

Anna Wynn

From: Elizabeth Burdick
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2026 10:54 AM
To: Anna Wynn
Cc: Gales Ferry District
Subject: FW: Concerns Regarding Proposed Parking Regulation Amendments

Good morning, Anna, Please add the below email from Lee Ann Berry as an exhibit for the file for PZ#26-2ZRA and post to the web. Thanks!

Liz Burdick, Director of Land Use & Planning
Town of Ledyard
741 Colonel Ledyard Highway, Ledyard, CT 06339
Telephone: (860) 464-3215
Email: planner@ledyardct.org

From: Gales Ferry District <galesferrydistrict@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2026 9:08 AM
To: Roxanne Maher <council@ledyardct.org>; William Barnes <wbar@ledyardct.org>; April Brunelle <ABru@ledyardct.org>; Jessica Buhle <Jbuh@ledyardct.org>; Carmen Garcia Irizarry <CGIri@ledyardct.org>; Ty Lamb <TLamb@ledyardct.org>; Elizabeth Burdick <planner@ledyardct.org>; Mike Cherry <mj.cherry@comcast.net>
Subject: Fwd: Concerns Regarding Proposed Parking Regulation Amendments

I am sharing a concerned email that I received from one of our CALU members. Can you please share these concerns with the Conservation Commission and all members of Planning and Zoning. Are members aware of the impact of these changes?

Hello CALU,

So I've been reviewing the proposed parking regulation amendments that are the subject of Thursday's public hearing. (Eric sent around a copy of the amendment package along with his flowchart and comments before leaving on vacation.)

One thing that immediately jumped out at me is on page 7 of the amendment, where it proposes deleting Sections 9.3.B.3, 4, and 5 under "9.3 Landscape Design Standards and Requirements." These are the portions of the regulations that specifically protect existing natural landscape features.

Current language proposed for deletion:

9.3.B General Requirements

3. "To the extent possible, existing trees, vegetation and unique site features such as stonewalls, ledge faces, kettle holes, and boulder trains shall be retained and protected."

4. "Any disturbed area of a lot or property which is not being used for the location of buildings, accessory structures or uses, parking, loading, storage areas, or other similar purposes shall be landscaped and maintained in such a manner as to minimize stormwater runoff."

5. *“The retention of existing topography and vegetation in the buffer areas is preferable to regrading and new plantings; however, if natural site conditions are not adequate to meet the purposes of the buffer requirement, then landscaping shall be required to comply with criteria set forth herein.”*

As written, removing these provisions appears to eliminate protections for existing site features and vegetation. In practical terms, it could allow developers to remove mature trees, demolish historic stone walls, blast or crush ledge features, and extensively regrade naturally sloped sites without the current regulatory preference for preservation and retention.

I’m struggling to understand what these provisions have to do with parking requirements specifically, or why they are being removed as part of a parking amendment package in the first place.

It also seems potentially inconsistent with portions of the POCD that emphasize preservation of Ledyard’s rural and natural character.

Is this something that should be brought to the attention of the Conservation Commission or another commission for review/comment? I’m especially surprised these sections would be removed without broader discussion, given their environmental and visual impact implications.

Curious to hear everyone’s thoughts before Thursday’s hearing.

Best
Dave S.

Respectfully,
Lee Ann Berry
President,
Gales Ferry District