

Jim Fiora
11 Ridge Road
Branford, CT 06405

04/05/2016

To the board and members of the Stony Creek Association,

In reference to Janet Weithas' letter to this body of 3/1/16. I'd like to comment:
Janet makes many good points but I must disagree with her conclusion. The Stony Creek Association should not withdraw as plaintiff in the lawsuit because of the importance of this case, both for the current issues at stake and for the long term development concerns for Stony Creek that this case portends. As a reminder, the board did not go into the lawsuit lightly. As I recall there was vigorous debate among the board and the citizens in attendance, the charter and by-laws were consulted and the vote was nearly unanimous. It was determined that the SCA had a very definite obligation to protect it's citizens from the aggravations and nuisances the tenant fit permit allowed for and for which the town has seen fit to ignore. It was the board that hired the attorney, the board who recruited the other plaintiffs and it has been the board that has paid the price of harassment for those actions. If ever there was an opportunity for the Stony Creek Association and its citizens to set a precedent for limiting development within our borders, this is it. It is often said that all politics is local. At the heart of this case, as with many issues nationally, there lies the question as to what is the proper role of government. Is it the role of this body to protect the rights and property values of it's citizens or is it to support development for some kind of trickle down effect to the community? I feel strongly that it is the former and urge the board to embrace their obligation to its citizens and continue as a plaintiff in the case.

Thank you,


Jim Fiora

Sec.2: The object of said association shall be to provide for the improvement of the lands in said district AND for the **health, comfort and convenience of persons living therein.**

Sec. 9: Executive board shall possess power to prevent and regulate the carrying on within said association limits to **prevent and regulate ANY BUSINESS** prejudicial to the public health or dangerous to or constituting **an unreasonable annoyance** to this living or owning property in the vicinity thereof.