

further back on the property. Mr. Brown stated that they plan to have most of the homes behind the ridge. They plan to incorporate the TND design guidelines from the Zoning Code & and Master Plan and to create a pedestrian friendly community. An EAF has been submitted, but the Conservation Analysis needs to be completed first. They are here tonight to receive general comments on the concept from the members.

The site is in the Florida School District. There is an existing farm road through the wetlands to the rear of the property, which they plan to use to connect the various portions of the project. The maps also show the steep slopes as well as the federal and state wetlands and the 100' buffer required by the state. These have been delineated in the field, but will need to be verified. Route 17A is considered a scenic road and a 100' green buffer is planned. They also plan to keep the stone walls on the property's boundary.

Mr. Gantter noted that it appears that the former owner was farming within the wetland buffer. Mr. Brown agreed that it does look that way and he noted they plan to hold to the farm roads as much as possible. Mr. Gillis asked if they plan to make a presentation to the Boards of the Village of Florida. No they do not – they will be notified as “interested agencies.” Are there any significant trees on the property? Mr. Brown responded that there were a few, but they were not very healthy. Mr. Gawronski noted that since this property was farmed previously, additional soils and water testing should be completed for presence of chemicals.

Ms. Cleaver pointed out that all of these lawns would really have an impact on the wetlands. Are there mitigation plans for the wetlands? Ms. Billeci stated that there would be a HOA, which will allow for limits on the chemicals used. Ms. Cleaver also asked for small ESA signs to be placed around the wetlands. She asked the applicant to be aware that this is in the middle of farmland and lighting needs to be downward directed and no glare. Again, the HOA should be able to control this. Mr. Brown responded that they would bring in a lighting expert. Ms. Cleaver also noted that there is a potential bike path on 17A for the County, so the applicant may wish to speak to the County.

Ms. Cleaver noted that the Hamlet district allows for some commercial entities. Has the applicant considered the possibility of any small shops? Mr. Brown noted that the owners have studied this concept in the past and they feel that a development of this size cannot support this type of commercial entity, and it is not likely that people from outside the development will come in to shop. Dr. Stein emphasized that they need the commercial to offset the tax increase that will affect the Florida school District. Ms. Billeci stated they will address these items as alternatives in the DEIS. Mr. Halloran asked if they could find an area on 17A

for a convenience store that would allow easier access for shoppers other than just those in the development. He also stated that there is a potential for hooking up with the next project to the North. Just beyond that section is the proposed Harvest Village (on the Karpy site) that will have some stores. Possibly they can find a way to connect all of these sites with an interior road, which would have less impact on Route 17A. Ms. Cleaver suggested they consider working with the local farmers to develop the possibility of a farm stand on the property.

Mr. Brown presented the conceptual plan, which is very preliminary. There will be a Village Green, which they expect to become a communal area with a rec center, swimming pool, etc. There will be walking paths connecting the various sections of the project. They plan to de-emphasize the role of vehicles. Most of the garages will be accessed from rear alleys. They plan to emphasize the role of porches. Along the northern border there will be duplexes. There will also be 12 unit "manor" homes, which will house 12 condo units. Mr. Gawronski asked if they could save any portion of the barn. Mr. Brown replied that they will look at this and may be able to save some of the features and the contents for the library. Mr. Gawronski asked if the rear of the property is to be open space for the public, would they consider a small parking area.

Mr. Halloran asked what questions the members feel would come from the community. The number of units and the impact on the schools will be a major issue as the Florida district is at its limits. Mr. Brown noted that approximately 50% of the units will be 2 bedroom and he feels that they will attract more "empty nesters" than young families with children. Ms. Cleaver asked if they have considered setting aside some affordable housing for seniors, which would lower the number of school age children. Mr. Brown replied that they are required to have 10% affordable housing and they have spoken to the Affordable Housing Committee.

Dr. Stein asked how they could have the "affordable" units look the same as the others. Mr. Brown replied that they would build them to look the same on the exterior, but the interiors may be smaller and some of the features will be downgraded. They would be interspersed throughout the development. They cannot have more than two "affordable" units next to each other. Ms. Cleaver is very concerned about the traffic impacts. There could be as many as 200 vehicles leaving every morning. She asks if they could consider another entrance to the project. Mr. Brown stated they would be doing a traffic analysis for the DEIS.

Ms. Billeci informed the members that they would be going to the Town Board for a zone line change, which will affect the density of the project. This zone line change is needed to accommodate this conceptual plan. Dr. Stein asked how the

plan would change if the lot line is not moved. Mr. Brown responded that the TND aspect would change because the profit margins would change if fewer units were allowed. Ms. Cleaver pointed out that the code calls for a TND concept regardless. Mr. Brown stated that the quality of the project would be affected.

Other community concerns will be questions regarding water availability. Mr. Brown noted that public water and sewer are required. Ms. Cleaver asked if there would be a "water tower". Ms. Billeci stated that would depend on the water availability studies. They may be able to connect with the Village of Florida. The view shed from Spruce Hill will also be a major concern. Ms. Cleaver asked if the applicant is aware of the energy efficient "green buildings". They will study this concept. Discussion was held regarding the power line that runs through the property. It is felt that this is not a large line and there should not be a problem. Ms. Cleaver reminded the applicant that they will be asked to bury the new utility lines. However, this should all be discussed in the DEIS.

Ms. Cleaver asked if they would form their own sewer district. If so, they should show a proposed maintenance plan for this district. Endangered species were also questioned. Mr. Brown stated that they have a letter stating that there are no known endangered species.

In regard to the possibility of changing the zone line, Dr. Stein feels that it would set a dangerous precedent. There is no need to make this change just so the applicant can increase his profits. He further noted that the increase in traffic and the strain on the Florida School District must be taken into account. Mr. Halloran noted that the Hamlet zone does allow commercial entities, and the Hamlet zone was placed near areas that had potential for commercial development as well as being near to available municipal water and sewer.

Mr. Dropkin stated in his written notes that it is unclear what the areas shown represent. The potential historic designations should be explained. The buildable areas are unclear. The applicant mentions 42 vehicular trips per hour to be generated. What is the basis for this? These items will be addressed in the DEIS.

GOSHEN SELF-STORAGE Amended site plan 12-1-37

Mr. Halloran explained that this project is in front of the PB and the ZBA. He also noted that except for one road, the roads on the plan are "paper roads". The applicant is proposing to add one more storage building in the rear of the property. It will be 60' x 72'. This will increase the overall "impervious" surface to 69%, and under the new zoning only 30% is allowed. They are also planning to combine these 20 lots into a total of 6 or 7 lots because the uses really do not fit

on 1-acre lots. All of the access will be off of the one road, which will go straight to the rear of the property.

Mr. Gawronski asked if there will be access for future development in the surrounding property. The applicant will give a right of way to the rear (Korycki) property. Ms. Cleaver noted that screening is a major issue as the originally requested screening has not been done.

Mr. Dropkin raised the following questions that the PB should ask of the applicant, and Mr. Halloran responded:

- 1) What is the height of the building and what materials will be used in the construction? The same as existing.
- 2) What materials will be used for landscaping and to what extent can the storage facilities be seen from other areas? There will be more of the same landscaping and the buildings can be seen off the site. There is also an issue with outside storage, which is not allowed by code.
- 3) Will there be signage and what materials will be used? There will be no new signage.
- 4) What are the lighting plans? Most likely it will be the same as currently used. Mr. Gillis stated that any new lighting should be night sky friendly, downward directed.
- 5) Is there any monitoring of stored materials, and is there prohibition against hazardous substances? How will monitoring be implemented and who will bear the cost? Mr. Halloran will check on these regulations.

LONE OAK - 11-1-58 Continuation of SEIS Review.

The members concur with AKRF's comments of 3/3/05. The ERB has commented previously and these comments still stand. Mr. Dropkin noted that these issues must be addressed if the Town is to fully consider the EIS. The ERB's previous comments are noted below.

From March 9, 2005 minutes: Mr. Halloran reported that they are proposing two phases, with a total build out of 299 units. The first phase will consist of 170 units all in the Goshen School District. Mr. Dropkin noted that it appears that approximately 60 acres will be lawn. The developer should provide more trees.

Ms. Cleaver expressed concern about the need for a large buffer from Route 17 and the impact on the schools. The Board would like to see the potential impact of traffic for the completed project even though they do not plan to build the full

project at this time. There is a question of whether the project complies with the TND requirements in the code.

MATCHPOINT SPORTS - 11-1-25.22 for conditional approval, located on 17M in the CO zone with an AQ6 and scenic road corridor overlay.

Mr. Halloran stated that the PB is close to having the local issues resolved. The applicant is waiting for the DEC comments regarding the C&D solution. The storm water plan and septic system have been approved. They are also waiting for the DOH for the water and the DOT for the driveway. Ms. Cleaver suggested that Mr. Dropkin see the rendering of the building as he may have comments on it. She also noted that the applicant was most cooperative regarding the plan to screen the air conditioning/mechanicals and the landscaping of the rear of the building with clusters of trees

Mr. Dropkin's comments state that he concurs with the engineer's comments and notes that the ERB previous comments be reiterated.

From the March 9, 2005 meeting: {The ERB requests that the PB review the following with the applicant:

- 1) Insufficient landscaping
- 2) Location of the tennis courts. They are far from the building and very close to the property line.
- 3) Lighting for the whole complex and especially the tennis courts. The outside lighting should be "no glare" and "night sky friendly."
- 4) There are stone walls on the property. The applicant should try to keep these and incorporate them into the landscaping.
- 5) Any signage should be wooden and in earth tones. }

SAGAFI 21-1-61 13-acres, two lot open space subdivision, located on Scotchtown Rd., in the RU zone with an AQ6 overlay.

The ERB comments are reiterated. From 11/10/04 meeting: {Ms. Cleaver stated that she has had members of the public inform her that the wetlands have been moved and/or that they were not delineated properly. Mr. Dropkin has serious questions regarding the sight distance for the driveway. Mr. Halloran noted that the applicant is planning a conservation easement of 4.7 acres in the rear, but there is a question of how they will be maintained. Also, how will the land be policed to see if the owners are living up to the easement? }

From January 12, 2005: {Mr. Dropkin expressed concern regarding the location of the driveway. It seems to be very close to the intersection with the school. This is the area where the buses exit and enter. Traffic is just leaving a school zone speed restricted area and accelerating down hill.

The Board requests that the PB consider requiring that the applicant pay for and post a “hidden drive” sign at the top of the hill near where the buses enter Scotchtown Ave. It should be not less than 380’ from the Village limits sign. }

SLESINSKI FARMS - 19-1-121 2-lot subdivision on Chestnut Lane in RU zone, with AQ3 overlay.

The ERB agrees with the comments from the engineer.

JONAS ESTATES - 10-1-6.22 Owens and Phillipsburg Roads RU zone with AQ6 overlay.

The members endorse the comments of AKRF in their 3/3/05 letter. The ERB has previous comments on this project - from minutes of 11/10/04: {If Mr. Dropkin’s conversation with SHPO discovers that the trolley tracks are significant, the PB should ask the owner to appropriately mark the area and make it accessible. Also, the very large trees in the rear, the stonewall and the old foundation should be saved if possible.} In regard to the status of the old trolley line, Mr. Dropkin has again called SHPO to ascertain the significance. They have responded that they will follow up on this request.

ZALUNSKI, 20-1-58 Open space subdivision located on Pulaski & Cross Rds. 74.8 acres in RU zone with AQ3 and scenic road overlay.

Mr. Gawronski noted that there is a very nice view shed coming down Pulaski Highway, which he feels should be preserved, i.e., from south of Cross Rd. to the existing building. He also asks that they preserve the house on the corner. He noted that since the area has been farmed, they should test the soils and water for chemicals. Mr. Halloran noted that the property is in the estate process now and no plans have been made.

OWENS ROAD ASSOCIATES – 10-1-10.22 for sketch plan modification, located Owens Rd., in an RU zone with an AQ6 overlay

ERB previous comments March 9, 2005: {Mr. Halloran explained that the area in the rear along the River might be given to the Town for parkland. The PB felt the need to provide buffering for the neighbors. There is also a question of the

Town allowing access to the River due to its' current condition. Mr. Dropkin suggested that the area be accepted, if offered, as parkland with the plan to make it available in the future when the cleanup of the River is completed.}

In regard to the possibility of parkland along the river, Ms. Cleaver feels that the Town should accept the land, but hold it until the pollutants are cleaned from the river. She asked if the Town Board has addressed the liability issues of accepting this as parkland.

Further comments from 3/9/05: {The applicant also needs to be aware that by answering "yes" to impact on the schools he should give a more thorough explanation of the impacts. The applicant is proposing 80 off street parking spots, this seems like a great deal of asphalt. The issue of runoff should be addressed. The PB should consider requesting more gravel rather than asphalt. The effects on air and water quality also need to be addressed.

The ERB recommends that the PB ask for cumulative analyses due to the unprecedented number of proposals before the Town at this time. The ERB suggests that the PB ask AKRF to see what other communities are doing regarding these types of impacts. There may be more creative ways to deal with the subject of impacts.

The issue of the number of trees that will be affected because they are not over 100 years old was raised on this project. The ERB asks that the definition of mature trees be changed to not over 50 years. The developer would then be obligated to review the trees and be sure the area is not clear-cut. Without the trees, there would be more lawn area, which will increase water usage. The ERB is trying to bring about water conservation. The members feel that the PB should discuss the possibility of a tree preservation program to be used for all projects.

The applicant also stated in the EAF that they will blasting, but there is no explanation. The applicant needs to explain this further. They also state there will be a demand for community services, but they feel that the existing services are adequate. Further explanation is needed. The ERB recommends that the PB ask for the completion of a Part 3 and possibly a DEIS

In regard to the degree of impact on the community, i.e., traffic, the ERB asks if it is possible to say that a project cannot be built until the infrastructure is completed. A lengthy discussion was held regarding the impact of all these projects on the schools. The attorney and the planner should be consulted. The ERB requests of the Planning Board or of Counsel that they consider what was in

the prior code as a requirement that any Planned Unit Development containing the potential for 400+ school aged children a 12 acre site be reserved for an elementary school.

When a developer puts together a PUD he needs to look at the aggregate impacts. Should the Board develop some sort of screen that these applications need to pass in order to be eligible to apply. Mr. Gawronski asked if an Architectural Review Board could be formed to review the impacts of projects on a case by case basis. It is also noted that there are no yes or no answers on the EAF. The PB should speak to AKRF about the possibility of making the EAF more adequate. Possibly the questions could be answered on a scale of 1 - 10.}

Mr. Dropkin asked that traffic impacts be further reviewed. Mr. Gawronski asked if the soils should be tested for the presence of chemicals. He feels the northern most lots could be affected by dense aqueous phase pollutants from the "dumping area" just off of the site. The ground water in this area may run toward the river, so lots 18 through 30 should be looked at carefully.

Ms. Cleaver noted that the applicant is being asked to consider a bike path on the main road to the rear of the property. However, there is the issue of the increase in impervious surface this would create. Ms. Cleaver has also asked the PB to consider the view shed from the river.

TRASKUS 18-1-8.22 sketch plan approval, located in the RU zone with an AQ3 overlay.

Mr. Halloran reported that there will be a site visit scheduled for 4/28. The applicant proposes 39 units. The PB is trying to have the houses moved to the rear of the property.

There may be access onto the adjoining Weslowski property. Mr. Gawronski asked that water and soil be tested for chemicals. Ms. Cleaver asked if drawdown testing would be done because they are near Arcadia Hills, which has had water problems. Also Lone Oak is in this area and they have had problems getting water. The ERB asks that the PB ask the applicant to address these water issues.

DYSINGER 24-1-63.2 for special use permit for storage of non-farm equipment and repair garage for non-farm related vehicles. Located on Pulaski Highway and Big Island Road in the AI zone with AQ 3 overlay.

Mr. Halloran reported that the applicant is proposing storage of construction equipment. The PB is requiring that they supply a bathroom. This is for one lot and one use. The only real change is the need for a septic system. The applicant plans to adequately landscape/screen the property.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

BIODIVERSITY - insert to Open Space Document

Mr. Dropkin suggested the following items be added to the Open Space Document to strengthen the document:

- 1) In the section regarding Purgatory Swamp it is stated that the swamp contains some of the most wildlife in the Town. The types of species should be listed and an explanation of their importance.
- 2) Under Otter Creek, it is stated that portions of the habitat system are at risk. This should be explained.
- 3) In regard to the Walkkill River, how will the re-vegetation improve water quality?

Mr. Halloran noted that some of these questions would be answered at a meeting on April 27 where the Wildlife Conservation Society will present their findings.

ZONING REVISIONS - No comments at this time.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm upon motion made by Mr. Gillis, seconded by Mr. Gawronski.

Philip Dropkin, Chairman

Notes prepared by Linda P. Doolittle

{ } Used to denote paraphrased notes from previous meeting comments.

