

1)

We all know by now that if the Legacy Theatre applied for a permit from the Planning and Zoning Commission on June 4, 2014 instead of a "^{Tenant}tenet fit-up" permit from the Branford Zoning Enforcement Officer to include "concessions, concerts, events, alcohol and rentals" to their theatre production schedules, we wouldn't be here now.

Two years and four months later.

On June 7, 2016 at the Board meeting Dan Bullard restated: "that we have appointed three people to negotiate a moderate position between the neighbors, town, Legacy Theatre and all the residents of Stony Creek. There was a meeting two years ago with 50-100 residents of Stony Creek who all agreed that we did not want to give full reign to the Legacy Theatre in terms of the zoning of the property. The issue at hand is a zoning issue not a matter of wanting or not wanting a theatre."

Has the committee and the present board forgotten this?

Dan is correct – the issue at hand is a zoning issue especially parking. The parking issue in Stony Creek will never be solved because we are a parking lot!

It's the ^{perception} ~~position~~ that this board has some conflict of interest's issues and that some are bringing their own agendas to the table instead of those of the Stony Creek residents. And I feel all the residents of Stony Creek for or against the "tenet fit-up" permit has every right to know what has been discussed at all these meetings and in executive session – particularly September 6th with the plaintiffs' attorney Caleb Hamel and the Legacy's attorney Jim Strub. And if you can't do that then this board has lost sight of what your function is: to represent all our best interests not just the plaintiffs and the Legacy Theatre.

2)

We have every right to know because the committee broke their confidentiality discussing these issues with the Board in executive sessions so you better have a damn good reason why we are being denied this information.

May I remind this board that it was the majority of Stony Creek resident that hired Tim Lee through the Board and it was the residents through private donations and our property tax dollars that have paid the lawyers and continue to do so.

For those of you here tonight that agree that we the Stony Creek residents are entitled to all the current information, please raise your hands now. *and be counted*

For those who will read this in the October minutes and agree that we are entitled to this information and that this should not be discussed in Executive Session, please email the board.

And for those of you who have not raised your hands, you are not a member or I assume you already know this information.

I would like to ask the committee who represents the residents, the following three questions through the chair, and Meagan will you please record them in the minutes.

1. At the August mediation the Judge cancelled the meeting but the discussions continued. Yes or no? And was Mr. Aniscovich the Town Attorney at this meeting? Yes or no? If not, please explain why not.
2. I thought the main purpose of the plaintiffs (all Stony Creek residents) to bring the town to court was to have the legacy Theatre go back to Planning and Zoning for the correct permits.

3)

3. Then explain to me why we have spent over two years meeting with the Legacy Theatre where the main discussions are parking – where are we with concessions, concerts, events, alcohol, and rentals – the “tenant fit-up” permit requests? Every one of these concerns effect the entire community. The Board continues to go into Executive Session and therefore the residents of Stony Creek, the primary plaintiffs, do not know what’s going on and it is not right.

If you go into Executive Session tonight, the only thing to discuss should be ending the Stony Creek Association’s role as a plaintiff. *now, tonight, end it*

-Janet Weithas