

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM D. GRADY

AS YOU ALL KNOW, THE APPLICANT FOR A ZONE CHANGE MUST JUSTIFY A REQUEST BASED UPON THE VISION FOR THE COMMUNITY REFLECTED IN THE ADOPTED PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT. THIS RESPONSIBILITY IS SET FORTH IN 9.3.3C2b OF THE EAST HAMPTON ZONING REGULATIONS. SPECIFICALLY, THIS SECTION STATES:

“IT SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT/PETITIONER TO PRESENT THE FULL SCOPE OF SUCH CHANGE, INCLUDING REASONS, AND COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS, AS REQUIRED BY THE COMMISSION, OF ALL, IF ANY, IMPACTS, SUCH CHANGE SHALL HAVE TO NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES, ZONES, OR THE PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT, AS ADOPTED BY THE COMMISSION.”

THIS REQUIREMENT PRESENTS THE APPLICANT WITH A SUBSTANTIAL BURDEN SINCE THE STATED PURPOSE OF THE EAST HAMPTON ZONING REGULATIONS, ARTICLE 1. SECTION 1.2 STATES THAT “THESE REGULATIONS ARE ADOPTED FOR THE PURPOSES OF GUIDING FUTURE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE TOWN IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT.”

COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANT HAS PREPARED TWO TEN (10) PAGE MEMORANDA DATED 6/14/19 AND 8/28/19 WHICH ATTEMPT TO COMPLY WITH THIS RESPONSIBILITY. THE COMMISSION MEMBERS HAVE A COPY OF THESE DOCUMENTS. MY NEIGHBORS AND I ALSO HAVE COPIES. I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE COMMENTS ON THE REPRESENTATIONS MADE IN THESE WRITINGS, MOST OF WHICH ARE UNTRUE.

THE APPLICANT IS SEEKING A SPECIAL PERMIT IN ORDER TO “PROPERLY APPROVE A (PURPORTED) PRE-EXISTING USE OF THE PROPERTY AS AN ASSEMBLY HALL.” THE COMMISSION WILL RECALL THAT THE BUILDING REFERRED TO WAS TO HAVE BEEN STRICTLY USED FOR STORAGE AND WAS ILLEGALLY MADE INTO A WEDDING FACILITY WHICH BURNED DURING A WEDDING EVENT. THE REPRESENTATION THAT IT WAS A PRE-EXISTING USE IS UNTRUE.

UNDER THE PARAGRAPH PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS/HISTORY, COUNSEL DISCUSSES PROPERTY OWNERSHIP FROM 1944 THROUGH 2013. THE KEY POINT HERE IS THAT WHEN THE APPLICANT PURCHASED THE SUBJECT PROPERTY, AND I QUOTE, IT “WAS UNDER THE UNDERSTANDING THAT COMMERCIAL USE WAS ALLOWED AT THE PROPERTY.” WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME YOU SPENT \$670,000.00 AND BASED YOUR INVESTMENT ON AN UNDERSTANDING? THE MARINA WAS A NON-CONFORMING ACTIVITY IN A RESIDENTIAL ZONE, PERIOD.

APPARENTLY, THE APPLICANT DID NOT PERFORM “DUE DILIGENCE” PRIOR TO THE PURCHASE AND NOW, FOR THE SECOND TIME , SEEKS TO HAVE YOUR COMMISSION ABSOLVE THEM FROM THEIR SELF-INDUCED PLIGHT. COUNSEL STATES THAT “IT APPEARS THAT THE CHANGE MADE TO THE PROPERTY WAS NOT PROPERLY DONE AND, INSTEAD, WAS DONE BY ERROR AND/OR MISTAKE AS THERE ARE NO NOTICES, DOCUMENTS AND/OR MINUTES INDICATING THAT IT WAS THE INTENT THAT THE PROPERTY BE CHANGED TO RESIDENTIAL.”

I HAVE CONDUCTED MY OWN RESEARCH AS HAS THE TOWN STAFF AND I HAVE THE MAP FROM 1990, THE COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE

MIDSTATE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY AND THE LEGAL NOTICE ALL OF WHICH MAKE THE ASSERTION REGARDING THE ZONE CHANGE TO RESIDENTIAL A NON-ISSUE, BECAUSE ALL ACTIONS TAKEN THEN WERE PROPER.

COUNSEL REPRESENTS THAT THE PROPOSED USE IS A "CONTINUATION OF THE USE PREVIOUSLY ESTABLISHED AT THE LOCATION AS BOTH A 'PASSIVE MARINA' AND AS AN ASSEMBLY HALL, I.E. A FACILITY TO BE USED FOR SOCIAL EVENTS/GATHERINGS SUCH AS WEDDINGS, BANQUETS, CORPORATE EVENTS AND FUNCTIONS." THE PROBLEM WITH COUNSEL'S REPRESENTATION IS THAT THIS ALSO IS NOT TRUE. MY FAMILY AND I HAVE LIVED ON OAKUM DOCK ROAD FOR 34 AND A HALF YEARS - PASSIVE MARINA IS TRUE, ASSEMBLY HALL IS ABSOLUTELY NOT TRUE. WHEN ST. CLEMENTS MARINA, LLC PURCHASED THE PROPERTY, THERE WAS A SMALL OFFICE BUILDING ALONG WITH TYPICAL MARINA BOAT BUILDINGS - THAT'S IT. THIS APPLICATION IS NOT THE CONTINUATION OF A PREVIOUSLY ESTABLISHED USE AT THE PROPERTY.

(SUBMIT EXHIBIT HERE; ASSESSOR)

COUNSEL HAS ALSO PROVIDED AN IMPACT ANALYSIS OF THE ZONE CHANGE AND SPECIAL PERMIT APPLICATION.

FIRST - COUNSEL REPRESENTS THAT THE ZONE CHANGE IS INTENDED TO RE-ESTABLISH THE PROPERTY AS A COMMERCIAL ZONE AND TO ALLOW FOR THE CONTINUANCE OF THE EXISTING LEGAL NON-CONFORMING USE AS A MARINA AND THE EXISTING NON-CONFORMING USE AS AN ASSEMBLY HALL.

THE COMMISSION KNOWS THIS

STATEMENT IS ANOTHER  
FALSEHOOD FOR TWO (2) REASONS:

THE MARINA CAN CONTINUE AS  
SUCH, FOREVER AS A LEGAL NON-  
CONFORMING USE NO MATTER  
THE ZONE AND,

AN ASSEMBLY HALL NEVER  
EXISTED UNTIL THE APPLICANT  
ILLEGALLY CREATED IT WHEN  
CONSTRUCTING A “STORAGE  
FACILITY” AS A RUSE. THE ILLEGAL  
ASSEMBLY HALL WAS NEVER  
APPROVED AS SUCH SO IT CANNOT  
BE AN EXISTING NON-  
CONFORMING USE. THE OFFICE  
STRUCTURE WAS NEVER AN  
“ASSEMBLY HALL”.

SECOND - ACCORDING TO THE  
MEMORANDUM - THE HOURS OF  
OPERATION WILL BE 9 A.M. TO 12 A.M., 15  
HOURS. IN THE WARM WEATHER  
MONTHS, THAT CAN MEAN FRIDAYS,  
SATURDAYS AND SUNDAYS. THE ST.  
CLEMENTS CASTLE ROUTINELY HAS  
MUSIC AND SOUND BROADCAST OUTSIDE  
DURING EVENTS. WE, ON OAKUM DOCK,  
ALL HEAR IT TO VARYING DEGREES.  
IMAGINE LIVING AT THE END OF OUR  
ROAD WITH MUSIC EMANATING FROM  
THE PROPOSED 11,000 SQ. FT.  
STRUCTURE, AS A HALF DOZEN OF MY  
NEIGHBORS WILL.

THIS BRINGS US TO COUNSEL’S  
REFERENCE TO THE CT.  
ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TITLE §22a-69  
INDICATING THAT ALL NOISE LEVELS AT  
THE PREMISES WILL BE CONSISTENT  
WITH STATE DEEP REGULATIONS.

(SUBMIT EXHIBIT HERE)

I HAVE REVIEWED THESE  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
REGULATIONS. I KNOW THAT YOU ALL  
HAVE COPIES OF THE REGULATIONS IN  
THE PACKET PROVIDED TO YOU BY MR.

**DECARLI.**

**THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE COMMISSION'S FOCUSING ON THE DEEP NOISE STANDARDS IS VERY SIMPLY THAT IT WILL BE VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE FOR THE APPLICANT TO COMPLY WHEN THE ACTIVITIES TO BE CONDUCTED INCLUDE BANDS AND DJ'S IN AN 11,000 SQ. FT STRUCTURE, BOTH OF WHICH GENERATE NOISE IN EXCESS OF 100 DBA. WE HAVE THREE (3) HOMEOWNERS ABOUT 300 FEET FROM THE PROPOSED BUILDING, AND SEVEN (7) MORE WITHIN 500 FEET, SOME OF WHOM HAVE SMALL CHILDREN. NOISE IS A SIGNIFICANT ISSUE AND ONE THESE RESIDENTS SHOULD NOT HAVE IMPOSED ON THEM.**

**COUNSEL'S MEMORANDA STATE UNDER IMPACT ANALYSIS, THAT NOISE LEVELS WILL BE CONSISTENT WITH THE DEEP REGULATIONS. NEITHER BAND MUSIC NOR DJ MUSIC COULD BE AT THE APPLICANT'S PREMISES EITHER IN DAYTIME OR NIGHTTIME, AS THE 55 DBA AND 45 DBA STANDARDS CANNOT BE MET AND THIS WILL CONSTITUTE "EXCESSIVE NOISE" AS DEFINED IN DEEP REGULATIONS.**

**I WILL NOT RESTATE MR. DECARL'S COMMENTS IN THE STAFF REVIEW ON THIS SUBJECT OTHER THAN TO GIVE YOU AN IDEA OF HOW QUIET 45 DECIBELS IS AT NIGHT (10 P.M. TO 7 A.M.) AND 55 DECIBELS DURING THE DAY, A HAIR DRYER TYPICALLY EMITS 70 DECIBELS.**

**THIRD - THE MEMORANDA INDICATE THAT A CHANGE OF ZONE AND USE WILL INCREASE THE VALUE OF THE APPLICANT'S PROPERTY AND THEREFORE THE PROPERTY VALUES IN THE SURROUNDING AREA. I'M SURE THAT MANY HOME BUYERS WILL BE CLAMORING TO BUY ON OAKUM DOCK ROAD AS SOON AS THEY KNOW THEY'LL**

**BE NEIGHBORS TO A WEDDING VENUE  
OR OTHER COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISE.  
(FIREWORKS, MUSIC, ETC.)  
PREPOSTEROUS!!!**

**(SUBMIT EXHIBIT HERE) - FIREWORKS,  
NO PERMITS PULLED PER PORTLAND  
FIRE MARSHALL.**

**FOURTH - THE MEMORANDA SUGGESTS  
THAT THE APPLICANT'S PROPOSED USE  
"PASSIVE MARINA" AND ASSEMBLY HALL  
WILL GENERATE LESS NOISE THAN THE  
MARINA DID. UNLESS YOU HAVE  
PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF THIS, THIS  
STATEMENT IS MEANINGLESS BECAUSE  
IT'S BASED ON SUPPOSITION. NONE OF  
THE RESIDENTS HAD EVER  
COMPLAINED TO ME NOR HAVE I EVER  
EXPERIENCED THAT THE MARINA WAS  
NOISY AND NOT A GOOD NEIGHBOR  
PRIOR TO THE APPLICANT'S  
OWNERSHIP.**

**FIFTH - COUNSEL'S MEMORANDA CLAIM  
THAT THE PROPOSED ZONE CHANGE IS  
APPROPRIATE BECAUSE IT'S ADJACENT  
TO THE PORTLAND BUSINESS ZONE AND  
ACROSS FROM THE MIDDLETOWN  
INDUSTRIAL ZONE. THE TRUTH OF THE  
MATTER IS THAT IT IS OUR  
COMMUNITY'S ZONING PLAN AND PLAN  
OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT  
WHICH RULES THE APPROPRIATENESS  
OF THE ZONE CHANGE, NOT  
NEIGHBORING COMMUNITIES.**

**IN THIS CASE, YOUR VISION FOR OAKUM  
DOCK ROAD WAS ESTABLISHED NEARLY  
30 YEARS AGO, AND HAS REMAINED  
CONSISTENTLY SO TO DATE.**

**TO CHANGE A ZONE AND DISREGARD  
THE PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND  
DEVELOPMENT WEAKENS ITS VALUE  
AND THE REGULATIONS WHICH  
IMPLEMENT IT.**

**THE APPLICATION YOU ARE CONSIDERING MUST BE EVALUATED BASED SOLELY ON ITS EFFECT ON OUR OAKUM DOCK NEIGHBORHOOD. A FURTHER PROBLEM, IS THAT THE APPLICANT OR ENTITIES OF THE APPLICANT OR PARTIES UNDER CONTROL OF THE APPLICANT OWN #40 AND #42, LAST TWO RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES ON THE EAST SIDE OF OAKUM DOCK ROAD AND 33 OAKUM DOCK, THE LAST RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY ON THE WEST SIDE OF OAKUM DOCK.**

**IT IS MOST LIKELY THAT THE APPLICANT, IF SUCCESSFUL ON THE ZONE CHANGE, WILL SEEK TO ADD THESE THREE (3) PROPERTIES TO THE COMMERCIAL ZONE, TRULY DEVASTATING THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND TOTALLY IN LINE WITH ILLEGAL USE OF 42 OAKUM DOCK AS PREVIOUSLY CONDUCTED BY THE APPLICANT OR ITS ENTITIES UNTIL STOPPED BY THE TOWN.**

**MY FAMILY AND I HAVE MADE OAKUM DOCK ROAD OUR HOME SINCE 1985. WE CHOSE THIS AREA FOR WHAT YOU SEE TODAY —ITS BEAUTY, SERENITY AND ITS UNIQUE QUALITIES. MY NEIGHBORS WOULD ALL AGREE WITH THIS CHARACTERIZATION AND WOULD AGREE THAT IT IS FOR THESE SAME REASONS THAT THEY TOO MAKE THIS THEIR HOME.**

**WE ALL HAD AND HAVE EVERY RIGHT TO EXPECT THAT THE NEARLY 30 YEAR ZONING HISTORY OF OUR NEIGHBORHOOD WOULD REMAIN INTACT. FAILURE OF THE COMMISSION TO STAND BEHIND ITS PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN THIS APPLICATION, DIMINISHES ITS EFFECT AND THE PURPOSES FOR WHICH IT WAS CREATED.**

WE NEED NOT FORGET THAT THE APPLICATION BEFORE YOU IS NOT ONE TO SIMPLY ALLOW WEDDINGS AND OTHER PUBLIC GATHERINGS, THIS CHANGE TO COMMERCIAL WILL, PER SECTION 5.2.B PERMIT A NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL COMMERCIAL USES BUT, MORE IMPORTANTLY PER SECTION 5.2B OTHER USES BY SPECIAL PERMIT COULD BE PERMITTED PER SECTION 5.2C OF THE REGULATIONS.

IF THE OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN APPROVAL FOR THESE USES EXIST, BASED UPON WHAT I KNOW AND HAVE SEEN OF THE APPLICANT, I CAN ASSURE YOU THAT IT WILL OCCUR. SUCH A STARK DISPARITY IN USES BETWEEN R-2 AND ANY OF THESE MORE INTENSE USES WOULD DEVASTATE OUR NEIGHBORHOOD. THE APPLICANT KNEW WHAT WAS BEING PURCHASED WHEN IT WAS PURCHASED. THAT USE, MARINA AND SHIPBUILDING MAY CONTINUE AT 49 OAKUM DOCK AS IT HAS FOR OVER 30 YEARS IN NON-CONFORMITY.

FINALLY, AS TO THE PROPOSED ZONE CHANGE, A FEW WORDS ABOUT SPOT ZONING. CONNECTICUT CASE LAW HAS DEFINED SPOT ZONING AS “ACTION BY A ZONING AUTHORITY WHICH GIVES TO A SINGLE LOT OR A SMALL AREA PRIVILEGES WHICH ARE NOT EXTENDED TO OTHER LAND IN THE VICINITY, IS IN GENERAL AGAINST SOUND PUBLIC POLICY AND OBNOXIOUS TO THE LAW. THE CONTROLLING TEST MUST BE, NOT THE BENEFIT TO A PARTICULAR INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP OF INDIVIDUALS, BUT THE GOOD OF THE COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE. ANY SUCH CHANGE CAN ONLY BE MADE IF IT FALLS WITHIN THE REQUIREMENTS OF A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE USE AND DEVELOPMENT OF PROPERTY IN THE MUNICIPALITY OR A LARGE PART OF IT.”



**THE COURTS HAVE THEREFORE INDICATED THAT SPOT ZONING BY A ZONING COMMISSION WILL OCCUR WHEN FIRST, THERE IS A CHANGE OF ZONE TO A SMALL AREA AND SECOND, WHEN THE CHANGE IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE GOOD OF THE COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE.**

**NOW, IF WE APPLY THESE TESTS TO THE APPLICATION BEFORE YOU, THE REQUESTED CHANGE SHOULD BE DENIED.**

**WE HAVE A RELATIVELY SMALL PIECE OF LAND, TOTALLY SURROUNDED BY THE R-2 ZONE. THE PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT SHOWS THIS PARCEL AS RESIDENTIAL (WITH A LEGAL NON-CONFORMING USE OF MARINA AND BOAT BUILDING FACILITY) LOCATED THERE. THAT USE WAS NEVER AN ISSUE AND IS NOT AN ISSUE TODAY.**

**IN VIEW OF ALL THE REGULATORY GUIDELINES I HAVE SUMMARIZED, THERE IS SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE TO PERMIT THE REASONABLE CONCLUSION THAT BOTH THE ZONE CHANGE AND SPECIAL PERMIT APPLICATIONS FAIL TO MEET REGULATORY STANDARDS AND THE PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT AND THEREFORE SHOULD BE DENIED.**

**WE ALL KNOW THAT IT HAS BEEN 20 MONTHS SINCE THE APPLICANT'S FAILED ATTEMPT TO CHANGE THE ZONE FOR 49 OAKUM DOCK ROAD FROM R-2 TO COMMERCIAL. WHAT HAS CHANGED? ANSWER: NOTHING----AS A MATTER OF FACT, THE IMPACT OF THE PROJECT HAS BEEN AGGRAVATED BECAUSE THE BUILDING SIZE OF 5,000 SQ. FT. HAS BEEN MORE THAN DOUBLED TO 11,000 SQ. FT.**

**AS THE COMMISSION EVALUATES THIS APPLICATION, KEEP IN MIND THAT AT THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE COMMERCIAL ZONE CHANGE SOME 2 YEARS AGO (WHICH WAS ULTIMATELY DENIED) THE RESIDENTS OF OAKUM DOCK ROAD AND I, TOO, AS A RESIDENT MADE A STRONG CASE AGAINST INTRODUCING A PROPERTY USE WHICH WAS INCONSISTENT WITH THE LONG HISTORY OF RESIDENTIAL ZONING ON THE ABUTTING PROPERTIES AND WHICH IS CONTRARY TO THE ADOPTED PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT.**

**FINALLY, AS YOU JUDGE THE APPLICATION, YOU SHOULD KNOW, CONTRARY TO COUNSEL'S ASSERTION, THAT , THE APPLICANT IS NOT A GOOD NEIGHBOR AND WILL NOT BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR BECAUSE THE APPLICANT DOES NOT FOLLOW THE RULES AS EVIDENCED BY:**

- 1. IT IS STATED THAT AMONG THE PROPERTY IMPROVEMENTS A DECK/PIER HAS BEEN CONSTRUCTED TO FULLY ENJOY THE SCENIC VIEWS OF THE RIVER WITH DEEP PERMITTING.**

**THE PROBLEM IS THAT THE APPLICATION TO DEEP WAS TO REFURBISH THE "FISHING PIER", (2) I BEAMS PROTRUDING INTO THE RIVER). THE REFURBISHED FISHING PIER TURNED OUT TO BE A CEREMONIAL PLATFORM ACCOMMODATING OVER 150 PEOPLE FOR WEDDING CEREMONIES.**

**(SUBMIT EXHIBIT HERE)**

- 2. THE WELL KNOWN STORAGE FACILITY ILLEGALLY TURNED WEDDING VENUE WHERE FOOD WAS PREPARED AND ALCOHOL SERVED WITHOUT PERMITS.**
  
- 3. THE PURCHASE OF THE HOUSE AT 42 OAKUM DOCK AND ITS CONVERSION TO AND ADVERTISING AS THE “QUEEN’S COTTAGE” FOR PRE AND POST WEDDING ACTIVITIES, ONCE AGAIN A COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY, NOT PERMITTED IN A RESIDENTIAL ZONE WITHOUT APPROVAL, WHICH WAS STOPPED BY THE ZONING ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**
  
- 4. THE APPLICATION TO CONSTRUCT A DRIVEWAY ON THE NORTH END OF OAKUM DOCK WHICH WAS CONSTRUCTED IN VIOLATION OF THE APPROVED PLAN AND WHICH IS NOW SUBJECT TO A CEASE AND DESIST ORDER.**
  
- 5. THE PAVING OF 11,947 SQ. FT OF UPLAND REVIEW AREA (WETLANDS) FOR A PARKING LOT AT THE MARINA WITHOUT A PERMIT FROM THE TOWN INLAND-WETLANDS AND WATERCOURSES AGENCY. THE APPLICANT SUBSEQUENTLY WENT TO THE INLAND-WETLANDS AND WATERCOURSES AGENCY FOR AFTER THE FACT APPROVAL.**

**6. INSTALLING A WELL AT  
THE MARINA WITHOUT  
REQUIRED APPROVALS.**

**THE BOTTOM LINE – THIS APPLICANT SHOWS NO RESPECT FOR THE REGULATIONS AND FOR THE PARAMETERS OF PERMITS GRANTED TO IT AND NEVER WILL, AND WE RESIDENTS WILL HAVE TO DEAL WITH IT. OUR QUALITY OF LIFE WILL BE SEVERELY IMPACTED SHOULD THIS ZONE CHANGE COME TO PASS BECAUSE WE WILL BE PUT IN THE POSITION OF HAVING TO CONSTANTLY INSTIGATE ENFORCEMENT WHEN VIOLATIONS OCCUR, WHICH THEY WILL; THIS IS AN UNREASONABLE BURDEN ON OUR NEIGHBORHOOD.**

**THE APPLICANT MUST FOLLOW THE RULES OF THIS COMMISSION. IF IT WASN'T FOR THE FIRE AT THE "STORAGE FACILITY" WE MAY NOT BE HERE TONIGHT.**

**THIS SHOULD NOT BE ABOUT WHO ARE THE GOOD GUYS OR BAD GUYS. THIS SHOULD NOT AND CANNOT BE ABOUT MAKING OR LOSING MONEY. BY THE WAY, THE REFERENCE TO THE PROVIDING OF A PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY EASEMENT TO THE TOWN OF EAST HAMPTON IN 2010, AS A PROPERTY IMPROVEMENT FAILED TO MENTION THAT ST. CLEMENTS MARINA WAS PAID \$673,000.00 FOR IT.**

**THIS IS ABOUT A NEIGHBORHOOD, A BUCOLIC PLACE WHERE FOLKS HAVE MADE THE BIGGEST INVESTMENTS OF THEIR LIVES, WHERE THEY HAVE CHOSEN TO RAISE THEIR FAMILIES AND WHERE THEY HAVE COME TO FEEL COMFORTABLE AND PROTECTED BY THE VIEW YOU HAVE HAD FOR OUR**

**NEIGHBORHOOD FOR MANY, MANY YEARS. THIS IS NO PLACE FOR A COMMERCIAL ZONE, ITS NO PLACE FOR AN 11,000 SQ. FT STRUCTURE INTENDED BY ITS' OUTFITTING TO BE A SIGNIFICANT WEDDING VENUE FAR MORE ELABORATE THAN THE APPLICANT'S CHARACTERIZATION AS "AN ASSEMBLY HALL."**

**FOR THOSE WHO WOULD SAY THAT A CHANGE OF ZONE HERE WOULD BE GOOD FOR THE TOWN OF EAST HAMPTON, I WOULD SAY WE, THE RESIDENTS OF OAKUM DOCK ROAD, KNOW WHAT WOULD BE GOOD AND APPROPRIATE FOR OUR NEIGHBORHOOD- AND THIS ZONE CHANGE CERTAINLY IS NOT!!**

**I HOPE YOU WILL WEIGH MY LEGAL ARGUMENTS REGARDING THE APPLICATION CAREFULLY AS YOU ALWAYS DO AND THAT YOU WILL DENY THE REQUESTED ZONE CHANGE.**

**IN BEHALF OF THE NEIGHBORS WHO ARE WITHIN 500 FEET OF THE APPLICANT'S 49 OAKUM DOCK PROPERTY, I PRESENT YOU WITH A PROTEST FILED PURSUANT TO SECTION 8-3b OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTES.**