

**A Planning Board Meeting took place on Tuesday, May 10, 2022, at 7:00 P.M. at Village Hall, 9 Fairlawn Drive, Washingtonville, New York.**

**PRESENT:**

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

**ABSENT:**

**Planning Board Member Maria Murdie, Planning Board Attorney Stephanie Tunic.**

**ALSO PRESENT:**

**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 – 61 EAST MAIN STREET – SITE PLAN AND LOT LINE REMOVAL:**

**Planning Board Chairperson Celina Rofer indicates that Engineer Michael Morgante is representing 61 East Main Street Associates LLC, property address, 61 East Main Street, is before the Planning Board regarding the Application for the Site Plan and Lot Line Removal, SBL 114-1-3.22 and 113-2-31, OR Zoning District. The Proposed Use is the demolition of existing Multi-Family Dwelling and Construction of Two (2) Seven Thousand (7000) Square Feet, Two (2) Story Apartment Buildings with Fourteen (14) Apartments and Twenty-Eight (28) Bedrooms, total for each along with parking facilities.**

**Planning Board Chairperson Celina Rofer indicates that she has previously recused herself from this application so she will navigate the meeting but I will not participate in comment and will abstain from the votes.**

**Engineer Michael Morgante indicates that he is joined with Brian Gibson, the Project Attorney, and he also is joined with Phil Greeley who is the Project Traffic Consultant. The plans have remained largely unchanged from what you have seen submitted in the past. There is still outstanding stuff so I would be glad to go through some of the changes with the Planning Board. In terms of setbacks and bedroom calculations, there were some technical comments associated with the stormwater pollution prevention plan that was submitted. Essentially providing a maintenance schedule and operation maintenance costs that go with it but the boilerplate for the stormwater agreement at least has been provided. We can certainly back up that agreement with the info that John is requesting. There were some comments on the traffic analysis that you see here on the comment letter and there are some lighting cut sheets that were more requested for me to put on the plans which certainly can be done. I do have the project surveyor working on getting the inverts for the sewer manholes hopefully we will get them back sometime soon so I mean that largely and large important general summaries what has been done on my behalf since the last time that you have been here.**

**DISCUSSION – 61 EAST MAIN STREET – SITE PLAN AND LOT LINE REMOVAL (CONTINUED):**

Project Engineer Brian Gibson indicates As part of our traffic study, we looked at the possibility of people crossing, we have an existing crosswalk in that proximity. In the last couple of years what we have found especially more village setting the areas that in order to accommodate pedestrians a New York State D.O.T. has gone to what is called a rapid rectangular flashing Beacon which allows a pedestrian to activate it when they are there. It is not a full traffic signal and by law you are supposed to stop if somebody is in a crosswalk to begin with, this is a device that has been used mostly in the Village Areas. As a way of accommodating Pedestrians crossing so that is somebody was not going to go for the Signal at Brotherhood Plaza drive, they could cross at the crosswalk. We made that recommendation. In terms of process with D.O.T., we made a formal submission on April 14<sup>th</sup>, they responded on April 26<sup>th</sup> with a few technical comments asking for additional information and wanted to know about pedestrian movements at the crosswalk. Our study is set at a single-family traffic generation. The design of these are hardwired most of them are solar powered. Want more information on the driveways across the street, the drainage, sidewalks etc. on the plan.

Project Traffic Consultant Phil Greeley indicates that the last traffic study was in December of 2021 so part of the study included identifying existing traffic volumes. At the time we were still in the protocol in terms of D.O.T. studies. We have to back and look at historical data along 94 incorporate those adjustments and the projections are projected out two (2) years with a conservative background growth rate to account for other developments I think that were one (1) or two (2) other projects in the Village that we accounted for their traffic on top of things in addition to the background growth the trip estimates I described so the study is dated December 2021 but the base traffic conditions are adjusted based on historical D.O.T data and in our records it goes back to 1990 along the corridor. The Apartments will only add 10 vehicles so it will not add too much traffic. The buses will pick up the children on Route 94. D.O.T. will be reviewing the crosswalk plan, traffic plan and parking. The Planning Board can write any suggestions or questions to send to D.O.T. Engineer Michael Morgante indicates that he sent all notes from the Department of Transportation to the Planning Board Members, the Engineer and the Building Department.

Engineer Michael Morgante indicates that no changes or modifications were made to the landscaping plan as of yet, but they will start to discuss that matter as the Planning Board would like to know the plan.

Village Engineer John Petroccione indicates that there needs to be a wetland/waterbody indication and a professional to address whether or not there is a presence of bats.

Engineer Michael Morgante indicates that they will be using traffic archeology. The wetland they are discussing on the EAF, that is where it is coming from. He did test kits in the back, it is all sand and gravel in the back are not conducive of any type of wetland. He can note that testing must be done in the back. The trees in the back don't need to be cut down but he will add a note on that as well. I do not believe there are any back doors on the plan. There is a common laundry room in the back left hand corner so there will be one door.

Village Engineer John Petroccione indicates that as far as recreation, like a backyard, there are no requirements that must be completed.

**RESOLUTION – REFERRAL OF APPLICATION TO ORANGE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING – 61 EAST MAIN STREET:**

Planning Board Member Richard Calore Jr. made a motion, seconded by Planning Board Member Tom Gildea for approval of the Planning Board to Refer the Application of 61 East Main Street to the Orange County Department of Planning pursuant to the General Municipal Law 239-M. Said Resolution passed by a unanimous vote of the Planning Board. 3 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Abstentions. (Planning Board Member Celina Rofer Abstains from the Decision).

**RESOLUTION – SET PUBLIC HEARING – REGARDING APPLICATION OF 61 EAST MAIN STREET:**

Planning Board Member Richard Calore Jr. made a motion, seconded by Planning Board Member Bob Buchalski for the approval of the Planning Board to set a Public Hearing regarding the application of 61 East Main Street for the date of Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 7:00 P.M. Said Resolution passed by a unanimous vote of the Planning Board. 3 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Abstentions. (Planning Board Member Celina Rofer Abstains from the Decision).

**BARODA REALTY LLC – 2 LOCUST STREET – APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN AND SUBDIVISION:**

Planning Board Chairperson Celina Rofer indicates that before the Planning Board is Baroda Realty LLC, property address 2 Locust Street, SBL 114-1-26.22, regarding the Application for Site Plan and Subdivision. I-Non-nuisance Industry Zoning District. Proposal includes subdividing the subject property into two (2) 51,718 Square Feet Parcels and seeking approvals to construct a 24,883 Square Foot Warehouse on each lot for a total of two (2) new warehouses.

Project Engineer Michael Morgante indicates that he is representing Baroda Realty for this application. It is shown now as Two (2) Buildings. They are essentially about 24,000 square feet. It has been revisited and refined. We had got some access to the particular site from the two (2) existing warehouses that are located to the west of us. The truck circulation operation wouldn't change. He indicates that he looked into how internal circulation might work and there is very well a likelihood that we would be required to access the very least, the larger, longer, loading docks from Hallock Road. The turning diagrams can be altered. He can not go further with this in terms of engineering. The well in the back will not be used by this project. He questions if there was an exception by the village to abandon both wells.

Village Engineer John Petroccione indicates that as far as having an informal discussion with the Health Department.

Planning Board Member Richard Calore Jr. indicates that the widened up the road to the fence line so at least they could mitigate some issues with trucks having to wait or back in a little easier that would leave more room for people to move past. Were you able to make any sort of determination of how it could be widened up to your fence line even if it is part of your property.

Project Engineer Michael Morgante indicates that the issues that we have is the drainage that is running along the street. We could put catch basins on either side of the entrance.

The Planning Board Members and Village Engineer John Petroccione also discuss the lighting of the plan and will be discussed further. Further discussion will take place in the next meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**Planning Board Member Bob Buchalski made a motion, seconded by Planning Board Member Richard Calore Jr. and adopted to adjourn the May 10, 2022, Planning Board Meeting; said Resolution passed by a unanimous vote of the Planning Board. 4 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions.**

**RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,**

**SOPHIA FOLEY**

**CLERICAL ASSISTANT**