

From: Paul Geraghty <pgeraghty@geraghtybonnano.com>  
Date: Nov 16, 2021 2:57 PM  
Subject: 121 Upper Patt  
To: "Casey, John P" <jcasey@RC.com>  
Cc: gary@uptonbass.com,kristenkeenan@hotmail.com

John, my client to state it is mildly "disturbed" at the continued delay of town's staff in providing timely responses to their application that has been pending since August 5, 2021. They are well aware of the "death by a thousand cuts" approach to applications when staff want to deliberately delay as is the case with the pending Nottingham Hills subdivision Phase 5 applications. As the record of the planning commission reflects, it took staff seven weeks to provide their first comments and then only after my prodding (See Ex. G to the Planning Commission's Record). My client provided timely responses from its engineers, Tim May P.E. , Record Exhibits H, Z, GG, HH, & I, and Kristen Clarke P. E., ex M. Revised plans were submitted by J.P. Mereen on September 28, 2021 Ex. Y. The Ledge Light Comments to which you refer are at best minimal, see attached instructions from Clarke P. E. to Mereen L.S., none of which effect the IWA Permit application from proceeding. The Town Engineer's comments received yesterday afternoon to the most recent requested information were submitted on November 5th have already been responded to and is attached as well. Your statement "initial comments" did not go unnoticed by my client and given the fact May P.E. had previously reduced the town engineer's issues to the minute issues addressed in the engineer's email of November 15, 2021 is demonstrative, in my clients experiences with town staff, of yet more silliness to come. The Town Engineers minimal issues in no way effect that fact that my client has demonstrated compliance with the storm water management requirements of the East Lyme Subdivision Regulations and from the IWA's perspective in no way will deviate from the facts and expert testimony that demonstrate that the re development of the property will have no adverse effect on the Inland Wetlands. My client is preparing a detailed response to this latest unnecessary delay. Moreover, the delay in IWC review has the effect of pushing out the planning review and approval. We need to have a conversation. Mr. Goeschel has a number of conflicts with this application that are, in my clients opinion, the reason for the delay. Please call me when you have a moment to discuss. Regards Paul

Paul M. Geraghty  
Geraghty & Bonnano, LLC  
38 Granite Street  
New London, CT 06320  
p.860-447-8077  
f.860-447-9833

**"Please note that among the services that this firm provides is for attempting to collect a debt, and if this communication is in regards to a debt collection, any information obtained will be used for that purpose."**

\*\*\*\*\*Confidentiality Notice\*\*\*\*\*

This email is intended solely for the use of the addressee hereof. In addition, this message may contain information that is confidential, privileged and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you are prohibited from reading, disclosing, reproducing, distributing, disseminating or otherwise using this transmission. Delivery of this message to any person other than the intended recipient is not intended to waive any right or privilege. If you have received this message in error, please promptly notify the sender immediately and delete this message from your system.

Ex "VV"

**From:** mayengineering@sbcglobal.net,

**To:** aklose@eltonhall.com,

**Cc:** pgeraghty@geraghtybonnano.com, ggoeschel@eltonhall.com,

**Subject:** Re: Drainage Report Rev November 5, 2021 - Questions

**Date:** Tue, Nov 16, 2021 8:55 am

**Attachments:**

Alex

**Question 1**

1. In Drainage Area A on the existing conditions map you have "Paved Roads" as 0.29 ac and "Gravel Roads" as 0.20 ac, however in the model you have the opposite. Can you please confirm which is correct? This is a copy from the report and as written and modeled is correct

Area (ac)	CN	Description
0.290	85	Gravel roads, HSG B
* 0.200	98	Paved Roads
* 0.040	98	Roofs, Tent platforms
0.220	98	Roofs, HSG B
4.400	67	Brush, Poor, HSG B
25.650	55	Woods, Good, HSG B

**Question 2**

2. You also list 4 Buildings and 6 Deck/Tent Platforms in area A, but I count 11 items that look like structures on the plan in that area. I do also count 31 items in B and 32 listed so that may be a displacement from one area to the other, please clarify.

There are 11 buildings/tent platforms in Area A and 31 buildings in Area B. The drawing indicates that number and is shaded to the ones that are to be removed. The model has the correct areas, I may have not articulated these in the write up precisely.

**Question 3**

3. It appears that there is only one check dam in area A and the runoff south of that, from the proposed driveway, runs untreated into the roadway is that correct?

There is one check dam for the driveway in Area A to slow runoff velocities and the driveway is sloped to drain in to the wood at all points. Stormwater runoff is treated to drain and flow as it does naturally.

**Question 4**

4. I do not see the proposed paved driveway area accounted for in the calculation for proposed area B. The "Driveways Paved, HSG B" is 0.230 ac which is the same amount as the "Paved roads, HSG B" in the existing condition calculation. The plans indicate that the 0.230 ac of paved area in area B is to remain, and an additional impervious paved drive is proposed for the 5 houses.

I will review the drainage data and verify that the driveway impervious area is included.

### Question 5

5. In area B you also have some roads and structures hatched (to be removed) outside of the drainage area hatch limits, please clarify.

These are buildings that will be remove due to location but are not included in drainage because they are not in the drainage area

Thank you

Tim May  
May Engineering, LLC

On Monday, November 15, 2021, 03:46:48 PM EST, Alex Klose <aklose@eltownhall.com> wrote:

Hello Tim,

Can you please clarify a few items in your revised Drainage Report (November 5, 2021) and associated plans "Proposed Building" dated October 10, 2021 and "Plan of subdivision Showing Existing Buildings and Roads" revised November 5, 2021.

1. In Drainage Area A on the existing conditions map you have "Paved Roads" as 0.29 ac and "Gravel Roads" as 0.20 ac, however in the model you have the opposite. Can you please confirm which is correct?
2. You also list 4 Buildings and 6 Deck/Tent Platforms in area A, but I count 11 items that look like structures on the plan in that area. I do also count 31 items in B and 32 listed so that may be a displacement from one are to the other, please clarify.
3. It appears that there is only one check dam in area A and the runoff south of that, from the proposed driveway, runs untreated into the roadway is that correct?
4. I do not see the proposed paved driveway area accounted for the in calculation for proposed area B. The "Driveways Paved, HSG B" is 0.230 ac which is the same amount as the "Paved roads, HSG B" in the existing condition calculation. The plans indicate that the 0.230 ac of paved area in area B is to remain, and an additional impervious paved drive is proposed for the 5 houses.
5. In area B you also have some roads and structures hatched (to be removed) outside of the drainage area hatch limits, please clarify.

Thank you,

Alex Klose, PE  
Town Engineer  
Phone: (860) 691-4112

[info@townofeastlyme.com](mailto:info@townofeastlyme.com)

Town of East Lyme  
PO Box 519  
108 Pennsylvania Avenue  
Niantic, CT 06357

**Kristen T. Clarke P.E.**  
**Response to Septic Feasibility Comments**  
**by Ledge Light Health District**  
**October 5, 2021**

**LOT 52**

In order to address the claimed proximity of the house to the proposed primary system area I would simply plot the actual trench size of the GST 6218 system which is 62". We currently show a trench 15' in width. That should allow more than the 25' from the foundation. Just make sure the trench's for primary and reserve are spaced 10' apart at all points. I'll have Dave Potts send us a detail sheet to be added to the plans.

**LOT 53**

Adjust the rear property line on lot 54 to address the 25' set back issue and to allow for additional trench space to address MLSS Issue. You may want to plot the 62" system trench width first to see if it fits without changing the lot line. While I'm not quite sure if there really is really an MLSS issue on this lot I would just enlarge the trench's to 62' since we have plenty of room to do so.

**LOT 54**

Plot well location on the remaining land aka Lot 55 to demonstrate no well conflict with lot 54. Its well over 100' from the well on the remaining land to the left side yard property line of lot 54 so we can easily show the 75' well arc without issue.

**LOT 55**

Plot location of the existing septic system on lot 55 taken from as built drawing from the Town of East Lyme building department. This as built was included with the Ledge Light Health District application.

**LOT 56**

Add Test Pit Data for TP 9-3

**LOT 58**

Move house location slightly North and West to allow for longer trench due to MLSS and claimed setback issues. While I believe the topography demonstrates the front property line should be the down gradient line subject to the 25' setback as opposed to the 15' setback on the right side yard property line I would make the revision to provide a 25' side yard just to avoid further delay. Increase trench size to 62' based upon the MLSS or reduce to a 3-BR review for the current feasibility review. Your call.