

# Comments on Draft Stanford Comprehensive Plan sent to the Comprehensive Plan email address

Complete as of May 9, 2021

## 1. Hudsonia Overlay



**Henry Boehringer**

I attended a meeting where Gary Lovett proposed a Hudsonia Overlay for the entire town. Tom Angle endorsed it because it would result in requiring anyone who had a grandfathered 5 acre lot to do a habitat study before building and give the planning board the right to set where a house could be built.

This should not be part of plan or zoning. I 'd like the committee to agree on that.

+++++

## 2. Hudsonia Overlay

**Henry Boehringer**

Will Lovet and Angle recuse themselves from discussions regarding my comment.

This concept was put on the table by Lovett . Angle , as I vividly recall , was very excited about the idea and was aware of the technical details. I also recall Angle told me I had nothing to say when I commented that it was unfair and over reaching.

I feel that their prior endorsement of the Hudsonia Overlay as Stanford Planning Board members was a clear attempt at a power grab , resulting in taking away a property owner's rights.

+++++

3.

## Comprehensive Plan- Written Comments

**Nathaniel Kimball**

To whom it may concern-

We reside at 777 Hunns Lake Road with our daughter Christina. We enthusiastically support the development of a comprehensive plan to ensure that the Town of Stanford continues to be a welcoming place for people and businesses. In particular, we view the following elements of the plan as critical and welcome improvements that will help ensure housing affordability and equity, continued development of renewable energy, and lasting environmental protection:

- Allowing additional uses for accessory dwellings and easing the permitting burden for constructing accessory apartments
- Relaxing requirement that the size of a solar installation must be less than 10% of a building's footprint and making it easier to install solar.
- Encouraging home-based businesses.
- Encouraging pedestrian scale lighting and streetscape improvements.
- Participating in the National Flood Insurance Program to allow homeowners to obtain coverage.
- Reducing road salting to the minimum necessary to protect our vehicles, our property and our water.
- Developing groundwater monitoring program.

We support the plan as it stands and offer our assistance in its continued development. In the long term, the Town of Stanford should consider whether it makes sense to invest in small scale wastewater infrastructure for sensitive communities such as Hunns Lake. Technology is rapidly improving for neighborhood scale wastewater treatment solutions, which could be deployed in a targeted manner so that we preserve our community's water quality for future generations. I'm happy to provide more context and detail if necessary.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Nate Kimball

Timothy Eng

777 Hunns Lake Road

+++++

4.

Lack of in person public meeting and other points.

**Henry Boehringer**

I don't feel that a Zoom meeting is proper platform to discuss your finding

A real meeting with in person participation could happen at the rec within a month or so.

Many folks are not computer savy or equipped .

Afer all this time what difference does 4 - 6 weeks make.

There is mention of a Hudsonia overlay, will this overlay be extended over the entire town?

There may be more to follow.

+++++

5.

**Wind Turbines**

**Henry Boehringer**

The plan endorses renewable energy development, which is as it should be.

Wind Turbines , from what I understand , are very frequently installed in rural

areas. I 've see just one or two turbines in large fields in Germany. A turbine

may by some be considered overwhelming . Is there any clarity regarding turbine installation?

Would turbine installations be permitted on ridgelines? Could the planning board

impede ridgeline turbine development? If a very visible turbine can be located on

a ridgeline why would a home require special consideration. ?

6.

# Over sight of community/commercial renewable energy on prime agricultural land.



## Henry Boehringer

I don't quite understand why this is necessary. If I owned a piece of this type property I feel that I should be allowed to determine if its best use is as a solar, wind , or for actual agricultural use. In Germany they exist side by side.

The plan constantly refers to "right to farm " does that mean I have to farm and assume all the risks that a farmer undertakes. I guess you are saying that he needs to be told what is the best use for his land,

This type of over sight is over reaching. Also what he doesn't farm is taxed differently.

## 7. Stanford Master Plan

### Paul Coughlin

I read the document and have cut/pasted that recommendations I disagree with.

- Require all major residential subdivision applications to prepare a conservation<sup>1</sup> and/or cluster<sup>2</sup> alternative;
- Create a detailed flow chart illustrating the land development application review process for use by Town staff and development applicants. The flow chart would list reference materials (i.e., maps of historic and ecological resources, ridgelines and scenic viewsheds) that would be considered during the first step of the land development application review.
- Revisit and refine existing Town regulations regarding location and requirements for utility/community<sup>1</sup>- and residential-scale<sup>2</sup>- solar energy facilities;

- Review the NYSERDA model solar code and customize the recommendations to best meet Town goals with regard to solar energy, including:

- *Defining residential and utility/community scale solar installation;*

- *Requiring additional oversight for community solar installations proposed for farms with prime agricultural soil, historic structures, or protected viewsheds and ridgelines; and*

- *Requiring visual impact assessment for ground mounted solar systems.*

- Identify zoning districts where utility/ community scale solar energy installation would be allowed by Special Permit.

- Ease requirements to allow flexible off-street parking in Stanfordville and Bangall hamlets, including shared parking.

- Prepare an inventory of short-stay residential properties and require a registration permit

- Consider pedestrian-scaled lighting and streetscape improvements that are consistent with the current character of the hamlets, sharrows or dedicated bicycle lanes, pedestrian crosswalks, and traffic calming measures;

- Establish a definition of “ridgeline” and protection standards and guidelines, and incorporate them in the Town’s Zoning Code;

- Identify and map the Town’s significant ridgelines;

- Establish siting guidelines to locate buildings and other structures below the ridgeline.

Guidelines might include locating structures to prevent rooflines from extending above the existing tree line;

- Require analysis during Site Plan Review of potential impacts from proposed non-agricultural projects adjacent to farm operations;

- Require Planning Board review of applications for non-agricultural development located within areas designated as having Prime Agricultural Soils and/or Soils of Statewide Significance;

---

**Paul J. Coughlin III**  
**Taconic Distillery, LLC**  
**179 Bowen Road**  
**Stanfordville, NY 12581**

**8.**

Debra Kaye and Steven Horowitz  
6187 Route 82  
Box 292  
Stanfordville, NY 12581

April 25, 2021

Re: Stanford Comprehensive Plan 2021 Draft

To: Stanford Comprehensive Plan Review Committee

Ladies and Gentlemen:

My wife Debra and I are residents of Stanfordville and have several comments on the Draft Plan. Debra purchased our property in 1986 and I joined her in 2005.

First, the Plan recommends (pp. 69, 123) extending the northern boundary of the Rural Center (RC) zoning district to the intersection of Route 82 and Millis Lane, to allow more opportunities for businesses that have larger space requirements, such as a nursery. This recommendation is somewhat analogous to the recently withdrawn proposal to build a Dollar Store on Hunns Lake Road in the same vicinity. That proposal was controversial and unpopular because it would have introduced increased traffic and an incompatible use in a largely residential area. We strongly oppose expansion of the RC district for the same reasons. The areas covered by the present RC district have plenty of land for commercial expansion. Moreover, as a planning matter, we believe it would be strongly preferable to cluster new commercial development in the same areas as current commercial facilities are located. For example, such clustering would encourage more pedestrian activity when shopping at multiple establishments rather than having to drive short distances from one store to the next. As a fallback position, we would consider permitting limited commercial uses north of the intersection of Route 82 and Hunns Lake Road solely for businesses that have larger space requirements. That could be accomplished by specifying both use (e.g., nursery) and minimum lot size, e.g., one or two acres. While this approach would still be objectionable to us, it is at least somewhat less intrusive.

Second, the RC zone also allows **utility-scale** ground-mounted solar energy systems via a Special Use Permit, with Site Plan review and approval granted by the Planning Board. The Plan recommends (p. 70) review of existing Town regulations regarding location and requirements for utility and community solar energy facilities. We have been following the controversy in Copake regarding a proposed large solar facility. It seems to us that such a facility would be highly disruptive to the fabric of that community, especially its rural and agricultural character. The same would certainly be true in Stanford. We recognize that New York State law limits the power of the Town to regulate such facilities. However, we strongly support efforts by the Town to control the development of any such facilities, especially those at utility scale.

Third, the Plan identifies potential capital improvements (p. 76), such as resurfacing two tennis courts, replacing nets and posts, and installing new fencing surrounding the tennis court area. As a tennis player, I would be delighted to see such improvements. Due to the uneven quality of our courts, I rarely play tennis in Stanfordville and instead drive to Rhinebeck and other communities to the west. The courts there are better maintained and as a result are often heavily used.

Fourth, the Plan discusses preserving the Town's rural character and agricultural heritage (one of the Plan's primary goals) and includes Objective 1.2 – "Provide regulatory tools to encourage the use of sensitive siting, cluster subdivision and conservation subdivision techniques" (p. 14). To that end, the

Plan recommends (p. 67) adopting a “requirement that all major residential subdivision applications to prepare a conservation and/or cluster alternative.” As a real estate attorney in private practice for 30 years and later as chief risk officer of Open Space Institute, a non-profit land conservation organization active in the Hudson Valley, I have long held a professional interest in this topic. To the extent it might be helpful to the Committee, I have attached a recent article which I authored about conservation development.

Sincerely,

Steven Horowitz

9.

**Chris Drago**

Dear town committee,

Great job drafting such a comprehensive plan!

I wanted to ask about whether we should include the need to outline ways to ensure we maintain the health and safety of the town residents as part of this plan. For example - what's our vision for looking at more dedicated services to supplement our volunteer fire and ambulance service? Might this be something we want to look into and include as part of the comprehensive plan?

Many thanks,

Chris Drago

1212 Hunns Lake Road

**Follow-up:**

**Chris Drago**

Hi Gary,

Sorry to only be getting back to you now and I realize I missed last night's meeting. Hope it went well.

Providing for a safe place to live should be, I think, one of the key purposes of town government. Enabling a place for people of all ages to live, and get older and feel comfortable and secure while doing so. Resident's may get discouraged and want to move away to towns that offer more services that support their healthcare needs over time.

Rather than jumping to the solution of needing to pay for part time emergency services like the towns of Millbrook and Northeast do, I think we could open up the dialog and create a committee to look at what our options are - with the goal of creating a safe and liveable place for people of all ages.

My Aunt is in her 80s and lives nearby. When she fell a couple years ago at home on a Sunday night, no one from the volunteer Stanford or Pine Plains fire departments came. She had to wait over 2 hours for the private service to come from Northern Dutchess.

I'm all for protecting our land and thinking about a state of the art recreational facility, but supporting people's basic need for health and safety I would think should also be top of this list.

My two cents!

Thanks again for all your work on this Gary.

Chris

## **10.** **May 3 meeting**

### **Dorsey Waxter**

To Whom It May Concern:

I am interested in the meeting about the Stanford Comprehensive Plan but am unable to attend that evening.

There are two concerns that I would like to voice. One is the ability for an event space to be located within the town. I am not in favor of this land use because of the many attendant issues such as traffic, noise, parking and the use of alcohol in a rural setting when driving on unfamiliar roads. Simply put, I think that this is potentially dangerous and should not be allowed.

My second concern is that it does not appear that there is any minimum zoning. It would seem appropriate that zoning should be considered relative to proximity to a village or commercial area. So if it is 'x' in the village or commercial area, then it should increase significantly when distanced from the village. This would ensure that the rural quality of the countryside is preserved.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorsey Waxter



6-30 Thimble House Trail

Millbrook, NY 12545

**11.**

Letter from A. Rappelyea below



CORBALLY, GARTLAND  
AND RAPPLEYEA, LLP

Since 1876

Charles J. Corbally (1966)  
John J. Gartland, Jr (2003)  
Allan E. Rappleyea (2010)  
Michael G. Gartland (2018)  
Paul O. Sullivan  
Rena M. O'Connor  
Allan B. Rappleyea  
Patrick T. Gartland  
Brooke D. Youngwirth  
Alexandra C. Downey

April 28, 2021

Bardavon Building  
35 Market Street  
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601  
tel 845 454 1110  
fax 845 454 4857  
  
30 Front Street  
PO Box 679  
Millbrook, NY 12545  
tel 845 677 5539  
fax 845 677 6297

Via Email

Comprehensive Plan Review Committee  
Town of Stanford  
26 Town Hall Road  
Stanfordville, New York 12581

Re: Rena Property

Dear Committee Members:

We represent Michael Rena, who is the owner of tax parcels 135200-6868-00-551378-0000 and 135200-6868-00-637243-0000, located at 427 and 461 Bangall-Amenia Road, Town of Stanford.

As I understand it, the draft master plan proposes to substantially expand existing "critical environmental areas" in several places in the Town.

The Rena property is already affected by such an area, noted as the "Ryder Pond & Cagney Marsh CEA". This is noted on page 94 of the draft plan.

It appears, on page 95 of the draft, that it is being suggested that this area be considerably enlarged. The enlarged area is numbered 5, colored in purple and labeled "Ryder Pond". Page 92 of the draft includes this enlargement as a recommendation of the Committee.

Mr. Rena does not agree with this recommendation or the enlargement of the area and this recommendation should be withdrawn, for several reasons as noted below.

Comprehensive Plan Review Committee

Rena Property

Page 2

The Rena properties are already materially restricted from development by an existing critical environmental area, a land conservation easement and exist under New York State Environmental Conservation Law and DEC regulation. Enlarging the area, as recommended, will materially impair and likely destroy the limited rights which exist now. The expansion of the area may well constitute an impermissible regulatory taking of property without compensation, which is unconstitutional and unlawful.

Lastly, with respect to p. 85/86 of the draft, "event venues", in proper locations may be appropriate. However, in areas where land uses are primarily open space preserved an "event venue" would be harmful to the peace and quiet people have built their homes for. So, while this may be appropriate use in the Bangall area where commerce was once more vibrant, it would not be appropriate on 1st Avenue, Amenia Road, or nearby. Therefore, if event venues are to be encouraged, they should be in certain areas only and then upon issuance of site plan approval and a special permit, so that the conditions of operation may be enforced.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

CORBALLY, GARTLAND AND  
RAPPLEYEA, LLP



Allan B. Rappleyea

ABR/s

cc: Michael Rena

12.

## Town plan

### Peter Kraus

My name is Peter Kraus and I reside with my wife at 312 Bangall-Amenia Road. I wanted to comment on a section of the town's comprehensive plan that we thought was problematic. There is an attempt in the plan to allow the town to develop commercial activities that will create vibrancy to the community. I want to say we embrace that idea. But one of the issues that is missing in the town plan is some concept of centralization. The town suffers from being spread out and this takes away from its ability to create social vibrancy that physical proximity creates. The lack of centrality also contributes to commercial activities affecting the bucolic portions of the town which in their own right serve to attract homeowners who want to enjoy the pastoral and peaceful nature of the geography that exists today. Allowing the initiative of commerciality to spoil the powerful but fragile natural community and at the same time deprive the community of the social vibrancy that centralization can create seems ill advised. I would suggest that the central theme of commercial viability carries with it a requirement to create some social vibrancy that will reinforce commercial success and protect the otherwise peaceful and beautiful part of the community that attracts existing and new homeowners to come to Stanford. Furthermore commercial ideas like "event venues" carry with it significant infrastructure requirements, e.g. lighting, substantial and safe buildings, sanitary requirements, fire protection, sound abatement and road congestion unless relieved by road construction, and road safety caused by heavy usage on roads not designed for that purpose. These issues can't be easily regulated or addressed if these venues are allowed to be situated on any property where the owner wants to pursue this activity. Putting this activity in a designated place which can accomplish meeting the above requirements and doesn't pollute the scenic and quiet nature of the surrounding homeownership locations would seem intelligent. Allowing this to be spread throughout the town based on the owner's desire to start a business on their land while supportive of commercial development undermines the value of the surrounding homes and decentralizes the commercial activity creating a dispersed and uneven commercial experience for the town. This is but one example, but one that the town specifically called out in the plan that to my eye seemed particularly odd and non responsive to the overall objectives of the plan. I would expect the town would want to encourage commercial development inside of a physical envelope that would create social vibrancy, so I think the plan should specifically address this issue. Thank you for listening to our thoughts on the matter of the town planning review.

Sent from my iPhone

13.

## Master Plan , Carbon Neutrality , and Nimby

### Henry Boehringer

The plan as I read it mentions renewable energy sources but does not high light their importance or set any goals for the town to achieve.

I propose that Stanford should set a goal of being carbon neutral by 2035. I acknowledge that this is likely a very complex undertaking , however I don't think many of us can deny how important this is and that accomplishing this would require focus , research, and buy in from home and landowners. It may also require sacrificing some of our vistas and ridge lines to accomplish this. Are we going to be a NIMBY community or one that is socially responsible .

We don't need absolute and complete information to start this process. We know carbon emissions are a given and any near term renewable installations will result in accomplishing our long term goal. Renewable energy will be even more important as automotive transportation becomes increasingly electrified.

What do we do ? Here are steps to consider.

1. The Master Plan acknowledges carbon neutral as a goal.
2. The town takes a lead in determining town property that could be used for renewables.
- 3 .Establish a Energy Team. This team would identify and track economic incentives, grants. Educate and promote the goal. Explore the feasibility of a hardware purchasing cooperative that might drive down purchasing costs , open book partnershipwith vendors and developers. Concurrent with the above it would use industry norms to establish a carbon footprint for the town. This would include agricultural and livestock activity. The team would establish a mechanism that would identify renewable potential for new building permits , but not require it .
- 5 . Track success.

We would exclude the commercial installation by town hall and carbon absorption by wooded lands. The more we do the more we contribute to cleaner air. We don't have to be perfect . I also believe that setting this goal could make home ownership here more attractive.

14.

## Comprehensive plan comments and questions

Dear Comprehensive Plan Committee, here are my questions and comments regarding your new proposed Comprehensive Plan.

You are taking very bold steps to regulate private property owners land use rights.

Regards

Neal Johnsen

2215 Bulls Head Road

Stanfordville NY

Comprehensive Plan Town of Stanford 5-1-21

Comments, questions and concerns

- 1.) Why has it taken 20 + years for a Master Plan to be revised? Why is it being created so quickly in the middle of the covid pandemic?
- 2.) The Current Master Plan has been effective meeting property owner's goals in my opinion. Where has it failed?
- 3.) The introduction on page 8 states, "Unanimous agreement about the future is not the goal of the Comprehensive Plan. Then on page 9 states "The plan is an official policy document. This will supersede current town code, correct? Is this why the committee chooses not to name the document Comprehensive Plan vs. Master Plan?
- 4.) Goal 2 has clear land use restrictions regarding the Towns drinking water resources, wetlands streams and lakes. Does the Town of Stanford hold title or is the committee referring to private property owners water resources?
- 5.) Goal 3 states "Encourage the use of renewable Energy" .Which types and where? How will it impact neighboring property values?
- 6.) Is the Statement regarding Mixed-use parcels are not common in Stanfordville accurate? How many residential properties currently have commercial use? Is Airbnb addressed?
- 7.) How many acres within the town of Stanford are currently protected from development?
- 8.) What significance did the research on Stanford residents, age and income have regarding how this plan was developed? Why was income and race even considered? How was this information collected?

- 9.) Which acreage size/property owners stand to lose the most from this plan? Why
- 10.) The plan has very strong language regarding protecting farm soils? Why
- 11.) Has the Bontecou Estate offered to donate property to the town of Stanford if a Master Plan or Comprehensive Plan is adopted?
- 12.) Why is cluster subdivision so important to the committee? Why can't property owners build a home on their property where they choose? How much additional costs will there be for new development requirements if this plan is adopted?

Regards

Neal Johnsen

2215 Bulls Head Road

Stanfordville NY 12581

15.

## Opinion from resident.

Good morning,

I've been a tax paying voting resident of this wonderful community 24 years since 1997. Formerly a life long resident and home builder (now retired) in Southern Dutchess, Hopewell and Wappingers.

First, I must applaud all your exhaustive efforts on the 140 page plan. I read and digested all of it.

I implore you not to encourage cluster housing and residential growth.

It will come at a severe cost to our infrastructure and all community municipal services.

It will destroy our beautiful rural landscape, no matter how good any proposed plan may initially appear on paper.

It will not work, you can have all the plans in place, and a developer and their attorneys will massage a deal. Before you can blink, our beautiful rural landscape will be destroyed just like the towns to our south. Don't believe me? Take a ride through Lagrange, Hopewell, and Fishkill. I was involved in the 70's 80's (IBM) building boom, I built 50 houses one neighborhood formerly a dairy farm, now Barnes Drive Hopewell Jct and I built numerous off sites as well. I was guilty of destroying their rural landscape. Why? Greed ! Did I care? No.

I came to Stanford in 1997 and purchased an existing home. I fell in love with what was once just like Southern Dutchess. I don't want to see this happen again.

Be very careful with the future vision of our town. It will be gone before you know it.

Thank you,

Bud and Linda Barnes

Shelly Hill Rd

**Follow-up:**

On May 5, 2021, at 9:21 AM, Stanford Comprehensive Plan Review Committee <[stanfordcomprehensiveplan@gmail.com](mailto:stanfordcomprehensiveplan@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Mr. and Ms. Barnes:

Thank you for submitting this comment on the Draft Comprehensive Plan. The Committee will review and consider all comments when it meets next week.

Just as a point of clarification, the recommendation for clustered site plans would not affect the number of units that could be built, only their arrangement on the property. For instance, under our 5-acre zoning, a 100-acre parcel could be subdivided to build 20 units. In a clustered site plan, instead of twenty 5-acre lots, some of the units could be built on smaller lots, preserving the remainder of the site as open space. This is intended as a measure to both conserve open space and provide a diversity of housing options.

Best regards,

Gary Lovett

for the Stanford Comprehensive Plan Review Committee

Thank you for your quick reply.

I do understand that, but I know from previous forty year business experience, it will still profoundly effect our best kept secret, and the real appeal of Stanfordville.

More people, more services, more burden. Less appeal.

Thank you for all you are doing to protect our environment.

Bud and Linda Barnes

16.

## Support for the Stanford Town Comprehensive Plan

### Gene Likens

*I strongly support the overall message of the Stanford Comprehensive Plan. Its vision for Stanford's future is sound and badly needed if we are to protect the vibrant character and natural beauty of our Town, and plan for a healthy and sustainable future.*



Gene E. Likens

88 Ridge Road

Clinton Corners, NY 12514

Resident of the Town of Stanford for some 38 years.

17.

## SPRC comments

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I was the "Tom, no last name" who raised his hand the other night on the call, but could not connect. Along with the chorus of individuals in town, I, too, appreciate the life you have breathed back into this plan review. The four goals are succinct and I think the entire community can come to a consensus around special permit review should we weigh all future applicants against these intentions.

The intent of my call was to follow up on Steven Horowitz's and Debra Kay's concern about the expansion of the RC zoning down route 82 toward the intersection of CR 87. I am also curious about the removal of "planned development district" as a recommendation because I think these two moves work against each other.

The point I would like to make is that if you blanket expand the RC zoning. You open up more land and effect more adjacencies to development allowed under a RC zoning special permits. This may seem like supply side economics, but I think it causes unnecessary friction with those who don't perceive their immediate environs as logically part of a rural center. We actually have density in town. Steve and I bought in Bangall and love that we see our neighbors recreating on the lanes and paths in and around Stanford's densest hamlet. When we renovated and put in the pool, I appreciated the relaxed setback requirements and also the restriction of the picturesque yet malodorous commercial activities associated with living in an agricultural community. I am actually surprised all of Bangall isn't RC zoning, because I think most of us who live there understand the charm of this density in juxtaposition to the open expanses just outside of our borders.

Perhaps planning development districts where there isn't development is not a good idea. but fostering density and creating an avenue for variance in districts that at one time were part of our original network of hamlets should be considered. It is true Stanfordville as a hamlet center is not perceived as the village of Millbrook or Rhinebeck, perhaps that will never be, but I think we must be cautious when we encapsulate large parcels in an RC zoning overlay.

We were all surprised when the Dollar Store came to town. It was great to see how it rallied interest in planning. We are gifted by a town with a certain character and if you begin to change that scale it will be impossible to turn back.

Thank you for your consideration

Best,

Tom Ambler

Steve Bruman

**18.**

## **MP feedback**

Thank you Team for the dedicated service.

From my perspective, we must at all cost avoid becoming Pleasant Valley or Hyde Park.

We need to anchor on our hamlets as distinct and historic identities (keep Bangall and Stanfordville separate).

We need to minimize development.

Regards,

Mark Lagus

45 Hunns Lake Rd

In the Hamlet of Bangall

**19.**

## **Comments on the Draft Comprehensive Plan**

**john hughes**

To Comprehensive Plan Committee Members,

Thank you for sharing with the community the Stanford Comprehensive Plan. Clearly a high-quality product, its thoroughness provides the reader with an illuminating discussion and analysis of the factors affecting Stanford's economy and quality of life.

However, despite the many common-sense recommendations included in the Comprehensive Plan, there is one in particular with which I disagree.

Specifically, at the outset, the Plan notes that one of the major revisions to the 2012 Draft Plan is the removal of a recommendation for a "Planned Development District" in the hamlet of Stanfordville. In fact, what's missing from the current plan is an acknowledgement that Stanford needs a central village to attract the youth and other residents alike.

The Plan notes that the population of Stanford is growing older in dramatic fashion. One of the key drivers of this highly unfavorable trend is the lack of jobs in the area. However, the other contributing factor is the total absence of any central locale to meet, socialize and shop.

Accordingly, I recommend that the Plan be revised to include a recommendation to foster the development of a central village in Stanfordville, with the requisite higher density allowance.

Sincerely,

John Hughes

Stanford Resident