

*New Paltz Times, January 1, 2009*

### **Just to set the record straight**

In response to Mr. Kraus's letter regarding the Rivendell issue, I would like to correct him on a couple of important items. One, I did not sell the property to the current owners. I was the listing broker only. Secondly, leasing our property for the agricultural use was genuine since I would like to retain the property for that use and not a cul-de-sac of homes. I spoke with Mr. Ransom about developing the property in stages for agriculture, benefiting us both and retaining an open space as well.

As for Wallkill View Farm preserving what is left of rural New Paltz, that is rather humorous in light of the property being a flood plain.

The point was that the community is willing to look the other way while they exceed zoning regulations and don't apply the same criteria to the proposed winery.

Whether the winery succeeds or not is of no consequence to me. I do feel very strongly that denying the agricultural designation for that property was biased and wrong. The issue of retailing and other related issues can be limited by building and zoning codes applied to all agricultural businesses equal handedly.

*Harry C Tabak*

*New Paltz*