

Nov 24, 2025,
3:12 PM (1 day
ago)

Hi Jane,

Thank you for your reply. I look forward to the DRB Hearing regarding this matter.

Below are some of the points I made to the ZA in my original notice:

The applicant repeatedly stated that the material scraped from the lake would be pulled up onto the beach toward the kayak stand. The applicant did not state that the excess material would be collected and then deposited in a westerly direction, adding to and backfilling against the jetty, beyond the MWL, further interfering with the outflow of Porter Brook into Caspian Lake and redirecting siltation to the West. The stated goal was NOT to rebuild an existing encroachment but this is exactly what they did. The nature of the work performed would require an Encroachment Permit from the State.

It is not incumbent on the ZA to obtain the permits for an applicant. However our ZA was trying to be helpful by emailing some State DEC engineers. I do not know what the ZA asked them because the emails are truncated and not visible in their entirety. Laura Wood opined that an Encroachment Permit would not be needed if the Applicant did what they described but the Applicant obviously did not. Again, the nature of the work actually performed would require an Encroachment Permit from the State. There was no evidence of an Encroachment Permit. Thus, Condition 1 of the Town's DRB Permit was not met.

As I read through the Conditional Use criteria I can unequivocally say that the work performed will have a negative impact on my lakeshore.

This work was performed within the 30 day permit appeal period nor, to the best of my knowledge, was there a "Permit" sign posted on a public road.

Attached is the 11.3.25 ZA decision. Please advise me what else you may need going forward.

Thank you for your consideration of this very important matter.

Best,

Christine Armstrong