25

Town Law on the application of O'Brien Lane III

for a two-lot subdivision on premises O'Brien

2.3

Lane off Pressler Road, designated on Town tax map as Section 6; Block 1; Lot 9.24. Said hearing will be held on the 3rd day of November 2011 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. Dated October 14, 2011."

MR. GALLI: The notice of hearing was published in The Mid-Hudson Times and in The Sentinel newspapers. Six notices were sent out, four were returned. The notice of hearing and the affidavit of publication are all in order.

MR. PROFACI: Thank you. I would like to ask Planning Board Attorney, Mike Donnelly, to explain the purpose of the public hearing.

MR. DONNELLY: There are two public hearings on this evening's agenda, both of them are subdivision public hearings and are mandated by State law. Though both of these applications have been before the Board for some period of time now, the purpose of the hearing is to hear

from you, the members of the public, what
concerns you may have about the project, given,
in most cases, that you live near it. After the
applicant gives its presentation, the Chairman
will call on those members that wish to speak. We
ask you to please step forward, give your name
and address to our Stenographer, and direct your
comments to the Board. If you have questions,
they can be directed to either the applicant or
to one of the Town's consultants.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Jim.

MR. RAAB: For the record, my name is Jim Raab, I'm representing Taconic Design Engineering and WNG Properties who are subdividing the original lot 4 of the original O'Brien subdivision which was filed back in `07 into a two-lot subdivision. There are two lots, 52,280 square feet and 53,344 square feet.

Both lots will be served by individual wells and septic systems. They'll be served by a partial common driveway off of the private road, O'Brien Lane, which is existing at this time.

That's pretty much it.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Comments from Board

2.3

1	O'BRIEN LANE III
2	they can be constructed without them.
3	The project is, as was mentioned, part
4	of a larger development scheme that was
5	originally approved in 2007, so we required that
6	they gain coverage under the original project's
7	stormwater SPDES permit. They have provided that
8	information to the Town and it's in our files, so
9	they've addressed our previous comments.
10	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Bryant Cocks,
11	Planning Consultant?
12	MR. COCKS: Jim, does that plan have
13	the 10,000 square foot buildable area
14	requirement?
15	MR. RAAB: Yes. We checked it today.
16	Because the lot lines had changed, I understand
17	why you thought that maybe we should check it.
18	We did. We did immediately. We have 10,500
19	square feet.
20	MR. COCKS: That was my only comment.
21	Orange County Planning Department did
22	issue a Local determination.
23	MR. RAAB: We're going to have to
24	revise the coverage on lot line sheet 1. We
25	didn't do that.

2.3

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Okay. As Mike

Donnelly had said earlier in the meeting, if

there's anyone here that has any questions or

comments, raise your hand and give your name and
address, please.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Let the record -
MR. MENNERICH: Jim, where they have

the crossed hatches, the proposed common driveway
easement, how can it come at such an unusual
shape --

MR. RAAB: What it is is that we were trying to cover -- the reason why it's -- it bends back in right here. The driveway bends back into that. That's why it's got that weird shape to it. We want to make sure that the common driveway easement covered both driveways where it needed to.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Any additional comments from Board Members?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: If there's no one in the audience that has any questions or comments at this time, then I'll move for a

MICHELLE L. CONERO - (845)895-3018

1	O'BRIEN LANE III 9
2	motion to close the public hearing on the two-lot
3	subdivision for O'Brien Lane III.
4	MR. FOGARTY: So moved.
5	MR. GALLI: Second.
6	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I have a motion by
7	Tom Fogarty. I have a second by Frank Galli.
8	Any 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. MENNERICH: Aye.
14	MR. PROFACI: Aye.
15	MR. FOGARTY: Aye.
16	MR. WARD: Aye.
17	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Myself yes. So
18	carried.
19	At this point we'll turn to the
20	Planning Board Attorney, Mike Donnelly, to give
21	us conditions of approval and the final
22	resolution.
23	MR. DONNELLY: As Pat Hines said, this
24	is subject to an existing SPDES permit. We'll
25	reflect that as the first resolution condition.

3

5

6

7

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PROFACI: The next item on the agenda tonight is Lands of Elapus, Limited. It's also a public hearing for a two-lot subdivision located on Bright Star Drive off of Oak Street, Section 9; Block 3; Lot 48.1, located in the R-3 Zone, represented by Darren Doce.

MR. MENNERICH: "Notice of hearing, Town of Newburgh Planning Board. Please take notice that the Planning Board of the 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 Elapus, Ltd for a two-lot subdivision on premises Bright Star Drive off Oak Street, designated on tax map number Section 9; Block 3; Lot 48.1. Said hearing will be held on the 3rd day of November 2011 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. Dated October 14, 2011."

MR. GALLI: The notice of hearing was

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

regulations.

MR. CANFIELD: Okay. That's all I

1	LANDS OF ELAPUS, LTD 16
2	have.
3	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Pat Hines, Drainage
4	Consultant?
5	MR. HINES: We previously had one minor
6	technical comment on the septic system. That's
7	been addressed. We have no outstanding comments
8	on this two-lot subdivision.
9	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Bryant Cocks,
10	Planning Consultant?
11	MR. COCKS: The applicant did e-mail me
12	a revised plan showing the 10,000 square feet
13	buildable requirement.
14	The twenty-foot drainage easement
15	language will need to be submitted to Mike
16	Donnelly for his review.
17	A stamped and sealed survey sheet is
18	needed before the plans can be signed.
19	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: At this point I'll
20	turn to the public to see if there's anyone here
21	that has any questions or comments, please raise
22	your hand.
23	(No response.)
24	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Let the record show
25	we had no interest from the public.

1	LANDS OF ELAPUS, LTD 18
2	easement and maintenance agreement provides the
3	right of access and the obligation of maintenance
4	for the new lot that's created. I assume that it
5	does but I'll need to see that. Finally, there
6	was one new lot created in the subdivision, and
7	that will be subject to a \$2,000 parkland fee.
8	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Any questions about
9	the resolution presented by Attorney Mike
10	Donnelly?
11	(No response.)
12	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Okay. Then I'll
13	move for a motion to grant conditional final
14	approval for the Lands of Elapus subject to the
15	presentation by Mike Donnelly.
16	MR. WARD: So moved.
17	MR. PROFACI: Second.
18	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I have a motion by
19	John Ward. I have a second by Joe Profaci. Any
20	discussion of the motion?
21	(No response.)
22	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I'll move for a
23	roll call vote starting with Frank Galli.
24	MR. GALLI: Aye.
	1

MR. MENNERICH: Aye.

2	MR. PROFACI: The next item on
3	tonight's agenda is a sixteen-lot
4	subdivision. It's the Greiner Subdivision,
5	project 2002-33, located on Lattintown Road
6	opposite Merritt Lane, Section 7; Block 1;
7	Lot 22.25, located in the AR Zone, being
8	represented by Greg Shaw.
9	MR. SHAW: The last time this
10	application was before the Board was in December
11	of last year. Since that point in time we've
12	gone to the Town Board and we have formed a
13	drainage district for the subdivision.
14	We also obtained from the Town Board a
15	waiver for cul-de-sac length.
16	We resolved with the Town the
17	utilization of the name Greiner Road for the
18	extension of that roadway.
19	Finally, we have the common driveway
20	maintenance agreements which have been reviewed
21	and accepted by your attorney.
22	In addition to that, we have revised
23	the drawings in accordance with your consultants'

So I'm here before you tonight to

24

25

comments.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN:

I would like to

discuss the next step procedurally with respect to the subdivision. Normally I think we're at a point where I'd ask for final subdivision approval, but it's my understanding that once that approval is given, if the Board were to give it, that sets a time clock. In reality what my client would like to do is not to have a time clock at this point in time but to go in and start building the infrastructure. He realizes he's going to have to pay the inspection fees for the Town to come in and inspect his work accordingly, and whatever other requirements that come into play. I'm just not sure what all of them are.

The purpose of coming before the Board tonight is to explore the possibility of commencing construction, okay, taking care of the necessary tasks before construction, and then, once he gets to a certain point in the installation of the public improvements, then at that point provide a bond for the balance and whatever fees would be appropriate at that time.

Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

-

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

turn to the group discussion with Mike Donnelly, Jerry Canfield and Pat Hines.

MR. DONNELLY: You're correct, Greq, that there would be a clock that would start when you get conditional final approval, and that's a provision of the Town Law. That clock runs for 180 days. It used to be that it could only be extended for two additional 90-day periods and then after that it could not further be extended. Earlier in the year that statute was amended and now allows the Planning Board to continue to grant sequential 90-day extensions. So the time clock is not the walking of the plank that it used to be. And once you have your conditional final approval, again under the Town Law, you can either build or bond. Those are the choices that the State law gives you. But there are also provisions of the Town of Newburgh Code that come into play. If you had a conditional final approval, you might still need to get a clearing and grading permit if you were not going to, you know, file the map and bond. And the stormwater work would also be subject to some type of financial security and inspection fees . What

you would certainly not be subject to would be the roadway bonding that would normally be the case if you wanted to file the map. But I don't think you can move forward without that conditional final approval unless you had some agreement, a developer's agreement of sorts, with the Town Board.

My recommendation earlier at the work session would be, since most of these do not come to the Planning Board, they would be postapproval discussions, that you try to set up a meeting with Jerry and Jim Osborne, and if necessary Mark Taylor and Pat Hines, to talk about how much earth moving there is, what the nature of the stormwater facilities are, whether they need performance bonding at all or just restoration bonding would be sufficient to restore the site to a safe and stable condition in the event work stopped, then to get an idea of what the inspection fees would be. It's not generally a Planning Board issue, but, as John said, I'll let Jerry and Pat chime in.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Jerry?

MR. CANFIELD: Like Mike had said, with

2.3

the provisions of the clearing and grading law,

Greg, on the surface what we looked at is the

amount of area to be disturbed will be over the

threshold. The clearing and grading permit

requirements are, A, the need for a permit, and

then the degree of review for the permit is based

upon the amount of disturbance that there will

be. In this case what it appears is that you

will be over the one-acre threshold, which will

bring you back before this Board for a clearing

and grading permit.

I think what Mike is referring to is for us to identify exactly how much clearing and grading there will be done to find out where you fit in that permitting process. I think at this point we're all in agreement, yes, a clearing and grading permit is one of the permits that will be required.

MR. SHAW: Okay. I think I understand it but -- okay. If not, I'll follow up with you.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Pat Hines?

CHAIRMAN EWASUTIN: Pat Hines?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ HINES: I concur with what everyone had said.

25 CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Comments or

2.3

questions from Board Members. Frank Galli?

3 MR. GALLI: No.

MR. MENNERICH: To be clear, if you wanted to get the final approval you would not have to go through the clearing and grading permit with the public hearings and everything.

Is that what I'm --

MR. DONNELLY: You may still be subject to some of its financial security requirements.

MR. SHAW: Can I just interject for a second? I think from what you just explained, all right, is for us to get a conditional final approval, with there not being a time clock, it wouldn't affect us negatively, therefore we could ask for it, okay, and be free of that burden.

Independent of that, we still have the issues with respect to securing with the Town the storm drainage and the soil erosion issue. I think what you said was that if we were to get conditional final approval, the clearing and grading now becomes a non-issue.

MR. DONNELLY: You don't need to have a separate clearing and grading permit if the grading work you're going to do is the same work

MICHELLE L. CONERO - (845)895-3018

1

that was approved on the subdivision plat.

3

5

7

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. SHAW: It will be.

MR. DONNELLY: I believe that the provisions of the clearing and grading article would require, if there wasn't subdivision security, that there be some financial security posted for the work. In any event, there be a stormwater security required.

MR. SHAW: Stormwater and --

MR. DONNELLY: But they're less than I think performance securities because they're not intended to complete the work but only to stabilize the site.

MR. SHAW: Correct. The estimate for the public improvements is a substantial number, hundreds of thousands of dollars. That's what we're trying to avoid at this point in time.

MR. DONNELLY: And that's permissible under the State law. The Town's interest is to make sure that the site is inspected as work progresses and that there's some degree of financial security on hand so if work stopped, or was done improperly, or you didn't obey the command to remedy the situation, that the Town

preliminary approval.

2.3

MR. SHAW: Correct.

MR. DONNELLY: If you wanted to start work on this site now without final approval, you would need to have some kind of developer's agreement with the Town.

MR. SHAW: From what we've just explained, I think I'm going to backtrack and ask you for us to get conditional final subdivision approval. It's probably to our benefit now as it's been explained to me. It just takes some of the hurdles away from us.

MR. DONNELLY: I believe that's true.

I don't know if you want to explore it with Jim

Osborne first to be sure or not, but I think

that's the direction you're going to want to go.

MR. SHAW: Okay. If the Board is inclined, I think we would take the conditional final approval.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Mike, would you present to us what the conditions would be in the conditional final resolution?

MR. DONNELLY: I didn't prepare such a resolution but I do have the preliminary resolution, and I'll simply mark off as we go

GREINER SUBDIVISION

DATED: November 29, 2011

24

MR. PROFACI: The next item on tonight's agenda is a conceptual site plan. It's the Fidanza site plan, project 2011-24, located on North Plank Road, Section 80; Block 7; Lot 7, located in the B Zone, being represented by Anthony Coppola.

MR. COPPOLA: Thank you very much. This is largely a site plan that was approved about three years ago by the Board. I'm actually going to start with what was previously approved because it's more of the old plan than there are changes to the new plan.

Basically what's going on here is my client, Franco Fidanza, is under contract to purchase the lot, and he desires a slightly different configuration of the building and a slightly different type of building than what was previously approved. He's purchasing from the current owner, Mid-Hudson, which is Steve Michalski.

What was previously approved was a single story, 3,975 square foot retail office building. This is right on North Plank Road next to Monroe Muffler. It's currently a vacant lot.

It was a vacant lot and is currently a vacant lot. There was basically a one-way traffic flow pattern around the building, all of which was angled parking. There were I think 27 parking spaces previously.

There was kind of a projection in the building which we had gotten approved previously through this Board through architectural review.

There was a drive-through also.

The stormwater retention system is underground in the back.

There's a landscaping buffer in the back because there's residential. The R3 Zone is behind us.

And there is a sewer --

MR. HINES: Force main.

MR. COPPOLA: Thank you. Forgot my words there. A sewer force main that's a couple hundred feet west up North Plank Road, and that is still in place.

What's changed on the plan from what we're presenting tonight -- this is a new application. The other site plan, as Bryant had stated, was never signed. So what's changed is

2.3

the drive-through is gone, the building is slightly larger. Still one story but it's about 400 square feet larger than it was before. There were a few parking spaces in the front which we removed. The building is a perfect rectangle now as opposed to the irregular shape before. So there's no parking directly in front of the building. There is still the same circular flow of angled parking.

We've increased the square footage of the building, so we've increased the number of parking spaces by three. So there's parking now directly in back of the building in the loading area there also.

Largely it's the same site plan. The stormwater retention system is still underground in the rear. The landscaping buffer is identical to what was previously approved. The rest of the details are largely the same, the stonewall in the front, the site lighting, the landscaping, as I stated. The dumpster was relocated slightly. All the rest of those details, as well as the utility details, are all the same.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Okay. I'll turn to

required.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Pat Hines, Drainage

2.3

Consultant?

MR. HINES: We reviewed the previously submitted and approved stormwater management plan. The impervious area on the site remains the same, the building just takes up more of the previous parking or pavement.

What I do suggest is the Town has a new requirement for entering into a maintenance agreement for long-term operation and maintenance of the stormwater facilities, so that will be a new requirement since the plan was before us last.

The sewage plans have not been updated. They contain the previous square footage. That needs to be updated. I suggest you use the worst-case, probably the combination of the restaurants that are proposed, to come up with that. Those plans can be modified.

As Bryant just said, the City of

Newburgh flow acceptance letter needs to be

revised accordingly because they're keeping track

of the Town's usage and approval for the

hydraulic loading for these buildings.

what was here, but overall the quantity on the

<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: November 29, 2011

2.3

MR. PROFACI: The next item on tonight's agenda is Magyar/Budget Truck Rental.

It's a site plan, project number 2011-04, located at 5465 Route 9W, Section 5; Block 1; Lot 3, located in a B Zone, represented by Frank Valdina.

MR. VALDINA: The plans have been revised to meet the requirements of the Consultants.

We had met with Karen pertaining to the landscape, and the items that she had requested had been revised. I did receive a comment from her indicating something about technical items.

I did try to -- I did provide information to her indicating where on the plans we had made all those revisions per her prior comments.

The water line information has been added pertaining to connecting to the existing water line on the east side of Route 9W.

Revised stormwater management had been submitted to the engineering consultant for their review. I believe there's still a few items -- minor items outstanding on that. We're working with your office to resolve any outstanding

.

2.3

2 issues.

On the question that was raised last time -- I raised a question last time pertaining to the utilization of the adjoining building for a temporary office. I submitted information to Jerry Canfield, as requested, for his input to the Planning Board prior to them making a decision.

The architectural review, I believe all the stipulations, which basically was the color of the roof, have been resolved. There aren't any outstanding issues pertaining to architectural review.

That's basically where we stand at this point.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I'll turn to Bryant Cocks, Planning Consultant, for comment.

MR. COCKS: I have no additional.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Pat Hines, Drainage Consultant?

MR. HINES: Our comments identify that the municipal water line has now been extended -- is proposed to be extended across 9W. A DOT permit for that will be required, but it

-

Ü

U

addresses the issue with potable and fire flow water on the site.

I had a comment regarding the finished floor elevations which we discussed at work session regarding the flood plain development permit which will be required. That's been addressed.

As Mr. Valdina said, a stormwater management report has been submitted. We have some technical items on there but I believe we're well along the way to resolving those. There's a meeting scheduled for next week with John Szarowski from my office and Craig Marti from Mr. Valdina's office.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Jerry Canfield, Code Compliance?

MR. CANFIELD: During the work session, Frank, we had discovered, through an error of the Code Compliance Department, there's a section of the Code that typically applies to this type of occupancy, and it deals with outside storage.

The section of the Code is 185-30. There's conditions that are to be met whenever there's outside storage of materials. What we discovered

2.3

is that the storage bins on the north side of the property, through discussion it was learned that perhaps there may be some material or construction already taking place there. Perhaps some blocks are already stored or a concrete pad being poured. That we can discuss. That's a code compliance issue. If perhaps someone is jumping the gun, we can discuss that. But the point is that through that — observing that brought attention to the outside storage section of the code which typically is a boilerplate that's affixed with these type occupancies. It was discovered that there is a fifty-foot setback from the property line of any of this type storage.

Looking at the plan, I believe there's a fifteen-foot buffer and then -- we did not scale it but I believe it's a twenty-on-one scale there. It looks like maximum what you have is thirty-five, thirty-eight feet.

So the options to correct this problem would be, number one, you would have the option of going to the Zoning Board for a variance. And I know it's late in the process for that,

1	MAGYAR/BUDGET TRUCK RENTAL 53
2	however, like I said, it was an oversight on the
3	Code Compliance Department. We did not notice
4	this. Your second option would be to perhaps
5	make the bins smaller so they can comply with the
6	fifty-feet regulation. That's your options on
7	how to handle that scenario.
8	MR. DONNELLY: There's actually a third
9	option.
10	MR. CANFIELD: I'm sorry.
11	MR. DONNELLY: The restriction is
12	normally ten feet unless the property is located
13	next to either a residential district or a
14	property in residential use. If your client was
15	to abandon the residential use for the adjoining
16	piece of property, then the setback requirement
17	would be ten feet.
18	MR. VALDINA: This building right now
19	was a single-family residence. It is currently
20	vacant.
21	MR. DONNELLY: It's vacant now but it
22	would have to be vacant for more than a year.
23	MR. VALDINA: It could not be
24	utilized
	1

MR. DONNELLY: We would need something

1	MAGYAR/BUDGET TRUCK RENTAL 54
2	from your client that said he surrendered any
3	right for the protected nonconforming use of that
4	property, then we would be back to the ten-foot
5	setback which you meet. So you would need
6	delivered to us something signed that says that.
7	MR. CANFIELD: Thank you, Mike.
8	One question, while we're talking about
9	that residence, and I think we'll get into the
10	temporary occupancy in a little bit, however the
11	Chairman chooses to handle that, but the question
12	I have on that is that the is that the
13	building that is proposed for the temporary
14	office?
15	MR. VALDINA: No.
16	MR. CANFIELD: It is not. It's the one
17	out on 9W?
18	MR. VALDINA: Yes.
19	MR. CANFIELD: So if that be the case,
20	then you're looking at perhaps abandoning the
21	residential use for both of those structures?
22	MR. VALDINA: This structure was never
23	intended to be used for a residence. That is in
24	the B Zone.

MR. CANFIELD: It's existing

1	MAGYAR/BUDGET TRUCK RENTAL 55
2	nonconforming as a residence in a B Zone.
3	MR. VALDINA: It's vacant.
4	MR. CANFIELD: That also is vacant?
5	MR. VALDINA: Yes.
6	MR. CANFIELD: There becomes
7	ramifications, Frank, with trying to make that a
8	commercial. Even though it's vacant, the Code
9	the provisions of the Code allows twelve months
10	of an existing nonconforming before it loses it's
11	existing nonconforming protection.
12	MR. DONNELLY: But that one is
13	separated by the other lots. I don't think it's
14	important for the fifty-foot setback. Right?
15	MR. CANFIELD: That's totally in regard
16	to the temporary office.
17	MR. DONNELLY: I guess what Jerry is
18	telling you is if you move temporarily into that,
19	the time you're there is the clock is running on
20	the one year, and if that time exceeds one year,
21	you will not be able to restore the residential
22	use.
23	MR. VALDINA: Fine. Unless the
24	temporary office, the intent is only to use it

until this project is complete, and then they'll

move into the building.

3

MR. DONNELLY: The Planning Board understands that to be your application for the waiver that is conditioned upon it being

6

5

temporary only.

7

MR. VALDINA: Yes.

8

9

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Frank, for the Board's benefit can you discuss the waiver?

10

You're asking them for the extension.

11

MR. VALDINA: The temporary office?

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Can you just put it

MR. VALDINA: Basically the existing

12

It's under Section 185-56.

1314

into words for us?

15

building just to the north of this site, roughly

17

90 feet or so north of the site, Magyar Lane is

18

right in here. While this facility is under

1920

property, moving the rental business out, use

construction, the intent is selling this existing

21

this for the office for the rental business,

22

temporarily store in the front here while they

operate -- you know, construct the site to keep

24

the truck rental business in operation,

25

especially getting into the holiday season. I

guess it's quite an active period of time for them.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Mike, do you want to elaborate?

MR. DONNELLY: There is a provision of the Code that does allow building under 2,500 square feet a discretionary exemption, granted exemption by the Planning Board of the requirement of site plan approval. It is not an entitlement but rather a discretionary waiver.

I'm not really familiar with the property that we're talking about here. I'll need some more

information to complete the resolution.

2.3

In the discussion at work session, I think the thought was if it was to be granted it would need to have appropriate safeguards. For instance, that it could not be occupied for the temporary use until some trigger event occurred, like issuance of a building permit for the new building, and then you would need something at the other end, that after a certificate of occupancy was issued for the new building, the use of that building on a temporary basis would have to cease within a fixed period of time.

MICHELLE L. CONERO - (845)895-3018

O

2.3

What we're trying to avoid, obviously, is the exemption being granted on a permanent basis, which is not what you're asking for and wouldn't be the Planning Board's intent, by just doing nothing with this site here.

MR. VALDINA: Right. In the schedule I had given to Jerry it indicated there were two conditions, one had to do with the utilization of the office was ten days after a CO was issued for this building and for the temporary parking of the vehicles. Once this fenced-in area was completed, then they would move back into that area, back further onto the site.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Jerry --

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ VALDINA: That would be a ten-day time period to move.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Jerry, what would you feel most comfortable with? You said you would like to have the language to compliment each other.

MR. CANFIELD: That's correct. I think they should be equal. That's what we had discussed, the fencing and everything on that site.

MR. DONNELLY: So you're going to move

MR. HINES: This is going to be right

out front, the trucks.

J

 ${\tt MR.}$ CANFIELD: There is no screening.

MR. VALDINA: There was a ZBA variance granted where they could store the trucks on this lot back in `89.

MR. CANFIELD: That is correct. I remember seeing that.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Frank, when do you -- weather conditions allowing, when do you think -- how many months do you think it will take to complete this site where you would be requesting the Building Department to issue a certificate of occupancy?

MR. VALDINA: Obviously with the landscaping, I don't think much can be done this year, but everything else -- they're going to get in there and start working. As was mentioned, I know they had the concrete blocks up there for the dividers on the storage areas. I know they've been anxious to get going in and start doing the stormwater management and so on. I told them we have to wait until they get final approval.

MR. GALLI: They filled the blocks.

2.3

They filled them high with material. The blocks are pretty high.

MR. VALDINA: They're not supposed to be any higher than the fence.

MR. GALLI: They're higher than the fence.

MR. VALDINA: Then they'll have to remove them.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$ CANFIELD: We talked about going up tomorrow and looking at it.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: So Mike, I think to maybe go back, you're saying screening of the truck --

MR. DONNELLY: If they have a variance for that, I guess they're permitted. My thought would be that -- I think this will attempt to avoid this thing becoming permanent, and that is that none of the shifting of the temporary use to either this site or the office use down the road can occur until a building permit is issued for this project so that we know that there's going to be some construction underway. And at the other end of the tunnel, all of the temporary use must cease and move into the proposed structures

MR. VALDINA: This office building?

1	MAGYAR/BUDGET TRUCK RENTAL 64
2	They're the ones that requested this be used
3	temporarily.
4	MR. DONNELLY: We're talking about a
5	permanent surrender of the right to conduct
6	residential use on that lot.
7	MR. VALDINA: Well he all I can say
8	is the client advised me that this is zoned
9	business, it's going to be utilized as business.
10	They want to use it for temporary office. Beyond
11	that, like I say, this was a residence, it's now
12	vacant. I don't know what their intended use is.
13	One of the conditions would be that it can not
14	convert back to a residential use unless they get
15	a variance or whatever.
16	MR. DONNELLY: If they're on the same
17	lot, none of them can be converted back.
18	MR. VALDINA: Right. I believe that
19	is
20	MR. DONNELLY: I think what Ken is
21	asking you is he wants to make sure your client
22	is agreeing to that before we take action because
23	that's going to be one of the conditions of the
24	approval.

MR. VALDINA: To be honest with you, at

back to fifty feet or get a variance.

want to stay with the ten-foot setback, your client is going to have to forever surrender the right to conduct residential uses on the adjoining property.

MR. VALDINA: Can we get the condition on either one of the options in the meantime? In other words, I can go back --

MR. DONNELLY: It's up to the Board. If they want to have a resolution that gives you the three options. The one option would require you to come back for an amended site plan. I think it's easier for you to find out which option your client wants. It's up to the Board. We can make such a condition.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: The other way to manage this would be to allow you the time to discuss it with your applicant, with the owner, and then under Board Business the meeting of the 17th, we would bring you forward and finalize a resolution with the understanding that your client selected A, B or C of this three-part approval. Is that all right with you?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ GALLI: How long has the house been empty, Frank?

1	MAGYAR/BUDGET TRUCK RENTAL 67
2	MR. VALDINA: Do you remember the
3	little two-lot subdivision? I think July he
4	moved out of there.
5	MR. GALLI: They almost got a year
6	coming up. Six months.
7	MR. VALDINA: That was the son. The
8	son lived here and they built a new house on
9	Larabee Lane. That little two-lot subdivision,
10	they moved in there.
11	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: What would you
12	prefer at this point, Frank?
13	MR. VALDINA: I would prefer some type
14	of approval.
15	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I knew you were
16	going to do that, which is understandable.
17	Mike, do we have to make mention of our
18	discretion because the building is under 2,500
19	square feet?
20	MR. DONNELLY: I don't even know what
21	lot this is. I don't have any information yet. I
22	think we're going to need a second resolution for
23	the grant of the exemption for the 2,500 square
24	feet for this temporary use. There will be a

resolution for this site, the site plan we have

3

5

•

7

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

been working on, and a separate resolution that will refer to each other for the exemption for the adjoining lot. I will need some information, tax map number, so on and so forth.

MR. VALDINA: I have it right here. Section 8; Block 1; Lot 8.2.

MR. DONNELLY: Okay. That's a part. That resolution -- you could vote on them at the same time, they will dovetail. I think in addition to the regular conditions that I go through, the temporary -- the exemption for the temporary use would be granted in a separate resolution with the conditions that I outlined before, the note that no use of either of the temporary sites, because we're talking about two temporary sites, until a building permit is issued for a structure on the approved site plan site, and a requirement that those operations cease ten days after a CO. And then on the resolution granting the exemption, that would be conditioned specifically on it being of a temporary nature with the same conditions.

In the site plan resolution we would have to have the three alternatives, that the

question for Frank.

3

5

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Lead time on the building, do you know how long it will take the building --

MR. VALDINA: I'm surprised it's not here now. They ordered it. They said it would take I think six to ten weeks, and they ordered it probably about six weeks ago. That's what I said. Plus the sale of this sped it up a lot quicker. They thought they would have this done by the first of November but --

MR. DONNELLY: The more mundane conditions of the site plan resolution would be a sign off from Pat's office on the deficiencies in the stormwater report, a letter from Karen signing off on the technical deficiencies in her memo of September 30th. The approval is subject to the review and approval of the water line crossing by the DOT as well as the curb cut, the issuance of a flood plain development permit from Jerry's office, the review of cross access easement agreements to my satisfaction. I think we covered ARB approval back in September but you do need to complete the Architectural Review Board application because it wasn't complete. will have the outdoor storage conditions.

25

MR. VALDINA: I'll have to check to see

1	MAGYAR/BUDGET TRUCK RENTAL 72
2	what they did. I mean they've been advised that
3	nothing can be stored higher than the fence.
4	Originally it was ten, they wanted to lower it to
5	eight feet, we lowered it to eight feet. Those
6	bins are going to be limited to the eight feet
7	height.
8	MR. WARD: Thank you.
9	MR. DONNELLY: Those are the two
10	resolutions. I think you can vote on them
11	together.
12	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: And bonding also.
13	MR. VALDINA: That application had been
14	submitted.
15	MR. DONNELLY: If it has, fine.
16	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Town Board approval
17	of the landscape bond amount?
18	MR. DONNELLY: Yes. And stormwater.
19	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Any questions from
20	Board Members?
21	(No response.)
22	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Okay. Then I'll
23	move for a motion to grant site plan approval for
24	Magyar/Budget Truck Rental subject to the

conditions presented by Mike Donnelly in both

1	MAGYAR/BUDGET TRUCK RENTAL 73
2	resolutions.
3	MR. GALLI: So moved.
4	MR. PROFACI: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I have a motion by
6	Frank Galli. I have a second by Joe Profaci.
7	Any discussion of the motion?
8	(No response.)
9	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I'll move for a
10	roll call vote starting with Frank Galli.
11	MR. GALLI: Aye.
12	MR. MENNERICH: Aye.
13	MR. PROFACI: Aye.
14	MR. FOGARTY: Aye.
15	MR. WARD: Aye.
16	CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Myself. Thank you.
17	MR. VALDINA: Thank you, gentlemen.
18	
19	(Time noted: 8:00 p.m.)
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

<u>CERTIFICATION</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: November 29, 2011

-

MR. PROFACI: We have two items of Board Business. The first -- both of these are discussions. The first is JPJR Holdings, LLC Subdivision, project number 2011-19.

The applicant is requesting to be referred to the ZBA for a use variance on one lot in a commercial zone to be used for a single-family residence.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Mike Donnelly at this point will discuss with the Board the unlikeliness of this happening to the Planning Board.

MR. DONNELLY: I gave you a letter on this. Quickly, Section 277, Subdivision 6 of the Town Law, which is the section under which you quite frequently refer area variances to the Zoning Board of Appeals, is quoted in the letter. In essence, in context it used to be that when an applicant made an application to a planning board, site plan or subdivision, and their plan did not comply with bulk table dimensional requirements, setbacks and the like, they would have to, in addition, apply to the code compliance department for a building permit.

22

2.3

24

25

Some municipalities would actually require they have construction plans and pay the fee for the building permit, get turned down just to appeal to the zoning board. That was cumbersome but, worse yet, it lost the coordination that might exist between the Planning Board taking a look at the file first and then giving a report to the Zoning Board. So ten years ago or so they made this amendment to the section which says they can go right from the Planning Board to the Zoning Board for the area variance together with the Planning Board's report on any concerns or recommendations they may have. That section only authorizes that for area variances, not for use variances. So the traditional method of getting turned down by the building inspector or code compliance department for the use and then appealing that denial letter to the Zoning Board for a use variance is the only way they can get There's no statutory authority to refer them to the Zoning Board.

I think we had one of these once before but I don't remember for sure. When I saw the adding of that to the Board Business, I sent out

3 <u>CERTIFICATION</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: November 29, 2011

I'll move for a motion to close the

know, on the approval.

24

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

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: November 29, 2011