

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 Table of Contents

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ROCKLAND
TOWN OF STONY POINT : PLANNING BOARD

----- X

In the Matter of the Application

RE: Public

INGAGLIO, Hearing

Applicants.

----- X

May 27th, 2010
7 o'clock p.m.
RHO Building
Five Patriot Drive
Stony Point, New York 10980

HELD BEFORE THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE
TOWN OF STONY POINT:

B E F O R E : PETER MULLER,
Acting Chairman

A p p e a r a n c e s :

THOMAS MC MENAMIN, Member
GLADYS CALLAGHAN, Member
EUGENE KREASE, Member
GERRY ROGERS, Member (Not Present)
KARL JAVENES, Member

CATHERINE FINNERTY for MARY PAGANO,

Secretary to the Board

Reported by:

Randi Vecchione for Patricia A. Puleo,
NYS Certified Court Reporter
and Notary Public

Appearances continued:

FERRICK, LYNCH & MAC CARTNEY, Esqs,
96 South Broadway
South Nyack, New York 10960
BY: DAVID RESNICK, Esq., Special Counsel

WILLIAM SHEEHAN, Town Building Inspector
(Not Present)

LIZ VERRIER, Deputy Town Attorney
(Not Present)

KEVIN P. MAHER, P.E, Town Engineer

ROBERT GENESLAW COMPANY,
Planning Consultants
Two Executive Boulevard - Suite 401
Suffern, New York 10901
BY: MAXIMILIAN STACH, Town Planner
ROBERT GENESLAW, Town Planner
(Not Present)

ATZL, SCATASSA & ZIGLER
Surveyors/Planner for Applicant
234 North Main Street
New City, New York 10956
BY: DAVID ZIGLER, P.E.

And the Public.

PULEO REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION SERVICES

61 Crickettown Road

Stony Point, New York 10980

(845) 429-8986 FAX and Phone

- Proceedings -

(At this time the Pledge of
Allegiance was recited.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Welcome,
everybody. Take the roll, please.

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. McMenamin?

MR. MCMENAMIN: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. Javenes?

MR. JAVENES: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. Kraese?

MR. KRAESE: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Miss Callaghan?

MS. CALLAGHAN: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. Muller?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Yes.

On our agenda is Ingaglio.

MR. EMANUEL: Ira Emanuel, Four
Laurel Road, New City, the attorney for
the applicants.

Mr. Chairman, this is our second

appearance here since we've returned from the ZBA as you may recall.

We needed to obtain some necessary variances in order to accomplish that two-lot subdivision.

- Proceedings -

The subdivision is fairly simple and the concept there is an existing lot, which is oversized for the district. There are three buildings already on the lot. A four-family house, a three-family house, and a one-family house.

The applicant wishes to subdivide the property, so that the four-family house is on one lot and the one and three-family houses are on another lot.

As I mentioned before, we needed to go to the ZBA to obtain relief in order to allow that to happen. That relief was granted.

We came back to the Board at the April meeting, which a negative declaration was granted by this Board and you set it down for a public

hearing.

That's where we are right now.

We're ready for the public hearing.

Hopefully, we will be able to answer

any questions that may come up and try

- Proceedings -

to get an approval for this expeditiously as possible.

Dave, do you want to go over a couple of things?

MR. ZIGLER: Basically, since we first submitted this map, there's been two changes.

The first change was the County wanted us to stay within those curb cuts that are there now. If you look at them, we changed the property line between one and two. It has a little bit of an angle on it as it meets the right-of-way; that way, the applicant can use the existing curb cuts and not cut the sidewalk up and make a new driveway over that.

That's the change in the lots from the very first submission.

The second change is, we gave the Town Engineer a drainage report. And that's for the additional parking area behind lots one and two for parking spaces. And your code requires that

- Proceedings -

area to be paved. The area, right now, is gravelled.

If it's paved, we have to do a little work and put a dry well on each lot to accommodate the additional paving.

What we'd like to ask the Board is, if we can just leave it as it stands today and that would be gravel, so the back parking lots would be gravel and we would probably then put one system in on a lower lot.

The gravelled area exists. The only thing we're doing is proposing to pave it. So, we would ask the Board to just waive that.

The access points from the right-of-way, Main Street, going back past the homes are paved anyway, so

we're just talking about a small area
in the rear. There's really no other
changes. We had no comments from the
County after we adhered to their "don't
change the driveway" codes. And it

- Proceedings -

doesn't need the Health Department,
because we're not changing the sewers.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Before
we go to the Board for comments, I
would like to open the public hearing.

MR. KRAESE: Let me address two
things. Dave, you were saying the code
requires it to be paved?

MR. ZIGLER: The building code
requires it to be a dust proof surface,
and that's been adhered to as being
paved. It's homes usually.

In this case, it's an existing
parking area.

MR. KRAESE: You want us to waive
that stipulation?

MR. ZIGLER: If the Board feels
so, yes.

MR. KRAESE: And the two dry

wells -- that's one of the questions I had. Is that SP1 and SP2?

MR. ZIGLER: Yes. If the plan goes as it's shown and it has to be paved, they both would have to be.

- Proceedings -

If the plan does not, and the Board will allow us to leave the gravelled area, I believe we would have to put only one in. If the Board does make that resolution, we would then modify the drainage report in proof to the Town engineer, and we would be happy to let him make the decision on that, if the Board so wishes.

MR. KRAESE: That was the only question I have for now.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Does anyone have anything to ask before we move on? We have one more question from Gladys.

MS. CALLAGHAN: Will the gravel situation last indefinitely?

MR. ZIGLER: The gravel's been there --

MS. CALLAGHAN: Since the change?

MR. ZIGLER: It's always been
there, that gravel, so it's hard packed
and it's not new.

So, it's going to stay. It's

- Proceedings -

going to be solid because it's lasted there for -- they don't know how many years. Too many.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: I would like to open it up to the public. Would anybody like to ask any questions?

MR. POTANOVIC: George Potanovic, Gate Hill Road. This is a pretty straightforward subdivision. I was curious if the Board could just explain why it's listed as a conditional use.

It looks like a fairly straightforward subdivision.

Could you explain why there was a conditional use listed in the -- what was the conditional use?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: I think -- isn't it because the amount of

buildings and the size of the property?

MR. EMANUEL: I don't know that it requires a conditional use permit of any kind. Quite frankly, until Mr. Potanovic mentioned it, I wasn't

- Proceedings -

aware of it.

MR. POTANOVIC: It was listed on the agenda that way.

MR. EMANUEL: I see that now.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: We'll check with counsel; one second.

MR. POTANOVIC: Is that a zoning issue?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: All the discussions up to this point --- it has not been discussed as conditional.

We believe it might be on the agenda as an error. If it is, we believe this is --

MR. POTANOVIC: If it's a conditional use permit, that's not compliant with the current zoning.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: No, the uses will be in compliance. It's just

because the number of the properties
and the size of the subdivision.

MR. POTANOVIC: The number of
existing homes?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Right.

- Proceedings -

It's an existing home and structure,
but just subdivided into one parcel --

MR. EMANUEL: Perhaps I could
explain, Mr. Chairman.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Please.

MR. EMANUEL: I had alluded to
this in my opening statement when I
mentioned the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Initially, the building inspector
was of the opinion that this was an
expansion of a nonconforming use, and
therefore requires us to go to the
Zoning Board of Appeals.

We went to the Zoning Board of
Appeals and received all of the
necessary approvals that we needed so
that this subdivision could exist.

If you will, it was in the nature
of the use variance, but those

approvals were granted. And as a result, there is no requirement for a conditional use permit or a special permit use or any other kind of permit other than the subdivision.

- Proceedings -

MR. POTANOVIC: Okay. I guess my question is, what are the other lot sizes under the required lot size?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Yes.

MR. POTANOVIC: What are the lot sizes?

MR. EMANUEL: Again, if I may, because we've got a four-family use -- because we have a four-family house on one lot and a three-family house and a one-family house on another lot, it doesn't meet any of the zoning requirements because the zone normally allows only one-family house.

This was vacant land. And we did not have preexisting uses, and the uses were legally preexisting.

Because of that, it does not fit into any of the categories that are in

the zoning code, so there are no minimum lot requirements, there are no side yard requirements, setback requirements, or anything like that.

Those requirements were set forth

- Proceedings -

in the variances that we were given and approvals we were given from the Zoning Board, which basically said that it has to be of this configuration.

MR. POTANOVIC: Just so I understand, a single-family house is allowed on this lot?

MR. EMANUEL: On each lot.

MR. POTANOVIC: How many lots are there?

MR. RESNICK: There's one lot and it's now two lots.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: One lot being divided into two.

MR. POTANOVIC: Three houses?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: One lot.

MR. POTANOVIC: So, the Zoning Board allowed an extension of an additional building --

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: It's a
unique situation where these -- this
home existing was on this lot long
before zoning regulations came in. It
is unique. It's not something that

- Proceedings -

we're just granting.

It's a difficult situation.

MR. POTANOVIC: I see.

MR. STACH: There's no new construction and no additional units. There's currently eight units there today. Tomorrow there will be eight units.

MR. POTANOVIC: So, it's just a lot line change. Thank you very much.

I understand.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: The gentleman in the back, state your name and address, please.

MR. DUKES: My name is Steve Dukes. I live at 70 East Main Street, the lot immediately east of this property. And I guess my major concern is, what's to prevent them from

splitting it again?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: They
can't.

MR. DUKES: Because the County
won't --

- Proceedings -

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Because the Planning Board and Zoning Board will not grant it. That's all been discussed. This division is the way it will be.

MR. DUKES: Okay. All right. That's really only my concern. And I guess I am concerned about the -- what they could do to the property next? I mean --

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Basically, live there the way they are. Really this is, I believe, giving them the right to sell one of those units.

MR. DUKES: What happens if they knock down the one-family house?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: They can't build or expand these homes in any way.

MR. DUKES: So, right now there
are four families on the property.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: But the
buildings has to stay. Everything has
to stay the way it is.

- Proceedings -

There would be two owners; not one owner should they decide to sell, but nothing on the premises can change. It's going to be just the way it is now.

MR. DUKES: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STACH: Additionally, if they were to knock down the one-family house, I believe the code would not allow them to even rebuild it because they would making it more nonconforming.

MR. RESNICK: There's the resolution of what can be done with the property, and it has to remain as it currently is, so there can't be an expansion.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: No expansion. No taking down homes and

building a bigger home.

They just have a unique situation where they have three homes on one piece of property.

Now, they're just asking to

- Proceedings -

divide it so in the future or now sell one of those parcels, but nothing changes as to the size of these buildings.

They will be just the way it is now.

MR. EMANUEL: I agree with that.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Are there any more comments from the public?

At this time I would like to close the public hearing.

Does anyone on the Planning Board have any other questions to ask?

Gene had a concern about waiving the paving. Is that something we can work through?

MR. ZIGLER: Yes.

MR. EMANUEL: As I understand,

Mr. Chairman, the requirement for paving in your subdivision regulations, you have the ability to waive provisions of your subdivision regulations as you deem appropriate.

- Proceedings -

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: I realize we have the ability --

MR. EMANUEL: You have the authority.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: We have the authority. We have members that are concerned about waiving that. We'll hash that out right now.

MR. EMANUEL: That's a different matter.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: We realize we can waive that.

MR. MAHER: I had the opportunity to review the report that was made by Atzl, Scatassa and Zigler and everything is in conformance.

As a matter of fact, the design is a little bit overboard.

They're only required to

compensate for the additional asphalt
pavement on the property and this
design does that and beyond.

So, to not put the asphalt on the
existing gravel area, that's an area

- Proceedings -

that they would not have to compensate for with additional runoff. That's why Mr. Zigler is talking about removing the one dry well. They would not be required to because on that lot they're not increasing the runoff from that lot. Everything would be as it is today.

I have no qualms, either way; if you want to have it paved or not paved.

If it's going to be paved, you need the dry well. No doubt about it.

MR. KRAESE: I'm just a little curious about why they're asking now to waive it now.

MR. EMANUEL: This is the first opportunity we have to ask for it.

MR. KRAESE: You weren't here last month?

MR. EMANUEL: We were, but that was an additional introduction. We needed to have the environmental review taken care of.

MR. ZIGLER: Last month was a

- Proceedings -

discussion about the drainage and water. So, that's why we really didn't ask.

MR. EMANUEL: We didn't have the drainage report at that time.

MR. ZIGLER: It's something we thought of as a better idea.

MR. MCMENAMIN: With regard to this change and Gene's concern about the change, I'd just like to state as far as storm water management and control storm water runoff goes, the State EDC has asked designers to use low impact designs in all new construction, so that more of the water that is runoff is allowed to percolate into the soil.

I would like them to get rid of all of the pavement, but I think this

is a good thing. I think this is a
plus.

I think waiving this is a good
thing and we should consider that the
fact that they're putting in the dry

- Proceedings -

well that he's proposing here, is necessary because of the impervious surfaces that are shown in the drawing.

Now, with the gravel, you'll have percolation and you'll have water return as opposed to running right over the edge.

There's a steep dry well behind this driveway and that water would go right back down to the river. Now, this is an improvement waiver.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: My thoughts are that this structure and homes have been there a very long time.

It's not like new construction, where we're asking to waive the paving and wait and see if we're going to have a water issue.

If we had a water issue, we would

know it already because that has been here a very long time. It hasn't posed a problem all this time.

I would leave it the way it is.

MR. JAVENES: Is there any

- Proceedings -

problems with drainage right now?

MR. ZIGLER: Not that I know of.

It was just a request to -- from early on to have a drainage report. I just forgot about it until last month when it was brought up again.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: You want to make a motion?

MR. MCMENAMIN: I'll make that motion, Mr. Chairman. I think I would like to see the applicant be given the opportunity to waive the lot one here.

MR. ZIGLER: Yes.

MR. MCMENAMIN: And I would ask that we pass this motion.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Do we have a second?

MS. CALLAGHAN: Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: We have

a motion and a second?

Do we have any additional
comments?

MR. KRAESE: My only concern --
I'm not arguing, but I just don't like

- Proceedings -

the Planning Board -- two weeks ago the drainage report was in. I just felt you should have said something then, not now. I agree with what Tom says.

It's been there forever. I understand the situation. I'm not into blacktop on anything --

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Take this into consideration, so you know this on future applicants down the line. Give us a little more notice.

MR. ZIGLER: Yes, I'm sorry about that.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Ms. Finnerty, will you poll the Board?

MS. FINNERTY: Yes.

Mr. McMenamin?

MR. MCMENAMIN: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. Javenes?

MR. JAVENES: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. Kraese?

MR. KRAESE: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Miss Callaghan?

MS. CALLAGHAN: Yes.

- Proceedings -

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. Muller?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Yes.

MR. EMANUEL: -- Mr. Chairman,
was the public hearing closed?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Yes, I
closed it. The waive of the pavement,
is that for lot one and two that you
requested?

MR. ZIGLER: No, it would be just
one of the existing parking areas.

MR. KRAESE: So, you're going to
pave number two?

MR. ZIGLER: Yes, because it has
to be constructed.

MR. KRAESE: You're going to pave
two and put dry well on two?

MR. ZIGLER: Yes, and we're going
to change the report to reflect that.

MR. KRAESE: Again, it wasn't

clear. So, one is --- it is what it
is?

MR. ZIGLER: Yes.

MR. KRAESE: And it's gravel now,
it's going to stay gravel. No dry

- Proceedings -

well.

Number two will be paved and
there will be a dry well?

MR. ZIGLER: Yes.

MR. KRAESE: I'm a little more
comfortable with that.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: We're
going to ask you to come back next
month to change the resolution and
waiving the pavement and we have to
make changes on the map.

Everybody is more comfortable
when we make those changes to the
resolution.

MR. EMANUEL: It's on next month
just for final resolution?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Correct.

MR. EMANUEL: Thank you.

* * *

- Proceedings - ²⁷

cert

STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ROCKLAND
TOWN OF STONY POINT : PLANNING BOARD

----- X

In the Matter of the Application

RE:

VIRGIN MARY & SAINT PACHOMIOUS COPIC
ORTHODOX CHURCH,

Applicants.

----- X

May 27th, 2010
7:40 o'clock p.m.
RHO Building
Five Patriot Drive
Stony Point, New York
10980

HELD BEFORE THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE
TOWN OF STONY POINT:

B E F O R E : PETER MULLER,
Acting Chairman

A p p e a r a n c e s:

THOMAS MC MENAMIN, Member
GLADYS CALLAGHAN, Member
EUGENE KREASE, Member
GERRY ROGERS, Member (Not Present)
KARL JAVENES, Member

CATHERINE FINNERTY for MARY PAGANO,
Secretary to the Board

Reported by:

Randi Vecchione for Patricia A. Puleo,
NYS Certified Court Reporter
and Notary Public

Appearances continued: 29

IRA EMANUEL, Esq. - Atty.for Applicants
Four Laurel Road
New City, New York 10956

FERRICK, LYNCH & MAC CARTNEY, Esqs,
96 South Broadway
South Nyack, New York 10960
BY: DAVID RESNICK, Esq.,Special
Counsel

WILLIAM SHEEHAN, Town Building
Inspector
(Not Present)

LIZ VERRIER, Deputy Town Attorney
(Not Present)

KEVIN P. MAHER, P.E, Town Engineer

ROBERT GENESLAW COMPANY,
Planning Consultants
Two Executive Boulevard - Suite 401
Suffern, New York 10901
BY: MAXIMILIAN STACH, Town Planner
ROBERT GENESLAW, Town Planner
(Not Present)

ATZL, SCATASSA & ZIGLER
Surveyors/Planner for Applicant
234 North Main Street
New City, New York 10956
BY: DAVID ZIGLER, P.E.

And the Public.

PULEO REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION
SERVICES

61 Crickettown Road

Stony Point, New York 10980

(845) 429-8986 FAX and Phone

- Proceedings - 30

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Second on our agenda is KBT Properties LTD.

We did receive a letter today that they requested it come off the agenda for tonight, so KBT will not be on the agenda.

Third on our agenda is Virgin Mary Coptic Orthodox Church.

MR. EMANUEL: Ira Emanuel, Four Laurel Road, New City. Attorney for the applicant.

Again, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, this matter was here last month. We gave you an introduction as to what the project is.

It's the Coptic Church at the Old Marvello Country Club.

The Church has been in existence there and has been operating there for

quite some time in one of the existing
buildings and now would like to
construct a structure to serve as its
worship hall.

And also to be able to refurbish

the existing buildings, so that it's more in keeping with their needs.

We were referred to the ARB last month.

This Board also declared its intent to become lead agency.

We need -- we're seeking an extension of the sewer district so that it can serve this parcel, take care of the sewer needs. And we are back for additional details.

Mr. Zigler?

MR. ZIGLER: Basically, we submitted a four-page map to the Planning Board, and on the first page is a layout of the addition.

We had a little bit of a different sized building and a different connection. Then when we

walked out there, it's still basically
in the same spot.

And the addition to the catering
hall, where we were standing on the
patio, that's still right there; just

basically, covering that patio, but then, instead of walking from one building to another building, they actually enclosed the two.

So, the Church is now attached to the catering hall. So, they can just walk between the buildings.

And the Church itself, I think, was wide in length, about another five foot.

That's it.

So, what we did was, we placed that plan and that building plan went to the ARB last week and they're still working on that. So, that's the plan in front of the ARB, that footprint.

The other additional information that we have on this plan, is the sewer system.

We're on, informally, with the
Town board for a sewer extension. And
the Health Department would really
appreciate a sewer extension to this
facility because the condition of the

septic systems and one of the locations of the septic systems. Where they're located today, one by the parking lot, one almost under the parking lot, and one in front of the catering hall, between the catering hall and the pond; in today's standards, they would not be allowed.

So, talking to the Health Department, they are endorsing a post station and a private line on 210, or any other method that would bring in Town sewer or just get rid of the septic system.

In addition to that, there's wells on site, but until we solve this septic field, or rather the post station, we really don't know how to address the wells, because you still

have to have separation from structures
uphill, downhill, streams, ponds.

And as you know, there's two
streams on the property and a pond.

So, that's something out there

that we have to solve.

If the gravity sewer comes to life, solving that is a lot easier than it is having to put in a septic system.

The other item on the plan shows reserved parking. And for that we got into a very confusing discussion at the workshop.

I have some layouts for you on that. It's just a blowup of what's on the map. I figured I would just give it as a handout.

Basically, I got into this discussion with Bill and we were discussing it at the workshop because now that the buildings are combined -- when we thought we had two different buildings, but now that it's combined, I think we meet the code.

So, I tried to parlay that on the
bulk table there, but it's very hard
because if you think about it, we
actually have three frontages; Cedar
Flats, Swim Club Road, and the PIP.

And because of the PIP's limited access, I'm calling that a rear yard.

So, we still need Bill to weigh in on any yard, but I do believe we meet all of the requirements for the variance for anything under the bulk coverage or anything except the height of the building, but we'll get to that later.

The next thing we talked about is the parking. And in the code, just like you did on the shopping center in Stony Point where the drugstore in the back was, you have to account for the total use of the buildings.

And then the parking has to be sized. The common area has to be sized for both buildings. The same thing with this structure. Although it's a

church, you're either in church or the
kids are downstairs. It's not the
entire complex that's going to be
filled, but we have to account for all
those areas.

So, even though there's only going to be children downstairs and a few grownups, you'll see by my calculation, we need 42 cars for just the basement.

You know, that doesn't make much sense, because we know they go to church and then come out and go to Sunday school or the social gathering area.

So, what I've done is, I broke down the parking to these different structures. And since the building is --- one building, I called it 1A, B, C. And on the handout I gave you, that would be the maximum parking with no requirements, no relief. It would be 203 spaces. We only have 156.

Why I come up with 156? By my

interpretation of that code, that's in
yellow, 21536, the Board has the right
to waive half the parking or half the
use of some of these areas in the
building.

- Proceedings - 37

So, that's what we're requesting.

We're requesting that on the three items that have the stars.

If you go into the second column, you'll see that that adds up to 156.

And just to the right of that, it's still on the map here, but to the right of that, is parking calculations. And we're including the parking for main parking lot.

We have a parking lot proposed in front of the Church for handicapped accessible.

We have parking in the back actually, where we parked when we did our field visit.

We have handicapped spaces in there to come in the side door. And then, we even have the office and the

dwelling on the site.

If we take all that together,
we're proposing 156 spaces. With your
relief that we're requesting, we would
meet the code.

- Proceedings - 38

Now, out of those 156 spaces, we're asking for 38 of those spaces to be put in a reserve. And we really believe that they're going to build the reserve when they build the Church -- the new building and the addition, but we would like to request that to be in reserve and allow them to make the decision or the Town engineer or the building inspector if that becomes a problem.

It hasn't been a problem now.

They're running the same amount of people they would if the facility was finished. And that parking is shown on the map along the entrance right here. (Indicating).

That's all reserved parking. If it was constructed -- it's constructed

later on, it's not a significant construction. You're just talking about taking 18 foot off the traveled way and putting a parking space.

The last thing we discussed was

the building height. And the building meets the code to the peak, no matter what the interpretation is, but that the building height of the third building has three domes on it. One on each side and one on the front.

That exceeds -- that exceeds the building height by 15 foot at least.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Would that be addressed in zoning?

MR. ZIGLER: We're asking this Board, after we get our neg dec or before depending on what Ira wants to do, but we'll ask this Board for a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals, besides a referral, because we believe that the building does hold to the code and these architectural highlights would be good for the

building, good for the whole area. And
it's not going to be out of place.

That's basically what our plan
is.

We wanted to come in and bring up

the point about the sewer that we are going and hopefully this Board will make a recommendation to the Town Board, bring up the parking analysis that we have, and hopefully agree to that.

Let Bill look at the bulk as far as the location and the yards of the construction, that we do meet the code for that, and ask you about the building height and then move on with the SEQRA.

I believe we do have a Part II.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: You have a couple of issues you wanted us to address?

MR. ZIGLER: We would like you to, yes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: You're

looking for our input on the height of
the steeples and the possible
recommendation to the Town, as I
understand it?

MR. ZIGLER: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Let me ask the Board. Does anybody have any problems with the height of the steeples?

MR. KRAESE: It's going to be the ZBA --

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: I understand you want a recommendation from us. That, we don't have a problem with that. They will be the ones that determine it, but that's what they're asking for at this point, our opinions, and hopefully, a recommendation from us.

MR. KRAESE: I don't have a problem as long -- the PIP was the big issue and some people on 210 -- we talked about this at the meeting.

You want to stay with that height

now, to reduce it -- that's up to the
ZBA to reduce it. It will offset --

MR. ZIGLER: Yes. I mean, the
two were 15 and the one was 20 foot
above the code.

- Proceedings - 42

So, it's not the peak of the roof. And to reduce it five foot -- I mean, in reality, being that we're discussing this now, most people won't even know it's a violation.

And there's a gray area in the code itself for steeples. You know, actually domes, that we're discussing, we're not trying to hide them in the gray area. We just brought them out and hopefully you'll see it's a benefit to the style of the building.

MR. STACH: Can I just ask for clarification?

You said you will decide or Mr. Emanuel will decide whether you're going to for a referral prior to or after a neg dec?

You're not looking for a referral

or a recommendation tonight; is that correct?

MR. EMANUEL: If the Board is comfortable giving a recommendation now, we would love to take it.

We understand, of course, that until a negative declaration is granted the Zoning Board can't act.

So, whether we actually get the referral tonight, unless you're going to give me a neg dec tonight, I don't think that's going to happen, so I'm not really concerned about the referral, but if the Board is comfortable with a recommendation, we can get that on the record and move forward with the other matters.

MR. STACH: I would imagine that one of the items that was identified was esthetics. And specifically, really, I believe, or I'm recommending that it's the esthetics from the parkway, since we have received some comments from the parkway on how this

might look from that.

The Planning Board may want to examine that issue as part of the recommendation.

MR. EMANUEL: That's fine.

MR. STACH: I'm speaking for you guys.

MR. EMANUEL: That's fine. If you want to handle that as part of or in response to the environmental review, the visual impact, that's fine.

In the long run, it all comes out at the same time. So, at the very least, we raised the issue and we feel it's something that needs to be addressed.

MR. KRAESE: So, you asked our opinion, but we're not going -- there's really no rush. Does it meet the height requirement?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: We know we're past the height requirement.

MR. KRAESE: As far as a referral, there's different

interpretations for domes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: We don't
have that.

MR. KRAESE: There's no -- we
know it's --

MR. MCMENAMIN: As far as I'm concerned, the height of the domes is irrelevant to me, but I don't live right next to it.

I think it's also the aspect of the parkway. Downhill from the parkway we see some kind of visual representation of what the domes would look like from the area of the parkway and their respective right-of-way, which I think is 50 feet from the parkway itself.

The domes, I really don't have a problem with it, but I think we're probably going to have a SEQRA public hearing.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: They have sewer lines. We can't really rule on SEQRA until we know whether it's

sewer lines or --

MR. MCMENAMIN: This whole PIP

station thing --

MR. STACH: It might be a little

tail wagging the dog because the Town

can't decide on a sewer extension.

So, I think what you have to do is proceed as though they are going to get their sewer extension, do the analysis as it is, and if they don't then they --

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Fair enough.

MR. EMANUEL: I agree.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Now, you said you want to be referred to the ZBA?

MR. EMANUEL: Eventually.

There's no point in referring us now. You can't do anything with us until after a neg dec is issued. I don't want to get in a whole discussion about that.

MR. STACH: And getting into the

whole SEQRA discussion. We haven't ran
our 30 days on notice of intent. That
will be before the next meeting
definitely.

I just gave a Part II to the

Board yesterday and mailed it to them.

And I gave them hard copies tonight.

So, they'll have a chance to review that before the next meeting, and then probably be in a position, I assume, to either modify that or adopt it or change it however they feel it appropriate at the next meeting.

MR. EMANUEL: I would like to address one item -- actually, two items because they're together on the proposed neg dec.

And that is impact on transportation, which is item 19 and also carried over in item 20, in terms of potential public controversy, that's fine.

Substantive transportation impacts. There's not going to be any

increase in the use of the facility.

They have the same number of worshippers going to be there as there are now and have been for quite some time.

Social events will be the social events that are of the community. And the same number and same type of social events probably at the same times as they are now.

So, we really don't believe that there's going to be an impact, and if there is, it's going to be a very small impact on transportation concerns.

Waters -- you know, surface water, ground water, esthetic resources, all of that, we agree need to be taken a look at that, but we really don't think there is a need to look at transportation impacts. That may be the max.

MR. STACH: I will clarify that.

When I filled out the Part II, I had not considered that you are using

it for a church use.

It was in my head it was being
used as a banquet hall as a previous
use. I forgot that you were declaring
to use it as a church.

- Proceedings - 49

MR. EMANUEL: Fair enough. I appreciate that.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Anything else?

MR. EMANUEL: We would love you to adopt the Part II now, but if you're not comfortable doing that --

MR. STACH: It hasn't been 30 days. I would recommend that you not do it.

MR. EMANUEL: Nonetheless, we're going to start working on all these things anyway and hopefully we'll deal with it at the workshop to cut the time down that way.

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Thank you very much.

* * *

- Proceedings - 50

cert

STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ROCKLAND
TOWN OF STONY POINT : PLANNING BOARD

----- X

In the Matter of the Application

RE:

S & V ALIMRON,

Applicants.

----- X

May 27th, 2010
8:30 o'clock p.m.
RHO Building
Five Patriot Drive
Stony Point, New York
10980

HELD BEFORE THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE
TOWN OF STONY POINT:

B E F O R E : PETER MULLER,
Acting Chairman

A p p e a r a n c e s:

THOMAS MC MENAMIN, Member
GLADYS CALLAGHAN, Member
EUGENE KREASE, Member
GERRY ROGERS, Member (Not present)
KARL JAVENES, Member

CATHERINE FINNERTY for MARY PAGANO,
Secretary to the Board

Reported by:

Randi Vecchione for Patricia A. Puleo,
NYS Certified Court Reporter
and Notary Public

Appearances continued: 52

FERRICK, LYNCH & MAC CARTNEY, Esqs,
96 South Broadway
South Nyack, New York 10960
BY: DAVID RESNICK, Esq., Special
Counsel

WILLIAM SHEEHAN, Town Building
Inspector
(Not Present)

LIZ VERRIER, Deputy Town Attorney
(Not Present)

KEVIN P. MAHER, P.E, Town Engineer

ROBERT GENESLAW COMPANY,
Planning Consultants
Two Executive Boulevard - Suite 401
Suffern, New York 10901
BY: MAXIMILIAN STACH, Town Planner
ROBERT GENESLAW, Town Planner
(Not Present)

ATZL, SCATASSA & ZIGLER
Surveyors/Planner for Applicant
234 North Main Street
New City, New York 10956
BY: DAVID ZIGLER, P.E.

And the Public.

PULEO REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION
SERVICES

61 Crickettown Road

Stony Point, New York 10980

(845) 429-8986 FAX and Phone

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Next we have S & V Alimron.

MR. ZIGLER: David Zigler from Atzl, Scatassa and Zigler. I felt naked without saying that before.

Basically, I had asked to have Alimron back on the agenda for a public hearing for a renewed finding. And what happened in the last year, it was almost exactly a year.

A year ago this Board did give me a new final with a condition, and the condition was the same one you used on the green subdivision for basically nothing to be done until the improvements were installed.

And that didn't work on this subdivision in the applicant's mind.

I thought it was a little bit

different, this application, than the
green application.

So, I had changed that request
for a offer of notes 12 and 13. And
what this applicant would like to do is

go in there and two fix those two homes.

Nobody is buying anything. So, she would keep the property. We would file a map and she would be allowed to go in there and fix the homes, get a C of O, so they would legally as the condition on the filed map. And then, either before she sold anything --- or before somebody bought that lot three or before somebody come in for a building permit for that lot three, and that's the empty lot --- the improvements would have to be there.

So, it's a little bit different.

The note that you have on the previous green file, I think, this was another one, had to do with improvements being in there before

there was a transfer of property.

In this case, we're asking our --
for the applicant, the owner to be
allowed to fix the buildings and get a
C of O.

The previous note didn't allow that. So, that's what I was talking about at the workshop.

I don't know if you wanted to discuss it or wait until Bill is at the next workshop. That's fine. I know it's new. We talked about it at the workshop.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: You're asking for an extension, two slight changes?

MR. ZIGLER: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: She'll do the changes. She'll get her maps; all that.

MR. ZIGLER: Well, she would probably file the map and then go and get building permit on both of those two structures and fix them and make

them legally two-family homes.

That's it.

Now, if somebody wants to come along and buy one of them, she would have to put the improvements in.

- Proceedings - 56

If she went for a building permit on the empty lot, she would have to put the improvements in.

So, we're asking for relief just to the fact of being able to fix up those two structures on the property.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Does the Board have any questions?

MR. KRAESE: Can we put it off to next month?

MR. ZIGLER: It will be on the workshop next month. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Any more questions that the Board has?

MR. MCMENAMIN: Fix up, but not occupy?

MR. ZIGLER: Fix them up.

They're unoccupied now. Fix them up, get a C of O, so she could rent

them.

MR. MCMENAMIN: So, they could be occupied without the site work being done?

MR. ZIGLER: Yes. Just like they

are now.

I mean, before we started this process, there was many people living in there. We're actually reducing the amount of people in there and reducing the traffic. So, it would be the kind of work as five years ago, but be less intense.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Now, there were water problems in the back of that building which led to the repair --

MR. ZIGLER: I don't know. I'll find out.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: If you could find out, because that was something she had promised.

I wanted to make sure -- sorry, if I've a jumped ahead of you. That's

one thing that came to mind. She had
to correct the water issue. And I
would like to know that's been
corrected before we do anything.

MR. ZIGLER: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Tom, did you have more?

MR. MCMENAMIN: These buildings are occupied now?

MR. ZIGLER: They're empty.

MR. MCMENAMIN: So, they don't have a C of O --

MR. ZIGLER: -- a building permit for both of them. To Bring them up to the standards and then go for a C of O so she can rent them.

My angle on this is, if she does that, it's going to be less intense than it was before we started this process, so what's there now would work.

And that's why it's a little bit different than what we've talked about.

That was more of a parking house.

It was six/seven different parkings in that.

The intentions they had before are now being reduced just by meeting the code and asking for a C of O.

MR. MCMENAMIN: Again, the determination would have to be made what's there now. And you're saying that because a less intense use would work, all those driveways --

MR. ZIGLER: That's my theory.

MR. STACH: Can you clarify something?

MR. ZIGLER: I'll try.

MR. STACH: What is the current use of those buildings today?

MR. ZIGLER: They're empty.

MR. STACH: So, clearly, the one that was a three family, the one in the back, which had the weird deck on it --

MR. ZIGLER: No, they're empty now.

MR. STACH: For a year?

MR. ZIGLER: For over two years.

That's what started this process,
which lead to a stop work order.

We went to the ARB, remember, and
we got building plans and everything,
but she can't do anything because she

has to file a map. And to file a map she has to put in the improvements. And the improvements are very significant.

That's no joke.

MR. STACH: Is a two-family home a permitted use in that district?

MR. ZIGLER: Yes. It was approved for two-family homes, yes. Both of them.

MR. STACH: They're permitted as opposed to special use permits?

MR. ZIGLER: Yes. If the Board allows it and they go pull a building permit for those units, they would be brought up to -- one would be brought -- actually both of them had ARB approval, so they would be brought up to what everybody agreed that would be

a better plan.

The only thing is, we're not asking to build the new home also.

We're trying to get her to have a flow of money and cash from the project

to create that pool to building improvements.

MR. STACH: But Bill could give you, right now, for a C of O for a single two-family home on that property in the existing buildings; is that correct?

MR. ZIGLER: No, not without filing a map. That's the way the original resolution read.

MR. STACH: So, that restricts any use --

MR. ZIGLER: The map has to be filed. The improvements have to be made before an issuance of a C of O.

And it's really hand strapping.

MR. MCMENAMIN: The problem is, though, that she could get her C of O for the two-family houses and stop

right there and not do another thing.

MR. ZIGLER: She could.

MR. MCMENAMIN: Those two-family
houses would be stuck with the existing
site amenities that they have now.

- Proceedings - 62

MR. ZIGLER: Yes, but it wouldn't be wise because she's paying taxes on one empty lot.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: She can't sell them unless she does --

MR. ZIGLER: She can't transfer title.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: She can't transfer title until all the work is done. She can't put renters in there until she files a map.

She can't file a map until we give her this resolution.

MR. MCMENAMIN: But she could bring them up to two-family houses to be coded. It's a C of O of the building to rent them and put four families in there.

MR. ZIGLER: Two in each,

correct.

MR. MCMENAMIN: And then stop and
then to another --

MR. ZIGLER: Absolutely.

MR. MCMENAMIN: And those people

would be living in a two-family houses.

Lot three -- lot one nothing would ever

happen. And you have the bad access.

You have the driveways. You have the parking lots.

You have the drainage problems.

You have everything that you have before and then --

MR. ZIGLER: Yeah.

MR. MCMENAMIN: And there's possible --

MR. ZIGLER: It's been like that for years.

MR. MCMENAMIN: Unfortunately. We're trying to make it better.

MR. ZIGLER: I'm not saying -- we're not trying to hit you with a hammer.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: That's

the way it's been with those homes.

So, to her extent, to get to the
end of where she can build the
additional home and all the upgrades
and then sell, she needs to get a cash

flow going. Right now they're sitting there empty, deteriorating.

MR. ZIGLER: Yeah, it's not easy. It's not an easy decision.

MR. STACH: Here's just a hypothetical.

Couldn't you adjust the resolution in a way that you get one two-family approval and withhold the other two-family approval until the map is filed?

MR. ZIGLER: You know, whatever you do is better than what it was.

That's why I wasn't in any rush to push this.

I'd go to the workshop and let you think about it for a while.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: You will be at the workshop?

MR. ZIGLER: I think so.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Let's
get our ideas together and see what we
come up with.

MR. ZIGLER: Thank you for your

- Proceedings - 65

time. Thank you.

* * *

- Proceedings - 66

cert

STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ROCKLAND
TOWN OF STONY POINT : PLANNING BOARD

----- X

In the Matter of the Application

RE:

STONY POINT FIRE DISTRICT SUBSTATION,

Applicants.

----- X

9 o'clock p.m.
RHO Building
Five Patriot Drive
Stony Point, New York
10980

HELD BEFORE THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE
TOWN OF STONY POINT:

B E F O R E : PETER MULLER,
Acting Chairman

A p p e a r a n c e s:

THOMAS MC MENAMIN, Member
GLADYS CALLAGHAN, Member
EUGENE KREASE, Member
GERRY ROGERS, Member (Not present)
KARL JAVENES, Member

CATHERINE FINNERTY for MARY PAGANO,

Secretary to the Board

Reported by:

Randi Vecchione for Patricia A. Puleo,
NYS Certified Court Reporter
and Notary Public

KORNFELD, REU, NEWMAN & SIMEONE 68

Attys. For Applicants
Suffern, New York 10901
BY: SCOTT DOW, Esq., Of Counsel

MR. SENDLEWSKI, Architect for Applicant

FERRICK, LYNCH & MAC CARTNEY, Esqs,
96 South Broadway
South Nyack, New York 10960
BY: DAVID RESNICK, Esq., Special
Counsel

WILLIAM SHEEHAN, Town Building
Inspector
(Not Present)

LIZ VERRIER, Deputy Town Attorney
(Not Present)

KEVIN P. MAHER, P.E, Town Engineer

ROBERT GENESLAW COMPANY,
Planning Consultants
Two Executive Boulevard - Suite 401
Suffern, New York 10901
BY: MAXIMILIAN STACH, Town Planner
ROBERT GENESLAW, Town Planner
(Not Present)

ATZL, SCATASSA & ZIGLER
Surveyors/Planner for Applicant
234 North Main Street
New City, New York 10956
BY: DAVID ZIGLER, P.E.

And the Public.

PULEO REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION
SERVICES

61 Crickettown Road

Stony Point, New York 10980

(845) 429-8986 FAX and Phone

- Proceedings - 69

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Next on our agenda is the Stony Point Fire District Substation.

Gentlemen, we are ready to go into Executive Session so you can have a few minutes and we will come back.

(Recess was taken.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Mr. Dow?

MR. DOW: Good evening, members of the Board, Chairman. My name is Scott Dow from the law firm Kornfeld, Rew, Newman & Simeone. I'm representing the applicant with respect --

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: I think the Board has something they want to say first.

MR. MCMENAMIN: Mr. Chairman, I
would like to make a motion.

On May 3, 2010, the Fire
Commissioner's Fire District declared
themselves to be lead agency for SEQRA

for this site plan application, and they circulated a notice asking for any objections to that determination or declaration to be properly named.

I would like to make the motion tonight that we challenge that determination, that the Board of Fire Commissioners made, and I would like to inform them that the Planning Board of the Town of Stony Point, in our opinion, is the proper agency in the Town to perform SEQRA for this site plan application.

And I would like to also inform them that because of our experience in SEQRA reviews for site plans, that we would give them the proper review for this application that's necessary.

And I would like the Planning

Board to vote on that motion tonight.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Do we
have a motion?

MR. MCMENAMIN: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Do we

have a second?

MR. KRAESE: I'll second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER:

Comments?

(No responses heard.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: I would like to make a comment.

It is our -- it's my intention to help this project through as quickly and as thoroughly as possible. I do believe that the Planning Board of Stony Point, who does SEQRA and site reviews continuously, is the best agency in this Town to review this project, so I'm going to agree with that.

When it comes to the vote, I will vote that way. I'll work as diligently as I can to help this process as

quickly as it can be done and as
thoroughly.

I do believe it's a good project
that needs to be completed as quickly
as possible and as thoroughly as

possible. I do believe this Planning Board is the proper agency to do SEQRA.

Ms. Finnerty, can you poll the Board?

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. McMenamin?

MR. MCMENAMIN: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. Javenes?

MR. JAVENES: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. Kraese?

MR. KRAESE: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Miss Callaghan?

MS. CALLAGHAN: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. Muller?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Yes.

MR. DOW: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Mr. Dow?

MR. DOW: Thank you, Board.

With all due respect, I heard

what you had to say.

It will be the Board's position
that because they're the municipality
with respect to this process, they too
have an architect they retained, and

experts in this area with respect to the SEQRA process.

They, too, feel that they're the proper agency to be conducting the SEQRA and that's why they notified this board with respect to their intentions to declare lead agency status.

With that being said, the Board of Fire Commissioners has been working on the project and it's part of this site plan application with respect to the replacement of an antiquated substation firehouse on 199 Central Highway.

It has, in essence, out-used its useful life where it's located.

It suits the needs of the fire district and their fire department, which provides fire protection to the

occupants of the Town of Stony Point.

In that regard, this is the
rendering of the firehouse.

(Indicating a drawing.)

MR. DOW: It is a slight increase

in size from the existing firehouse,
which is about 57 to 5800 square feet
to a proposed 8500 square foot
firehouse.

I don't know if the Board
has any specific questions, but we have
Dave Zigler, who you're very familiar
with from Atzl, Scatassa and Zigler.

Also, the project architect,
Martin Sendlewski, who's here tonight
to provide any information that you may
need regarding the nuts and bolts of
the proposed firehouse.

MR. MCMENAMIN: Yes, I have a
question. I'm very interested -- I
understand from what I've read, which
was presented to us, there's going to
be a traffic signal.

I was wondering because I know --

I can't imagine where it would be. I think the -- you're introducing a new curb cut into the New York State Route 210, right in front of a short distance of another major intersection.

- Proceedings - 75

Are you ready to talk about that
or is that something --

MR. ZIGLER: Basically, the fire
district jumped on the opportunity to
solve this layout by getting a traffic
light at the intersection.

We met with Town officials; the
building inspector, the town engineer,
police chief, and it was offered as
mitigation to the driveway access that
you see.

So, there's going to be a full
traffic light set up right at the
intersection and the police station
driveway, Central Highway and 210. And
it's going to meet the standards of the
State of New York and work full time.

It's not going to be a partial
blinker or anything else. It's going

to have crosswalk lights and
everything.

In addition to that, there's
going to be -- if you're coming from --
if you drop down underneath, it opens

up into two lanes. Most people get in the right lane and make a right turn down in that belly.

There's going to be another stoplight, which works that if there's a fire or an emergency, the light will be activated.

It turns red, and nobody moves, and either the fire truck or whatever is coming out of the firehouse, will come out with everything shutdown, or the police.

This is a good opportunity for the fire company. It's a good opportunity -- the police chief is behind it.

And everybody, even the County, is behind it.

It meets every one of the 16

criteria. It's really a cause of the design, a design that was based off of keeping the doors off the residential neighborhood.

MR. MCMENAMIN: So, you're

intending to make a new curb cut into
210 and put a second light to the west
-- northwest?

MR. ZIGLER: Yes.

MR. MCMENAMIN: And it would be
controlled from either the firehouse or
the police station?

MR. ZIGLER: Correct, that would
be -- like on 9W right now in front of
the firehouse it turns red and the
truck pulls out, but in this case, we
have to leave an opening there, so it's
going to be down in that belly before
the road widens.

It will turn red and it will
allow everybody a safe route in and
out.

MR. MCMENAMIN: That would block
both lanes on the eastbound --

MR. ZIGLER: It shuts down
everything.

MR. MCMENAMIN: East and west?

MR. ZIGLER: Everything. You
can't even cross the street. If the

police come out on an emergency, they're going to be able to activate it.

You know, it's quite a bonus to everybody.

At certain times of the day, it's going to be a benefactor for the traffic movement. They're going to widen and restripe the lanes for turning lanes. You're going to have dedicated lanes.

The whole intersection is going to be repaved, restriped, and now we'll incorporate a traffic light.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: What happens with the secondary lane, that would just stay green as the light on Central --

MR. ZIGLER: I think it does

nothing except red.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: It will
be off or then red?

MR. ZIGLER: Off or red.

MR. MCMENAMIN: Could you walk us

through the -- just give us an idea of how the building works.

MR. SENDLEWSKI: Basically, what you're looking at here on the site plan is 210.

Currently, the building, basically, sits right about here. (Indicaing).

The portion of this building is on Central Drive. All the ingresses facing the residences across and egresses up Central Drive and turns either way.

There's also a curb cut on Central Highway currently.

The plan here is to have the apron facing the 210 for the main egress, to close down any entrance on Central Highway.

One of the things that we did do with the driveway is, we did allow a responding firefighter -- this will be restricted.

These four spaces allow direct

access to prepare the trucks to leave, as well as working generally where the currently parking lot is.

This access is for intended purpose vehicles coming, that could park along this curb cut and go into the back entrance of the apparatus and can return this way. (Indicating).

These two (indicating) are double doors so they can drive directly through the firehouse.

This driveway (indicating) allows the truck to come through this way and square up and back into the single base this way they don't have to stop on 210 and back off of 210.

We do that on every firehouse that we have an opportunity to, so that the trucks can pull off the

road and then maneuver on site without
impeding traffic.

One thing I would point out
about the apron, is that the apron
really doesn't function as much as a

curb cut, as it is a firehouse apron.

It's a no-parking zone with the exception of the Chief's vehicle because they respond first. And it would have signage that it's authorized vehicles only, so it's not an active curb cut. It will only be used for emergency egress.

The building you see on the site, this will be a view (indicating) from the corner, essentially looking this way.

You see the four bay doors here, (indicating), which are this elevation facing 210.

And the side of the building on Central Highway would be the same as the elevation. We have here high windows.

We have windows in the training rooms up in the building house, as well as a crew room, which is located directly off the apparatus.

We have a small patio so that if

they're on standby, they could utilize that.

Topography of the site, that area is higher and this (indicating) quadrant of the building is three feet higher than the base.

The overall site slopes from south down to the north.

This would (indicating) be the front base here. The four bays facing 210.

This (indicating) would be the rear elevation. You pull into the rear parking lot here. You see the double gable, that would be this double gable entry in the administrative portion of the building.

This (indicating) would be two doors that would be the drive-through

bays, which is the same as this here.

(Indicating).

Again, the side towards Central
Drive.

And then we have a side of the

building toward Central Drive, which basically, has no more garage doors, no more impact on the neighbors.

We also eliminated -- this is almost a continuous curb cut. This median (indicating) would provide a buffer and plantings.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: When you make the -- maybe we raise it up, because I'm having a hard time seeing what you're doing down there.

Just so we can understand --

(Complying.)

MR. SENDLEWSKI: This is the 210 elevation, (indicating on a diagram), which is, basically, four doors facing 210. This would be the north elevation facing the parking lot.

This (indicating) double gable is

an entryway going in to the
administrative area.

These (indicating) are the two
driveways through bay doors.

Here, this would be the area

facing Central Highway. Windows from the administrative area, as well as a door from the patio from the ready room, and high windows in the apparatus space. Again, on the Central Drive area.

What we did is, we eliminated all overhead doors. We have the access doors directly into the base from outside both corners of the apparatus as well.

They're all manned doors.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: That's the opposite side of 210?

MR. SENDLEWSKI: That is correct.

MR. MCMENAMIN: Could you identify yourself?

MR. SENDLEWSKI: I'm Martin Sendlewski. I'm an architect out of

Riverhead, New York.

We've been brought in by the
District, based on our office designing
firehouses for 25 years.

MR. MCMENAMIN: So, you're

providing the engineering services, as well?

MR. SENDLEWSKI: I'm providing the design and engineering services in conjunction with Mr. Zigler's office, who do site engineering and site work.

MR. MCMENAMIN: With regard to site engineering, the limited information that we were provided with shows a very steep -- seven percent grade where the trucks leave the apparatus.

And then, into 210, it seems to be it's very steep. There is the fact that you put the garage doors on both sides of the building, because you're requiring the trucks to only go in one direction around those.

And have you taken that into

account, the sizes of the trucks? Do
you know whether that grade is going to
be a problem for those trucks to make a
turn into 210 or is there further
engineering --

MR. ZIGLER: We took all that into account.

MR. SENDLEWSKI: We did it with the building. We did with the grade on two ten and it all works.

MR. MCMENAMIN: One last question, I'm sorry.

I only counted 12 parking spaces; is that right?

MR. ZIGLER: You passed, yes.

MR. MCMENAMIN: Is that all that's needed for the amount of people that respond to that firehouse on an emergency situation?

MR. ZIGLER: We were there to discuss the traffic light. We had three people from the Town there. The police chief. I had a vehicle. Martin was there. He had a vehicle. There

were two people from the fire
department there.

At that time, they had an alarm
go off.

The truck was warmed up and ready

to go out before, it was canceled and it was five more cars and everybody was parked there.

It's a substation and most people, the way I understand it, do not go there and go in the truck.

They meet the truck at the fire. Twelve spaces is actually more than right now. It's suffice.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Do you have administrative offices right there?

MR. ZIGLER: It's just a dream.

It's an area they put into the building for bathrooms.

They just need that kind of area to operate, but it's not going to be whole buildings. They already discussed that in the narrative.

The main firehouse is going to be
the meeting hall and everything else.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Thank
you.

Any other questions?

MR. STACH: I understand that regardless of what happens with lead agency, you're going to request that the Planning Board review the traffic study that you've developed already for this; is that correct?

MR. DOW: Correct.

MR. STACH: I would apprise the Board that our traffic consultant, John Sarno, is not equipped to review traffic signalization from the actual standpoint of the installation.

And Mr. Zigler had provided a list of consultants that John Collins Engineers had indicated are qualified.

There were three names on that list. We have worked with one of the people on that list, John Collins -- sorry. John Canning from Adler

Consultants, out of White Plains.

I would recommend to this Board
in order to -- if they would be okay
with it, we would provide the
qualifications for the firm to the Town

Board, so that he could be approved to review on the Board's behalf.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: I would like to make a motion that we forward that name, John --

MR. STACH: John Canning.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: I recommend that we forward that to the Town Board for their consideration.

MR. KRAESE: Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Ms. Finnerty, poll the Board, please?

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. McMenamin?

MR. MCMENAMIN: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. Javenes?

MR. JAVENES: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. Kraese?

MR. KRAESE: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Miss Callaghan?

MS. CALLAGHAN: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. Muller?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Yes.

MR. DOW: Will there be a site
inspection that the Planning Board

would be doing?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Can we schedule a site inspection on Saturday?

What is our next available date?

MS. FINNERTY: I don't know.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: June 5th.

MR. KRAESE: 8:30 at the firehouse.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: 8:30, June 5th, at the firehouse substation.

MR. DOW: Thank you. Also, a referral to the ARB.

MR. KRAESE: I'll make a motion that we send him to the ARB.

MS. CALLAGHAN: I'll second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Ms. Finnerty, poll the Board, please.

MS. FINNERTY: Yes.

Mr. McMenamin?

MR. MCMENAMIN: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. Javenes?

MR. JAVENES: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. Kraese?

- Proceedings - 91

MR. KRAESE: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Miss Callaghan?

MS. CALLAGHAN: Yes.

MS. FINNERTY: Mr. Muller?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: Yes.

You're all set.

MR. DOW: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: I guess

we just have to accept the minutes.

Can I have a motion to accept the
minutes?

MR. KRAESE: I'll make the motion
to accept the minutes of March 25th --
hold on.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: The
agenda says "March 25th". We're going
to have to pass on accepting the
minutes. The agenda states the wrong
date for the minutes.

Do we have a motion to adjourn?

MR. MCMENAMIN: Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MULLER: All in
favor?

(Unanimous affirmative vote.)

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

STATE OF NEW YORK)
) ss.
COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER)

I, RANDI VECCHIONE, Court
Reporter and Notary Public within and
for the County of Westchester, State of
New York, do hereby certify:

That I reported the
proceedings that are hereinbefore set
forth, and that such transcript is a
true and accurate record of said
proceedings.

AND, I further certify
that I am not related to any of the
parties to this action by blood or
marriage, and that I am in no way
interested in the outcome of this
matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand.

RANDI VECCHIONE
Court Reporter