

PLANNING COMMISSION  
PUBLIC HEARING

**Subdivision Regulation Change:** The Ledyard Planning Commission proposes to add “Section 4.9 Open Space Subdivision” and related definition to Section 2 of the Ledyard Subdivision Regulations. The primary purpose of the proposal is to provide greater flexibility in the clustering of residential units.

1. The public hearing was reconvened by Ken Koe on Thursday, January 5, 2012 at 7:31 p.m. in Council Chambers, Town Hall, 741 Colonel Ledyard Highway, Ledyard, CT 06339.

2. Regular members present: Roger Tremblay, Ken Koe (Acting Chair), Naomi Rodriguez. Mike Cherry (Excused), Ed Lynch (Excused).

Alternate members present: Tom Baudro, seated for Ed Lynch.

Also present: Charlie Karno, Town Planner

3. Exhibits:

- A. Legal Notice
- B. Proposed Regulation
- C. 9/14/2011 letter from Atty. Heller regarding “Open Space Subdivision”
- D. 12/15/2011 email from Eric Treaster regarding “Concerns Regarding Application #3575”
- E. 12/21/2011 letter from Kenneth Norris, Chair, Ledyard Conservation Commission, regarding “Open Space Subdivision”

4. Presentation by applicant and/or consultants: None

5. Questions from Commissioners: None

6. Statement of Citizens In Favor of the application: None

7. Statement of Citizens Opposed to application:

a.) Eric Treaster, Chair of Ledyard Zoning Commission:

- He is speaking as a private individual. He is not in support of the amendment as presently worded; but he could support it with some changes similar to those cited in his email (Exhibit D).

He left a copy of his speaking notes for distribution. He delineated several specific comments from his notes, which included numerous suggested re-wordings and clarifications addressing concerns about potential areas of high density and which he summarized that he felt there was lot's of potential for unintended consequences.

- Naomi Rodriguez asked that copies of Mr. Treaster’s notes be distributed to Commission members.

b.) Nate Schroeder, Ledyard Conservation Commission:

- The intention of the letter submitted as Exhibit E, was to be specific about why they thought it's not right; they are not against the amendment in principle, but thought that, as it currently is, 'it's scary'

- If you looked at all the additional rooftops, you actually could get less permeable space than with a Conservation Subdivision.

- Walkability is good; but why not go vertically in village districts.

8. Rebuttal by applicant and/or consultant: None

9. Adjournment/Continuance: The public hearing was continued at 8:21 p.m., to Feb. 2nd, at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Roger J. Tremblay  
Secretary (Acting)