

RECEIVED

MAY 30 2023

To Mayor Orman and the Village Trustees
May 30, 2023

Dear Friends and neighbors

I understand that there is a substantial question whether the village even has a right of first refusal for the lakeshore south of the village. I hope that the college, as a matter of civic propriety, will give priority to the village's interest. I am glad that conversation has been engaged, and hope devoutly that common purposes are engaged as well.

I volunteered for my position on the CPP in response to that board's caving (as I saw it then and see it in retrospect) to the Inn's application for the dock that was subsequently built—on account of it being too close to the village park and liable to constrict its use. As has proved to be the case, with further crowding by the Inns compounding the matter.

I am not opposed to development. We need it. But we adopted zoning—not just the Historic District, but broadly—to preserve our community. Not to arrest its growth, but to maintain its character and quality of life for its residents. Our strongest obligation is to residents. I'd be happy if we could accommodate Kevin Fitzgerald's plans while still working productively with the generous benefactor who has offered to assist us in developing a park in that area. The park surely ought to be the village's first interest, with assisting Mr. Fitzgerald a (strong) second.

There is obviously a different schedule for the projects. Conversation with a disposition to come to agreement needs to allow for that. Most essential right now, I think, is whatever needs to take place for Mr. Fitzgerald to reveal his intentions for the whole scope of development. I presume he has been sharing it with some parties. We shouldn't help him proceed if he won't share it with us.

Not sharing that information justifies local paranoia, which poisons the room. Speaking for myself, I have all along inclined to support his plan, despite the two-rental-house replacement for McGordon House not making financial sense to me: but I did not vote against demolition on that basis, rather (after being assured the motion would pass) just in protest of not being allowed to visit the proposed demolition site. Given what he told the CPP, I don't know why he needs the lake front; a park would

assure the tenants of lake access. If the intent is to build a dock, as has not been acknowledged—well, that is a fragile area, for wildlife, prospective park use, and significantly on account of it adjoining the village water intake. So the size and amount of traffic would need to be regulated, or I dread the effects.

My (mild) version of paranoia, I acknowledge: but if not easy enough to reassure away, then I'd say we have a problem. I hope we can work through this issue before proceeding too much further.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chris", with a stylized, cursive script.

Chris MacCormick