

Cynthia states that Steve Bliss and Kevin McKenna came in to meet with her, and mentioned they were going to resubmit new Plans showing a three-lot subdivision. Cynthia states she noticed there is still a private road being proposed. Cynthia is not concerned about the width of the common easement area. Cynthia refers to the width of the road and questions whether there needs to be as much disturbance and paved area considering there will only be three lots. There is a discussion about possibly calling this a driveway instead of a private road. The last time the Applicant came before the Board, they were proposing a five-lot subdivision. Cynthia states that back then, the Town Engineer, Applicant, and herself had attended a Meeting with the Fire Commissioner's. At that time there were concerns about the proposed long road, the proposed width, as well as maneuvering. Cynthia states that is why we are still seeing a private road width. Cynthia is not sure, but states if we reconsidered this as a driveway, and introduced a couple of pullovers, it may be better for the environment and there would be a lot less cut and fill. Cynthia states the Applicant is looking for direction from the Board tonight. Cynthia asked Frank Annunziata to attend our Meeting tonight, as he was at the Fire Commissioner's Meeting a year or two ago.

Cynthia states she did a little research on how we handled past situations involving large pieces of property having a few lots, and very long access routes. Cynthia refers to the Tompkins Subdivision off of Hardscrabble Road where the access route is 2,500 feet in length and it services four lots. In that situation they showed a 50 foot right of way but they only were required to construct a driveway. The Plat clearly states that if they ever were to have more than four lots then the driveway would not be sufficient and the Planning Board would have to reconsider it. Cynthia refers to the Veduta Del Lago Subdivision which started off as a 2,000 foot driveway to a single family home. Later when it went through a re-subdivision for three lots the Planning Board increased the width of pavement to 15 feet. Cynthia believes there was a 30 foot right of way. Cynthia refers to the Keeler Lane Subdivision which had two private driveways that were 2,000 feet in length. One driveway services three lots and the other services five lots. Cynthia states that once again they had wide easements or right of ways along the private driveways. Cynthia brought copies of the maps with her tonight for the Board and Applicant to see. Cynthia states that we may learn from these subdivisions. Cynthia refers to the Map submitted by the Applicant and states she believes the distance from Hawley Road to the driveway for the last house is just over 1,000 square feet. Mr. Gould agrees. Cynthia states it looks like about 16 feet of pavement is being proposed. Cynthia asks when the 700 or 800 feet is done for the last house, what size is being proposed? Mr. Bliss states twelve. Mr. Gould states the common driveway has two, three foot gravel shoulders in order to allow two vehicles to pass. Gary confirms it will be 22 feet altogether. Cynthia refers to the Veduta Del Lago Subdivision Map and states the driveway is very steep going up off of Route 116. The arrows point to all of the pullovers. The fine print states that the common driveway is increased to 15 feet all along. It may have started off as a private driveway of 12 feet, and when the subdivision was approved, it was increased to 15 feet with the pullovers. This is a case of a very steep road going up. Sonja asks if that subdivision has a cul-de-sac at the end. Cynthia states yes they do, and she is not sure why. Cynthia states that it is interesting to see the frequency of the pullovers, and is not sure if anything is gained by so many. Charlotte states it is a nice way to do it in order to keep the road narrow. Cynthia states that the Keeler Lane Subdivision did not have any pullovers.

Cynthia asks Frank if he has any words of wisdom. Frank states that when he looked at the latest submittal he believed a private driveway was being proposed, because there is no right of way showing easements. Frank states he did not find any standards in the Code for private roads or common driveways. Frank states his main concern is related to the length of the road, and the width may be adjusted later. Frank states the first 500 feet off of Hawley Road comes into play where there is a 14% grade slope for part of it. At the bottom where the driveway meets Hawley Road there is a 4% apron. If we measure it against the Town standards, the requirement is 2%. If we measure it as a driveway there is not a standard. The proposal is a bit steep, and the turn is rather sharp. Frank measured it to be approximately 50 feet at the centerline radius. Referring to the Code that we have for a road meeting another road, it should be coming off 100 feet at no less than 75 degrees. The closer you can get to 100 degrees or 90 feet the better. Frank refers to the vertical curve in the

bend and states it is shorter than what would be required if it were to be a road. It looks like it is being proposed at 130 feet, and it should be 150 feet. If the apron is lowered a bit to maybe 3%, which a lot of towns use as a standard, the vertical curve would need to be 165 feet. Frank states there is another short vertical curve a little further up the road. Frank states if this were considered to be a driveway, the 14% would comply. Frank refers to the 4% apron at the bottom and states there is no driveway standard he could find so we would have to say it complies. Frank could not find a standard on a minimum, so the 50 foot centerline radius at the bottom, as well as the vertical curve would comply, if this were to be called a road, all of the previous items he mentioned would not comply.

Cynthia refers to the very first issue regarding the 4% grade and states we would need the Superintendent of Highways to weigh in, as that would be part of the regulations for a driveway cut. Frank states that it would be a road standard as part of the subdivision regulations. The Superintendent of Highways would be interested in it, but it would not be for maintenance, it would be a design/safety issue. Frank states the Board should keep in mind that there is no absolute safe or unsafe road. It is a matter of degrees and opinions. The Board's job is to balance these issues out, along with the environmental issues. Frank states the last version had a straight forward road with 10% maximum, which had more cuts.

Frank refers to the retaining walls that are being proposed. Frank did not understand the cross section in terms of width and states there were no details on the Plans. Frank states it is being proposed at 22 feet wide with a 16 foot traveled way. Frank was not sure what the three feet on each side were being proposed for. Cynthia confirms that is a proposed gravel shoulder. Cynthia asks the Applicant if with the gravel shoulders, a car could pass a fire engine. Mr. Gould states that yes, a car would be able to pass a fire engine, or two fire engines could pass each other. Frank states that his notes from the last Meeting with the Fire Department indicated a request for an 18 foot wide road width. Cynthia states at that point, the proposal was for a five lot subdivision. Mr. Bliss states that the Fire Department suggested the shoulder, so we had a 12 foot wide road with two three foot gravel shoulders, for a total of 18. Mr. Bliss states they are assuming this to be a private driveway. Cynthia states it has been called a road. Mr. Bliss states it will be a three lot subdivision. He refers to a document entitled "Town of North Salem Private Road Versus Private Driveway Standards". Cynthia states that document was drafted, but never adopted. Cynthia states the document has been referred to in some instances, and as far as she knows, the Board always relied upon the advice of the planning consultants and engineers, which is why she brought in the samples of other subdivisions so we may learn from them. Cynthia asks the Board how they feel. Gary states he is fine with the driveway, and the six foot shoulders. He is not sure what an appropriate width for the road itself should be. There is a discussion about the suggestion by the Fire Department to have having places to pull over. Cynthia is not sure which is better for the environment, and talks about having everything a little bit smaller, with a few pullover areas. Charlotte also talks about having the shoulders. Gary asks if it has to be 18 feet wide no matter what. Frank states that a driveway has to be a minimum of 12 feet. Gary asks Mr. Bliss what his preference is. Mr. Bliss states they are amenable to a 12 foot road, while maintaining a 3 foot shoulder on either side, as well as the pullovers. Charlotte states they do not need the pullovers if they have the shoulders. Mr. Bliss states they have spots where shoulders could be located. Gary states that sounds like the most environmentally friendly way to go. Cynthia asks what pavement size we are looking at here. Mr. Gould states 16%. Frank has concerns about the narrowness of the road width and would like to obtain the opinion of the Fire Department. Cynthia states that Veduta Del Lago has 15 feet of paved area with the pullovers. She is not sure about the shoulders. Gary states the Fire Department suggested 18 feet. Mr. Bliss states yes, that is what they mentioned when we met with them. Gary asks why we are concerned about recommending something this narrow. Cynthia states it would be twelve, three and three. Frank states we talked with the Fire Department about 18 feet for the traveled way. We probably talked about shoulders on the side.

Frank is not sure what is being proposed in terms of drainage. The drainage and swales are discussed. Cynthia states that we are talking about two fewer lots. There is a suggestion about the Applicant going to meet with the Fire Commissioners with two alternatives. One showing the 12 foot road, with the three foot shoulders

and pullovers, and the other with the wider road. Cynthia does not like to see so much disturbance and pavement. Frank understands that and talks about getting below 18 feet, and then having stabilized shoulders, such as grass. Frank would like to see what is being proposed in regards to drainage off the road, as there are steep slopes. Frank states it becomes an issue when cars leave the road. We would need to know the cross section dimensions. Gary asks if the 18 feet would only apply to driveways. Frank states that the safety concerns are there regardless. It is almost like looking at it in terms how it will function. Cynthia talks about the possibility of bringing down the amount of disturbance with the width and asks if that will improve the 14% slope, maybe down to 13%. Cynthia asks Frank if that will help the situation. Cynthia states it will need more cut and fill. Frank agrees, especially along the grade. There is a discussion about having a section to take the cut down and maybe that would improve the disturbance situation. Frank states yes, it is possible, except the grade is only one issue. Frank states he is almost more concerned with the other issues in terms of the steepness of the slope in terms of the flow going out to the road. Cynthia states the 12% does bother her also and talks about it being brought down. Frank asks if that is the best sight distance, and if that is why the entrance was located there? Cynthia states that Roger Schalge the prior Town Engineer from Hahn put the Applicant through variations regarding the cut. Cynthia states that if we go back and look at the history of this Application, that is the best location. Frank asks if the location had been moved. Mr. Bliss states it did move a tiny bit due to the stormwater management design. Cynthia asks if the location has moved since the last time they looked at it. Mr. Gould states it has moved a few feet. Frank talks about moving the entrance, and states that going up on the road there is less elevation to deal with. Frank talks about lengthening the road a little bit to get more of a platform. Frank states it is very important where the sight line is.

Cynthia asks Mr. Bliss if he has this current version engineered out as far as the stormwater. Mr. Bliss states that Westchester County has come back and looked at all the septic fields for the three lots. He is not sure whether they have totally signed off. Mr. Gould states there were a few minor comments from Westchester County. They did provide us with positive feedback in our Pre-Application Meeting. We are approximately 85% complete as far as the drainage stormwater layout based on the new regulations. Cynthia confirms the comments were based on this new layout. Cynthia asks if Frank would like to see the Plan submitted to Westchester County. Frank states it would be best to narrow down the road layout first. Cynthia states something should be put together for Frank to look at, as well as the Fire Commissioner's. Cynthia asks if the Applicant needs further direction. Mr. Bliss states that they have spent a lot of time on the entrance and that is the spot that works, as far as where the private road meets Hawley Road. Mr. Bliss states that going down to the private driveway, they thought was an improvement over the old road, as there would not be as much cut and fill. Cynthia states the Applicant has heard Frank's concerns. Mr. Bliss states it is one thing to say it, and it is another thing to resolve it. We are limited by the lay of the land. Cynthia states that is why this is a difficult site. Mr. Bliss states they understand. Mr. Gould refers to the road layout and asks Frank whether it is more important to have the 2% grade at the beginning rather than having the short distance at 14%. Frank states they don't need to go all the way to 2%, and suggests maybe 3%. Frank states the tangent should be as long as possible. Frank talks about the first curve being moved back. Frank asks if the Board has determined whether this will be called a private road or a common driveway. Cynthia would prefer to call it a common driveway. Both Charlotte and Gary agree. Cynthia states that does not mean that the Board will not weigh in on details. Cynthia states this will provide more flexibility for there not to be as much disturbance of cut and fill, as well as trying to achieve some of the items Frank has pointed out. Cynthia states that Frank has not looked at the stormwater yet, which may change items drastically. Frank confirms the Board agrees that the travel way itself does not have to be more than 18 feet, and it could be less. Frank states that 6 feet could be saved from the shoulders. Frank does not see the point of having 6 feet of gravel. Frank talks about the drainage being proposed off the traveled way, where a shoulder will be located. This will either be grass or impervious surface which will allow grass to grow through. Charlotte asks if a shoulder may be installed if there were 12 feet of pavement. Frank states maybe, it would cut down on the traveled way. Additional turnarounds are discussed. Frank states that gravel is hard to maintain. Gary talks about surfaces that will absorb the water. Mr. Bliss talks about substituting pavers instead of the gravel. There is discussion about a

12 foot road, as well as three feet of pavers on each side. Frank again talks about gravel providing an extra area for cars possibly to go off on, and states for a long term perspective, having a stabilized grass surface provides the same kind of absorption. Gary states that over the course of a year, there may be six instances where cars go off the gravel, especially with only three driveways and three homes. Sonja talks about building something in, in case it fails. Cynthia states that according to our Code a private road has to have 18 feet of pavement. The Board would like to see what the Fire Department has to say. Mr. Bliss asks whether they should meet with the Highway Superintendent. Cynthia states we will ask the Highway Superintendent to attend the meeting with the Fire Department.

Cynthia confirms we will need five copies of the new Plans. A copy will go to the Fire Commissioner's, Frank, Sonja, Cynthia, and Project File, and then a meeting may be set up. Cynthia asks Frank how much detail he will need at this point. Frank would like to see detail, and he is not sure how much detail the Fire Commissioner's will need. Frank asks the Applicant to take a look at the sight lines, and the retaining wall close to the road. Frank refers to the turnarounds and would like to see vehicle turning movements. Mr. Gould will provide details on the turning areas.

3. Fuelco: Mark Kornhass (owner – Joseph Bryson)
Site Development Plan (location – 2 Fields Lane & Hardscrabble Road)

- Discussion of Project Status

Cynthia states that Mark Kornhass is here tonight to represent the Applicant. Mr. Kornhass had submitted a cover letter and disk which had been circulated to the Board. A mini Meeting was held to highlight some of the issues. Cynthia asks Mr. Kornhass to provide the Board with a quick overview to let them know where this Application has been through and where it is.

Mr. Kornhass states they have been trying to square off issues with the Westchester County Department of Health (WCDOH). The New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) became involved after the WCDOH referred everything to them. We have submitted our Plans back and forth with both agencies, and are in pretty good shape. The last letter we received from the NYCDEP stated we were to submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), because in their view, this is considered to be a new gas station. Cynthia states as a point of clarification that our Board sees this as an Amended Site Development Plan. The NYCDEP is looking at it as a new Application. Cynthia states the terminology is important. Mr. Kornhass refers to the comments from the WCDOH regarding the restrooms and states they went from a public restroom to a private restroom because of the soil testing and potential septic issues on the Site. They have asked us to do an evaluation of the existing system, as well as a perforation test. Mr. Kornhass states they have been revising their Plans based on previous comments, most of them having to do with Planning. We made revisions regarding the canopy, signage, fences, landscaping, as well as the SWPPP. Mr. Kornhass states he had hoped his client would be here tonight which would have been helpful. Mr. Kornhass states that they changed the design of the canopy. There have been a lot of changes to the Building Plans. The Plans have been scrutinized by a lot of different entities, including the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). We feel the canopy style is much more in harmony with the building. Cynthia asks Mr. Kornhass to describe the surface of the canopy and asks whether it will be painted white. Cynthia asks whether the canopy will have shingles. Mr. Kornhass states it is a typical canopy. There will be a white band painted white, it may be metal. It will be very simple with clean lines. Mr. Kornhass confirms the trim on the building will be white. Cynthia asks where the canopy will hit compared to the roof. Mr. Kornhass states the building is approximately 18 feet high and the canopy will be lower at approximately 14 feet high.

Mr. Kornhass refers to the signage and states his client is now proposing this to be branded as a BP Gas Station. Gary asks if the tenant and the landlord have reached an agreement. Referring to the sign, Mr.

Kornhass states he understands that 32 square feet of signage is what his clients are proposing. There have been comments about the height of the sign.

Mr. Kornhass refers to the fences and states they were proposing six foot fences to wrap around the parking lot on both sides of the building. He talks about possibly eliminating the fence. Comments were also made that perhaps we could change the size to three feet instead of six. Mr. Kornhass states that they would have to reduce the size anyway because he does not believe the regulations allow a six foot fence in a front yard. Mr. Kornhass states they do not have a problem with a three foot fence.

Mr. Kornhass refers to landscaping and states there have been a lot of comments about this, especially the lack thereof. Mr. Kornhass states he has seen a reference to 250-73 which had to do with a planted strip with fencing around the property. Cynthia states that if this were a brand new Site those are the minimum specifications that would apply across the board. This is an Amended Site Development Plan for a pre-existing use. We have established it as such. Cynthia took a look at the Site Development Plan for the Shell Gas Station as far as what they were put through when installing their canopy. Cynthia states that fencing and heavy screening requirements did not happen on that Site. Cynthia assumes the Planning Board took the same position, that it was an Amended Site Development Plan, where they looked at the items that were actually changing, and if the Applicant is going to make that change, then they need to apply today's standards. Cynthia states that Gary was on the Board at that time and asks him if he recalls what was done. Gary states that the incrementals were dealt with. Cynthia asks who is proposing the fencing, is it the client or the ZBA. Mr. Kornhass states they would like to take down the existing fencing. Cynthia states that originally the fencing was asked for because of the parked vehicles, and asks if that is still going to be a parking lot. Mr. Kornhass states no, not for the storage of vehicles to be worked on. This area will be for customers of the convenience store. Cynthia states there is an issue with headlights, the fence does not have to be six feet tall. There is a discussion about whether this could be accomplished with trees or shrubs instead. Cynthia asks Sonja what her opinion is. Sonja suggests evergreens that will stay green throughout the seasons. Gary asks Mr. Kornhass who his client is. Mr. Kornhass states that his client is Fuelco. Gary asks if Fuelco is the tenant or the landlord. Mr. Kornhass states Fuelco will be a tenant at the Site. Gary asks if an agreement has been reached with the landlord. Mr. Kornhass states he believes they are in some kind of contract. Cynthia states the landlord is here tonight. Mr. Kornhass states it has been an ongoing process for a while. He believes they have reached some type of contractual agreement. Cynthia asks Gary if his question is whether the landlord approves of this Site Plan being put forth. Gary states partly. Gary states this has been ongoing for more than three years. Mr. Kornhass will discuss these changes with Fuelco, as well as Joe Bryson, the Landlord. Cynthia states that the Board is flexible. They would much rather see something more natural. They do not want to see a six foot fence. The goal is to try to offer an appropriate screening for the headlights of the vehicles.

Cynthia states that at one point there was a proposal to relocate the storage tanks, and asks if that is still the case. Mr. Kornhass shows where the original fuel tanks were located before they were removed. We were proposing to relocate the tanks due to a violation of the health code relating to the well. Mr. Kornhass states that with the convenience store, we need to increase the well radius to 200 feet which has prompted us to move the well over to the corner of the property. This will allow us to take the tanks and put them back in where they originally were. Cynthia confirms with Mr. Kornhass that there will be a decrease in disturbance. Mr. Kornhass states there are two types of disturbance he classified, which are shown in shaded areas of blue and yellow on the Plan. Mr. Kornhass states that disturbance for repair and maintenance are highlighted in blue, and the other is a new disturbance to the site, which he has highlighted in yellow. Cynthia asks Mr. Kornhass if he is making this distinction for our Code, or for Stormwater. Mr. Kornhass states it is for Stormwater Management and SWPPP Plans. Frank asks Mr. Kornhass if the areas shaded in blue qualify for stormwater mitigation. Mr. Kornhass refers to the 5,000 square foot threshold. We looked at that threshold originally when trying to determine what the new disturbance is, and what is maintenance and repair that

would maybe not be looked at as a new disturbance. Mr. Kornhass states that the resurfacing, restoration work, and replacement of the retaining wall are approximately 6,237 square feet of disturbance. The new disturbance that would be created due to the canopy, drainage, refuge container, cooler addition, and possible changes to the driveway are approximately 2,199 square feet. The new disturbance is less than 5,000 square feet. The total Site disturbance, including the restoration is over 5,000 square feet. Mr. Kornhass refers to the asphalt and states it would need to be replaced when the canopy and the pumps are installed. Mr. Kornhass shows an old retaining wall on the Plan that is in failure, and needs to be replaced. Mr. Kornhass shows a previously approved storage area on the Plan and states they would like to add crushed stone, as the storage area in the original approval from 1992 had a grass surface. Frank states the Planning Board does have discretion, and the Applicant may not need, by our Code, post construction practices. Cynthia asks if there is room for post construction practices. Frank states they do show it. Mr. Kornhass talks about creating a little more additional impervious surface due to the driveway improvements. Mr. Kornhass states he took the roof drains and added in an infiltration system. Mr. Kornhass states that NYCDEP may require us to capture and treat the runoff from the asphalt. Cynthia asks where they would do that. Mr. Kornhass states they may be able to do this, if the well is moved over to the corner. Mr. Kornhass states that they are very limited on this Site, and it may be considered as an alternative practice. Frank confirms Mr. Kornhass is proposing infiltration. Mr. Kornhass states it will be clean water that comes off of the canopy deck. Mr. Kornhass does not know what type of treatment they could do. They may have to submit a Plan to the NYCDEP in order to receive their feedback. Frank states that if the NYCDEP pushes the Applicant, they may want to consider parameter sand filters. Mr. Kornhass states he is not crazy about parameter sand filters, but they may be an option. Frank talks about the Planning Board possibly agreeing that the new impervious surface, and what they are proposing for the treatment of the canopy runoff as enough of a trade off, and they would not require additional practices over and above that. Frank states that beyond that it will be driven by the comments of other agencies.

Frank requests a breakout of the disturbance areas on the next submittal. Mr. Kornhass provides Frank with a copy of a form which will be in their SWPPP which shows a breakout of the disturbance areas.

Cynthia asks Mr. Bryson if they previously had a free standing sign. Mr. Bryson states that they had a sign on the corner. Cynthia asks how tall the sign was. Mr. Bryson states it was approximately 12 feet tall. Cynthia states that Mr. Kornhass should tell his client that the Board would be more inclined to see a sign that is between 8 to 10 feet tall. Cynthia states that a comment at one point was the concern about having the sign be seen when people are traveling on I-684. Cynthia states by the time someone would see the sign, it would be too late for them to get off the exit. There is a suggestion to have a directional sign right on I-684. There is discussion about the GPS units being programmed to provide drivers with a list of gas stations. Ann Morley states the trees are much larger now than they were many years ago. Sonja asks if there will be a light on the sign. Mr. Kornhass is not sure at this point. He does not believe they are permitted to have an internally lit sign. Cynthia confirms that internally lit signs are not permitted. There is a discussion of indirect lighting. There is a discussion about timers. Cynthia states that lighting the sign is not necessary. There is discussion about locating the pricing at the bottom of the sign. Mr. Kornhass thought the Shell Station sign was 32 square feet. Cynthia will check her notes on that, and refers to the Code which states that a free standing sign may not exceed eight square feet. Sonja states she wondered where this humungous sign was coming from. Mr. Kornhass confirms the Board is not recommending a sign larger than eight square feet. Mr. Kornhass states that the previous Getty sign was 29 square feet. Cynthia states that was pre-existing. Cynthia states that any sign proposed to be over eight square feet would require a variance from the ZBA. The question would be whether the Planning Board would give a favorable recommendation to the ZBA for a larger sign. There is a discussion about having a nice sign design, including lower plantings, in conjunction with the possibility that the Planning Board may agree to a larger sign. Gary states a preference closer to 8 square feet, than 32 square feet. Cynthia refers to a lovely sign the Croton Falls Fire District installed, which has a stone wall around it.

Cynthia asks Mr. Kornhass if he has any other planning issues he needs direction on before putting this package together. Cynthia states she knows Mr. Kornhass is dealing with other agencies, but suggests everything come into the Planning Board so they may do their completeness review, and referral. Now the message to the other agencies will be that this is the Plan the Town is looking at, and that the Town wants everybody to review. That might help to pull this all together with the other agencies. Cynthia encourages Mr. Kornhass to make a submittal as soon as possible. Gary states that the Board is looking at this as an Amendment, and if the materials are submitted all in one step, it can't hurt the Applicant in trying to obtain approvals. Cynthia states that is a very good point. This is an Amended Site Plan for a pre-existing use. Cynthia asks Frank if he has any other comments. Frank states no.

Mr. Kornhass refers to the proposed lighting and states there are no lights hanging below the canopy. There is a discussion about the height of the poles. Mr. Kornhass states the poles are proposed to be 14 feet tall, as well as sconces on the building. Cynthia asks if there is any other way to achieve the proper lighting, such as at a bollard level. Mr. Kornhass does not know whether they would obtain the proper light from a bollard. Cynthia confirms this lighting is being proposed so people may get safely from their cars into the building. Mr. Kornhass states the canopy lights will illuminate the front. Cynthia states the canopy lights will be substantial. Gary states there is a fair distance from the last parking spot to the building. Charlotte asks how high the Salem Golf Club poles are. Gary states that 14 feet poles seem tall. Mr. Kornhass asks if there are any poles locally he may view. There is discussion about the prior lighting being incorporated into the fence and directed down. Mr. Kornhass states that based on the conversation tonight, he will speak with his client about the lighting. Cynthia states we do not want to see the lights travel off the property.

Cynthia thanks Frank for being here tonight to provide guidance, and confirms there are no further questions for him.

4. Discussion Regarding Chapter 89 Fill, and Chapter 189 Sand & Gravel/Tree Removal

This discussion will be continued at the June 1st Meeting.

5. Next Meetings:

- Regular Meeting – June 1, 2011
- Work Session – June 15, 2011 – discuss cancellation

REGULAR MEETING:

6. Comments from the Chair:

- Consider Referral of Subdivision Code Changes to the Town Board
- Signs

Cynthia states she is not sure the Board had a chance to review the two items she had e-mailed. Cynthia states the Subdivision Code change is one that Roland informed us we had to do for Finals. Cynthia added something to the Preliminary that she thought was necessary, and is in other Town Codes. Cynthia uses Salem Hills as an example and talks about the length of time between Preliminary, and when they actually came back for Final. Cynthia talks about adding in a 90 day check-in. Gary agrees. The number of extensions may not be limited at the end of Final.

Cynthia refers to the signs and there is discussion about adding height restrictions. There is a discussion about Planning Board Minutes – 05/18/11

all of the signs that do not require a permit, being brought down in size, and the length they may be up. There is a discussion regarding campaign signs. Cynthia states that elections are always held on Tuesdays. By stating that signs may be up for 10 days, they will be up for two weekends. Cynthia states they put up three separate signs for the Library fair. They went up one week before, and then were taken down. The restriction is for the signs to go up 45 days prior. There is a discussion about penalties. Cynthia states that Maureen takes the signs out. Gary talks about fining people. Cynthia states that Maureen calls people. Cynthia states she will try and put these Work Session items on the June 1st Meeting for discussion if the Agenda is not large, as she will be in Philadelphia from June 15th to the end of the month. Cynthia states the Board had talked about signs a long time ago.

Sonja asks whether we received comments from Bruce on Chapters 89 and 189. Cynthia states she had sent out an e-mail stating that she needed to finish the clean fill portion, and that Bruce was very busy, so this discussion will be continued at the June 1st Meeting. Gary confirms there will be no Work Session on June 15th.

7. Resolution:

Chairwoman motions to adjourn the Planning Board Meeting. Charlotte Harris seconds. All in favor. No opposed.