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Summary of Report

As part of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies pilot program of professional and technical services, the Woodbridge Conservation Commission requested assistance from the School in the evaluation and revision of the 1965 Woodbridge Open Space Plan. In accordance with the Commission's request, the 1965 Plan has been critiqued and recommendations for its revision have been made with reference to specific criteria. In addition, information on New Haven Water Company lands, farmlands, and trails systems in Woodbridge has been compiled for the Commission.

The recommendations set forth in the critique of the 1965 Plan are intended to provide direction to the Commission in its drafting of a new Plan. A new format is presented to facilitate the incorporation of additional information recommended for the updated Plan. The format is designed to encourage a logical progression of reasoning leading to an Action Plan which designates specific areas for future preservation.

It is recommended that the Commission formulate its own definition of open space in light of the specific needs identified in Woodbridge. The Commission should utilize the expanded base of natural resource information currently available, possibly through a map overlay system. A systematic analysis of open space needs should also include input from other town boards and the general public. A inventory of existing open space areas has been completed and should be included in the new Plan.

The objectives listed in the 1965 Plan are not comprehensive and should be expanded to include farmland preservation and trails
linkage of open space. Part IV of the objectives should be reworded to include specific recommendations with respect to Water Company lands.

The needs and recommendations of all town residents regarding open space should be identified through use of a town-wide questionnaire. This will ensure that the new Plan reflects the goals of the populace it is meant to serve.

The Commission should encourage consideration by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission of innovative development techniques such as cluster zoning which are more suited to the natural features of certain land areas. In addition, the Commission should develop its own guidelines for action on New Haven Water Company lands in light of a marked reluctance by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission to do so.

Alternative means of Plan implementation aside from fee simple acquisition should be considered by the Commission. The paper by Peter Cooper entitled, "The Town's Potential Role in Acquiring Interests and Rights in New Haven Water Company Land" (6), is a comprehensive study of such alternative approaches. It is recommended that the strategies explained therein be incorporated in the Plan update.

The guidelines presented for incorporation of the New Haven Water Company Lands Study (7) address the need for a level of detail that conforms with the proposed format of the new Plan. The level which has been selected is considered to be the most workable while still retaining the major recommendations of the Study. The classification system includes parcels to be considered for outright acquisition; parcels recommended for acquisition of partial interest;
and parcels to which existing and proposed regulations can be applied.

The problem of farm abandonment prevails in Woodbridge despite application of the special assessment provisions of Public Act 490. The Commission should encourage formation of a regional cooperative among local farmers to alleviate the high costs experienced by small scale farm operations. The purchase of development rights to farm properties should also be considered. The Commission should strive to enhance public awareness of the value of farming and encourage leasing of Town and Water Company properties to Woodbridge farmers.

The methods of achieving an effective trails system in Woodbridge require further examination by the Commission. Landowner reluctance to open his or her land for public use and the possibility of trail fragmentation in future years are two major problems that may frustrate attempts to develop and maintain trails on private land. Five techniques for dealing with these problems have been identified in this study. They range from oral agreements to outright acquisition of fee simple interest in land. The Commission should develop a strategy which includes all five of these methods to allow for flexibility in negotiations with individual landowners.

Eight resource maps have been prepared for the Conservation Commission: 1971 Land Use, Inland Wetlands and Watercourses, Steep Slopes, Erosive Soils, Drainage Basins and Existing Water Service, Flood Hazard Areas, Favorable Aquifers and Existing Sewer Service, and 1978 Open Space. An explanation of each map is provided in Section V of the report.

Due to the time limitations of this project, several needs identified in preliminary meetings with the Conservation could not be addressed. The final section of the report lists areas requiring
further study or action by the Commission. Some of these areas have been identified as a result of the current project's findings. The Commission may request additional assistance from the Yale pilot program in order to satisfy these remaining information needs.
Introduction

The Woodbridge Open Space Plan, Open Space for Woodbridge, was drafted in 1965 by the Town's Conservation Commission. In only its second year of existence at the time of plan adoption, the Commission viewed its effort in this regard as a means of providing a frame of reference for future natural resource conservation activities in Woodbridge. The Commission's action was also based upon recommendations set forth in Public Act 490 which instruct Conservation Commissions to "conduct researches into the utilization and possible utilization of land areas of the municipality" (5, Sec. 7-131b).

The Woodbridge Conservation Commission has demonstrated a remarkable capacity to respond to the open space needs of the Town. Thirteen years later, the present Conservation Commission is evaluating the 1965 Plan for the dual purpose of updating the basic content of the document and integrating new open space components such as agricultural lands, New Haven Water Company properties, and trails linkage of open space areas. The Commission is seeking to take stock of its past efforts and develop new ways to better assure an optimum level of environmental quality in Woodbridge.

In light of the above goals of the Woodbridge Conservation Commission, this report addresses several of the Commission's information needs. First, the 1965 Open Space Plan is examined and evaluated according to criteria commonly utilized in open space planning at the local government level. Guidelines are presented for use by the Conservation Commission in its revision of the 1965 Plan.

The second section of the report develops a possible framework
for inclusion of New Haven Water Company lands in the new Open Space Plan. The framework is based largely on information contained in a 1974 study of Water Company land carried out by a team of graduate students from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies (7).

The third section deals with agricultural lands in Woodbridge and presents a current inventory of these lands. It explores the problem of farmland abandonment within the context of State-wide trends and programs developed to meet this problem.

The fourth section examines the trails system in Woodbridge and explores techniques that are sensitive to their future security and maintenance.

The final section contains the resource maps which have been prepared for the Conservation Commission as part of this report. In addition, a map overlay technique is described as a possible method of identifying ecologically sensitive areas in Woodbridge for inclusion in the new open space plan.

The information and recommendations contained in this report present the conclusions of a project undertaken for the Woodbridge Conservation Commission as part of a pilot program of professional and technical services which the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies is conducting for conservation commissions in the Greater New Haven area. A grant made to Yale by the New Haven Foundation assists towns with the cost of studies carried out under the program by graduate students from the School.

This project has been undertaken for academic credit and time constraints imposed by the course's requirements limit the scope of the study. A map overlay analysis could not be completed within the given time allotment. Consequently, recommendations
set forth in the evaluation of the 1965 Plan and the sections
dealing with New Haven Water Company lands, farmlands, and trails
are treated separately. Integration of these guidelines with the
results of a map overlay analysis is left for the Commission to
complete. This may prove to be of greater benefit in the long run
as the resource maps are intended for continual use by the Commission
rather than for a single analysis.
I. Evaluation of the 1965 Woodbridge Open Space Plan

"Factors Considered"

The Introduction to the 1965 Woodbridge Open Space Plan (hereinafter referred to as the "Plan") sets forth two approaches selected by the Conservation Commission to assure maintenance of open space within the Town. The first approach involves designation of specific areas to be purchased outright by the Town or Conservation Trust and thereby preserved as open space. These areas could also be maintained as private land with development restricted through use of conservation or scenic easements.

The second approach considered by the Conservation Commission is the application of the special assessment provisions of Public Act 490 as a means of encouraging private owners to hold their lands in open space use. According to the Act, the planning commission in any municipality may designate areas on a plan of development which it recommends for preservation as open space. Any owner of land included in designated areas may apply for its classification as open space land on the town assessment list.

To avoid the unjustified provision of potential tax benefits to some landholders and not to others, the Conservation Commission decided not to propose that the Town Plan And Zoning Commission adopt areas described in the Open Space Plan as designated open space on the Town Plan of Development. As it is apparent that the Town Assessor has approved applications for special open space assessment without regard to official designation on the Plan of Development, this decision by the Conservation Commission now appears to be unwarranted.
The Conservation Commission identified eight areas having special value as conservation land in Woodbridge. Each of the areas is described in the Plan, and the reasons for acquiring and developing land within these areas are set forth. A map is included to illustrate the location of the eight areas on a town-wide scale. An individual map of each area accompanies the text. Some of the areas such as Milford Meadows and the Old Derby Trail are roughly designated with cross-hatchings while others such as Konold’s Pond are more accurately designated using parcel boundaries taken from the Assessor’s ownership plat maps. It is recommended that the new Plan include maps using a single method of designation to avoid potential challenges to the unequal treatment of landowners. Some owners may wonder why their properties are specifically designated while other properties are not.

The rationale used by the Commission in arriving at the selection of the eight areas is directly and indirectly revealed through statements scattered throughout the Plan:

Page 1: Our objective in drawing up this plan has been to present a basic outline around which we can develop and build as our experience and finances increase. (Introduction)

We arrived at the eight areas which we have marked for this type of conservation by discussion followed by field trips and the study of soil maps. (Index of Specific Areas for Conservation)

Page 3: It is up to us to see that that increase (in population) can be fitted into a pattern which supplies the best use of our land for residence, recreation, and open space in accordance with the provisions set forth in Section 2 of Act 490. (Problems)

Page 6: The purpose of designating these specific areas is to set forth a plan for the acquisition or preservation of conservation land in an orderly manner...The Commission simply hopes to give rational direction to efforts of those individuals and groups who are
interested in maintaining open land in the town.
(Index of Land Desired for Conservation)

In addition to the above statements, the sections dealing with each area include consideration of outstanding natural, aesthetic and historical features of the land along with existing or potential recreational uses. These considerations reflect the use standards for wetlands, stream beds, ravines or steep slopes, ridges, unusual landscape features, neighborhood recreation areas, and water supply watersheds set forth in objectives I and II of the Plan (pp. 2-4).

Without an accumulated base of experience and information, the Woodbridge Conservation Commission formulated in 1965 what it considered to be the best approach to open space preservation in the Town. Aside from the use of general soils maps, the Commission apparently relied on rule-of-thumb reasoning in its selection of the eight areas to be included in the Plan. Its pioneer effort has not been in vain as evidenced by the acquisition of various parcels within and near these areas by the Town, State, and Conservation Trust (see Appendix A).

Pressure for development in Woodbridge is likely to increase the demand for a diminishing amount of undeveloped land. As this trend continues, an even greater burden of proof will be place on the Conservation Commission as it deliberates the fate of a given parcel of land having both open space and development value. For this reason, it is recommended that the following sections be included in the update of the 1965 Plan.
A. Background Information on Town

1) Location and Area
2) Settlement and History
3) Physical Characteristics
   Topography
   Soils
   Vegetation
   Wildlife
   Climate and Air Quality
   Water Resources
4) Population Characteristics
5) Land Use Patterns
6) Transportation Networks
7) Water Supply and Sewage Disposal Systems

B. Open Space

1) Definition of Open Space
2) Purpose of the Open Space Plan
3) Town and Agency Participation
4) Methodology
5) Goals and Objectives
6) Inventory of Existing Open Space
7) Analysis of Needs

C. Action Plan

Specifying conservation and recreation priorities for the Town on a year-by-year basis within a specified period of time (i.e., five years, ten years)

1) Areas or sites to be acquired, controlled, or protected
2) Facilities to be developed or rehabilitated
3) Programs to be provided
4) Operation and maintenance activities
5) Strategies for implementation

Through such an arrangement of information, the Plan will be both comprehensive and straightforward. The format lends itself to a logical progression of reasoning leading to the Action Plan which sets forth specific areas for future preservation as open space. By beginning with a general, town-wide consideration and analysis of needs for open space, the Plan would embrace a systems
approach which considers open space as an integral part of the social and economic makeup of the Town. Rather than being a response to "problems", the Plan would emerge as a positive instrument that works alongside of the Town's Plan of Development.

The definition of open space as set forth in the 1965 Plan, is a quote taken from Public Act 490. While it provides a sense of legitimacy to the Plan, overreliance on the Act to express goals and definitions tends to detract from the Plan's role as a working tool drafted specifically for Woodbridge. The Commission may find it more effective to relegate the Act to footnote status and formulate its own definition of open space. It is useful to note that Connecticut Courts have since decided that the basic concept of open space is that the "land be 'open' and not that it be entirely unused, undeveloped, or unimproved" (5, p. 68). The Commission should create an impression of open space as a positive, critical land use which provides a direct service to an urbanizing community such as Woodbridge. The "use" can range from undisturbed wetlands to carefully designed parks and playgrounds.

The purpose of the Plan should be stated in a clear and concise fashion. Since the new Plan is preceded by the 1965 Plan, the Commission should explain how it will differ from the previous Plan and how it is expected to foster a more comprehensive and effective approach to open space preservation.

The methodology employed should reflect the Commission's use of a more complete and comprehensive information base now available. Town, state, and federal studies of the natural systems and land use in Woodbridge offer new and valuable analytical tools not available in 1965. The 208 Water Quality Planning maps, the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies report on the New Haven Water
Company lands in Woodbridge, and the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (3) are some examples of these studies.

This information can be integrated through a systematic analysis of open space needs which identifies environmentally sensitive areas, farmlands, historic sites, scenic areas, and sites suitable for recreational use. Preliminary maps have been prepared for use by the Conservation Commission. As they are all at the same scale, an overlay analysis can be performed. An explanation of this technique is provided in Section V of this report. Once these areas are identified, input from town residents and other town boards can be used to develop priorities in the Action Plan.

In addition to natural resource information and citizen input, the Commission should include consideration of existing open space as a means of determining the direction of future preservation activities. A list of major open space areas in Woodbridge has been compiled for the Commission (see Appendix B). A map showing the locations and boundaries of these areas accompanies this report.

It is recommended that the new Plan be loose-leaf bound for continual updating of information, thus making the Plan current and usable at any future date.
"Comprehensiveness of the Plan"

The objectives of the Conservation Commission stated on pages 3-4 of the 1965 Plan are not comprehensive. These objectives should be expanded to include farmland preservation and trails linkage of open space areas. In addition, the new Plan's clarity and usefulness would be enhanced by the inclusion of specific resource maps in this section showing where the specific land types listed in Part I of the objectives are located. These need only be schematic in nature to serve as a visual guide to the distributional pattern of these resources.

In Part III of the objectives, the Commission should recommend that the Town Plan and Zoning Commission amend Chapter II, Section 1 and Chapter V, Section 1 (h) of the Town Subdivision Regulations to include "open spaces, parks, and playgrounds" in place of "open spaces for parks and playgrounds". Recent changes in the Connecticut enabling statute were enacted during the February, 1978 session of the General Assembly (Public Act 78-104, sec. 5). Furthermore, Section 2 of Chapter V of the Subdivision Regulations does not require that such information be included in the Final Subdivision Plan. These changes would allow the Town Plan and Zoning Commission to require the provision of open spaces in subdivisions without the requirement that they be used for parks and playgrounds.

Part IV of the 1965 Plan objectives should be reworded to reflect certain attainable goals. Reference should be made to the specific recommendations regarding Water Company lands that will be integrated in the new Plan. Agriculture should be included among purposes of conservation and recreation in light of the fact that
portions of Town and Water Company lands are leased by farmers for such use. These areas allow marginal farm operations to remain in operation. Loss of this privilege may force these farmers out of business.

"Degree of Involvement"

For a plan to be credible, and conducive to implementation, it should have the support of the town which it is meant to serve. Input from various town boards concerned with implementation of the Plan, specifically the Recreation Commission and the Town Plan and Zoning Commission, can be both instructive and beneficial. It is not apparent from conversations with past Conservation Commission members that solicitation of input from other Town Boards was accomplished in the drafting of the 1965 Plan.

In addition, the opinion of town residents should be surveyed and their recommendations incorporated into the Plan. The Garden Club, Lions Club and other private groups in Woodbridge did make contributions to the 1965 Plan. The present Commission should expand this practice to include the entire Town citizenry through use of questionnaires designed to elicit their needs and suggestions. Samples of questionnaires used by Massachusetts towns for this purpose are included in Appendix C.
"Compatibility with Plan of Development"

Zoning was enacted in Woodbridge in 1932, but it was not until 1960 that a Plan of Development was adopted to help guide the growth of the Town. Most of Woodbridge is zoned for large-lot (65,000 ft\(^2\)) residential uses. Four smaller-lot residential zones are located in the southeastern corner. In this same general area, four industrial and commercial zones are also designated. Sewer and water service is generally limited to the southeastern corner with most of Woodbridge having on-site sewage disposal and wells. Topographic extremes and rocky outcrops in the Town make sewer extension unlikely. The 1974 Review of Plan of Development for Woodbridge discourages expansion of utility service areas "over and above the need to take care of documented public health hazards" (16, p. 58), because of the high cost of sewers. It states:

If it is the desire to implement the original plan objective and to maintain the open space character of the town in the interest of the town as well as the region, it would be important to exercise great care when planning for sewers. (16, p. 58)

While this approach apparently coincides with the desire for open space in Woodbridge, there is a major drawback inherent in adopting a predominantly large-lot system. What results is the encouragement of residential sprawl, a process which may provide for an appearance of open space but at the same time may result in the subdivision of larger areas of land often without regard to natural features. Large lot zoning precludes consideration of housing options that may conform more effectively with land features. As an example, cluster development has been proposed for the New Haven Water Company's Race Brook Parcel in the event that this land is offered for sale (7).
Such an innovation should be encouraged by the Commission as future disposition of Water Company lands occurs in Woodbridge. The higher density development could be made feasible through use of neighborhood sewerage systems. The Commission should be aware of advances being made in this approach (4).

The 1974 Review also considers the impact on the Town if New Haven Water Company lands are offered for sale in future years. The Yale ecological study of these lands, including its recommendations for preservation, are referred to in the Review's discussion. However, the Review circumvents the need for Town action in this regard by stating that these lands would be unsuitable for development anyway due to features such as wetlands and steep slopes. The Review presents only a general overview of the lands involved. Consequently, the Conservation Commission should develop necessary guidelines in the new Open Space Plan and encourage their adoption by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission.

In other areas of concern such as inland wetlands, trails, and West Rock Ridge, the Review generally supports a view that is consistent with the 1965 Plan. In fact, it exceeds the Plan in its treatment of nature trails and bike paths. The recommendations contained in the Review will be discussed in Section IV of this report.

"Feasibility of Means"

The 1965 Plan sets forth a two-pronged approach to open space preservation in Woodbridge: acquisition of full or partial interest in lands, and the maintenance of lands in open space use by private owners through the tax abatement measures of Public Act 490. Town acquisition of the 32.7 acre Bishop Estate West with the help of
funds available through the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the 116.5 acre Bishop Estate East through HUD's Open Space Land Grant Program, and outright purchase of the 130 acre Fitzgerald property. illustrate the expectations of the Commission's first approach. Lands acquired by the Conservation Trust further complement Town actions.

The second approach of tax abatement has resulted in the classification of almost 4,000 acres of land in Woodbridge as farm, forest or open space under Public Act 490. The Town Assessor’s Office has demonstrated remarkable sensitivity to classification requests for open space. Owners have received approval for parcels without any requirement that they be designated as open space on the Town Plan of Development. As seen in the list of 490 lands in Appendix D, classifications have been as small as one and one half acres.

The Town of Woodbridge has been generous in its purchase of land for temporary or permanent open space use. However, the high costs of land acquisition and its retention as tax exempt property may limit the extent to which this method can be applied in future years. Alternative methods of preservation should be recommended by the Commission with outright acquisition reserved for particularly sensitive natural areas. A thorough discussion of alternative preservation techniques is presented in a September 4, 1974 paper by Peter Cooper (6). It is recommended that the measures presented therein be incorporated in the update of the 1965 Plan.

The Conservation Commission should proceed to identify areas within Woodbridge through an analysis of needs predicated on a defined methodology. The areas thus identified should then be assigned priority rankings and appropriate implementation measures recommended
within the framework of the Action Plan. A town-wide theme such as trails linkage of open space areas would serve to focus attention on certain land areas and, hopefully, stimulate enthusiasm for their preservation.
II. New Haven Water Company Lands

A major portion of the undeveloped land remaining in Woodbridge is owned by the New Haven and the Ansonia-Derby Water Companies. As of 1975, the New Haven Water Company holdings totalled 1,761 acres grouped in large parcels within the northeastern and southern parts of Woodbridge. The Ansonia-Derby Water Company owns 281 acres in the northwestern part of the Town along the Seymour border south of the Woodbridge landfill site.

In 1974, the New Haven Water Company notified the Town of Woodbridge that approximately 746 acres of its holdings might be disposed of in future years. Those lands not acquired by the Town or State would subsequently be placed on the market and thus be available for development.

In light of this move by the New Haven Water Company, the Woodbridge Conservation Commission initiated a field study of Water Company holdings for the purpose of identifying areas having high ecological value. The results of this study, conducted by a team of graduate students from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, have been compiled in a report entitled, "An Ecological Evaluation of New Haven Water Company Land in Woodbridge, Connecticut" (7, hereinafter referred to as the "study").

Although the study encompasses all of the existing New Haven Water Company land in Woodbridge, it is recognized that only portions of these lands would be offered to the Town for disposal in future years. The intent of the study was to provide a basis of factual ecological data upon which the Conservation Commission could make informed decisions as to the fate of any given parcel of land.

As recommended in the "critique" section of this report, the
Commission should reword its Objective IV in the 1965 Plan to reflect a more realistic appraisal of New Haven Water Company land by referring to specific tracts rather than broadly recommending that all these lands be preserved as open space. To this end, this report will present a possible framework for inclusion of the Yale study's recommendations in the new Plan.

The New Haven Water Company lands study involves a detailed field inventory of four defined parcel groups: the Race Brook Parcel, the Wepawaug River parcels, the Sperry Falls Parcel, and the Lake Dawson and Lake Watrous Parcels. The inventory for each parcel grouping is broken down by ecologically distinct tracts involving consideration of soils, topography, vegetation, existing conditions, and use potentials. As such, the study exemplifies the type of approach recommended in Part I for the new Open Space Plan. The Commission need not indulge in as great a level of detail as the Yale study. However, the study's ranking of priorities and use of natural resource information should be noted.

The study establishes four classifications reflecting graduated levels of site importance as potential open space:

1) Parcel has high value as conservation-open space land and should be acquired outright by the Town, or by a regional or local conservation trust or association.

2) The particular parcel involved can be adequately preserved through acquisition of interests in the land, such as development rights or scenic easements.

3) Existing or further regulatory mechanisms, such as existing Inland Wetlands Regulations and possible further regulations, and limitation of development on ridge tops or scenic slopes, are suitable for preservation of particular resources.

4) Parcel has no significant ecological features and can be developed directly under normal zoning and subdivision controls.
For the purpose of inclusion in the updated Open Space Plan, it is recommended that the results of the Yale study be presented according to the above classifications. This level of detail appears to be a middle ground between the "rule of thumb" rationale of the 1965 Plan and the finer analysis of the Yale study. If the remainder of the updated Plan is also drafted along the lines of this intermediate level, a suitable compromise will be reached which should prove both manageable and defensible in future open space deliberations in Woodbridge.

The various methods available for acquisition of partial interests in the land, along with existing and proposed regulatory mechanisms, have been explored in the report by Peter Cooper referred to in Section I. Such discussion in detail should be included in the "Strategies for Implementation" section of the new Plan to avoid potentially distracting repetition in the text of the Action Plan. A statement could be included in the introduction to the Action Plan which specifies that alternative preservation methods are to be considered in the event that any given method recommended in the Plan proves to be unfeasible.

The following is a summary of the Yale study recommended for inclusion in the Woodbridge Open Space Plan update.

A. Outright acquisition: In the event that the New Haven Water Company offers any or all of the following parcels for sale, the Town, or a qualified private conservation association or educational institution as the case may be, should acquire title to:

1) Race Brook Parcel
   a) Red maple swamp (approx. 8 acres) and stream / See
tract 7 on Race Brook Parcel map.

This area is presently undisturbed. Forest cover is dominated by red maple with other typical swamp species such as spice bush, skunk cabbage, and various sedges in the understory. It is valuable as a flood storage area, reducing the severity of floods in downstream areas. Although it is protected as an inland wetland under Public Act 155, measures should be taken to acquire and preserve this site as a natural open space area.

b) Upland forest with steep slopes (approx. 9 acres) /See tract 8 on the Race Brook Parcel map.

Abundant and diverse wildlife are supported by a mature hardwood forest which occupies this area. Dominant tree species are red oak, chestnut oak, black birch, tulip poplar and ash. The site has been free of the influence of fire and grazing in recent history, accounting for the development of rich vegetation and soil.

Both of these areas are situated adjacent to the Yale Natural Preserve and, as such, constitute a logical and valuable extension of the Preserve. Yale University should be encouraged to acquire these areas in the event of their disposal by the Water Company. Purchase by the Town or Conservation Trust may be necessary if Yale does not choose to do so.

2) Wepawaug River Parcel

a) Mature red maple swamp and wetland meadow (approx. 26 acres) /See tract 2 on the Wepawaug Parcel map.
This area has inherent value primarily as a natural wetland area with potential for light recreational use. As such, although it is protected as an inland wetland under Public Act 155, it should be acquired to make it available to Town residents. Access over adjoining land should be obtained.

A mature wetland forest composed mainly of red maple, elm, and black gum occupies the low areas while windthrow mounds support upland hardwoods. The meadow is covered with goldenrod, grasses, and numerous other herbaceous species plus hardwood saplings invading from the adjoining swamp.

The site is located over a potential source of groundwater. As an important link in the hydrologic cycle, the wetland serves to enhance aquifer recharge and water purification.

3) Lake Dawson and Lake Watrous Parcels
   a) Bottomlands below Lake Dawson Dam (approx. 13 acres)
      [See Lake Dawson and Lake Watrous Parcels map].

This tract is adjacent to the Town's Bishop Estate East property, and its acquisition would enhance the scenic character of the valley. Its use for hay farming and pasture could then be maintained by lease arrangements with local farmers. Use of the land for non-intensive recreation is also possible.

4) Sperry Falls Parcel
   a) Hemlock-hardwood forest (two areas totalling about
      80 acres) [See tract 1 on the Sperry Falls Parcel map].
The area is characterized by forest vegetation consisting of pure stands of hemlock, red oak, beech, black birch, and yellow birch. These forest types generally occur along the steep slopes surrounding Glen Dam Reservoir and the Sargent River.

Most of the forest type lies within areas designated by the Water Company as land under intensive utility control making it unlikely that the Company will dispose of this land. If it does so, the Town should acquire these areas for watershed protection and light recreational use.

b) Alluvial Wetlands (two locations totalling approx. 90 acres)

[See tract 2 on Sperry Falls Parcel map].

These wetlands and their adjoining uplands have formed on fine sand and silt deposited in temporary lakes created by melting glacier. A larger area overlies a mantle of alluvium, three feet or less thick, which was deposited directly over bedrock. The wetlands support typical red maple swamp vegetation species. hardwoods such as tulip poplar, white ash, and red oak are also present and indicate that these areas may be slightly better drained than most swamps. Erosional hummocks give rise to drier spots which support single trees and sprout clumps of sugar maple, black oak, red oak, and tulip poplar. Basswood, sassafras, and spruce are also found growing on these drier hummocks.

The better drained areas on glacial till support forests dominated by sugar maple and flowering dogwood growing on soil rich in organic matter. This forest type grades into a midslope hardwoods type. The slopes along the Sargent
River support oaks and hickories typical of drier sites and a young larch-white pine plantation.
The distinctive geology and vegetation of these areas makes them highly valuable as natural open spaces. They should be so preserved if offered for sale to supplement their protection as inland wetlands under Public Act 155. Light recreation is possible within certain areas of the tracts designated.

B. Water Company parcels recommended for acquisition of partial interests including conservation easements, scenic easements, and purchase of development rights.

1) Racebrook Parcel
   a) Open fields and shrubland between Race Brook and Race Brook Road (approx. 16 acres) (See tract 1 on Race Brook Parcel map7.

   While relatively uninteresting as open space and not level enough for most heavy recreation, this area is ideally suited for agriculture as evidenced by its past use for hayfields. In light of the Commission's concern over loss of agricultural land in Woodbridge, this area could be made available for present and future farmers through the purchase of development rights.

2) The Sperry Falls and Lakes Dawson and Watrous Parcels constitute a valuable scenic resource of the Region which should be protected as a scenic district from inappropriate intrusion by structures and land clearing activities on and off Water Company lands.
The Lake Dawson and Lake Watrous Parcels lie within the boundaries of the West Rock Ridge Conservation Area established under Special Act 75-80. Under this Act the State is allowed first option to acquire any land offered for sale within the Conservation Area.

Local acquisition and regulatory activity are further options available for preservation of the scenic value of Lake Dawson and Lake Watrous Parcels as well as the Sperry Falls Parcel. If none of these methods are adequate to achieve and maintain such scenic preservation then supplemental acquisition of scenic easements by the State, the Town, or by appropriate conservation organizations should be undertaken. In particular, the bottomlands within the Lake Dawson and Lake Watrous Parcels [see Lake Dawson and Lake Watrous map], and the ridgetop areas within the Sperry Falls Parcel [see tract 4 on the Sperry Falls Parcel map], should be preserved through use of scenic easements.

C. Regulation of lands sold by the New Haven Water Company but not acquired by the Town or by conservation groups.

Wetlands regulation under Public Act 155 should be applied to the following tracts:

1) Race Brook Parcel
   a) Red maple swamps (three locations totalling approx. 28 acres) [See tract 2 on Race Brook Parcel map].

2) Wepawaug Parcel
   a) Scattered red maple swamps (three locations totalling approx. 26 acres) [See tract 5 on Wepawaug Parcel map].

3) Sperry Falls Parcel
   a) Red maple swamps (two major areas totalling approx. 40 acres) [See tract 3 on Sperry Falls Parcel map].
If the Race Brook parcel between Race Brook Road and Johnson Road is not retained by the New Haven Water Company for watershed purposes, then the Town should propose modifications to its existing zoning regulations to permit cluster development on this site in a way which will best preserve the site's conservation value.

Subdivision regulations should be revised to allow the Town Plan and Zoning Commission to require developers to reserve a certain percentage of subdivision land for "open spaces, parks, and playgrounds" (Public Act 78-104, sec. 5). Attention should be given to natural areas within the subdivisions, such as streams and smaller wetlands, and present and future trails. The latter purpose is noted in the 1974 Review of the Town Plan of Development which states that the Town Plan and Zoning Commission "can incorporate proposed trail locations and protect the same when approving subdivision proposals" (16, p. 59).

Continuing protection of the water supply should be assured by strict adherence to the technical requirements of the State Health Code. The use of any land sold by the Water Company should be carefully evaluated in light of these requirements.
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- Remainder of bottomlands to be preserved through use of scenic easements
Sperry Falls parcel
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1. Hemlock-hardwood forest
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III. Farmlands in Woodbridge

From the mid-1600's to late 1800's, Woodbridge was primarily a farm community. Statistics available from 1845 give evidence that farming was still the major source of income for town residents at that time. Indian corn, hay, fruit, wheat, rye, barley, oats, potatoes, and "'other esculents'" were grown on Woodbridge farms. Sheep and cattle grazing was extensive (13).

Farming in Woodbridge is now reduced to a few marginal operations scattered throughout the town. They are virtually enclosed and isolated as small units by residential development. This situation is not unique to Woodbridge and reflects a process which has occurred in towns throughout Connecticut. Total farmland acreage in the state has decreased by more than 60% since 1950 and by almost 80% since 1850 (10). In New Haven County, only 9% of the area was farmland in 1975 with 27 farms sold between the years 1972 and 1975 (10).

The rapidly rising population level in Connecticut, along with a diversification of occupations and interests of this population, have resulted in a move away from farming as a major industry in the state. Concurrently, rising land values caused by development of large areas from residential, commercial, and industrial uses, have caused the abandonment of many farmlands to these uses. Farmers belong to a profession characterized by low returns on capital and rising operational costs. It is therefore understandable that many farmers will be tempted to sell out when confronted with attractive offers for their land. Smaller operations such as those in Woodbridge are generally the first to succumb to these pressures. Their size
precludes an attainment of scale needed to reduce already high operational costs. This is supported by the fact that the mean farm size in Connecticut almost doubled between 1940 and 1969 (10).

An inventory of Woodbridge farmlands was conducted as part of this study. The results, shown in Table 1, reveal that the mean farm size in Woodbridge (excluding the "flats" market gardens) is only about 35 acres. One of the farms listed (William Hitchcock's on Center Road) has been sold to a buyer in Italy. It is not known whether its use as farmland will be perpetuated by the new owner. The Zeider farm is in the process of being sold. The Massaro farm is owned by two bachelor brothers with no apparent heirs. Thus it is likely this farm will remain in operation only as long as the Massaros (now in their 50's) choose to do so. The Shepherd farm is the largest in Woodbridge. Mr. Shepherd supplements his operation by leasing land from the Town and the New Haven Water Company. The "flats" farmers consist of a group of Italian families who have held onto their land over the years despite the fact that the area is zoned for industrial development.

Most of the farms in Woodbridge are under Public Act 490 classification in the Town Assessor's records. The Act defines farmland as "any tract or tracts of land, including woodland and wasteland, constituting a farm unit" (5). It goes on to specify general guidelines for use by assessors in classifying properties as farmland.

In determining whether such land is farm land, such assessor shall take into account, among other things, the acreage of such land, the portion thereof in actual use for farming or agricultural operations, the productivity of such land, the gross income derived therefrom, the nature and value of the equipment used in connection therewith, and the extent to which the tracts comprising such land are contiguous. (5, sec 107c)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classifed Under Pub Act 490</th>
<th>Map#</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Clark, Theodore R. 993 Race Brook Road</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Davis, Joseph and Sarah 248 Ansonia Road (Sold)</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. DiGennaro, Anna, 75 Beecher Road</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Fellows, Edward 145 Beecher Road</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Hitchcock, Robert F. 901 Baldwin Road</td>
<td>10.9 (West of road) 26.7 (East of road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Hitchcock, William and Helen K. 48 Center Road (Sold)</td>
<td>49.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Hubbell, Herbert, 424 Amity Road</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Kozak, Peter 154 Ford Road</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Luciani, Robert Johnson Road (Leased from Water Company?)</td>
<td>~ 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Massaro, John B. 41 Ford Road</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Shepherd, Jr., Edythe and Fred Litchfield Turnpike</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Sirowich, Helen K. 11 Ford Road</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Todd, Chrystal H. and Eliza 164 Newton Road</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Zeider, Irving and Sylvia 118 Newton Road</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>15. &quot;Flats&quot; Farmers DeGennaro, et. al. Salvatore 245 Amity Road</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Under Public Act 490</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>DeLucia, Salvatore 291 Amity</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Mastromarino, Anthony and Rose 5 South Bradley Road</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Pepe, Sabata Maria Fonte 275 Old Amity Road</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Perrotti, et. al., Antonio 1760 Litchfield Turnpike</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Perrotti, et. al., Frank 1722 Litchfield Turnpike</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Perrotti, Giovanni 225 Amity Road</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Perrotti, et. al., Katherine 110 Bradley Road</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the relatively small farm acreages seen in Table 1 would indicate, the Town Assessor has been generous in the treatment of farmland classifications. However, the success of special tax treatment in assuring perpetuation of farming in Woodbridge is marginal and, at best, has only slowed the rate of farm abandonment. Rates of annual appreciation of land and the value of the land for development tend to diminish the impact of the conveyance tax penalty in a decision to develop. In addition, the availability of young people willing to carry on the work of present farmers in future years is uncertain. The low returns from small scale farm operations tend to discourage most potential farmers.

Alternative approaches to preservation of farmland are the encouragement of regional cooperatives among local farmers and the purchase of development rights to farm property. The first method would serve to lower operational costs. The second would better ensure long-term preservation of farmlands by lowering the purchase value of the land. This would allow more young farmers to enter the profession. A State appropriation of $5 million is currently available for development right purchases. However, it is uncertain whether any of the farms in Woodbridge would qualify for state purchase.

As this less-than-optimistic analysis would indicate, the best the Commission can do is to inform the Town of the value of farming, solicit its views on the subject (in the proposed questionnaire), and include farmlands in the new Open Space Plan as a special subsection in the Inventory Section. The Commission might also encourage the continuation of Town and Water Company policy with respect to leasing of lands to farmers.
IV. Trails

Trails can serve many purposes. They are used for organized hiking, walking for pleasure, jogging and running, nature study, snowshoeing, cross-country skiing, or simply reliving the history of a region. They satisfy a wide array of human needs for solitude, sociability, aesthetic enjoyment, and appreciation of culture and history. They stimulate curiosity, excitement, and self-improvement.

Existing trails in Woodbridge can be classified in three categories: trails within the Alice Newton Street Memorial Park, West Rock State Park, and the Town-owned Fitzgerald property and Bishop Estate East; the trails maintained on Conservation Trust properties; and trails passing through private land. This third category of trails is of present concern to the Conservation Trust and the Conservation Commission in light of their shared goal of connecting open space parcels in Woodbridge by a comprehensive trails system. Currently, trails exist on private land only under verbal agreements with owners. This loose arrangement, it is feared, will not assure the continued existence of the trails as lands are sold and developed. Even if the land sold is not subdivided, there is no guarantee that the new owner will allow trails to remain.

Water Company lands present another problem. While trails may be permitted under Public Act 73-522, there is the possibility that trail continuity will be lost in the event that various parcels are sold to private developers. Future owners may object to trails passing through their properties and thus frustrate efforts to assure the permanence of a carefully planned trail system.

The 1974 Review of the Town Plan of Development recommends that a trail system be implemented in Woodbridge.
It is suggested that this activity (trails) be further encouraged to provide a town-wide network of interconnecting trails which could be used as leisurely nature walks with as little interruption as possible from automobile traffic. (16, p. 59)

As stated in Section I of this report, the Review suggests that these trails be considered by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission when approving plans for subdivisions. The Review does not, however, address the problem of maintaining trails on privately-owned lands.

Between the extremes of oral agreement and outright acquisition of fee simple interest in land, there are three middle-ground methods available for trail corridor protection on private land: the easement, the lease, and the license.

The easement is the most durable of the three non-possessory interests in land. While it may be limited to a specified period of time, an easement granted in perpetuity is the most desirable from the standpoint of future trail protection. Donors of easements in perpetuity qualify for Federal Income Tax deductions making this approach more attractive to the landowner. The easement is not revocable with the exception of reverter clauses that may be included to qualify its termination. It is recorded in public records of title and is binding upon all future owners.

The lease may be more acceptable than easements in situations where landowners are unwilling to allow their properties to be encumbered by deed restrictions. A lease is a terminable arrangement and provides for payment of an agreed-upon fee. A written arrangement can be drafted to satisfy the wishes of both the lessor and the lessee. While a lease does not guarantee long-term maintenance of a trail system, it offers greater assurance of this over the short-term than does an oral agreement.

The license is the most limited of the three devices as it is
revocable by either party to the agreement. The license is legally non-binding and landowners can terminate this arrangement without fear of litigation.

All of the five methods, ranging from oral agreement to outright acquisition of fee simple interest in land, can be applied to specific landowner situations. Care must be taken to assure that every owner is aware of all the options in order to avoid ill-feelings arising from unequal treatment among neighboring landowners.

The Commission should anticipate owner concerns before attempting negotiation. An obvious first consideration is the attitude of any given owner toward the opening of his or her land to use by the general public. Even if a landowner is receptive to the idea of a trail system, there are three major concerns that he or she may have regarding trails: maintenance of future options for use of property in and near tracts designated for the trail, liability for hiker injury, and, litter and vandalism.

It is often the case that a linear trail would bisect a person's property thereby severely restricting future use of the entire property, particularly when easements in perpetuity or fee simple interest in the trail property are acquired. In such cases, it would be better to obtain a more temporary agreement with the owner. The trail could also be rerouted to follow the property boundary thus avoiding bisection.

Landowners will also be concerned with the threat of liability for injuries sustained by persons using their properties. Trails open to public use theoretically invite use. As trail users would consequently be considered invitees rather than trespassers, landowners are obligated to warn users of hazards existing on their properties. Recent court cases have upheld this theory (9, p. 178). Connecticut
State law exempts landowners who open their properties to public use from liability unless it is demonstrated that "wilful or malicious failure to guard against a dangerous condition, use, structure or activity" existed at the time of user injury (Conn. General Statutes 52-557g and h). However, no appreciable amount of case law exists at this time to clarify landowner and user responsibilities under the law.

Vandalism, littering and physical deterioration of the land are legitimate concerns which the Commission or Conservation Trust must address before approaching a landowner. They should be able to demonstrate how trails will be maintained and policed once they are constructed on an owner's land. Fulfillment of these responsibilities can be a time-consuming and expensive proposition.

As a final suggestion regarding the trails system in Woodbridge, the Commission should incorporate trails linkage as a unifying theme in the Open Space Plan. A rough base map showing existing and proposed trails has been prepared for use by the Commission. A field survey will be necessary to check the accuracy of the map and to establish the best routes for proposed trails. The cost of clearing and maintaining these trails should be considered to avoid recommendations that are overly ambitious and potentially unsupportable.
V. Resource Maps for Overlay Analysis

The following maps have been prepared for the Woodbridge Conservation Commission using a common base of 1" = 1000'.

1) Land use. Traced from a map prepared by the Town Planner, this map shows land use in Woodbridge as of 1971. Open space areas and farmlands have been updated to 1978.

2) Inland Wetlands and Watercourses. The map was prepared from field surveys and a base map of SCS soils (1" = 1000'). Mrs. Janet Riley has examined the map and has made revisions according to her personal knowledge as a member of the Inland Wetlands Commission in Woodbridge.

3) Steep Slopes. This map was prepared using an SCS detailed soils map. In delineating slopes 15% or greater, attention was given to soil areas with "D" designations (greater than 15%) and to the topographic information prepared by the U.S. Geological Survey.

4) Erosive Soils. As with the map showing steep slopes, this map was prepared on an SCS detailed soils map using a list of highly erosive soils compiled by the SCS. In Woodbridge these soils are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rock outcrop-Hollis complex (slopes 15% and extremely rocky)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17C</td>
<td>Charleton-Hollis fine sandy loams (3-15% slopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17LC</td>
<td>Charleton-Hollis fine sandy loams (3-15% slopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17LD</td>
<td>Hollis-Charleton fine sandy loams (15-35% slopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map #</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17MC</td>
<td>Hollis-Rock outcrop complex (3-15% slopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17MD</td>
<td>Hollis-Rock outcrop complex (15-35% slopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31MC</td>
<td>Woodbridge extremely stony fine sandy loam (3-15% slopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32C</td>
<td>Charleton fine sandy loam (8-15% slopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32D</td>
<td>Charleton fine sandy loam (15-25% slopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32XC</td>
<td>Charleton very stony fine sandy loam (8-15% slopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35C</td>
<td>Paxton fine sandy loam (8-15% slopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35D</td>
<td>Paxton fine sandy loam (15-25% slopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35XC</td>
<td>Paxton very stony fine sandy loam (8-15% slopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38MC</td>
<td>Wethersfield extremely stony loams (3-15% slopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38MD</td>
<td>Wethersfield extremely stony loams (15-35% slopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41MC</td>
<td>Sutton extremely stony fine sandy loams (3-15% slopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69C</td>
<td>Agawam fine sandy loam (8-15% slopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94LD</td>
<td>Holyoke-Cheshire complex (15-35% slopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94MD</td>
<td>Holyoke-Rock Outcrop complex (15-35% slopes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) **Drainage Basins and Existing Water Service.** Information for this map was taken from 208 Water Quality Planning maps prepared by the South Central Connecticut Regional Planning Agency. Water service areas were obtained from water service maps of the New Haven Water Company. Drainage basins of third order magnitude (15-25 sq. mi.) were identified using a model map published by the DEP Natural Resources Center (1:125,000 scale).

6) **Flood Hazard Boundaries.** The information for this map was also taken from the 208 Water Quality Planning maps. Original flood boundary delineations come from HUD maps depicting the extent of flooding in a projected 100 year storm.
7) Favorable Aquifers and Existing Sewer Service. The information used for this map came from the 208 Water Quality Planning maps. Existing severed areas were taken from DEP Existing Sewer maps dated 1975 and were updated using information from the Town Engineer. Favorable aquifers were taken from a map published by the U.S. Geological Survey in 1978. Favorable aquifers are defined as "known or inferred coarse-grained and layered (coarse-over-fine and fine-over-coarse) stratified drift deposits having a water saturated thickness of ten feet or greater. These areas are known or inferred to be capable of yielding moderate to very large amounts of water (50 to 2,000 gallons per minute) to individual wells" (8, p. 4).

8) Open Space 1978. Information for this map was acquired from numerous sources. Trails information was provided through interviews with Rev. George Milne, President of the Woodbridge Conservation Trust, Inc.; Mr. Donald Rowland, Boy Scout leader; Mrs. Christine Donaldson, member of the Woodbridge Conservation Commission; and Mr. Andrew Howard, graduate student, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies. References 1 and 2 were also used.

Farmlands information was obtained from Mrs. Olive LeRoy and records of the Tax Assessor.

Open space information was provided by Mrs. Susannah K. Scully of the Woodbridge Publicly Owned Properties Commission and by Mr. Richard S. Pyszkowski, the Woodbridge Town Assessor.

The boundaries and location of each of the parcels shown on the map are approximate and are intended to illustrate only relative size and distribution of open space and farm areas.
All of the above maps should be used with the knowledge that they are not completely accurate. However, this fact does not diminish their usefulness for planning purposes. As they are all at the same scale, the maps can be overlayed on each other. Specific areas can then be identified which have two or more environmentally-significant attributes.

For example, an area which the overlay analysis shows as having wetlands, erosive soils, and within a residential area might receive more consideration for preservation as open space. Areas falling along future trail passages might be examined for soil limitations for such use. Proposed subdivision locations can be located and the resources existing in those areas examined readily.
VI. Suggested Future Action by the Conservation Commission

Only a few of the Conservation Commission's original information needs could be addressed within the scope of the present study. In addition to those areas previously omitted, the recommendations of this report point out several new areas requiring further action by the Commission. In recognition of these needs, a plan for future action is presented below. Major needs are briefly stated and are assigned priority rankings.

For the purpose of completing some or all of the proposed studies, it is hoped that the Commission will consider continued participation in the program of professional and technical services conducted by the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies.

1) Should the Conservation Commission decide to adopt the recommended format for the new open space plan, its first major task will be to prepare an open space questionnaire for town-wide distribution. Background information on the Town will also have to be researched and compiled for inclusion in the Plan. Additional maps may be needed for the map overlay analysis. These may include: significant historic and natural areas, proposed trail systems, designated wetlands, surficial geology, and 1978 land use.

2) Results from the open space survey will need to be analyzed and integrated with the map overlay methodology. Once sites are selected for future open space, field studies should be conducted on these areas. Field study of proposed trails
is also recommended in order to determine the most desirable routes.

3) The Commission should investigate the possibility of forming a regional farm cooperative and determine whether or not this action would benefit Woodbridge farmers. The Commission should remain informed of the progress being made at the State level in the implementation of the farmland development rights legislation. State Representative Dorothy McCluskey should be contacted by the Commission and her opinion requested as to the possible application of this law in Woodbridge.

4) As soon as all relevant information is collected and studies completed, the Commission should then proceed to develop an Action Plan as the final step in completion of the new Open Space Plan.
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Appendix A: Acquired Areas Recommended for Preservation in the 1965 Open Space Plan
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Appendix B: Major Open Space Parcels in Woodbridge
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map#</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fitzgerald Property</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Old Derby Trail</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Meiss Property</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hoffman Property</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bishop Estate East</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>116.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bishop Estate West</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>32.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parks and Playgrounds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map#</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Alice Newton St. Memorial Park</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>93.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Center Field</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>West River Field</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rice Property 149 Center Street</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sperry and Hickox Park</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>West Rock Ridge State Park</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1857 Litchfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871 Litchfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barrone Quarry</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computaro Property</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>West Rock Park</td>
<td>City of New Haven</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conservation Trust Properties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map#</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pond at 55 Peck Hill</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lodge Land</td>
<td>27.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conservation Trust Properties (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pond at 35 Indian Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hogan and Cleft Rock Land</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Haight Land</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Shepherd Land</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Forest Glen Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Forest Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>McGuire Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Land South of Milford Meadows</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Former Center School</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Beecher School</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>B'naï Jacob School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>22.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Amity Regional High School</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Churches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>First Congregational Church</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The Church of the New Assumption</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Trinity Evangelical Free Church</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assorted Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1045 Johnson Road</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sperry Road</td>
<td>117.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Litchfield</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Dillon</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615 Amity</td>
<td>199.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sperry and Morris</td>
<td>432.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map #</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven Water Co. (continued)</td>
<td>1970 Litchfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2097 Litchfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Morris Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1955 Litchfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Natural Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Golf Course (under 490)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Golf Course (under 490)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Golf Course Par 3 (under 490)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Power Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72 Rimson Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>405 Amity Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 Clark Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>United Illuminating Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 Krum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44 Park Lane (under 490)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ansonia-Derby Water Company (under 490)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Sample Open Space Questionnaires
HANOVER CONSERVATION COMMISSION
HANOVER, MASSACHUSETTS 02339

IMPORTANT! THIS SURVEY WILL BE PICKED UP BY A BOY SCOUT ABOUT ONE WEEK
AFTER YOU RECEIVE IT, OR YOU MAY PLACE IT AT THE "BOOK DROP"
AT THE CURTIS LIBRARY. THANK YOU!

Dear Resident: The Town of Hanover is preparing an Open Space and Recre-
ation Plan under the auspices of the Hanover Conservation Commission with
the cooperation of the Planning Board and the Recreation Committee in order
to qualify for State and Federal Funding on future projects.

It is essential that you participate in this survey so that we may effec-
tively determine the Town's needs and desires. We thank you for your time
and welcome any suggestions you feel may be helpful.

1. In what area of the Town do you live?

2. What ages are your family members?

3. Is there Conservation Commission Land in your neighborhood?
   If yes, what is its primary use?
   ( ) Water supply protection
   ( ) Open space protection
   ( ) Wildlife habitat
   ( ) Other: ______________________

b. Do you use this land? ______________________

4. Is there some land in your area or any
   where else in Town that you feel deserves
   protection? If so, list location and reason:
   ______________________

5. How do you think Conservation Land should be used?
   ( ) Kept in its natural state
   ( ) Nature trails & quiet recreation
   ( ) Parks and active recreation
   ( ) Farming and/or forestry
   ( ) Other: ______________________

6. Which of these outdoor activities would you like to see developed?
   ( ) Bicycle & horse trails ( ) Golf
   ( ) Picnic areas ( ) Jogging areas
   ( ) Outdoor classrooms ( ) Hunting
   ( ) Fishing ( ) Boating ( ) Hiking
   ( ) Town Forest ( ) Town Swimming
   ( ) Other: ______________________

7. List here any recreational facilities you would like to see added to the
   Town other than existing tennis courts, baseball fields, basketball courts
   and open playing fields:
   ______________________

Instructions for Questions 8 through 24:
   If you agree with the statement, circle "A". If you disagree, circle "D".

8. In some cases, an individual's use of
   his land should be limited for the
   benefit of the whole Town. A D

9. Protection of the Town's water supply
   should be a prime function of zoning. A D

10. Zoning should be based on the Town's
    resources and their limitations. A D

11. The Town should permit only a limited
    number of new homes each year A D

12. Hanover needs a youth center. A D

13. Keeping our "Rural" character is
    extremely important. A D

14. We should have Housing for the
    Elderly. A D

15. Hanover should have some apartments
    and/or condominiums. A D

16. Hanover should have Cluster Zoning. A D

17. Business should be confined to a
    specific area or areas. A D

18. All new streets should have sidewalks
    on one or both sides. A D

19. There is still plenty of room in Town
    for new subdivisions. A D

20. I feel that new development is dest-
   roying the Town's rural character. A D

21. I would vote for a slight tax increase
    to pay for regular bus service to the
    new Braintree "T" station. A D

22. The Town needs a full-time, qualified
    Town Manager. A D

23. The Planning Board and Conservation
    Commission should be encouraged to
    purchase conservation and/or recrea-
    tional lands for the Town with State
    and Federal funding. A D

(Continued on other side)
OPEN SPACE SURVEY

Dear Resident,

The Town of Ningham is evaluating its Open Space and Recreation holdings under the auspices of the Conservation and Recreation Land Acquisition Study Committee in order to qualify for State and Federal funding in future projects.

It is essential that you participate in this survey so that we may effectively determine your needs and desires. Please complete the survey and add any suggestions that you feel will be of assistance.

PLEASE DO NOT ANSWER MORE THAN 1 SURVEY
(In all questions, please answer for yourself and/or others in your family.)

I. Background

STREET ADDRESS: ____________________________

WHAT NEIGHBORHOOD DO YOU LIVE IN? ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OF FAMILY MEMBERS</th>
<th>EACH MEMBERS REC. PREFERENCES:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>___________ under 5 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>___________ 5-12 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>___________ 12-18 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>___________ over 18 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>___________ over 55 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AMOUNT OF LAND OWNED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a) Less than 1 acre</th>
<th>b) 1 to 3 acres</th>
<th>c) 7-10 acres</th>
<th>d) Over 10 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

II. Conservation

IS THERE CONSERVATION LAND IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD? YES _____ NO _____

WHAT IS ITS PRIMARY FUNCTION?

Water supply protection _____ Wildlife habitat _____

Rare ecosystem protection _____ Protection of open space _____

Other _____

IS IT READILY ACCESSIBLE? YES _____ NO _____

DO YOU USE THE LAND? YES _____ NO _____ BECAUSE: ____________________________

HOW OFTEN DO YOU USE IT?

Once a day _____ Once a week _____ Once a month _____

Occasionally _____ Never _____

HOW OFTEN DO YOU SPEND YOUR TIME IN OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES?

Every day _____ Every weekend _____ Once a month _____

Occasionally during the year _____ Other _____

HOW DO YOU SPEND THIS TIME?

Nature walks _____ Hiking _____ Camping _____ Golf _____

Bicycling _____ Boating _____ Fishing _____ Tennis _____

Hunting _____ Bird Watching _____ Picnicking _____

Snowmobiling _____ Other ____________

DO YOU DO THESE AS A GROUP OR INDIVIDUALLY?

(Check any that apply)

Family Unit _____ School _____

Mother/Children _____ Scouts _____

Father/Children _____ Camps _____

Age Group _____ Other _____

Church _____ Individual _____

Club _____

TOTAL SURVEYS: ____________
III. Recreation

IS THERE RECREATION LAND IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD? YES ___ NO ___

IS IT READILY ACCESSIBLE? YES ____ NO ____ (BECAUSE) ______

WHAT FACILITIES ARE NOW AVAILABLE?

Tennis courts ____ Baseball fields ____
Basketball Courts ____ Open playing fields ____
Other ________________

HOW OFTEN DO YOU USE THEM?

Daily ____ Weekly ____ Monthly ____ Never ______

ARE THE FACILITIES ADEQUATE? YES ____ NO ____

WHAT FACILITIES AND/OR PROGRAMS WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE ADDED?

IS MAINTENANCE A PROBLEM? YES ____ NO ____

IF YES, IN WHAT FORM? ____________________________

SOLUTIONS: ________________________________

IV. General Questions

DO YOU USE RECREATION LANDS OUTSIDE YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD?

YES ____ NO ____ FOR WHAT ACTIVITIES ________________

HOW FAR AWAY ARE THEY? ________________ IN/OUT OF TOWN? ________________

DO YOU VISIT CONSERVATION/RECREATION LANDS THAT ARE NOT TOWN OWNED? YES ____ NO ____

WHAT SPECIAL ASPECTS DO THEY OFFER? ____________________________

IS MANIPATUCK STATE PARK ONE OF THEM? YES ____ NO ____

ARE YOU A MEMBER OF A PRIVATE CLUB OR ORGANIZATION WHICH OFFERS RECREATIONAL FACILITIES? YES ____ NO ____

WHAT FACILITIES DOES IT OFFER NOT AVAILABLE ON TOWN OWNED LANDS?

Golf course ____ Yacht facilities ____
Other __________________________

DO YOU HAVE ANY SPECIAL NEEDS WHICH PRESENT FACILITIES DO NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT?

______________________________

WHO DO YOU THINK SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTENANCE OF CONSERVATION/RECREATION LANDS?

Conservation Commission ____ Recreation Commission ____
Private contracted groups ____ Volunteer groups ____
Other __________________________

REMARKS: ________________________________

IF YOU CAN NOT RETURN IMMEDIATELY, PLEASE RETURN TO THE CONSERVATION COMMISSION OFFICE IN TOWN HALL, OR TO THE LIBRARY, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. THANK YOU.
Appendix D: List of Landowners Qualifying for Public Act 490 Tax Abatement in Woodbridge
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Record</th>
<th>Prop Location</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Kelsey, George &amp; Helen</td>
<td>334 Rinnamon Rd</td>
<td>65 p450-6/1/59</td>
<td>29.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>Kleeman, James A. &amp; Joan S.</td>
<td>181 Seymour Rd</td>
<td>58 v411-5/25/72</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>Knodol, George H.</td>
<td>Baldwin Rd East</td>
<td>60 v190-4/8/35</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746</td>
<td>Kozak, Peter</td>
<td>154 Ford Rd</td>
<td>61 v348-7/11/57</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>914</td>
<td>Kusterer, Grace V.</td>
<td>46 Old Barnabas</td>
<td>62 v274-10/14/57</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Lawrence, Roberta</td>
<td>Walker Lane</td>
<td>46 v295-2/5/46</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td>Lewars, Ken B. &amp; Marian H.</td>
<td>193 Scymour Rd</td>
<td>89 v51-8/5/68</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td>L'Hommedieu, Alice B.</td>
<td>181 Rinnamon Rd</td>
<td>70 v28-4/21/61</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Lockyer, Cliff &amp; Dorothy M.</td>
<td>14 Apple Tree L</td>
<td>50 v209-8/22/49</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Loberg, Arthur</td>
<td>291 Rinnamon Rd</td>
<td>102 v200-7/10/73</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>Luther, Michael</td>
<td>128 Northrop Rd</td>
<td>73 p360-1/25/63</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>Massaro, John B. et al</td>
<td>41 Ford Rd</td>
<td>43 p182-4/16/59</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>Mastromarino, Anthony &amp; Rose</td>
<td>5 S Bradley Rd</td>
<td>46 p277-8/2/42</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Mazlow, Robert et al</td>
<td>Round Hill Rd</td>
<td>103 p56-8/23/73</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>McKinney, W. Loo et al</td>
<td>1163 Racebrook Rd</td>
<td>90 p397-1/23/69</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
<td>McKrigger, Sarah S.</td>
<td>1952 Litchfield</td>
<td>32 p468-3/14/24</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>Nangle, Katharine R.</td>
<td>17 Perkins Rd</td>
<td>50 p321-7/10/50</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>New Haven Water Co.</td>
<td>1045 Johnson Rd</td>
<td>94 p685-1/21/71</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>New Haven Water Co.</td>
<td>30 Sperry Rd</td>
<td>76 v23-1/16/64</td>
<td>117.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Litchfield</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Dillon Road</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
<td>Anity Road</td>
<td>199.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>New Haven Water Co.</td>
<td>Sperry &amp; Morris</td>
<td>76 p35-1/28/64</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>New Haven Water Co.</td>
<td>1970 Litchfield</td>
<td>76 v23-1/16/64</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2097</td>
<td>Litchfield</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Morris Rd</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>New Haven Water Co.</td>
<td>1955 Litchfield</td>
<td>577.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Newman, Richard &amp; Lottie M.</td>
<td>1172 Racebrook</td>
<td>72 p22-4/9/64</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>Nugent, Arthur J.</td>
<td>1875 Litchfield</td>
<td>77 p287-8/27/64</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Oaklane Cty Club</td>
<td>1072 Racebrook Rd</td>
<td>73 p511-1/10/63</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Peck, James B.</td>
<td>1341 Racebrook</td>
<td>43 p71-10/5/43</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Peck, Stuart et al</td>
<td>47 Newton Rd</td>
<td>94 p443-1/18/67</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>Pepe, Sebata Maria Fonto</td>
<td>275 Old Amby Rd</td>
<td>85 p354-5/15/67</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Perrotto, Antonio et al</td>
<td>1760 Litchfield</td>
<td>87 p231-12/11/67</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>Perrotto, Frank et al</td>
<td>1710 Litchfield</td>
<td>94 p313-10/21/70</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>Perrotto, Frank et al</td>
<td>1722 Litchfield</td>
<td>94 p313-10/21/70</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>Perrotto, Katherine et al</td>
<td>110 Bradley Rd</td>
<td>93 p312-6/2/70</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>Perrotto, Giovanni</td>
<td>225 Amity Rd</td>
<td>87 p232-12/11/67</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>940</td>
<td>Pierson, Leonard</td>
<td>650 Amity Road</td>
<td>41 p483-5/1/34</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>Putnam, Ruth &amp; Baldwin Thoos</td>
<td>27 Overhill Rd</td>
<td>109 p204-11/18/75</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>Putnam, Ruth</td>
<td>21 Milan Road</td>
<td>61 p23-4/23/51</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Relihan, Thomas &amp; Dorothy</td>
<td>928 Baldwin Rd</td>
<td>91 p255-6/3/69</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Reiss, Albert J. Jr. &amp; Enna H.</td>
<td>45 Center Rd</td>
<td>100 p556-2/5/73</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>Robinson, Franklin &amp; Gloria</td>
<td>272 Ruminum Rd</td>
<td>54 p221-9/24/53</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>Rowland, Don &amp; Louise B.</td>
<td>177 Newton Rd</td>
<td>77 p555-10/13/64</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>837</td>
<td>Russell, Estelle L.U.</td>
<td>236 Newton Rd</td>
<td>43 p501-8/27/62</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>Newton Rd</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>927</td>
<td>Ryker, Don W. &amp; Ruth T.</td>
<td>45 Hunting Hill</td>
<td>63 p410-6/11/58</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Samuelson, Lilli</td>
<td>245 Newton Rd</td>
<td>68 p413-8/2/60</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>Savino, Louise</td>
<td>128 Ford Rd</td>
<td>97 p173-11/12/71</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>Scavone, Angelina &amp; Chas C.</td>
<td>883 Baldwin Rd</td>
<td>87 p394-1/29/68</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880</td>
<td>Scholz, William</td>
<td>1160 Racebrook</td>
<td>31 p352-10/19/74</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Shepherd, Elythe H.</td>
<td>Litchfield Tpke</td>
<td>43 p215-10/23/51</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Shepherd, Elythe &amp; Fred Jr.</td>
<td>Litchfield Tpke</td>
<td>85 p59-3/22/67</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Silverstein, Alicia</td>
<td>44 Dillon Road</td>
<td>94 p226-9/30/70</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>Sirowich, Helen K.</td>
<td>11 Ford Road</td>
<td>62 p305-5/6/66</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790</td>
<td>Smith, Woodruff, R. Est</td>
<td>116 Northrop Rd</td>
<td>67 p172-12/14/59</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Spielvogel, Sam &amp; Rosalind</td>
<td>1899 Litchfield</td>
<td>86 p329-8/31/67</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916</td>
<td>Todd, Chrystal H. &amp; Eliza</td>
<td>164 Newton Rd</td>
<td>43 p342-7/21/53</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>United Illuminating Co.</td>
<td>44 Park Lane</td>
<td>84 p282-12/1/66</td>
<td>50.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Velleco, Samuel A Jr. &amp; Janet</td>
<td>64 Beecher Rd</td>
<td>76 p560-6/29/64</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Vlock, Jay I &amp; Laurel</td>
<td>101 Ansonia Rd</td>
<td>109 p390-1/5/76</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>Vlock, Jay I &amp; Laurel</td>
<td>v109 p242-1/8/76</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Acq. Date</td>
<td>Acreage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7760</td>
<td>Vernon, Chas I &amp; Katherine</td>
<td>Amity Road</td>
<td>v102 p438-7/24/73</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9072</td>
<td>Wallace, Estate of Helen</td>
<td>172 Peck Hill Rd</td>
<td>v40 p579-3/2/44</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9088</td>
<td>Wallace, Estate of Helen</td>
<td>211 Peck Hill Rd</td>
<td>v40 p579-3/2/44</td>
<td>271.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3104</td>
<td>Wallace, Estate of Helen</td>
<td>230 Peck Hill Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3312</td>
<td>Weir, James &amp; Margery B.</td>
<td>27 Brook Road</td>
<td>v92 p99-9/30/69</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3408</td>
<td>Wentworth, David K &amp; Evalene</td>
<td>1215 Racebrook Rd</td>
<td>v92 p377-12/15/69</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3448</td>
<td>White, Isadore Est &amp; Eva O</td>
<td>9 Tallwood Rd</td>
<td>v57 p422-11/7/55</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3728</td>
<td>Winters, H. David &amp; Jean B.</td>
<td>124 Center Rd</td>
<td>v80 p177-8/15/65</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3760</td>
<td>Wolff, Emanuel C. &amp; Eliz</td>
<td>10 Sperry Rd</td>
<td>v88 p527-7/1/68</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3924</td>
<td>Woodbridge Cty Club Inc</td>
<td>50 Woodfield Rd</td>
<td>v87 p3-10/25/67</td>
<td>137.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4281</td>
<td>Yucker, Robert</td>
<td>20 Robin Rd</td>
<td>v66 p138-7/20/59</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4240</td>
<td>Yucker, Anna</td>
<td>254 Seymour Rd</td>
<td>v89 p373-9/20/69</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>Zeider, Irving &amp; Sylvia</td>
<td>118 Newton Rd</td>
<td>v96 p245-3/4/55</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now on 1977 Grand List

compiling the list above, I have included those who have applied for classification is year and previous years. The list above does not show an expiration of liability but in all cases it would be 10 years from acquisition date under present law.

thereby certify the above list to be accurate as far as I can determine at this time.

Received for record Dec. 2, 1977
at 10h 45m a.m. and recorded by:

\[Signature\]

Ass'n Town Clerk

\[Signature\]

Richard S. Pyszowski
Assessor
TOWN OF WOODBRIDGE
TO: TOWN CLERK - TOWN OF WOODBRIDGE  

OCTOBER 1, 1977

CERTIFICATION UNDER SECTION 6-PA §152

In accordance with certificate under Section 6-PA §152 the following updated list is submitted for the Grand List of 1977. I trust it may be of assistance in determining when and whether transfer taxes are payable. Acquistion dates and deed references are shown, as it seems to me these would be the determining factor under Act §152 rather than the date of classification. If original classification dates become necessary they can be found for farm and forest applications in the 1971 file of such applications in my office.

410 Alexiades, Alexander & Mary J. 14 Seymour Rd v96 p117-6/25/71 12.1
740 Ansonia Derby Water Co 357 Rimon Rd v46 p369-5/28/43 281.0
1280 Baldwin, C. (Oakland City Club) Racebrook Road v73 p505-1/10/63 88.3
1290 Baldwin, Clarence et al 1020 Racebrook Rd v10 p289-12/14/72 53.0
1320 Baldwin, Malcolm W. 1015 Racebrook Rd v76 p181-2/26/64 7.5
1340 Bomer, Frederick B. & Jean E 18 Perkins Rd v86 p393-9/11/67 2.1
1530 Bassett, Vivienne E. 821 Fountain St v80 p531-10/20/65 3.5
2380 Blakeslee, Martha E 514 Amity Rd v51 p413-9/5/51 9.5
2490 Blum, Mary K. & Fred Jr. 234 Seymour Rd v43 p128-4/22/46 10.0
3070 Brown, Henry S. & Hilda T. 1834 Litchfield Tpke v11-7/1/53 3.5
3392 Bussmann, Anne Marie 493 Amity Rd v10 p422-6/7/73 6.5
550 Cahow, E. Elton & Joy C. 194 Rimon Rd v88 p351-6/5/68 2.5
4560 Calabresi, Guido 639 Amity Rd v43 p494-5/9/62 23.0
5290 Chatfield, Elizabeth J. 30 N Pease Rd v81 p310-12/30/65 1.39
5556 Clark, Gordon H. 100 Newton Rd v58 p377-4/24/56 35.0
5610 Clark, Theodore R. 993 Racebrook Rd v40 p315-2/16/38 16.0
5690 Clifton, Eugene E. & Genia N 578 Amity Rd v50 p190-8/4/49 8.25
5840 Colberg, Virginia 15 Hickory Rd v101 p412-5/2/73 3.3
5850 Colby, Mary T. 232 Newton Rd v44 p103-12/6/38 10.75
5960 Cooper, James Wayne 21 Clark Rd v41 p268-8/20/32 8.4
6170 Costello, Gervasi J. & Marian 140 Rimon Rd v53 p18-1016/52 6.0
6090 Connor, James Wayne 21 Clark Rd v41 p268-8/20/32 8.4
7460 Davis, Joseph & Sarah 248 Ansonia Rd v56 p439-5/19/55 32.0
7700 DiGennaro, Salvatore etal 245 Amity Road v43 p199-5/10/63 7.1
7820 DiLaccio, Salvatore 291 Amity Rd v50 p389-3/14/50 4.12
7740 DiLuccio, Dorothy 18 Rimon Rd v90 p225-12/30/68 4.5
7743 Delizio, John Jr. 69 Acorn Hill Rd v11 p604-8/12/77 7.5
8050 Deutsch, Barbara W. 18 Pleasant Rd v94 p103-9/2/76 4.85
8210 DiGennaro, Anna etal 75 Beecher Rd v62 p398-11/20/51 36.0
8450 Doob, Leonard W. 6 Clark Rd v47 p218-9/18/45 4.5
8420 Donaldson, Christine H. 6 Clark Rd v47 p218-9/18/45 4.5
8580 Duff, Raymond S. & G. Joyce 259 Newton Rd v76 p1-1/7/64 2.0
9142 Elston, Dorothea K. 16 Cleft Rock v55 p235-7/6/54 6.19
9387 Farrow, Franklin III 149 Northrop Rd v50 p136-6/21/49 12.5
9912 Frechette, Eugene J. Jr 17 Brook Rd v63 p495-6/30/58 16.5
570 Giordano, Frank J. 115 Newton Rd v47 p445-7/24/46 2.25
11130 Grauer, Elizabeth A. 62 Forest Glen v110 p336-7/20/76 1.54
12210 Haight, Gordon S. & Mary N 145 Peck Hill Rd v40 p527-12/17/42 105.0
12670 Haskoch, Philip Dickinson 67 Newton Rd v58 p377-4/24/36 54.75
12850 Hitchcock, Robert F. 901 Newton Rd v50 p537-7/18/50 11.5
12860 Hitchcock, Wil H & Helen K. 48 Center Rd v43 p570-9/2/64 4.91
12955 Holman, Robert R. & Sandra J. 215 Seymour Rd v103 p193-9/6/73 5.8
13150 Horell, Herb & Katherine M. 400 Amity Rd v49 p23-3/1/47 22.0
13170 Hubbell, Herbert etal 424 Amity Rd v43 p329-8/25/63 41.5
14330 Ives, Milton B. & Cornelia H. 1 Perkins Rd v57 p95-7/20/55 25.0
14520 Jacobs, Max D. & Ruth K. 34 Rimon Rd v50 p493-6/12/50 3.5
14750 Johnson, Kathleen Yvonne 46 Acorn Hill v63 p321-5/15/58 7.64

* Forward