



LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

FOES OF WYKEHAM INN WANT TO PROTECT THEIR HOMES, HEALTH, SAFETY

This letter is in response to Joe Mustich's March 1 letter, "NIMBY naysayers stand in the way of new luxury inn."

NIMBY? I don't know anyone who would welcome an 83-space parking lot (lighted 24/7) directly across the street from their house in the middle of their residential neighborhood.

While Mr. Mustich supports the development of the proposed Wykeham Rise Inn by offering a wishful marketing spin and narrative, "NIMBYs" responsibly identify substantive issues, having continually taken time to carefully review extensive, ever-changing plans proposed by Wykeham's inexperienced developer in hopes of protecting, their own homes, but also the health and safety of our residents and roads.

Hugely expanded over time to 110,000-plus square feet (including an 81,000-square-foot, five-level main building), the Wykeham project still fails to appropriately address many of the basic issues. For example, Wykeham will be running shuttle buses up and down Wykeham Road day and night, to and from off-site parking for its many parties — large, catered gatherings and 24-tented events. Having crammed so much onto a constrained site, the 100 total onsite parking spots fall far short of what will be needed.

Similarly, only recently acknowl-

We welcome your letters. They should be brief and refer to current or recent events. Writers are limited to one letter every 30 days. Please include your name, street address and daytime telephone number for verification.

For your convenience, a form for writing letters is available at: www.rep-am.com/opinion

Letters also may be emailed to: opinion@rep-am.com

Or they may be addressed to:

Letters to the editor
Republican-American
P.O. Box 2090
Waterbury, CT 06722-2090

edging there's not enough water on the site to meet all its needs (after pointed out by "NIMBYs"), Wykeham's astonishing new proposal is to continuously truck in supplemental water from offsite locations.

Mr. Mustich references Ocean House to legitimize the project, but Ocean House was never owner or an investor and is currently uninvolved. In fact, Wykeham has never successfully partnered with anyone (except, perhaps, neighbors that Ms. Klauer bought out who have since moved out of town). Remember

Wykeham's touted partner, Pali-house, introduced in 2014? That developer's relationship with Wykeham devolved into lawsuits. They're history, too.

The inns Mr. Mustich cites as approved in Litchfield differ dramatically. Those inns re-purpose already standing historic buildings within the commercial district on wider state roads, whereas Wykeham entails enormous new construction (nearly three times the square footage of Litchfield's new Stop & Shop and three times as tall) shoe-horned into the middle of a residential district on a narrow, winding town road.

Finally, I appreciate Mr. Mustich's interest in jobs. Wykeham's development of a few houses on the site or even a charming small (right-sized) inn would be welcomed by neighbors and immediately create jobs.

Just think of all the job opportunities lost over the past 15 years because Wykeham (ignoring pleas, including from land use commissioners) allowed its property to become Washington's most notable and enduring eyesore. Indeed, the entire community would have appreciated Wykeham hiring contractors and tradesmen for clean-up and ongoing care and maintenance of its property rather than having to face the perpetual blight.

Matilda Giampietro
Washington, Conn.