## TOWN OF CORTLANDT PLANNING AND ZONING BOARDS

BOARD MEETING

Nyberg Meeting Room

Town Hall, Cortlandt, New York

June 1, 2021

7:00 p.m. - 8:55 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Loretta Taylor, Chairperson

Thomas A. Bianchi, Vice Chairperson

Robert Foley, Member

Stephen Kessler, Member

George Kimmerling, Member

Jeffrey Rothfeder, Member

Suzanne Decker, Member

Robert Mayes, Alternate Member

2.3

(The board meeting commenced at 7:00 p.m.)

MS. LORETTA TAYLOR: June 1st regular session of the planning board of the town of Cortlandt, can we stand please and recite the pledge.

MULTIPLE: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MS. TAYLOR: We're going to proceed with the roll call shortly, but before we do that, I want to announce that the planning board is finally back up to full strength. We have two new members, a regular and an alternate, who we are pleased to welcome here tonight.

Suzanne Decker, a real estate lawyer, will serve as the regular member. She, excuse me, she's worked with developers, investment bankers, and she's also advised lenders on zoning and land issue matters. She is currently a partner with a New York City firm. This is Suzanne, welcome.

Robert Mayes is a lawyer, he's a former

1	June 1, 2021
2	ADA with the Westchester County District
3	Attorney's office, and a former executive board
4	member of the Westchester Bar Association.
5	Currently, he's a hearing officer with the New
6	York State Department of Corrections and he is in
7	his second term as a trustee of the Lakeland
8	Central School Board of Education.
9	So, I'm happy to, on behalf of the
10	Board, welcome you tonight and tell you how
11	pleased we are you are joining us and we look
12	forward to working with for as many years as you
13	can stand us. [applause] Okay. Welcome.
14	MS. TAYLOR: So now we can proceed with
15	the roll call.
16	MR. CHRIS KEHOE: Mr. Kimmerling?
17	MR. GEORGE KIMMERLING: Here.
18	MR. KEHOE: Mr. Kessler?
19	MR. STEPHEN KESSLER: Here.
20	MR. KEHOE: Ms. Taylor?
21	MS. TAYLOR: Here.
22	MR. KEHOE: Mr. Rothfeder?
23	MR. JEFFREY ROTHFEDER: Here.
24	MR. KEHOE: Mr. Foley?

2.3

MR. BOB FOLEY: Here.

MR. KEHOE: Ms. Decker?

MS. SUZANNE DECKER: Here.

MR. KEHOE: Mr. Bianchi?

MR. THOMAS BIANCHI: Here.

MR. KEHOE: Mr. Mayes?

MR. ROBERT MAYES: Here.

MS. TAYLOR: Okay. We don't have any changes to the agenda, but I have been advised that probably should mention that PB 6-15, which is the application of Hudson Wellness Center will return to the agenda for the July meeting. So for those people listening, either here or at home, you will know that they will be here in our July meeting.

We don't have the minutes tonight. We've been working with trying to get someone on board who will take the minutes. We do work with I think currently a transcriptionist, I think is what you said. And so she's working to try to catch up with some of the things that have been, some of the meetings that we don't yet have minutes for. Let me put it another way. We have

1	June 1, 2021
2	recording of the actual proceedings, but they
3	have not yet been typed and so we cannot approve
4	them at this point.
5	All right, the next item on the agenda
6	is the correspondence and there is a letter dated
7	May 14, 2021 from Laura DeMaria Silva requesting
8	an adjournment of a request for a beer garden to
9	be located at the Hemlock Hill Farm on 500 Croton
10	Avenue.
11	MR. KESSLER: Madam Chair, I move that
12	we receive and file the letter.
13	MS. TAYLOR: Thank you. May I have a
14	second?
15	MR. ROTHFEDER: Second.
16	MR. KIMMERLING: Second.
17	MS. TAYLOR: Thank you. On the question,
18	all in favor?
19	MULTIPLE: Aye.
20	MS. TAYLOR: Thank you. Alright, we're
21	going to skip down to old business. We're going
22	to leave the public hearing until a little later,
23	and move down to old business, the first item
24	being PB 2020-9, the application of CVE North

2.3

America Inc., for the property of Kirquel
Development, Limited and Patrick and Sharon Parr
for site development plan approval and a special
permit and for tree removal and steep slope
permits for a proposed three megawatt solar
energy production facility to be located on two
parcels of property located along Red Mill Road
and at the end of Mill Court, totally
approximately 43.12 acres. The latest drawings
were revised, dated March 2021.

Okay, you all were out for a sign inspection on Sunday. Did you, well, I guess you might want to start by saying a few things about the application and then our members can talk about whatever concerns they have with the site.

MR. CARSON WEINAND: Sure. Yes. Thanks for having us, good to see the board again. I'm Carson Weinand with CVE, senior project developer. I also have Jared Lusk from Nixon Peabody, our counsel and then Ali Yildiz, our engineer, internal engineer at CVE. But yeah, just wanted to take this opportunity with the Board to follow up on our site visit from last

2.3

June 1, 2021

Sunday. I wanted to review any comments or questions you had from that site visit. We also wanted to review the carbon impact analysis that we submitted to the Board. I wanted to review the hot off the press biodiversity comments from Weston & Sampson, and then confirm the public hearing for July 6th.

So, yeah, I thought the site visit went well. We were there for maybe an hour and a half. We toured the site pretty extensively, showed you all the limits of disturbance, the footprint of the limits of disturbance and the property lines, where the landscaping will be going, where the access road is going, which way the panels will be facing, away from Mill Court. And where some of the steep slopes will be graded, where that one tree of stature is located, where the wetlands were, I'm just wondering if you had any questions or if I could answer anything following up on that site visit.

MR. BIANCHI: Well, I can begin. Yeah, as a result of the site visit, and I'm looking at that bigger tree on your photo location map, --

2.3

MR.	KEHOE:	Tom,	please	use	the	mıc.	

MR. BIANCHI: Oh, sorry, forgot about that. And I'm looking at figure 3 of the photo location map that's in your supplemental [unintelligible] [00:08:13] report. And I saw this when I was there. There are two locations right off of Mill Court and I think they're designated as two, eight and seven over here. The houses sort of, when you're facing the end of Mill Court to the right and to the right.

MR. WEINAND: On the east?

MR. BIANCHI: Yeah.

MR. WEINAND: Yeah.

MR. BIANCHI: And when we stepped into the site, we did have leaves on the trees, but based on that model that you had put up, I could see that I could see those houses from where I was standing, and I'm sure the opposite would be true. If they could see those panels from their view.

MR. WEINAND: Sure.

MR. BIANCHI: Now, I asked, I don't know if it was you, I asked somebody about the

1 June 1, 2021 2 screening. MR. WEINAND: Yeah. 3 4 MR. BIANCHI: And I don't know what the 5 size of the trees is, but they look pretty small in terms of the plantings --6 7 MR. WEINAND: Yes. 8 MR. BIANCHI: -- that you're using for 9 screening, and I don't think that's going to cut 10 it in terms of blocking the view. 11 MR. WEINAND: Sure. 12 MR. BIANCHI: So that's one question I 13 had. 14 MR. WEINAND: Yeah, understood. If you 15 went up to -- yeah, there's a landscaping plan, 16 there you go, in the site plan deck. That one 17 home, which is on the western side of Mill Court, 18 probably has the most direct view of the facility 19 and you can see the home even 250 feet into the 20 forest. So that forest there on the northern 21 property line is not as dense as other areas, and 22 something we can do is increase landscaping and 2.3 screening along that northern edge.

MR. BIANCHI: The other question I had,

24

2.3

and I sort of learned this since the last -since the site visit, is that the tilt of the
panels is, it's not arbitrary but it's
adjustable. Let me put it that way.

MR. WEINAND: To some degree.

MR. BIANCHI: Your panel was I think eight feet at the peak I think, something like that or nine feet? I don't recall.

MR. WEINAND: Yeah, about eight-and-a-half feet high.

MR. BIANCHI: And if you were to lower the tilt, you would lower the visual impact. So can you talk about lowering the tilt and if that's a doable thing or if it's not, from your viewpoint, from an operations viewpoint.

MR. WEINAND: Sure. I think that tilt is roughly about 20 degrees and that's been decided to optimize the energy production from our engineering team. Actually, Ali designed that, configured the tilt and the height of the array. There's not too much wiggle room there for us at CVE, because you start lowering it too much and it significantly, noticeably starts to impact

1	June 1, 2021
2	production, energy production. But that's
3	something we can chat about and see if there's
4	maybe half a foot of reduction.
5	MR. BIANCHI: Yeah, anything you can do
6	would help because eight-and-a-half feet is
7	pretty high and again, these homes over here are
8	going to be impacted. Now, you know, with the
9	screening will help and with the leaf off season,
10	it might also help.
11	MR. WEINAND: Yeah. We can try to maybe
12	make some tweaks to the design. But there's only
13	so much wiggle room before the economics
14	MR. BIANCHI: No, I understand.
15	MR. WEINAND: Yeah.
16	MR. BIANCHI: I understand and the
17	economics and the efficiency too.
18	MR. WEINAND: Yes. Mm-hmm.
19	MR. BIANCHI: Alright. Thank you.
20	MR. WEINAND: Yeah, so there's two
21	panels, about six feet in length each. And it
22	doesn't add up to 12 feet tall because they're at
23	a tilt.
24	MR. BIANCHI: Right.

1	June 1, 2021
2	MR. WEINAND: And right now, they're
3	configured to about eight-and-a-half feet high.
4	MR. BIANCHI: Right.
5	MR. ROTHFEDER: In your carbon impact
6	comparison, could you tell me how you got the CO2
7	avoided figure.
8	MR. WEINAND: Yeah. So we used figures
9	provided from the EPA. The conclusion there was
10	even though we're removing 3,000 trees,
11	approximately
12	MR. ROTHFEDER: Right. No, I meant
13	MR. WEINAND: Yeah.
14	MR. ROTHFEDER: no I understand what
15	you're getting at. But how did you figure out
16	that specific line, CO2 avoided pounds per year,
17	what did you multiply?
18	MR. WEINAND: CO2 avoided, so it came
19	from an average carbon impact of generating one
20	kilowatt hour of electricity.
21	MR. ROTHFEDER: Okay.
22	MR. WEINAND: A data point provided from
23	the EPA.
24	MR. ROTHFEDER: Right. The problem is,

1 June 1, 2021 2 and there are a few -- I appreciate you doing this comparison, but there's a little bit of 3 4 apples and oranges comparisons going on with your sources at the bottom, the average household 5 pounds of carbon consumption per year, that 6 7 includes people driving cars and things like that. That's not just electricity. So I didn't 8 9 know how you got that number, that's why I'm 10 bringing it --11 MR. WEINAND: I think it should just be 12 the electricity. 13 MR. ROTHFEDER: No, not the household 14 pounds of carbon consumption per year. I looked 15 it up. 16 MR. WEINAND: Okay. 17 MR. ROTHFEDER: The pounds of carbon 18 produced per kilowatt hour is the electricity. Of 19 course, and this gets even a little more complex, 20 obviously, but at this point, there's very little 21

> MR. WEINAND: Because you're what? I'm sorry.

carbon usage because we're using Indian Point. I

realize Indian Point is closing though.

22

2.3

24

	Dago 1
1	June 1, 2021
2	MR. ROTHFEDER: Because we're using
3	Indian Point, there's no carbon emissions from
4	Indian Point.
5	MR. WEINAND: Okay.
6	MR. ROTHFEDER: So the EPA number is a
7	national average number.
8	MR. WEINAND: Yeah.
9	MR. ROTHFEDER: This is a very I
10	don't know if you want concede this, but I've
11	looked into this a lot over the years. It's a
12	very difficult comparison to do because of the
13	different types of energy and where it comes
14	from.
15	MR. WEINAND: It's tough to get hyper
16	local energy data for consumption and generation.
17	MR. ROTHFEDER: Right. But I do
18	appreciation that there is a difference. I
19	understand that. The other question I had though
20	is so your starting number on the trees removed
21	is 3,386 and aren't we more at like 3,800?
22	MR. WEINAND: That was revised down with
23	our resubmission.
24	MR. ROTHFEDER: Okay. So that is where

	Page 16
1	June 1, 2021
2	you're starting, at 3,396?
3	MR. WEINAND: Yes.
4	MR. ROTHFEDER: Okay.
5	MR. WEINAND: And then I think we
6	subtract out some of the trees that we're
7	planting.
8	MR. ROTHFEDER: Right. Right. Okay.
9	Thank you.
10	MR. WEINAND: Mm-hmm.
11	MR. FOLEY: If I could echo what Tom had
12	said earlier, after we went to the site visit,
13	and the fact that at least two field office those
14	homes are very visible. So we're assuming the
15	solar arrays will be visible to them. Plus, there
16	seemed to be a closeness up at the other end of
17	the property by Courtland Colony.
18	MR. WEINAND: Mm-hmm.
19	MR. FOLEY: Where I think you walk
20	further in to the wooded area. So I'm also
21	concerned about the visual impacts.
22	MR. WEINAND: Sure.
23	MR. FOLEY: And I'm wondering, although
24	I don't know if it's been brought up before,
	n

1	June 1, 2021
2	whether your total footprint may be too large. So
3	I'm concerned about that. The higher the panels
4	that Tom brought up, we had attended virtually a
5	seminar about solar on farms, recently. I think
6	it was the Cornell Cooperative. And it seems that
7	that, the moderator of that seminar talked about,
8	at least with the, from his experience, the
9	height of five and six foot high panels.
10	MR. WEINAND: Yeah.
11	MR. FOLEY: Is that something that's
12	doable with your proposal?
13	MR. WEINAND: I don't think so, no. I'm
14	not sure where five and six feet came from.
15	MR. FOLEY: Well, maybe I'm wrong, but I
16	thought that that was mentioned during the I
17	could check the seminar again. I mean it was a
18	week ago.
19	MR. KESSLER: I think it was. I recall
20	that too.
21	MR. FOLEY: It was a lower number.
22	MR. KESSLER: It was a lower number,
23	yeah.
24	MR. FOLEY: Than what you had showed us,

	Dago
1	June 1, 2021
2	eight to eight-and-a-half feet as we were there
3	in the field, in the wooded area. So I'm just
4	asking about that, whether anything could be
5	adjusted down. I think some of these questions I
6	asked are in the site visit and you answered, but
7	just for public, the staging area would be off of
8	the top of Mill Court, but off of Mill Court into
9	the property, correct?
10	MR. WEINAND: Correct.
11	MR. FOLEY: And that would only last
12	five to six months, max?
13	MR. WEINAND: Yes.
14	MR. FOLEY: During construction.
15	MR. WEINAND: Mm-hmm.
16	MR. FOLEY: And then during
17	construction, the equipment, bringing up
18	equipment, not only the construction equipment,
19	would be all brought up or down Red Mill Road,
20	the two precarious hill, S-curve hills?
21	MR. WEINAND: Yeah, they'd have to use
22	Red Mill Road and then they'd come up and down
23	Mill Court, for construction and permanent

24

access.

2.3

MR. FOLEY: Yeah, as I looked at this further, I don't know. I did as, our CAC member who site visited the same day whether there was any chance temporarily whether a staging area could have been up by Lexington, across from the West Street George Washington School, temporary and bringing equipment down, skirting the wetland.

MR. WEINAND: Right.

MR. FOLEY: Without damaging, again, I didn't walk up there completely. I just wondered if that's something that's doable during the six-month period. Again, I don't know. The town would have to look at it.

MR. WEINAND: Yeah, we can take a look at it. The wetlands are extensive over there.

We've got to see how much frontage is on

Lexington as well, if any.

MR. FOLEY: Well, a lot --

MR. WEINAND: See the amount of steep slopes to get over to the --

MR. FOLEY: That was the issue, the steep slopes and the wetland.

Geneva Worldwide, Inc. 256 West 38th Street, 10th Floor, New York, NY 10018

22

2.3

24

MR. FOLEY: But the frontage, it seems to be a lot. That's where the original proposal from Kirquel was to build two other houses there. MR. WEINAND: Yeah, I think that one section is no longer part of this parcel. MR. FOLEY: Oh, yeah, I think it was taken out. There was a new storm water drain, it would seem to be an improvement I think, from years ago. I think I asked someone who was on the site, the, oh, he explained about HVEA Engineering's, that was our consultant that reviewed the TRC, but okay, he explained. And the reference to, this sounds minor, but the references in the document, in the book, Peekskill Hollow Creek is Peekskill Hollow Brook, MR. WEINAND: Is that in the MR. FOLEY: It's in the, it's in your book here, in your -- there's a reference to the

Peekskill Hollow Creek. Maybe it's just semantics and you really mean Peekskill Hollow Brook.

MR. WEINAND: Maybe.

MR. FOLEY: Which is a protected

watercourse.

2.3

MR. WEINAND: Okay.

MR. FOLEY: I'm just wondering. I don't know, I can't get into battery storage and hazard. I think you address that in the book.

That's my main concerns.

MS. TAYLOR: Anybody else?

MR. KESSLER: Yeah, just a question on, in terms of the [unintelligible] [00:19:46] on the property, do you expect it to even out on the property, do you -- if not, how many trucks do you expect to be leaving the property with excess debris?

MR. WEINAND: Yeah, so there's a grading plan in that site plan set that does touch on cut and fill, includes the figures, the cubic yards for cut and fill. And to the maximum extent possible, we'll leave all of the cut onsite. And then, it would be up to our EPC discussions, further discussions with our construction contractor to pinpoint how many trucks we'll need

1	June 1, 2021
2	to remove.
3	MR. KESSLER: So you have no estimate
4	right now of how many trucks are going to be
5	traveling up and down Mill Court?
6	MR. WEINAND: No. We could take a
7	closer look at the grading plan, but I haven't
8	calculated an estimated truck.
9	MR. KESSLER: And how many trucks will
10	it take to bring in all of the equipment?
11	MR. WEINAND: I'm not sure.
12	MR. KESSLER: Okay. Can you get that for
13	the public hearing then?
14	MR. WEINAND: Yes, sir.
15	MR. KESSLER: Thank you.
16	MR. KIMMERLING: I just had a couple of
17	follow ups from the site visit. It was a
18	beautiful day.
19	MR. WEINAND: Yeah, it was great.
20	MR. KIMMERLING: And we were there for
21	quite a long time. You and I and someone walked
22	sort of to the south end, right. And we were
23	talking about the placement of that one flag.
24	MR. WEINAND: Yeah.

2.3

MR. KIMMERLING: So I just wanted to understand, because I think no one else from the Board was with us when we were discussing it.

What is the distance from that private property, which I guess is a pool.

MR. WEINAND: Yes.

MR. KIMMERLING: Right, there's a fence, and maybe there's a wall, because it's set up a little bit higher than ground level, to the limit of disturbance on the southern end?

MR. WEINAND: Yeah, so it should be 150 feet. So our property line setback along the northern edge was 200 feet, along the western edge, where we had more buffer with the town land, further away from the homes, was 100 feet, and along the south, the southern property line, it was 150 feet. So I don't know why that flag was so close to the property line, to the facility.

MR. KIMMERLING: I mean --

MR. WEINAND: It didn't make sense. It looked like 50 feet away.

256 West 38th Street, 10th Floor, New York, NY 10018

MR. KIMMERLING: Yeah. No, it seemed

2.3

really close, especially because that, you know, is an active recreation spot for that complex or whatever. And they are set, you know, higher than ground level, so in terms of both disturbance and screening, it didn't seem right to me.

MR. WEINAND: Sure, I agree. It was a bit odd how close the flags were. I mean even looking at those plans. They look well set back from that community facility. And there's, you know, a couple of good rows of landscaping, screening there.

MR. KIMMERLING: Yeah, okay. And then my other question was we talked a little bit about this. There were one or two really relatively sizable boulders or rock formations, one of them had a lot of nice graffiti on it. We talked a little bit about removing those. They would need to be removed and whether or not you would anticipate blasting or you would simply use some, I forget the name of the device.

MR. WEINAND: A backhoe with some sort of, yeah.

MR. KIMMERLING: Well, some hammer

1 June 1, 2021 2 thing. I mean any thoughts about what's going to be required to remove that? 3 4 MR. WEINAND: Yeah, our plans don't 5 include any blasting. 6 MR. KIMMERLING: Okay. 7 MR. WEINAND: And we can make every best effort to not blast. We can make that a condition 8 9 if needed. 10 MR. KIMMERLING: Okay. 11 MR. WEINAND: Yeah, and I can check with 12 TRC on why that flag was so close to that 13 community facility, because it doesn't match up 14 with the plans. 15 MR. KIMMERLING: Okay. Great. And then 16 just one last question. There's, I guess you 17 can't really see it on this picture, but there's 18 Cedar Lane, which is sort of a cul-de-sac but on 19 the lower left. You can't really see it, but I'm 20 assuming there's sufficient distance, or what is 21 the difference I guess between those houses in 22 that corner and the limit of disturbance? 2.3 MR. WEINAND: Yeah, it would be more

than 200 feet, which is the requirement from the

24

	$\mathbb{P}_{2}$
1	Page 26 June 1, 2021
2	town.
3	MR. KIMMERLING: Okay. Great. Thanks.
4	MR. WEINAND: Yeah.
5	MR. BIANCHI: I just have a
6	clarification. You mentioned the 3,396 trees that
7	are, would be removed.
8	MR. WEINAND: That's correct.
9	MR. BIANCHI: I have a question for
10	staff. If this were, if we were to proceed with
11	the Mill Court subdivision, do you recall how
12	many trees were involved in that?
13	MR. KEHOE: Well, believe it or not,
14	that Mill Court subdivision came in prior to you
15	having a tree ordinance. So I looked at that
16	recently. I believe they only delineated trees
17	greater than 12 inches at that time, so it's not
18	really an apples to apples comparison.
19	MR. BIANCHI: Oh, and this is four
20	inches, right?
21	MR. KEHOE: Yes.
22	MR. BIANCHI: Okay.
23	MR. KESSLER: But you have 1,700 on your
24	comparison?

	Dage 2
1	June 1, 2021
2	MR. WEINAND: Yeah, above 12 inches, or
3	you talking the Mill Court trees?
4	MR. BIANCHI: Yeah, say 16-home
5	development, 1,750, right?
6	MR. WEINAND: Yeah.
7	MR. BIANCHI: Yeah.
8	MR. WEINAND: That was an estimate based
9	on a rough area of disturbance for the Mill Court
10	Subdivision of 12 acres.
11	MR. BIANCHI: I see.
12	MR. WEINAND: We don't have the final
13	plans for that subdivision in our FOIL requests,
14	but we have some pretty late stage documents and
15	it showed a 12-acre limit of disturbance. And
16	that was rounded down and trying to be
17	conservative.
18	MR. BIANCHI: Okay. And that's with the
19	four-inch?
20	MR. ROTHFEDER: Right, that's, yeah,
21	exactly.
22	MR. BIANCHI: Thank you.
23	MR. ROTHFEDER: I have to, just my
24	observation was that was a pretty nice forest,

1

June 1, 2021

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and it's in really good shape and that's what the tree report says as well, and it's a lot of trees going to -- double the amount of the development, so that was, I was struck by in what great shape that forest is in.

MR. WEINAND: Mm-hmm. Yeah, just to rebut that, we are clearing about net 3,100 trees. This is a pretty low impact development. We're not installing any pervious surfaces, it'll be pollinator friendly vegetation, a bed of grasses and flowers underneath the array. It will still be a habitat, it'll still be biodiversity friendly. We also will make a donation to one, the local tree fund. I think we're making an estimated 80, \$90,000 payment to the town of Cortlandt, to their tree fund for the trees that we are removing. And then we're going to make something that CVE does on every project, it's called -- it's part of our green initiative, is a one dollar donation per panel, so there's about 12,000 panels onsite, and we'll make a \$12,000 donation to a local environmental agency that locals can decide which cause they want to put

2.3

2 that money to.

MR. ROTHFEDER: I mean it, to me, that doesn't replace a forest because if you just start to plan new trees. So, we've walked through a lot of properties, for a lot of developments and a lot of times, many times, the forest is in pretty bad shape, a lot of vines, a lot of invasive trees, and this one just isn't that way. Plus, you may be gone in 25 years and then we will have taken down 3,300 trees in a forest that would be a lot, would continue to grow for, for centuries, so --

MR. WEINAND: Part of our decommissioning plan with the town is a tree reforestation plan, so at the end of the useful life of the facility, we'll also be replanting according to the town code. There's no trees of significance, except for one. There's no endangered trees, so these trees were rated as good or fair grade, not exceptional, so we think it's -- it's unfortunate a little bit. I understand what you're saying, but there's a lot of things we're doing to mitigate and trying to

1 June 1, 2021 2 work with the town. 3 MS. TAYLOR: I have a quick question. 4 What would be the size of the trees that you 5 would be planting at the end? MR. WEINAND: Mm-hmm. Oh, at the end. 6 7 MS. TAYLOR: For reforestation. MR. WEINAND: That's a good question. 8 9 Within the reforestation plan, they'd be 10 compliant with town code, and I think it's one 11 tree every maybe 40,000, one tree every acre, 12 maybe more dense than that. But size wise and 13 species, I'd have to double check. Maybe Chris, 14 do you know? Mike Preziosi might know that. 15 MR. KEHOE: Well, I think it's typical, a minimum of two-and-a-half inches is what we 16 17 require. But I think sometimes, he likes to go to 18 three, three-and-a-half inches. But I can talk 19 with him about that. 20 MR. WEINAND: Okay. 21 MR. KEHOE: But along those lines, I 22 wanted to ask you, your plan, I think L101, is 2.3 where you do your math with respect to the trees. 24 And it talks about the removals and the credits

2.3

and then what you're going to plant and how many you're short. And then, at least in this, it says that you're short 537 trees, which, you know, we can discuss as we go through the public hearing process. But then you say those 537 trees will be planted once the project has been decommissioned, which is what you just mentioned now. But if you multiply 537 by \$150, that comes out to the 80, \$90,000. So that's the number that you're basing your contribution on as well?

MR. WEINAND: Yes.

MR. KEHOE: Okay.

MR. WEINAND: Yeah, we'll --

MR. KEHOE: Because that's not really clear. It seemed to imply that those trees would be planted 20, 30, 40, 50 years from now when you decommission.

MR. WEINAND: Right. We're replanting when we decommission, and we're making an upfront payment for that gap in trees.

MR. KEHOE: And then just quickly, the other thing I looked at recently is when we approved the Mill Court Subdivision, the entire

1 June 1, 2021 2 eastern third, where the wetland is was to be preserved in a conservation easement. Would you 3 be willing to conserve it in a conservation 4 5 easement as part of this project? MR. WEINAND: Yes, mm-hmm. 6 7 MR. FOLEY: If I could say something more again about the trees, if I could reiterate 8 9 what Jeff had said a few minutes ago. After we 10 walked through that property and we walked 11 through many over -- I've been on the Board I 12 don't know how many years, more than 20. Is that 13 second growth forest, do you know? In other 14 words, it seemed to be a good, a pretty good 15 forested area. 16 MR. WEINAND: I'm not sure when it was 17 last cleared, the site. 18 MR. FOLEY: I thought there was a 19 reference to it. 20 MR. WEINAND: It doesn't seem overly 21 mature, but it doesn't seem young either. 22 MR. FOLEY: So that still remains a big

concern of mine. And whatever happens with this

in making any kind of donation, you did emphasize

2.3

24

1	June 1, 2021
2	local, and if that happens, I would hope that it
3	would really be local, whether it's to the
4	Lakeland School System, where there's a school
5	right there, across from, within a half-mile of
6	the property, as opposed to an agency or
7	something that's distant or national.
8	MR. WEINAND: Understood.
9	MR. FOLEY: So I hope the town
10	MR. WEINAND: We put together
11	MR. FOLEY: will follow that I hope.
12	MR. WEINAND: Mm-hmm. Yeah, we put
13	together a group of local environmental advocates
14	to decide on where that money should go. We're
15	not making that decision. Locals are.
16	MR. FOLEY: Yeah.
17	MS. TAYLOR: Alright. Okay.
18	MR. ROTHFEDER: Madam Chair?
19	MS. TAYLOR: Go ahead, Jeff.
20	MR. ROTHFEDER: I move that we refer
21	this back and set a public hearing for the next
22	meeting, on July 6th.
23	MR. KESSLER: Second.
24	MS. TAYLOR: On the question? All in

1	June 1, 2021
2	favor?
3	MULTIPLE: Aye.
4	MS. TAYLOR: Opposed? Okay. Alright. So,
5	we will have that public hearing.
6	MR. WEINAND: Thank you, Loretta.
7	MS. TAYLOR: I'm sorry?
8	MR. WEINAND: I said, thank you,
9	Loretta.
10	MS. TAYLOR: Oh.
11	MR. KEHOE: In advance of that meeting,
12	if you could answer, put together a memo and
13	answer some of those questions the best you can.
14	MS. TAYLOR: Yes.
15	MR. KEHOE: And get it to us by June
16	23rd.
17	MR. WEINAND: Is the public hearing at
18	7:00 o'clock?
19	MS. TAYLOR: Yes. Carson, are you
20	agreeing to getting that list together?
21	MR. WEINAND: Yes.
22	MS. TAYLOR: Yes?
23	MR. WEINAND: Yes.
24	MS. TAYLOR: Okay. Very good. All

2.3

rightie. Are we ready for -- I think we're ready for the public hearing at this point?

MR. BIANCHI: Yes.

MS. TAYLOR: Great. Okay. Alright. So we're going to go back in the agenda up one, to the public hearing, which was adjourned at a prior meeting. This is for PB 2020-10. It's an application of Cortlandt CSG, LLC, for the property of 202 Cortlandt, LLC for site development plan approval and a special permit and for tree removal and steep slope permits for a proposed 2.3 megawatt community solar power system located on approximately 33.86 acre parcel of property located on the north side of Route 202, west of Lexington Avenue, the latest revised drawings, May 20, 2021. Alright.

MR. KIERAN SIAO: Great. Good evening, Chairman Taylor.

MS. TAYLOR: Good evening.

MR. SIAO: And the rest of the board.

It's great to see y'all again in person. I know it's been a while, so glad to be back in this room. My name is Kieran Siao. I'm the director of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

development with Dimension Energy. I'm joined here tonight by Keith Staudohar, from Cronin Engineering and Brad Schwartz from Zarin & Steinmetz, we're here tonight because our company is proposing to develop a 2.3 megawatt DC 2.1 megawatt AC community solar facility on our approximately 35 acre property on Lexington Avenue.

So, since we last met, in March, we had some great updates that I'm excited to share with you. But before that, I figure it's best not to bury the lead and just talk about [unintelligible] [00:34:51]. So, looking back through our notes, this is our sixth planning board meeting, this is our fifth public hearing. I think for the last couple meetings we've done a great job at working through the open end questions for this project, answering all the questions, meeting a lot of milestones and I think in our meeting tonight, we'll demonstrate that we've resolved several of the remaining open items. And those that remain after tonight, predominantly the biodiversity study and the

2.3

June 1, 2021

2 SWPPP, will be answered by the July meeting.

So, as noted in our cover letter, what we are requesting tonight is simply that the planning board authorize planning staff to start drafting a resolution for a SEQRA negative declaration, to be prepared and ready for the July meeting. And I want to be very clear about what we're not asking. I'm not asking the planning board to commit to issuing a SEQRA negative declaration in July. We understand that in the second round of biodiversity Weston & Sampson could find anything onsite. In reviewing the SWPPP, there could of course always be more questions.

We're simply asking that this resolution be prepared so it's ready in July, so should nothing be found, as we expect to be the case, and should the remaining issues with the SWPPP be resolved, it's simply administratively ready to be read at the July meeting. And if we find there are additional issues identified, obviously, the planning board would simply not move to pass that resolution at that meeting, and then we'll all

June 1, 2021

come back together in September.

-

But we think this is a fairly
straightforward and simple ask that will put all
of us in a good position should the remaining
survey identify what we all expect to be found on
site, which is nothing. And it will help us
maintain our overall intended schedule, which
will allow us to go to the Town Board in August,
and then back to the planning board for final
site plan in September.

So, Brad's going to cover that more, I'm happy to answer questions there, but at a high level. Not that we're requesting, I just want to be very clear that this is with no expectation that the planning board commit to issuing the SEQRA Neg Dec in July. This is simply an administrative exercise.

So, with that said, lots of great updates since our last meeting in March. The first one of course is the first round of the biodiversity field assessment, which Weston & Sampson, the town's consultant performed on April 14th. I know that that memo was provided to this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

planning board at the last meeting. I know Weston & Sampson couldn't be here tonight, but just as a quick recap of the event, their biologist went on site, they reviewed the entire property, with special focus to our limit of disturbance. This particular field assessment was specifically to review the site for amphibians, reptiles, mammal species. And in their memo, Weston & Sampson says that the site has very low biodiversity habitat on site. It is a young to mid-age secondary successional forest. Predominantly, if you recall from the tree inventory, invasive species predominantly black locust and Norway maple, and with a good portion of the trees being in poor health.

They also note that in this first field assessment for amphibians, reptiles, mammals, they also note birds in the assessment, they note that the site has very little understory, due to deer predation. And the understory is there is a combination of herbaceous and shrub level invasive species, mainly phragmites, Japanese barberry, Japanese stillgrass, mustard grass. All

2.3

of these do not provide biological value, and in fact, based on their analysis, show that the conditions reduce the available nesting habitat for many forest bird species and reduce habitat suitability for reptiles and amphibians.

So I think this is very important to note not only for the intended scope of their visit in April for these amphibian and reptile species but also to give a preview of what they might find in their next biodiversity field study, which is in June.

So I think this is very important to consider, especially when you consider it against what we are proposing on site. Currently, there's very little understory, little herbaceous layer. As part of our project, as part of our planting for our solar array of course, as we've discussed in the past, we are providing native low growth pollinator grass and flower species within the confines of our fence line within the array, which we think will serve that habitat function to benefit reptile, amphibian and bird species above and beyond what is currently on site.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

In addition to that, the understory, the shrub layer of trees that we have included as part of our landscaping plan will further serve that benefit above and beyond what is currently onsite. So we think that that's very important to highlight and we look forward to what Weston & Sampson finds when they're back onsite with our consultant later this month.

Of course, the other thing that they highlighted on site, given the tree species, the black locust, the Norway maple, they did identify that there could be potential habitat here for bad species. Of course, not surprising, it's a forest [unintelligible] [00:40:00]. They did highlight that the site is not flagged for endangered species by the DEC and there's no federal nexus, so therefore, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service -- and they also noted that given this, there's currently no time requirements with regard to tree clearing. However, they do recommend that we maintain seasonal tree clearing timing restrictions with no tree clearing from April to October, which is

2.3

something that we're happy to commit to. That's something that we included in our original biodiversity assessment as we were scoping the field assessment.

So we think this is really positive. We think this is largely consistent with what we originally proposed to the planning board several months ago, and again, look forward to what Weston & Sampson identifies in their next round later this month. And I'm happy to answer any questions about this report.

The second update we have is with regard to visual screening. So if you recall at our last meeting, we provided photo simulations from a variety of vantage points around the project site to show what it would look like from Lexington Avenue, from the south and Crompond Road, from the north and to the west.

And I think we all agree that for the majority of these vantage points, it was determined that the project would either not be within view, or it would be perhaps slightly in view, but not a nuisance or impact.

2.3

The one open area of course, was the northwestern corner along Baron De Hirsch and the neighbors who live on those properties along Baron De Hirsch Road. So, since we had that hearing in March, our team met on site with those neighbors, the Fueys [phonetic], the Lockwoods [phonetic] and the Harts [phonetic].

We had great discussions. The first thing we did, it was me and our consultant C&S who performed the visual simulations. We met them all onsite, we stood at the edge of their property boundaries, so we all agreed where the vantage point would be from, and then we walked into the field, me and the C&S team. And what we did was we walked out and showed them where is the limit of tree clearing and where is the fence line, and that in and of itself was a very helpful exercise. I think there was some confusion over what is our limit of disturbance versus what were the limits of the tree inventory that we did several months ago.

The neighbors saw some ribbons on trees, they thought that meant that the trees were

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

June 1, 2021

getting cut down, which of course is not the case. And in fact, between those parcel lines, for those properties, in our limit of disturbance, there's around 380 feet of tree stand that's going to be left in place and maintained. So I think that clarification that all those trees were being kept in place was very helpful to understand.

So, from there, we talked through what are some other things we can do to make those neighbors more comfortable with the perceived visual impact with the concern about the visual nature of the site. And two things that they raised were of course as we reiterated in previous public hearings, a new row of evergreen trees along our western fence line, which we've committed to and we're providing here in this sim. This is also reflected in our landscaping plan. This is around 90 to 95 new evergreen trees. I believe it's a combination of Fat Albert spruce and arborvitae. We think this is going to do a great job of screening the project from view from those properties.

2.3

MR. KIMMERLING: What's the size of the trees?

MR. SIAO: At planting, it's like six to eight feet tall, six feet are typical. But we picked these species and Fat Albert Spruce in particular, because it grows fast, it grows wide, but it caps out at around 15 feet tall. So this would be effective at screening the project from view, but it will not cast shadows on the array, so we think this is typically the ideal choice or type of tree. And this was very satisfying to the neighbors. I spoke to the Fueys earlier today and they were very happy to see our revised [unintelligible] [00:43:42].

The other thing they suggested and something that we included in our original biodiversity assessment to this board is, you know, within that 380 feet between the property line and our limit of disturbance, that's of course where the wetlands are in sight. And we're of course avoiding impact to wetlands as part of our project.

But to go further, something we

2.3

suggested in our biodiversity desktop assessment, many months ago and something that the neighbors were interested in and we're happy to commit to is putting those wetlands and the acreage around the wetlands and their associated buffer into conservation easement.

And that gave them a lot of comfort in knowing that if this project were to be developed, not only is the array being screened in such a way that it mitigates visual impact from their properties, but also these areas that are nearest to them and the associated water resources in this area will be protected in perpetuity.

So these two pieces together I think, went a long way in making these neighbors comfortable and Dimension is happy to do it.

So, Chris, just going back quickly to the sims, I think that's helpful to look at again. So if you go back to the first one, this is existing conditions. It's hard to tell, but if you kind of look in the middle of the image, there's an orange flag here. That orange flag

2.3

represents the limit of our tree clearing. That's around 380 feet from where we're standing, which is the edge of the property line.

Even harder to see, but behind that, if you look really closely, there's a yellow flag. And the way we did this to show them is we went out there, there was two of us. We had these ten foot poles. And on top of the poles, were these colored flags. Orange represented tree line, green represented fence line, or probably it was a bright yellow. And I was holding the fence line one, and I was so far back, if you recall, from where we're standing in this photo, to the fence line is around 500 feet.

It was so far back that no one could see me. And in fact, they couldn't see the flag on the top of the pole. And so what I had to do was take off my construction vest, put it at the top and then wave it like I was on Castaway. So I think it was really helpful to show just how far away this was and how many trees are going to stay between the parcel line and the limit of disturbance.

So can we go to the second one? So this is proposed conditions at day one of planting.

So, like we mentioned, and very similar to the sim that we provided several months ago, we have here some of the array being visible, if you recall, given the topography of the site, this is upslope of where we're standing. The topographic relieve is around 50 feet. Then we're at kind of the plateau of the hill and then it drops down to the other side to Lexington Avenue.

So what we see here is just the leading edge of those panels before it goes over the crest of the hill to where it cannot be seen anymore. And again, these evergreen trees in the front, six feet at planting, already doing a great job at screening a lot of the array from view.

Another thing to call out here of course is these photos were taken in leaf off conditions. So we wanted to be as conservative as possible and show kind of the most visible this will be. Of course, for the majority of the year, all these trees in the foreground, that 380 feet

2.3

will have leaves on them. So that will further obscure the property. And again, this is right at the parcel line, the closest we could be to the parcel. The Fueys in particular, they have this nice deck in their backyard. That's where they have barbeques over the summer. That's further back and we think that the existing trees, leave on conditions are even going to further obscure the project from view. So --

MR. FOLEY: So what we're seeing on photo 1B there, beyond the tree line, the new, the evergreens, those are the arrays?

MR. SIAO: Yes. That's our fence line and then 20 feet beyond the fence is kind of the leading edge of the panels.

MR. FOLEY: Okay.

MR. SIAO: So this is day one, day one of planting. One thing I will call out here is in our landscaping plan, if you look, not only do we have the evergreen trees and the fence line, but if you recall from our previous submittals, we also have a number of trees planted kind of on the toe of that hill within our limit of

1	June 1, 2021
2	disturbance that we're replanting as part of our
3	mitigation onsite. That is not included as part
4	of this sim, so there there's going to be
5	additional screening even between our limit of
6	disturbance leading edge and the fence line.
7	MR. ROTHFEDER: So why didn't you make
8	those evergreens, if they were evergreens?
9	MR. KIAO: They are evergreens.
10	MR. ROTHFEDER: Oh. I guess I'm not
11	seeing the leaves on them. Okay.
12	MR. KIAO: The trees along the fence
13	line?
14	MR. ROTHFEDER: Yeah, they look, they
15	look bare to me, but maybe it's, I can't see from
16	there. That's fine.
17	MR. KIAO: The trees along the fence
18	line are certainly evergreen trees. Those are
19	MR. ROTHFEDER: Oh, I see. On the site,
20	right, Okay. I got you.
21	MR. KIAO: Yes, yes. So as you recall,
22	at our previous submission of visual simulation,
23	we provided not only winter conditions, but also
24	spring conditions, where we rendered what it

1 June 1, 2021 2 would look like with the leaves on. And I admit, it looked a little silly. So we didn't bother 3 4 with that. You can kind of imagine all these 5 trees in the foreground, what that'll look like 6 with full foliage. 7 MR. ROTHFEDER: Right. 8 MR. SIAO: But we wanted to show worst 9 case. 10 MR. ROTHFEDER: I've got that now. 11 MR. FOLEY: So photo 1C would be the 12 full growth of those evergreens? 13 MR. SIAO: That's correct. So that's 14 after a couple of seasons of growth. So, and as I 15 mentioned, the Fat Albert spruce typically cap 16 out around 15 feet tall and they grow side, so it will effectively be a wall of evergreen. 17 18 So this was a really great conversations 19 with the Fueys and the Lockwoods and the Harts, 20 glad to be able to meet with them, and talk with 21 them on this issue. I think we brought a lot of 22 comfort there. 2.3 So, in addition to those neighbors, and 24 with regard to this sim, around May, I'm sorry,

2.3

around March, we also received a letter from an organization called the North Cortlandt

Residents' Group. And they provided a couple other vantage points where they were interested in seeing will this array have any visual impact.

And the two areas they called out were Granite

Road, which is south of Crompond Road, as well as various points of view from the Sylvan Glen

Preserve.

So while C&S and I were in the area, we not only visited the neighbors along Baron De Hirsch, but we went to these additional areas to try and assess is there any ability for this project to likely be seen from those vantage points. And the answer is no. So this is Granite Road. This is a couple hundred feet south of Crompond Road. You can see kind of the tree, the, the truck along the road here, some smaller vehicles in the distance. We do not anticipate the project that the project to be visible from this vantage point. There is a significant number of trees even between these properties and Crompond Road to the south, but even once you get

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

to the north of Crompond Road, if you remember, there are multiple -- rather [unintelligible] [00:50:10] there's a dense tree stand not only made up of our parcel, but also the [unintelligible] [00:50:16] right of way of Crompond Road, which is forested. And between both of these, there's around 600 feet between, rather I should say 500 feet between Crompond Road and the natural gas right of way. None of those trees are proposed to be removed as part of the project. There's also substantial topographic relief from this property to the site. So it's not as if these folks will be looking down at the property, if anything, the property will be higher than them and those existing trees, those 500 feet of trees are going to be screening of the view. So we do not anticipate visual impact from Granite Road.

And then that leaves Sylan Glen Park

Preserve. They called out a few places here.

Snake Hill, which is kind of the top, if you look at the map again, those western trails, Snake

Hill is kind of that top trail. Slightly below

June 1, 2021

that is Grant Lookout, and then below that is Turtle Pond.

So we visited all three of them, beautiful preserve by the way, I was really happy to walk through that. And we went to each of these areas and took photos. And once again, the project is not going to be able to be seen. This is from the same right of way that cuts through our project. This is kind of looking down the road, you know, towards Lexington, and again, given the topographic relief and the existing forest line from this area, which is the most open out of anywhere we went in the park, the project is not going to be seen.

There are a couple other areas kind of down in this area. Just clicking through, of course, the preserve has its own robust tree stand. Again, these are leaf off conditions. This was taken, I believe late March, maybe early April. And this is where the potential for the project to be most visible. And as you flip through these and similar for Snake Hill and Grant Lookout, the existing tree stand within the

2.3

2.3

park is so dense that you could barely see outside of the park.

When we were up at Snake Hill, which is the area that's highest in elevation in that preserve, we could see maybe to the next neighboring block. I believe that's Grant Avenue, yes, it's Grant Avenue, we could start to see maybe the rooftops of those properties, but nothing beyond it.

And the distance from Snake Hill to the Grant Avenue properties, that's around 1,000 feet. The distance from that same lookout to our property is 3,000 feet, so three times the distance. So, as you can see here, we're confident that from these areas, you will not be able to view the project. And I think it's great. I think this preserve is a great asset to the towns of Cortlandt and Yorktown. It'll continue to be a great asset for future generations to come, and the view will not be impacted by the project.

So we think both of these were great updates. We were able to really close a lot of

1	June 1, 2021
2	open items here. In addition to that, we of
3	course, updated both the site plan and the SWPPP,
4	so I'm going to turn the floor over to Keith, who
5	can provided updates there, and once Keith
6	provides those updates, Brad will come up and
7	kind of talk through next steps and process from
8	here.
9	MR. BIANCHI: One question before you
10	turn it over. I'll ask the same question I had
11	for CVE.
12	MR. SIAO: Sure.
13	MR. BIANCHI: The height of the panels
14	and the tilt.
15	MR. SIAO: [unintelligible] [00:53:32]
16	25 degrees.
17	MR. BIANCHI: And is there anything that
18	can be done to lower them?
19	MR. SIAO: No.
20	MR. BIANCHI: And lessen the tilt?
21	Mr. SIAO: No. It's, as Carson
22	mentioned, for, when we design a project, we look
23	at the different tilts to see what is the maximum
24	yield and the maximum productivity. And in this

June 1, 2021

2

we look at things like effective screening to,

3 4

and maximizing setbacks to make the form factor

area, 20 to 25 degrees is typical. And that's why

5

and the line of sight as noninvasive as possible.

6

Mr. Foley, to answer your question about

7

five or six feet tall, to get to a panel of

8

around that height, that's kind of like a ten or

9

a fifteen degree tilt, so that's pretty flat,

10

something that's not really able to be done kind

11

of in this geography. So I know it was Cornell, I

12

think that it's interesting that they suggested

13

that. We don't typically see tilts that low

14

around this area.

15

16 projects here in New York State, because of snow,

17

the bottom edge of our panels are typically two

18

feet off the ground and that's so for part of the

And another thing to consider, for

19

year there's a heavy snow, the bottom of your

20

panel is not going to be buried in snow and

21

you're going to lose productivity there. I know

22

in other geographies, sometimes, that leading

2.3

edge is lower to the ground, but that's not

24

typical or feasible in New York. So perhaps

1 June 1, 2021 2 that's what they were suggesting. MR. FOLEY: It could have been from 3 4 upstate, because one of the moderators of the seminar was from --5 MR. SIAO: Sure, Cornell. 6 7 MR. FOLEY: I'd have to --8 MR. SIAO: I'd be interested in hearing 9 more about that project. That's not 10 [unintelligible] [00:55:00]. So, any other 11 questions on either of these updates before we 12 turn the floor over to Keith? Alright. Thank you 13 very much. 14 MR. KEITH STAUDOHAR: Good evening, 15 Keith Staudohar with Cronin Engineering. It's 16 good to be back in person, or do we miss the Zoom 17 meetings. As part of the updates, our office has 18 prepared a stormwater pollution prevention plan. 19 It's been submitted. We are awaiting technical 20 comments from I guess WSE and Mike Preziosi. 21 Of note, this project, except for a 31

22

2.3

24

foot by 12 foot wide equipment pad will not

result in any impervious areas. So we're going to

replace the wooded area with a pollinator meadow

2.3

and this solar panel array. For the equipment pad though, even though it is impervious and it's very small, we are providing stormwater quality treatment for that pad with an infiltration trench around the pad. Other than that, the access road is a pervious access road. I don't know if anyone remembers what we did at Croton Avenue with the solar farm that's finished now, basically. We did the same thing there, and this SWPPP is similar to that. So we don't expect anything but some minor technical comments from WSE and Mike Preziosi regarding this.

As far as the site development plan that we prepared, it's been updated since the last time you saw it. We've provided a zoning layout plan. This project meets all requirements of local law number eight for the solar panel system in terms of setbacks from property lines and things of that nature. We have added a utility and grading plan. And of note with the utility and grading plan is it's, we're not changing the grades that are out there necessarily, we're just creating a side slope. So there will be no

2.3

removal of any material from this site, so there will be no trucking of material offsite.

In addition, we've prepared an erosion and sediment control plan, which is part of the SWPPP. And then we did a tree removal landscaping plan. So this is where we talk about the trees. Chris if you could put up 4.0.

MR. ROTHFEDER: What's the date on the newest site plan, Keith? The one that we just got.

MR. STAUDOHAR: It should be March 30th. I can't read it, even with my glasses on, but it should be March 30th. So, within the tree cut line, we have 2,023 trees. The tree inventory exceeded our limits of disturbance, and it was a total of 3,100 and something trees in the -- 3,111 trees in the inventory, but within our tree cut limit line, there's 2,023 trees to be removed.

Of that, 901 of those trees are invasive and 329 of those trees are dead or in poor condition. So when we do the math back out, we add in 86 trees that are counted that are on

June 1, 2021

2

slopes, which would count as two trees, do the

3

math, we have a grand total of 879 trees that we

4

believe we have to mitigate.

5

And going back to the invasive and dead

So we have a tree planting plan that

6

7

eight, which is what controls this project.

and poor trees, pursuant to local law number

8

Section H-10F-iii, trees determined to be

9

diseased, dead or invasive species are not

10

subject to the requirement of this plan. So,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) ^{2}$ 

11

we're down to 879 trees.

12

includes the planting of areas at the entrance,

\_\_\_

which is in the southeast corner, and then areas

in the northwest flank of the project. And then

16

as Brad alluded to, we have added 90 plus trees,

17

evergreen trees along the western fence line to

18

add to the existing buffer that's there to any

19

houses along Baron De Hirsch. So when we add the

200, so we have a total of 228 trees that we're

2021

planting back, so we take 879 minus the 228,

22

we're down to 651 trees that we believe are to be

23

mitigated. And we believe that those 650, you

24

know, would be an amount to the environmental

1	June 1, 2021
2	fund of about 97, \$98,000.
3	MR. KESSLER: I can't read the caliper
4	size, what does that say?
5	MR. STAUDOHAR: Excuse me?
6	MR. KESSLER: The caliper size, on the
7	planting chart.
8	MR. STAUDOHAR: It should be between two
9	and three. I can't read it.
10	MR. KESSLER: Okay.
11	MR. BIANCHI: Yeah, that's what it says.
12	MR. KESSLER: Could you go a little
13	bigger than that? I mean not on the font, but
14	like three to four?
15	MR. STAUDOHAR: Well, I mean going up
16	that far is a huge cost difference, but I could
17	talk to the client and see if we could
18	MR. KESSLER: Okay.
19	MR. STAUDOHAR: mix in some three to
20	four inch trees. I don't know if all of them can
21	be that.
22	MR. KESSLER: Okay. Thanks.
23	MS. TAYLOR: It wouldn't hurt if you
24	could [unintelligible] [01:00:32] to the font as

1	June 1, 2021
2	well, with the tree surveys, you can't read them.
3	Pardon me?
4	MR. BIANCHI: [unintelligible]
5	[01:00:40]?
6	MS. TAYLOR: No, I don't know that he's
7	done. Are you done?
8	MR. STAUDOHAR: I'm done for now, unless
9	you have any more I'd be glad to answer any
10	more questions.
11	MR. KIMMERLING: I just had a question
12	on the tree replanting. So I'm just a little
13	confused. So the 96 total spruce and arborvitae
14	along Baron De Hirsch, is that, that's part of
15	the 228 trees?
16	MR. STAUDOHAR: Yes.
17	MR. KIMMERLING: Or that's in addition
18	to the 228?
19	MR. STAUDOHAR: That's part of the 228.
20	MR. KIMMERLING: Okay.
21	MS. TAYLOR: Are there any other
22	questions, concerns from the board?
23	MR. STAUDOHAR: If not, I can hand it
24	over to Brad for a recap.

2.3

MR. BRAD SCHWARTZ: Thanks, Keith, and good evening, everyone, Brad Schwartz from Zarin & Steinmetz, nice to see you all and welcome to the new board members. I know tonight is a public hearing, so before I wrap up on process, if the Board would be, would like, we could open it up to the public to hear if anyone is here tonight to make any additional comments.

MS. TAYLOR: Okay. This is a public hearing, and if you have any comments, concerns, issues of any kind, you are welcome to come up and express them. You'll need to give us your name and your residence and you know, state your case. I don't know that we expected no one, but, okay.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Then, just to reiterate what Kieran said at the beginning of the presentation, our only ask tonight is that the Board authorize staff to prepare a draft neg dec for consideration at the July meeting. As Kieran said, no promises, no guarantees, it all depends upon the outcome of the stormwater review and the outcome of the second field visit in June

1	June 1, 2021
2	for the [unintelligible] [01:02:38]. If both of
3	those check out clean, then at least your board
4	has a draft in front of you to consider in July.
5	If it is an issue, if a problem arises, you don't
6	vote on it in July, we come back in September. SO
7	that, that's the request tonight.
8	MS. TAYLOR: Alright. Tom, you go ahead.
9	MR. BIANCHI: All set?
10	MS. TAYLOR: Yeah.
11	MR. BIANCHI: Okay. Madam Chair I'll
12	move that we first close the public hearing.
13	MR. KIMMERLING: Second.
14	MS. TAYLOR: Alright. On the question,
15	all in favor?
16	MULTIPLE: Aye.
17	MS. TAYLOR: Opposed?
18	MR. BIANCHI: And if the Board is so
19	disposed, I'll request staff to prepare a
20	negative declaration, even though there are a
21	number of outstanding items, as Brad just
22	mentioned, the SWPPP report is being reviewed by
23	a consultant, the second phase biodiversity study
24	May, June, and a discussion on tree replanting,

1	Page 66 June 1, 2021
2	but there is no commitment to vote on it. We
3	could just have it prepared.
4	MR. SCHWARTZ: Understood.
5	MS. TAYLOR: Okay.
6	MR. KESSLER: Second.
7	MS. TAYLOR: All rightie. On the
8	question?
9	MR. KIMMERLING: So these are two
10	separate motions and we'll vote on them
11	separately?
12	MR. BIANCHI: Yes.
13	MR. ROTHFEDER: We just voted.
14	MS. TAYLOR: We voted to close the
15	public hearing.
16	MR. BIANCHI: We voted on the first one,
17	closing the public hearing.
18	MR. ROTHFEDER: We did?
19	MS. TAYLOR: Yes.
20	MR. ROTHFEDER: Oh, see, old, okay,
21	sorry. I'm thinking way ahead.
22	MR. KIMMERLING: We've got to go back to
23	Zoom.
24	MR. ROTHFEDER: Exactly.

**Geneva Worldwide, Inc.** 256 West 38<sup>th</sup> Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor, New York, NY 10018

	Page 67
1	June 1, 2021
2	MS. TAYLOR: Okay.
3	MR. ROTHFEDER: Exactly. Sorry folks.
4	MS. TAYLOR: So, did you finish your
5	second motion?
6	MR. BIANCHI: Yes.
7	MR. KESSLER: And I seconded. We're on
8	the question, yeah.
9	MS. TAYLOR: Okay. Then, on the
10	question, all in favor?
11	MULTIPLE: Aye.
12	MS. TAYLOR: Opposed?
13	MR. KIMMERLING: No.
14	MS. TAYLOR: Alright.
15	MR. SCHWARTZ: I really appreciate that,
16	thank you.
17	MR. KEHOE: Was there a no?
18	MS. TAYLOR: You have to poll.
19	MR. KEHOE: So I've got to poll the
20	board?
21	MR. KESSLER: Yes.
22	MS. TAYLOR: Yeah.
23	MR. KEHOE: Mr. Kimmerling?
24	MR. KIMMERLING: No.

	Page 68
1	June 1, 2021
2	MR. KEHOE: Mr. Kessler?
3	MR. KESSLER: Yes.
4	MR. KEHOE: Ms. Taylor?
5	MS. TAYLOR: Yes.
6	MR. KEHOE: Mr. Rothfeder?
7	MR. ROTHFEDER: Yes.
8	MR. KEHOE: Mr. Foley?
9	MR. FOLEY: Yes.
10	MR. KEHOE: Ms. Decker?
11	MS. DECKER: Yes.
12	MR. KEHOE: Mr. Bianchi?
13	MR. BIANCHI: Yes.
14	MR. KEHOE: Motion caries six to one.
15	MS. TAYLOR: Alright. Okay.
16	MR. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
17	MS. TAYLOR: Alright. Okay, we're moving
18	along in the agenda, and we're back under old
19	business at this point. This is PB 1-16,
20	application of Pomona Development, LLC for
21	preliminary plat approval and for steep slope
22	wetland and tree removal permits for a proposed
23	three-lot major subdivision of an approximately
24	16.78 acre parcel of property located on the

June 1, 2021

2.3

south side of Revolutionary Road, 500 feet south of Eton Lane, drawings are dated May 19, 2021.

MR. JAMES ANNICCHIARICO: Hi, good evening, Jim Annicchiarico, with Cronin
Engineering, nice to be back, especially for this project. So, I know many of you were on the Board when this first was before you a few years ago.

It was at that time, a six-lot subdivision. There were, we ended up coming to basically one meeting, we were referred back to staff obviously, and at that meeting, I heard enough pushback if you will, or issues with some of the lots and some of the layout.

But we did go back and meet with staff many, many times. One of the issues being the legal access for the right of way, which we did submit what David Steinmetz of Zarin & Steinmetz looked into and I believe the town attorney concluded that, you know, he was correct and that there was legal access, legal rights over, over the right of way for the project.

The next item that we ended up spending some time on was how to, how to access the site

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

June 1, 2021

and meet the code, both state and town, for a public road. We ended up really not being able to do that. So, we've come back now with a three-lot proposal, which does meet those requirements, both town and state, the IFC, the International Fire Code.

So we think this layout is a good layout. I know we, the original layout for six lots proposed about 3.25 acres of disturbance, and the new layout is about 1.8 acres. This, I don't know if I was clear or not, but this will not be a town road, this will be a private access drive for the three lots. We will still have to bring up a public water main and fire hydrant at the end of the access drive. There will then be meter pits and water services up to each of the houses. We are also still proposing to install a public sewer main that we will, that we have been and will continue to speak with the neighbor for access to the existing public water main that the town owns that's just off to the east of the project, through the back yards of those existing houses.

1 June 1, 2021 2 We do have the ability to propose septic systems if necessary. We've looked at the layout 3 4 and we've identified what we think is a septic area for each of the lots. So that is our backup. 5 Position. 6 7 MR. BIANCHI: Have you done any testing 8 yet for that? 9 MR. ANNICCHIARICO: No, not for that, 10 but based on, based on the soils that we know 11 that are there and the slopes, we're fairly 12 confident that that would be a backup. But we, 13 our main desire is to install the public sewer 14 main. 15 MR. BIANCHI: Is there any one specific 16 backyard you have to go through for the sewer? 17 MR. ANNICCHIARICO: There are at least 18 two. 19 MR. BIANCHI: Can you just --20 MR. ANNICCHIARICO: The one that we're 21 connected -- the one that's shown on there right

MR. ANNICCHIARICO: -- that would be

now, now or formerly Rice, that would be --

MR. BIANCHI: That one?

22

2.3

24

1 June 1, 2021 2 choice number one, but we do have the ability to go to the lot just to the south of that and still 3 4 connect via gravity. Chris, if you could, maybe go to the 5 site plan page. I'm trying to remember, there was 6 7 a lot of talk about a lot of trees coming down. I 8 want to show how many trees we aren't taking 9 down, or how few trees we're taking down. So, if 10 you could find that chart. I don't have that off 11 the top of my head. I believe it's on -- that's 12 the existing conditions. That's the zoning plan. 13 It should be one more. 14 MR. KIMMERLING: It's the last one I 15 think, Chris. 16 MR. KEHOE: Subdivision plan? That's the 17 tree preservation plan. 18 MR. ANNICCHIARICO: There should be, 19 yeah, actually, yeah, because it was right there 20 actually. It was a chart up in the top of that 21 tree preservation plan. I don't know if you can 22 zoom in there. 2.3 MR. FOLEY: TP 9.1?

MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Yeah, that's it,

24

2.3

right there. So, we've, could you zoom in one more? Sorry.

MR. KEHOE: 968.

MR. ANNICCHIARICO: So 968 trees that were located, you know, that's a larger number because that was based on 50 feet outside the limit of disturbance for the proposed six lot layout, so back then, we located that many trees. If we were to do it again, it would be obviously less. But we are only proposing to remove 87 trees. There is, there's obviously more trees on the site. It's a 16-and-a-half-acre site. We didn't locate probably half the trees that are on the lot, or actually even less.

So, it's definitely less than the six lot subdivision. I don't remember what that number was. I don't know if you have that, Chris anywhere, but it's definitely less. There is a large area where the existing houses and the driveways, outbuildings and whatnot, that is a bit open anyway, with few trees. So, that might, you might be able to see that in the existing condition Chris, a little bit better.

2.3

We also, we have very little wetland disturbance and it's mainly just the existing drive that would be improved. And quite frankly, in my opinion, the wetland that was flagged out within the right-of-way is probably just seep out from the wetland itself that wetland B that you see there. And if that were piped properly, it probably wouldn't be wet out there. But it's 700 square feet of wetland technically, that we would be disturbing by improving the access drive slightly.

MR. ROTHFEDER: But you are putting the new road over a significant portion of the buffer.

MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Yes, which is -- it actually exists right now. We'll be widening it to meet the --

MR. ROTHFEDER: In what way does it exist? I mean --

MR. ANNICCHIARICO: There is a driveway there right now.

MR. ROTHFEDER: Is that what the -- I'm looking at this plan. Is that what these, these

1	June 1, 2021
2	are existing? There's no date on this. It just
3	says Revolutionary Road subdivision wetland now,
4	[unintelligible] [01:14:15] 1.1.
5	MR. FOLEY: It's a dirt road after Eton
6	Lane?
7	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Yeah, Tom, you're
8	looking at, at
9	MR. ROTHFEDER: Yeah.
10	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Right. Yeah, that's,
11	you can see the drive. It's a little difficult to
12	see, but you can see the access drive that
13	traverses the right of way all the way up to the
14	existing house.
15	MR. ROTHFEDER: Is there anything you're
16	going to be doing to mitigate any of that?
17	Because it's a larger road now?
18	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Yeah, we will be
19	MR. ROTHFEDER: Is that going to
20	mitigate that incursion into the buffer.
21	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Yes, we, we will be
22	proposing whatever we can do stormwater wise for
23	the driveway itself. Likely, it'll be in the
24	form of an infiltration trench along the edge of

2.3

the driveway with the drive pitched towards it.

If there is anything we can do down at the bottom at Revolutionary Road and Eton Lane, we will certainly do something there but for each of the lots themselves, we will be proposing stormwater management on each of the individual lots as well.

MR. ROTHFEDER: Has that plan been submitted yet?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  ANNICCHIARICO: No, we haven't gone that far yet.

MR. ROTHFEDER: Okay.

MR. ANNICCHIARICO: That would something we would expect to submit in a response to Mike Preziosi's technical review. Tonight, I'd really like to get a better sense of how the Board feels about this layout. Obviously, I would hope there's a better reaction to this layout than the six. But in order to move forward, and expand the plans, we would like some sort of feedback I guess, if you will, about whether or not we're on the right path here. It's been quite a long road, obviously, no doing of this board or anybody

1	June 1, 2021
2	else. But it's
3	MR. ROTHFEDER: Is there any reason why
4	you put a T at the end of the road before you get
5	the houses versus a circle?
6	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Well, the slope
7	there at the end is such that a cul-de-sac
8	doesn't work very well. It requires a very deep
9	cut up into the property. So and then that
10	exacerbates the driveways up to the houses. So,
11	working with, discussions with Mike Preziosi, we
12	came up with a hammerhead T that does the same
13	it meets the same code requirements as the
14	MR. ROTHFEDER: Okay. I just wondered.
15	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Yeah.
16	MR. ROTHFEDER: Chris, is this our
17	requirement to show slopes at zero to 20 and 20
18	plus? I thought we had more gradations.
19	MR. KEHOE: We have more ranges than
20	that.
21	MR. ROTHFEDER: Yeah, I mean it's hard
22	to have an opinion when, you know, you're lumping
23	everything into a zero to 20.
24	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Sure, we can change

	$\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{q}}$
1	Page 78 June 1, 2021
2	that.
3	MR. ROTHFEDER: Yeah.
4	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: And, you know.
5	MR. KEHOE: I think you go, you know,
6	not a steep slope, then I think you go 15 to 20,
7	20 to 25 and then above 25.
8	MS. TAYLOR: Right.
9	MR. KEHOE: I think.
10	MR. ROTHFEDER: That sounds right.
11	MR. FOLEY: When you drive in, the
12	existing house is where? Where the T is? Or one
13	of the three?
14	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: When you drive in,
15	the existing house is actually, it's a little
16	ways into the property.
17	MR. FOLEY: Is it shown on any of these?
18	MR. KEHOE: Yes.
19	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Yeah, if you look at
20	the
21	MR. KEHOE: It's on the screen now.
22	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: WM-1.1, the
23	yellow and green, that map, Bob. The yellow and
24	green, basically the wetland map, if you look at
	ii

1	June 1, 2021
2	that, it'll show all the outbuildings. There are
3	a lot of outbuildings
4	MR. FOLEY: Oh, I see.
5	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: on this property.
6	Pools, sheds, garages, it's quite something.
7	MR. ROTHFEDER: So just to be clear on
8	this road, so starting at Eton Lane, that's a
9	dirt road?
10	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Right now, yes.
11	MR. ROTHFEDER: And you're proposing to
12	pave that, is that
13	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: We would have to
14	pave it, it would not have to be a town standard
15	road.
16	MR. ROTHFEDER: Okay.
17	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: So it would not have
18	to meet grades.
19	MR. ROTHFEDER: Are you widening it?
20	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: We would be, we
21	would be required to do, I believe, 18 feet wide.
22	But it would follow, it would basically follow
23	the same grades. There would be very little cut
24	and drill.

1	June 1, 2021
2	MR. ROTHFEDER: So the road is already
3	going through the wetland, you're just paving it
4	
5	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Right.
6	MR. ROTHFEDER: and widening it?
7	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Right. And we would,
8	we would put a new stormwater conveyance pipe
9	right at the, where the wetland does cross right
10	there and go into the adjacent property. So we
11	would essentially, we would fix that situation
12	right now.
13	MR. KIMMERLING: And the width of the
14	current dirt road is?
15	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: It's about 12.
16	MR. ROTHFEDER: And then, Chris can you
17	go back to just whatever, just the whole yeah,
18	zoom out on that. No, no.
19	MR. KEHOE: It's just, the file's big,
20	so it takes a while.
21	MR. ROTHFEDER: Okay.
22	MR. KEHOE: This type of plan?
23	MR. ROTHFEDER: Yeah, just move it up a
24	little. So lower left, is there a house there? It

1	June 1, 2021
2	says, now a former, now or formerly
3	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: I believe there is a
4	house on that property, to the which on?
5	MR. ROTHFEDER: Yeah, the lower one.
6	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: That one, yes, there
7	is a house on that property, yes.
8	MR. ROTHFEDER: And then they
9	MR. FOLEY: But on your property?
10	MR. ROTHFEDER: they don't come off
11	of Revolutionary, they come off of
12	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: They come off Eton
13	Lane.
14	MR. ROTHFEDER: Eton Lane, okay.
15	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Yes, correct.
16	MR. ROTHFEDER: And same on what
17	about on the other side of Revolutionary Road?
18	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Same thing. I don't
19	believe anybody comes off of Revolutionary Road
20	except for us.
21	MR. FOLEY: And the existing house you
22	mentioned, that's on WM-1.1 Is that a two story?
23	It's hard to read the plan. It's to the right
24	after you come in, and all these other are

	D 0
1	Page 8 June 1, 2021
2	outbuildings?
3	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Yeah, all the
4	smaller buildings that you see there are all
5	garages or sheds.
6	MR. FOLEY: But the actual existing
7	house, the larger
8	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Right. It's kind of
9	like L-shaped.
10	MR. FOLEY: Yeah.
11	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Yeah, that's it.
12	It's got a pool behind it.
13	MR. FOLEY: Okay. I see.
14	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Above ground pool.
15	MR. ROTHFEDER: Chris, how much as staff
16	viewed this at this point?
17	MR. KEHOE: Well, staff did a it was
18	a long time ago, but Mike Preziosi did a pretty
19	thorough review memo of the six-lot subdivision.
20	There hasn't been a review memo done for this
21	three-lot subdivision yet. Although, as Jim said,
22	we have met several times, because I think
23	reducing it down to three lots really minimizes
24	the amount of improvements they need to make to

1 June 1, 2021 2 that driveway/road. And the fire inspector has already examined it. We'd have to double check 3 4 with all of the environmental things that have been done, the trees and the wetlands were done a 5 while ago. We would have to confirm that. So 6 7 another review memo would need to be done, but I think that you thought that maybe you could go 8 9 out and take a look at it. 10 MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Yeah, I'd ask that 11 we set something up for a site walk if you're 12 willing to do that at this point. 13 MR. ROTHFEDER: Well, I think after the 14 review memo we should do that. 15 MR. KEHOE: Well, you're going out 16 anyway. That's up to you, but I thought there was some thought since you're going to Colonial 17 18 Terrace and this is right next door, you would do 19 both. 20 MR. ROTHFEDER: Oh, is it? All right. So 21 we'll do three that day, is that what you're 22 saying?

MR. KEHOE: I think only two.

MR. ROTHFEDER: That's what I'm saying,

2.3

24

	Page 84
1	June 1, 2021
2	this'll be three.
3	MR. KIMMERLING: Two.
4	MR. ROTHFEDER: Oh, no, I'm sorry.
5	MR. KESSLER: No, I think this would be
6	the second.
7	MR. ROTHFEDER: I'm sorry, you're right.
8	Okay. Got it.
9	MR. FOLEY: You want to make a motion?
10	MR. KIMMERLING: Yes.
11	MR. ROTHFEDER: Yeah.
12	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: I think we've enough
13	of the larger issues. I don't know if you
14	remember, Mr. Kessler, but we were coming through
15	the two wetlands buffers to a house back there
16	and I know that you had a big issue with that.
17	So, you know, and we had some, we had another
18	lot, which was lot five, just to the south or
19	east of that, that had a very long, windy
20	driveway and was way up on the slope. So I think
21	this brings it all down together, down into areas
22	that are much more manageable, less disturbance.
23	MR. ROTHFEDER: But way back, this was a
24	two-lot subdivision when we first came, the Hay

1	June 1, 2021
2	subdivision.
3	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: A long time ago.
4	MR. KEHOE: Yeah, this is the leftover
5	piece of it.
6	MR. ROTHFEDER: Twenty years ago, yeah.
7	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Right. That was one
8	of the first subdivisions I did I think.
9	MR. ROTHFEDER: Is that right?
10	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Yeah.
11	MR. ROTHFEDER: Full circle.
12	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Yeah. My daughter
13	started high school when this started I think.
14	She's graduating now.
15	MR. FOLEY: So question before I make a
16	motion. How close, when you go over the border to
17	Peekskill, is that near the Peekskill Reservoir,
18	or water source? Or am I wrong?
19	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: I think it's close.
20	MR. KESSLER: Yes.
21	MR. FOLEY: So is that why you want to
22	make sure you get the sewer connection as opposed
23	to septic?
24	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: No, because we're

1	Page 86 June 1, 2021
2	downhill from them.
3	MR. FOLEY: Oh, you're down?
4	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Yeah, that's much higher.
5	MR. FOLEY: Oh, this is Peekskill is
6	higher?
7	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Yeah, we wouldn't have
8	any impact on their
9	MR. FOLEY: Alright.
10	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: property.
11	MR. FOLEY: Okay. I make a motion to refer
12	this back and to set a site visit, do you want it as
13	one motion? And set a site visit for Sunday morning,
14	June 27th.
15	MR. ROTHFEDER: Second.
16	MS. TAYLOR: Alright. On the question, all in
17	favor?
18	MULTIPLE: Aye.
19	MS. TAYLOR: Opposed? All rightie.
20	MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Thank you very much.
21	MR. KEHOE: Ms. Taylor? The applicant for
22	Paraco Gas, which is the Rail Niner project would like
23	to know if they could go up, it should only take a
24	minute or two, above NRP because NRP has a longer

2.3

presentation they'd like to make.

MS. TAYLOR: That's fine with me. What about the members?

MR. ROTHFEDER: Yeah.

MR. KEHOE: Sure.

MS. TAYLOR: Okay.

MR. ANNICCHIARICO: Thank you very much.

MS. TAYLOR: Okay. Let me go ahead and read this. This is actually new business, but we're going to handle it now. The PB 2021-3 is the application of Paraco Fuel Company for amended site development plan approval for the construction of an approximately 1,400 square feet building for office and storage space at the existing gas storage and distribution facility located at 8 & 14 Bay View Road. The drawings are dated May 21, 2021. Alright. Good evening.

MR. KEITH STAUDOHAR: Good evening, Keith Staudohar, Cronin Engineering. I want to thank you for bumping me up one, and thank you, Mr. Steinmetz for allowing me to ask. This project is Paraco Field down on Bay View Road, right down on the river, off of Roa Hook Road. Superstorm Sandy, back in 2012, knocked out their existing building which is that huge

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

rectangular, there you Chris, thank you. So they replaced that building with two trailers which didn't make code and they were violated by the code enforcement department several years ago. So we came in with a site plan to put a new office on the site. It's a little bit bigger than this office we're showing now. We've carried that through the approval process. We got all the conditions resolved. We had the chairman sign the site plan and the project just laid dormant. They came back, they wanted to put this office where we're showing it, and that's where we're at right now. It's a smaller office. Everything else on site remains the same. There's no other improvements proposed other than this building. The building has to be built so that the first floor elevation is above, two feet above the flood plain and the back half of the building is going to be storage. So we're hoping this gets referred back to staff and we can go from there. I'm glad to answer any questions.

MR. KEHOE: We did have a brief, we've had some discussions about this with Keith and Mike Preziosi. So we would need to do a review memo. We

1 June 1, 2021 don't think you would ultimately need a public hearing 2 3 necessarily, but we would like to do a review memo so 4 you can refer it back. MS. DECKER: Motion to refer back to staff. 5 6 MR. KESSLER: Second. 7 MS. TAYLOR: Alright, on the question, all in favor? 8 9 MULTIPLE: Ave. 10 MS. TAYLOR: Opposed? Okay. 11 MR. STAUDOHAR: Thank you very much 12 everybody. 13 MS. TAYLOR: You're welcome. Alright. This is 14 the application -- this is PB 2021-1, the application 15 of NRP Properties, LLC for site development plan 16 approval, a special permit and for tree removal and steep slope permits for a proposed 135-unit active 17 18 adult residential community to be located on an 19 approximately 8.7 acre parcel of property at 119 20 Oregon Road. The drawings are dated May 19, 2021.

> MR. DAVID STEINMETZ: Good evening, Madam Chair, members of the board, Chris, first note for the record Keith Staudohar owes me one, so just make a note of that.

21

22

2.3

24

2.3

2 MR. KEHOE: Noted.

MR. STEINMETZ: Madam Chair, members of the Board, you may not have expected to hear me say this ever, but it's kind of good to be back before all of you. So having spent many a night in this room together, it was productive, but unusual to be spending as much time as we all did over the last 15 months on Zoom, and I'm really, I am happy to be back in this room. It kind of feels comfortable and good and glad to see all of you well.

So I'm here this evening, David Steinmetz, from the law firm of Zarin & Steinmetz, on behalf of NRP and St. Katherine's Group. We've talked about this matter virtually. I'm glad to be able to talk about it live and in person. We're going to try to be efficient.

Just to remind you procedurally, as well as for the new members of the Board, and welcome to both of you, we are here processing a zoning text amendment in front of the town board simultaneously with conceptual site plan review in front of your board specifically with regard to the redevelopment of Colonial Terrace.

2.3

As the chair indicated, this is a proposal for 135 mixed-income residential rentals and 146 parking spaces. This is an exciting project for this site. We've spent a great deal of time working with your board, the town board and your professional staff to come up with a design that we think is conducive to the appropriate redevelopment of the property. And most importantly, it provides a housing type for the community that really doesn't exist today.

We know we've been working in conjunction with the sellers, trying to make appropriate historic recognition of the property. We'll talk a little bit about that tonight. I'm joined by Jonathan Gertman and Myles Monaghan from NRP with me this evening, as well as Jerry Schwalbe from Divney Tung and Schwalbe.

So the Board knows and so the record is clear, we have met with neighbors. We, at the request of the supervisor, we did send out a notice to our neighbors and conducted a meeting a while back. I think we did tell you that in our last appearance. But I wanted to make sure everyone was clear that we did announce to the public that we were proceeding in this fashion, we had a very productive and favorable

2.3

June 1, 2021

meeting with the neighbors. We've made some revisions to the plan, which Miles and Jerry are going to go through this evening.

And one of the main focuses for tonight's presentation, and we will try to make it efficient, is to make sure your board is clear what studies we've already conducted and what studies are underway. We are trying to amass all of the necessary empirical data to present to your board and the town board, to demonstrate that there are no significant adverse environmental impacts. We are working on formulating some mitigation measures presently in conjunction with your staff as well as your outside consultants. And we're going to walk you through where we stand in all of that with the hopes of making some progress in the process.

I will get up at the end, we'll talk a little bit more about process but I'm going to turn it over, and our PowerPoint over to Myles Monaghan and Jerry Schwalbe. Thanks.

MR. MYLES MONAGHAN: Good evening everyone.

Thank you, David. Thanks for having us. I will echo

David's sentiments. It's nice to stand in front of you

2.3

in person. I was beginning to think I might only get to know you all as tiny floating boxes on my computer screen, so I appreciate the opportunity. Thank you, Chris. If you wouldn't mind, I'll just kind of flag you when I need to move to the next one.

So we are back here to tell you a little bit about Overlook Terrace, our concept for the Colonial Terrace property at 119 Oregon Road. I want to keep it short and sweet this evening. A quick little background refresher, just to let you guys know, or I guess remind you of our concept here. So we have 135 units. If you wouldn't mind moving to the next one, Chris, thank you, of senior housing, active adult housing, age restricted at 55 years and older.

We feel the property from a location perspective is complementary to the existing uses along the Oregon Road corridor. It's going to be a contextual development in terms of scale and density and really will offer our new residents the opportunity to kind of enjoy those amenities and services along Oregon Road, and we feel will be a very desirable asset for the town of Cordtlandt.

We also feel it's going to be addressing a

2.3

significant amount of demand for affordable rentals that, as kind of David noted, there's a limited supply in the town of Cortlandt and really in northern Westchester, and there's really pent up demand for this type of product.

And we also want to note for the town of Cortlandt that this will be another opportunity to kind of diversity the local tax base while providing kind of a net benefit to municipal budgets.

The next slide, Chris. Yeah, we'll show you a little bit kind of what we're thinking in terms of this corridor. And we really thought a bit about it and how our site ties into the neighborhood. We have quite a bit of local services and amenities right along Oregon Road, highlighted by the B-line bus running on that corridor. That offers local residents already and will offer once we are able to build this, if we can be so lucky, the access we feel they're really going to appreciate to local religious organizations, country clubs, the Morabito Senior Center, grocery stores, and of course, Town Hall, where we are today.

So, that really wraps up kind of the

2.3

introduction that we wanted to offer once again to you all just to kind of remind you of kind of our vision and how that ties into the details. So, we want to update you as well on our progress on the site plan.

And I think if that next slide, Chris is the one I'm thinking, yeah, is the existing conditions. I'm going to invite our civil engineer Jerry from Divney Tung to speak a little bit more about kind of the challenges and opportunities that we're seeing on the site.

MR. JERRY SCHWALBE: Thank you, Myles, and good evening. It is good to be back, certainly after all this time. And not to go through the details of the site in a certain way, but just to get you, obviously, you know where it is, it's next door, so the site is 8.7 acres in size. It's the Colonial Terrace Catering Hall, which is in the middle of that white mass that's there. Parking areas are all throughout the site. This site has been developed over a number of years and been disturbed over a number of years. And it's evolved into certain aspects of what it is. It's a catering hall and it has parking basically. It's closed at the current moment. If you see the center part of the site straight up to the

2.3

June 1, 2021

top, which is Oregon Road, that's the main driveway coming into the property, then it swings back off to the left and right with parking and then you head up to the building.

And then off to the left of that property is Eton Downs Road, which is also next to Heady Street. And then it curves back around the back of it, which was part of the old, well, they called it the Oval, which is a road that goes back to the backend section of the neighborhood. And at the little notch in the side of the property there, you'll see in the back, right off the oval where the catering hall has their loading dock and their facilities coming in and you can see it's a little busy place back there, and there's pavement and there's buildings and that's where they had storage and the refuse and so forth, it was back there.

And then on the right hand side, it was more quieter, the area next to the adjacent residential zone and also there's an unnamed brook that goes, flows, I guess that's north, on the right side. And that goes tributary to the Peekskill Hollow Brook, in that location.

1

2.3

24

preserved.

2 Just to give you a little perspective on those property elevations and you may have known that 3 4 from looking at it from the front, but the back is elevation 183 at the middle of the curve at the back. 5 That's the highest point on the property. And then if 6 7 you go down to the right hand corner, that's where the drainage actually flows down to, is at elevation 110. 8 9 So there is quite a bit of drop. You don't see that 10 when you're looking from the road, but when you drive 11 up the main driveway, it's sort of a gentle slope and 12 then you get to the building and then there's a large 13 stairway and then you get to the first floor and then 14 the roof is above that. So the elevation increase is 15 more towards the back end of the property and the 16 front end is more gentle, even though it was an 80 foot elevation change, you don't really realize that 17 18 looking at it from the street. But in the back you do 19 and you have that wooded area in the back that also 20 has a, I guess the sewer line was installed through 21 there, so there's like a little bisect that's under 22 easement owned by the town, which is going to be

So I just want to give you a sense of what

2.3

the property looks like today or feels like today anyway. There's no wetlands on the property, there's a lot of lawns. There's some forest areas in the back but basically everything's been redeveloped in some way or in some manner over a period of time.

Some of the trees, we're having an assessment done currently now, we don't have that report in. We should be getting that within a week or so, get a better handle on it. But some of the trees there we've noticed are damaged, tops are broken off, especially the white pines. They don't do well in some of these areas. They struggle a little bit. And we want to assess what those look like and what we can keep and what we may have to replace, more from a sustainability point of view.

So in positioning this building, if you would go to the next slide, Chris, this is the site plan which you've seen before, and that's the building, the 135 unites, and there's parking that encompasses the three sides of the building. And the main entry, the main entry is the same location that currently exists today. There will be some gradings through there. The trees that are along that allay there, that entry

2.3

road, are not in great shape, and I think we'll look at that when we see that on the 27th. And then on the left and right of that road, you have one the right hand side, where we have a stormwater basin proposed, that's where an existing parking lot is somewhat overgrown. On the left side is more of a meadow kind of grass field, which has a better feel to and more a level area.

So as you come up to the entrance drive, you arrive at the entrance to the building, which is also in some ways similar to the existing catering hall where there's a center court and then there's, except in that particular case, there's like a ten-foot rise from going up the stairway to the main entrance, obviously not an accessible building.

Here we have to make this building more obviously accessible, accessible around the parking lot in the back so people can enjoy the property more, also get in the building, fire access and that sort of thing. We've discussed briefly, not fully, but briefly with the building department and the fire folks about access for this particular building, allowing for fire trucks coming into the property and around the

2.3

building. So in trying to do that, I mentioned that the high point was at 183 in the back. Our finished floor is going to be at 135. So it's actually going to be about 14 feet lower than the current first floor of the catering hall, because it's so far up in height, and that requires us then to cut the site down.

So it's a big investment in bring the site more balanced down and at a lower level, which has some benefits as well, because it brings it down below the sight lines from the neighborhood in the back, which is up at 183. You're kind of looking over at the top of those, the forest in the back where I mentioned where the sewer line was for the most part will remain. There's some grading that we're going to have to do closer to the back of the building.

But I think for the most part, we'll be able to keep what we can in terms of that buffer and reinforce that much more. So you don't see a lot of plantings there because we're kind of keeping that alone as a restored woodland area. But then in the front, we've got a walkable site, so everything's sort of level around there. We have handicapped parking around the site, we have 146 spaces, of which eight

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

would be handicapped, around the outside, which I believe exceeds the actual requirement for handicapped parking, even though it's not assisted living or anything, there's still active adults here that may require some assistance at times too.

And then coming out to the front, there was a -- the planning board requested a walkway of some kind to the street for a bus stop. If you can see that on the side there, there's a little bit of a curve. As a matter of fact, maybe you could go to the next one, Chris, I think it might be easier to see on there. A little bit more zoomed in, so you can see on the top left quadrant, if you want to call it there, that green area, there's a white line that comes through. That's where the walkway, and that'll be ADA accessible, in other words less than half of five percent slope. And then at the street, we're going to put the bus stop in that location coming through, so theoretically they could go there and get access. As Myles mentioned before, the route is pretty robust and there's a lot of places you can get to with the bus.

And then the only access will be from that one point, and then off on the left, we have an

2.3

emergency access, even though it's shown tying into

Eton Downs, the idea there, there would be like a

gated fence of some kind, decorative maybe that would

be used for emergency access only but no traffic would

be going through or into that area.

The area below the building on the bottom of the sheet is not meant to be a full access road for the users, but more for emergency as well. There will probably be a signage there emergency vehicles only. But obviously it's a walkable thing, you can walk on it and for maintenance and so forth.

And then from a landscaping perspective, we've got two courtyards I think that are going to be a valuable asset for them in those, and what we actually put in there, the amenities, will be something I guess, I think we're developing over time. Maybe there's some community gardens that we could put in there, passive seating areas, I don't know maybe a hibachi court or something like that, if it's not too noisy, but certainly there's some things I think we can do to make that more of a useable kind of quaint little area for the residents.

The parking on each side of the building,

2.3

June 1, 2021

left and right, if you noticed, they're pretty close to the building. We try to meet the fire requirements of being within 26 feet of the building from an aerial truck being able to use a ladder to get up into the building.

The front, where we have more room, obviously has more trees. I think the board mentioned about screening some parking where we can. We feel we can do some of that there as well, and try to keep that screened from the upper floors. It is a three-story building. The total building height to the peak of the roof is less than 50 feet. So at elevation 135, the top of the building would be at 50 feet and 185. But just below the road, or just at the road elevation at the back. And then with the trees and the buffer there, you can see that the building is going to be tucked down into the hillside quite a bit.

But the front of the property will be more closer to the elevation that's there today. But instead of going up like this, we're going to try and keep it back balanced into the site, so the views, and Myles will show you some of the renderings that look really great on how this thing might look in the

2 future.

2.3

Then we have stormwater measures that we've done. We've given you a simple report that we're going to expand with that with the engineering department to do a full SWPPP that we're going to have to provide for the property. We have a sewer connection. We've monitored the sewers for four weeks as per Mike Preziosi's request. We have that data, we're going through that now. And when we get a little bit further ahead, we're going to meet with Mike's office and kind of go through that.

There's also a water line actually comes through the site, because this had many subdivision aspects to it in the past, in its history, I think there was a water line that came through it, which is a town water line. Unfortunately, we have to move it, we can't keep it. But we're going to keep it through the site as well, but just move it in a different location. The pressures and the flow from the water line in that area is quite good. No problem for fire protection. As a matter of fact, the building will have fully sprinkler capabilities for the building and then the only other thing I would just mention is the

2.3

utilities would be available from Oregon Road as well.

know about it is the landscaping. So we've given you a landscape plan that has, at the current moment, it shows about 60 shade trees, 17 evergreen trees and 33 ornamental trees. And they would be scattered around the site and you can see the colored trees that are shown on the drawing are more the flowering trees or ornamental trees. And then the larger ones like along the roadway, they may be more higher shade trees. I don't know if they'd be lindens or oaks, we're not sure yet. Those are things we have to -- we have a pallet of trees that we like to work with the Board on to kind of create a nice image as we go through there.

The proposed disturbance limits is around 7.5 acres. That's primarily because of the building and the stormwater basins that we have to provide. But generally, it's fully restored, meeting the requirements for the stormwater management, which now includes as you know, infiltration in the ground, unlike the way the property is currently, it doesn't have any provisions for any water quality or of course stormwater measures at all.

I'll bring it back to Myles.

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

And then lastly, I mentioned we have a sewer line, but the existing catering hall is on a septic system. It's in the district, it's in the town and the county district, so it just never connected for some reason I guess. I'm not sure why, but the sewer is right down on Eton Downs Road, where we can make a connection into it, so that's our plan. And with that,

MR. MONAGHAN: Thank you, Jerry. So, you'll see here we wanted to give you all a sense this evening of kind of the visual aesthetic we're going for. Here, the goal is to show you we're really maintaining this verdant look and feel of the property that the community will experience from Oregon Road. We have the central entry drive, we'll preserve the two stone walls and really try and preserve kind of the way this property is experienced from Oregon Road.

The next one Chris would be great. Here, we've got the building entrance. So the circular vehicular access at the building entrance is kind of an homage to the accessibility of Colonial Terrace as it is today. You'll see we're using kind of a colonial architectural vernacular. That is abundant in the town

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

of Cortlandt and is also experienced at Colonial

Terrace as it is today. So that was a significant

inspiration for us here, and we also will using kind

of a columned portico entry, which is a very similar

entry for Colonial Terrace.

MR. ROTHFEDER: Does that entry extend over the driveway, or it's just to the sidewalk?

MR. MONAGHAN: Currently, it's just to the sidewalk, yeah. Thank you, Chris. So this is a bird'seye view and the goal here is to kind of show you the scale of the development and really our ability through our site plan to preserve a significant amount of the site as permeable landscaped area. As Jerry was mentioning, we've got the two kind of lawns, page left, property north, that will serve as stormwater basins, will serve as kind of outdoor recreational areas and kind of provide the same face to the community that the property has today. And we have the back, where you start to have that topography going up the hill to the Overlook Oval, largely undisturbed as best we can and obviously, we'll need to create a retaining wall because of that grade change, but that will also be a significant kind of a view mitigant, if

1	June 1, 2021
2	you will, of our development for neighbors to the
3	south in Waterbury Manor.
4	MR. KESSLER: I didn't notice that before.
5	Are you proposing a second entrance off
6	MR. MONAGHAN: So that's off Eton Downs, yes,
7	so we're proposing that to be emergency access only.
8	MR. KESSLER: Oh, just emergency?
9	MR. MONAGHAN: Yeah, it would be gated, you
10	know, with like a rope that would just say emergency
11	vehicles only, similar to the way that we are treating
12	the back road behind the building as well.
13	MR. KESSLER: Okay. But you raise an
14	interesting question there, because I mean if you come
15	out that way, at least you're coming down to a light,
16	right?
17	MR. MONAGHAN: If you exit onto Eton Downs
18	MR. KESSLER: And you make a right.
19	MR. MONAGHAN: and you make a right, yes.
20	MR. KESSLER: You're coming down to Oregon.
21	MR. MONAGHAN: Yep.
22	MR. KESSLER: Then you have a traffic light,
23	whereas coming out in the center, you do not.
24	Mr. MONAGHAN: That's right. So, we, and

2.3

June 1, 2021

actually, we'll get to this in just a minute. Through our SEQRA studies, we've engaged Provident Design and Engineering to conduct a traffic study and actually kind of a parking analysis for us. And so they are looking at the traffic patterns along Oregon Road at the corner with Heady Street, at Eton Downs and that's all part of what will be assessed over the next couple of weeks, so I definitely appreciate the comment.

MR. KESSLER: What are they doing for the parking study?

MR. MONAGHAN: So, if you wouldn't mind,

Member Kessler, I'm actually going to cover that in a
slide, yep. So, the next one, Chris, so here we go. I

wanted to update you on a couple of ongoing SEQRA

studies that we don't have results yet to share this

evening, the first being the sewer monitoring which is

ongoing. We do have a SWPPP that was submitted as part

of the site plan, that was submitted prior to this

meeting. The traffic study is ongoing and Provident

has been engaged. The parking analysis, they are,

Provident is conducting parking counts at a comparable

property in the town of Cortlandt, Jacob Hill, to get
a sense of the parking counts onsite, as well as

1 June 1, 2021 2 parking utilization that will inform the site plan. MR. KESSLER: Before they're done, can you 3 4 include Round Top at Montrose and Springvale? MR. MONAGHAN: Yeah, Round Top and 5 Springvale? 6 7 MR. KESSLER: Yes, please. 8 MR. MONAGHAN: Yeah. 9 MR. KESSLER: Springvale seems to keep coming 10 back for more and more parking, so I'm just curious 11 what their ratio is, I want to know. 12 MR. MONAGHAN: Yeah, I appreciate that, 13 absolutely. And we'll cover a little bit more on 14 traffic and parking in just a moment, so definitely 15 happy to take more questions and feedback on that. 16 MR. KESSLER: And the tree assessment, we 17 understand that the town has engaged a tree consultant 18 to assess the health of the trees onsite. Our 19 understanding is that may have been completed. We haven't see the study yet, but happy to continue to 20 21 collaborate and discuss the results of that over the 22 next couple of weeks. 2.3 And then just lastly, we'll cover this in a

moment, but Colonial Terrace's heritage and we

24

2.3

June 1, 2021

understand that that is an important piece to the community and we do have some ideas and a plan around that as well.

So traffic and parking, we know this is a concern locally. We do feel that the current parking ratio we're proposing of 108 is adequate based on our existing portfolio of senior housing, primarily in Ohio and Pennsylvania. We understand that the Board may say that that's not local, it's not New York, and that is a totally valid piece of feedback and that's kind of what we are doing, Member Kessler, is looking at some of the comparables locally and we'll have I think some more robust data to share in the next meeting.

We do feel though that the pretty robust services actually that the Morabito Senior Center offers will help to mitigate parking demand. They offer daily shuttle with property pickup and drop off, and a three times a week medical car service. So they're super helpful. We've spoken to Beth over there on the phone, and she's like they just really need to pick up the phone and call me and we're very flexible about scheduling pickups and drop offs.

weeks as well.

1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

2 That in addition to, as we all know, kind of the ubiquity of ride share services, and what we feel 3 4 is going to be a pretty prominent and nice looking bus 5 shelter, new bus shelter, which a walkway leading to it, will all kind of combine to mitigate some parking 6 7 demand. And then just here a note again, as I mentioned, there will be five intersections studied by 8 9 our consultant, Provident. And the scope was closely 10 formed with HVEA, the town's traffic consultant, so 11 we'll have results to share on that in the coming

MR. KIMMERLING: Is there staff associated with the building in terms of custodial staff and is the parking, that's inclusive of any parking for staff?

MR. MONAGHAN: Yeah, we should have -- we will have one full time property manager, who will live onsite. And we will have, you know, another one to three staff members, depending on what we feel is needed when we complete the building, who will be onsite at various hours and would need a parking space. So all said, it might be two to four spaces that would be needed at various times on various days.

But we still feel with management and guests and then kind of the intermittent exiting of residents throughout the day, there'll be freed up parking spaces that should satisfy demand there. This parking will not be permanent or reserved by space.

MR. KIMMERLING: And then just for like contractors who might need to work in the apartments or deliveries, where do they come in and how do they circulate around the property?

MR. MONAGHAN: They would come in in the same manor. I guess if there was, they'd come in in the same as any of the residents, so access off of Oregon Road. They would park in any spot available to them.

If there were significant capital improvements that would be needed to make for some reason, we would arrange for them to maybe access off of Eton Downs and use the emergency services lane and access the back of the building. That would just make sure we're not disrupting kind of the daily vehicular traffic onsite.

 ${\tt MR.}$  KESSLER: There are no assigned spots?

MR. MONAGHAN: No assigned spots.

MR. KESSLER: Okay.

MR. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

2.3

2.3

MR. KIMMERLING: And no like community services inside the building? There's no dining room, there's no medical office? There's no -- this is completely --

MR. MONAGHAN: We'll have some residential amenity rooms. There won't be any common dining. There's going to be a common room, a residential lounge. There'll be a fitness room and then courtyards. But if, yeah, there shouldn't be another space onsite that would present significant new traffic demand or parking demand.

MR. KIMMERLING: Could I just ask one more question.

MR. KESSLER: But is your report that you're going to produce about parking taking into account even in the other places, those extra people that may be working there, or coming onsite during a given day? Because the way you have it now is just parking ratio per unit.

MR. MONAGHAN: Right

MR. KESSLER: But that doesn't seem to take that into account.

MR. MONAGHAN: Utilization is what you're

1 June 1, 2021 2 implying? 3 MR. KESSLER: Yeah. 4 MR. MONAGHAN: Yeah. MR. KESSLER: So when you're making the 5 comparison are we going to see that comparison? 6 7 MR. MONAGHAN: So I think the answer to your 8 question is yes. And we anecdotally, so these 9 properties that we're displaying here are also not 10 permitted, so we don't really track parking 11 utilization data specifically because they're not 12 permitted. However, anecdotally, actually several of 13 those in Ohio our colleagues say they feel are over 14 parked. There are significant points in the day where there is available parking spaces, and they have not 15 16 had trouble and haven't yet. There haven't been 17 issues, so. 18 MR. KESSLER: I would argue though, in your 19 comparison, not to get too detailed here, that the 20 average age of the people in each one of those would 21 make a difference in your ratios. That there's another 22 variable here that you're not considering. 2.3 MR. MONAGHAN: Okay. That's fair. The --

MR. KESSLER: If everybody moved in here and

24

2.3

they're 55 years old, I don't know how long those other entities have been around, but I think age would have an affect also, and also access to public transportation and other things as well.

MR. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

MR. KESSLER: I just -- it's a little overly simplistic for my taste.

MR. MONAGHAN: Okay. Noted, thank you, Member Kessler. I will just note for the Board all five of those properties do have an age restriction of 55 plus, so they're not 62 plus or in some way different from an age restriction, but I hear you that, if you know it's a 20 year old property, folks may be aging in place and their vehicular needs may differ, so understood.

MR. KESSLER: That's my point.

MR. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

MR. KIMMERLING: Can we just look again, sorry, at the parking spaces --

MR. KEHOE: You want a plan or in the chart?

MR. KIMMERLING: On the plan. Yeah, so just a question because I'm looking at this one here. There are three exits and entrances to the building, right.

2.3

There's the front and then there's two sort of at the

MR. MONAGHAN: That's right.

MR. KIMMERLING: -- sort of tail ends, lowest. So regardless of whether that's fire code, I'm sure it is, or it will be, it seems like a long way to walk from certain parts of the parking lot to get into one of those. I don't know how that fits, and how that consideration fits into your plan, whether that should be differently located or two at the top and two at the bottom on those side flanks or, anyway, just a question. It seems a little inconvenient if you're parked, you know, on the side but up towards Oregon versus down one of the entrances. I'm assuming it's an entrance and exit, right, not just a fire exit?

MR. MONAGHAN: Yes, it will be like a key card access. Yeah, that's a valid point and we'll definitely consider it in our design. It is a tough thing to solve for, just given the parking needs on the site and needing to accommodate the footprint of both the building and the parking, but absolutely we'll be looking into that as we get a little bit further into vertical design.

1

24

	,
2	MR. KIMMERLING: Cool. And then also, are
3	there entrances to the courtyard from the middle of
4	the building, or how do people enter the courtyard?
5	MR. MONAGHAN: Yes, you can see those
6	actually just faintly from kind of the core. You'll
7	see two pads coming out on the right and the left.
8	MR. KIMMERLING: Oh, I see it.
9	MR. MONAGHAN: Yeah. So those are, yeah.
10	MR. KIMMERLING: Okay. Great. Thank you.
11	MR. MONAGHAN: No problem.
12	MR. KIMMERLING: Thanks.
13	MR. FOLEY: I have a few questions. On
14	traffic, Steve brought up earlier, main driveway that
15	exists now, that will be two way, in and out?
16	MR. MONAGHAN: That's right.
17	MR. FOLEY: And it comes out to Oregon Road,
18	which is between a traffic light at Eton and the town
19	hall traffic light?
20	MR. MONAGHAN: Yep.
21	MR. FOLEY: And currently, what's been there
22	has been a catering hall, which is not used every day,
23	and the traffic that sometimes flows out of there is

at night or weekend. I'm just concerned knowing the

2.3

June 1, 2021

corridor and having lived here 50 years, and experiencing the traffic jam just getting to the meeting earlier that was unusual, would it be, would the traffic study consider the safety of in and out?

MR. MONAGHAN: Oh, absolutely, yeah. And -MR. FOLEY: Because an alternative, thinking
out of the box maybe just to come in from Oregon Road
and maybe exit out the Eton Downs, which is now only
emergency, but that would bring the cars down to a
controlled intersection at the traffic light at Oregon
and Eton Downs.

MR. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

MR. FOLEY: Just thinking of it, and if you've been in the traffic, or just traveling that route, you know what I'm talking about.

MR. MONAGHAN: Yeah, absolutely.

MR. FOLEY: Just to consider it, because it would be a higher volume. I assume your study will show them which currently exists there. Second, the places, we'll see it in the traffic study, right, where the counters are or will be? We noticed one on Oregon Road already, near the site, but how far east will they go? Do you know yet? Or the study will show

1 June 1, 2021 2 us? 3 MR. MONAGHAN: Yeah, the study is going to 4 show us all that, Member Foley. MR. FOLEY: I hope it considers --5 MR. MONAGHAN: We're going to be, yeah, happy 6 7 to analyze safety, traffic flow in and out, as well as the larger kind of impacts, you know, across 8 9 intersections. MR. FOLEY: Because traffic comes from the 10 11 east more so than it has in the past ten years, from 12 the Putnam Valley Oregon Corners area. The back 13 retaining wall, Jerry, would it be similar to what you 14 did, if I'm not wrong, at Shoprite, in the back, on 15 Route six? 16 MR. SCHWALBE: Yeah. I mean we don't have the 17 final details, but it would be similar to that. 18 MR. FOLEY: It would be attractive and yet --19 MR. SCHWALBE: Yeah, more like -- it's 20 obviously going to be a pre-cast product, but the idea 21 is to have the image look like a stone wall kind of

> Geneva Worldwide, Inc. 256 West 38th Street, 10th Floor, New York, NY 10018

MR. FOLEY: And with the gardens proposed in

thing, you know, maybe some color to it, yeah.

the back, it would be a safe area with the --

22

2.3

24

1	June 1, 2021
2	MR. SCHWALBE: Yeah, definitely lit.
3	Obviously, the courtyards are facing that way too.
4	MR. FOLEY: Okay.
5	MR. SCHWALBE: So everyone can see what's
6	going on down there.
7	MR. FOLEY: Okay. Last question, you said
8	MR. SCHWALBE: There's no traffic there. The
9	idea is to keep it more just pedestrian use.
10	MR. FOLEY: Yeah. You said there would be no
11	dining facilities in the building?
12	MR. MONAGHAN: There will be kitchens in
13	every unit.
14	MR. FOLEY: Oh, so it would be up to the
15	individual
16	MR. MONAGHAN: That's right, yeah.
17	MR. FOLEY: or rentee to provide?
18	MR. MONAGHAN: That's right.
19	MR. FOLEY: Okay. But there would be a common
20	area where they could gather?
21	MR. MONAGHAN: Absolutely.
22	MR. FOLEY: Okay. Alright. Alright. Thank
23	you.
24	MR. MONAGHAN: Yes, on to the Colonial

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

Terrace heritage, we've heard from the town board, members of the planning board as well as in the meeting we conducted with the Waterbury Manor residents that this place holds some cultural, it holds a place in the cultural consciousness if you will, locally.

So, we've thought a little bit about how we can go thinking about and maintaining this legacy of Colonial Terrace. We will commit to documenting the legacy of Colonial Terrace with local experts. We've spoken with Jeff Canning of the Historical Society. He's expressed particular interest in helping us with this. We will also incorporate kind of a commemorative wall in the building lobby honoring the legacy of Colonial Terrace and we also feel that kind of the architectural vernacular that we are designing onsite is kind of in the tradition of Colonial Terrace and specifically expresses some of its most distinct features with the columned portico entry and the entry drive and kind of circular access to the building entry. So we do feel like we want to be collaborative community partners in this way and this site is very conducive to this type of redevelopment. But we

2.3

June 1, 2021

understand that this place does hold kind of a special place in a lot of people's hearts and want to do our best and try and honor that.

MR. FOLEY: On the historical, I'm glad you're talking with Jeff and the society, plus there's the town preservation advisory committee, whatever it's called. But the Historical Society up the road in Cortlandtville, we did a story a year or two ago in our newsletter, which I could forward to you. I think I sent it to our board members a few months ago, because one of the, Valerie, who used to be on the Board, was interested about the history and the families of Colonial Terrace, so anything you could do along preserving anything, or whether it's an area inside the new building similar to what we did at the Hollow Brook Golf Club, with the history of the Hollow Brook, you know, where the Hollow Brook is.

MR. MONAGHAN: I'll take a look at that. I didn't know about that. So that will be another visit I will make locally, absolutely.

MR. FOLEY: The old golf club and what kind of events, historical events that happened there.

MR. MONAGHAN: Thank you, okay.

1	June 1, 2021
2	MR. FOLEY: So anything you do there, and
3	I'll get you the newsletter, copy of that story.
4	MR. MONAGHAN: I appreciate that. Thank you,
5	Member Foley.
6	MR. KIMMERLING: Madam Chair, I'd like to
7	make a motion.
8	MS. TAYLOR: Please.
9	MR. KIMMERLING: That we schedule a site
10	visit for the 27th of June and a public hearing for
11	the July 6th meeting.
12	MS. TAYLOR: Thank you. Can I have a second
13	on that?
14	MR. KESSLER: Second.
15	MR. FOLEY: Second.
16	MS. TAYLOR: Okay. On the question, all in
17	favor?
18	MULTIPLE: Aye.
19	MS. TAYLOR: Opposed? Okay. So we'll see you
20	on what, on the 27th?
21	MR. MONAGHAN: Thank you all, and I'll see
22	you on the 27th.
23	MS. TAYLOR: Okay.
24	MR. MONAGHAN: I appreciate your time this

1	June 1, 2021
2	evening.
3	MS. TAYLOR: Okay. Thank you.
4	MS. DECKER: Motion to adjourn at 8:55 p.m.
5	MS. TAYLOR: So moved.
6	MR. KIMMERLING: Just say it, yeah. We're
7	adjourned. Thank you.
8	MR. KESSLER: It doesn't have to be voted on.
9	(The public board meeting concluded at
10	8:55 p.m.)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

## CERTIFICATE OF ACCURACY

I, Devin Turpin, certify that the foregoing transcript of the board meeting of the Town of Cortlandt on June 1, 2021 was prepared using the required transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Certified By

Devin Turp

Date: July 2, 2021

GENEVAWORLDWIDE, INC

256 West 38th Street - 10th Floor

New York, NY 10018