

aghini_99 · aghini@rcn.com

CRSE - Concerned Residents of Southeast

[Start a Group](#) - [My Groups](#)

Group Moderator [[Edit My Membership](#)]

Messages

[Messages Help](#)

[Reply](#) | [Forward](#) | [View Source](#) | [Unwrap Lines](#) | [Delete](#)

Message 761 of 861 | [Previous](#) | [Next](#) [Up Thread] [Message Index](#)

Msg #

From: "Lynne Eckardt" <midfarm@bestweb.net>

Date: Tue Jun 15, 2004 1:00 pm

Subject: Planning Board Recap 6/14/04

Hello All,

ADVERTISEMENT

Below please find a recap of the Southeast Planning Board meeting held last night (6/14). These are not official minutes, which should be available by June 28th. In the interest of time I am including only those items which may be of interest to CRSE members.

The comments that follow are, of course, only my own observations.

The most telling (and fun) part of the meeting were Planning Board comments made before the official start. Trouble in Paradise?

REGULAR SESSION:

1. GASLAND (Brewster ATI), Starr Ridge Road and Route 6:
Request for a waiver to the Commercial Moratorium. More on the 400 square foot addition, which will house Dunkin Donuts. No drive-thru planned.

The Board voted 5-2 in favor of the waiver. Mr. Rush and Mr. Armstrong voted against.

3. MAHOPAC NATIONAL BANK: The Highlands.
Review amended site plans. The bank and its drive thru will be located over the 'Marshalls' building. A restrictive height bar has been installed to keep 'larger, heavier vehicles' from parking or using the drive thru. The drive thru road is 11' '7".

The new sign is NOT in conformance of the proposed new regs. One sign is 2' X 27' the other 2' X 19'. Because of the roof top location special snow plowing equipment will be used.

The amended plans were approved 7-0.

4. STEPHEN JOHNSON FAMILY, LLC. 38 Argonne Road
This property is asking for 7 variances although no concrete proposals have been submitted. It was forwarded to the ZBA by a vote of 7-0.

5. HEWITT SUBDIVISION, 211 Joes Hill Road.

- [Home](#)
- [Messages](#)
- [Post](#)
- [Chat](#)
- [Files](#)
- [Photos](#)
- [Links](#)
- [Database](#)
- [Members](#)
- [Calendar](#)

[Promote](#)

[Management](#)

- = Owner
- = Moderator
- = Online

Subdividing this property will require several variances. This was forwarded to the ZBA by a vote of 7-0. The PB was asked to 'take a position' on the requested variances. And from now on the board will have to state their position when forwarding anything to the ZBA. The position choices are: Positive, Negative and No position. The Planning Board voted to take 'No Position.' Mr. Manteo questioned why the Town Attorney wanted to take a position on this but not on item #4.

COMMENTS:

Trouble in Paradise...

There was a lot of chit chat between Board members before the meeting. Apparently the recently enacted moratorium on major subdivisions was never mentioned to members of the Planning Board. In fact Chairman Rohrman said that his opinion was never sought and that he had heard nothing about it until the moratorium had been established.

Welcome to the club Chairman Rohrman. CRSE had mentioned it in previous on-line recaps but as residents we too know what it's like to be left out 'of the loop'.

One Board member wryly commented that a moratorium at this point was 'like closing the barn door after the horses had escaped.' as all the really large projects have received approvals. The Board then tried to count the number of subdivisions that would be affected and speculated that some lawsuits might follow.

It is curious that a decision as major as a building moratorium wasn't even mentioned to members of the Planning Board first. One would think that the Town Board might, at the very least, solicit PB member's opinions before making their decision. Or, as a courtesy, simply let them know what they were going to do.

GASLAND PETROLEUM: It seemed strange not to have engineer Peder Scott there. His ever entertaining cajoling to push this project to the max (remember there's one pump too many and a canopy that was never agreed upon) was almost missed. The Board did mention again that there are already 7 variances on this gem. By the way it was nice to see the Board civilly 'agree to disagree' on the waiver vote.

MAHOPAC NATIONAL BANK: Suffice it to say that the restrictive 'height bar' limiting tonnage on the 'deck' is a really comforting thought.

STEPHEN JOHNSON/HEWITT SUBDIVISION: ZBA referrals. Mr. Manteo raised a good point. Why did the Board have to render a recommendation on one project but not the other? If these recommendations are going to become a requirement it would stand to reason that both these projects need one. Is it possible that the difference is: one is commercial and the other is in an upscale neighborhood with several prominent residents?

If I were a betting woman I'd guess that the 'No Position' on ZBA referrals will become the position of choice.

As always please feel free to e-mail me with any questions that you might have.

With Best Regards,
Lynne Eckardt

Message 761 of 861 | [Previous](#) | [Next](#) [Up Thread] [Message Index](#)

[Reply](#) | [Forward](#) | [View Source](#) | [Unwrap Lines](#) | [Delete](#)

Msg #