

Kristen T. Clarke P.E.
20 Risingwood Drive
Bow, New Hampshire 03304

January 11, 2026

Hand Delivered
Mr. Brian Bohmbach, Chairman
Town of East Lyme Planning Commission
108 Pennsylvania Avenue
Niantic, CT 06357

Gary Goeschel, Director of Planning
Town of East Lyme
108 Pennsylvania Avenue
Niantic, CT 06357

Re: Cedar Brook Drive Re-S

Dear Chairman Bohmbach and Mr. Goeschel,

This correspondence is meant and intended to respond to the communications received by Mr. Goeschel from Craig Bryant dated November 4, 2025, attached as Exhibit A, and Lisa Coggins dated November 10, 2025, attached as Exhibit B. Please note for the record that neither of these communications were provided to the applicant or their legal counsel until well after the November 10, 2025 Public Hearing.

Response to Craig Bryant Communication

In Mr. Bryant's memo he makes several false claims beginning with "*...there are many obstacles with this property especially with it being mostly ledge, uneven, and on a decent grade*" a claim that is demonstrably untrue as evidenced by the A-2 survey of the application property, Plan Sheet 2 of 4, which identifies the location of ledge in the northeast corner of the lot that is largely within the side and rear setbacks which prohibit buildings to be located, or the site plan, Plan Sheet 4 of 4, which provides site topography, proposed grading, as well as existing and post construction conditions.

Next, Mr. Bryant claims without any demonstrated foundation or professional knowledge or support that "*It seems as if this lot should be deemed unbuilding able and that they are trying to squeeze in this structure without real thought.*" This statement is also untrue. The site plan prepared, Plan sheet 4 of 4, was prepared by Connecticut licensed Professional Engineers 1 whom, as evidenced by the site plan, gave a lot of thought to the location of the home in terms of site topography where, as evidenced by the plan, minimal grading was required and the homes location which is a minimum of 165' from the abutting common property line at the rear of the Meadowlark Lane homes when only 30' is required. The site plan clearly demonstrates that the applicant is not seeking to "squeeze" anything into this property that has 387.61' of frontage (more than twice that which is required) and 1.2 acres/52,177 s.f.

Ex "L.L."

of area an amount that is 30.4 % more than is required. The location for the home was chosen due to its ease of access, topography, existing grades requiring minimal re-grading and ability to comply, rather easily I might add, with the recommendations contained in the 2024 DEEP Storm Water Management Manual regarding and relating to stormwater management. As evidenced by the Town Engineers Alex Klose's Plan Comments dated November 14, 2025 "*Given the amount of minimal amount of impervious surface proposed...*"

Mr. Bryant next falsely laments "*this is going in my back yard has the potential to cause some issues of integrity of my property (and my neighbors) as a whole, especially the foundation while they are blasting ledge to make space to squeeze the home.*" As stated earlier herein the proposed home location is not being "*squeezed in..*" in fact, quite to the contrary. Additionally, there is no factual support that blasting is even required given the proposed location, its relatively flat topography, and site testing in the vicinity of the proposed home would cumulatively demonstrate no blasting is likely to be required. Moreover, even if blasting were required the location of minor blasting would occur in excess of 250' of any existing residence. To give this blasting concern some perspective the Orchards subdivision has regularly blasted for more than a decade without incident within 50' of existing residences. Next Mr. Bryant claims "*..the lot is uphill from me and my neighbors*" a claim that is misleading as a review of the site plan topography demonstrates. As evidenced by the topographic map, Exhibit C, there will be no line of sight from Mr. Bryant's home to the proposed new home

Finally, Mr. Bryant expresses "*other environmental concerns with deforestation and the removal of flora which has the potential to create significant run-off, stormwater, and flooding issues.*" for which he provides no support. The Town Engineers review of the applicants proposed site plan rather conclusively demonstrates all of the above referenced "concerns" are unfounded, unsupportable and untrue.

In the final analysis Mr. Bryant's claims are all unfounded and unsupported. Not a single document was included with his letter to support the allegations he set forth. His claims not to be a "not in my backyard guy" ("NIMBY") statement clearly does not pass the Duck Test in my opinion (**If it looks like a duck, swims like a duck, quacks like a duckit's probably a duck**). As the Site plan clearly demonstrates;

- The site plan demonstrates that the proposed new home, at its closest point is 339' from the rear of Mr. Bryant's home.
- Within the 339' separation between the proposed home and Mr. Bryant's home the topographic elevation rises from a proposed finished floor elevation of 98.5" to 110' which elevation at the common boundary of Mr. Bryant and the Hathaway Farm LLC lot. This elevation continues for a length of 25 +/- onto Mr. Bryant's property. Mr. Bryant's home is located at an elevation of 81' which would translate into a first floor elevation approximately 83'. Assuming 8' ceiling heights this translates into an elevation of 101' at the ceiling of Mr. Homes second floor meaning, at best, Mr. Bryant's view from his second floor ceiling height is an 8' ledge outcropping located in his back yard.
- As is evidenced by Exhibit D attached hereto Mr. Bryant's home is located 54' from his neighbor's home located at 4 Meadowlark Lane, 167' from 2 Tern Court and 232' from 29 Cedarbrook Lane all of which Mr. Bryant enjoys direct line of sight. By contrast the proposed home on the application lot is 339' at its closest point and is/will be invisible given the existing topography of both Mr. Bryant's property and the application lot.

Response to Lisa Coggins Communication

As I had indicated in my correspondence to then Planning Commission Chairman Gordon and Mr. Goeschel dated November 24, 2025, responding to the questions raised by commission members Menapace and Dixon, Ms. Coggins comments rather clearly demonstrate a lack of knowledge and understanding of both the Exemption Provision and the Stormwater requirements of the Town of East Lyme Subdivision requirements. Ms. Coggins “objection” to the waiver ignores that the waiver is merely the process in which the Exemption is provided to an applicant upon review, demonstration and approval by the Town Engineer that an applicant has engineered their plans to conform to the requirements of Section 6-8-7 of the Subdivision regulations.

With regard to Ms. Coggins false claim that *“In a review of the applicants documents on the Town website, Planning Commission, I did not see a landscape design plan, which was represented as providing acceptable alternatives to the Stormwater requirements”*. I would note the following;

- a) The Rain Garden details as well as the drainage calculations are provided at the top of page 4 of the plan set. The rain garden size is based upon the drainage calculations provided and fully complies with the State of Connecticut DEEP 2024 Stormwater Manual recommendations.
- b) There was no representation in our application that there was a landscape plan that provided “...acceptable alternatives to the stormwater requirements. As evidenced by the Town Engineers review the applications site plan has demonstrated compliance with the applicable requirements of your subdivision regulations stormwater requirements.

In further response to Ms. Coggins questions;

1. *“How does this waiver request benefit the residents on the neighboring parcels to the Catbird Lane subdivision”*

Putting aside the facts the “waiver” is merely the process and that the exemption is an entitlement under the subdivision regulations based upon sound engineering reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer and that the application is not located on or near Catbird Lane the benefit is that the Town Engineer’s review has confirmed that the site plan demonstrates that the receiving aquifer, wetland or watercourse will not be affected nor will the development cause or exacerbate downstream flooding.

2. *How does this waiver request benefit the environment surrounding the Catbird Lane Re-Subdivision ?*

See answer to question 1.

3. *What is the amount of earth removal planned for this project ?*

The site plan demonstrate the minor grading proposed balances the cuts and fills. Accordingly, there will be no earth removal from the property

4. *Will the slope of the parcel change with the development ?*

The “slope” change claims are part of a false narrative being advanced with regard to this application and its site plan. The topography of the subject property is consistent with a majority of the lots in the Heritage at East Lyme Subdivision. From an engineering perspective the applicant, as is evidenced by the applications site plan, has chosen a location on the site that is relatively flat, and requires only a small amount of grading.

5. If the reason for the waiver request is for financial factors, why would that be the problem for the community at large, and not a burden for the developer to bear ?

Putting aside once again that the “waiver” is merely the process and the exemption is an entitlement under the subdivision regulations based upon sound engineering reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer the answer is “financial factors” play no role in the exemption entitlement. This question by Ms. Coggins further demonstrates her lack of understanding of the subdivision regulations which when written by this commission have to address future applications be they 1 lot with no public improvements i.e. roads ect, as is the case here, or 100 lots which require roads, off site drainage/stormwater facilities and the like. Section 6-8 of the subdivision regulations is an all encompassing view of all potential stormwater requirements. Section 6-8-7, a portion of Section 6-8, recognizes correctly that some of the requirements of Section 6-8 are not necessary when the Commission is dealing with small subdivisions with three lots or less and thus incorporated an “Exemption” Provision in the regulations. The “Exemption” does not waive the requirement that site plans be properly engineered it only exempts “certain” requirements that are simply not applicable to smaller subdivision applications especially when no public improvements are required.

In the final paragraph of Ms. Coggins communication she claims without any support *“in my personal experience as a property owner in various Town’s throughout Connecticut, I find developers who request waivers are trying to do so to maximize profits and their request in no way benefits the community at large”*. In response I would note that in addition to providing no support for this claim it is not applicable to the current application and demonstrates a rather clear bias against property rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Secondly, Ms. Coggins makes the unsupported false claims that *“This parcel is near to Latimer Brook and if stormwater runoff is not appropriately addressed, the surrounding properties could experience unwanted impacts.”*. In response, and as is evidenced by the Town Engineers review of our site plan, we have most certainly addressed stormwater and have fully complied with the State of Connecticut DEEP 2024 Stormwater Manuel. Finally, with regard to Ms. Coggins claim that there is a “...limited amount of documentation available on the website...” does not mean that it has not been submitted. As this Commission is aware several of my applications over the past few years have suffered from both actual failures and or untimely uploading of my application submissions to the commission’s website. The applicant certainly is not responsible for staff failures, inattention and application bias in this regard.

Please make this response to Mr. Bryant and Ms. Coggins written comments attached hereto a part of the record to my pending re-subdivision application.

Sincerely,


Kristen T. Clarke P.E., Applicant

EXHIBIT A

Gary Goeschel

From: Craig Bryant <cbryant@hebronct.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 12:20 PM
To: Gary Goeschel
Subject: Cedarbrook Subdivision

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning Mr. Goeschel,

My name is Craig Bryant and I live at 2 Meadowlark Lane in East Lyme. My property abuts a lot on Cedarbrook Lane where there is a sign suggesting to reach out to you for further information.

I am aware that this property was sold and that some of the land was or will be given to the Town for conservation. Although I do appreciate that a portion of the property is now considered conservation land, I am very concerned with the possibility of building a structure in that location.

As I am sure you are aware, there are many obstacles with this property especially with it being mostly ledge, uneven, and on a decent grade. It seems as if this lot should be deemed unbuilding able and that they are trying to squeeze in a new structure without real thought. I am not a "not in my backyard guy" but this going in my back yard has the potential to cause some issues to the integrity of my property (and my neighbors) as a whole, especially the foundation while they are blasting ledge to make space to squeeze in this home. I am also a bit worried about other environmental concerns with deforestation and removal of flora which has the potential to create significant run-off, stormwater, and flooding issues. This lot is uphill from me and my neighbors, and it is a concern for us all.

Maybe it seems as if I am just worried about having another neighbor breathing down my neck or losing what little bit of privacy I have with living on a corner lot, but I can assure you that is not my complaint. I grew up in the city, I'm used to it and does not affect me. However, the issues that I bring up are real and should be considered. The effects of this construction should not be detrimental to myself or my neighbors.

Trust me, this is the last thing I wanted to bother you with as I know the frustrations and the constant negativity that comes with being a municipal employee. I don't envy your position. But I do very much appreciate you taking the team to read my note and if there is a meeting I can attend or if you can include this in public comment please let me know.

Thank you very much.

Craig Bryant CPRP
Parks and Recreation Director
Town of Hebron
Office: 148 East Street
Mailing: 15 Gilead Street
Hebron, CT 06248
P: 860-530-1281 ex230
C: 860-335-6260



EXHIBIT B

Gary Goeschel

From: Lisa C <lc2w2kids@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2025 3:29 PM
To: Gary Goeschel; jsutherland@eltownhall.com
Subject: 11/10/25 Public Hearing: Catbird Lane

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon Gary,

I am unable to attend in person this evening and would like my email submitted to the Planning Commission for the record:

Good Evening,

Lisa Coggins
162 Flanders Road

I want to comment tonight on the developer's request for a Stormwater waiver in their application on Catbird Lane.

In a review of the applicants documents on the Town Website, Planning Commission, I did not see a Landscape Design Plan, which was referenced as providing acceptable alternatives to the Stormwater Requirements.

Therefore, I object to the request for a waiver and I have the following questions that I want the Commission to consider as they review this request this evening.

1. How does this waiver request benefit the residents on the neighboring parcels to the Catbird Lane Resubdivision?
2. How does this waiver request benefit the environment surrounding the Catbird Lane Resubdivision?
3. What is the amount of earth removal planned for this project?
4. Will the slope of the parcel change with the development?
5. If the reason for the waiver request is for financial factors, why would that be the problem for the community at large, and not a burden for the developer to bear?

In my personal experience as a property owner in various Towns throughout Connecticut, I find that developers who request waivers are trying to do so to maximize their profits and their request in no way benefits the community at large. This parcel is near to Latimer Brook and if stormwater runoff is not appropriately addressed, the surrounding properties could experience unwanted impacts. With the limited amount of documentation available on the website, I do not understand how you can approve the waiver.