www.courtreportingny.com

STATE OF NEW YORK :	COUNTY OF ROCKLAND
TOWN OF STONY POINT :	PLANNING BOARD
	X
IN THE MATTER OF	
SAINSBURY'S "C" S	TORE
	Town of Stony Point RHO Building 5 Clubhouse Lane Stony Point, New York February 25, 2021 7:06 p.m. (via Zoom)
BEFORE:	
THOMAS GUBITOSA, CHAIRMA KERRI ALESSI, BOARD MEMB MICHAEL FERGUSON, BOARD E ERIC JASLOW, BOARD MEMBE MARK JOHNSON, BOARD MEMB JERRY ROGERS, BOARD MEMB	ER MEMBER R ER
2 Conger New City,	ORANGE REPORTING s Road, Suite 2 New York 10956) 634-4200

www.courtreportingny.com 2 1 Proceedings 2 3 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Our next application 4 is Sainsbury's C Store. It's located on 210. 5 Dave, I know last month you closed the public 6 hearing. Oh, not Dave. I'm sorry. 7 Where's --8 THE CLERK: Mr. Patel is there, and his 9 surveyor. 10 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yes. 11 MR. ANDRADE: And Manny here. 12 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Manny. 13 MR. ANDRADE: Yeah, the video stopped 14 for a minute. I can't turn my video on for 15 some reason. 16 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: That's all right. 17 If you just want to give us -- yeah, give us 18 an update. 19 MR. ANDRADE: Okay. After the public 20 hearing from last, last month, we met with 21 the neighbors. We met with the neighbor to 2.2 the rear and the neighbor to the left side. 23 We discussed the hours of operation and their 24 concerns with that. And after going back and

forth a couple times and explaining the

25

1 Proceedings 2 reasoning why Mr. Patel wanted to keep those 3 hours that long, we worked out an alternate 4 solution of working with the neighbors along 5 the back and along the side and planting new 6 trees. 7 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. 8 MR. ANDRADE: Along -- on their property 9 to provide more privacy for theirs. 10 based on discussions we had, they seemed if 11 we did that, they were okay with the hours. 12 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, good. 13 And Manny and Mr. Patel, you weren't -- just 14 to make everyone clear, you weren't asking 15 for any, any variances, or anything outside 16 of the normal, what's already there. You're 17 just -- this was just for some on-site 18 improvements, correct? You didn't -- yeah, 19 you didn't do any variance to, you know, 20 extend hours or anything. Whatever was in 21 place since it's been a deli, that's, that's 2.2 what you had. 23 MR. PATEL: Yes. 24 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. 25 John O'Rourke, any comments on this one?

4 1 Proceedings 2 MR. O'ROURKE: No. We have -- they've 3 addressed all our comments. We have no 4 further issue with this project. 5 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, good. 6 John Hager, any comments on your end? 7 MR. HAGER: I have no comments on this. 8 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Okay, good. Thanks, 9 John. Any of the Board Members? Comments? 10 I'll go to each of you. Jerry, any comments 11 on this? Any --12 BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: No, I'm fine with 13 it. 14 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Good. Mike, 15 anything on your end? 16 BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: No. I'm good. 17 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Eric? 18 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: I think it's very 19 nice of the applicant to plant the trees as 2.0 goodwill. 21 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah, I do, too. 2.2 Thank you. Thanks, Eric. Kerri, any 23 comments? 24 BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: I just have a 25 question. Did Mr. Patel and the neighbors

5 1 Proceedings 2 work out any issues they had regarding 3 questions on the fencing? 4 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: I think he did. 5 Mr. Patel, Manny, you -- I think that was 6 with the --7 MR. ANDRADE: We explained to them that 8 we were going to put that vinyl fence all the 9 way around. The neighbor to the back that 10 had the driveway along the right side of the 11 property asked if they can keep the wooden 12 fence there because they've been maintaining 13 the look of that. And we're going to put the 14 vinyl fence inside of that area. 15 BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: Okay. 16 MR. PATEL: And it will be all six feet 17 high. 18 Right, because CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: 19 that's the code is six feet. So you 20 couldn't, you couldn't change it if you want. 21 Okay. Mark, any comments from you? 2.2 BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: No, I'm good. 23 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. And I 24 think, same as Eric. Mr. Patel, and I, you 25 know, I thank you for working with the

2.2

neighbors. I know they got noticed of this late, and I know you've been working on this since last July. So I appreciate your patience. And I appreciate the neighbors getting involved and, you know, working it out with you. Thank you.

So, Steve, any, anything updates, or?

MR. HONAN: No. I did, however, prepare
a resolution for the Board's consideration,
and it is a little bit lengthy. It's about
seven pages long. It is seven pages long.

What I propose to do is to read the resolution. And I'll -- rather than read the Rockland County Department of Planning letters in full, I'll refer to them. They are part of the record, and they're also set forth in the resolution.

But in order to get through it tonight,
I'm going to read the first part, indicate
where I'm skipping to, and then I'll conclude
by reading the overrides. Because of the
items placed in the letters by the Department
of Planning for the County of Rockland, we
have to specifically identify which items we

1	Proceedings
2	2020, has been submitted to the Planning
3	Board of the Town of Stony Point for final
4	site plan approval seeking to
5	redevelop/improve an existing site and
6	construct a 1,463.45 square feet addition to
7	an existing commercial building, which
8	presently consists of 1,384.43 square feet,
9	housing a deli, and to install site
10	improvements together with a submitted
11	proposed site plan for the project designated
12	Sainsbury's C Store, consisting of three
13	sheets, prepared by Paul Gdanski, P.E., PLLC,
14	dated March 19, 2020, and last revised
15	October 28, 2020, hereinafter, subject
16	application, and concerning premises
17	designated as Section 15.03, Block 5,
18	Lot 60.1 on the Tax Map of the Town of
19	Stony Point, County of Rockland, situated in
20	a R-1 Zoning District, located at 133
21	Route 210, Stony Point, New York, 10980, and
22	consisting of 0.5241 acres, hereinafter, the
23	subject premises; and
24	Whereas, pursuant to New York State
25	Environmental Quality Review Act, this

1	Proceedings
2	application constitutes a Type 2 action, and
3	the proposed action is not expected to have a
4	significant adverse environmental impact, and
5	accordingly, no further environmental review
6	required; and
7	Whereas, by letters dated July 16, 2020,
8	and September 23, 2020, the Rockland County
9	Department of Planning conducted a review of
10	the application pursuant to its GML authority
11	and recommended certain changes and
12	modifications to the plan, to which the
13	applicant's architect, Manuel Antonio
14	Andrade, responded by letters dated August 8,
15	2020, and November 3.
16	The substance of those letters are made
17	part of the Planning Board record. They also
18	are referred to in this resolution and will
19	not be read at length at this point.
20	However, if you're reading along, we're
21	skipping now to Page 4 of the resolution, at
22	the bottom of the page, the next whereas
23	paragraph, which reads:
24	Whereas, by letters dated July 14, 2020,
25	and September 2, 2020, the Rockland County

2.2

Highway Department conducted a review of the application pursuant to its GML authority and determined that the proposed action would have no significant impacts upon the County Road, and this department has no objection to the project, and prior to the commencement of construction, a right of way permit must be obtained from the Rockland County Highway Department; and

Whereas, by letters dated July 21 and September 21, 2020, the Rockland County Center for Environmental Health conducted a review of the application pursuant to its GML authority and determined that if a storm water management system is needed in the future, application must be made to the RCDOH for review of the system for compliance with the County Mosquito Code; and

Whereas, by a project review sheet dated August 17, 2020 -- yes, could you please mute your mic if you're not speaking.

Whereas, by a project review sheet dated August 17, 2020, of John O'Rourke, P.E., the Town of Stony Point Engineer, a review was

Proceedings

2.2

conducted of the application and proposed site plan, and he noted numerous changes and clarifications were needed as well as corrections to the EAF, and the applicant, in response, has revised the plans and corrected the EAF in a manner satisfactory to the engineer; and

Whereas, this Board referred the applicant to the Architectural Review Board of the Town of Stony Point, and by a decision dated September 15, 2020, the ARB issued an approval of the application; and

Whereas, this application was the subject of a duly noticed public hearing before this Board, at which time the neighboring residents advised the Board of their concerns regarding this project, including the receipt by this Board of a two page letter dated January 24, 2021, from Mr. and Mrs. Piscopiello, the neighbors at 131 Route 210, regarding concerns relative to the proposed expanded building, traffic, noise, lighting, fencing, hours of operation, and related issues, and the applicant

2.2

thereafter addressed the neighbors' concerns before this Board; and

Whereas, this application was the subject of a duly noticed Public Hearing before this Board on December 10, 2020, at which time the hearing was opened and continued to January 28, 2021, at which time the Public Hearing was closed.

Whereas, this application came up for further review and consideration as an agenda item at the regularly scheduled meeting of this Board on February 25, 2021, at which time the applicant informed this Board that he met further with certain of the neighbors after the public hearing of January 28, 2021, and answered their questions and addressed their concerns.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the subject application for final site plan approval relative to the subject premises is approved, and the Chairman is hereby authorized to sign same and to permit same to be filed in the office of the Town Clerk upon payment of any and all outstanding fees to

Proceedings

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

the Town, subject and conditioned upon the following:

One, all of the whereas paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference.

Number Two, Item Number Four of the Rockland County Department of Planning letter dated July 16, 2020, stating, inter alia, the site plan must be amended to include a landscaped buffer of low, evergreen shrubs or a berm to shield neighboring properties from the headlights of vehicles on site, is hereby overridden because the plan reflect a limited amount of available space on the site and calls for the installation of continuous solid fencing which shall operate to visually screen and acoustically shield the neighboring properties from the headlights of vehicles and noises on the site, and landscape plantings and/or a berm in this area would not result in adequate screening to the benefit of the neighbors under the unique conditions found on this site.

Number Three, Item Number Six of the Rockland County Department of Planning letter

Proceedings

1

2 dated July 16, 2020, stating the development 3 coverage for the site is currently, and 4 proposed to be, 94.5 percent. This exceeds 5 the maximum development coverage of the H.1 6 use group by 89 percent. In addition, the 7 proposed site plan provides 28 parking spaces 8 while the Town zoning regulations require 9 only 15, which is 87 percent more than 10 required. The applicant must provide a 11 rationale for the proposed number of spaces, 12 particularly in light of the significant 13 excess of impervious surfaces on site. 14 Otherwise, the applicant must reduce the 15 number of proposed parking spaces, is hereby 16 overridden because the development coverage 17 is due to the prior development of the site, 18 and is existing, and the applicant seeks to 19 reduce the development coverage on the site 20 and has reduced the number of parking spaces. 21 Although the number of parking spaces exceeds 2.2 those required, under the circumstances, the 23 additional parking spaces will serve to 24 accommodate customers during busy business 25 periods and avoid queuing and congestion on

б

2.2

Route 210, and the additional spaces will be used for on-site snow pile storage during snow events.

Number Four, Item Number Seven of the Rockland County Department of Planning letter dated July 16, 2020, stating to help reduce the extent of the development coverage non-conformity, pervious pavers and/or other porous materials must be used wherever possible, is hereby overridden because the development coverage of the site is existing due to the prior development of the site, and the applicant seeks to reduce the amount of development coverage and replace existing macadam with landscaping, and the use of pervious pavers is expensive and has minimal benefits under the present circumstances.

Number Five, Item Number Nine of the Rockland County Department of Planning letter dated July 16, 2020, stating there shall be no net increase in the peak rate of discharge from the site at all designed points is hereby overridden because the plan calls for the redevelopment of an existing site with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

significant development coverage. A storm water management system is not required. The plan will result in a reduction of existing impervious surface area on the site, and to the extent there may be an increase in the rate of runoff, it will only be minor and non-substantial.

Number Six, Item Number 13 of the Rockland County Department of Planning letter dated July 20 -- I'm sorry, dated July 16, 2020, stating areas designated for snow removal must be clearly delineated on the site plan so that the plow drivers will know where to place the snow piles. This will help to protect the proposed landscaping from damage due to the weight of the snow and salt intrusion. In addition, providing specific locations on the site for the snow piles will reduce the use of the parking spaces meant for customers for this purpose, is hereby overridden because the applicant has a limited amount of available space on site, and it proposes to use the extra available parking areas to store plowed snow during

Proceedings

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

snow events, therefore allowing the additional parking to be used for the dual purpose of snow storage, which under these unique circumstances is reasonable. The use of some spaces for snow storage will leave sufficient spaces for parking.

And finally, Number Seven, Item Number 15 of the Rockland County Department of Planning letter dated July 16, 2020, stating a noise-dampening barrier must be installed to shield the adjacent property from the proposed HVAC units and generator is hereby overridden because the applicant has represented that the HVAC units are consistent in size with a single-family residential dwelling and will be located adjacent to a long driveway approximately 16 feet from the property line. The units will also be located behind a fence which will serve to both visually screen and acoustically shield the neighboring properties from the operating units. Therefore, their placement behind a fence will serve as a noise-dampening barrier.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

2.0

And Number Eight, compliance with all other applicable site plan requirements set forth in the site plan regulations of the Town of Stony Point and consistent with the general notes on the applicant's approved site plan.

And that concludes the reading of the proposed resolution, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Thank you. Thank you, Steve. All right, I have a proposed resolution. I need a motion to adopt the resolution.

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: I'll make that motion.

16 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Mark made it.

BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: I'll second it.

18 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Seconded. And

19 before we vote, any questions on it?

MR. HAGER: Yes, I have a question.

21 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Go ahead, John.

MR. HAGER: It's probably a

23 typographical. But on Page Two, Number Five,

24 in the reply, that the language there just

25 seems like it might be missing a word.

19 1 Proceedings 2 Page Two, Number Five, the reply. 3 MR. HONAN: Yes, I see that. I'll make 4 sure that it reflects what's actually in the 5 letter. 6 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yes, okay. Thank 7 you, John. So just the reply on Number Five, 8 right, John? 9 MR. HAGER: That's all I noticed. 10 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yup. All right. 11 Thank you, John. Did any of the Board 12 Members, any -- all right. I have a motion 13 to adopt. I have a second. Mary, just poll 14 the Board. 15 THE CLERK: Okay. Mr. Rogers? 16 BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: Yes. 17 THE CLERK: Mr. Jaslow? 18 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Yes. 19 THE CLERK: Mr. Ferguson? 2.0 BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: Yes. 21 THE CLERK: Mrs. Alessi? 2.2 BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: Yes. 23 THE CLERK: Mr. Johnson? 24 BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: Yes. 25 THE CLERK: Chairman Gubitosa?

```
20
1
                 Proceedings
2
         CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yes. All right, so
3
    we'll adopt the, grant the final site plan
4
    approval. So I think we're good. Right,
5
    Steve?
6
         MR. HONAN: Yes. We've got a
7
     supermajority. We've got six members voting
8
    for the resolution. We're fine.
9
         CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right.
                                          So
10
    you're good, Mr. Patel. Thank you.
11
         MR. ANDRADE: Thank you.
12
         CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Mr. Andrade.
13
         MR. PATEL: Thank you very much.
14
         CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: And I thank you for
15
    working with the neighbors, both of you.
16
    Thank you very much.
17
         MR. GDANSKI: Thank you. Have a good
18
    night.
19
         CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Have a good night.
20
    Thank you.
21
          (Time noted: 7:24 p.m.)
2.2
23
                     000
24
25
```

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