

GOOD EVENING LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

MY NAME IS SUSAN GRADY. I AM THE WIFE OF ATTORNEY WILLIAM D. GRADY AND A RESIDENT OF 10 OAKUM DOCK ROAD FOR MORE THAN 34 YEARS. ALMOST TWO YEARS AGO, I STOOD BEFORE YOU, THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION, TO SPEAK AGAINST A PROPOSED ZONE CHANGE AT 49 OAKUM DOCK ROAD FROM R-2 (RESIDENTIAL) TO COMMERCIAL. THAT REQUEST FOR ZONE CHANGE WAS RIGHTFULLY DENIED. MY HUSBAND WILL ADDRESS THE LEGAL RAMIFICATIONS OF THIS ZONE CHANGE. I WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE ON A MORE PERSONAL LEVEL.

I WISH TO ADD MY NAME TO THE OPPOSITION OF A ZONE CHANGE AT 49 OAKUM DOCK ROAD. WE LIVE ON A VERY UNIQUE STREET. WE HAVE ONLY 12-13 HOMES I BELIEVE AND OUR STREET DEAD ENDS AT THE CONNECTICUT RIVER.

NOTHING IS BASICALLY NEW WITH THIS LATEST PROPOSAL WHICH APPEARS BEFORE YOU. THE APPLICANT IS THE SAME, THE PURPOSE THE APPLICANT WANTS TO DO WITH THE LAND AT 49 OAKUM DOCK ROAD IS THE SAME. THE ONLY THING DIFFERENT IS HAVING HAD THE COMMERCIAL ZONE CHANGE DENIED, THE APPLICANT IS NOW ATTEMPTING TO RAISE ISSUES, SOME OF WHICH ARE TOTALLY FALSE IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE ITS GOAL TO CHANGE THE ZONE TO COMMERCIAL.

HAVING LIVED ON OAKUM DOCK ROAD FOR THIRTY-FOUR AND A HALF YEARS WE HAVE ENJOYED THE FACT THAT OUR STREET IS QUIET, SMALL AND CONTAINING AN ABUNDANCE OF TREES, FOREST AND EVEN A STREAM RUNNING DOWN TO THE RIVER. MY FAMILY AND I HAVE ENJOYED THE DEER, WILD TURKEYS AND THE OCCASIONAL RED FOX.

AFTER READING THE LETTER WRITTEN BY THE APPLICANT'S ATTORNEY, I COULD NOT BELIEVE CERTAIN REPRESENTATIONS THAT WERE MADE. COUNSEL CLAIMS THAT 49 OAKUM DOCK ROAD IS "AN EXTENSION OF ST. CLEMENTS CASTLE". THAT IS NOT TRUE. THIS PROPERTY HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH ST. CLEMENTS CASTLE UNTIL PURCHASED BY THE APPLICANT IN 2001. FURTHERMORE, THIS PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN THE TOWN OF EAST HAMPTON, NOT PORTLAND. IT IS NOT PART OF ST. CLEMENTS, BUT SIMPLY A MARINA LOCATED IN OUR TOWN.

IN ATTORNEY HARRIS' LETTER, SHE STATES THAT THE PROPERTY IS "LOCATED BETWEEN VARIOUS PORTLAND BUSINESSES AND VARIOUS EAST HAMPTON BUSINESSES." THIS IS UNTRUE AS THE VERY NEXT STRUCTURE TO

THE EAST OF ST. CLEMENTS IS A PRIVATE RESIDENCE FOLLOWED BY OAKUM DOCK ROAD AND RESIDENTIAL PRIVATE HOMES ON OLD DEPOT HILL ROAD ADJACENT TO OAKUM DOCK ROAD ALL IN A RESIDENTIAL A-2 ZONE.

IT IS ALSO STATED THAT THE APPLICANT WAS “UNDER THE UNDERSTANDING THAT COMMERCIAL USE WAS ALLOWED AT THE PROPERTY AND CONTINUED USING IT AS A MARINA AND PLACE FOR SOCIAL EVENTS.” IN OUR OVER 34 YEARS OF RESIDENCE, WE HAD NEVER SEEN “SOCIAL EVENTS” HELD AT THE MARINA, AND IF A TITLE SEARCH WAS PERFORMED CORRECTLY BY A REAL ESTATE ATTORNEY AT THE TIME OF THE APPLICANT’S PURCHASE, IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN MADE CLEAR TO THE APPLICANT THAT THE PROPERTY WAS ZONED R-2. MY HUSBAND WILL ADDRESS THIS ISSUE MORE THOROUGHLY AS WELL AS TO THE REFERENCE TO “PROPERLY CONVERT THE PROPERTY BACK INTO A C COMMERCIAL ZONE.” WHICH IS ALSO AN UNTRUE STATEMENT.

IN PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE MEMORANDA INDICATING THE “IMPROVEMENTS” THE APPLICANT MADE, IT IS STATED THAT THE “APPLICANT REPLACED EXISTING STRUCTURE (AT THE MARINA) “WITH NEW STRUCTURES...ALL THROUGH OBTAINING PROPER BUILDING PERMITS.” THE TRUTH OF THE MATTER IS THAT THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN “ASSEMBLY HALL” WAS NOT PERMITTED BY THE TOWN OF EAST HAMPTON. WHEN THE APPLICANT FIRST CONSTRUCTED THE EXISTING STRUCTURE, THE APPLICANT STATED THAT THE STRUCTURE BEING BUILT WAS TO BE “ A STORAGE FACILITY” AND WAS IN FACT CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT PROPER PERMITS. IF THE FIRE HAD NOT OCCURRED, THIS ILLEGAL USE WOULD HAVE CONTINUED. THIS IS ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF HOW THE APPLICANT DOES NOT ADHERE TO THE RULES AND SIMPLY DOES WHAT IT WANTS TO DO. THE “PRE-EXISTING USE” AS CLAIMED, WAS ILLEGAL AND NEVER SUPPOSED TO BE USED AS AN “ASSEMBLY HALL”.

THE NUMEROUS IMPROVEMENTS CITED IN THE LETTER PRESENTED TO THE COMMISSION INDICATES THAT BY CONSTRUCTING A DRIVEWAY FROM ST. CLEMENTS TO THE MARINA, IT DECREASED TRAFFIC ON OAKUM DOCK ROAD. TRAFFIC HAD NEVER BEEN AN ISSUE IN THE PAST UNTIL THE WEDDING VENDORS BEGAN USING IT. IN ADDITION, THE RESIDENTS HAD NEVER BEEN DISTURBED BY THE NOISE THAT IS ALLUDED TO AS COMING FROM THE MARINA. PRIOR TO THE APPLICANT’S PURCHASE THE MARINA HAD BEEN A VERY QUIET PLACE WITHOUT MUCH ACTIVITY.

AS FURTHER EVIDENCE OF SKIRTING THE RULES AND MISREPRESENTATIONS, THE REFERENCE TO CONSTRUCTING A DECK/PIER FOR ENJOYING “SCENIC VIEWS OF THE RIVER” WAS NOT WHAT HAD BEEN REQUESTED TO THE DEEP. THAT PIER WAS SUPPOSED TO BE USED AS A

“FISHING PIER”. INSTEAD, IT BECAME A PLACE FOR WEDDING CEREMONIES WITH 125-150 CHAIRS ON IT. THIS WAS NEVER THE ORIGINAL INTENT AUTHORIZED BY THE DEEP. ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF HOW THE APPLICANT DOES NOT FOLLOW RULES AND REGULATIONS AND DOES WHATEVER IT WANTS TO DO. PLEASE REFER TO THE PHOTOGRAPHS WHICH MY HUSBAND WILL SUBMIT.

AS FAR AS NEVER HAVING COMPLAINTS - THE APPLICANT WAS RUNNING AN ILLEGAL WEDDING VENUE AND KNEW IT, SO OBVIOUSLY IT WAS CURTAILED FROM FULLY UTILIZING THE PREMISES AND THEREFORE KEPT ITS ILLEGAL USE SOMEWHAT HIDDEN SO AS NOT TO BE DISCOVERED.

AS STATED, THE “FACILITY WILL BE USED YEAR-LONG”. I BELIEVE THAT IF THERE IS A DISC JOCKEY OR A BAND INSIDE OF THE STRUCTURE, THE NOISE AND VIBRATIONS WILL STILL BE HEARD BY OUR NEIGHBORS AND THE APPLICANT ADMITS IT COULD LAST AS LATE AS MIDNIGHT. WE RECENTLY COULD HEAR MUSIC EMANATING FROM ST. CLEMENTS DURING A WEDDING AND WE ARE QUITE A DISTANCE AWAY.

IN CITING THE LACK OF IMPACT ON NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES, ATTORNEY HARRIS, IN HER LETTER STATES, “THAT THE PROPERTY HAS AN ADDRESS OF 1931 PORTLAND-COBALT ROAD, PORTLAND CT.” UNLESS I’M MISTAKEN, THE PROPER ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY IS 49 OAKUM DOCK ROAD, COBALT, WHICH IS PART OF EAST HAMPTON. IF IT WERE PORTLAND, NONE OF US WOULD HAVE TO BE HERE TONIGHT!!!!

I WOULD LIKE TO BELIEVE THAT OUR PROPERTY VALUES ON THE STREET WILL INCREASE, AS CLAIMED BY ATTORNEY HARRIS, HOWEVER, WE DO NOT NEED A WEDDING VENUE AT THE END OF THE ROAD FOR THAT, THE MERE FACT THAT OUR STREET ENDS AT THE CONNECTICUT RIVER IS ENOUGH OF A SELLING POINT AND HAVING A COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISE IN THE MIDDLE OF A STRICT RESIDENTIAL ZONE WOULD SERVE MORE AS A DETRIMENT TO POTENTIAL BUYERS THAN AN ASSET.

AS FAR AS BRINGING MORE BUSINESS TO OUR TOWN - I HAVE PERSONALLY GIVEN TWO WEDDINGS AND NOT ONE GUEST WENT “SHOPPING” BEFORE OR AFTER THE EVENT. YOU COME TO A WEDDING, ENJOY THE CEREMONY AND RECEPTION AND LEAVE PERIOD. ANOTHER ERRONEOUS CLAIM BY THE APPLICANT AND ITS LEGAL COUNSEL.

IN ADDITION, THE NUMBERS OF GUESTS ANTICIPATED IN OUR TOWN IS DEFINITELY INFLATED. IN COUNSEL’S MEMORANDA SHE STATES THAT IN THREE (3) YEARS THERE WERE 98 SOCIAL GATHERINGS AT THE MARINA. THAT’S A LITTLE OVER 32 PER YEAR. ASSUMING BY COUNSEL’S OWN ESTIMATION, MOST GATHERINGS WILL AVERAGE 100 -120 PEOPLE, THAT

APPROXIMATELY IS 3,840 PEOPLE A YEAR. DO YOU THINK THEY ALL WILL UTILIZE THE EAST HAMPTON SHOPPING DISTRICT? I HIGHLY DOUBT IT. ONE INDIVIDUAL IN HIS LETTER OF SUPPORT ESTIMATED 50,000 PEOPLE VISITING EAST HAMPTON IN A YEAR. THAT'S RIDICULOUS. IN ADDITION, MOST ARE NOT OUT OF THE AREA, AND THE FEW THAT ARE WILL MOST LIKELY STAY IN PORTLAND, CROMWELL OR MIDDLETOWN OVERNIGHT.

TONIGHT, WE HAVE HEARD FROM THOSE THAT SUPPORT THIS ZONE CHANGE TO COMMERCIAL. NOT ONE OF THEM LIVE ON OUR STREET. WOULD THEY LIKE THIS (A COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISE) IN THEIR NEIGHBORHOOD? I DOUBT IT.

IF YOU PERMIT THIS ZONE CHANGE IT WILL ALLOW THE APPLICANT AND ANY OTHER SUBSEQUENT OWNERS TO DO ANYTHING COMMERCIAL ON THE PROPERTY, INCLUDING CONSTRUCTING A RESTAURANT, OFFICE BUILDINGS, A STRIP MALL FOR SHOPPING, ANYTHING.

THE APPLICANT HAS STATED THAT ST. CLEMENTS CASTLE CONSISTS OF 77.80 ACRES WHEREAS THE MARINA CONSISTS OF 4.96 ACRES. WHY NOT BUILD AN ACCESSORY WEDDING VENUE ON THE LARGE ACREAGE BY ST. CLEMENTS INSTEAD OF TRYING TO CHANGE THE CHARACTER AND ZONE OF OUR NEIGHBORHOOD?

I AM ASKING THE COMMISSION TO DENY THE APPLICATION. IT IS INAPPROPRIATE AND DOES NOT FIT THE CHARACTER OF OUR NEIGHBORHOOD OR THE INTENT OF THE PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND CONSIDERATION.

.