1 STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ROCKLAND 2 TOWN OF STONY POINT : PLANNING BOARD 3 - - - - - - - - - - - - - X IN THE MATTER OF 4 BA MAR MANUFACTURED HOME PARK - - - - - - - - - - - - - X 5 Town of Stony Point 6 RHO Building 5 Clubhouse Lane 7 Stony Point, New York May 23, 2019 8 7:54 p.m. 9 BEFORE: 10 THOMAS GUBITOSA, CHAIRMAN 11 PETER MULLER, VICE CHAIRMAN MICHAEL FERGUSON, BOARD MEMBER 12 ERIC JASLOW, BOARD MEMBER PAUL JOACHIM, BOARD MEMBER 13 EUGENE KRAESE, BOARD MEMBER 14 15 APPEARANCES: 16 STEPHEN M. HONAN, ESQ., Special Counsel MAX STACH, Town Planner JOHN O'ROURKE, P.L.S., Town Engineer 17 WILLIAM SHEEHAN, Building Inspector 18 MARY PAGANO, Clerk to the Planning Board IRA EMANNUEL, ESQ., Attorney for Applicant 19 20 ROCKLAND & ORANGE REPORTING 21 2 Congers Road 22 New City, New York 10956 (845) 634-4200 23 24 25

1 Proceedings 2 3 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Next is Ba Mar. All right, this is, I'm sorry, Ba Mar 4 5 Manufactured Home. It's located on the south side of Grassy Point, and it's a review. 6 7 VICE CHAIRMAN MULLER: Ira, we're all 8 warmed up for you. 9 MR. EMANNUEL: The projector or you? 10 VICE CHAIRMAN MULLER: Both. CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, Ira, tell 11 12 me when you're ready. All right, thank you. 13 You can go ahead. Go ahead, Ira. MR. EMANNUEL: Okay. Good evening. Ira 14 15 Emannuel, 4 Laurel Road, New City. I'm the 16 attorney for the applicant. This is a 17 continuation of our discussion with respect 18 to redevelopment of the homes. CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Speak into the mic. 19 MR. EMANNUEL: Sorry. 20 21 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. MR. EMANNUEL: I thought I was. 22 23 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Oh, wait. 24 BOARD MEMBER JOACHIM: Might not be on. MR. EMANNUEL: Okay, now it's on. 25

1	ribecedings
2	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: How is that?
3	MR. EMANNUEL: I'll start over. Is that
4	better?
5	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah, go ahead.
6	Sorry.
7	MR. EMANNUEL: You have my appearance?
8	Okay. So this is a continuation oh, wow.
9	This is a continuation of the discussion that
10	we've been having with respect to the
11	redevelopment of the Ba Mar homes, mobile
12	home park down at Grassy Point. We've
13	appeared before the Board a number of times.
14	We've appeared in front of TAC many, many
15	times as this project keeps evolving and we
16	think improving over time.
17	One of the things that we want to talk
18	to you about this evening is the visual, the
19	visual impacts of the proposal. We've got
20	some new visuals that were prepared in
21	accordance with the guidelines that were
22	given by Mr. Stach. In the meantime, in
23	addition to that, we've also had some
24	conversations with Mr. Sheehan. We've worked
25	out an understanding as to how the wetlands

1	Proceedings
2	regulations and the stream regulations apply
3	with respect to the plan.
4	So with that, I'd like to turn it over
5	to Mr. DeGennaro, who is our project
6	engineer. And he's going to walk you through
7	these visual impact studies so you can have
8	an idea of what the difference is going to be
9	between the current views and what we're
10	proposing.
11	MR. DeGENNARO: Okay. My name is Ken
12	DeGennaro from Brooker Engineering. We're
13	handing these updated visual simulations out.
14	These have been revised as per coordination
15	with Max's office. So I wanted to pass them
16	out to you. I wasn't sure how they would
17	project on the screen.
18	So this first slide is taken, is a
19	photograph taken east of the Penny Bridge
20	looking south. It's overlooking more of the
21	peninsula area of Ba Mar. And this is a good
22	one because right here so existing
23	conditions is on the top. Right there, this
24	is the outparcel that's going to remain. So

25 you can see how it stays the same, obviously,

-	rideedamgs
2	for existing and proposed conditions.
3	This, I think these were prepared by Dan
4	Sherman. He did an excellent job of this
5	because it really does show the impact of the
6	fill that we're proposing. So if you look at
7	this outparcel home right there, in the ridge
8	of that, compared to the ridge of the
9	existing structures here, the existing
10	structures are a little bit below the ridge
11	of the outparcel buildings and that's going
12	to remain.
13	So down here where you're going to
14	propose, and obviously we're elevating, so
15	the bridge is really the ridge of the new
16	buildings at this location are a little bit,
17	just a little bit higher than the ridge of
18	the existing building that remains. So I
19	think this view in particular does a good job
20	of demonstrating the impact with respect to
21	visual esthetics of the fill. So we have two
22	more locations.
23	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Now, is that with
24	the, with the seawall raised?
25	MR. DeGENNARO: That's the same seawall.

Proceedings At this location, we have a lot of room from the seawall to the backyards of the new building, which would be here. So you could see the ground, that's the timber cribbing seawall, and that's the same for existing and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 proposed. And then you can see all the 8 plantings upland of that seawall.

9 We have a lot of options in that area 10 with what we can do. If the wall is going to 11 remain, heavy fill above, what we're going to plant it with. There's a lot of horizontal 12 13 separation from that wall to where our houses 14 are, as opposed from the existing conditions 15 right here, where you see the red house and the white house, they're really right on top 16 17 of the seawall at that location. 18 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right.

MR. DeGENNARO: So this is another picture now, also east of the Penny Bridge, but this is looking more west towards Ba Mar Drive. So it's not the peninsula where it kind of turns. But this is more like a main street.

25 So at this location you could see,

1	Proceedings
2	obviously, existing conditions on the top,
3	proposed on the bottom. Here we do have the
4	timber cribbing seawall that's staying the
5	same for proposed conditions. The green
6	above it is a sloped area that's going to
7	that represents the fill. And then you can
8	see the home behind there. That would be
9	placed on the, on the west side, New Ba Mar
10	Drive.
11	BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Just, when we went
12	for the walk through, just, there's like
13	four feet of fill or something
14	MR. DeGENNARO: Right.
15	BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: going there.
16	So it's actually being raised up.
17	MR. DeGENNARO: Yes, correct. At that
18	location, it was about four feet. And
19	luckily for us, at that location, again,
20	there's some existing parking stalls that are
21	perpendicular to Ba Mar Drive. And those are
22	coming out. So the location of Ba Mar Drive
23	is staying the same. Stalls are coming out.
24	And that gives us some more horizontal
25	distance to achieve that change in vertical

Proceedings

2 grade.

3	As we get closer, as we travel north of
4	Ba Mar Drive, it does get a little bit
5	tighter, and that will require some more
6	detailed evaluation of the seawall itself and
7	how we want to transition with the changing
8	grade. But we're hoping to get through with
9	the DEC and make some progress with the
10	layout, and that will certainly be a design
11	detail we'd love to progress with.
12	So that one we looked at. And again,
13	this picture, you saw something similar last
14	month that was part of the full Part 3 EAF.
15	Obviously this is from Ba Mar Drive, from
16	Grassy Point Road looking down the street to
17	Ba Mar Drive.
18	So you can see for reference the utility
19	pole stays the same. That's in the
20	right-of-way, we're not moving that. And the
21	wires here going to our site are shown as
22	being removed. And again, we're coordinating
23	that with Orange and Rockland as to the
24	feasibility of underground. That's our
25	preference.

2	So yeah, I think these were the three
3	locations we discussed. And I hope that they
4	support the mitigation that we proposed in
5	the EAF Part Three. A lot of the focus of
6	the discussion at the TAC meeting was about
7	providing updated simulation pictures. And
8	I, you know, this is the first that Max is
9	seeing them. Obviously, we'll give him as
10	much time as he needs to review them. But I,
11	you know, I hope we've met all of his
12	technical specifications.
13	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Just a question. If
14	you go back to the very first, the
15	MR. DeGENNARO: This is the first one I
16	showed you. This is the one with the
17	outparcel. You want the one off Ba Mar
18	Drive?
19	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: No, yeah, that's
20	right, the first one. And then the bottom is
21	the now, on the bottom you have the new
22	trees in the front. But all the trees in the
23	back, they're not going to be there, are
24	they?
25	MR. SHERMAN: Yes. Those are on the

1	Proceedings
2	railroad embankment and beyond.
3	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Are those those
4	trees are up on the railroad?
5	MR. SHERMAN: Yeah.
6	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Okay.
7	MR. SHERMAN: That's part of the, that's
8	part of the rendering. It won't be modified.
9	That's why with the railroad slope, all that
10	woods will stay.
11	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Oh, that's up on
12	the okay.
13	BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: So basically,
14	because we were just there, basically you're
15	not touching the railroad trees. But
16	everything else is basically taken out.
17	MR. DeGENNARO: Correct.
18	MR. SHERMAN: With the exception of some
19	of the trees that are around the perimeter,
20	where there won't be grading.
21	BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: I understand.
22	MR. SHERMAN: And the site plan shows
23	which those are. They're nice big ones,
24	planted new.
25	BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: It seems like I'm

1	Proceedings
2	into seawalls here lately. That's in pretty
3	bad shape. Is the DEC reviewing that at all?
4	Are they getting involved with it?
5	MR. DeGENNARO: Right now, we're just
6	before the DEC for the freshwater, or for the
7	tidally influenced freshwater wetland permit.
8	BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: But that would
9	affect it.
10	MR. DeGENNARO: It would, but
11	BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: That's part of a
12	stream, correct?
13	MR. DeGENNARO: It's below mean high
14	water, so it would be under the jurisdiction
15	of the Army Corps and the DEC, if we were.
16	So that's a little bit well, it's a
17	different permit. But it would be repair of
18	an existing structure. So it's a little bit
19	easier in term it might even been a H and
20	Y permit for the Army Corps, which is a
21	default permit. And for the DEC, in my
22	experience in getting other permits with them
23	for these types of items, if you don't
24	encroach further into the mean high water,
25	and you kind of pull it back a little bit,

	5
2	it's a lot easier to get the permit.
3	And we're not looking to do, you know,
4	big concrete seawalls and other items that
5	would trigger a more substantial technical
6	review by the DEC. If we do replace them
7	and I'm not committed to that, at this point
8	it's crossed my mind I would probably
9	recommend more like the boulder type seawalls
10	because we're really not that high, and it
11	would be similar to what they have down by
12	the condos along the Piermont pier, like a
13	dry laid stacked boulder retaining wall that
14	has a batter to it so it kind of angles back,
15	too.
16	MR. SHEEHAN: So are you proposing to do
17	anything with the seawall?
18	MR. DeGENNARO: I am not.
19	MR. SHEEHAN: Okay. Simple question.
20	To me, that's where you were trying to go.
21	MR. DeGENNARO: It was.
22	BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: But we will be
23	addressing that again.
24	MR. DeGENNARO: Yes.
25	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Now the I know

1	Proceedings
2	you're the lots, the areas are going to be
3	raised. The trailers are also going to be up
4	higher, too? They're going to be raised on
5	top of
6	MR. DeGENNARO: Oh, yes.
7	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: What did you say, it
8	was another
9	MR. DeGENNARO: Well, it varies with the
10	grade, because the grade varies. The
11	finished floor elevations of the trailers
12	have to be at least Elevation 12. So that's
13	Elevation 12 with respect to a fixed datum
14	somewhere else. That doesn't mean 12 feet
15	off the ground. It means Elevation 12 and
16	the ground is going to be elevated, it
17	currently again, it varies. But it goes
18	from generally about Elevation 4 to
19	Elevation 7. And we're raising it to about
20	Elevation we're trying to hit Elevation 9
21	as much as we can.
22	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: And everything is on
23	a concrete pad.
24	MR. DeGENNARO: The concrete pad, we're
25	not we're going to discuss that with Bill

1	Proceedings
2	during building permit phase. Again, the
3	client hasn't decided construction-wise. It
4	doesn't make a difference with respect to the
5	flood pain development permit if it's on
6	concrete or not. But we did our bulk
7	requirements. We counted that as development
8	coverage. So if we don't put it in there,
9	then we're, you know, we're still under it.
10	As far as I'm concerned, it's development
11	coverage because it has a building on top.
12	It's not receiving any in capacity.
13	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: I got you.
14	MR. DeGENNARO: So that's that.
15	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. Max, you
16	have any?
17	MR. STACH: On the visuals that we
18	received tonight, if you go to the second
19	visual.
20	MR. DeGENNARO: I'm sorry, is that this
21	one? This is the one with the outparcel.
22	MR. SHEEHAN: That was the first one.
23	MR. STACH: The main street.
24	MR. DeGENNARO: Okay.
25	MR. STACH: That one, yeah. On that

1 Proceedings 2 visual, you show the line of homes there 3 having different facades facing the public street. Some of them have front porches on 4 5 the front, some of them have single windows, 6 some of them have picture windows. Is that 7 typical to what the applicant is looking to build? Or is that -- because the plans that 8 9 we reviewed had all the entrances on the 10 side. 11 MR. DeGENNARO: Right. 12 MR. STACH: And I see other areas where 13 the ends of the homes don't have any windows. 14 It's just sheet siding. For example, if you 15 look at your first slide, all the homes there 16 have just siding facing the pond, the Cedar 17 Pond Brook. 18 MR. DeGENNARO: From this perspective, 19 it should be the rear of the homes. So from 20 the other perspective, that would be the 21 front. MR. STACH: So we're looking at the 22 23 rears which won't have windows, is that 24 correct? 25 MR. DeGENNARO: Dan?

Proceedings

2 MR. SHERMAN: No. No, the models we got 3 did not.

4	MR. STACH: Okay.			
5	MR. SHERMAN: In the rear, because			
6	that's just the way the units are designed.			
7	MR. BROWN: I'm Joel Brown with the			
8	ownership. The renderings the elevations			
9	that were used for these renderings were from			
10	the typical design. We've as it relates			
11	to front porches, our intention is to have			
12	some front porches. I do acknowledge the			
13	fact that there's some side entry on the			
14	plan. We may need to adjust that. But our			
15	intention was to have different elevations to			
16	have better relief in the presentation. As			
17	far as the rear of the homes, the homes			
18	typically do not have windows. If it's			
19	something that's objectionable, then we can			
20	consider putting the windows on the rear of			
21	the homes.			
22	MR. STACH: Well, I think that's			
23	something that might help.			
24	MR. BROWN: Sure.			
25	MR. STACH: The way this project looks			

1 Proceedings is if you can propose it, and if the Board 2 3 can require it as a condition that not every building look exactly the same. Some have 4 5 porches, some have the single window, some have the picture window, or whatever you want 6 7 to call it, bay window. And that the facades facing the road, the public road, meaning 8 9 Grassy Point Road, all will have a window. 10 That would do a lot, I think, to making this look attractive. 11 12 MR. SHEEHAN: The problem with that is 13 the bedrooms are in the back of the units. 14 MR. STACH: Right. 15 MR. BROWN: So that would be the only 16 issue, is that typically, those are the 17 bedrooms. The bedrooms don't have windows on 18 that side. I think that if it's -- we can 19 consider an alternative. We can have shades 20 or something installed. 21 MR. STACH: Or maybe you plant, maybe you plant. Can you plant up against the 22 23 buildings or is that really a no-no? 24 MR. BROWN: We'd prefer not to because the growth. It's heavy maintenance in terms 25

1	Proceedings			
2	of growings. And also, there's some roots			
3	issues that we've had in the past. But I			
4	think I don't want to complicate things. I'm			
5	only looking to improve things. I don't			
6	think that that's			
7	MR. STACH: Maybe even if it's just not			
8	every building shows a blank facade.			
9	MR. BROWN: We're, as you know, we're			
10	going to be ordering other homes. So we can			
11	kind of control that. So we can certainly			
12	review that. And I acknowledge that that's			
13	something you would want to see.			
14	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Bill, do you have			
15	any questions on this one?			
16	MR. SHEEHAN: No. As far as the			
17	renderings, no. Again, the only spot is			
18	pretty much this shot, as Max pointed out,			
19	because that's the only area that the rear of			
20	the homes will be facing Grassy Point Road.			
21	Unless there's closets on that back wall, you			
22	could do, definitely you could do windows.			
23	Single windows, though. You couldn't I			
24	wouldn't put a bay window in any bedroom. I			
25	don't know where the closets are in those			

```
1
                  Proceedings
 2
      rooms.
 3
           MR. EMANNUEL: We could take a look
 4
      at --
 5
           MR. SHEEHAN: You know what I'm saying?
      Even if you put a, you know, a double hung
 6
 7
      window or something to that effect.
 8
           MR. EMANNUEL: There are ways that we
 9
      can deal with the facade that don't
10
      necessarily --
           MR. SHEEHAN: No, no, I don't have an
11
      issue with it.
12
13
           MR. DeGENNARO: It would be the other
14
      side.
15
           CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: John, any?
16
           MR. O'ROURKE: On the renderings, no.
17
      At the last meeting, we did get some
18
      information about EAF and the SWPPP. We've
      done an initial review of that. The
19
20
      outstanding issue, honestly, is the DEC and,
21
      the overhead power lines, and what they can
      do and what they can't do underneath the
22
      transmission line. So we'll hold off on the
23
24
      full review until that gets resolved because
      that could affect the layout of the property.
25
```

1	Proceedings			
2	But generally, on the renderings, we have no			
3	comments at this time.			
4	MR. EMANNUEL: We're in active			
5	conversation with DEC and O and R with			
6	respect to that. That's, that's ongoing.			
7	MR. O'ROURKE: Yeah, no, I understand			
8	that.			
9	MR. EMANNUEL: Well, for the Board's			
10	information.			
11	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. Steve,			
12	any? All right.			
13	MR. EMANNUEL: Mr. Chairman, one other			
14	thing that we wanted to address that we			
15	brought up tonight. Mr. Brown will address			
16	that.			
17	MR. BROWN: I think there was some			
18	concern at TAC and maybe with the Board about			
19	the existing residents and how we were, how			
20	some of the residents are going to remain. I			
21	just wanted to give an update on that, if I			
22	could.			
23	There are a maximum of about 20			
24	residents that do not plan at this time to			
25	move. So those residents do not have any			

1 Proceedings 2 plans to move. We have met with each of 3 those residents through our on-site staff. We made sure that they're aware of our plans 4 5 for the redevelopment through our on-site 6 staff. We have begun gathering information 7 from those residents about their housing needs, and maybe a little bit more detail on 8 9 their plans. 10 It's my understanding that most, if not 11 all of those residents, the reason that they're not moving, one of the reasons 12 13 they're not moving is because they were not, 14 did not take advantage of the New York Rising 15 funding reimbursement plan. However, a 16 majority of the residents, of those residents 17 that I'm speaking of, have expressed an 18 interest in staying and acquiring a new home 19 through us when that becomes available. 20 There are a few that plan on staying that indicated that -- they did not expressly 21 22 state that they are interested in acquiring a 23 We will have further discussions with home. 24 them. And we are also working on alternative

25 plans with them.

	5			
2	And possibly, if possible, including			
3	reopening New York Rising as an opportunity			
4	for housing reimbursement. I'm not certain			
5	if that still is possible, but it's something			
6	we'd like to explore with them. And we also			
7	intend to keep lines of communication open			
8	with them through our on-site staff or any			
9	other means.			
10	VICE CHAIRMAN MULLER: Can I just ask			
11	that you do everything in your power to work			
12	with these people to find a good answer for			
13	them? It sounds like you are, but just, I			
14	would like that on the record that we're			
15	asking you to do whatever you can to make			
16	these 20 residents, you know, made whole, or			
17	do whatever you can to get them a new home,			
18	or I don't know what the final outcome			
19	will be, but do whatever you can, please.			
20	That would be important for those people that			
21	want to stay, maybe don't have an option.			
22	A lot of times, people in those mobile			
23	homes are a little strapped. I lived there			
24	for many years before we bought our first			
25	home. So I'd hate to see somebody forced out			

-	110000001190	
2	or in a real bad position. So I'm just	
3	asking that you do what you can to help	
4	anybody who is in need down there to the best	
5	of your ability.	
6	MR. BROWN: That's our intention. Our	
7	intention is to make sure that we can	
8	accommodate everyone within our power to do	
9	so. And I'd also like to just recognize the	
10	fact that we have been through this process	
11	for a very long time. As owners, we've hung	
12	in there to try to find a solution that's	
13	mutually beneficial. I've been I'm from	
14	out of state. We have on-site staff here.	
15	I've been here twice a month now for the past	
16	year working with not only yourselves, but	
17	working with the residents and trying to work	
18	something out. So it's our intention to make	
19	sure there's a mutually beneficial win-win	
20	situation for everyone.	
21	VICE CHAIRMAN MULLER: Thank you.	
22	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right.	
23	Mr. Emannuel?	
24	MR. EMANNUEL: We have nothing further	
25	other than a request that the Board set a	

1 Proceedings 2 public hearing for the June meeting. 3 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. VICE CHAIRMAN MULLER: I'll make that 4 5 motion. BOARD MEMBER JOACHIM: I'll second. 6 7 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Second. I got a motion and a second. All in favor? 8 9 (Response of aye was given.) 10 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, so we'll 11 set the public hearing for June 27th. Same 12 time, seven. And just if I can make a quick 13 suggestion is for the public hearing, if you 14 could have maps in the back, like just 15 renderings placed in the map, you know, big 16 enough so people can see. 17 MR. EMANNUEL: Sure. 18 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: And then also with 19 the, with the different homes, how they're 20 going to be off the ground. So that we 21 don't -- we saw one rendition with the 22 typical steps, so that at least they could 23 see, you know, what it's going to look like 24 from the area, and then just the layout. Like the map that you showed us when we were 25

1	Proceedings
2	there when we walked around so they get an
3	idea. So everyone, you know, we have a nice
4	area in the back so when they see things
5	before they have public input.
6	MR. EMANNUEL: Okay.
7	MR. DeGENNARO: Absolutely. Great.
8	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, so we'll
9	see you next month.
10	MR. EMANNUEL: Wonderful. Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Thanks.
12	(Time noted: 8:19)
13	
14	000
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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