

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  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

**Litchfield Planning Board**  
**January 22, 2008**  
Minutes Approved 3/18/08

**Members present:**

- Steve Perry, Chairman
- Jayson Brennen, Vice Chairman
- Alison Douglas, Clerk
- Leon Barry
- Raymond C. Peebles, Sr., Selectmen’s Representative
- Edward Almeida, Alternate
- Marc Ducharme

**Members Not Present:**

- Carlos Fuertes, Alternate
- Mary Ann Geist

**Also Present:**

- Joan McKibben, Planning Board Coordinator
- Steve Wagner, Nashua Regional Planning Commission, Circuit Rider
- Lou Caron, L.C.Engineer, Consultant Engineer

**Agenda**

**1. Rolling Acres IV, Tax Map 2 Lot 88. The Board to continue consideration of an application to subdivide one lot into four single family, one acre residential lots with one remaining non-residential lot of 88 acres.**

**2. CTAP**

**3. Any Other Business**

Chairman Perry called the meeting to order at 7:08 p.m. Chairman Perry appointed Edward Almeida as a voting member. At this time, Chairman Perry announced there was \$501 left in the 2007 budget.

**Cutler & Page LLC, Rolling Acres IV**

The applicants have submitted an application for acceptance and approval for a proposed 4 lot single family subdivision with a large remainder lot.

Mr. James Crowley, Maynard & Paquette, PA, and Attorney Andy Prolman were present

1  
2 representing the applicants: Cutler & Page LLC, and Vatchie Manoukian.  
3

4 Mr. Perry asked when the plans were submitted. Mr. Crowley replied January 14, 2008.  
5 Mr. Crowley: We had a meeting on the 10<sup>th</sup> with Caron Engineering and NRPC and made  
6 the changes based on that meeting. Revision 3 is submitted incorporating the changes.  
7

8 Mr. Caron went over his comments in his letter dated January 21, 2008. He told the  
9 Board that all the comments in his December 17, 2007, letter were taken care of.  
10

11 Mr. Caron: The one issue has to do with the interrelationship of the project. Pieces of  
12 Phase I right-of-way or land is being partially built already and somebody else will be  
13 building some of the roads to tie into this one. I have been on too many projects and sites  
14 where they need to be tied together this approval with progress on the other projects to  
15 make sure something does not come up. The other part is the drainage. Jim Crowley did  
16 quite an extraordinary job putting this report together. I took a simplified approach rather  
17 than go through in-depth all his numbers, it is very detailed. The question that needed to  
18 be answered had to do with volume of water. The direction the Board gave the applicant  
19 was the next phase they had to demonstrate the project would not add to the flooding  
20 going to this culvert, the 24 inch culvert, on Page Road and so what they took upon  
21 themselves not to just look at Phase IV but the whole project, prepost development. So,  
22 the situation you have here is you have Tributary B which wraps around and goes offsite  
23 in the area where the geography we are talking about is the site itself and offsite water  
24 from Louise Drive that comes onto the site and ends up in Tributary B eventually. So,  
25 you have this site which drains directly to Tributary B and then you have offsite up here  
26 and this goes to low spot which does not get to Tributary B. There are also low spots on  
27 the site which do not go to Tributary B. Then you have another little area that goes off  
28 this way, it is site water that goes offsite to the northeast.  
29

30 Mr. Caron continues. This area up here is 6.2 acres, the low spot is 23.9 acres, and the  
31 acreage I got off the chart that Jim had on his plan which is predevelopment. There is 4.6  
32 acres that goes offsite then 104.7 acres and this is broken out into 28 acres of wetland and  
33 76.7 acres of uplands. So, that is the condition before they ever broke ground. There are  
34 4 low spots, two are wetlands, the others we had an argument at one point on Phase I  
35 whether it was wetland; it turned out not to be. When you do the calculation for a 100  
36 year storm, I used 6 ½ inches of rain for a 24 hour period. The storms that we had last  
37 April were ranging about 3-4 inches and calculating out they were about a 25 year storm  
38 event. The calculation that I have, both SCS method uses 6 ½ inches for 100 year storm  
39 and when you go to the congressional method for a 24 hour event, it comes out to be 6 ½  
40 and looking at history over the last three years, that number tends to be the one that pops  
41 out over a 24 hour period as being a 100 storm event. So, applying this number to this  
42 acreage and the wetlands has a different runoff factor than that upland and I factored that  
43 in. This yields 1,147,000 cubic feet of water over a 24 hour period; that is what goes to  
44 Tributary B. So, this number here was kind of a baseline that you did not want to exceed.  
45

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  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

So, now when you go to the post thing, you have your site. This 6.2 acres now goes to Tributary B because of the drainage they put in under Phase I. They put in culverts and that all got routed down to the brook or through that long drain swale and it gets to Tributary B. Out of these low spots they get split up because the low spots in front of the site now go to Tributary B. There are two other low spots that don't. So, you have this becomes 13 acres which are low spots and the other 10.9 acres are now going to go to Tributary B and you still have the 4.6 offsite...so then what is left on this site is you have 42 acres on this site that have been developed and you have this 10.9 that are low and the balance which is the underdeveloped part comes out to be 62.7 acres of which 20 acres is wet and 34.7 is uplands. So, what I did I looked at the 42 acres and I looked at the 6.2 and the 10.9 acres of the three areas that will increase runoff to Tributary B and I did a little computation, a spread sheet and I signed prepost runoff values and for predevelopment I used a runoff coefficient because the soils are very good there. Point 2 means 20 % of the water would runoff because of the soil types and this goes back to tables that I have available in drainage manuals. The post development you have the houses and the driveways; I made some assumptions there for footprint and how many square feet per lot. The roadways is 90% runoff from roadways where it was 20% ...and I came up with 42 acres was going to generate an additional 110,700 cubic feet of water. The 6.2 acres off Louise Drive was going to add 54,200 cubic feet of water in that the low spots the 10.9 acres going to Tributary B is going to add 51,400 acres. So, the total acres increase that I calculated was 212,500 cubic feet, the total that was coming off of here when you compare the numbers.

Talk ensued. Mr. Caron: This is the amount that needed to be put in the bathtub and not leave the site. What Jim has provided is four detention basins on the site and the total storage volume in all four is 213,250. So, what my numbers are saying he has provided enough storage to handle what I had calculated as being the overflow? Now, you talk about method, it is essentially what I have done is taken runoff coefficient as defined by a rational method as the percentage of what is going to runoff and I just took the footprint. You have this geography and it has these four components and then you develop it and the components change...you have pavement for driveways, you have lawn where you have woods which has a little higher runoff and I just calculated this difference. Generally, what Jim has done is provided enough volume. There was one recommendation I had on one of the ponds it had a very large footprint and by changing the wear elevation by a couple of tenths, it added another 23,000 cubic feet of storage. I am hoping he will be able to do that and just give a little bit of I guess safety factor.

Mr. Perry: Is it sufficient and it will be such a slight change to make it larger, is it worthwhile?

Mr. Caron: I think so. I have made a lot of assumptions; the detention facilities really do not come into play here because with a storm event they will be typically drained out. Detention ponds are to have peak flows so they do not let the peak flow go in but the

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  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

water volume, the extra volume is still going in through detention ponds. So, I ignored that; it is not time based other than this is just 6 1/2 inches of water falling out of the sky on this site the so many acres that are involved here. It is a rough calculation but to me it is a simple way as compared to convolutions that you go through with the SCS method. I tried to be a little on the conservative side. This does not account for future development. It would have to be able to take care of itself. This is not an entire lot solution but rather Rolling Acres I through IV, it should be better off when they are done than it is today.

Mr. Perry: It will help the situation that we have on Page Road coming over?

Mr. Caron: Yes.

Mr. Perry: It would lessen that.

Mr. Caron: It would lessen that.

Mr. Perry: Dramatically?

Mr. Caron: Probably not. I did not do any analysis of how much is being contributed from offsite.

Mr. Perry: So, most of it is coming from offsite?

Mr. Caron: This is 100 something acres of the watershed. You can feel comfortable in saying that Rolling Acres I thru IV it will not increase the volume of water to Tributary B.

Talk ensued. Mr. Perry: They are not responsible for fixing the water that is already there just to make sure no more water is going there.

Mr. Crowley: What we are trying to do is to take all this development at Phase I thru IV and before we build anything, you had so much runoff, 900,000 cubic feet, and after we did all four phases that we are proposing, we are up to a million something. Now, what we did is different areas on here we captured that water before it gets into Tributary B and goes underneath the culvert...

At this time, Mr. Leon Barry removed himself from the Board.

Mr. Crowley: We tried to capture all the water for a 100 year event that we would cause any increase to or least equaled or less impact on this culvert from our project. We have no control over what is up radiant or whatever...we equalized everything.

Mr. Caron: Using his calculation for conglomeration of the entire site with the catch basins and drain pipes and diverse ways in which water travels he calculated 157,000

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  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

cubic feet was going into his four ponds.

Mr. Crowley showed location of the four ponds on the plan. Mr. Crowley: I had to take all the phases and give them water treatment, 25 year storm then design it so I capture 100 year event.

Mr. Perry: How much do you have to elevate the sidewalls of the detention basins on the three that you are going to put over by the let's call it the brook?

Mr. Crowley: That is about 2 ½ feet. It is not considered a dam; a dam would be 4 feet.

Mrs. McKibben: The sides will be elevated?

Mr. Caron: It is a combination of a berm with excavation behind it.

Mr. Crowley: But the original land would be here and we berm up and we might go down a foot.

Mr. Brennen: What is the low to high elevation from the bottom of your basin to the top of the wall?

Mr. Crowley: That would be 4 feet max and that would be 2 year emergency overflow.

Mr. Caron: It will be shown on the grading plan.

It was said Drawing 11 gives the treatment basins, and it is on the plans. Mr. Perry: Drawing 4, I see the one that used to be on your fifth lot. Mr. Crowley: Yes, drawing 4, you have your detention basin OL43.

Mr. Perry: On Drawing 5 you have another one on Rolling Acres III. Does that one stay in existence?

Mr. Crowley: Yes, that detention basin what happens all that drainage was designed to come down Horizon Drive, be treated in that detention basin and then released into the swale and keep on going to Tributary B. Now, back in the earlier phases we were more worried about peaks not volumes and we got more intelligent... I have severed the pipes in Horizon Drive and taken the cul-de-sac and say 2/3 half of that and rerouted back to retention area. So, I captured that volume and I percolated into the ground to stop gradient of a wetlands and what that does it relieves the flow going to Tributary B; that detention basin that we were looking at, OL43.

Mr. Perry: Are you dumping it down towards that little wetlands that is delineated on your main plan? Mr. Crowley: Yep, right in there. Mr. Perry: How close are you getting?

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  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

Mr. Crowley: We are outside, there is the 50 foot setback and then I am about 75 feet away.

Mr. Perry asked if there are vernal pools. Mr. Crowley: In November I sent our wetlands scientist out there and he said it was very low to moderate. On your regulations 1207.03 on your buffers that is where it talks about 200 feet within that. If you go all the way to the end, it says that you are allowed to do swales, drainage ditches, sedimentation, detention basins within that 200 feet but you stay out of the 50 ft buffer and I tried to maximize it and kept 75 feet away.

Mr. Perry: Drawing 6 we have another one catch basin c.

Mr. Crowley: I blew up that corner of the project and you will see at the top is the detention basin lot 43 you have a swale coming down, that is where we were going to put our detention and is the primary treatment of your 25 year storm. Then what happens as that fills, as you approach 100 year event that will overflow into retention/detention basin b. So, your 25 year event is happening and then you are shifting into a 100 year...what that does is fill up and even as that fills up for a 100 year event, it can even flow into basin d. It is like filling up different bathtubs and then not directly connected to that is retention basin c, those are down low, outlet 43, b and d are down at a lower elevation and up higher is c. I am trying to add even more storage and all the time I tried to keep the berm heights to a minimum and capture towards the surface. Most of this what you see is for 100 year event. It was a balancing act. I always want to treat the 25 year storm...your major event 2 year storm trying to take the sediment load out and treat the water as best you can and your design for Litchfield is a 25 year event. Hudson and Nashua is 10 year events. This project is unique in we are worried about the 100 year and now volumes not treating the water while we are capturing, holding the water in a bathtub...indirectly we are treating.

Mr. Perry: So, it just percolates through.

Mr. Crowley: Right.

Mr. Brennen: During the big storms the water went over Cutler up to the houses in Phase II. Do these detention basins and topo changes displace any water that would have been sitting there during the storm?

Mr. Crowley: No, what we do just like if you had a thing here in your 100 event went to this elevation. What you are saying if I am building out in here I am displacing some of that storage. We are outside the 100 year event area right now where we are building these extra retention areas so we do not displace. About 4 months ago I had proposed we come in certain areas and build a shelf and add storage just connect it with Tributary B but it did not work out too well.

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  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

Talk ensued. Mr. Crowley: We are not using up any existing storage. When you talked about Cutler flooding by Rotterdam Drive that is already predicted on a 100 year flood event on FEMA maps. I will admit Phase II here, the houses are outside the 100 year event but what we did when we put in the drainage system we picked up extra areas that were offsite because the Town of Litchfield had dumped the low points and we had to pipe it. We had actually aggravated the problem but I really wish I had had over in here where the culvert is there is like a sag in there and ideally the first floors are all above that but I wish I would have took the basement and had at least that or a foot above it and then we would not have gotten all these phone calls. People would have still gotten water in their back yards but they would not have had the Fire Department out there...it is designed to be above the 100. I think we picked up more drainage this time.

Mr. Caron: Aesthetically when you first see these things they will look like a ball park but over time...mother nature the woods that are out there will slowly reclaim...it will look like a wooded area in 15 to 20 years from now.

Mrs. McKibben: Will it still work as a retention?

Mr. Caron: Yes.

Talk ensued. Mr. Perry: Retention basin c, that seems to be the largest one of all...give me a ballpark idea how big that is.

Mr. Crowley: 130 x 330 feet. What it is you are just building a slight berm on that and it is coming in there.

Mr. Caron: At the elevation of 177, the surface area is 58,000 square feet but when you are talking 100 year event talking 200,000 cubic feet and divide that by 40,000 you are talking some acreage feet.

Mr. Perry: I like the fact that you were able to put most of the stuff over to the side where Tributary B is...much improved.

Mr. Crowley: We have definitely improved the situation out there. Phase IV has improved not only is good but we have improved everything all the way from Phase I to Phase IV and alleviated quite a bit of a problem at the culvert...we added roof drain retention on each of the houses as well which was a carry over.

Mr. Caron: For 29 homes each one has a footprint of 1200 feet, the cubic feet runoff was 13,200 cubic feet for a 100 storm event. So, that amount is being put into the ground through these infiltrators which I did not figure that in.

Att. Prolman: In Lou's letter there are three points and all are fine by the applicant. The first is because of the phasing we are modifying some drainage issues on Phase III. Lou

1  
2 suggested the owner of Phase III provide written concurrence to the modifications. That  
3 is fine. Cutler & Page LLC still owns Phase III & IV so there is the implied consent so if  
4 the Board wants something on letterhead, we will be happy to provide that. Second thing  
5 is there has been some legitimate concern about the phasing out of the infrastructure that  
6 Weatherstone is not getting built fast enough. Phase IV might get built before Phase III. I  
7 would suggest that a note be added to Phase IV plan that no building permits be allowed  
8 for Phase IV until Phase III infrastructure including Weatherstone is substantially  
9 complete. Finally, you heard Jim say the additional elevation to the overflow wear adding  
10 what appears to be ½ foot to the detention basin b overflow. That is fine.

11  
12 Mrs. McKibben: Are the detention grassed slope?

13  
14 Mr. Crowley: Yes.

15  
16 Mrs. McKibben: The one that covers two lots, how deep is that?

17  
18 Mr. Crowley: That was actually designed on Phase III; it is about 4½ feet deep.

19  
20 Mrs. McKibben: The slopes are gradual?

21  
22 Mr. Crowley: Yes, 3 on 1 slopes.

23  
24 Talk ensued. Mr. Crowley: On Cutler Road 20/20 hindsight if we would have raised the  
25 houses another foot or two, we would have been all happier.

26  
27 Chairman Perry opened the meeting to public comment.

28  
29 Mr. Barry said he has a concern when “we walked the land at Phase IV and looking at the  
30 swale in the backyard, it was in tough shape and so close to where the houses were. There  
31 was a lot of junk thrown in which it has nothing to do with the builder any longer but my  
32 concern is when the new swales are built and you are saying they are going to be up 2½  
33 feet, the berms were up four feet. They were up higher than 2½ feet”.

34  
35 Mr. Crowley: What you are looking at is any height was right in this area, that was  
36 actually a trench; down in this area, the berm was about this high...

37  
38 Mr. Barry: If you go through that area now, he pipes are up higher than where the water  
39 level would be. I guess my concern is when you say it is going to be grass, you put the  
40 cloth down first, that what you do to hold it back?

41  
42 Mr. Perry: Lou, you inspected that and it is fixed? Mr. Caron: I do not think so. I never  
43 went back out there and checked. I do not think it has. What I saw evidence out there was  
44 lack of loam in some areas and you could see the coconut matting, you could see it on  
45 there usually that disappears with time and it looked like there were a few spots where

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  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

people had taken ATV's and went across; it was trashy. Mr. Perry: What it was if I remember underneath Weatherstone the pipe came through and it probably only went 20 feet, the water did and the water stopped right there because there was a six inch puddle. What happened this is where some of the erosion brought down the side. It filled it to a point, it was holding that water back and that is what needed to be fixed.

Mrs. Douglas asked if these will become an expense to the Town to maintain when completed. It was said yes. Mr. Barry: This is why I think the interesting thing to consider is the berm all dirt and loam or for the sake of the Town is part of that berm concrete, I am just throwing that out. Then there is a control; it does not keep eroding away, because you see when you walk that place where it is not trashy where it has been opened up by a vehicle or something, the water is just coming in that way and filling up with dirt. If that was a trench that was down 4 feet and now it is a heck of a lot less than that because it is getting filled in from everything that is washing down to it.

Mr. Perry: If you do have a major storm, you are only blocking six inches of water.

Mr. Barry: If Phase I is not complete yet then I think it should be noted that it should be addressed or looked at.

Mr. Perry: I am surprised that it has not been fixed yet because that was over a year ago.

Mr. Caron: It has been noted.

Chairman Perry closed public comment.

Att. Prolman: If this were to be sold to separate builders Phase III and IV part of the sale would make each phase subject to the other and there would be various cross access rights and build out rights. They would need to tweak note 28 to state that if Phase IV gets held back, permits building permits on Phase IV until such time as Weatherstone and Phase III are substantially complete.

Mr. Perry asked if the telephone pole (Phase I) has been moved. Att. Prolman: I do not know but a pole was added a few feet down on Page out of the driveway area. I do not know if PSNH and Verizon have made the switch. Mr. Perry: That house cannot get a C.O. until that pole is gone.

Mr. Wagner asked about putting in cul-de-sacs in case Phase IV was not finished which was mentioned at the preconstruction meeting. Mr. Caron: If Phase III gets built out before Phase IV goes without having Horizon, what we talked about at the preconstruction meeting is they wanted to build from Page Road to Weatherstone to the ten where the intersection is and take some building permits they have and build houses. Well, it would result there would be no turn around at the end of the road...the right-of-way will be there, the road is there, but somebody would have to be on top of that.

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  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

Talk ensued regarding phasing. Mr. Caron said it was never suggested that it would be phased until they got to the preconstruction meeting.

Mr. Wagner's notes were reviewed:

6. Add note No building permits issued until Weatherstone is completed to base coarse and drainage functional. Attorney Prolman agreed.

8. Marc Jacobs, CWS didn't think Lot 88 wetlands is Vernal. Any disturbance is temporary and minimal drainage control is proposed. We can verify in spring but it appears to fall under Zoning 1205, Permitted Uses. Recommend note stating BMP's to be followed and inspected. Mr. Wagner said it seems to meet the standard of minimal impact...verify in the spring. Mr. Wagner said put a note that activity will follow appropriate BMP's and be part of the inspection process to make sure they are following the BMP's.

9. Lou will check.

11. Basement floor elevations are correct. Lou reviewed and no issue. See drawing 4.

Mr. Crowley said he has no response from the Fire Chief. He did receive a phone call the day of the last meeting from the Fire Chief and he reminded him he was happy with the plan but he wanted Springhill changed to spring. Mrs. McKibben will ask the Fire Chief for a letter. Talk went on regarding the Fire Chief's naming the road different names. This was discussed. Some members want to see it with one name for the entire road. Att. Prolman said he will think about it further. Mr. Crowley will ask the Fire Chief to review it again.

Mr. Wagner suggested that street signs and house numbers be erected before starting construction.

19. Recommends the developer split construction traffic between roads to reduce impact on residents: one road to enter and one road to exit. It was said that this would be hard to enforce. Mr. Wagner said to bring it up at the preconstruction meeting.

20. Active and Substantial Development and Substantial Completion.

21. Legal documents to town counsel.

22. Updates to floodplain maps. If they have been adopted, need to incorporate them.

23. Abutters were noticed for the December meeting.

Attorney Prolman said he has requested an extension. Mr. Brennen: We are plotting all kinds of drainage that they have done extensive work on for 4 lots. There are a ton of other areas in this subdivision and I am concerned about the big picture and the drainage mitigation for the entire thing as opposed to what we are doing here just for 4 lots. When we talked about this subdivision back in the day there was thoughts of using some of this as recreation area...and for me without seeing the entire thing and thinking of the drainage as that lot would be potentially built out, it is hard for me to put my approval on it.

1  
2 Mr. Wagner: I know when this process started we talked about showing drainage for the  
3 whole thing.  
4

5 Talk shifted to open space development of the large lot. Att. Prolman: The only thing I  
6 was going to ask is the Board talking about something like this (open space) and it sounds  
7 like you started that, and, again, for those who weren't here we were asked to come in  
8 with a cookie cutter layout...you wanted to see the big picture and we came back with  
9 that. We recognize our 73 lot build out is not going to happen, or it may happen but if  
10 what I said to the Board the last time and I will say it again if it is a topic the Board is  
11 legitimately moving forward, my client has said he will hold out building Phase III and  
12 IV if it looks like the Board is going to go down this road with rezoning of this area. But  
13 at the same time, we will continue to accumulate building certificates so if the whole  
14 thing falls on its face, my client can go forward and build out III and IV.  
15

16 Mr. Peeples said he does not see the open space initiatives even thought about in that  
17 plan. Mr. Peeples: When you start talking about open space you have to take into account  
18 natural services network: how does this whole thing fit into the land. Then you look at the  
19 land where is recreation, open space that separates the houses, etc.  
20

21 Mr. Wagner said the Board could require a landscape architect as part of the process.  
22

23 Att. Prolman: I wish you were here last time because we had this discussion. We know  
24 this design is not the end of the process...Jim just crunched numbers to show you could  
25 set aside 40% of what would otherwise be built.  
26

27 They were told they need to submit the plan 15 days in advance of the meeting. Attorney  
28 Prolman suggested waiving the 15 day requirement since most of the work has been  
29 completed. Chairman Perry said that he will not be at the February 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. Mrs.  
30 Douglas felt Mr. Perry should be present for the conditional approval. Att. Prolman: My  
31 client has said if we see a legitimate effort going forward with zoning work, my client is  
32 willing to hold back on III and IV but if it is September, or October and we do not see  
33 anything, we will pull it off the table.  
34

35 Mr. Perry **MOTIONED** to continue Rolling Acres Phase IV until March 4, 2008. Mrs.  
36 Douglas seconded. Motion carried 5-1-0. Mr. Perry said the Board will be discussing the  
37 cluster proposal and Att. Prolman can check in with the Board on the progress. Mr.  
38 Brennen will discuss the street naming with Chief Schofield.  
39

40 **CTAP APPLICATION**

41  
42 The members had reviewed the CTAP application. Mr. Barry said that he had spoken  
43 with Angela Vincent to answer his questions. Talk went on as to the contact person.  
44 Alternate Edward Almeida volunteered to be the contact person. The Board agreed to do  
45

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  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

a summit. It was also said to involve local farmers in the project. Mr. Barry suggested inviting organizations such as the local rotary and other business people. Talk went on regarding economic development and the SEED report.

**Rodonis Subdivision**

Mrs. McKibben said their fees have not been paid and the final plan has not been submitted. Mr. Wagner suggested sending a certified letter stating the conditions are outstanding and they will be found not to have met the conditions and if not taken care of by a certain date, action will be taken and the approval will go away. Mrs. McKibben will contact Town Counsel. This will be discussed February 5, 2008.

**Sunset Clause**

Mr. Almeida questioned the comments made by Attorney Prolman regarding prolonging the ordinance. That it is not in the spirit of the law. Mr. Peeples said he would have been in the mindset to let it go this year because of the economy but he was not at the meeting to vote. This was discussed. This is something the Board will be reviewing in the future. Mr. Peeples said you cannot keep it forever; it is temporary.

Mr. Almeida is still concerned with Attorney Prolman’s comments at the hearing. Mr. Wagner said that some of his points are valid but Town Counsel says the methodology and everything is sound and the numbers in the methodology are the same and we should still continue. The Board had considered changing it to one year but it had no time to hold another hearing and get it on the ballot but it could get lifted next year.

There being no further business, Mrs. Douglas **MOTIONED** to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Barry seconded. Motion carried 6-0-0. The meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Lorraine Dogopoulos  
Recording Secretary