

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

----- x

IN THE MATTER
OF

BA MAR MANUFACTURED HOME PARK

----- x

Town of Stony Point
RHO Building
5 Clubhouse Lane
Stony Point, New York
April 25, 2019
7:15 p.m.

B E F O R E :

THOMAS GUBITOSA, CHAIRMAN
MICHAEL FERGUSON, MEMBER
ERIC JASLOW, BOARD MEMBER
PAUL JOACHIM, BOARD MEMBER
EUGENE KRAESE, BOARD MEMBER
JERRY ROGERS, BOARD MEMBER

A P P E A R A N C E S:

STEPHEN M. HONAN, Special Counsel
MAX STACH, Town Planner
WILLIAM SHEEHAN, Building Inspector
KEN DEGENNARO, Brooker Engineering
IRA EMANUEL, Esq. Attorney for Applicants

ROCKLAND & ORANGE REPORTING
2 Congers Road
New City, New York 10956
(845) 634-4200

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Next item on the agenda will be Ba Mar Manufactured Home Park. This is located on the south side of Grassy Point Road, and to review of the application. Thanks.

Dave, can you take off the top map?

MR. ZIGLER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: And I have a copy of the map, if anyone wants to look at it.

All right. If you give us a review since we just got this tonight the part three we probably won't go through it.

MR. DEGENNARO: My name is Ken DeGennaro from Brooker Engineering.

So, since we last appeared before the board last month, at last months meeting we received the EAF part two. We completed an EAF part three for the board and the consultants review. And we have also had a site visit about two weeks ago at the property, and we've also been coordinating with the DEC.

In terms of DEC, we received comments from them last week. They asked for more

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

details of the engineering design. They asked for a landscaping plan. We have that information prepared, and we made a formal response to the DEC today. So, hopefully we will be getting some additional comments from them in the near future.

Part of the EAF part three was performing visual simulations. So we took three viewpoints from Grassy Point Road looking at the site and superimposed the proposed conditions construction including the grading and filling the area with the density of the layout in the simulations. So, that's contained in the part three. And we will await the board's review and the consultants comments on that.

One question that we did have, I wanted to follow up. I guess in our site visit that we had on Saturday, to see if there are any other questions from the board based on what we discussed from being at the property?

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: I think not at this time. I know we had gone down there. We saw -- I think everyone has kind of -- has an

1 Proceedings

2 idea what's going on there. I think just we
3 talked about the height of where it would be
4 from the shore. And I think we got a good
5 idea. But I guess next time we go out we
6 could have a mark on that pole in the water
7 or up a little.

8 MR. DEGENNARO: Sure. We could set that
9 up.

10 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Are you planning
11 on the site --

12 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: We will plan another
13 one.

14 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: A few of us didn't
15 make the last one. Can you make any
16 arrangements for some of us that missed it to
17 go down there and take a brief look overall
18 of what you're doing.

19 MR. DEGENNARO: Absolutely. We spray
20 painted the location of the new roads, and we
21 also put the markings that we have in the
22 field on a separate map. So, I can
23 distribute that to the board and this could
24 be self explanatory. So if you go out there
25 and visit the site. But if you wanted to

1 Proceedings

2 arrange another site visit with myself or
3 someone else from the RHPT we could certainly
4 complete it as well.

5 MR. KRAESE: You did get his name,
6 correct.

7 THE REPORTER: Yes.

8 MR. KRAESE: I would like to give you a
9 buzz. If you -- somewhere along the line, if
10 the three of us that missed it could take
11 another look.

12 MR. DEGENNARO: Absolutely. Let me know
13 what works best for you.

14 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Thanks.

15 MR. DEGENNARO: These visual simulations
16 are in what we handed out, part of the EAF
17 part three, on pages 3-14, 15 and 16.

18 MR. KRAESE: Say that number again.

19 MR. DEGENNARO: Pages 3-14, 3-15 and
20 3-16. We selected three locations from
21 Grassy Point Road in which to prepare these
22 visual simulations. So, this is the existing
23 conditions. Grassy Point Road about 400 feet
24 east of Pennybridge. So, this is existing.
25 And here is we have proposed.

1 Proceedings

2 So, you could see the elevations where
3 the houses are a little bit higher. But
4 given the context and perspective from Grassy
5 Point Road, it's not a tremendous difference.
6 The next one is an elevation.

7 MR. STACH: Can you do that back and
8 forth a couple of times?

9 MR. DEGENNARO: Sure. Okay.

10 MR. STACH: Maybe keep going a lot back
11 and forth.

12 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: There is a lot of
13 landscaping there.

14 MR. DEGENNARO: There is a lot of
15 landscaping. And the images we took, are in
16 the winter, there is no leaf cover on the
17 existing.

18 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: So, you will be
19 leaving some of the green trees as you see on
20 this picture?

21 MR. DEGENNARO: Straight ahead from this
22 perspective, is the out parcel, so there are
23 about three trees there.

24 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: We will go over
25 them.

1 Proceedings

2 MR. DEGENNARO: These here, those two
3 buildings are existing. And these nice trees
4 right there are also existing. You can kind
5 of see them without leaves right there.

6 MR. SHERMAN: Dan Sherman, landscape
7 architect. The large trees are taken from
8 the plan of one that can remain, because the
9 grading is small around the edges, so we put
10 those right into the drawings exactly where
11 they are. Those are the existing. All of
12 the smaller ones are new.

13 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: The big ones are the
14 existing ones.

15 MR. SHERMAN: Yes.

16 MR. DEGENNARO: As we get closer to the
17 existing sea wall, the fill tape is back to
18 existing grade. It's the road that's in the
19 center of that peninsula that we're elevating
20 and the homes as well. Under the proposed
21 conditions the homes that are on top of the
22 sea wall will no longer be there. They're
23 getting pushed further inland, upland.

24 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Is that to the right
25 of the dock or the left? When you look at

1 Proceedings

2 dock, that's probably to the right of the
3 dock?

4 MR. DEGENNARO: Yeah.

5 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Where the office is?

6 MR. DEGENNARO: The office will be all
7 of the way down here.

8 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: This is down the
9 other side where that --

10 MR. DEGENNARO: This is --

11 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: -- the tow truck
12 place?

13 MR. DEGENNARO: Yeah. That's kind of
14 behind the fenced in area.

15 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: The fenced in area,
16 okay.

17 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Bill, do all of
18 these units have to be 50 feet from the
19 water?

20 MR. SHEEHAN: Well, they're supposed to
21 get back to me as far as -- well, the 50 foot
22 is from the Hudson. This isn't the Hudson.

23 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: This is in the
24 inlet.

25 MR. SHEEHAN: They're supposed to get

1 Proceedings

2 back to me as far as what type of stream
3 classification it is, to figure out what the
4 buffer is. And --

5 MR. DEGENNARO: We do have to coordinate
6 that with Bill's office and ask for --

7 MR. SHEEHAN: So, I can't answer that
8 question.

9 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: All right.

10 MR. SHEEHAN: It could be 25, it could
11 be 50, it could be 75.

12 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: I want to make
13 sure that they're aware that there is some
14 limitations to the setback. You are aware of
15 that?

16 MR. DEGENNARO: We are aware of it. We
17 discussed it with Max. Max brought it up.
18 It's a little bit of a gray area, that
19 section of the code --

20 MR. SHEEHAN: It's actually not. But --

21 MR. DEGENNARO: Okay. Whatever your
22 interpretation is. But what we are proposing
23 everything is significantly further back from
24 the waters edge than what's there now. So,
25 that be might be a variance that we would be

1 Proceedings

2 requesting.

3 So, the next one here is taking really
4 at the Pennybridge crossing. So, again,
5 existing conditions and close conditions.
6 So, you could see here, that's the sea wall,
7 the temporary wall. And there is the out
8 parcel building, there is the out parcel
9 building. And there are, the structure right
10 there, that's right on -- it's part of the
11 facilities for the marina. That is coming
12 out. It could be more of a grassy area from
13 the sea wall, Ba Mar Drive. And that's going
14 to slope up. So, we intend on keeping the
15 existing tinder cribbing wall as much as we
16 can.

17 So, I will flip back and forth between
18 these two, existing, proposed. And again,
19 over here you can see that's pavement and
20 parking spaces that are perpendicular to the
21 sea wall. They're coming out of that
22 location. That's going to be grass and nice
23 and landscaped.

24 MR. STACH: Are you going to submit the
25 landscape plan that corresponds with these

1 Proceedings

2 visuals?

3 MR. DEGENNARO: Yes. Right now the
4 landscaping plan that we talked about at our
5 previous meeting focussed more on the buffer
6 in between the water and the weeds. The
7 ultimate landscaping plan will also include
8 shade trees and additional landscaping within
9 the site itself. But we wanted to focus
10 preliminarily on the impacts of the
11 landscaping with respect to the water and the
12 wetlands. As a matter of fact, that was one
13 of the comments from the DEC. They wanted to
14 see what we were proposing with the areas
15 that's been submitted to the DEC.

16 So, this is the third simulation that we
17 did. Obviously right at the entrance at
18 Grassy Point Road looking at Ba Mar Drive.
19 So, this is existing and this is proposed.

20 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: That's with the new
21 road elevation, right?

22 MR. DEGENNARO: Yes, it is. So,
23 obviously we have the existing grade right
24 there we're tying in. The road dips down a
25 little bit under existing conditions, right

1 Proceedings

2 there. There is a drop. And we're filling
3 in this portion of the road, and we are
4 meeting grade right there. So, there will be
5 a less severe drop in elevation. There is
6 really just beyond this, the limits of the
7 sim, is the boat ramp down. So, there is
8 only so much we could fill at that boat ramp,
9 otherwise it would be become too steep. So
10 we are getting closer to grade at that
11 location. But we -- that's part of our loop
12 road needs work. There is a loop as we go
13 down hill from the road, there is a loop that
14 goes up the street. Really just beyond that
15 house and before the boat ramp.

16 So, again, this was the last simulation.
17 It's part of the EAF part three. It really
18 was done to address the potential significant
19 adverse impacts identified by the part two
20 with respect to aesthetic resources.

21 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. I guess
22 for next -- I guess that's it for the
23 presentation right for now?

24 MR. DEGENNARO: Yes.

25 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: And we will go over

1 Proceedings

2 it, I guess, for next month.

3 MR. STACH: Yeah. I think we will have
4 some comments on this. I just flipped
5 through, and what I didn't see anywhere was a
6 discussion of your methods in developing
7 these simulations. So, I will want to know
8 for example, the photos that you took, what
9 your camera settings were in terms of zoom
10 and aperture to make sure that they are
11 representative of, you know, a natural view.
12 And how you built the simulations. So, what
13 software did you use and how did you
14 reference scale --

15 MR. DEGENNARO: Sure.

16 MR. STACH: -- and depth in that
17 simulation.

18 MR. DEGENNARO: We can certainly amend
19 the part three to include that information.

20 MR. STACH: Or maybe even just
21 supplement it at this point.

22 MR. DEGENNARO: Whatever is the
23 preferred method.

24 MR. STACH: But I think we just got it
25 tonight, so I think it's only fair we go

1 Proceedings

2 through it.

3 MR. O'ROURKE: I agree. We will have
4 comments. We were briefly looking at it
5 while we discussed it tonight. We are going
6 to need some storm water damage reports and
7 have some numbers in there, but we don't have
8 the --

9 MR. DEGENNARO: The actual documents.
10 And we can provide that next week. We did
11 run through the numbers -- in the preference
12 area. So, what we intend on doing with
13 respect to storm water management is a
14 development site. But we are -- while we are
15 reducing purpose area. We are not reducing
16 it significantly enough to get a waiver of
17 water quality requirements. So, we have some
18 infiltration pipes and some of the property
19 -- for management.

20 MR. O'ROURKE: That's going to be
21 wrapped up in a report and the same with the
22 military or how many trucks and all of that
23 stuff. That may be in here. I just looked
24 at it briefly. You're bringing in a lot of
25 fill material to build on the hole, filling

1 Proceedings

2 in the flood zone. But you're going to have
3 a lot of vehicles bringing in truck loads of
4 material if you're bringing in as much fill
5 as it appears.

6 MR. DEGENNARO: Yes. It's certainly a
7 substantial amount. And that was not
8 discussed in the EAF part three. It was
9 identified in part two. But we can provide
10 whatever supporting information you would
11 need to make an assessment. Okay.

12 MR. STACH: FYI, on the DEC website
13 that's showed up a EC Trout Spawning, ECTS.

14 MR. SHEEHAN: So, 75 foot. But as
15 discussed that after, I have to mention as
16 discussed at one of the tech meetings that
17 the Town Board did do a blanket waiver on
18 some of the zoning requirements on most of
19 the areas down there that were damaged by the
20 storm. So I -- we -- as discussed we need to
21 determine what units were severely damaged
22 and so forth to come into those variances.
23 That information has not been provided to me.
24 But we did discuss it. So, to answer your
25 question now you know it's a TS, it's 75 foot

1 Proceedings

2 buffer.

3 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Bill, do they need
4 anything from the railroad since they're
5 close to it?

6 MR. SHEEHAN: Ear plugs.

7 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Besides that, they
8 don't need like --

9 MR. SHEEHAN: As far as I'm aware,
10 they're not encroaching on the property, so
11 no.

12 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right.

13 MR. SHEEHAN: They would have been
14 notified as if they own that and he has
15 jointed property owner.

16 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right.

17 Steve, any other.

18 MR. HONAN: No.

19 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Does the board have
20 any questions? So, I guess Ira --

21 MR. EMANUEL: I would like to ask the
22 board to set up the public hearing --

23 MR. SHEEHAN: I have some questions and
24 comments.

25 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Sorry.

1 Proceedings

2 MR. SHEEHAN: Couple of them have been
3 answered. One was the classifications of the
4 stream. I noticed on your map your
5 calculations on your land, to me your net
6 area doesn't coincide with your bulk table.
7 I think you have 719 thousand on your bulk
8 table. If you look at your calculations, I
9 think it doesn't jive --

10 MR. DEGENNARO: I will check that.

11 MR. SHEEHAN: -- check that.

12 And on your calculations, you have
13 everything broken down into acres, but your
14 bulk table has square foot.

15 MR. DEGENNARO: Okay.

16 MR. SHEEHAN: Can you keep it the same
17 so apples to apples.

18 MR. DEGENNARO: Sure.

19 MR. SHEEHAN: The other question was, on
20 your square footage for impervious surfaces
21 did you count underneath the units?

22 MR. DEGENNARO: We counted the actual
23 units, yes.

24 MR. SHEEHAN: So, you deducted from
25 impervious surfaces underneath the units?

1 Proceedings

2 You're not counting that as storage?

3 MR. DEGENNARO: No. We did not count it
4 as storage. We took the footprint of the
5 unit with --

6 MR. SHEEHAN: I'm not talking
7 development coverage. I'm talking about
8 impervious surfaces.

9 MR. DEGENNARO: Correct. We didn't
10 count it twice. But we counted it just for
11 the rooftops.

12 MR. SHEEHAN: The other issue is, which
13 we discussed in the past, about you were
14 going to provide to the flood administrator
15 your calculations of the fill, and also
16 demonstrate that you're not going to cause a
17 problem elsewhere by filling this.

18 MR. DEGENNARO: Sure.

19 MR. SHEEHAN: That has not been
20 provided.

21 MR. DEGENNARO: We will provide it.

22 MR. SHEEHAN: It goes back to what John
23 is also saying, that you know, we need that
24 information before I can make a determination
25 if you can fill.

1 Proceedings

2 MR. DEGENNARO: Okay.

3 MR. SHEEHAN: We both know it was tiles,
4 so it's a lot easier to achieve the goal.
5 But we still need that information.

6 MR. DEGENNARO: Okay.

7 MR. SHEEHAN: I was on vacation this
8 week, so I didn't see the DEC letter. But
9 I'm still -- my review of our code still is
10 -- my interpretation is that you cannot
11 encroach into that buffer even though the DEC
12 may allow you to. So, that needs to be
13 addressed.

14 MR. DEGENNARO: Okay. We will -- I
15 believe Ira had submitted a report about
16 that. I guess we have not come to a
17 conclusion with respect to that, but we
18 will --

19 MR. SHEEHAN: Well, Ira way back when,
20 we were back and forth on e-mails. As far as
21 different parts of it we never had a
22 conclusion on it. I don't know if anything
23 new has come up about it. I think some of
24 these things need to be ironed out before we
25 get too far down the road.

1 Proceedings

2 MR. DEGENNARO: Okay.

3 MR. SHEEHAN: We have been asking for
4 this information.

5 MR. DEGENNARO: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right.
7 Bill, anything else or that's it?

8 MR. SHEEHAN: No.

9 MR. EMANUEL: I was starting to ask the
10 board's public hearing date for the next
11 meeting. Plans are fairly well developed.

12 MR. SHEEHAN: Let me interrupt one more,
13 Ira --

14 MR. EMANUEL: He's never going to let me
15 make this request.

16 MR. SHEEHAN: Because you might be able
17 to touch on this in your summation.

18 You were also going to give us a list of
19 what units needed variance and what
20 variances.

21 MR. DEGENNARO: Okay.

22 MR. SHEEHAN: Okay.

23 MR. STACH: Can I?

24 MR. EMANUEL: I'm going to sit down.
25 Tell me when you're ready.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

MR. STACH: Mr. Chairman, I guess part of this was I was out of town, and I think Mary was out of town, or indisposed for a little while.

What was last official submission that was made, and what did it comprise? Because between the review of February 14 from my office, was there a full revised submission made other than -- I didn't see a plan that sort of had truck turning movements on it. But it didn't seem to be a fully developed plan.

MR. DEGENNARO: That was independent. Those were supplemental drawings. But I believe there was a full site plan submission made, I think on February 19, after the February 14 TAC meeting.

MR. STACH: And was there a full response? We talked at the TAC meeting about doing a full response memorandum that responded to each of the points in our memorandums that we had provided on the 14th. That was part of that package?

MR. DEGENNARO: It was.

1 Proceedings

2 MR. STACH: Okay.

3 MR. DEGENNARO: So, at this point,
4 honestly, based on the DEC discussions, we've
5 developed the plans in more detail. So, we
6 can resubmit what we gave to DEC so everyone
7 is on the same page.

8 MR. STACH: That's part of it. So, we
9 got the submission tonight. Are the plans
10 going to change before next month
11 significantly from what they are on
12 February 19 last submitted?

13 MR. DEGENNARO: No.

14 MR. STACH: So, are we going to get
15 landscape plans that weren't previously
16 submitted?

17 MR. DEGENNARO: Yes.

18 MR. STACH: Are we going to get any
19 other plans that weren't previously
20 submitted?

21 MR. DEGENNARO: Not with respect to the
22 layout plan or the grading planning with road
23 profiles. That stays the same.

24 MR. STACH: You will be submitting stuff
25 like the drainage report?

1 Proceedings

2 MR. O'ROURKE: 2/14/19.

3 MR. STACH: 2/14/19, which is the date
4 of the last TAC meeting?

5 MR. O'ROURKE: Right.

6 MR. DEGENNARO: The TAC meeting.

7 MR. STACH: We were clarifying the last
8 plans were dated 2/14, dated received by the
9 town February 20.

10 MR. O'ROURKE: Correct.

11 MR. DEGENNARO: Yes.

12 MR. SHEEHAN: Is that plan shown in
13 the 20-foot road in the southwest corner, you
14 know that loop around road?

15 MR. DEGENNARO: I believe it does.

16 MR. SHEEHAN: Okay. Because --

17 MR. O'ROURKE: I think it does, and also
18 just to question after this, when you say
19 it's not going to change much. Did you
20 resolve the issue with the utility, overhead
21 utility lines and easements? Because you had
22 talked about maybe having to potentially have
23 to move some units.

24 MR. DEGENNARO: That is still under
25 discussion with Orange & Rockland similar to

1 Proceedings

2 discussions with DEC.

3 MR. O'ROURKE: Okay. I just wanted to
4 clarify it.

5 MR. DEGENNARO: There is a lot of moving
6 parts with this application.

7 MR. STACH: I just wanted to get that
8 clarified.

9 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Are we good? Come
10 on Ira.

11 MR. EMANUEL: Are you sure, Bill? Am I
12 good to go?

13 MR. SHEEHAN: Go ahead.

14 MR. EMANUEL: I would like to ask the
15 board to set a public hearing date. Yes,
16 there is additional information that is being
17 requested. Much of that information can
18 certainly be provided to the board and made
19 available for public review prior to the next
20 meeting of the board. We've been with this
21 basic plan for quite some time now. I would
22 like to hear from the public. I would like
23 to hear what the public has to say about it.
24 If there is going to be changes to the plan
25 lets make those changes one time rather than

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

having to make piecemeal. Lets get this out.
A lot of people would like to -- feel this
the site of public interest because of the
location, because of the number people that
live there. And we think that this is the
appropriate time now to start having public
hearing and start hearing from the public.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Personally I think
there is a lot of information that has to be
gathered and submitted to us, from my point
of view, at this point. To start the public
hearing process, I think it's maybe a month
too early. Let's get all of that paper work
in, satisfy the town planner, building
inspector, and what we can go through this.
That's just my opinion. It's up to you,
you're the boss.

MR. STACH: Mr. Chairman, can I ask Ira
a question?

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah.

MR. STACH: What is the status of the
marina and the parking for the marina and
whether or not that's going --

MR. EMANUEL: Right now we're still

1 Proceedings

2 showing a marina, still showing parking for
3 the marina. It's a not -- question that we
4 are all working out. I am hoping to do
5 something with it. As I said, before it's a
6 lot easier to take it out than it is to put
7 it back in.

8 MR. STACH: But you're maintaining the
9 parking on your property --

10 MR. EMANUEL: At this time, yes.

11 MR. STACH: -- to support that?

12 MR. EMANUEL: Yes.

13 MR. STACH: I think it would probably be
14 better to have an opportunity to go through
15 the information. The EAF part three is part
16 of the material that's going to be available
17 for public review. And I think it makes
18 sense to review that information in terms of
19 it's accuracy before you make it available
20 for the public for review. And there may be
21 additional information that needs to be
22 provided. Certainly there is some
23 engineering questions that have to be
24 reviewed. We want to make sure that the --
25 these elevations are accurately portrayed. I

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

agree that it's -- if not this month
upcoming, it's certainly almost certainly the
following one. But I think this one will be
a little early.

MR. O'ROURKE: Not to speak for Bill,
but I think you have to resolve the issue
with the setback with the DEC versus the town
code, that's going to affect it.

MR. STACH: And the list of variances.
Because we're going to have to know what this
is going have to be referred to the zoning
board for before that hearing is closed. And
they're going to have to go to the zoning
board.

MR. DEGENNARO: The variances that are
required are lot width for most of the units.
We can give --

MR. STACH: But you have to provide the
information for the building inspector to
verify that.

MR. DEGENNARO: We can go through
the 141 unit or 140 units and see what the
proposed lot width would be. Based on the
discussion for the stream setback, that would

1 Proceedings

2 be another variance as well. So, it's a
3 variance that would be requested. It's --

4 MR. STACH: Is it a variance from the
5 stream or is it --

6 MR. SHEEHAN: Yeah. That's one of the
7 issues that is actually set in two different
8 sections. One in the zoning and also one in
9 it's own local law chapter, which is our
10 board would not have jurisdiction. So, I am
11 leaning towards the blanket variances that
12 the town board had issued. But again, the
13 applicant has to provide that information.

14 I have to say that I will be here at the
15 TAC meeting on the ninth. But then I'm off
16 for the rest of the month. So, what I think
17 I need to make prior to actually the part
18 three being either a negative deck or a
19 positive deck or whatever the board might do,
20 determination is made that the map might
21 change significantly if the DEC or the buffer
22 for the wetlands area need to be altered, not
23 the buffered, but the units. The units on
24 the O & R easements need to be changed. And
25 if in fact, that the setback from the Hudson

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

or the Ceder Pond Brook needs to be adjusted, that's going to have an impact on the layout of the project. Also, what's another big determination is the fill on the property, still has to be determined that the filling is not going to create -- I don't foresee it to, but I need that documentation. And we have been asking for this for a while. So, what I'm saying, if we don't get this by -- I think we should have all of this information by the TAC meeting so we can finally iron it out. Otherwise, I don't think we're really ready to get to a negative deck, which I need for the zoning board. And also needs to normally be adopted prior to a public hearing. So, it's quite a bit of stuff that needs to be done in two weeks.

MR. HONAN: Can I ask a question of Bill? Bill, with respect to the foundations for these new units, I believe the code requires a pad, doesn't it?

MR. SHEEHAN: That was my reason for the question. Because you have -- you have development coverage, which would count the

1 Proceedings

2 building. But they're actually counting the
3 area underneath the building, if they're
4 going to be doing slabs, which most likely
5 are going to do, that becomes impervious.

6 MR. HONAN: I thought they were looking
7 not to do it on slabs, but on piers.

8 MR. SHEEHAN: Well, the code allows you
9 to do both ways. However, typically what
10 we've done over the years is pour a complete
11 slab. It's easier to put the units on. It's
12 less maintenance. To get under it's easier.
13 They have haven't proposed what they're
14 doing. I was just thinking that what they've
15 done in the past they would continue to do.
16 So, that's why I raised the question if they
17 were counting that area as pervious versus
18 impervious.

19 MR. HONAN: I thought I remembered at
20 one of the TAC meetings that the applicants
21 had suggested that piers were going to be
22 used, but that would be impervious surfaces.

23 MR. SHEEHAN: Right. That's why I
24 raised the question.

25 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. Ira,

1 Proceedings

2 unfortunately we're going to wait.

3 MR. EMANUEL: Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Next month, if
5 everything is in order, we will set the
6 public hearing up. We will wait to get all
7 of this information by the TAC meeting. If
8 everything is good we will do it in March --
9 -- in May.

10 MR. STACH: May be a couple of days
11 before.

12 MR. EMANUEL: So pushy.

13 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: So, the TAC meeting
14 is?

15 MR. SHEEHAN: The ninth.

16 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: The ninth. So, you
17 got the first, May first, that week you get
18 to him before so Bill has time, and our
19 planning consultant engineering.

20 MR. STACH: The deadline is the Friday
21 before?

22 MR. SHEEHAN: Usually.

23 MR. STACH: If you can get it in by the
24 third.

25 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: May third, that

1 Proceedings

2 would be good.

3 MR. EMANUEL: That's Ken.

4 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: So, May third. And
5 I think is that it?

6 MR. EMANUEL: From us.

7 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: I did see the
8 fire --

9 MR. LARKIN: Thomas Larkin, Fire
10 Inspector. The fire hydrant layout from
11 sewer and water main size?

12 MR. DEGENNARO: Okay. We can show the
13 locations of where you think the water main
14 will go and have them review it, propose some
15 locations for fire hydrants.

16 MR. LARKIN: They're going to use ten
17 state stand. So, they're already going to
18 have it laid out for you, and it has to be
19 approved by the board of fire commissioners.

20 MR. DEGENNARO: Sure.

21 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Thank you,
22 Mr. Larkin. That's it. You guys, we will
23 see you next month.

24 MR. EMANUEL: I think we have enough to
25 keep Ken off the streets for a while.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Last item on the agenda is accept the minutes from March 28. I need a motion.

MR. ROGERS: Make the motion.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Second?

MR. JOACHIM: Second.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All in favor, aye?

BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Aye.

BOARD MEMBER JOACHIM: Aye.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Aye.

BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: Aye.

BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Opposed?

We have one more item. Max is going to --

MR. STACH: It's real brief. I guess John was contacted again by DOS. Army Corps is looking for a consistency review. They are doing some sort of investigation work at Iona Island for munitions dating back to when, I guess, it was a munitions depot. So, they're going to be doing some digging in that area, they're going to be doing some diving in the waters around the island. And

1 Proceedings

2 technically that's an action that would
3 normally require a consistency review. As
4 with previous federal action proposals, they
5 said please provide us any comments. And if
6 we don't hear from you in 30 days we will
7 assume you have no issues. So, you are, by
8 resolution, the town board, the water front
9 consistency review, the authority. As long
10 as you are comfortable with the Army Corps
11 going and conducting, it's again, it's
12 exploratory. They're looking to find if
13 there are any residual contamination or
14 munitions left over from when the island was
15 used as a depot.

16 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. So, do
17 we have to --

18 MR. STACH: If you don't want to
19 comment, again, as time runs out, they will
20 just assume you don't have any concerns.

21 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Bill -- I don't. We
22 don't have any concerns?

23 MR. SHEEHAN: They've been there since
24 World War II.

25 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Thanks, Max.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

Last item. Motion to close.

MR. KRAESE: Make the motion.

MR. JOACHIM: Second.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All in favor aye.

Opposed?

Meeting is closed.

(Time noted: 7:55 p.m.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE FOREGOING IS CERTIFIED to be a true and correct transcription of the original stenographic minutes to the best of my ability.


Debra Boggs

