A Planning Board Work Session Meeting took place on Tuesday, April 12, 2022, at 7:00 P.M. at Village Hall, 9 Fairlawn Drive, Washingtonville, New York.

PRESENT:

Planning Board Chairperson Celina Rofer, Planning Board Members Maria Murdie, Richard Calore Jr., Bob Buchalski and Tom Gildea.

ALSO PRESENT:

Planning Board Attorney Stephanie Tunic, Village Engineer John Petroccione, Building Inspector John Terry.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG:

Planning Board Chairperson Celina Rofer led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

DISCUSSION – 36 NORTH STREET – APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN:

Planning Board Chairperson Celina Rofer indicates that before the Planning Board is Applicant Mr. Halpert from "North 36 LLC", representing 36 North Street, SBL 107-2-63, RN Zoning District, proposed use is a Multi-family Dwelling with Public Utilities Revised Site Plan Proposal includes instructing One (1) Six (6) Unit Townhouse Dwelling and keeping and converting the existing Single-Family Home to a Two (2) Family Dwelling and Removal of the Existing Garage.

Mr. Halpert indicates that he did get permission from the owner to start mobilizing an excavator on site so that we could meet John out there and start to do our deep hole test to see if the stormwater can be located in that location that we show on site or if it needs to be relocated. We did investigate if we could locate any other underground stormwater chambers away from that swale that. It is a swale it is not a stream of diverse water. We are able to relocate it to the front of the property which would be towards the Northeast towards the South and closer to the road where John noted that we started tapering the site to create a Valley in the front there. That area could actually be filled and have the stormwater underground stormwater tanks located there. It fits in dimension if it is in capacity, they'll just have to test the soils to see if it will work so I am hoping if our schedules allow that software towards the middle of the end of next week or the beginning of the following week, we could arrange our schedules accordingly to meet out on site have it been excavated for the day and test the soil. You see the way we are detailing the services entering the building as laterals.

Village Engineer John Petroccione indicates that the main services being in separate trenches but when they get to the building you have to split out to the six (6) units. As far as the layout, it is more specification, more water sewer specifications on the connection, either a four (4) or six (6) inch depending on where you look, you can get verification as to what size will be appropriate, clarify what material you are using.

Mr. Halpert indicates that they will clarify the specifications and details on the plan and we will make them consistent. The recent codes have a little bit of revision regarding the water and sewer service and the building and plumbing code. If they have them both within ten (10) feet, they need specific material. We are trying to comply with it as the mains are in separate trenches. The trench is only about Thirty-six (36) inches wide but they will remain within Ten (10) to Twenty (20) feet within each other.

DISCUSSION – 36 NORTH STREET – APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN (CONTINUED):

Village Engineer John Petroccione indicates that within Twenty (20) feet is good, the Orange County Building Code requires minimum separation.

Planning Board Attorney Stephanie Tunic asks the applicant how they are going to control traffic in and out of the driveway. There is proposed two (2) entrances to the parcel. They are keeping the driveway for the existing dwelling there which I am assuming is to service that house and then there is a new driveway near the cemetery. I am trying to think of ways that the Board can ensure that the site distances will work and not be of concern with in and out traffic from the two (2) parallel driveways, maybe visuals coming in and out so you can see if it feels tight, maybe add signage as to which way they can turn in and out.

Village Engineer John Petroccione indicates that some vegetation would have to be cleared. Identify what the limits of that clearing are if it is on subject parcel. The site difference you should definitely show c2 which also brings up the comment regarding the traffic studies so we will go back to colliers and make sure that they make some mention of acknowledging the fact that this drive is near the cemetery drive and that has been taken into account.

Planning Board Attorney Stephanie Tunic adds that the traffic study discusses ingress and egress with regards to the cemetery, so if that should be discussed.

Village Engineer John Petroccione indicates that the applicant is showing no lighting on the existing building. If they want to put a light at their front door, they have to come back to the Planning Board for that. There will be an approved lighting plan deviation from that.

Mr. Halpert indicates that in the building code we need to have lights at the exterior doors of a residence. We show lighting on the new construction but on the dwelling, I will have to review that again. We do have to show exterior lighting on the doors, so we need to show lighting for the existing dwelling. There is a porch out front. He has no problem restricting the lighting to the building. There are four (4) bedrooms per unit. It would be very difficult to have a lot of bedrooms that had another area. No floor plans have been made official as of now, but we did create a conceptual floor plan of the first and second floor. These are for sale, and not for rent.

Planning Board Attorney Stephanie Tunic indicates that in the Zoning Board of Appeals Minutes it indicated that in the existing dwelling, it shows that it will be over occupied.

Village Engineer John Petroccione indicates that right now they are showing a landscape plan, there are eleven (11) proposed trees and seven (7) proposed shrubs. He lets the Board know that they can make recommendations and requests for landscaping and anything they would like to see modified.

<u>RESOLUTION – REFERRAL TO ORANGE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT – 36</u> <u>NORTH STREET:</u>

Planning Board Chairperson Celina Rofer made a motion, seconded by Planning Board Member Bob Buchalski for approval under General Municipal law Section 239M for the Orange County Planning Department for referral and they will have 30 days to comment on the application regarding the property of 36 North Street. Said Resolution passed by a unanimous vote of the Planning Board. 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions.

PLANNING BOARD WORK SESSION MEETING:

<u>RESOLUTION – DECLARING PLANNING BOARD AS LEAD AGENCY – 36 NORTH</u> <u>STREET:</u>

Planning Board Chairperson Celina Rofer made a motion, seconded by Planning Board Member Bob Buchalski for approval of the Planning Board to be declared as Lead Agency regarding the application of 36 North Street. Said Resolution passed by a unanimous vote of the Planning Board. 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions.

-3-

RESOLUTION – CHANGE IN PLANNING BOARD MEETING DATE:

Planning Board Chairperson Celina Rofer made a motion, seconded by Planning Board Member Bob Buchalski for approval to reschedule the Planning Board Meeting from Tuesday, April 26, 2022, at 7:00 P.M. to Thursday, April 28, 2022, at 7:00 P.M. Said Resolution passed by a unanimous vote of the Planning Board. 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions.

ADJOURNMENT:

Planning Board Member Bob Buchalski made a motion, seconded by Planning Board Member Richard Calore Jr. and adopted to adjourn the April 12, 2022, Planning Board Work Session Meeting; said Resolution passed by a unanimous vote of the Planning Board. 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

SOPHIA FOLEY

CLERICAL ASSISTANT