Right to Know/FOIL

Information contained herein is compiled and made available for informational purposes only. While every effort has been made to provide correct and timely information neither the Town nor its employees or agents assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, scope or timeliness of its content. The Town reserves the right to alter or remove any material or information posted or contained on this website without notice. The DRAFT Resolutions and documentation herein are for the convenience of the Board and should not be construed as an indication as to how the Board will vote. The Resolutions are only proposed and do not become final until approved by a majority of the Board.

Chris Kehoe

From:

John Lentini <pencilbase@aol.com>

Sent:

Thursday, February 22, 2018 9:33 PM

To:

Chris Kehoe; tracytom888@gmail.com; pencilbase@aol.com

Subject:

Vape/Restaurant, 2081 E. Main Str2017-22

All Concerned.

I pursued the suggestion, during last months Town Planning Board review, for the subject project, to evaluate opening vehicle traffic between the subject and the Westerly neighbor. First I discovered that the two lots appear to meet at the same level and that there would be no physical restriction to vehicle travel if the fence was removed between the properties and paving augmented. I discussed this suggestion with my clients who expressed the desire to be good neighbors and be part of a solution that would benefit traffic at this area. I learned, however, that the fence was removed for awhile and some disputes erupted involving snow removal and storage encroachment. A further analysis produced the following concerns, that we have, that is not encouraging, as follows:

- 1. Providing an easement through the subject property will not increase subject's value and, probably, would reduce the property value.
- 2. There will be expenses associated with the fence removal, pavement improvement and surveying/legal costs with recording a required easement.
- 3. It appears that there will be no benefit to the subject, especially, because the neighbors parking lot is often used for attended parking and not always passable.
- 4. There is a potential expense and time involved with the possible requirement that the neighboring property apply for an amended site plan review.
- 5. There would be an increase in traffic, on the subject lot, that will exceed what we expect for the subject. An increase in traffic will provide additional wear, on the subject lot, that will reduce the life of the asphalt wearing course. The expense for repaving the subject parking lot will be a hardship. I doubt that my client can recover any reoccurring expenses from the neighbor.
- 6. There would probably be the need for a cooperative agreement that we have no assurances will be entered into by the neighbor.
- 7. We have concerns for the safety of our patrons while walking to their vehicles and believe the property insurance premiums may rise.
- 8. Nothing is presently compelling the neighbor from having to incur any costs to accomplish this marriage.

I advised my client to consult with their insurance company, an attorney and appraiser to evaluate and refine concerns and values. I respectfully request that our application proceed without the aforementioned alteration as a requirement.

Respectfully

John Lentini, RA



