



**TOWN OF LEDYARD**  
**CONNECTICUT**  
Zoning Office

741 Colonel Ledyard Highway  
Ledyard, CT 06339-1551  
(860) 464-3264  
FAX (860) 464-0098

1 December 2010

Charles Karno, Town Planner  
741 Colonel Ledyard Hwy  
Ledyard, CT 06339-1511

cc: Ledyard Planning Commission (Mike Cherry)

**Review of Proposed Conservation Subdivision Plan dated 7/20/2010**  
**(Watrous Properties – Colonel Ledyard Highway, Lambtown, & Haley Road)**  
**(Updated)**

Dear Mr. Karno,

This letter constitutes the results of my review for compliance with the Ledyard Zoning Regulations of a proposed Conservation Subdivision Plan prepared for Watrous Properties, LLC for Colonel Ledyard Highway, Lambtown Road, and Haley Road dated 7/20/10 per your request on approximately November 15, 2010.

The review was performed under the authority of §17.2.6 of the Ledyard Zoning Regulations, which under specific conditions authorizes a designated member of the Zoning Commission to perform the zoning officer's duties during his absence. My authority under §17.2.6 was renewed during the Zoning Commission's regular meeting on Thursday, October 28, 2010 to December 9, 2010, or until the return of the Zoning Official.

Please note that while I have made a good faith effort to document deficiencies as they relate to the zoning regulations, I am not a certified zoning official and it is possible that a noted deficiency may be in error, or I may have overlooked a deficiency. I do not object if the Town or the applicant chooses to hire an independent consultant who is better qualified to review the subject plans.

My review concentrated on compliance with the zoning regulations, and was not intended to look closely at other regulatory requirements. However, I did identify some wetland and subdivision issues that may require follow-up. I have not visited the site.

The Plans have been returned to the Planning Office.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if any questions.

Respectfully,

Eric Treaster

1. Why is there a 40' easement for the shared driveways? They could (should) be much narrower.
2. Lot 2 has the building setback line within the easement.
3. Lots 1 & 4, even though they have an existing house and garage, should show the building setback line.
4. Lots 2, 3, & 7 shows an 18' side yard setback on both sides. However, for R40, the minimum is 16' on one side yard and 36' combined.
5. Lot 5 shows an 18' side yard setback on the north. The minimum is 16'.
6. Lot 8, which fronts on Lambtown, shows a rear yard setback of 18'. It should be 30'. It shows a side yard (east) setback of 30', should be 16'. It shows a 50' setback to the west property line which should be 20' (16' + 20' = 36' combined). Also, the existing house is outside the building setback line. The setback from Lambtown should be 75 feet from the centerline.
7. Lot 9 is an interior lot. It shows 18' side yards, should be 16' and 20' (36' total). It shows a 50 foot building setback line to the property line (on west), should be to easement line (same as shown for lot 6).
8. The driveway strip off Lambtown is 14', and off Haley Road is 18'. Why the difference? Section 4.8.9 of the subdivision regulations appears to require the driveway to be fully contained within a 25' corridor, with the driveway itself a minimum of 18' in width.
9. All of the driveways are proposed as being only gravel. However, per the topographic lines, many sections of the driveway exceed an 8% slope (2' in 25'), and must be paved. See Section 4.8.9 of the subdivision regulations second paragraph. (See NE corner lot 12, and south side of lot 5.)
10. It is not clear if there is enough room for a well field on lot 8.
11. The shared driveway off Haley Road requires two pullouts, but only one is provided (shared driveway is in excess of 1,200'). Reference: Section 4.8.9 of subdivision regulations.
12. The shared driveway off Lambtown is in excess of 1,200' and requires two pullouts. Only one is shown.
13. Lots 1, 4, 8, & 9 do not show a footing and/or roof leader (gutter) drain.
14. Reference sheet 5. Per section 5.5.b - the abutting parcel without a lot number (due south of lot 126-R) appears to be landlocked, with access only via the proposed shared driveway off Lambtown. However, Section 5.5.b of the subdivision regulations prohibit the shared driveway from providing access to any other property (except for agricultural purposes).
15. Section 5.4.5 requires monuments every 100' for shared driveways. Said monuments are not shown on the drawings.
16. Section 4.3.5 prohibits the "nesting" or "stacking" of interior lots. One is ok for conservation subdivisions (5 lots maximum on a shared driveway). I do not know if the prohibition on nesting or stacking has been achieved. Is lot #7 nested or stacked behind #6? Is lot #2 stacked behind lot #1? Is lot #3 nested behind #2? Is lot #9 nested behind #8? Is #11 nested behind #10, and is #13 nested behind #12? Appears to be a subjective criteria.

17. Contiguous non-wetlands are not shown on drawings (square feet) Reference Section 4.1.1 of subdivision regulations. (75% requirement)
18. Wetlands demarcation line should be added to legend on sheet 1.