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> Proceedings

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: All right. The next item on the agenda $I$ think is why everybody is here. The next item on the agenda is request of Jack Lieberman, 111 South Liberty Drive, Application Number 23-02, for an area variance.

The area variance Number One is the north parking. It's Chapter 215, Article V, Section 215-15A, Attachment 16, Table of Bulk Requirements Part II, Use Group H, Column 7 requires minimum side yard of 20 feet. Proposed side yard of five feet, 5.4 feet. A variance of 14.6 is needed.

West side driveway, Chapter 215, Article V, Section 215-15A, Attachment 16, Table of Bulk Requirements Part II, Use Group H, Column 7 requires minimum side yard -- can you please --

MR. MacCARTNEY: Can you keep it down there, please?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: We can't hear.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Use Group $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Column} 7$ requires minimum side yard of 20 feet.
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Proposed side yard is six. Variance necessary is 14 feet.

North retaining wall height,
Chapter 215, Article VI, Section 215-24C requires fence, wall setback equal to two thirds of the fence height where fence height exceeds six feet. The proposed wall is eight feet, requires 5.4 feet setback, three-foot setback provided. Variance necessary is 2.4 feet.

Is the applicant or representative present?

MR. DeGENNARO: Yes.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Nicole, has there been any information on applications or affidavits of mailing?

THE CLERK: Say that again.
MR. MacCARTNEY: Did you receive
affidavits of postings and mailing?
THE CLERK: Yes. Yes.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: And if you could identify yourself and who you're with.

MR. DeGENNARO: Ken DeGennaro, Brooker Engineering.

## Proceedings

PUBLIC SPEAKER: That's for the fan, not you.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: I'll take a motion to open the public hearing.

BOARD MEMBER ANGINOLI: So moved.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Second?
BOARD MEMBER LYNCH: Second.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: All in favor?
(Response of aye was given.)
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Okay.
MR. DeGENNARO: Hi, my name is Ken
DeGennaro. I am the civil engineer for the project. I work for Brooker Engineering, and my office is at 74 Lafayette Avenue, Suffern, New York.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Can you repeat your name? I can't hear you.

MR. DeGENNARO: Ken DeGennaro.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Mr. DeGennaro, if you could just kind of go through the three variances that you're seeking and just kind of give us a little bit of background on it.

MR. DeGENNARO: Sure. So the project requires three variances as were contained in
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the pulbic notice. The variances are area variances pertaining to the parking and grading configurations of the property. They do not pertain to the actual building themselves or the density that is being proposed for the floor area.

So the first variance is on the north, north side of the property. We need a variance for parking spaces that are proposed in that location. They are located within the side yard similar to the adjacent property to the north, the medical office building complex. The variance requested is, the side yard has a dimension of 20 feet, and the parking spaces would be 5.4 feet offset from the property line. So therefore, we need a variance of 14.6 feet.

We also at that location require a, or are requesting a variance for the retaining wall that is proposed. The height of the retaining wall is based on the distance from the property line. So we need a variance of 2.4 feet based on that retaining wall height.

The third variance is along the west
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side driveway of the property. That's the rear. The driveway encroaches into the side yard. This is measured after the buffer along that property line, which is to remain. And the side yard has a dimension of 20 feet. And the provided side yard at the maximum encroachment of the driveway is six feet. So we are requesting a variance of 14 feet for the driveway. And that is located along the northwest corner of the site.

So those are the three variances that are being requested. And that is what the focus of the $Z B A$ review is based on.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Any questions from the Board?

MR. MacCARTNEY: Can I just start, as a lawyer? Because I've been looking at the plans. I can't tell where that third variance is. I don't see a number that says, that's matching up with the variance that you're asking for. Can you just clarify for the Board where that is and what it is?

MR. DeGENNARO: I'm sorry. You want me to go through all three or the one --
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MR. MacCARTNEY: The one in particular, the west side driveway, the last of the three that you just mentioned.

MR. DeGENNARO: Right. So on the plan, it currently shows a dimension of 7.2 feet, which is greater than the six feet that was requested for the original application. And that's a function of some site plan revisions that were made when there was another question regarding parking and residential. So we left the original application as is. We're requesting a slightly higher variance. But the actual number on the plan is 7.2 feet.

MR. MacCARTNEY: So that's the spot, the 7.2?

MR. DeGENNARO: Yes.
MR. MacCARTNEY: And you built in about a foot, a 1.2, you know, leeway.

MR. DeGENNARO: Correct.
MR. MacCARTNEY: Okay.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: How long is that
driveway that you're requesting a variance for?
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MR. DeGENNARO: So that's the maximum dimension. But the encroachment into the side yard, starting from zero, extending out to 7.2, it's a radius and going back to zero, it's a length, full length of 160 feet. So it's not 160 feet at 7.2 with the encroachment.

MR. MacCARTNEY: And the second variance, the wall variance, is that the wall that we see on the plan that's on that north side, that runs the length of those parking spots?

MR. DeGENNARO: Correct.
MR. MacCARTNEY: Near where the 5.4 is?
MR. DeGENNARO: Yes.
MR. MacCARTNEY: And that's a -- the wall that you're proposing is eight feet tall. And the code requires the setback to be two thirds of the height.

MR. DeGENNARO: Yes.
MR. MacCARTNEY: And so you're providing three feet, but it needs to be 5.4 feet. Is that the -- do I have that right or did I get it backwards?
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MR. DeGENNARO: The maximum height based on that setback would be three feet. And we are proposing -- it's, I think we're proposing eight-foot maximum. So we would be allowed --

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: And is that all
commercial property, as you understand it, to the north there?

MR. DeGENNARO: Yes. With its own retaining wall. So again, the height of the retaining wall varies. The maximum height as it kind of goes into grade, the maximum height of the wall is 8.2 feet. And that's shown on the profile within the drawings. So -- I'm sorry, let me just go through the exact notes. So the eight-foot high wall would require a 5.4-foot setback. We were providing a three-foot setback. So the variance requires 2.4 feet.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: And what is the purpose of the higher wall to --

MR. DeGENNARO: It's just to match existing grade from the adjacent property. So we have our building elevations set. And
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through the course of the Planning Board review and TAC review, we actually lowered the first floor elevation to reduce the scale of the building. So this retaining wall variance originally was being requested for a higher degree of variance. But the retaining wall was lowered in height as a result of lowering the building garage elevation.

And we have a garage. We have an access road on the north side that leads from 9W into the garage. We could only come up at certain grade, maximum grade, maximum slope. And it's, we have -- let's see.

We have about 50 feet from the building face to the property line. So we have the access road in between the building base and parking permitted on that access road. And that is dictated by maximum slopes you could have, you know, for a parking area to be practical and including having the drop of the slope. So what's, what you can't get back down to grade, which we build the retaining wall. So that's why we have a retaining wall at that location, to max grade
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at the property line. And again, it's
similar to the retaining wall that's on the adjacent property.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: And this height was as a result of a discussion with the Planning Board?

MR. DeGENNARO: Correct. It was reduced as per discussion with the Planning Board.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: And that was their recommendation.

MR. DeGENNARO: Their recommendation was to try to minimize the overall impact of the height of the building. So we lowered from -- from lowest floor to ceiling remained the same. That dimension remained the same. But instead of siting it higher in elevation, because the ground slopes from back to front, it slopes downhill, so we originally had it set higher in elevation within the slope and the topography of the property. Having the building set higher in elevation caused it to be, you know, slightly more prominent.

In the Planning Board's review, the recommendation was made to investigate means
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to decrease the effect of the height of the building, of which that was lowering the first floor elevation on the site. So we reduced that. And as a result, kind of a tangential result, the retaining wall height was reduced as well because everything, all of the proposed conditions grade just became lower. The retaining wall height was.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Now, did the three variances requested, are they all as a result of discussions you had with the Planning Board?

MR. DeGENNARO: Yes. It was. We could eliminate this retaining wall if we eliminated parking in that area. That would have required a waiver of the Planning Board and not a variance for, you know, allowing a reduction in parking spaces. They thought it was more important to have the full parking space requirement for the zoning code, of which we proposed at this location along the north property line, which resulted in a grade of six feet. So if we didn't have that extra 20 feet of parking space, we certainly
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could either eliminate the wall or reduce it in height, to which a variance would not be required.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: And John, were you
part of those discussions, too?
MR. HAGER: Not really. I was present for them, but I wasn't part of the discussion.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Board, are there any questions?

BOARD MEMBER ANGINOLI: In developing this plan.

MR. DeGENNARO: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER ANGINOLI: Is there any way
that you can develop them to eliminate the need of variances?

MR. DeGENNARO: In our opinion, we cannot. There were several other variances that were on the original site plan. And just, I guess for the record also, this plan has undergone multiple iterations starting in 2019. And this was what we feel is kind of barebones variances that are need to advance the project.
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The parking and the retaining wall
request, we -- in discussions we had with our interpretation of the situation as well, since they do abut commercial property that's developed in a similar fashion, we certainly did not think those variances were extreme or would cause any detriment, you know. The driveway in the rear, yes, it does encroach into the rear yard.

But again, this scenario already has a 30-foot buffer zone before the start of the measurement of the required yard. So there's a fair amount of non-disturbed area that will remain in that area where the driveway does encroach into the yard. And, you know, there are significant opportunities for landscaping and planting, and honestly, less development than what currently exists with respect to the barn, the house, and the other features.

So again, that was a design feature that our design team, along with review from the Planning Board, thought was a variance that did not result in any significant impact.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: So would they be
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amenable to adding vegetation in that 30 -foot buffer zone?

MR. DeGENNARO: Yes. Yes. A
landscaping plan has been provided to the Planning Board with, you know, with replanting of that area for screening.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Sorry, Joe. I didn't mean to interrupt.

MR. MacCARTNEY: And I'm sorry. Did you say you submitted one, or you're going to submit one?

MR. DeGENNARO: We've submitted it several times. Revised as to the layout was revised, and additional plantings in accordance with comments received from both the Planning Board and the Planning Board professionals.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Sorry to interrupt.
BOARD MEMBER ANGINOLI: In terms, we conducted a site visit. And the property was not marked.

MR. DeGENNARO: Okay.
BOARD MEMBER ANGINOLI: So it made it virtually impossible for us to really see
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where it was and what the scope of the variances were. All that was marked were the holes for bedrock, really.

MR. DeGENNARO: Okay. Okay. BOARD MEMBER ANGINOLI: You have to have it marked.

MR. DeGENNARO: Okay.
BOARD MEMBER LYNCH: Now, how many parking spots is on that north side right there? How many is that, how many parking spots would it affect on your number of apartments that you have for this building?

MR. DeGENNARO: There are 20 parking spaces in that area. There are also four vegetation islands between spaces.

BOARD MEMBER LYNCH: I mean, if you just, if you took that and made it compliant, because I know you moved parking spots around very easily. You did that from the last plan that was presented to us, showing that you were going to look for an area variance on the previous one. But as soon as you found out it was an area variance, you changed it, the plans, to present us with this one.
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So if you, you know, do something with those parking spots and rearrange it around once again, see what you can do there.

Because we didn't have a good look at it to measure it out, to see the extra variance, what you're asking for. But if you can move spots around that easily, you may want to give it a go.

MR. DeGENNARO: We've already moved spots from the residential area. That was based on the interpretation of that parking being a use variance. One potential alternative would be to designate the parking as parking for compact cars. It would decrease the stall lengths slightly. We could look into that. You see that from time to time. It's certainly an alternative.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Anything else, John?
Any questions?
BOARD MEMBER STRIETER: Well, I want to follow up on Joe's question. Are you saying that it's not possible to build a structure that would eliminate these variances? I mean, yes or no? I mean, is it possible?
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MR. DeGENNARO: It's possible. It's possible.

BOARD MEMBER STRIETER: All right. I
mean, before when he asked, you said no.
MR. DeGENNARO: Well, the question was yes or no, and is it possible to build a structure that doesn't need variances.

BOARD MEMBER STRIETER: Right.
MR. DeGENNARO: So, yes. The answer is yes, it's possible.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Less units.
MR. DeGENNARO: But it's a difficult site to develop. The topography is changing. There's a fair amount of roadwork involved. So there is economics involved. And it's not the purview of the Board, but in order to see this land get redeveloped, it's a combination of items that need to be balanced.

And it also, just to reiterate on the history, the original project was two alternatives shown to TAC. Each had 100 units. And one was the alternative similar to this. The other one was an alternative with two separate buildings.
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The initial feedback was to move forward with the single building. We did that. And we reduced the density to 88 units from 100.

Additional discussions were had.
Reviews were done. And we now did drop from 88 to 86 units. So we have been, through the course of the project's development and review, we have been reducing units. And right now, the applicant -- this is
(inaudible) to present to the ZBA.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Excuse me. Can I just -- it's very hard to hear as it is. We just need --

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Get a better sound system.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Well, we don't have one. So if we can just keep it back -- we don't want to be here all night. It's already hot, it's uncomfortable. I appreciate the assistance from the crowd. But the best way to get through this stuff is just try to keep the minimum, the noise down to a minimum. We'll try to be as -- we'll project as well we can. Any other questions?
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BOARD MEMBER KEEGAN: At the meeting with the Planning Board, when the planner was here, okay, and he advised us that the floor area ratio didn't apply in this particular case, okay, I asked him, well, if the floor area ratio doesn't apply, what limits the size of this building? I mean, if it doesn't apply, then we could build the Empire State Building. And he said no, that the parking and the side yards and the front yards and everything would determine the size of the building. Were you there at that meeting?

MR. DeGENNARO: I certainly was. And I believe the Building Inspector made the determination or the request that your Board, the Zoning Board of Appeals, make the interpretation with respect to the floor area ratio, whether or not it applies.

BOARD MEMBER KEEGAN: That's correct.
But what I'm saying is in the absence of the floor area ratio, okay, we were told that the number of parking spaces, okay, and the requirements in the different yards around the project would determine the size of the
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project. Am I right?
MR. DeGENNARO: It certainly
contributes, yes.
BOARD MEMBER KEEGAN: Excuse me?
MR. DeGENNARO: It's one of the
contributing factors that, you know, ultimately present the plan.

BOARD MEMBER KEEGAN: Okay. And then the second part of that was with the recreation, okay, we were putting 200 feet on the ground and 200 feet on the roof, but -- I mean, if my memory serves me correct. Is that right?

MR. DeGENNARO: It was 200 square feet per unit, yes. So it's a combination.

BOARD MEMBER KEEGAN: Okay. And we were told at that time that if we were to determine that that was okay, okay, there wasn't a need for any other variances, okay. That moving the recreation up there gave us ample room to build the building the way it was.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: But I think, Mr. Keegan, where we are is that the --
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BOARD MEMBER KEEGAN: I'm not making a statement. I'm asking a question.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: I know, but let me just respond and then I'll let him finish up. They've gone through -- after we had the discussion about the floor area ratio, they went back to the Planning Board. This is what they came up with. And what this plan requires are three variances. So I'll let you take it from there.

MR. DeGENNARO: These variances have been on this plan in some form or another basically since the beginning. And it was, there was many design constraints for this property. And it was our opinion and, you know, with feedback from the Board and consultants, that the variances that were being requested, given the location and similarly developed areas adjacent to the property, were not significant.

BOARD MEMBER KEEGAN: Okay. Let me, let me just say this. Okay. Asking for these variances is admitting that you don't have the amount of property that you need to build
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this particular building. Right. Okay.
MR. DeGENNARO: I'm sorry. I'm not an attorney.

BOARD MEMBER KEEGAN: Okay.
MR. DeGENNARO: But we can't admit that.
Your Board exists for a reason. That's the reason variances exist.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Really, please. If we could just -- I understand there's a lot of emotion about this, but we want to try to get through this as best we can. So just try to hold your enthusiasm down as much as you can and try to keep the speech down as little as you can so we get through this. It's already hot and muggy here, so it would be a lot easier for everybody. Thank you. Go ahead. BOARD MEMBER KEEGAN: Okay, just one more. What you're asking this Board to do, okay, is to grant these variances, okay, to allow you to build this building.

MR. DeGENNARO: We are asking the Board
to grant these variances to allow us to redevelop the site in this manner.

BOARD MEMBER KEEGAN: Fair enough.
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Okay, thank you.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Any other questions from the Board? Did you get the memorandum from the Rockland County Planning Department dated July 5th?

MR. DeGENNARO: I do not -- dated
July 5th?
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: It's one we got it today ourselves, July 5th.

MR. DeGENNARO: I did not.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Nicole, do you have another copy of that from --

THE CLERK: I think the one from today might have been for the last project we just got over. I have June 30th, from environmental.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: I thought I saw one that said July 5th on it.

BOARD MEMBER DAVIS: Yeah, there is.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: There's one for July 5th, yeah.

THE CLERK: Oh, no. You're right, you're right. I apologize. Yes, I have an extra.
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CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: So we'll probably do the same thing that -- Mr. DeGennaro, we'll give it to you. We'll review it. You'll review it. You can respond back to the points on that one. And we'll still have the public hearing going on here. We'll have it at our next meeting in two weeks. Are there any other questions from the Board?

BOARD MEMBER LYNCH: When are we going to schedule another site visit?

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: So, yeah, so.
BOARD MEMBER LYNCH: We want it marked out.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Yeah. If you could mark that out as best you can for this map, because I was there yesterday. I couldn't make heads or tails of it.

MR. DeGENNARO: That's a fair point.
And I do recall that being requested last time. So in terms of marking out, we're just marking out what is germane to the variances. So we'll mark out the locations of the walls and the location of the encroachment of the driveway into the side yard.
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CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Yeah. If you could make them very visible.

MR. DeGENNARO: Okay.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Because pulling into
the driveway, there's not -- it's very, it's
hard to see the fence there.
MR. DeGENNARO: Okay.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Any other requests on
the staking out? He's going to stake out where the three variances are going to be required.

BOARD MEMBER LYNCH: Okay.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Fair to everybody?
BOARD MEMBER DAVIS: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: So we'll do the site -- we have to do the site visit this Saturday if we're going to have it for the next --

THE CLERK: It's either this Saturday or
next Saturday.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Any preferences?
BOARD MEMBER LYNCH: Next Saturday. MR. DeGENNARO: Next Saturday would be better.
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BOARD MEMBER DAVIS: 15th.
BOARD MEMBER ANGINOLI: 15th, you said. CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: July 15th. BOARD MEMBER ANGINOLI: What's that? BOARD MEMBER DAVIS: July 15th. CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: July 15th at 9:00. BOARD MEMBER DAVIS: And make sure that it's marked so we can see it, please.

MR. DeGENNARO: I will take pictures of the flags and with the map, and I'll send that to you in advance.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Any other questions from the Board? All right, so what I'm going to do is I'm going to open it up to questions from the town. Given the number of people here, I'm going to ask you to keep your questions to about three minutes, and specific to the three variances that are here, right.

We can't -- if you just don't like the idea that they're building something here, there's nothing that's before this Board that says they can't do it. What they're here for are three different variances. That's for
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parking, and a wall, and a driveway. So limit them to them. Try to keep it to three minutes. If I see you're drifting, I'll try to guide you back on the path. But just to keep things crisp and targeted, I'm going to ask that of the questions.

Yeah, and if somebody has asked the question, I mean, ask it again. It means it's important. But we think all the questions are important, anyway. So if somebody has asked your question, and you don't need to ask it again, that's great. If you have a point, that's (inaudible).

The idea here is to elicit public input. I'm not looking to discourage you. I'm just looking to be efficient with our time and temperature here, so. Given that, are there any questions from the public? Yes, sir?

MR. POTANOVIC: Comments.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Comments, sure.
Again, targeted, three minutes.
MR. POTANOVIC: Good evening, Members the Zoning Board, members of the public. My name is George Potanovic. I live at 597 Old
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Gate Hill Road in Stony Point. I'm President of the Stony Point Action Committee for the Environment, SPACE.

One of the comments I want to make first to the Board and to the Town Attorney is whether or not the applicant has met the minimum legal requirement to notify the public of tonight's meeting. There was no notice published in the Rockland County Times that I saw this week. I called up the editor, and he said he never received a legal notice of the agenda for this meeting.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Sorry, just --
MR. POTANOVIC: Excuse me. I wanted public access.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: No, no, no. Listen.
All questions are directed to me and now the attorney will listen.

MR. POTANOVIC: Okay. And the public access to this meeting is important. The people are here tonight not because they received notices in the mail. Probably because I sent something out, and maybe other people sent it out. And that's why they know
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about this meeting. Not because you notified them. Not because you notified them.

In fact, you withheld the agenda last week when $I$ asked for a copy of it. I had to do a FOIL request. And the agenda was only published on the website yesterday. Morning. Okay, so that's ridiculous to have a public hearing on such an important application and not give the public sufficient advance notice --

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: You don't need to yell at us.

MR. POTANOVIC: -- to know about the meeting. We're happy that people showed up tonight, and I appreciate you being here.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: You don't need to yell at us.

MR. POTANOVIC: Okay. Well, I can talk loud if I want. And you can listen if you want. Okay.

So it was no notice in the
Rockland County Times. I don't know if you have a copy of the record. Is it legally required for the applicant or for the Town to
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put a legal notice in the newspaper prior to the public hearing? That's my understanding, and I've attended a lot of Planning and Zoning Board meetings over the years. And it's not publicly noticed. Is this even a legal public hearing?

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Well, Mr. Potanovic, I can cancel the whole meeting, have everybody walk out of here and we got nothing done, so. MR. POTANOVIC: Oh, so you're saying that it's not a legal meeting and you're going to hold the meeting, anyway.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: I didn't -- don't put words in my mouth.

MR. POTANOVIC: Well, I'd like to know. Please let me know. If you didn't notify the people, there's a lot of people who are not here tonight.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Ask your question, Mr. Potanovic.

MR. MacCARTNEY: Nicole, did we receive an affidavit of publication?

THE CLERK: Yes.
MR. MacCARTNEY: And do we have proof
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that it was published?
THE CLERK: Yes. And the publication is right here as well.

MR. POTANOVIC: Okay. What date was it published, on two weeks ago?

THE CLERK: June 8th.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: So you can apologize to --

MR. POTANOVIC: Well, I'm sorry. The thing is, I had most of the, most of the copies of the Rockland County Times. It was probably one I didn't have. Okay, so it was done way back on June 8th. But that does not also say that the problem was that the, is the agenda, which usually is published a week in advance. It was only published a day in advance. And that's not sufficient notice, in my view in any case. So you didn't go out of your way to let the public know about this meeting.

This is a meeting, a request for a conditional use, okay. There's a certain criteria for conditional use. And it does relate to what we're talking about, okay. I
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didn't want to say that. Is it shall be subject to location, size, and character that would be in harmony with the appropriate and orderly development of the district. That's one of the conditions for a conditional use.

And so you're being asked for variances here. One the Zoning Board Members raised a question, can you build this without the variances? Should the applicant be able to build this without the variances if it's a use that fits in with the conditional use of this property? Why are we even considering giving additional area variances, like from looking at nailing the two area variances, the parking and the west side drive.

You have a required side yard on the north parking, 20 feet, and the applicant only has 5.4 feet. So they're asking for a variance of 14.6 feet. And on the west side driveway, the requirement is 20 feet, okay. And the proposed side yard is only six. So you have 14 -foot variance that's being required. So it's more than twice of what is required is not available. So there is a

## Proceedings

shortage of space here.
The -- as you know, the -- and I did not get a copy of the most recent Planning Board agenda, Planning Board, Department of Planning review. I understand it came, one came out just very recently. The one I was able to get a copy of was from March.

But in the case of the March Department of Planning review, they suggest disapproving this project. They say that the proposed building is massive in scale, exceptionally well with the content of the surrounding neighborhoods, the ability of existing infrastructure to accommodate the mixed use. There's many concerns that they have. And the conditional use, by definition, is subject to a higher standard of review.

Okay, and I know the Planning Board is reviewing this for site plan. I realize that. But you're part of that because you're being asked to do a variance, which if you give these variances, that just adds to the idea that the Planning Board can give the higher density that's being requested by the
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applicant, and we shouldn't be doing that.
What's our obligation to ask -- what's our obligation to give them a bigger project? We don't have any obligation for that. So it's more financially better for him, but it's feeding us with potential traffic problems.

The Rockland County Department of Highways has asked for a traffic study. I don't think the traffic study has been done. Why are we having this public hearing and not even have any traffic study to look at from the state? We don't have any information. We don't have any information from which to even understand what the impact is going to be .

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Mr. Potanovic, so others can get a chance, you want to come back later on.

MR. POTANOVIC: Okay. There are other comments that I would like to add. And I appreciate your having the public hearing. But I think you have to announce public hearings with more public notices. And I'm
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very discouraged with the fact that you did not let the public know about this meeting in advance. And, but I'm happy that everybody's here. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Anybody else? Please rise and I'll recognize you. All right. And just so you know, you can also -- after we're done here, we will take written requests and comments, and we'll incorporate them into the record.

MR. CERRATI: I don't know if I have a question for this. But it might be at the end.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Could you just -- I'm sorry. Could you just give us your name?

MR. CERRATI: Arthur Cerrati, 8 Michael Court, Stony Point.

MR. MacCARTNEY: You have to give your name and address, please.

MR. CERRATI: Arthur Cerrati, 8 Michael Court, Stony Point, New York.

MR. MacCARTNEY: Thank you.
MR. CERRATI: I stood in front of this group about five years ago, about variances
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for new construction. I love building. I'm, I'm a contractor. I own my own business. I'm a capitalist. I want to maximum every dollar that $I$ invest in a project, I do.

Maybe you bought the wrong piece of property, my friend. You've got to figure out what you could put on this property that doesn't piss off this entire community.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Mr. Cerrati. I'll let
you go on with this, but if you could focus your questions on the three variances.

MR. CERRATI: I am focusing. I just did. I'm saying he bought a piece of property that he shouldn't have bought. Or we ratchet down your project so it fits within the confines of our community.

That is your job on this Board. Okay. That's what you guys should be looking at. But every variance that we grant for projects that just don't belong, we are opening up doors for more problems down the road. We need to stay focused on what we're doing.

Mr. Keegan at the end, thank you. You had a wonderful comment to make, and hundred
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percent. And I hope that you can convince the rest of this Board that this project -maybe it does belong here. Maybe you should be developing it. You got to bring it down.

It is -- those variances just means it's too big. We need to lower it. And how it's not going to be a security problem for the future. That is not a place to be putting that many homes and businesses.

So no questions, just comments. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: I'm just going to ask, you don't have to comply, but if you can just withhold your applause, we'll get through this faster. I understand everybody's emotions. I appreciate your positions. But we're going to be here longer.

Yes, sir. We have a speaker. Please.
MR. EVANGELISTA: Can you flip this over
for me? Good evening. I'm David
Evangelista, 54 Wilderness Drive,
Stony Point. Thank you for your time.
First of all, since someone said, yeah, I want to thank the residents for coming out
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on a night like this to something like this. It's been encouraging over the last couple years to see people, no matter what side you're on, coming out and demanding the transparency and the information and making your voices heard. So please keep doing that.

I'm also encouraged, like the previous speaker, to some of the things I've heard the Board ask and inquire about. So if my comments -- I'll try to keep them on point. But there's some of you who know who I am. I'm a simple kind of guy. I've lived here, I've lived here many years. 60 years I've been in Stony Point. 61, to be exact. And I don't like what I see.

And I'm looking here at this variance for this west side and north side. If I'm looking at this drawing right, that's the Govan Drive side. Those are residential properties, longtime Stony Point residential property owners. All right. Who are being asked to give up -- I'm going to have five feet from my property, I'm going to have
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parking. I'm going to have this retaining wall getting a variance, where if something happens to this wall, it could affect my property. I think you need to realize that these are real residents, and this affects people.

I'm also looking at, you know, I do a little bit of numbers. And I understand the economics of making a project work. But I looked at some of the information that's out there, and I did a count. And on a weekend day, when all the residents are there with two or more cars per unit, and some guests, and the retail is open, there is not enough parking even with the variances.

Where are they going? Are they going to park in the senior residential thing across the street on 9W? Are they going to park on Govan Drive?

So I'm going to leave you with this. I think people have said it, but I'm going to say it in a different way. This Board, this is -- there are other issues under the purview of the Planning Board and other
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agencies such as the County. This project has a lot of problems that we all can see. What I'm asking you is you do not empower it to go forward by granting a variance for something that doesn't fit and doesn't make sense. Right.

Where is this traffic going? This is not downtown, all these little towns and villages in New Jersey that have mass transit and a village where people walk to shop and walk to eat. They have to drive somewhere.

You do not need to empower -- Patsy goes back a long way. Is Patsy still here? All right, Patsy goes back a long way. Maybe even longer than me, I'm not sure. But she said it right. When you buy a property, you know what you're buying. If it doesn't fit, don't make exceptions. That's the way this town was built, right.

So I think you need to consider that. I think you need to consider even simple things, like drive up and down 9W. Do we need more retail? No. There's plenty of retail.
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Don't empower them to build something that doesn't fit, doesn't conform, and doesn't meet our criteria. And those exceptions, those exceptions become the rule. You bring an exception, whether this is built or not, whether it includes the Planning Board or not, you create an exception for these variances, now it's there. And somebody can come right in afterwards and use it again.

So I'm going to leave you with that concept. Your goal is to protect the public of Stony Point. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Anybody else? Have them come on up, the Yankee fan.

MR. HART: Hi. I'm Greg Hart,
5 Rochelle Court, Stony Point. I do have a bunch of questions. I apologize if anything's been addressed. I have a hearing disability. I have otosclerosis. I've lost 35 decibels in each ear. I can't hear any of you guys. I even brought speakers for that.

So, you're the Town Attorney? Can I maybe get your information so $I$ can request

## Proceedings

an ADA accommodation? Just a speaker, something, because $I$ can't participate.

MR. MacCARTNEY: You can certainly request it, yes.

MR. HART: Okay. So, thank you, I appreciate that.

I do have questions about these variances. So, do these variances -- because I'm, I don't know anything, really, about this. But does this set a precedent that leaves, like, the Town liable in the future? Like, if you grant these variances and then someone else wants to do an equal, similar project, that it's granted for them and then it's not granted for the next people, that the Town is liable for lawsuits or anything?

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: There are five criteria, balancing criteria that we use to make a decision based on all the information we get, including information we're getting here tonight from all the residents. I'd love to see more people come to all of our meetings. Normally, there's nobody here. We actually had to move because we expected
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overflow.
For the most part, there's five balancing criteria. We discuss -- everything we discuss, we discuss in public so you know what our positions are as we discuss them. So that's generally what we do. Five criteria, then come to a decision.

MR. HART: Okay, thank you. Now I also, with these variances, it seems like I've been, I've been starting to read all this stuff. I've got laws with me here. You know, the mixed use zoning that was passed. And it seems like our zoning laws are good.

The only problem that's here, that why they need these variances, is because there's too many units in this building. If this building -- because it says in the mixed use zoning, the residential mixed use in the business zoning district, because I mean, we all know the retail is a -- they don't care about that. It's to put in apartments.

They need to have two parking spaces for each unit. Because there's too many units, more than should be there, they're requesting

## Proceedings

variances on other things. There's a simple solution here. Less units means no variances.

And that's what I'd like to see you guys uphold. We have good laws that are in front of us, and the solution is simple. And I'm hoping that you guys will view it like that and say hey, look, there is a solution here. Fewer units. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: I want to make one other note, too. We have a stenographer here. So if you don't see us officially taking notes, we're more --

PUBLIC SPEAKER: We can't hear you.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: We have a stenographer here. So if you don't see us taking notes, it's because we know we're going to capture the dialogue from the stenographer. We'd rather listen to you in realtime than sit there and take a bunch of notes on our own.

Is there any, are there any other, any other residents who have questions? Let me have a hand up. I have two people spoken already. All right, you.
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MR. GALANTI: Gary Galanti, 18 River Road, Stony Point. I do have one specific question, which we never seem to get the number. As far as I understand, there's 88 units here. If you don't give him the variance, how many can he build? What's the number?

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Are you prepared to answer that, or you're not able to answer that tonight? Or do you want to just kind of give a comment.

MR. DeGENNARO: It's 86 units that are being proposed. And I cannot answer that question without coordinating with the architect.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: So he said --

MR. DeGENNARO: We would have to coordinate with the architect that designed the building itself and the footprint of the building in order to answer that question. It's not a simple of -- it's not a simple calculation.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: So as it stands right now, he said there's 86 units right now. And
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he really couldn't give you an answer off the top of his head if they were going to reduce that number.

MR. GALANTI: Well, if that's -- that's the one question $I$ would like an answer to. And then a couple comments from living on River Road, which runs parallel to 9W. In the last couple years, I've noticed a large increase in traffic during rush hours. Okay. There's cars coming from 9W, come down Tomkins Avenue, and then they go up to where Ba Mar is, and then take River Road all the way around rather than use 9W.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Okay. Does that impact this at all, or?

MR. GALANTI: Well, it's going to, he's going to impact the traffic coming down 9W because there's going to be more people trying to do that. And on top of that, you have Eagle Bay or whatever the final call was, and Ba Mar that still hasn't opened, and you're talking a lot of cars heading down River Road.

And now I also notice, since I'm
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retired, school buses. They're using River
Road to get back to the yard in Haverstraw.
Go sit down there at 3:30 and 4:30 and see
how many buses go by with no kids on them.
Those are my comments. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Thank you very much.
I guess next? Okay.
MS. O'CONNOR: First, I also want to thank you guys because this job is not easy. It's a lot of time. It's a lot of research. It's a lot. So I want to --

BOARD MEMBER DAVIS: Name and address.
MS. O'CONNOR: My name is Deirdra O'Connor. I'm on Cross Creek Lane. And I just also want to make a point that this isn't about emotions or pissing people off. This is about, and relevant comments are about the health and safety of our community and our town and future generations as well. We've always been a close, inclusive community. And I also grew up in Haverstraw, and we are one community as well.

So I heard some things I had a little bit of concern about. You know, we talked,
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there was talk about slopes, there was talk about retaining walls, and there was talk about an access road, okay, that these variances would impact.

So my question is, and it's something that I've been asking the town to do for a few years now, has there been a comprehensive strategic collaborative plan made with the police chief, the school superintendent, the environmental engineers, all the people that have knowledge that are without your boundaries, you know, your one brain. And so we need the expertise. How will this impact school buses, emergency vehicles, you know, roads on that car daily, all emergency evacuation?

So we need a demography report. We need environmental, traffic. All of these things need to be done, and that's what keeps emotions in place. It has to do with intelligent, researched conversation. And asking the Board to (inaudible). So thank you.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: I just -- so just so
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you know, those are all very valid points. But those aren't in the purview of the Zoning Board. Those are the purview of the Planning Board. So while you come here and express your opinions, $I$ would encourage you, when these come up in the Planning Board, to go to those and raise these same issues. We have, like I said, there are three variances that we look at. Anything beyond that, we have no control over, so.

Any other person? Yes, I promised the woman in front. Okay. You're next.

MS. MARI: Hi. My name is Colleen Mari. I live at 142 Route 210 in Stony Point. I am also a real estate agent in the county. And I just want to say the fact that $I$ live in this town and there is -- I couldn't hear a word any of you people said. From the get go.

I buried a friend today. And I made sure I came back in time to get to the Zoning Board, and I didn't hear a word you said. It's pathetic. And this is my town that I love. So I am very -- this is
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heart-wrenching, that the fact that the people in the back cannot hear what you are saying. And it might be very valid. But what does it matter if you can't hear it?

So I have no questions. I appreciate your time. But it's very sad.

MS. ROBERTS: Theresa Roberts, 34 Nordica Circle, Stony Point. I've never been to one of these meetings before, so I agree with you that it's a lot of us diving into the experience. So my first question is does granting these variances improve the property value or the way of life for the existing residents in the surrounding area? That's my first question.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: What's the answer?

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Well, this will be part of the public discussion, so.

MS. ROBERTS: Okay. Then the next one is do these variances improve the impact on traffic in the area? Because I know some of them refer to parking. So I don't know if that's to help with the entering or exiting of the area. Has a traffic impact study been
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done? Those are my questions.
My only comment is $I$ don't appreciate the not significant quote that he believes he's asking for. I don't do building, but it seems to me that the minimum says 20 feet, and they're asking for one fourth the size of the minimum, which is half of half of the minimum. That's significant to us. That's why we're all here.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Anybody else?
MR. MAHER: Good evening, Board Members.
Kevin Maher, 130 Central Highway, Stony Point.

I wasn't born and raised in this town. I came here in 2011. And as some of the Board Members are aware, I was the Town Engineer for about six years. And I participated in a lot of applications in front of the Planning and Zoning Boards as a consultant to the Board.

So I look at this application and say to myself, why. Even the variances that are being asked of this Board, in my professional opinion, are self-created variances. And as
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such, I think you should be asking the applicant to prove financial profit. Why can't he build smaller and still make a profit?

And by doing that, chances are these variances would disappear, and the project would be more in tune with the character of the neighborhood. This project is more suited for Bruckner Boulevard or Tremont Avenue in the Bronx where I grew up. Not in Stony Point.

To even think about the granting variances, as this other gentleman just said, you're going to set a dangerous precedent in this town. Because if you do it once, you got to keep doing it. Otherwise, you're going to be arbitrary and capricious, and you set yourself up for an Article 78 proceeding as a result. I know all about Article 78s. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: All right. We're still open. Anybody else?

MR. ROSADO: Good evening, everyone.
Angel Rosado, 14 Wiles Drive, Stony Point.
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I'm not familiar much with the Zoning Board, but thank you for being here today. Thank you, everyone, for showing up.

Just a question. Are there -- how does the zoning relate to safety? So I know part of the zoning he's asking for is more space for a parking lot, more space for a wall. So when my son's in town riding his bicycle, is he supposed to not pay attention to these extra ordinances because we have this building that three years ago, when I looked in this neighborhood, wasn't there.

I picked this neighborhood because of the people and the community. Not because -and just like the gentleman before me, I came from Southern Boulevard three years ago. This can stay there. We don't need this here. It's not for our kids. It's not for us.

But how about -- so are there any safety metrics that are done, or safety studies on how the kids will be impacted in that direct neighborhood? That's a question for the Board, for the engineer. Are there any
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studies for how this project and these ordinances will impact the kids in the community?

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: So the site plan, the planning is done by the Planning Board.

MR. ROSADO: Okay. And when do those meetings happen?

MR. POTANOVIC: Thursday the 27th.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: 27th at 7:00 here, continued public hearing on this project.

MR. ROSADO: And that's going to be made public, right, as the gentleman said, that should be easy to come. Okay, thank you. I'll be here. Thank you, everyone. Have a good day.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: We can change our zip code to 10461, too.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Anybody else? All
right, so --
PUBLIC SPEAKER: Did everyone hear?
July 27th, 7:00, continued public hearing on the Planning Board on this project. So be here then also. Bring friends.

MR. MULLIGAN: George Mulligan,
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4 Liberty Square Mall, Stony Point. I attended, I've attended, actually, a number of meetings concerning discussions of 111 South Liberty Drive. And I can tell you I am not in favor of this project as it's currently constituted.

I don't believe that this fits in the character of the town of Stony Point. And I do not believe that the Zoning Board should grant the variances that have been requested by the applicant. The applicant has every right to request them. And you have every right to deny them. And that is what I would urge you to do.

And this is not a tangential comment, but looking at the property literally every day for years and years, it is kept in a state of disrepair. In fact, we have had multiple residents, even this year, have had to call because the property itself was not being maintained on the outside. There are still large branches that have fallen and have never been carted away. That could impede emergency services in our community
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from responding and doing the proper job, especially if there is a fire in that building.

And I think, quite frankly, it is very disturbing. And then, you know, I think about it. Well, what will the future portend if this property -- according to me, it's my opinion -- is being kept in such poor condition as we speak right now.

So again, thank you for being here. And
I would thank everybody else that's speaking and showing up tonight. And I do hope you consider the public's comments. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: Anybody else? All right. So I'll move that we close this meeting out today. We'll keep the public hearing open. You'll all get a chance to come back in two weeks, and we can do this some more and have some more comments.

In the meantime, we'll stake out the property. We've gotten -- and I do, I appreciate all your comments. It's hot. It's muggy. It's uncomfortable. And I'll see if we can't get better acoustics in --
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the acoustics $I$ can't do anything about. If there's a way we can get it to project better, I'll see if we can do that.

In the meantime, unless there's anything else, I'll take a motion to close the meeting.

MR. MacCARTNEY: I would take a motion to continue the public hearing to July --

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: So we'll make a motion to continue the public hearing.

BOARD MEMBER LYNCH: I'll second the motion to continue the public hearing.

MR. MacCARTNEY: What's the date?
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: No, no. When is the next -- Nicole?

MR. MacCARTNEY: Nicole, when is the next date?

THE CLERK: The 20th.
CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: So I make a motion to continue this until July 20th.

BOARD MEMBER DAVIS: I make a motion to continue this July 20th.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT: All in favor?
(Response of aye was given.)
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