

Two Additional Examples of Noncompliance With the Zoning Regulations

Eric Treaster
December 12, 2024

1. §11.3.4.D in the zoning regulations for special permits states: “... *To the extent the Commission finds such criteria applicable, the applicant shall have the burden to prove: ...* **D. that no adverse effect would result to the property values or historic features of the immediate neighborhood;** ... ”

The December 12, 2024 edition of The Connecticut Examiner includes a report regarding the public hearing conducted on December 5. The report contains the following statements from Company President Jay Cashman:

“He [Jay Cashman] also pledged to compensate neighbors for any losses in property value.

Cashman said he planned to offer residents a “property value guarantee,” which he also offered when developing wind farms in Maine. If a homeowner was unable to sell a property at its appraised value, Cashman said he would offer up the difference or buy the home.

He said he hadn’t pitched the idea earlier during the public hearing process so that his intentions would not be misunderstood as an effort to win residents’ support through money.”

If the reporting is accurate, it means that Mr. Cashman recognizes that GFI's proposed excavation of Decatur Mountain *may* have an adverse effect on nearby property values, *which is prohibited by the zoning regulations* and is a reason to deny the application.

2. The adverse effect on nearby residential property assessments due to reduced appraised values would also **reduce net tax revenues** to the town, which would conflict with the economic development goals on page 37 of the POCD, and is another reason to deny the application.