

Public Hearing Response 12.18.24

Deborah Edwards
30 Bluff Road West
Gales Ferry, CT

To Planner Liz Burdick and P&Z Commission members.

I am writing for the record regarding the Public Hearing (not yet closed) for GFI Application PZ#24-8SUP/PZ#24-9CAM. I want to express just a couple of the several concerns I have regarding the procedures and rule changes throughout this 6 month (and more) process. Most recently, during the hearing of Thursday, Dec. 12th, I heard 3 residents request to speak yet were denied. One relayed he specifically asked prior to the opening that evening to be added to the list, denied. If I had not spoken up at the end of the evening, I too would have lost my opportunity, even though I had been on the list since the beginning and had been granted a deferment from the previous week due to illness. And yet, that evening the public was once again forced to listen to the applicant and their PR (LaForest Advisors) firm, taking time from the residents who have been more than patient with this 2 year long process. **I would like to know who added both the applicant and their PR presenter to the list and when that was done?**

They weren't on any list I have seen in recent weeks. It seems to me that both of those presentations by the applicant, that took time away from the due process of residents, could have and should have been part of the applicant's presentation at the start of this journey. Initially we were told the applicant will present at the beginning of the hearing and then have closing arguments at the end. Their attorney will have an opportunity to question any expert witnesses during the hearing.

I would also like to point out that we have been subjected to several "rules changes" throughout. We were told "everyone who wishes to speak will have the chance, at least once", but that was not the case. The technical difficulties, which were numerous, appeared to happen repeatedly whenever it was the public's turn to speak. I don't remember that being a problem during the hours upon hours of presentation from the applicant.

Finally, the public was asked to try not to be repetitive in comments if someone else had already spoken on the topic. I know both my husband (Bruce Edwards) and I tried to respect that

request during our own time to comment. I deferred commenting on the numerous regulations that the applicant needed to comply with, knowing that both Eric Treaster and Dave Harned had a much better understanding and stronger presentation to that end. I chose to comment on the very biased Goman + York report (received in Oct.), as well as some comments by Jay Cashman which had just been released in the media last week. My husband, Bruce Edwards, chose to focus his presentation on video and photos of actual events that have occurred since this process began. He did an excellent job of underscoring "*a picture is worth a thousand words*". Both of us felt that was an efficient use of the time we were allowed, while concurring with others who brought so many additional issues to light.

I am disappointed that the P&Z department has allowed this application to drag on and disrupt our lives for more than 2 years, when it is clear that there are several regulations in place that could have made it shorter. But I'm especially frustrated that this applicant was allowed to push their way into valuable residents' time to speak, which we had been promised and waited for. Mr. Cashman himself, in his remarks, described himself as "pushy". P&Z allowed it to happen.

Thank you,

Deborah Edwards

P.S. – Please add the above question to the ones I have previously submitted. I have not received replies to any as of today.