SE	<b>Planning</b>	<b>Board</b>	Recap	3	/12/	07
----	-----------------	--------------	-------	---	------	----

Hi All,

Sorry for the delay in getting this recap out but between the late March snow and still cold temps it's been a rough re-entry from vacation and difficult to get back into the swing of 'community affairs'. Anyhow, on March 12th I attended a Planning Board Meeting. A brief and almost somnolent affair which I hopefully can make short work of in my briefest recap ever. See, there's always a silver lining.

By the way, I arrived at this meeting late (after the first two items) so my thanks to Cathy Croft and Larry Rubin, who were on time and kind enough to fill me in.

As always the snarky comments (and I was pretty good until Durkin Water when I totally snapped) are my opinions only and represent no group unlucky enough to have me.

### AGENDA:

1. Brewster Plaza LLC, Route 22 & 6- Intent to Declare Lead Agency

Lead Agency declared 6-0.

2. EEC Plus mended Site Plan, Danbury Road- Review for Final Approval

Reviewed.

3. Maplewood North Group, Bradford Court- Discussion of Alternate Plans

Two lots on 39 acres. Complete drawings and an EAF are needed. Dan Armstrong mentioned that he'd like to see a conservation easement so there would be no further subdivision.

This will be on the March 26th agenda.

4. Durkin Water Amended Site Plan, Fields Lane- Intent to Declare Lead Agency

SEQR must begin again. The Planning Board will be the Lead Agency. 6-0

# 5. Strazza Subdivision- Doansburg Road (added late)

The Board addressed the historical and cultural aspects of the property primarily due to the barn. AKRF will assist and take a look. No action was taken.

### **COMMENTS/OPINION:**

# **Maplewood North Group:**

There have been a lot of complications regarding access to this subdivision. I believe that this was land belonging to Green Chimneys and that developer John Petrillo is involved. It makes sense to require either a deed restriction or conservation easement so that there will be no further subdivision of this property. Three cheers for Dan Armstrong who has been pretty consistent in advocating for conservation easements.

### **Durkin Water:**

Nothing says 'Office Park' quite like a water-pumping/selling concern. Yeah, welcome to Fields Lane-Southeast's answer to White Plains 'Miracle Mile'.

Honestly, I think the Putnam County EDC/Southeast IDA must have a recruiting brochure that reads something like this: "Give us your retreads, your unwanted, your "corporate" concerns that employ less than ten and have pretty good polluting potential. Give us your businesses that your county wouldn't approve in a million years. Because we'll showcase them on our ridgelines, or shoehorn them in by variance, special permit or even a rezone- what ever it takes. Sound impossible? Call today! A quick tour of Southeast will answer any questions you might have. Seeing is believing!"

If I got to do the brochure graphics I'd feature Westchester Tractor on the front page. The heading would read: "Believe it or Not!" going on to explain what the applicant's attorneys claimed during the planning and zoning process:

- Westchester Tractor would not be visible from anywhere in town (Can be clearly seen from Route 312 and North Brewster Road) [Illustration: four-color photo- long distance shot]
- WT would not service vehicles on site (Yet just opened with 'Fourteen Service Bays' which will result in 'reducing service waiting times') [Illustration: four-color photo of bays]
- WT was not involved in 'Retail Sales' (Latest brochure features over 30 'pre-owned tractors etc-with prices ranging from \$2500 to \$115,000) [Illustration: four-color photo of February brochure open on Town Supervisor's desk]

Yet despite all this Westchester Tractor was granted a variance and a special permit! If we can do it-you can too! Problem business? Problem solved! Southeast- where anything goes!

### Strazza Subdivision:

Yet another barn under scrutiny. The Historic Sites Commission ruled that the barn was not of historic significance. The Commission suggested that a settlement between the developer and adjoining property owner would be beneficial but I don't believe that anything was worked out. To avoid an election year barn-tear-down-brouhaha we'll be asking our planner to take another look at this structure. This way, if a demolition permit is issued, we can throw AKRF under the bus.

That's it from my desk. As always please don't hesitate to e-mail me with any questions or comments you might have. Have a terrific weekend!

With Best Regards

Lynne Eckardt