The Golf Course Design Considered in Light of the
23 Goals of an Open Space Subdivision. Despite the
24 general desirability of a golf course as an element
25 of this open space plan, the commission finds that

1 there are certain deficiencies. And then I've
2 started to list some of what I have heard, but you
3 haven't -- like I say, I am not going to read you
4 that, because you haven't reached a consensus on
5 that.

6 I've also -- under road pattern I have written
7 Road A should be a public road, as proposed by the
8 applicant, and that is what they are telling you now.

9 Road H should also be public (the application
10 materials are unclear as to the applicant's proposed
11 status for this road) and designed to public road
12 specifications.

13 The commission finds that there was not intended
14 to be and requires that there not be access to land
15 of others via the corridor at the end of Road B
16 (depicted as wetlands on the plans).

17 There should be full access to Ingham Hill Road
18 via Road H (not just an emergency access) as
19 recommended by the traffic's engineering --
20 commission's traffic -- commission's traffic
21 engineering consultant (memo of December 1, 2004).
22 This not only provides improved access for residents
23 of The Preserve, but also provides a second means of
24 egress for existing residents on Ingham Hill Road in
25 the event of emergency (such as the flooding observed

1 near the ice house in 1982). The existing Ingham
2 Hill Road shall be realigned at the north end across
3 lots 73 and 79, as shown on the conventional
4 subdivision plan, to eliminate the sharp curve on
5 Ingham Hill Road, also as recommended by Mr. Hillson.
6 The applicant should also address improvements to
7 Ingham Hill Road to accommodate any additional
8 traffic produced by this connection, including
9 improved pedestrian movement.

10 Now, that's all I have so far that I heard
11 consensus on. Am I wrong on anything as far as
12 consensus?

13 MR. TIETJEN: Read the first statement about the
14 golf course. I'm not sure that -- well, maybe it's
15 four to nine or what.

16 MR. BRANSE: That's why I'm reading it. If it's
17 not a consensus and needs further discussion, I'll
18 just bracket it. See, I've got some things in here
19 that somebody said that I have bracketed, which
20 means -- is my signal to me that I haven't heard
21 consensus, all right. But if two or three of you
22 said something and nobody said no, then I'll put it
23 down.

24 So I'll read that again. You don't have to take
25 it down again. I won't change it. The commission

1 finds that a golf course is a valid recreational use
2 that should be included in the final plan.

3 MR. TIETJEN: That's the sentence I don't like.

4 MR. BRANSE: Okay. Then that's -- I mean that's
5 important.

6 MR. TIETJEN: We are working on a what if
7 situation I think later on in this discourse on the
8 golf course, about what do we do with it to change
9 the juxtaposition on the swamp.

10 MR. BRANSE: I have some notations on it.

11 MR. TIETJEN: I don't accept -- valid is a very
12 strong word. And I'd say that maybe it's a
13 convenient, or economical, or whatever they think it
14 is. But I'm not so sure it's valid as a
15 justification for this.

16 MR. BRANSE: Well, I mean that's a key question.
17 If the consensus is that there should not be a golf
18 course in the open space subdivision, then you don't
19 need to address rearranging fairways, and tees, and
20 adding additional buffering.

21 MR. TIETJEN: That's right.

22 MR. BRANSE: Then that's the end of that.

23 MR. TIETJEN: That's right. Well, I guess valid
24 is sort of a yes or no proposition, isn't it?

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No.

1 MR. BRANSE: No. Whether you want to have it --
2 I could take out valid and I could say the commission
3 desires to include it.

4 MR. TIETJEN: Accepts it.

5 MR. BRANSE: Accepts it or does not accept it.

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: Or that it may be part of the
7 plan.

8 MS. ESTY: The should I object to.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, we need to make a
10 decision whether it should or not or we are going to
11 waste a lot of time. I don't want to sit here and
12 talk about it and all of a sudden there's a vote and
13 everybody goes I don't want the golf course and we've
14 wasted three hours talking about it.

15 MR. BRANSE: About where the holes should be.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: There's one area. That
17 flooding was not in '78. It was the early '80s, but
18 I don't know the exact date.

19 MR. JACOBSON: '82 was that.

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: That sounds right.

21 MR. JACOBSON: June of '82 was the big --

22 PUBLIC SPEAKER: June '82.

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: When Ivoryton had a big
24 problem.

25 MR. JACOBSON: It was June of '82.

1 MS. GALLICCHIO: Okay.

2 MR. TIETJEN: So you're going to say accepts it
3 or --

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Is everybody right at this
5 point in time in favor of a golf course as being a
6 part of that open space subdivision?

7 MR. TIETJEN: Yes. As long as you don't say
8 it's a valid something or other. Accepts is fine.

9 MR. BRANSE: I can say that the commission finds
10 that a golf course is a recreational use that should
11 be included in the final plan.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: All right. Okay.

13 MS. ESTY: I'm not sure it should.

14 MR. BRANSE: I hear one okay.

15 MR. TIETJEN: Why should it?

16 MR. BRANSE: That's my question. It's not my
17 decision. It's yours.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's what we need to come
19 out with right now.

20 MR. TIETJEN: Do we have to agree?

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yes.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: No.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No, no, no.

24 MR. TIETJEN: Go ahead and say it, but
25 somehow --

1 MS. ESTY: I think semantics.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It's not really semantics.
3 It's a question of are we going to spend hours upon
4 hours talking about something if we don't have a
5 consensus that you want to have a golf course?

6 So right now we need to decide as a board
7 whether there's -- and it would be like -- it has to
8 be at least three votes that are in favor of, yes.
9 The golf course needed to be a consensus, at least
10 three with the five of us here. I want to throw out
11 right now who is in favor of including the golf
12 course as a part of the open space subdivision? I
13 am.

14 MR. TIETJEN: I.

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, I am with reservation.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But --

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: That's why I say --

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Who is in favor of it as it
19 stands presently with leaving open the option of
20 modifications?

21 MR. BRANSE: Clearly, yes.

22 MR. HANES: Yes, with modifications.

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: I am.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: All right. There's three.
25 And Dick, how would you and Janis --

1 MR. TIETJEN: Well, I don't -- we have been
2 talking about the best way to handle it.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I just need to know whether
4 you want it. Would you approve -- this is the moment
5 of truth. Would you approve a golf course?

6 MR. TIETJEN: If I had the choice?

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You have a choice.

8 MR. BRANSE: You do have a choice.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: In the open space
10 subdivision and with the option of making
11 modifications later on in this deliberation.

12 MR. TIETJEN: No.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You have your right to
14 change your mind later on, also.

15 MR. TIETJEN: You're putting a very fine point
16 on it and that's your position. Go ahead. But I'll
17 say no.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. That's what we need
19 to hear. Janis.

20 MS. ESTY: I'm not at all sure I'm in favor of
21 the way this is configured. And it's difficult for
22 me looking at this to say I am in favor of a golf
23 course if I don't like totally what I see here. It
24 would be more correct for me to say I'm not opposed
25 to golf courses, but I'm not sure that I like this.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

2 MR. BRANSE: Let me play with that language
3 then. And you can change your mind, as you pointed
4 out, Mr. Chairman. You know, you're going to keep
5 deliberating; you're going to keep -- for example,
6 you are -- apparently now you will be talking about
7 modifications. And maybe by the time you reach the
8 end of that discussion, someone will have changed
9 their mind one way or the other, and that's okay.
10 I'm just trying to help you express a consensus if
11 there is one, but I'm not trying to tell you how to
12 vote. That's very important.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And neither am I. I'm just
14 saying that we need at this point in time to make a
15 determination whether we are going to expend the
16 effort of talking about modifications of the golf
17 course. Because if there wasn't at least three
18 people in favor of the golf course with
19 modifications, there would be no sense in talking
20 about it.

21 MR. TIETJEN: It's okay. Just don't shut out
22 the dissidents from the discussion of what best to do
23 about it, because we are going to get it. We know
24 perfectly damn well it's going to be a part -- a
25 significant part of the plan. They are not going to

1 accept our saying no in the first place.

2 MR. BRANSE: Well, there I'll correct you. If
3 the commission feels that a golf course should not be
4 part of the plan, whether they accept it or not is
5 their problem, not yours.

6 MR. TIETJEN: Right. All right.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The only thing we ask is
8 that if you have objections to the golf course or
9 whatever you object to, that you have points to back
10 it up.

11 MR. TIETJEN: Points?

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Reasons.

13 MR. TIETJEN: You mean reasons, yeah, sure. I
14 do.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. That's all we ask.

16 MR. TIETJEN: You don't want to hear them now,
17 I'm sure.

18 MR. BRANSE: For now I've changed it to say -
19 the first sentence - the commission finds that a golf
20 course is a recreational use that could be included
21 in the final plan if properly designed. And we can
22 play with that a little more as your discussion
23 evolves. Can you keep going. I just, as I mentioned
24 Mr. Chairman, when I started --

25 MR. TIETJEN: Did you study diplomacy in your

1 youth?

2 MR. BRANSE: And in old age.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Just before you leave, Mark,
4 we are going to continue on with our deliberation.
5 Obviously you're going to get the transcript so
6 you'll be able to hear what we say and make sense of
7 that. Okay. I won't ask the other question then.
8 Have a good night.

9 MR. BRANSE: Thank you. I'm sorry to leave, but
10 tomorrow is going to be bad.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: All right. Now, we have
12 done -- what time is it anyway?

13 MS. GALLICCHIO: Ten o'clock.

14 MR. TIETJEN: Ten of ten.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We're going to go to 10:30
16 unless anyone on the board feels that we need to go
17 later. Five-minute break.

18 (Recess)

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I would like to reconvene.

20 Is there any -- where I think we are at right
21 now, we all heard what Mark had read and we've kind
22 of got all of that summarized. We do -- and I guess
23 everyone's in agreement with -- I want to find out if
24 people are in agreement with the -- I guess what Mark
25 said about the road improvements on Ingham Hill Road

1 and Road H and everybody would be in favor of that.

2 There's no issue with that?

3 (No response)

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And on the rest of the map
5 of RD-0, the remaining roads that are depicted as
6 private and private residential, they will remain the
7 same as depicted on the map other than Road H.

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

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You have to look at that.

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

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

12 MR. TIETJEN: Road C.

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

15 MR. TIETJEN: Oh, okay.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: At least we have a point.

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

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Then when we get back we are
19 going to kind of roll this around in a barrel for a
20 while, and we may get back to Judy's suggestion when
21 she was talking about Road J, and Road K, and
22 changing some sort of access or activity that way.
23 And I guess we should go there right now. Road A as
24 it exists on this map, do we feel that Road A should
25 go through like that or should there be some

1 alternatives to it, possibly one as Judy had
2 suggested, to give more contiguous open space or just
3 leave Road A?

4 I guess the point is should Road A -- I am
5 uncomfortable with taking Road A and not making it go
6 all the way through.

7 MR. HANES: Could it be revised, though, to
8 eliminate --

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

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

16 MR. TIETJEN: I didn't know that that's what she
17 said.

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yeah, it is.

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

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

23 MR. TIETJEN: You were going to take Road C out
24 altogether then.

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes. Road A.

1 MR. TIETJEN: I mean Road A.

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: This part of Road A.

3 MR. TIETJEN: I thought you were just going to
4 straighten it out.

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

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And access to whatever is
8 going to happen up to the town property. Who knows
9 what kind of facility is going to end up there.

10 MR. TIETJEN: I thought you wanted to just
11 remove the road.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Is everybody in favor of
13 keeping Road A a through road?

14 MS. ESTY: Yes.

15 MR. TIETJEN: Yes.

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

22 MR. TIETJEN: Juggling we call that.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Is there anything else that
24 anybody feels that we need to discuss on the roads at
25 this point?

1 MR. HANES: You mentioned the houses that front
2 on Road H, whether or not they should or should not.
3 Because those are --

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You know, I think if Road
5 H -- my feeling is Road H is going to be built to
6 road standards anyway. So it's going -- no matter
7 what it does it's going to receive as much traffic as
8 it would before and it may get a slight bit more. My
9 feeling is it's good to have the third egress for
10 many reasons, but just by the layout of the property
11 that you're probably going to find -- you're going to
12 find that dividing up, you know, this majority it's
13 going to use this as their main access; this majority
14 main access. There's only going to be these few
15 houses that really will, you know -- because by the
16 time you go this way and down and around up to --

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: Up Bokum Road.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No, not Bokum Road, but up
19 to 9, down into Saybrook and you're there. Same
20 thing with going out Westbrook. You could just say
21 go to Westbrook and come around that way. So you're
22 not really looking at a -- I'm not seeing that
23 everybody is going to flock to come down Ingham Hill
24 Road.

25 MS. ESTY: Road H, though, did that have bike

1 paths and things that would be impeded if we made it
2 a public road that they had as part of a private?

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: Sidewalks.

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

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

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

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

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

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Geoff, the Road H as
14 depicted now, that's a private road. What would be
15 the specifications for a public road versus a private
16 road are what, different than --

17 MR. JACOBSON: I think for Road H they would
18 basically be the same. The only thing that it could
19 possibly impact is I believe the applicant had
20 proposed some parallel parking along Road H, but,
21 again, we are starting to kind of get into some of
22 these final design details.

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

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

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

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

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yes.

7 MR. TIETJEN: I mentioned the business about
8 grade awhile back, because it is a fierce situation
9 gradewise.

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

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

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's the board of
15 selectmen's call.

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

19 MS. DeDOMINICIS: Tape change, please. Excuse
20 me. Thank you.

21 (Tape is changed.)

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

25 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Correct.

1 MR. JACOBSON: They designed it to town
2 standards. It did involve a considerable cut at that
3 end.

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

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

7 MR. JACOBSON: You're right.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We tried several different
9 things. Finally, we got to whatever section we ended
10 up calling it -- it finally went through. That was
11 the only section.

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

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It was a public road up
15 to --

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

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

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

20 MR. JACOBSON: Correct.

21 MR. TIETJEN: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Janis brought up the issue
23 of a bike path. I believe the Road A has a bike path
24 along it or was it that's been proposed? Do we want
25 to continue the bike path on Road H now that it is a

1 public road?

2 MR. HANES: I think so.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: We can make that
4 stipulation.

5 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes.

6 MR. HANES: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Road H, extend bike path.
8 Don't anybody hold their breath in our lifetime the
9 bike path will go down Ingham Hill Road. It will
10 take a lot, a lot of work. As much as we would like
11 to see that, I think it's a major safety -- you know,
12 I joke about it, but if you envision going down
13 Ingham Hill Road, Janis, to anything, the safety
14 issues would be --

15 MS. ESTY: I understand.

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

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

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I would just say this, and
24 as I mentioned to Mark earlier, that from past
25 experience there's mixed reviews legally on the -- of

1 what a developer can do -- what a town can force a
2 developer to do down -- it normally deals with
3 frontage. And the frontage is no question yes, we
4 can have him make improvements on frontage. It
5 becomes a gray area the further we get away from the
6 development and his frontage. And they can do that
7 on their own accord. We can ask them during the
8 regular process and if they agree to it, but then we
9 have to get the people that live on that road to
10 agree to it, which can be --

11 MS. GALLICCHIO: But I think that part of it is
12 showing that there is a nexus or a cause, as Janis
13 said I think very well, that if you have another 200,
14 300 --

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Trips a day.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: -- vehicle trips on Ingham Hill
17 Road and on Bokum Road, that that is going to make a
18 difference in terms of the safety of the road and
19 that there are certain areas that would be more
20 difficult with more traffic. So I think that there
21 is a point to be made for requesting or requiring the
22 applicant to make some changes down the road.

23 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right. I would say,
25 speaking as a board member and only as a board

1 member, one of the things that I would do during the
2 main application is to get as many down-road
3 improvements as we can. That would be something in
4 the best interest of the town and something we
5 should -- I would pursue as a board member.

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: Because I think everyone would
7 acknowledge --

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

11 MS. ESTY: And we may be too early in asking for
12 it.

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

15 MS. ESTY: Because both Ingham Hill Road and
16 Bokum Road --

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: There are some major safety
18 issues on Bokum and Ingham Hill Road that would need
19 to be addressed for safety issues and that we would
20 be looking to the applicant to help in remedying
21 these situations.

22 MS. GALLICCHIO: Because the difficulty would be
23 increased with the increased traffic.

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

1 Anybody have any other issues on the roads? We
2 have bicycle paths, which is the same thing as a
3 pedestrian path.

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

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah, that hot dog looking
9 thing.

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

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

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Excuse me?

14 MR. TIETJEN: Did we take the lots out, several
15 lots out there and have a recreation laid out last
16 time?

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

18 MS. GALLICCHIO: That was down in the lower
19 part.

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That was an exercise.
21 That's all it was was an exercise, that whole of
22 getting the yield.

23 MR. TIETJEN: Right.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: It was all -- you know, some
25 was based on formulation of what lots would be

1 removed, and on the basis of that we used that as one
2 of the criteria of wanting to have some active
3 recreational area in that area.

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

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

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

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And it would have to before
16 it could get approved.

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

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

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Any road that we see on here
23 has to be a doable road. I mean right now it may not
24 be as it's depicted on here, but it's going to have
25 to shift left, right, up and down one way or the

1 other to make it, you know -- because if you get into
2 a situation where you have a subdivision application,
3 the roads have to meet the standards, period, or the
4 subdivision doesn't get approved. So to worry about,
5 you know, this thing here, that can be addressed. It
6 will be addressed as just another issue of probably
7 hundreds of other road issues that will be, you know,
8 taken up by engineers.

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: Okay. Then I have nothing
10 else.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: At least 100.

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

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: In his report.

15 MS. GALLICCHIO: Well, he's saying that it needs
16 to not be discussed necessarily by us, but that the
17 applicant would need to discuss it with the board of
18 selectmen, because it's --

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And they have probably at
20 these meetings.

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

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Functional as maintenance.

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: Is that doing maintenance?

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Maintenance, oil,
2 construction, garbage trucks; it's moving vans. You
3 just can't get them around those tight radiuses.
4 School buses.

5 MR. JACOBSON: School buses.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Fire trucks. The biggest
7 vehicles are the school buses and the fire trucks.

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: It is a public road.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah. So there could be
10 possibly one or two kids that live down there. All
11 it takes is one.

12 Any other issues on the roads that we need to
13 discuss tonight? It doesn't mean you can't bring it
14 up later on. I just want to make sure nobody has
15 strong outstanding feelings on the roads that we
16 haven't discussed yet.

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

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Well, I think if you look
21 here --

22 MR. HANES: That's our land.

23 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: They have to go here. And
24 they brought that road purposely there, and I think
25 at the suggestion of the board of selectmen. So we

1 would -- if in fact when we wanted to have access to
2 our property, when we built our road going into that
3 property, that it would have to be the shortest
4 distance.

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

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

12 MR. JACOBSON: Yeah. I think what we would
13 probably do is just make sure that that little sliver
14 of land between the road right-of-way and the town
15 was deeded over to the town to provide the frontage
16 for access into -- but I mean not knowing what the
17 use is now, it would be hard to plan an access.

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

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

1 MR. HANES: Well, true.

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: You could have a driveway or a
3 road coming at another angle.

4 MR. HANES: Having like a boulevard through a --
5 you know, public land.

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

8 MR. JACOBSON: I think with the roads along
9 parallel both property lines, there's all kinds of
10 opportunities for access, wherever they might want
11 it, for whatever they might put in there. It's a
12 fairly steep drop-off down towards the wetlands up in
13 the corner. There might be an area for possibly a
14 ball field or something like that. But, again, I
15 have no idea of what the selectmen, you know, have
16 ideas for for that property. I have no idea.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Is there any other concerns
18 about the roadways?

19 MR. TIETJEN: How about runoff?

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: No.

21 MR. TIETJEN: From the roads I mean.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I don't think so, not at
23 this time. Unless you see one that -- it's the
24 question to Geoff. Any road that you're going to
25 approve to build is going to have to have the runoff

1 managed --

2 MR. JACOBSON: Yes.

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

5 MR. JACOBSON: Correct.

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

8 MR. JACOBSON: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: If we had a road running
10 right through Pequot Swamp, we would say move it out
11 of Pequot Swamp.

12 MR. TIETJEN: Surely you're kidding.

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

16 MR. TIETJEN: I'm mostly worried about that one
17 connection.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Our concern's with the road
19 as access. We took care of three points of access.
20 We have a bicycle path going down all public -- you
21 know, A and H. H is open to Ingham Hill Road. And
22 like I said, as we go along -- obviously, there's 26
23 houses -- 27 houses eliminated from this design here.
24 This brings us back to the point of one of the things
25 I brought up during the public hearing; you were just

1 bringing up about active recreational area. I still
2 feel strongly that there should be some of this land
3 set aside for active. I'm not sure where I want to
4 have that. I would just say I want a levy
5 requirement of at least a seven-, eight- or ten-acre
6 parcel for active recreation and then when we get
7 into the final deliberations later on, if we get that
8 far - this is all still just talking - that we be
9 back -- then we would be back in the public hearing
10 and get some input from park and rec what they would
11 like to see there ball fieldwise, soccer field,
12 whatever they want want to see.

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

15 MS. ESTY: Yes.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And there shouldn't be any
18 problem doing that with 27 houses being removed from
19 there. They should be able to manipulate this map
20 for doing that. Before there was no room for it
21 other than using the active -- the open space that
22 had already been dedicated as passive open space, and
23 they said there weren't any good flat spots.

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

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

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right here.

4 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right there?

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

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

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: Look on the bigger map.

10 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What we are asking about is
11 where is old Ingham homestead?

12 MS. GOODFRIEND: On the enclosed map it has it
13 right in the center, next to the green. The bottom
14 of Pequot Swamp to the west.

15 MR. SNARSKI: West.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Between 11 and --

17 MS. GOODFRIEND: Fifteen.

18 MR. JACOBSON: There's an arrow leader that goes
19 to a little dot. Do you see the arrow leader that
20 goes through the wetland and then it goes -- it's
21 actually the yellow area there.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So it's to the north of hole
23 13.

24 MS. GOODFRIEND: Correct.

25 MR. JACOBSON: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That little dot right there.

2 And it's just adjacent to where it says Old Ingham
3 Hill Trail or whatever that wording is right there.

4 MR. JACOBSON: Yep.

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

8 Is there anything else anyone needs -- that we
9 want to discuss tonight? Do you feel strongly
10 about --

11 MR. HANES: I think there was one comment made
12 by --

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Go ahead, keep talking.

14 MR. HANES: There was comment made about the
15 workshop, the maintenance shop for the golf course.
16 It was in an area that drains down to the swamp.

17 MR. SNARSKI: To the vernal pool.

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

1 MR. HANES: And they drain toward that.

2 MR. SNARSKI: Yes.

3 MR. HANES: I think your recommendation was that
4 they should be relocated.

5 MS. GOODFRIEND: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I agree on that. The
7 problem is -- the other thing is what -- you know,
8 you have this maintenance area. It sounds like it's
9 not in the best location. There are 27 houses that
10 are going to be -- lots that are going to be removed
11 which will give the developer some wiggle room to
12 relocate things, but there's only so much wiggle
13 room. I don't want to use that trump card too many
14 times. You can only use them for 27.

15 MS. ESTY: But if we don't like it, it's up to
16 them to figure it out.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's the other side of the
18 coin. As Mark said you can be specific or you can be
19 general, and that's how we are going to have to stay.
20 If we want to stay general, we can't be specific and
21 general at the same time. He said to stay away from
22 that, that gets oddball. But if you say move -- you
23 know, move to -- the golf course's maintenance
24 facility to a better location, not where it's
25 running -- so that it's not running downhill into a

1 vernal pool area or into a wetlands.

2 MS. ESTY: That makes more sense, otherwise we
3 are going to try to squeeze all of these little
4 widgets in.

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Everywhere you're going to
6 go, wetlands, maintenance facilities, that has a
7 higher standard. That's where everything is being
8 stored. There's oil, gas, fertilizer, pesticides,
9 all of these things that are going to be stored there
10 that it does mean we should focus on that.

11 MS. ESTY: I agree. I'm saying maybe it's the
12 direction. I don't think I want to be telling the
13 developer where to put these things. I want to tell
14 the developer what I don't like and he can figure it
15 out.

16 MS. GALLICCHIO: Absolutely, yes.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's the way we should
18 proceed with everything. We don't like this, but how
19 does everybody feel about the 27 lots? Should we
20 leave -- you know, make our recommendations and allow
21 the developer to use the removal of 27 lots for him
22 to be able to do these changes that we want or do we
23 want to say we don't want this one; we don't want
24 that one?

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: Let me just speak kind of in

1 general that -- something that has disturbed me and I
2 mentioned it at public hearing is the concept of
3 estate lots in a Conservation C District. To me the
4 Conservation C District is to conserve areas and
5 provide more open space by clustering. And one of
6 the things we wanted to avoid was having one house on
7 acreage with its own driveway, et cetera, and which
8 does not provide contiguous open space just by nature
9 of driveways and houses that are far apart and have
10 perhaps manicured lawns, et cetera.

11 MR. TIETJEN: Touché.

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: So I think that that's one
13 possibility is that if the other commission members
14 felt as I do, that I'm uncomfortable with those
15 type -- the estate type lots of four acres, that they
16 could -- the houses in that area could be clustered
17 more.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Lot size reduced.

19 MS. GALLICCHIO: Lot size reduced, more closely
20 clustered lots and that would open up spaces for more
21 contiguous open space in other parts of the plan and
22 for moving some of the golf course to different
23 locations. I say that as one alternative.

24 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So basically what you're
25 saying you want to see -- what do they call these

1 other things? What are they calling these?

2 MS. GALLICCHIO: Single family.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Single-family resident lots
4 versus the estate lots. You would like to see the
5 estate lots condensed more.

6 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: And make it --

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: Using less infrastructure.

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

11 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yeah. If you think of -- how
12 many estate lots are there? Anybody know off the
13 top --

14 MR. TIETJEN: Forty.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Approximately 24 best count.

16 MR. TIETJEN: That's all?

17 MS. GALLICCHIO: All right, so 24.

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's what I counted. I
19 may be wrong.

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: If they were even in areas half
21 the size, which isn't really even clustering.
22 Theoretically you could fit 80, 96 houses in the area
23 where you've got 24 and then allowing you -- I mean
24 to me that's the whole concept of a Conservation C
25 District is you use the best land for developing --

1 to develop and you leave the rest alone.

2 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You could still -- okay.

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

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: Definitely more expensive,
9 because it's more land.

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

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

13 MR. TIETJEN: Contiguous open space. This is
14 what you say. It's one of the things the plan is
15 supposed to be talking about and we are supposed to
16 be talking about. Great idea.

17 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: What the developer, when he
18 gave his proposal to us that these lots would make --
19 this is what he was looking for to make this thing
20 work, okay, which not a whole lot of weight needs to
21 be thrown on that, but the statement was made. You
22 could -- and I believe this was discussed during --
23 when we talked I think you might have brought this
24 up, that what can happen on these 20 some odd lots is
25 that a lot of this land can be put into conservation

1 easement.

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

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I'm saying that's another
4 route to -- because I think all this little dark
5 area --

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

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

9 MS. GALLICCHIO: It's not. And theoretically
10 it's contiguous because it's connected, but it's not
11 meaningful. It's not as meaningful as an area.

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: You would like to see this
13 clustered a little bit tighter.

14 MS. GALLICCHIO: I would like to see it
15 clustered a lot tighter.

16 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: The thing is I think -- I
17 don't mind telling them what we want to do. I want
18 to be able to tell them what we want them to do, that
19 right now these are probably some pretty hefty square
20 footage houses.

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: I would guess.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: So, in turn, that I'm not
23 sure we allowed to put these together here and I
24 don't know whether there's any square footage
25 regulation here. Could you almost cluster these like

1 this. I've seen it done. You go down to Long Island
2 and you see it, you know.

3 MS. GALLICCHIO: I think about other pictures,
4 et cetera that I've seen of golf course communities
5 in the Carolinas, et cetera.

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

8 MS. GALLICCHIO: But they are not necessarily
9 estate -- what we think of as an estate home, a
10 four-acre parcel.

11 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's what I'm trying to
12 get at. When we say this are we saying we don't mind
13 them being -- the size of the homes can remain the
14 homes as anticipated by the developer; we just want
15 to see them clustered. And how much clustering do
16 you want to see? I mean do you want one -- each one
17 of them one acre and then the rest be -- do you want
18 them on one-acre parcels, two-acre parcels, an
19 acre-and-a-half parcel?

20 MS. GALLICCHIO: I'm not sure.

21 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: That's something we would
22 have to direct them so he knows what we are asking
23 him to do. You have to be able to tell him what we
24 want to do.

25 MS. GALLICCHIO: I'm not sure if the other

1 commissioners are comfortable with that. It does
2 afford a variety of housing style.

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Right.

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

5 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I would say to the
6 developer, yes, it is.

7 MS. GALLICCHIO: Yes, it is what?

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Beneficial to him to have --
9 you know, by marketing techniques and everything.
10 They realize that they would be presenting this as
11 what they thought was the most marketable, but that's
12 not what our main concern is. Our main concern is
13 the environment and the layout of the subdivision.
14 It doesn't conform to the Conservation C District,
15 does it? Does it?

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

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But don't we run into --
21 what is the amount of open space that is presently --
22 we have so much open space being presented to us now.
23 Do we go -- do we start going on to that other -- are
24 we on the positive -- we are pretty well at our
25 requirements right now, correct? I can't remember.

1 It's getting late. So why don't we check that out.
2 That's one thing we need to do.

3 My question is is that when we start saying we
4 want more open space here, okay, are we now -- say we
5 brought this down into five acres. This is four --
6 whatever that multiplication is. You would end up
7 with having a significant additional acreage of open
8 space.

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

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

16 MR. TIETJEN: It sounds like we are getting a
17 little closer to our justification for the clustering
18 and so forth is all about. Open space is accessible
19 to people and they don't have to walk ten miles to
20 get somewhere or cover an acre with a driveway. It's
21 nuts.

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Is there anything anybody
23 has to discuss tonight? Okay. Then we get back to
24 our little -- okay. Once again, so we are at the
25 point of there was -- once those plans, those yield

1 plan numbers are determined, should the proposed
2 preliminary plan be approved as submitted or should
3 it be modified, and conditioned, and approved? I
4 think we are at the modified, conditioned, and
5 approved stage right now. We are -- basically, we
6 are not as submitted, correct?

7 MS. GALLICCHIO: Right.

8 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. So we are at the
9 modified number four. If modified, conditioned in
10 what way? And that's the process we are in right
11 now, and that's a continual process. After we get
12 done with that process, is the open space subdivision
13 as proposed by the applicant - we are going through
14 that phase right now - unlikely to reasonably impair,
15 pollute as I stated earlier?

16 Number six, last thing, are there feasible and
17 prudent alternatives that would reduce and eliminate
18 adverse impacts? So basically, we are going to just
19 continue this to the next meeting.

20 I would say this to the board members, that we
21 have -- as we have been holding these meetings, they
22 have been going to every other Wednesday opposite our
23 regular planning meetings. I don't know how the
24 other board members feel about how close we are to
25 getting to a final conclusion on this, but keeping in

1 mind that we should try to get it closed up by the
2 next meeting. And I'm not feeling comfortable with
3 what I'm hearing right now that that's going to be
4 doable. So in that turn that we may have to have one
5 more special meeting before the 16th to finalize and
6 that may be necessary.

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

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

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: We used it all up on public
13 hearing.

14 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Yeah, yeah. As a matter of
15 fact, that's what happened. We kept going and going
16 and going. That's the 65 days. We might have a
17 couple of days.

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

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: But I would have thought
21 that Christine would have built that into the -- we
22 need to find that out.

23 Now that -- I know there's three people
24 wondering whether they need to be here at the next
25 meeting. I would think yes, we would like to -- if

1 you can come to our next meeting that we have, and
2 that will be the -- what's this -- next Wednesday
3 is --

4 MS. GALLICCHIO: The 2nd is our regular planning
5 commission meeting.

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

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

12 MS. GALLICCHIO: Ninth.

13 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Stu, why don't you make a
14 motion.

15 MR. HANES: I make a motion that we continue our
16 deliberation on The Preserve to our next special
17 meeting on March 9th at 7:30 at the town hall, first
18 floor conference room.

19 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: At 302 Main Street.

20 MR. HANES: 302 Main Street.

21 MS. GALLICCHIO: I'll second.

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

25 (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: All in favor, aye.

2 (Affirmative response given by all.)

3 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Everybody is in agreement.

4 Our staff should come. Maybe we can invite Christine
5 again and she'll show up for us. She's sick. I
6 shouldn't do that to her.

7 Thank you very much for your time tonight and
8 your input. Is there anything I missed before we
9 adjourn that we normally do?

10 Are we out of tape?

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

12 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay. Motion to adjourn.

13 MR. HANES: Motion to adjourn.

14 MR. TIETJEN: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Motion made by Stuart,
16 second by Dick Tietjen. Any discussion?

17 (No response.)

18 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: All in favor, aye.

19 (Affirmative response given by all.)

20 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Opposed.

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: Okay.

23 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
24 10:44 p.m.)

25

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

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

I, Debrah Veroni, Registered Professional Reporter, do hereby certify that the within and foregoing pages 1-137 are a true and accurate transcript of my steno notes taken at the Deliberation Hearing held by the Old Saybrook Planning Commission on the 23rd day of February, 2005, at the Old Saybrook Town Hall, 302 Main Street, Old Saybrook, Connecticut, in the matter filed In Re: The Preserve Special Exception for Open Space Subdivision.

Certified this 3rd day of May, 2005.

Debrah Veroni, RPR, LSR

