1 STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ROCKLAND. 2 TOWN OF STONY POINT: PLANNING BOARD 3 -----X IN THE MATTER 4 OF 5 BA MAR MANUFACTURED 6 HOME PARK -----X 7 Town of Stony Point RHO Building 8 5 Clubhouse Lane 9 Stony Point, New York Thursday January 24, 2019 10 8:35 p.m. 11 12 BEFORE: THOMAS GUBITOSA, CHAIRMAN EUGENE KRAESE, BOARD MEMBER 13 ERIC JASLOW, BOARD MEMBER 14 PAUL JOACHIM, BOARD MEMBER JERRY ROGERS, BOARD MEMBER 15 PETER MUELLER, BOARD MEMBER 16 APPEARANCES: 17 STEPHEN M. HONAN, ESQ., Special Counsel MAX STACH, Town Planner 18 JOHN O'ROURKE, P.L.S, Town Engineer WILLIAM SHEEHAN, Building Inspector 19 MARY PAGANO, Clerk to the Planning Board 20 21 22 23 ROCKLAND & ORANGE REPORTING 2 Congers Road 24 New City, New York 10956 25 (845) 634-4200

Proceedings

2	
3	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. Next
4	item on the agenda is Ba Mar Manufactured
5	Home Park located on the south side of
6	Grassy Point Road east of Nelly Drive. This
7	is a new application. This is the first
8	time that this Board has entirely has
9	seen this application.
10	MS. MIELE: Good evening, everybody.
11	Amy Miele, 4 Laurel Road, New City. Tonight
12	I am here of Counsel to Ira Emanuel on
13	behalf of the applicant for the project that
14	we're calling the Ba Mar Manufactured Home
15	Park. We're here to unveil the applicant's
16	plan to revive this manufactured home park.
17	As many of you know the park has existed in
18	some of form for seven decades.
19	Unfortunately this park was largely
20	destroyed by Super storm Sandy in 2012. The
21	owner, the Town, the County and the State
22	worked diligently with the families that
23	were displaced and now the park is largely
24	unoccupied.
25	I just want to point out that the Town's

1	Proceedings
2	master plan which was amended in 2013
3	specifically calls for the maintenance of
4	existing manufactured home parks and
5	recognizes their significance to the
6	community. And it also recommends flexible
7	zoning regulations and better standards for
8	the protection of manufactured homes and I
9	think the Town has done that.
10	Since Sandy we've been in a holding
11	pattern and one of the main reasons we were
12	in a holding pattern was because the Town's
13	base flood elevations. Their the Town
14	regulations post Sandy defaulted to FEMA's
15	advisory base flood elevations. And you may
16	recall we were here before I think to ask
17	for your recommendations to the Town Board
18	on revising those base flood elevations to
19	be more in line with the reality of the
20	topography here where we're located.
21	So in May 2018 the applicant petitioned
22	the Town Board to revise the base flood
23	elevations and the town this Board
24	actually reviewed that and recommended the
25	revisions which were at adopted by the Town

1	Proceedings
2	Board in August of 2018. So we're back and
3	we're ready to rebuild and we've done quite
4	a bit of work behind the scenes before
5	coming before this honorable board tonight.
6	We've been having several technical review
7	meetings, most recently on January 10th,
8	where we received a lot of valuable feedback
9	from you professional staff. A large
10	majority, if not most of that feedback has
11	been incorporated into the plans that are
12	before you tonight so we're a bit further
13	then conceptual. We're not, you know, site
14	plan ready, but I think everybody agrees
15	that we're a bit further along than just
16	conceptual plans.

17 So we're here tonight to present our current plans which we think is quite 18 detailed, it addresses most of the feedback 19 we received thus far. I'll let Mr. Rocks 20 21 from Brooker Engineering walk you through 22 the details, but the following are some of 23 the highlights of the plan: We have 24 141 units as opposed to the 151 that were 25 there pre Sandy. We have a new layout that

Proceedings

1

2	provides for better circulation and less
3	dead-end roadways and way better circulation
4	for emergency access vehicles. The main
5	access road is being raised above the
6	existing grade. The homes are being
7	relocated away from the wetlands area. The
8	individual homes will be two feet above your
9	new revised base flood elevation. Well
10	require some variances, we know we'll need a
11	lot width variance for the lots, there may
12	be others depending on how the plans
13	develop.

14 But what we're asking for tonight so we 15 can get moving is for the Board to declare 16 its intent to be lead agency so that we can start the SEQRA process. If we had waited 17 to do this next month we wouldn't have been 18 19 able to do that until April. We're hoping that you declare your intent tonight and 20 21 then you'll be in a position to declare 22 yourselves lead agency at your March 28th 23 meeting. So any feedback that we receive 24 tonight as well as any EAF form that's 25 required which was requested by your Town

1	Proceedings
2	Planner will basically put is in a position
3	for February 26th and hope to be back at the
4	Board at your March 28th meeting. We're
5	happy to come to the February meeting as
6	well if you want an update, but we won't be
7	in a position to declare lead agency until
8	the March 28th meeting.
9	So with that I'm going to hand it over
10	to Mr. Rocks who can walk you through the
11	plan, unless you have any questions of me.
12	Okay.
13	MR. ROCKS: Thanks. Dennis Rocks from
14	Brooker Engineering, very happy to be here
15	tonight. So we have the sheet one if I
16	could just walk you through it. So this is
17	a vicinity map, this shows the site
18	boundaries, this shows Grassy Point Road,
19	here's the rail line, hear's Minisceongo
20	Yacht Club and then here would be the U.S.
21	(inaudible).
22	Without further adieu here is our
23	proposed plan, as Mrs. Miele was saying it
24	was very sad what happened in Sandy. We're
25	very excited to be participating in this

Proceedings

1

2	project, it's a great projet and it's a
3	great project from an engineering standpoint
4	and I also happen to be a certified flood
5	plain manager and we're very excited to be
6	working on such a good project in really
7	every way. And so Ms. Miele was talking
8	about really what amounts to resiliency.
9	Resiliency is really how an environment or a
10	residence can really bounce back from a
11	significant environmental event like a big
12	rainstorm or hurricane or that kind of a
13	thing. So really what you see here is a
14	plan that elevates the roads, it elevates
15	the homes. She was talking about the
16	circulation patterns. If you remember and I
17	can show you the layout of the existing and
18	it's just a series of different of dead end
19	driveways that extend toward the railroad.
20	And now we have a beautiful circulation
21	pattern that really gets you around and
22	limits we have 150-foot dead end,
23	otherwise you can come through here and
24	circulate around.
0 F	

25 The plan is really dynamite in that we

1	Proceedings
2	reduce the number of homes, we reduce the
3	amount of impervious surface, we push back
4	from the wetlands and so it's it's a nice
5	plan, it's a better plan, it's an
6	improvement and I'd be happy to answer any
7	questions.
8	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Max, anything?
9	MR. STACH: Max, not at this point, but
10	I'd think I'd like to go over the agencies
11	at the end.
12	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. A
13	question, what's the distance between each
14	of the homes?
15	MR. ROCKS: So what we have here these
16	homes are all sixteen feet wide and so each
17	of em has an exterior staircase, but if you
18	just scale from home to home it's about
19	fifteen feet.
20	MR. O'ROURKE: Just to clarify for the
21	Board as to the latest plans which we
22	received last night, the home is fifteen
23	feet but when you add the porch and the deck
24	I think they're a little bit closer cause it
25	

1	Proceedings
2	MR. ROCKS: So if you go from a
3	staircase from the outside of the
4	staircase to the closest part of the next
5	unit is about ten feet; do you know what I'm
6	saying?
7	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah. And like John
8	said we just got the plans so you know right
9	now we're, like you said, we're looking at
10	things and we're probably gonna have a lot
11	more questions at the TAC meeting and the
12	next meeting.
13	MR. STACH: You know what useful
14	probably to go over tonight is the primary
15	reason for this change. I know you say
16	resiliency, but I think we discussed things
17	like what elevation you're gonna put the
18	road at in order to be able to be to access,
19	what elevation the units are at
20	MR. ROCKS: Sure. I'd be happy to.
21	Thank you. So, the base flood elevation,
22	the 100 flood elevation which happens to be
23	about the same elevations that existed
24	during the peak of Sandy is ten. And so
25	these elevations, the elevations of the

1	Proceedings
2	homes, the minimum elevation, is 12 so now
3	we're two feet above the base flood
4	elevation so that's a nice factor of safety.
5	Then we've elevated the roads to make
6	them passable as much as possible. There's
7	some locations where we're tied into
8	existing offsite properties, but by and
9	large we have situated the roads at an
10	elevation nine and so that would be the
11	wheels would be in the hundred year flood,
12	but the exhaust pipe would be above it and
13	the emergency vehicles would be able to
14	travel down the road.
15	BOARD MEMBER MUELLER: So you're going
16	to go raise the grade of that whole area?
17	MR. ROCKS: Yes.
18	BOARD MEMBER MUELLER: Not the unit that
19	grade, it's the whole elevation of the
20	property.
21	MR. ROCKS: It's both, yes, everything
22	is higher, yes.
23	MR. STACH: But the road in places will
24	be higher than the ground under the units;
25	is that correct?

1	Proceedings
2	MR. ROCKS: Yes.
3	MR. STACH: So some of these units will
4	be five and six feet in the air; is that
5	correct, over the ground current grade?
6	MR. ROCKS: No, no, I think it's more
7	like four. The maximum is about four max
8	four.
9	MR. KRAESE: Is any of this in the
10	500-year flood plan?
11	MR. ROCKS: If it's in the 100, then
12	it's by definition in the 500.
13	MR. STACH: So the 100-year flood plain,
14	if you recall we did an action we previously
15	we provide some recommendation to the Town
16	Board Brooker Engineering did a flood study
17	to establish what the flood elevation would
18	be here at time of the 100-year flood. At
19	the time it was established it was ten feet.
20	MR. ROCKS: Elevation ten.
21	MR. STACH: Elevation ten. So anything
22	on this map that is under elevation ten is
23	going to be in that hundred year food plain.
24	I don't know that you have
25	MR. O'ROURKE: The buildings have to be

1	Proceedings
2	two feet above that.
3	BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: I understand that.
4	MR. STACH: Can you also describe how
5	many units there were before Sandy, how many
6	units there are now and how many are
7	proposed.
8	MR. ROCKS: Well, there were 151 and
9	we're proposing 141.
10	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: But after Sandy,
11	how many did you lose?
12	MS. MIELE: I have a map. I have a map
13	that might provide the answer to that
14	question. So this's less than 30 residents
15	there today. I had a rather rudimentary map
16	I can pass up. So this is sort of the
17	layout pre Sandy, but these were occupied
18	residents, they were seven vacant lots,
19	there was one office, if you add that up you
20	get 151 and you can sort of see what the
21	layout was before.
22	I'd also point out that, yes, there is a
23	little bit of intrusion into the flood plain
24	and both Ira and I have had conversation
25	with Mr. Sheehan about the applicability of

1	Proceedings
2	the DEC flood plain regulations versus the
3	Town's and I think they'll be more
4	discussion about that at a subsequent TAC
5	meeting, but I believe this Board does have
6	the authority to permit some incursions into
7	that by virtue of your own code, but we're
8	also going to be getting the DEC permit. So
9	I think what we decided at the last meeting
10	was to get the DEC permit, see what the DEC
11	has to say and then see basically which ends
12	up being the most protective of the
13	wetlands.
14	BOARD MEMBER JOACHIM: You guys talked
15	about there's 30 families, residents that
16	are still there, is there any type of plan
17	moving forward with these guys, with the 30
18	families, what's the plan with these guys?
19	MS. MIELE: Well, Joel Brown who is a
20	principle of the applicant is here tonight.
21	I don't know if you have a plan yet to share
22	or
23	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Can you state your
24	name?
25	MR. BROWN: Joel Brown, I'm with the

1	Proceedings
2	ownership of the group. The management New
3	York Rising has made arrangements for the
4	residents to allow them to be relocated and
5	they've provided funding for their
6	relocation so most of the families, all but
7	a handful of those families have accepted
8	that. I think there are less than five and
9	currently the families that have
10	participated have been relocated or are in
11	the process of being relocated.
12	So to answer the question at this point
13	almost all the families have been accounted
14	for in terms of where they're going to be
15	going.
16	MS. MIELE: When you say 30, there were
17	30 occupied residences; is that correct?
18	MR. BROWN: There were approximately
19	nearly every home was affected and so
20	through the process of the New York Rising
21	what they've been able to do is they've
22	the bar for whether or not a family or a
23	residents would be able to participate in
24	the program got lower and lower. So, like I
25	said, a large large majority of those

1	Proceedings
2	families have taken advantage of the funding
3	that's been available to them. And so
4	what's happened is over the last couple of
5	years as they've gotten they funding and
6	they've found a place to relocate to they've
7	done that and so the number of residents in
8	the community is going down and down and
9	down. So by our hope is and expectation
10	is by the time that we're ready to redevelop
11	the community all of the residents will have
12	relocated somewhere. Most large large
13	majority of those were through New York
14	Rising funding.
15	BOARD MEMBER MUELLER: Where did they
16	get relocated to?
17	MR. BROWN: They've I'm not an expert
18	in where they've gone to. From what I hear
19	they've been able to buy houses that are
20	somewhere in Rockland County, alternative
21	housing, they've rented apartments, some
22	have gone to other mobile home parks not so
23	much in the area, but in and around, not so
24	much in Rockland County, but other parts.
25	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. Good.

1	Proceedings
2	Thank you. Amy, one last question, are you
3	doing with the Marina or is it just?
4	MS. MIELE: Yeah, that's to be
5	determined. We have to do a little more
6	title research on the ownership of the
7	marina and get back to you on that, but what
8	we're presenting here includes parking
9	includes enough parking as though we're
10	keeping the marina. So it includes parking
11	for I think 32 boat slips which is probably
12	more than what is there actually right now,
13	and also whatever the requisite number like
14	one and a half times parking spaces for cars
15	trailers. So we're proceeding along the
16	lines that we'd like to keep it. We have to
17	do a little bit more legal research, title
18	research to determine that. But what we're
19	trying to propose to you here is, as always,
20	worst case scenarios so like, you know, the
21	highest elevations, the most number of
22	parking spaces, all of that so you can make
23	your determination based on that, but we'll
24	have an update for you as the project
25	proceeds.

Proceedings

2	MR. BROWN: Can I just add one thing?
3	Probably the most important that I forgot
4	was that the biggest difficulty we had early
5	on with New York Rising be after the storm
6	was that all of the residents wanted to
7	stay, wanted to be the area. They liked
8	where they were living and finding
9	alternative housing that was comparable for
10	their families were here was not really easy
11	to do. So what we've heard over time is a
12	lot of these people went to apartments or
13	more transitional housing and what we've
14	heard is that they want to come back and so
15	we think that this plan and the new homes
16	that we intend to bring are gonna be
17	affordable and we think that there's gonna
18	be a large demand for them. We want to fill
19	that void for affordable housing and for
20	those people that have left and want to come
21	back.
22	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Can you spell your
23	name?
24	MR. BROWN: My first name is Joel,
25	J-O-E-L, and my last name is Brown

Proceedings

2 B-R-O-W-N.

3 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Okay. Thank you. MR. STACH: I have a couple additional 4 questions. The first is how has the DEC 5 6 wetlands affected the design for the Board's 7 benefit? MR. ROCKS: The design -- well, first of 8 9 all we availed ourselves to a great 10 conference that the DEC has it's called the 11 pre application conference and it's a great 12 tool for really getting on the same page 13 with the DEC to understand what it is 14 they're interested in that's going to make a 15 successful application. So we met with the 16 DEC at the site and the primary component 17 that we're incorporated into this application is to reduce the number of homes 18 19 and the impervious area and the proximity of 20 the development to the wetlands. So we've 21 pulled back and minimized. MR. STACH: Okay. And the other one is, 22 in 1982 the flood elevation, the hundred 23 24 year flood elevation was set at seven feet, now we have ten feet in 2018 and the 25

1 Proceedings projections are by 2050 we'll have another 2 3 30 inches, by 2080 it maybe 60, so sort of, is there any thought, I understand we want 4 5 to make this resilient for now, but has any 6 thought been given to how to continue to 7 keep this resilient going forward as we 8 might be facing higher elevations down the 9 road?

10 MR. ROCKS: The short answer is no. The proposal and how it relates to the 100-year 11 flood elevation would be two feet above that 12 13 and we're kind of really maximizing the 14 futility of this property to work with the 15 existing grade. For instance we have to tie 16 into Grassy Point Road, we have to tie into 17 the existing sewer system and so there are similar limitations as to how this project 18 can fit in. Really you can't put a site on 19 a pedestal. A site has to relate to an 20 environment and a community and there's 21 limitations and we think we've achieved 22 23 that. So the minimum home elevation is 12 24 and we're pretty happy with that. MR. STACH: Now going through the agency 25

Proceedings

2	list that when we were preparing the draft
3	lead agency NOI we identified the Stony
4	Point Town Board for sewer hookups, the
5	Rockland County Health Department for water
6	main, sewer main extension, mosquito control
7	and actually they approved the initial site
8	plan of mobile home parks, also the US Arm
9	Corps of Engineers for approval water site
10	improvement for the event that you have
11	involving the marina, possible protection of
12	water, tidal, wetlands is DEC, approval of
13	water side improvements of marina for New
14	York State Department of State Office of
15	Planning and Development, Coastal Zone
16	Consistency is zoning for the waterfront
17	advisory committee which is the Planning
18	Board, County Stream, Rockland County
19	Drainage Agency, and we then also listed as
20	interested supervisor, the flood
21	administrator, the Rockland County Division
22	of Environmental Resources for the Stony
23	Point Marsh, the architectural review board,
24	Rockland County Planning, the fire district,
25	and the ambulances corps, can you think of

1	Proceedings
2	anybody that we missed?
3	MS. MIELE: There's a park nearby, who?
4	MR. STACH: Yeah, that would be the
5	Stony Point Marsh. It's actually an open
6	space. That would be the Division of
7	Environmental Resources. The Town Park is
8	gonna be covered because the Town Board is
9	approving your sewer.
10	MS. MIELE: No, I can't think of anybody
11	else off the top of my head, but since we're
12	giving ourselves a little time to pull
13	together another submission if I do will I
14	let you know.
15	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Steve, any comments?
16	All right. At this to make I just need a
17	motion to declare lead agency.
18	BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: Make that motion.
19	BOARD MEMBER JOACHIM: I second.
20	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All in favor?
21	(A response of aye was given.)
22	
23	* * * *
24	
25	

1	Proceedings
2	
3	
4	THE FOREGOING IS CERTIFIED to be
5	a true and correct transcription of the
6	original stenographic minutes to the best
7	of my ability.
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	Melissa Pezzullo
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	