Hi All,

Whoa! Lepler and Camarda at the same Planning Board meeting. I’m thinking that this was going to be the Mother of all Planning Board meetings but alas, (sniff), like all overbilled events the meeting was almost a complete bore.

So calm, so understated, really, so dull that Rick O’Rourke (attorney of Waterview fame) actually stole the show with some very splashy rhetoric. And, horrors! to some small degree he was right.

I must say the Planning Board was extremely professional. All applicants were treated with respect and many good questions were asked. So except for one little dustup between the Chairman and the always charming Mr. Camarda it was relatively quiet. And in an interesting twist Mr. Rohrman abdicated his Chairmanship for the evening to Vice Chair David Rush.

Lest you think I’ve had a lobotomy or have started taking Xantax I’ll put forth the usual disclosure. The opinions expressed are just that- my own. They reflect no one else's warped take on life in Southeast.

**WORK SESSION:**
1. Puretech: Mt. Ebo Corporate Park
Harold Lepler was the applicant and Terry Hahn was the engineer. This is a building expansion that was approved years ago. Drawings of the building and site plan were shown. Mr. Lepler said he would be willing to update all outdoor lighting to the new codes and add landscaping. It was said that updated lighting was not mandatory. Mr. Lepler also stated that once the steel is erected he will make sure it is not highly visible from Fieldstone Pond. The visit before the Planning Board was strictly a courtesy.

**REGULAR SESSION:**
1. Super Value Citco Station 1485 Route 22: Referral to Town Board for waiver to the Commercial Moratorium:
There are to be no exterior renovations. The two bays will be converted into a convenience store. Mike Manteo asked when the existing convenience store had been approved? The applicant's
attorney did not know. Mr. LaPerch asked how the parking would be affected if Route 22 was widened? No definitive answer was given. A Board member asked when the Moratorium had last been extended. Answer: Recently- for another 6 months. Mr. Rohrman mentioned that this might be because the Town Board was waiting for a decision from the DOT on widening.

2. Arborscape: Fields Lane: Referral to the Town Board for Release of Performance Bond
No one representing Arborscape appeared. There are still issues to resolve.

3. Waterview Estates Subdivision: Allview Avenue- Discussion of Preliminary Plan
Condition:
Teresa Ryan, of Insite Engineering, showed the latest Waterview plans. Frontage on Route 22 was briefly discussed.

Mr. Rohrman asked acting Chair, David Rush, if he could take over this portion of the meeting.

Mr. Rohrman then discussed a meeting which had taken place between he, Rick Feuerman (neighbor), Tim Radigan (neighbor), Lorraine Mitts (Councilwoman), and Graham Trelstad (Town Planner).

Attorney, Rick O'Rourke, asked why the owner of the project had not been notified. Mr. Rohrman replied that he didn't know why and that Supervisor Dunford had asked him to attend when they met in a the parking lot. The Supervisor did not have time to discuss it at length as he was headed home to 'pack for vacation'.

At the meeting frontage and access to Route 22 were discussed. As was a possible '3-D rendering' which may now be asked for by the Planning Board. Town Attorney Jacabellis said that the preliminary approval could not be revoked. Mr. O'Rourke pointed out that this project had been in the works since 2003 and the new law regarding '3-D renderings' did not take effect until 2006. He continued that there had been 'a lot of political pressure' over the past three years and it was unfair to expect an applicant with preliminary approvals to supply such a request but they will consider it.

4. Stateline Retail Centre- Route 6 Revised Sketch Plan review
183,000 square foot Shopping Center. 4 stores including an anchor of 135,000 sq. ft.
Mr. Camarda gave a power point presentation regarding the Town's Master Plan. He pointed out that in 2002 there were no planned changes for Route 6. The Comprehensive Plan states that to make up for the loss of tax revenue (due to the 4 acre up-zoning) commercial growth would be required.

After the presentation George Rohrman asked Mr. Camarda if he'd heard the Board ever state that they objected to the shopping center. Mr. Camarda answered 'no'.

Mr. Camarda pointed out that berms had been added and parking lot islands increased in size. Parking in the rear was discussed.

Mike Manteo asked if there would be an alternate scaled down plan. Mr. Camarda said there would be. He reiterated that the project would not need any variances and would be out of the wetlands and buffers.

Mr. Armstrong mentioned that the center's name 'Stateline' left a lot to be desired.

Two traffic lights were proposed. One at the 121/Route 6 intersection and another at the Shopping Center's entrance.

65%-75% of the site along Route 6 will remain green. 67% of the site will remain open.

The Board requested a lighting plan and architecturals be submitted. Mr. Camarda felt that this was premature. A more detailed plan was also needed before proceeding with SEQRA. Ms. Ryan said she'd like feedback so that SEQRA could be started.

COMMENTS:
1. Puretech:
Actually the new lighting must comply with new code.

1. Supervalue Citco
Nah, I'm not bashing the applicant here. Certainly we can't have too many convenience stores. And, ding, ding, ding, it's official! With this latest entry Convenience stores will finally outpace Auto Parts and Nail Salons as the retailer of choice in Putnam.

That said, it was mentioned that the Moratorium had been instituted back in 2002. Four years! It's really a miracle that the Town hasn't been sued by a Route 22 property owner over this. Of course Mr. Lepler's projects in the works are all north of Putnam Lake Road. You remember, the spot on 22 where the Town Board declined to enact a moratorium.

3. Waterview: Allview Avenue
This is a really twisted tale.

It's no secret that I don't like this project. Although only 4 lots on 40 acres the access is really crummy, seems slightly unsafe, and some of the site work leaves a lot to be desired. Plus the case of the 'gerrymandered' lot lines (frontage on Route 22) well, don't get me started.

Still, I don't get the meeting requested by the Town Board. I don't believe that the Town Board is supposed to insinuate itself in land subdivision in any way. Further, at this stage why bother with the '3-D rendering', no matter how inexpensive. I mean, that ship has sailed.

That said, the neighbors on Allview Avenue never got to see the approved map although it had been requested before the preliminary approval was granted. Further, it was never shown at any meeting I attended. And just the fact that the lot lines were redrawn makes this quite a different project than the project originally submitted.

4. Stateline Retail Center:
Jeeze... where to begin...

First, I was most impressed by the Planning Board's professional behavior. It was head and shoulder's above the embarrassingly and transparently hostile display the Town Board treated us to several weeks back. I actually couldn't tell whether or not the Board liked or disliked this project and that's how it should be. The meeting was taped thus it was even more important to present a completely unbiased front.

Charming Paul's power-point presentation was definitely setting the stage for a possible lawsuit. Because if the Town Board goes ahead with their 'thanks-for-reminding-us-to-zone-you-out-of-existence' plan Charming has all his bases covered.

In fact, this portion of the meeting was vaguely reminiscent of an old Perry Mason where the evidence just keeps building and building until, cue melodramatic music, the witness is demolished and a tearful blond in the back of the court room screams, 'Okay, okay, I did it'!

While minor in the grand scheme of things a heartfelt thanks goes to Mr. Armstrong who takes issue with the name of the project. Because let's face it ‘Stateline Retail Centre’ manages to be both poor-white-trash and pretentious all at the same time. First, I thought nothing but a liquor store was allowed the 'Stateline' moniker and second, 'Centre'??? I mean, this spelling should be against the law anywhere outside the UK.

As for the plan itself. There was some give and take between Mr. C and the Board. They wanted parking in the rear Mr. Camarda wanted the building set back. Sadly, in this case I probably agree with him due to the narrow lot and the thought of a Big Box looming over Route 6. I'd like to see pervious pavers in the 'holiday overflow' parking section but of course I'd like green roofs, tiered parking, a pulled in design leaving even more open space, and live-in help. None of which appear to be forthcoming.

There were about 20 people gathered to keep an eye on the project. And, thus far, Mr. Camarda has had the good sense not to stock the room with 'local people' clamoring for Costco and the
like. And of course, I so enjoyed the always debonair Mr. Lepler watching the show from the peanut gallery. Who knows... this project might even prompt him to join CRSE.

Mr. Manteo's question about a scaled back alternative was a good one so I'll live for the day the DEIS shows nothing more than 47 acres of open space and a lemonade stand... Ahhh, hope springs eternal. Anyhow, the only way I can legitimately see to change the project dramatically will be through engineering studies- storm water run-off and the like.

Hopefully the Town Board will at some point (a point at which we will not be embroiled in an impossible law suit we can't win) enact the zoning legislation that they could have and should have enacted several years ago.

That's it from my desk. As always please feel free to e-mail me should you have any comments or questions. Have a wonderful weekend!

With Best Regards,
Lynne Eckardt