

## **June 8th, 2009-Meeting Summary**

Members present: Chair Rachel Verno, Gloria Rabinowitz, Bill Berkoski, Mary Shader, Rik Kristiansson, Joe Krajewski and June Morris

Non-members present: Mary Rode, Jennifer Hartnagel from the Group for the East End and Jennifer Landes from the East Hampton Star

### **WATERMILL STATION DEVELOPMENT:**

Site Plan was approved with the addition of a roundabout on the eastern side of the property at Nowedonah Avenue. None of the CAC's concerns were addressed regarding the impact of traffic onto this residential street with the Community Club right opposite or size of project.

### **SPORT SOUTHAMPTON RETAIL:**

#### **(luxury car showroom proposed for Former Fortunoff location)**

CAC has submitted a letter stating our concerns. Once Planning Board schedules site plan again for further review, we will let members know.

### **BURNETT PROPERTY at 1025 Flying Point Rd:**

There is a public hearing on July 8th with the Conservation Board. This is the third hearing.

The applicant is still refusing to make any changes to scale down the size of the proposed 2-story home but has agreed to reduce the size of the driveway.

The Conservation Board is still not satisfied with the answers from the applicant regarding flood maps. Neighboring resident has hired Atty, Jeff Bragman to represent her.

Since the CAC meeting, Chair has spoken with Jeremy Samuelson from Group for the East End and they are concerned with this project and will attend the CAC's July meeting to discuss.

### **PROPOSED LIGHTING LAW:**

The CAC is still opposed to 10-year amortization and will have a member attend public hearing on June 9 and report back.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:**

Jenn Hartnagel from the Group for the East End described their proposal for the formation of an Environmental Review Committee. The idea being there needs to be a board within the planning process whose sole purpose is to review projects for a SEQRA determination. The public has an ongoing concern with the current Planning Board awarding a negative declaration to too many large-scale projects. As an example, Dennis Suskind's Water Mill Station project should have gone through the SEQRA process and did not in part because the Planning Board did not hear from the public until the first public hearing and by that time it is too late.

Some CAC members wondered why should we create an additional board when the real problem lies with the existing Planning Board? Wouldn't it be more effective to fix the flaws in the process instead of creating another board? There were questions about who would make the appointments, whether stipends would be given and the concept of the Planning Board needing a super majority (6 people) to override whatever decisions the ERC made. the process.

Since the CAC meeting, the Chair attended a coalition meeting made up of representatives from several CACs where Bob deLuca addressed these concerns. In addition, Councilwoman Anna Throne-Holst is drafting a resolution that would move the public hearing portion of the planning process prior to the SEQRA determination. The resolution would perhaps even include several public hearings at different stages of the planning process.

