

**JAMES AND JOANN CORDES**

33 Turkey Plain Road  
Bethel, CT.

JCordes@ProAerial.com mobile (203) 733-7117

**To: Planning & Development Committee  
Public Hearing, Friday, March 4, 2016  
H.B. No. 5483 (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING ZONING  
OF CREMATORIES**

**We hereby submit this testimony against the above bill and recommend it be rejected as being both unwise and unnecessary for numerous causes.**

The General Statutes § 8-2n *rightly* prohibits zoning commissions from adopting regulations which allow crematories within 500 feet of residential zoning districts. This prohibition is a minimal protection for all residents from suffering health and financial damages, and from being burdened with long term unknown risks in a poorly understood science of genetics and cellular division.

The current law which mandates the 500' buffer from cremation furnaces was thoughtfully enacted by Connecticut lawmakers and well serves the legitimate interests and safety of Connecticut citizens, as is, without this modification.

The Planning and Development Committee should be aware that this bill seeks to circumvent and undermine a Superior court case currently being tried, wherein Attorney Peter Olson is seeking to contest, overturn or undo a thoroughly considered decision by the Town of Bethel and its citizens which rejected his client's efforts to

force an unwanted business upon its community.

Attorney Peter Olson, in his letter of support for this bill, misrepresents the facts. This bill will not help planning and zoning to better represent town interests but work against it. The property he mentions in his letter, as unbuildable can certainly be built upon. The intrusion of a buffer into his client's property is wrongly characterized. It is his client's property which has always, even prior to its purchase, had restrictions against the use they are seeking.

Many in town fear this is a ruse to circumvent a local decision. This would constitute a violation of spot zoning where no need or desire for modifying the 500' buffer exists anywhere in the State of Connecticut. This would open a flood gate of protest if the hundreds of thousands of potentially impacted residents were to know this is even being considered. The statute is well considered and relied on as it is. It does not need modification and the bill should be rejected.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

James and JoAnn Cordes