EUGENE GHIKAS SUBDIVISION 2
MR. BROWNE: Good evening, ladies
and gentlemen. Welcome to the Town of Newburgh
Planning Board meeting of January 19, 2012.
At this time I'll call the meeting
to order with a roll call vote starting with
Frank Galli.
MR. GALLI: Present.
MR. BROWNE: Present.
MR. MENNERICH: Present.
CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Present.
MR. FOGARTY: Here.
MR. WARD: Present.
MR. BROWNE: The Planning Board has
professional experts that provide reviews on the
business before us, as well as SEQRA
determinations and code details. At this time
I'd ask to them introduce themselves.
MR. DONNELLY: Michael Donnelly,
Planning Board Attorney.
MS. CONERO: Michelle Conero,
Stenographer.
MR. CANFIELD: Jerry Canfield, Code
Compliance Supervisor, Town of Newburgh.

MR. HINES: Pat Hines with McGoey,

25

may have about the project itself, particularly

25

24

25

1

2

because those of you who wish to speak are likely from the immediate surrounding neighborhood. This project has been before the Planning Board for a period of time. The old subdivision was approved some years back. The Planning Board has heard from the various consultants. The public hearing will begin by a presentation made by the applicant's engineer. After that, when the Chairman calls for the public hearing, we'd ask you to raise your hand if you wish to be heard. The Chairman will recognize you. We ask you to come forward, tell us your name, spell it for the Stenographer, tell us where you live in relation to the project so the Planning Board has an idea of the perspective you bring to bear. Direct your comments and questions, if you have them, to the Chairman. He will then, if it's appropriate, ask either the applicant's representative or the Town's consultants to answer your question.

MR. BROWNE: Thank you. At this time I would ask Ken Mennerich to take care of the notice of hearing.

MR. MENNERICH: "Notice of hearing,
Town of Newburgh Planning Board. Please take

2.3

notice that the Planning Board of Town of
Newburgh, Orange County, New York will hold a
public hearing pursuant to Section 276 of the
Town Law on the application of lands of Eugene
Ghikas Subdivision for a three-lot subdivision on
premises Highland Avenue and Fern Avenue in the
Town of Newburgh, designated on Town tax map as
Section 67; Block 8; Lot 1.21. Said hearing will
be held on the 19th day of January 2012 at the
Town Hall Meeting Room, 1496 Route 300, Newburgh,
New York at 7 p.m. at which time all interested
persons will be given an opportunity to be heard.
By order of the Town of Newburgh Planning Board.
John P. Ewasutyn, Chairman, Planning Board Town
of Newburgh."

MR. BROWNE: Frank Galli, the mailings?

MR. GALLI: The notice of hearing was

published in The Mid-Hudson Times and in The

Sentinel. The applicant made out sixteen

letters, twelve were returned, one was

undeliverable. Everything is in order.

MR. BROWNE: Again, this project is known to us as the Eugene Ghikas Subdivision, project number 2011-26. It's a public hearing

2.3

for a three-lot subdivision. It is being presented by Vincent Doce Associates. Vincent Doce is present.

MR. DOCE: My name is Vince Doce, I have an engineering and surveying business located in the Town of Newburgh. I'm here this evening with my clients, Vaughn and Gene Ghikas, to present a modification of a previously approved three-lot subdivision.

About six-and-a-half years ago this subdivision came before the Town and was approved as you see it on the board before you. It's a 51,000 square foot lot that I'm circumscribing now. There is a 26,000 square foot lot and a 32,000 square foot lot.

The parcel of property is bounded by the lands of, I think it's Thusbon, Marcione, Sneed, Hilltop Avenue, Breau and Michetti as I circumscribe it. It fronts on Highland Avenue and Fern Avenue just southerly of Route 52.

As I said before, the subdivision was previously approved just as it exists today and as it will continue in the future.

The only modification being requested

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this evening is that my client be allowed to move the proposed house location from where you see it crosshatched in red to a point that you see shaded in red closer to Highland Avenue. reason for that was after I reviewed the subdivision for my clients, I found that it was immensely advantageous to move the house, because in its previously proposed location it required a retaining wall and reasonably heavy grading to the site. In moving the house from the crosshatched area to the red shaded area, it removes the need for the retaining wall and it eliminates the grading, the heavy grading that was necessary. Everything else on the subdivision will remain exactly the same. was approved before is the same proposal that you have this evening with the exception of moving the house. Everything else is the same. septic locations are the same, the entrance drives are in the same place, the lot configurations are the same.

We presented this application to the Board in December and they granted us preliminary approval, or I guess it's conceptual approval now

Frank Gall

as they call it, with the provision that we show the building envelop for the lot and also the usable land area, which we have done on the revised subdivision map.

Other than that, there's not an awful lot I can say about this subdivision. It was approved before. We just want to move the house location.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Thank you, Vince.

As Mike Donnelly, the Planning Board

Attorney, said in the beginning of the meeting,

now it's time to receive comments and questions

from the public. If you would be so kind as to

raise your hand, give your name and your address.

We're here to listen.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Let the record show that there was no interest from the public tonight for the public hearing for the three-lot subdivision for the land of Eugene and Vaughn Ghikas.

At this point I'll turn to our Planning Board Members to see if they have any comments. Frank Galli?

concern last time. Retaining walls have been

25

2.3

eliminated so the bonding of those can be removed from the plan.

The only outstanding comment we have is we would like a note stating that the house sites will be staked prior to the issuance of the building permits. The house location, especially the one that's moved, is at the front and side yard setbacks. To avoid any problems with potential zoning variances, we request a note be added to the plans staking that out. I believe that's been done on the plans, we just don't have the current copy.

We have no other issues with the subdivision.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Bryant Cocks?

MR. COCKS: My only outstanding comment was having the applicant demonstrate the lot area requirement, Section 185-48.5 of the Zoning Law.

I did speak to Darren Doce today and he said he had included it in the revised plans so that they can have conditional approval.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: We'll address the public one more time. Are there any questions or comments from the public?

MR. DONNELLY: The resolution is a final subdivision as amended. First we'll carry a condition that removes the condition that had been in the original approval resolution that required construction of that retaining wall. We will carry forward all of the other applicable provisions of the first resolution. We'll need a sign-off letter from Bryant Cocks on the issue relating to showing the usable area on the lots. We will carry forth the foundation staking note into the resolution of approval itself.

Vince, I believe I looked at the common driveway easement and maintenance agreement already. I'll leave it in the resolution for a checklist to make sure.

We will tie into the Town Board resolution that earlier allowed you to have three lots on a common driveway. The landscape security and inspection fee, we made provision for you to apply to the Town Board for its reduction because you had bonded the wall. The resolution will reflect you have already paid the recreation fees and no new fee is being imposed at this time.

\_

\_

.

MR. BROWNE: The next item of
business is Rogan Subdivision, project number
2011-33. This is a conceptual two-lot
subdivision being presented by Arden Consulting
Engineers.

MR. MORGANTE: Good evening, everyone.

My name is Michael Morgante, I'm a project

engineer with Arden Consulting Engineers

representing the applicant, Margaret Rogan.

The project that's before you tonight is located near the intersection of Lattintown Road and Lockwood Lane near the border of Ulster and Orange County as shown on the location map. The property is approximately -- it's bounded by several lots on the west side, namely Bell, Werlau; on the easterly side by, it appears, DeQuarto and Bell, Pignatello; on the north side by CHG&E.

The current situation of the property, there's an existing one-story dwelling there with a detached garage in the back. We are looking to, as far as the project, subdivide the parcel into separate lots, one being a flag lot as you can see on the northerly and easterly side of the

2.3

property.

We would look to extend the existing driveway and provide some kind of a shared driveway easement for that. This seems to provide the least amount of disturbance to the site. We have an existing driveway and we can simply extend it for the proposed dwelling.

We've done soil testing in the area of the proposed septic system, which the soils are shown to be adequate. The septic systems have been designed, and individual wells have been proposed also for the lot. We have located all sanitary facilities within 200 feet of the parcel to make sure we weren't impacting anything else.

I think that pretty much summarizes the project in a nutshell.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Okay. At this point I'll turn to our consultants. I'll turn to Bryant Cocks, Planning Consultant.

MR. COCKS: Sure. Michael, can you just explain, through the middle of the property it looks like there's two filed lots there but then the tax map parcel just shows it as one lot.

MR. MORGANTE: It is one lot. What

2.3

happened was back in, I think approximately 1986 the parcel was subdivided. So for reference purposes only we've shown that original lot line just to kind of give you a history of the project or the site. I think back in 1996 or so, roughly ten years later, the lots were combined. So you do have one existing lot. Here we are back before you today resubdivising again. The original subdivision almost kind of split the lot right down the middle. The easterly portion of the lot is bounded by wetlands and there's lost vegetation, the soils are wet. There's a pond. I don't know how useful that is for development purposes. I thought it would be useful for the Board to show it. It is one single lot.

MR. COCKS: We were confused because it said filed map number and we weren't sure if this was going to be a lot line change.

MR. HINES: That wasn't helpful.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  MORGANTE: I probably should have put that in the narrative.

MR. COCKS: You will have to show the 10,000 square foot buildable area requirement, Section 185. There's plenty of room so I don't

1

2

5

7

9

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21 22

2.3

25

24

The Ulster County Planning Department, because of its proximity to the Ulster County border.

The common driveway access and easement agreement must be submitted.

A surveyor's seal and signature will be required.

Also, I wasn't sure how Lockwood Lane was with the 911 addressing system. We had a problem with another lot that there wasn't an actual address for a two-lot subdivision with a flag lot. Do a little research and see if there's going to be an address available.

MR. MORGANTE: We'll contact the Town and figure that out. That's fine.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Jerry, who would they contact in the Town?

MR. CANFIELD: That would be my office. I did order that they research with respect to Bryant's comments. There's plenty of numbers in the database, the 911 database. The existing house is currently number 47. Should the Board approve this, the new residence in the rear would

2.3

MR. BROWNE: Nothing.

MR. MENNERICH: No questions.

MR. FOGARTY: I have no comments.

MR. WARD: No comment.

MR. DONNELLY: We had earlier discussed this might qualify for treatment as a lot line change the Town of Newburgh has recently adopted. If you have the consolidation into a single lot nature of this, it is in fact a subdivision. It will require referral to the Orange County Planning Department as well as to the Town of Marlboro under 239-N, and a public hearing of course is required.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I'll move for a motion from the Board -- Michael, can we make a SEQRA determination at this point, unless we -- since we haven't heard back or we're just circulating to Orange County Planning?

MR. DONNELLY: You can make it if you choose to.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Thank you. I'll move for a motion from the Board to grant conceptual approval for the Rogan Subdivision, to circulate it to the Orange County Planning

1	ROGAN SUBDIVISION 22
2	Department, and to declare a negative
3	declaration.
4	MR. GALLI: So moved.
5	MR. WARD: Second.
6	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I have a motion by
7	Frank Galli. I have a second by John Ward. Any
8	discussion of the motion?
9	(No response.)
10	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I'll move for a
11	roll call vote starting with Frank Galli.
12	MR. GALLI: Aye.
13	MR. BROWNE: Aye.
14	MR. MENNERICH: Aye.
15	MR. FOGARTY: Aye.
16	MR. WARD: Aye.
17	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: And myself. So
18	carried.
19	I'll move for a motion to set this for
20	the 16th of February for a public hearing with
21	the understanding that we may not be able to take
22	action the night of that public hearing because
23	the County has thirty days to respond.
24	At this point I'll move for that
25	motion.

ROGAN SUBDIVISION 1 23 MR. GALLI: So moved. 2 3 MR. FOGARTY: Second. CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I have a motion by 4 5 Frank Galli. I have a second by Tom Fogarty. Any discussion of the motion? 6 7 (No response.) CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I'll move for a 9 roll call vote starting with Frank Galli. 10 MR. GALLI: Aye. 11 MR. BROWNE: Aye. 12 MR. MENNERICH: Aye. 13 MR. FOGARTY: Aye. 14 MR. WARD: Aye. 15 CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Myself. So 16 carried. 17 If you'll see to contacting Bryant Cocks for maps to circulate. 18 19 Bryant, you'll discuss the notice of 20 hearing as it relates to the public hearing. 21 MR. MORGANTE: Thank you very much for 22 your time today. 2.3 (Time noted: 7:20 p.m.) 24 25

O

 ${\color{red} \underline{C} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{E} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{R} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{T} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{I} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{F} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{I} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{C} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{A} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{T} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{I} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{O} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{N}} }$ 

I, Michelle Conero, a Shorthand
Reporter and Notary Public within and for
the State of New York, do hereby certify
that I recorded stenographically the
proceedings herein at the time and place
noted in the heading hereof, and that the
foregoing is an accurate and complete
transcript of same to the best of my
knowledge and belief.

DATED: February 8, 2012

\_

\_

О

MR. BROWNE: The next item of business is Cronk Estates II, project number 2010-07.

This is an amended six-lot subdivision being presented by Jim Raab.

MR. RAAB: I also have the applicant's attorney with me tonight, Julian Schulman, and Morty Gluck who is a member of Fox Crest, LLC.

What I had proposed in a letter to the Planning Board back in November, and then again amended in December, was we could shorten the amount of pipe along the closed drainage, that was agreed to when we got the approval, along the easterly side of Peaceful Court. That is not to include the Harris's -- really to include the Harris's Drive. It starts just beyond the Harris's driveway and goes 240 feet versus the 400 feet we would have taken in frontage.

The second -- really the second thing. The first thing was that the difficulty in trying to get the improvements done so that we could get building permits, we attempted very vehemently, both myself and Jim Osborne, to get the pole relocated so that we could redo the paving before the plants closed down. We didn't really think

10

25

1

there was much hope in doing it but we gave it the college try. We had everybody helping us, Jim had some contacts at Central Hudson that he brought in. They got through but the hang up was the telephone company. So therefore we're not going to get this pole relocated for another two months.

9 With that said, we understand -- based on what I read in Pat's comments and after 11 reviewing the minutes of the Planning Board 12 meeting and the public hearing, I understand that 13 -- I understand, and we understand Pat's point 14 and the fact that we probably can't do anything 15 about the length of the pipe now because it was 16 mentioned -- that was asked of us during the 17 public hearing and we said yes to it during the public hearing. The fact is if we could have had 18 the other condition amended about the building 19 20 permits and give it to -- and make it COs instead 21 of building permits for the improvements on Cronk 22 Road. Granted we are going to bond this, just as 2.3 the bond amount was approved by the Town Board 24 back in October or early November. We're going to bond it prior to asking the Planning Board to

stamp it but we need a little bit -- we would like to have some relief here on this. We would like to get some building permits in the next couple of months. It doesn't look like -- if we go the other way we're not going to get any building permits until probably April or May, the way things are going.

I talked to Darrell Benedict today and he is not in favor of doing any paving for the next two months no matter where we bring it from. He was adamant about it, and he said if you need that in writing, he'd be glad to give it to the Board.

Right now we're looking for the one condition to be amended, if we could, so that we can get building permits once the map is filed and the fees have been paid and the bonds have been posted.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Any comments from Board Members. Frank Galli?

MR. GALLI: Since I'm the first one in line, I guess I'll make a couple comments that we were discussing. For such a small project we've had a lot of problems, okay. I think there's a

stop work order on the project right now.

MR. RAAB: Yes.

MR. GALLI: We've had DEC issues

constantly. We've had all kinds of issues.

Whether some are valid and some aren't, we still have a lot of issues with this project. I just don't feel that we should do anything further until we actually correct what's there. I don't think we should waive anything. Keep the pole in place, blacktop in place and the pipe in place.

That's my personal feeling.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Cliff Browne?

MR. BROWNE: If I remember from our discussion, part of the issues that were put in place originally were due to safety, not just because. It was a safety issue with the road and what not. So with that, that's not going away. That's going to be there. That was part of the reason for doing those particular conditions.

MR. RAAB: If I just could make something clear. We're not trying to get out from under doing them. We just want to change the way --

MR. BROWNE: The problem is the timing.

2.3

Part of the thing with the safety part was for construction, period. If you're doing the construction and avoiding that requirement, the safety during that period, then you're going around what was approved and what was actually -- again, we looked at it from the safety thing from our -- Ken also had the same concern that our consultants brought up, and it was also echoed by the public at the same time. Again it was agreed to that you would do that. So with that in mind also, I would not be in favor of doing it. At the same time I understand from a technical standpoint if you choose to you can go forward and have a public hearing.

MR. DONNELLY: Just to echo what Cliff is saying, you may remember our traffic consultant, who is not here tonight, had made a recommendation and it led to this somewhat unusual condition. We don't very often require public improvements like these be made before a building permit. There was a sight distance issue, there was a condition of the roadway issue, a school bus stop in the area that led him to recommend that before the construction

vehicles start utilizing that area, that the road be improved, and that is why that unusual condition was there. Obviously if you're asking to have it revisited, we can send it to the traffic engineer and have him reevaluate it and see if his report and recommendation back to the Planning Board is otherwise. I just want you to recall where that came from --

MR. RAAB: I understand.

MR. DONNELLY: -- in the initial

12 review.

MR. RAAB: I just want to reiterate the fact we made every attempt to try to get this done this year. I mean we're not trying to avoid it at all, okay. The fact that the way everything laid out, by the time we got the bond amounts set and approved by the Town Board, we were in noman's land, and then we rushed to get Central Hudson's approval of this, and we were just hoping -- my question here is then if we do have a public hearing, are you going to change your minds? What's the sense of having a public hearing if you're going to make the same restraints again?

1

\_

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DONNELLY: I think what you heard thus far is unless the Board's traffic engineer was somehow to take a different recommendation and opinion than he did the first time, and I'm not going to predict what the Board Members will vote, but I think you may want to take to heart what you hear.

MR. RAAB: I am taking to heart what I I'm also trying to make a very big plea for my client who probably should have had -they should have been able to construct this this year. He's been given the okay to do so, okay. But all of that stuff was completely out of his control. Bond estimates were submitted in September. We didn't get them approved until sometime in mid October. We couldn't get them in front of the Board until November. So I'm just asking if the Board could work with us, we would really appreciate it. I understand the safety issue. I really do. If there's something -- if I could do this, if I could ask Ken to revisit this and give the Board some kind of recommendation, okay, then I might -- then we may rethink the point about the public hearing,

because there's really -- again, there's no sense of us having a public hearing if nothing has changed. So if it's okay with the Board, we would like to visit this point with Ken and see if there was something we could do in the meantime, okay.

Something that comes to mind is no construction vehicles coming from Forest Road, okay. That eliminates the fact that a construction vehicle has to turn into Peaceful Court from coming the other way, which is the worst way.

MR. GALLI: You know that can't be bonded. That's a useless request. There's no way you can monitor that. We can't monitor what's on the site now.

MR. RAAB: Okay. To address those issues right now about the stop work order, we corrected the issues the stop work order were based on almost immediately after they were --

MR. DONNELLY: In fairness to you, I know Frank raised it, but realistically what happens on the site in terms of after approval, it isn't relevant to your request here tonight.

۷.

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. RAAB: Okay. All right. Then I understand what the Board -- where the Board is going with this. I don't really want to waste any more of your time.

Julian, is there anything you want to say?

MR. SCHULMAN: Julian Schulman. Good evening. The only thing I'd like to say is as I understand it, construction vehicles have been there building up the infrastructure. From the builder's standpoint, that's more of an investment that he put into it and more of a hardship of having to wait to start building the houses. There are one or two pre-solds in there that we'd like to close early summer. So all we're asking for is the right to obtain two building permits. I do understand now that the construction vehicles will be using that intersection. They won't be parking in that intersection or blocking anything. So perhaps the Board will consider that, and not just two building permits, so we can start building.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Ken Mennerich, we were going around the table getting opinions from

MR. MENNERICH: I concur with what Frank and Cliff both had to say.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Tom Fogarty?

MR. FOGARTY: The only thing, I'm glad you went back on that 240 to the 400 because the rationale you gave is as long as the Harrises didn't complain, therefore we're not going to run it in front of their house, instead of saying what is the right thing to do. Whether a person comes to a public hearing and voices a concern should not be the reason why, you know, the situation is corrected.

MR. RAAB: Again, we weren't -- we were going to -- we were going to adhere to the fact that we were going to pipe in front of Cascianos. That would have been a death wish.

MR. FOGARTY: It shouldn't be the one with the squeaky wheel that's concerned. You should be taking a look at the project and saying what's the correct thing to do here.

MR. RAAB: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: John Ward?

MR. WARD: We understand your

2.3

2.3

condition, what you're trying to ask, but at the same time you came in front of us and we went with safety, with what the public said about a school bus stop and everything else. Basically you're asking us to do something else.

MR. RAAB: Understood. It's understood.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Comments from the Consultants. Jerry Canfield?

MR. CANFIELD: As Code Compliance
Supervisor I have to advise the Board that I
frown upon these type of conditions, simply
because my department will be charged with the
responsibility to enforce any conditions that are
imposed. The restricted accessibility for a
construction vehicle, in the real world we all
know, Jim, that's not going to happen. Whose
going to have to police that? My department?
I'm taxed with manpower and our situation right
now.

I would plea with the Board and suggest to them that any type of concession to this scenario, I'm not in favor of it. I am not. We are overburdened right now with what all we have

to do, and then to impose specific conditions that we have to further babysit is going to be a difficult task. It's a very difficult task now.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Thank you.

Pat Hines, Drainage Consultant?

MR. HINES: Our comment had to do with the closed pipe drainage system. That apparently has been taken off the table.

We did recommend that a public hearing be held since that issue was or grew out of public hearing comments.

I think referring it to Ken Wersted for his opinion, because he was involved in the initial review, he's not here this evening but I think his opinion would be valuable to the Board.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Bryant Cocks, Planning Consultant?

MR. COCKS: These requests had nothing to do with any house locations or setbacks, so I have no comments.

MR. RAAB: Let me save the Board any further trouble with this. You don't need to contact Ken. I don't see the Board's opinion changing, and I really don't know of any

alternative thing we could do here. I threw that

out there only because -- as a bad example I

guess. The fact is that I can understand that

the Board isn't willing to back off of that

condition, so I really don't see any sense in

contact with Ken. We'll just have to finish it

up the way it is.

So thank you very much for your time.

I really appreciate you letting us appear before
you and giving us a chance to plea our case.

Thank you.

(Time noted: 7:34 p.m.)

 $\underline{\text{C} \ \text{E} \ \text{R} \ \text{T} \ \text{I} \ \text{F} \ \text{I} \ \text{C} \ \text{A} \ \text{T} \ \text{I} \ \text{O} \ \text{N}}}$ 

I, Michelle Conero, a Shorthand
Reporter and Notary Public within and for
the State of New York, do hereby certify
that I recorded stenographically the
proceedings herein at the time and place
noted in the heading hereof, and that the
foregoing is an accurate and complete
transcript of same to the best of my
knowledge and belief.

DATED: February 8, 2012

2.3

MR. BROWNE: The next item of business we have before us is IHOP at Crossroads Plaza, project number 2011-32. This is ARB being presented by David Higgins of Lanc & Tully.

MR. HIGGINS: Good evening. Thank you very much. As you mentioned, my name is David Higgins with Lanc & Tully Engineering. I'm here for the application tonight which involves the renovations and a new business to move into an existing restaurant. You may know it as the Harp & Whistle, the old Harp & Whistle Restaurant which is located on New York State Route 17K. It's about a mile east of New York State Route 300.

The building is 4,350 square feet.

It's located on a lot which is roughly 12.3 acres in size. The rear portion of the lot is occupied by a strip mall, a building. Target is the anchor of that shopping plaza there known as the Crossroads Plaza.

What the applicant is proposing to do is to renovate the building, some work on the exterior and some work on the interior, which we'll get to in a few minutes.

-

2.3

With regard to the exterior, the improvements involve the renovation of a handicap access ramp. Currently there exists a paved asphalt ramp that goes from the parking area up to the sidewalk. Currently it doesn't meet ADA standards for handicap accessibility, so we would be removing that asphalt ramp and replacing it with a concrete ramp on the front portion of the building that does meet the ADA standards.

Also, there's an existing awning along the front of the building and some railroad tie walls, very short walls, maybe a foot in height. Those are proposed to be removed, and placed along with the handicap ramp would be a landscaping -- basically shrubs along the front and a few shrubs along the side of the building as well.

With the application, we submitted the site plan drawings and the architectural plans, and a long EAF.

Tonight with me also is Mr. Joseph
Boylan from Boylan Services, and he'll be
providing some information regarding the
architectural improvements that are proposed to

be built.

oo buil+

MR. BOYLAN: These are just blowups of the architectural plans that were previously submitted. I thought it might be easier to reference them.

My name is Joe Boylan, I'm a project manager at Croce Management, a franchisee for the IHOP in Newburgh. I'll talk about the architectural components, as Dave had spoken about the site information.

What we're proposing to do is to gut the entire interior of the building and to build a brand new restaurant with significant changes to the exterior of the building. We're proposing to remove, on the old Harp & Whistle, the mansard parapet and also the -- around that building there's a very deep overhang that runs the perimeter of the building. We're looking to cut that back to the original building line. What we're going to do is install -- we're going to put a new fascia and parapet element on. The parapet will be approximately five feet high off of the roof and will screen all rooftop

equipment. So as you approach this building no rooftop equipment will be visible.

The entry portico element here, this is a plastic IHOP element that is incorporated into all the buildings. What it does is it identifies where the building entrance is as well as provides some protection to our customers as they enter and leave the restaurant.

The color palette is one that's made up of blues and earth tones, which is compatible with the existing shopping center materials that are already there. The materials that we're using, the existing cut face block will be painted the IHOP scheme color. The stucco efface material on the fascia and parapet wall, the cultured stone which are located on the chimney elements that houses our signage, and also on the entry columns. The portico roof is a blue standing seam metal roof. On the fascia of the portico are copper panels. The awnings are a Sunbrella canvas awning. They're not the plastic type of awnings and they're not illuminated underneath.

The signage that we're proposing, we're

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

proposing to have the same amount or less than what the Harp & Whistle currently has on the building. The two cabinet signs are approximately 2 foot 8 high by 8 foot 4 wide, which comes to a little bit over 31 1/2 square feet. It's 31.56 square feet per sign.

I do apologize, the rendering that we have does not show the improvements that Dave had spoken about with the ADA handicap ramp. Due to the fact that the slope to the current entrance right now is not ADA compliant, we're installing the ramp area. Previously this patio area, this would be removed as it's shown on the plan, but everything else on the building is correct.

I can tell you a little bit of the history about IHOP restaurants. IHOP first opened in 1958 in Tuscaloosa, California. Two years later, in 1960, it franchised its first restaurant. Ninety-nine percent of the restaurants with IHOP are franchised. Everyone recognizes and remembers the IHOP restaurants, the old A-frame building. That building was around for twenty years. In the early 1980s the company revamped the whole concept and introduced

24

25

a menu for lunch and dinner, and they found that the existing prototype wasn't conducive to it because it was really perceived as a coffee shop. So a new prototype was created and quite a bit of expansion was done during the `80s and `90s. Twenty years have gone by again and in the early 2000s the company decided again it was time to come up with a new prototype, so the icon prototype came up. Most of what we see here, even though this is a conversion, looks like an icon presentation. Through that design of the icon building there was a tremendous amount of customer research and they found that the previous prototype -- they were distancing themselves from the A-frame because it was perceived as a coffee shop. All of the research showed the A-frame was a very positive thing with the customers. It was received very well. the new prototype has incorporated that back. This element is very important for the IHOP building since it is such a signature element.

If there's any questions that the Board has about the construction of the building or about the restaurant, I'd be happy to answer them

1	IHOP AT CROSSROADS PLAZA 47
2	as best I can.
3	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Cliff Browne does
4	most of the traveling for us. Cliff, where did
5	you have breakfast?
6	MR. BROWNE: Nashville. Actually, I
7	see a lot of IHOPs but I've never seen this
8	particular design any place yet.
9	MR. BOYLAN: Okay.
10	MR. BROWNE: I don't go to too many of
11	them but I see a lot of them. Sorry.
12	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: How many are there
13	right now?
14	MR. BOYLAN: Good question. As of the
15	last count update this past November, it was
16	1,532. That is throughout the United States,
17	Canada, Mexico.
18	MR. GALLI: I have a question on the
19	signage. The IHOP signs on the building are
20	going to be internally lit?
21	MR. BOYLAN: Yes.
22	MR. GALLI: And then are you going to
23	have are you going to be part of the
24	MR. BOYLAN: The Harp & Whistle had its

own sign. What we would like to do is keep that

MR. BOYLAN: It's a much larger

MR. BOYLAN: The franchisee owns the

MR. BOYLAN: Actually, the parking lot

1	IHOP AT CROSSROADS PLAZA 52
2	MR. CANFIELD: That would be the south
3	side of the building?
4	MR. BOYLAN: No.
5	MR. CANFIELD: East side?
6	MR. BOYLAN: It's the east side. What
7	happens is there is a big lawn area that comes
8	down away from the parking lot and that's up
9	against the building. There's a sidewalk. There
10	really is no cars back there. We can install
11	them but there's no cars really there.
12	MR. CANFIELD: You feel you have enough
13	distance between the actual loading zone
14	MR. BOYLAN: Actually, the loading zone
15	is on the side. That would be the north side.
16	MR. GALLI: They have a door.
17	MR. BOYLAN: That's where the service
18	door is. I would say it's a good 20 feet of
19	grass area in between that and the sidewalk, then
20	you have the sidewalk and then you have the
21	parking lot.
22	MR. CANFIELD: Okay.
23	MR. HIGGINS: Here's a picture here. I
24	don't think you can see the meter. From the map
25	that's the side of the building. If you look at

MR. CANFIELD: What are the walls of

1	IHOP AT CROSSROADS PLAZA 54
2	that enclosure?
3	MR. BOYLAN: It's a concrete block.
4	MR. CANFIELD: It is block?
5	MR. BOYLAN: Mm'hm'.
6	MR. CANFIELD: It's noncombustible
7	then. My concern was the proximity of the
8	dumpster to the building. Typically dumpsters
9	have occasion to catch fire. We're looking for a
10	separation. If it's noncombustible block, that's
11	fine.
12	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Pat Hines, Drainage
13	Consultant?
14	MR. HINES: We have no comments on this
15	reconstruction. There's no changes to the site.
16	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Bryant Cocks,
17	Planning Consultant?
18	MR. COCKS: In regard to the signage,
19	we usually require just the signage chart on the
20	site plan and just showing what's allowed and
21	what's proposed. I know it's going to be the
22	same but just so the building department has it.
23	And this will need to be referred to
24	the Orange County Planning Department.

Other than that, I have no comments.

Τ	THOP AT CROSSROADS PLAZA 55
2	MR. BROWNE: What about the we would
3	need a spec sheet on that.
4	MR. HINES: Do you have a chart?
5	MR. BROWNE: We're looking for just the
6	materials, what they are, so when the inspectors
7	go out they know what they're looking for.
8	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: David, we have an
9	architectural form that will need to be completed
10	and then you can list the materials, the
11	manufacturers and numbers.
12	We'll also need a cost estimate for the
13	landscape material. Karen Arent will review the
14	cost estimate associated with that.
15	MR. HIGGINS: Okay.
16	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: And I guess I'm
17	assuming with the dumpster enclosure, the cinder
18	block that you're constructing with will be of
19	the same color as the building itself.
20	MR. HIGGINS: Joe, are we changing the
21	color of the block, the dumpster enclosure?
22	MR. BOYLAN: The dumpster enclosure is
23	going to be painted the same color as the
24	concrete block of the building. That will blend

in together.

understand it. So yes, we'll need SEQRA and

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: You'll have some

6

7

8

2 means of securing the building itself as far as 3 public safety goes?

4 MR. BOYLAN: During construction?

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: During

construction.

MR. BOYLAN: Absolutely.

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

9

## 

11

10

12 I, Michelle Conero, a Shorthand 13 Reporter and Notary Public within and for 14 the State of New York, do hereby certify 15 that I recorded stenographically the proceedings herein at the time and place 16 17 noted in the heading hereof, and that the foregoing is an accurate and complete 18 19 transcript of same to the best of my

knowledge and belief.

21

20

22

23

24

25

DATED: February 8, 2012

2.3

MR. BROWNE: Next is Shoppes at Union Square, project number 2007-05, an amended site plan being represented by Joe --

MR. MINUTA: Joseph Minuta, Minuta Architects.

Good evening, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Board, consultants. Joseph Minuta with Minuta Architecture. I am here tonight for the Shoppes at Union Square. For the phase 1 plan we have an amendment. I have with me this evening Mr. Adrian Goddard and Mr. Nicholas Sotara, both owners of the project.

We have received the comments from all the consultants. We have received your responses. All of the items seem to have been buttoned up.

I did receive Mr. Hines' comments of late, and I do have responses to them if you would like to hear them this evening. They're pretty simple.

Pat, to answer your questions: Number one, there was a general note number 11 on the plan. The response to that is no, the existing structures will be demolished in each phase prior

2.3

to the issuance of a building permit for that phase as long as it's permissible by the Code Compliance Department.

MR. HINES: That's fine. It was a red flag. I didn't want you guys to get into a situation where the back building is 1,000 feet behind this phase of the project and have to be taken down. A lot of mine are note changes.

My second comment was with the Board I discussed at work session utilizing asphalt curbs for blocking off the future phases. I don't have a problem with it, I just wanted to call it to the Board's and Jerry's attention that that's what they were proposing. As long as the Board's okay with it, I'm fine with it. It's not going to visually look like the other curbs but it is temporary and significantly cheaper than pouring concrete curbs that are just going to be torn out.

There's a conflict in the notes you worked out between Karen regarding the landscape berm. There was a remnant of the other plan that we gave you notes to use. We don't want 25 foot stockpiles on these phases. The 5 foot note

calculations. That's all been accomplished.

1	SHOPPES AT UNION SQUARE 64
2	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Jerry, do you have
3	anything else to add?
4	MR. CANFIELD: No. I have nothing
5	outstanding.
6	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Bryant Cocks,
7	Planning Consultant?
8	MR. COCKS: I have nothing further.
9	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Comments from Board
10	Members. John Ward?
11	MR. WARD: No comment.
12	MR. FOGARTY: Going the other way. The
13	only thing that I didn't get a chance to talk
14	about in the work session, as you go through
15	these different phases, all right, how do you
16	prevent the phase that's under construction from
17	interfering with the completed sections? I mean
18	is there will that be part of the plan? Is
19	that written out, how that's all phased?
20	MR. HINES: It is. The phasing plan
21	matches it. It's conducive to the way the site
22	lays out with the stream in the center for the
23	rear phase and the two access drives into this
24	parcel. I think it will flow pretty well on the
25	site.

3

5

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. CANFIELD: I think also, and I might add, that the phasing for a project of this type is very important for our department because it gives us a start and a finish. You know, what section -- that section the phase is complete, and we have definitive parameters, what's to be complete, and then you go on to the next phase. 9 It's worked in the past with other projects 10 similar to this.

> MR. FOGARTY: I just have one other. Ι know in phase 2 there's Staples. Is there anything added to that? I know there used to be a bank. Was there anything beyond just --

> > MR. GODDARD: We're working on it.

MR. FOGARTY: Good luck. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Ken Mennerich?

MR. MENNERICH: There was a note relative to the timing of the lot consolidation. You were going to be discussing that.

MR. MINUTA: Yes. I'm glad you brought that up. That was my next point. I do have a lot line consolidation plan that has been prepared. It had been signed by the owners. Αt this time we are seeking the Planning Board

MICHELLE L. CONERO - (845)895-3018

1	SHOPPES AT UNION SQUARE 66
2	Chairman's signature and approval if deemed
3	appropriate, as well as the Town engineer's
4	signature.
5	MR. DONNELLY: The Real Property Tax
6	service wants to see a map signed by the chair
7	before they'll do this. I think appropriate you
8	do so.
9	Ken's question was when. The original
10	resolution required that it be done before the
11	plans were signed. I take it that's still what
12	you propose to do before the site plan is signed.
13	MR. MINUTA: Before the site plan is
14	signed. We have we would appreciate if it can
15	be done to have
16	MR. DONNELLY: Sign them all at once.
17	MR. MINUTA: And get them in. That's
18	really
19	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: What you could do
20	is leave that, I'll stamp it when I go over this
21	evening and you can pick it up tomorrow morning,
22	if the Board is in agreement.
23	MR. GALLI: Sure.
24	MR. MINUTA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Do you want to

25

I'm going to carry forward the first condition that except as modified by this resolution, all the earlier conditions will apply. We'll need a sign-off letter from Pat Hines' office, and we also need a sign-off letter from Karen Arent with her memos of January 13th and January 10th. As we did before, we'll note the variance granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals. We will list the other agency approvals required in checklist fashion and tabled the way we did before. Some of them I'm sure are already satisfied but I'll include them all. The usual condition that you copy us on all correspondence. The lot merger condition will be carried over. The restrictions on outdoor sales, potential future roadway connection. There's no new ARB approval. That's already done. There will be further ones for the new sites. In the phasing condition for the most recent resolution, it said, as it will now, no certificate of occupancy shall be issued for any building unless the improvements for that phase have been completed. We then said specifically in phase 1 this shall include under parking storage and water quality

MICHELLE L. CONERO - (845)895-3018

MR. DONNELLY: Unlike at the time of

MR. HINES: Yes.

the original resolution, there's now a

2.3

24

2.3

24

25

requirement when you have a stormwater collection and treatment system like this, you have to enter into a maintenance agreement. It's set forth in the code but we'll make reference to that language. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Thank you. And that would have to be approved by the Town Board;

MR. DONNELLY: It's a standard form.

MR. HINES: It's a standard form included in the ordinance. They need to execute it to ensure long-term maintenance and operation of the stormwater improvements.

Just for the record, the consolidated lot with the removal of the four lot lines is going to result in a 10.39 acre parcel of

This map is fine.

CHAIRMANE EWASUTYN: Any questions from the Board Members as far as the resolution presented by Mike Donnelly for the amended site plan?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Okay. That being

1	SHOPPES AT UNION SQUARE 71
2	understood, then I'll move for a motion to grant
3	that approval.
4	MR. GALLI: So moved.
5	MR. WARD: Second.
6	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I have a motion by
7	Frank Galli. I have a second by John Ward. Any
8	discussion of the motion?
9	MR. GALLI: This has been a long time
10	coming. I just know you two gentlemen will do a
11	fine job. Good luck.
12	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: There being
13	discussion, a motion made by Frank Galli,
14	seconded by John Ward, any further discussion?
15	(No response.)
16	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I'll move for a
17	roll call vote starting with Frank Galli.
18	MR. GALLI: Aye.
19	MR. BROWNE: Aye.
20	MR. MENNERICH: Aye.
21	MR. FOGARTY: Aye.
22	MR. WARD: Aye.
23	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: And myself. So
24	carried.
25	Thank you.

 $\underline{\text{C} \text{ E R T I F I C A T I O N}}$ 

I, Michelle Conero, a Shorthand
Reporter and Notary Public within and for
the State of New York, do hereby certify
that I recorded stenographically the
proceedings herein at the time and place
noted in the heading hereof, and that the
foregoing is an accurate and complete
transcript of same to the best of my
knowledge and belief.

DATED: February 8, 2012

MR. BROWNE: Our next item of business is Orchard Hills, amended site plan, project number 2011-28, being represented by Ross Winglovitz.

MR. WINGLOVITZ: Good evening. Ross Winglovitz with Engineering Properties here on behalf of JK Scanlon regarding the amended site plan for Orchard Hills.

We were here last month regarding minor site plan amendments which we identified in our letter of submission to the Board back in November.

Most significant of those were the recreation area, larger pool deck, slightly smaller all sports court, a number of sidewalk changes and so forth that we've outlined.

At the meeting last month there was a concern about phasing. We did have a work session here on December 27th in which the project manager for JK Scanlon, Sal Moffa, showed up and explained where they were at. Basically the entire apartment area is complete, with the exception of building 16, with the foundations going in. The building will be set probably in

February. All of the buildings have been set, parking areas are primarily completed. There's still a couple curbed islands that need to be finalized.

The plan for occupancy for the entire site starts here with occupancy of what's called building 2 and working their way around the exterior of the loop. The area around building 16, building 10 and the parking lot will be fenced for safety because that will be the only construction really going on in this area, other than landscaping probably would need to be completed in the spring.

The townhouse section, the roads have been completed up to the intersection and then up the hill to the top. There are still utilities being installed here. That will be the last area to be occupied.

Buildings 3 and 5 also still need to be constructed. The remainder of the buildings are all actually in.

Procedurally they want to start with occupancy in building 2, work their way around to building 4, 6 and 8, 11, 12 and then 10 at the

Τ	ORCHARD HILLS AMENDED SITE PLAN //
2	rear of the site.
3	The sewer treatment plant is expected
4	to be complete in February, early February.
5	They're working on finalizing that now.
6	The State highway improvements have
7	been completed with the exception of one light
8	that needs to be in.
9	We're here to answer any questions you
10	may have.
11	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I think we'll turn
12	to Jerry Canfield. You know the history of this
13	project so well, bring us along.
14	MR. CANFIELD: What was your question?
15	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Is this still an
16	active project in the Town of Newburgh?
17	MR. CANFIELD: It's still a very active
18	project. I think with this, I have no
19	outstanding issues with this amended site plan
20	for these changes.
21	Just to reiterate the fact that the
22	original conditions that were imposed still apply
23	with respect to certificate of occupancies. I
24	believe the sewer treatment plant was to be

online, functioning, serving the project. The

25

2.3

traffic light must need to be functioning and in service. The light -- I know the Board Members had done an inspection up there a couple weeks ago in the area, so you're aware the light is there. It's not functioning yet but it is strung. I believe they're waiting on the telephone company.

MR. WINGLOVITZ: Correct. One mass drum that needs to go in can't be installed until the telephone company moves their lines.

MR. CANFIELD: Right. I know the developer has hopes of occupying the apartment portion, which is in the front, I've heard several different dates, perhaps as early as February. We have no problem with complying with that or trying to help you meet your goals, however the previous conditions, I just can't reiterate the importance of the sewer plant, the traffic light.

Karen was up. I know she has some concerns with the berm and the fence that was installed. She's going back up and going to meet with Sal again. That would be the berm and fence on the Oak Street entrance side which would be

Τ.	OKCHARD HIBBS AMENDED SITE IBAN /9
2	somewhat of a buffer for the few residents that
3	are there in contact with the site.
4	MR. WINGLOVITZ: This location here?
5	MR. CANFIELD: Yes.
6	Basically that's all I've got. I have
7	no issues with this amendment.
8	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Pat Hines, Drainage
9	Consultant?
LO	MR. HINES: We don't have any
L1	outstanding comments on the amendment.
L2	We did discuss, at work session, the
L3	project has been going relatively smooth with
L 4	regard to the soil erosion and site work. We've
L 5	had very little, if any, issues during the
L 6	construction.
L 7	What just came to mind is at some point
L 8	the Oak Street access is going to be terminated.
L 9	Is that upon occupying the buildings? It's a
20	construction entrance only. I just want to make
21	sure
22	MR. WINGLOVITZ: The access is to be
23	through here for the whole project, that was one
24	reason they did that first, and then be

maintained. There were concerns from Parr Valley

25

about using this as a construction access and
just limiting it to the sewer treatment plant,
the construction of the entryway and so forth.
MR. HINES: I don't believe that
entrance is currently gated.
MR. WINGLOVITZ: Oak Street?
MR. HINES: Yes.
MR. WINGLOVITZ: Boy, you know every
time I've been through there I went right in.
MR. HINES: Myself also. If you're
going to start I don't mind if you use it for
construction but I don't want it to become the
sneak out, avoid the light for the residents. I
think if it is not gated it needs to become a
gated construction entrance with access for the
emergency services. Because you were speaking,
it came up.
CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: And some kind of
post and signage on the interior to warn people
of that.
MR. HINES: People may start thinking
that's
CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: You can't maintain
it but at least it will be up.

O

comments.

MR. CANFIELD: I agree with Pat's comments. That's a very good point. I have received some inquiries from some of the residents up in the Oak Street area, specifically Bright Star Drive and Alta Drive. Once they seen this on the agenda, that was their first comment, are they changing it and is that going to be an entrance. My response was no. So it's a legitimate point.

MR. WINGLOVITZ: Yup. Good comment.
CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Thank you, Pat.
Bryant Cocks, Planning Consultant?
MR. COCKS: I have no additional

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Mike Donnelly?

MR. DONNELLY: This will be the sixth amended site plan approval resolution. We will carry forth the earlier original conditions. We had discussed one, at least my notes say, and it came from a concern of what happens if there are buildings that are started or sites that are disturbed and then nothing happens. We wanted to have a trigger to say those building sites would be returned to a safe, stable and attractive

1	ORCHARD HILLS AMENDED SITE PLAN 82
2	condition. I don't remeber when in time that
3	was, whether such a note
4	MR. HINES: It's really not an issue
5	anymore. The building sites are up.
6	MR. CANFIELD: At the time we had a
7	concern that there were certain buildings that
8	were not going to be constructed.
9	MR. DONNELLY: I had a feeling it was
10	old. There's nothing new that needs to be
11	carried over. The old conditions will carry.
12	We need a stormwater maintenance
13	agreement, which may not have been in the
14	original agreement.
15	MR. WINGLOVITZ: The Town has a
16	standard agreement?
17	MR. HINES: It's right in the ordinance
18	now. It's an appendix to the ordinance.
19	MR. GALLI: Ross, are you having the
20	same problem with the telephone company as the
21	other applicant was? I heard you say something.
22	MR. WINGLOVITZ: This improvement
23	started in October right after the hurricanes and
24	floods. All the utilities have been backed up
25	trying to get manpower mobilized to do projects

HUDSON DINER 1 86 MR. BROWNE: We have a couple items on 2 Board Business. The first one is the Hudson 3 Diner, project number 2011-02. 4 5 The applicant is requesting a six-month extension of final site plan approval which will 6 run from February 15, 2012 to August 15, 2012. 7 CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I'll move for that 8 9 motion. 10 MR. GALLI: So moved. 11 MR. FOGARTY: Second. 12 CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I have a motion by 13 Frank Galli. I have a second by Tom Fogarty. Any discussion of the motion? 14 15 (No response.) CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I'll move for a 16 17 roll call vote starting with Frank Galli. 18 MR. GALLI: Aye. 19 MR. BROWNE: Aye. 20 MR. MENNERICH: Aye.

21 MR. FOGARTY: Aye.

22 MR. WARD: Aye.

2.3

24 (Time noted: 8:19 p.m.)

25

DATED: February 8, 2012

MICHELLE L. CONERO - (845)895-3018

CERTIFICATION

Reporter and Notary Public within and for

the State of New York, do hereby certify

proceedings herein at the time and place

noted in the heading hereof, and that the

that I recorded stenographically the

foregoing is an accurate and complete

transcript of same to the best of my

knowledge and belief.

I, Michelle Conero, a Shorthand

1		8
2	STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ORANGE TOWN OF NEWBURGH PLANNING BOARD	
3	X In the Matter of	
4	In the Matter of	
5	DDODOGED MOMN OF NEWDIDCH LOCAL LAW, DECHEOM FOR	
6	PROPOSED TOWN OF NEWBURGH LOCAL LAW: REQUEST FOR ZONING TEXT REVISIONS & OPEN AREA DEVELOPMENT DESIGNATION MID-HUDSON MARINA, OAK STREET	
7	(2010-19)	
8	DISCUSSION BY MICHAEL DONNELLY & BRYANT COCKS	
9	x	
10	BOARD BUSINESS	
11	Date: January 19, 2012	
12	Time: 8:20 p.m. Place: Town of Newburgh	
13	Town Hall	
14	1496 Route 300 Newburgh, NY 12550	
15	DOADD MEMBERG. TOUN D. EMAGUEDAN Chairman	
16	BOARD MEMBERS: JOHN P. EWASUTYN, Chairman FRANK S. GALLI	
17	CLIFFORD C. BROWNE KENNETH MENNERICH	
18	THOMAS P. FOGARTY JOHN A. WARD	
19	ALSO PRESENT: MICHAEL H. DONNELLY, ESQ. BRYANT COCKS	
20	PATRICK HINES  GERALD CANFIELD	
21		
22	•	
23	MICHELLE L. CONERO	
24	10 Westview Drive Wallkill, New York 12589 (845)895-3018	
25	(042)032-2010	

MR. BROWNE: The next item is Michael

Donnelly and Bryant Cocks will discuss the

proposed Town of Newburgh law, request for zoning

text revisions and open development area

designation Mid-Hudson Marina, Oak Street, Town

of Newburgh, New York.

MR. DONNELLY: Maybe I should begin. I outlined this a little bit in the work session.

Just to clarify again, this is a project that, under an earlier version, had received full SEQRA review, meaning an EIS and a Findings Statement.

I've seen that document and we're all in agreement it did occur.

What's currently proposed is, I'm quite sure because I've been told this, a reduction in the size of the project. I think we have every reason to believe the SEQRA review in terms of its content would have handled all of the environmental issues raised. I also have a feeling the Findings Statement addressed a very different project, and that might need to be amended.

Put aside the SEQRA for a moment and then I'll come back to it. There are three

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

proposals before various boards of the Town. One, most obviously is the new site plan approval for the revised project. Additionally, the applicant has applied to the Town Board for a change in the zoning chapter text to allow some changes in density or use, I forget the exact flavor of those, and that's pending before the Town Board. In addition, the access way that will serve this project is across a right-of-way or easement, and under the Town Law, Section 280-A, an open development area needs to be created before building permits can be issued and site plan approval can be granted for the project. application is a Town Board application. That has been made to the Town Board.

Under Section 280-A of the Town Law, before the Town Board can act on creation of an open development area, they are required to ask the Planning Board for its advice on that application. The Planning Board's jurisdiction is to grant that -- to render that advice, you have a letter from the Town Board asking for it, and they ask specifically for both your advice as well as the rationale and the information backing

3

5

7

1

it up. You were also given authority to propose to the Town Board that the Town Board enact regulations governing the creation of the open development area, if they approve it, of either a general or specific nature, and I think it's the

specific ones that really have application here.

It is before you for the purpose of that advice. I don't know that you need to closeout SEQRA before you give the advice. However, before the Town Board can take action on either the zone change petition or the open development area petition, and before you can take action on the site plan, you need to closeout SEORA. I think we need to have the applicant get to us a copy of the EIS so we can look at it. We need to have a summary prepared of the highlights of why this project is fully addressed in that EIS, and we certainly need to have a copy of the Findings Statement so we can determine whether or not it adequately covers this project. If it does, you can then issue a SEQRA consistency determination. That is a finding that the EIS covers all of the issues in the project and all of this proposal is within

25

9

1

its threshold and that the Findings do not need to be amended. I think it's more likely you'll say that the EIS covers the project but then issue an amended Findings Statement. I think as we're doing that, we need to have the applicant prepare that or help to have a chart or highlight of the Findings that need to be changed so we can do an amended one.

25

In the meantime I think you need to get a hold on the issues raised by the creation of the open development area, how wide is the easement, what precautions need to be put in place, is the sight distance adequate, does it need to have warning signs or are there any restrictions on further development that may make it unable to handle that. Those would be the types of things I think you could put into your recommendations. And of course your thumbs up/ thumbs down and rationale advice to the Town Board needs to be given. I don't know if you need to turn to your technical consultants for them to give you specific advice in that regard. I think you should hear further from the applicant on the SEQRA issue. At some point, and

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think sooner rather than later, that advice needs to be handed off to the Town Board. It would be preferable if we closed out SEQRA first, but I believe that the advice to the Town Board is a preliminary nonbinding determination that could be done before you close SEQRA.

There are two tasks before you: Get a handle on SEQRA, work with your consultants to put together your advisory report to the Town Board on creation of the 280-A open development area. You have not yet been asked, I don't think -- and, Bryant, correct me if I'm wrong -for any particular report on the proposal for the zone changes before the Town Board. You will at some point if that continues on, because when the Town Board has before it a change in either the map or the text of the zoning chapter, it's required to ask you for a report on specific criteria. You're quite familiar with that. I don't think that's been done yet. I think Mark's letter said they have not yet prepared the local law because I think they're still in discussion with the applicant over the nature of what those proposals might be.

1

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Ouestions from

3

Board Members. Frank Galli?

4

MR. GALLI: No.

5

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Cliff?

6

MR. BROWNE: With respect to the open

7

development area, could you explain that one more

time to me?

9

MR. DONNELLY: Why one is needed?

10

MR. BROWNE: What it is.

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. DONNELLY: I think I had given you -- probably one of the things that might help you is the letter on the proposal last month outlining Section 280-A. 280-A is a very specific section of law to follow. Essentially what it says is that before building permits can be issued, and obviously you can't issue a building permit in this context unless you have site plan approval, the status of the roadway that will provide access has to have a certain level of formality. That level is met by it being on the official map of the Town, or, if there's no official map, by it being a road shown on a plot or approved plat, so on and so forth. The road must also be suitably improved. Usually

1

4

6

7

5

8

1011

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

that means to Town roadway specifications. the roadway providing access does not satisfy the formal status requirement, it's not on the official map of the Town, not on a subdivision, not an existing State, County or Town highway, then therefore the access to the site is by easement or right-of-way, then the only way which a building permit can be issued for the site is if the Town Board creates for that site what's called an open development area. It is basically a specific legislative act that will allow a piece of property that could not otherwise be developed, because it doesn't have the access, to obtain the right to use the easement or right-of-way as its access point, and in the process of creating one the Town Board is required to ask the Planning Board for its advice on that proposal. That's the juncture we're at.

MR. BROWNE: Essentially it's a special form of an easement?

MR. DONNELLY: It allows an easement to be granted by legislative act of the Town Board when it wouldn't otherwise be allowed.

MR. BROWNE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Ken Mennerich?

MR. MENNERICH: A couple things. One

345

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

is on the road that will go in on that easement,

assuming it was approved. I think we should have our technical experts look at that and tell us

7 what type of road is needed and what kind of

improvements are needed on that. That should go

in our suggestion to the Town Board.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: And that would be a specific recommendation.

I'm wondering about -- I realize this project has got less impact than the previous one. If my recollection is right, the previous one had the big marina operation and single-family houses where this one is going to have the townhouses. I don't know what the numbers are of people in the two scenarios, but I do remember when we had public hearings there was a lot of input from the public on the site. I guess I'm questioning whether we should have another public hearing or not on the new proposal.

MR. DONNELLY: Certainly that's an option for you, both under SEQRA, if you require

25

1

a supplemental, and for the site plan. There's no provision for a public hearing on the advisory report under 280-A. That's not to say that inherently you can't hold a public hearing on whatever you'd like, but it's not one that's provided for in State law. I think you should get a handle on what is the density of this project and is the roadway that's proposed to be used adequate for that purpose, because that's the rub of the open development area, does this easement work for this particular piece of land. I think that is really what you need to give your advice to them on. It's important that you give that specific advice because it is possible that the open development area is created and then for whatever reason this application goes away and now the open development area is created, it can be used for any other use. If you don't impose or if the Town Board doesn't accept your proposed regulations and restrictions on the creation, then there's no handwriting on the wall for the next user and they think it's a walk in the park to do what they'd like. So I think the comparative analysis of the old project and the

2

3

5

6

Ŭ

7

Ö

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

new, and then technical advice on the nature of the roadway and what types of regulatory restrictions should be addressed for the creation of the open development area.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Tom Fogarty?

MR. FOGARTY: Mike, what is the next immediate step for the owner to take and the next step that we have to take to move this?

MR. DONNELLY: The only step that's before you immediately is the advisory report on the 280-A open development area. I have said to the applicant's representatives I think sooner -the sooner the better we get a handle on the SEQRA issues, because while you can give your advisory report before you close out SEQRA, I think it might be helpful to have that SEQRA analysis before you so you can look at what are the environmental issues that the earlier members of the Planning Board saw with this project, because they may directly relate to what restrictions you may want to place or regulations you may want to recommend in relation to the open development area. The site plan will come later and be guided by the creation of the open

that are before you.

development area, if it happens, and any

amendments to the code that may take place. So

you can push that further down the road. I think

SEQRA and your advisory report are the two things

MR. FOGARTY: The advisory report, who will put that together?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  DONNELLY: I'm going to volunteer Bryant.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I think that would be a combination again. That would be a combination of Bryant, that would be a combination of Ken Wersted, and that would be a combination of Pat Hines.

MR. DONNELLY: And you.

MR. FOGARTY: That's the next step in that process.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: And the question then is, and it's a good question, good point,

Jerry, Pat and Bryant will be meeting on the 31st to review the Russell and Lee site plan on Route

52. If you remember, we had set that up for a consultants' meeting. That's a project across from Tarsio's, because it was the old garden

center, it had a lot of buildings. The question was do we demo buildings, can you demo buildings. So they're meeting with him on the 31st.

Correct?

MR. CANFIELD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: The Board may want to consider, and Ken Wersted would have the make the trip down, to also add this on for a think tank session to come up with these recommendations. It could be an advisory group get together to come up with specific recommendations and discuss this. You're right. Like Mike said, as far as SEQRA and Findings, that will have to come from the applicant group themselves. Do you want to move in that direction?

MR. FOGARTY: Yeah. I think that's the way we should go. I think we should go in an orderly process.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: John Ward?

MR. WARD: I had a question. When you said open space, and say this project doesn't go for future open space, is that like setting a foundation for a future --

1	PROPOSED LOCAL LAW 104
2	those two meetings.
3	I'll move for a motion to close the
4	meeting of January 19, 2012.
5	MR. FOGARTY: So moved.
6	MR. GALLI: Second.
7	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I have a motion by
8	Tom Fogarty. I have a second by Frank Galli.
9	I'll ask for a roll call vote.
10	MR. GALLI: Aye.
11	MR. BROWNE: Aye.
12	MR. MENNERICH: Aye.
13	MR. FOGARTY: Aye.
14	MR. WARD: Aye.
15	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: And myself. So
16	carried.
17	
18	(Time noted: 8:35 p.m.)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

<u>C E R T I F I C A T I O N</u>

I, Michelle Conero, a Shorthand
Reporter and Notary Public within and for
the State of New York, do hereby certify
that I recorded stenographically the
proceedings herein at the time and place
noted in the heading hereof, and that the
foregoing is an accurate and complete
transcript of same to the best of my
knowledge and belief.

DATED: February 8, 2012