

for all the stormwater work, including the landscaping. Cynthia states the estimate is sent over to the Town Engineer and he confirms whether it is an appropriate amount. Cynthia states he usually boosts it up slightly to cover inspection costs. Mr. Gaudioso confirms the estimate should include stormwater work and landscaping and states no problem. Mr. Gaudioso states this was done for the Removal Bond.

Cynthia refers to the Removal Bond and states the reason it is not firm, and if memory serves her right, the \$32,000 response from the Town Engineer was based upon the tower and Verizon, and she does not think AT&T's incorporation onto the tower was included. Mr. Gaudioso states that is correct. Cynthia states we either have to modify the Bond to include AT&T or ask them to submit a separate Bond. Cynthia states the Town Attorney is not here tonight but she does not think there will be a problem with having a second Bond. Cynthia asks whether it would be easier to have one Bond which means the cost will be split. Mr. Gaudioso states it would be easier if AT&T did a separate Bond. Cynthia asks if there is a representative from AT&T here tonight. Anthony Morando comes forward. Cynthia states to Mr. Morando that he will need to submit an estimate on the removal of the AT&T equipment which will be forwarded to the Town Engineer, and he may adjust it slightly higher to cover the Town. Cynthia states the Planning Board will then accept the Bond and make a recommendation to the Town Board. Mr. Morando confirms the Planning Board will make a recommendation to the Town Board. Cynthia states the Town Attorney also signs off on the Bond prior to the recommendation. Cynthia states there will be two separate Removal Bonds, one from Verizon and one from AT&T.

Cynthia refers to the Draft Resolution and states Mr. Gaudioso had a few questions. Cynthia states to Mr. Gaudioso that this is the Board's Resolution. Mr. Gaudioso states he totally appreciates that. Mr. Gaudioso states that one of the required approvals on Page 8 is for a NYCDEP SWPPP approval and he does not believe NYCDEP has jurisdiction. Cynthia states she will run this by Frank Annunziata, and if he confers, that will be taken off.

Mr. Gaudioso states he had previously told the Board that Sabre, the tower manufacturer would prepare a more detailed branch engineering drawing and asks if they can refer to it on the Site Plan because that information will be provided by one engineer and the way the Draft Resolution reads it will be on the Plans from Tectonic. Christopher asks what page Mr. Gaudioso is on. Mr. Gaudioso states Page 9, Item 6. Cynthia suggests changing the wording to "to be provided by others". Mr. Gaudioso states that will be fine and that will also be noted on the Tectonic Plans.

Mr. Gaudioso goes back to the last bullet on Page 9 and states the intent for the battery back-up would be that there would not be diesel because it is covered someplace else. Mr. Gaudioso states that some of the carriers don't use generators at all but have battery back-up.

Mr. Gaudioso refers to Page 4 and states the only other concern has to do with the Fish and Wildlife Service regarding the bats. Mr. Gaudioso states the Fish and Wildlife restriction is that they cannot cut the trees, due to the potential bat habitat, between March 31st and October 1st and there is no way they will be able to get Plans signed and start the work between now and then. Mr. Gaudioso states he spoke with the Building Inspector and he will allow them to cut the trees only if the Planning Board specifically agreed to it and put it in their Resolution. Cynthia states that cutting the trees is so critical to the Planning Board review because they want to make sure that everything is marked in the field, inspected, and there is an understanding of how the trees are going to come down so other trees will not be damaged. Cynthia states she does not see how all of that may be accomplished in a short period of time. Mr. Gaudioso states the fallback position they have was based on the possibility that they could prepare a survey of the trees and show that to the Fish and Wildlife Service to see if they will agree to remove the cutting restriction. Mr. Gaudioso refers to the language in the Draft in regards to not impacting the bats based on the time limitation of the cutting. Mr.

Gaudioso talks about tweaking the language, unless the Fish and Wildlife Service allows them to cut the trees down, and then there would be no objection from the Planning Board. Mr. Gaudioso states he wants to make it clear for the SEQR process. Cynthia states she does not think there will be an issue with it, and asks Will his opinion. Gary asks if the trees have to be marked before getting an approval from the Fish and Wildlife Service. Mr. Gaudioso states they sent out a specialist yesterday to evaluate the trees to see if they were possibly bat habitat, and it was determined that only a handful of the trees are bat habitat. Mr. Gaudioso refers to the way the bark looks on the trees and states there is a whole standard on this. Mr. Gaudioso states the specialist went back to the Fish and Wildlife Service and feels fairly confident that the restriction will be removed. Mr. Gaudioso states worst case scenario is to perform a study with an acoustical monitor to see if there are bats in the trees when they go to cut them. Mr. Gaudioso states there is a process and they are happy to go through it, but he just wanted to talk with the Board about it. Christopher states his only suggestion will be to have ND3 on Page 4 modified slightly to clarify in case the Fish and Wildlife Service modify their rules. Chris states the language that exists is quite right. Will states a concern that this was not a part of the Public Hearing process as this is all new. Mr. Gaudioso states the restriction on the Plans is specifically based on the Fish and Wildlife Service and asks if the Planning Board could add a Condition in the Draft requiring them to submit the Approval to the Board when they receive it. Will states a suggestion for the Applicant to come back before the Board for an Amendment if they are successful with the Fish and Wildlife Service. Mr. Gaudioso asks if they would need to have a Public Hearing. Will states no. Cynthia states it would just be done by a Resolution. Mr. Gaudioso asks whether the Plans or Mylar's would need to be redone. Cynthia states no, the Board just amends the Resolution. Cynthia asks whether there is a note on the Plans. Will states this can be handled with the amendment.

Mr. Vicente clarifies that two removal bonds, and one escrow need to be submitted.

Cynthia asks the Board whether they have any further questions on the Draft. Christopher states it is quite thorough. Charlotte agrees.

Cynthia states to recap, on Page 4 reference will be made about the Referral to the ARB regarding their recommendations. Cynthia refers to the last paragraph on Page 4 and states she has no problem changing the fourth line up from the bottom to read "threatened or endangered species, particularly since the proposed tree removal will be restricted by the guidelines of the Fish and Wildlife Service". Cynthia states to Mr. Gaudioso that this does not give him the go-ahead.

Cynthia refers to Page 8 and states assuming our Town Engineer concurs, the second bullet under 8a will be removed, which indicates NYCDEP sign-off is needed on the SWPPP.

Cynthia refers to the last bullet on Page 9 and states the words "or batteries" will be added. Gary asks how long the batteries usually last for. Mr. Gaudioso states it depends on the usage, and four to six hours is standard, but it could be two hours if there was incredible usage, or sometimes more than eight hours. Gary asks whether there will be a generator. Mr. Gaudioso states Verizon and AT&T are both planning on generators and some of the carriers and Town emergency systems will have batteries as well as a back-up for generators, so he wanted to make sure it was clarified that batteries are okay.

Cynthia refers to the first bullet on Page 10 and states the date will be changed to March 11, 2015.

Cynthia refers to Page 11 and states the amount of \$32,000 is for Homeland and Verizon and a second Removal Bond from AT&T, to be confirmed by the Town Engineer, will be submitted. Will states he will revise the Draft when the estimate has been submitted.

Will states the same revision date of March 11, 2015 has to go in on Page 16.

Christopher states he would like the record to reflect that he was unable to attend the two Public Hearings, but he reviewed them online. Christopher apologizes to the Planning Board Members as well as the Applicants that he was unable to attend. Christopher states he has caught up and heard all of the comments from the Public Hearings and is prepared to cast a vote. Will confirms with Christopher that he has reviewed all of the materials.

Bernard refers to Page 17 and states that Robert Tompkins name should be taken off and his name should be added.

Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Accept the Approval for Homeland Towers, Verizon Wireless, and AT&T for a new cell Tower on the Bloomerside Cooperative Property Including Amendments Discussed this Evening. Gary Jacobi seconds. All in favor. No opposed.

2. **Hawley Woods:** Peter Gregory (owner – Hawley Woods, Ltd.)
Subdivision (location 396 – 404 Hawley Road)

- Consider Report From Planning Consultant
- Consider Report From Town Engineer

Cynthia states that Peter Gregory is here tonight and asks him to introduce the members of his team. Mr. Gregory states Steve Bliss, the Applicant, as well as Patrick Bliss, the Project Attorney is here tonight. Mr. Gregory states that Alan Pilch from Evans and Associates is also here tonight.

Cynthia states there are Reports from the Planning Consultant and Town Engineer. Cynthia states there are a few issues and the Board is trying to get this Project to a point of Completeness so they may move to the next step. Cynthia asks Mr. Gregory if he has any questions or concerns with what is being asked of him from either of the Consultants. Mr. Gregory states no. Mr. Gregory states they have had a chance to go through the Reports and in terms of the MDRA Memo, they will be able to clean up some of the language, and make corrections to the Plat. Mr. Gregory states the Wetland Permit Application was submitted, along with a set of Plans to the Building Department for distribution. Mr. Gregory states they have not heard back from the Building Department yet. Mr. Gregory states those materials were submitted to the Building Department after their submittal to the Planning Board. Mr. Gregory refers to the road widening and states they referred to them as easements, and they will refer to them as dedication strips instead, as well as revise and clean up the language in all of the easements. Mr. Gregory states they will add language back in that was asked for, and clarify some of the items between Hawley Woods and the Town.

Mr. Gregory states that Mr. Pilch will speak in regards to the Environmental Report.

Mr. Gregory refers to the Hahn Memo and states they provided additional details and will clarify on the plans where the items were called out and where they may be easily shown. Mr. Gregory states they are minor in nature, and can easily provide responses. Cynthia states that one of the items Frank has been asking for over the course of time is the detail on the retaining walls in the front. Cynthia refers to the Plan and states she believes this is going to be significant. Cynthia states she wants to make sure that when we go into the Public Hearing the Board understands exactly what this might look like and whether or not it is going to work. Cynthia states that personally she would like to see more detail and more of a visual, as to what this will look like on Hawley Road in terms of what two, nine foot walls are going to look like and whether or not the landscaping is actually going to work. Cynthia refers to the gabion mats and states there has got to be

something better. Mr. Gregory states their cuts range between six to nine feet and their deepest cuts are along the edge of the driveway. Mr. Gregory states he believes they are going to encounter rock, and what they may see is more of a rock cut on some of the deeper portions with some earth re-grading as it tapers back. Mr. Gregory states they will see rock in places as opposed to the walls. Cynthia states if you do hit rock, and still have to reinforce areas, how will the plantings work and live. Cynthia asks if there is an alternative to gabion mats. Mr. Gregory states yes, there is. Cynthia asks Mr. Gregory to work on that because going into a Public Hearing she does not think the Plan should show gabion mats. Christopher states that 18 feet is quite towering. Cynthia asks for a visual of what the view will look like from Hawley Road. Mr. Gregory states they have had this type of request on prior projects and can do something in that area. Cynthia states it will be helpful to the Board. Mr. Gregory refers to the walls that are on the individual lots. Cynthia states the closer to natural stone, such as the walls in this Town, will be the best, but if something different were used, the Board would need to see the landscaping and how it will hide the walls. Christopher refers to the 10 foot separation on the Plan and asks whether trees will be planted in between. Mr. Pilch states yes, that is correct, there will be pockets of soil that would be available for the plants, and fracturing of rock to provide drainage. Mr. Pilch states there may be some undercutting with the replacement of a planting soil mix. Cynthia states that 15 of one plant and 10 of another plant is being shown and asks whether something more natural and not so uniform could be suggested, so they will not look like office complex walls where everything looks the same in a row. Cynthia states she would like to see how this is going to look and suggests variations in height, in addition to plants that would drape over and cover the walls. Mr. Pilch states they will work on that.

Cynthia states we are going to have to wait for one more submission. Mr. Gregory states they will provide the requested materials in the next submission in terms of what the views will be from the road.

Cynthia states the next step will be to do the referrals to all of the agencies and set a Public Hearing.

3. Salem Golf Club: Steve Lopez (owner – Salem Golf Club)
Site Development Plan (location – 18 Bloomer Road)

- Consider Report From Planning Consultant
- Consider Report From Town Engineer

Steve Lopez states he is from Tim Miller Associates and he is the Planner on this Project. Mr. Lopez states that Ralph Peragine from TRC Engineers, Inc., as well as Luigi Demasi, from Goewey & Demasi Architects are with him tonight. Mr. Lopez states they have looked at the comments received by Hahn Engineering and the Town Planner and would like to touch on some of the items they have questions about. Cynthia states the biggest concern she has is putting two septic fields on a residential lot, which cannot be done. Cynthia states she isn't sure how it happened in 2004 without showing the lot line and now the Applicant is suggesting another septic field that is going to go onto a residential lot. Cynthia states she suggested to Todd Zorn that the easiest way to handle it is to remove the lot line and merge that lot to make it part of the Golf Course. Mr. Peragine states he believes that is a decision that the owners will have to make and is not something he can speak to. Cynthia states at this point if the Applicant is going to show the Board that they are proposing septic on that then they have to show how that can still be a viable lot. Cynthia states she doesn't think the Applicant wants to go through all of that work. Mr. Lopez states whether this is viable in the future or not is a future decision because if they went through proving that the lot was viable many things could change such as the Health Department could change their Regulations, the Town could change their Zoning, and we could go through a lot of effort, energy, and expense to prove that in 2015 this works with whatever development impacts we are imposing on the Site. Mr. Lopez states their concern is that at some point in the future the owners need to look at these two separate lots and make a decision about how they could realistically approach development, if they ever decide to develop. Cynthia states no, that is a free-standing residential lot and in

2004 when the addition was put on they showed a septic and received approval from the Health Department for septic on a residential lot and that wasn't shown on the Plans in 2004. Mr. Lopez does not understand what wasn't shown. Cynthia states that the septic was going on a separate lot. Mr. Peragine states that was not his firm's design. Cynthia states there would have been a discussion, first of all, as to whether the Health Department would allow that, and second of all if they do, we would have needed Easements from that lot. Cynthia states that happened back in 2004, and now the Applicant is showing it again. Mr. Peragine states they are suggesting an Easement in this particular case. Cynthia states we need to find out if the owners will get rid of the lot lines because that is the easiest way to do this, otherwise it will raise a lot of questions. Cynthia asks why the Board would look at another septic on this lot. Will states he doesn't know whether anything could be done by an Easement because we are dealing with a Conditional Use Permit for the property which needs to be encumbered on the other property as well. Will states to use the other property as part of a Conditional Use Permit you cannot just obtain an Easement in order to bi-pass the process.

Will states there are also other encroachments. Mr. Peragine refers to an existing gazebo. Will states he understands, and states the gazebo is over the line, and if that lot was created in a subdivision that would not have been able to happen because of the setbacks. Will states something is not jiving well. Cynthia states she did bring this to Mr. Zorn's attention. Mr. Peragine states he knows Mr. Zorn has been discussing this with the ownership. Cynthia states Mr. Zorn had concerns as to whether this would slow the process down and in her book she doesn't think it does. Cynthia states it can all be done at the same time and will require another filing to show the removal of the lot line, and merger. Cynthia states the sooner a decision is made the easier it will be for the Board to deal with this. Mr. Lopez states he understands the Chairwoman's position, and asks if it is the Board's opinion that the lot line issue has to be resolved. Cynthia states the 2004 approval still has to be dealt with. Will states the pre-existing does not seem to be reflective of the approvals the Board ever gave. Christopher states the Board needs to see historically what happened in 2004, and from what he is hearing, if there is an Easement to allow the septic to be on a separate lot, a copy should be provided. Cynthia states there is no Easement. Cynthia states it appears that it was approved because no one showed that there was a lot line there. Cynthia states maybe the Applicant thought that if the same people owned both lots they didn't have to worry about the lot line. Cynthia states there are multiple lots that make up the Golf Course but the two-acre lot is not one of the Golf Course lots, it is a free-standing residential lot that was created by a Subdivision back in 1966. Cynthia states it just happens to be owned by the same people. Gary states it is not owned by the Golf Course. Mr. Peragine states as he understands it, the lot is owned by the same corporate entity. Cynthia states it doesn't really matter, it is not on our official Tax Roll as part of the Golf Course. Cynthia states the lots that are mentioned in the Application are, and the other lot is a sub-standard two-acre residential lot. Mr. Lopez asks how this was approved in this location. Cynthia states maybe without people knowing that there was a lot line there. Mr. Lopez states separate from the lot line, if the septic was approved in this location, and there is one or more lot lines, wouldn't one assume that the Conditional Use was extended. Cynthia states not if the Planning Board didn't know that they were looking at a septic being proposed on another lot. Cynthia states the Mylar she looked at doesn't show the lot line. Cynthia asks if the septic was built in the place where it is indicated on the Mylar. Cynthia asks whether the Board is being shown an as-built or was the information picked up from the 2004 Plan. Mr. Peragine states the Surveyor picked it up from the as-built. Cynthia refers to the as-built she pulled from the Building Department files. Mr. Peragine states it looks like the same drawing the Surveyor used. Cynthia refers to the Mylar's she brought with her and states the septic approval is about four pages in. Cynthia states they show a setback line, but do not show a lot line, and she doesn't know why nobody picked that up. Mr. Peragine, Mr. Lopez, Mr. Demasi, and Will look at the Mylar's. Mr. Peragine states he sees the point the Chairwoman was trying to make, as the Mylar is not showing a separation line. Cynthia states when everybody signed the Mylar's no one knew there was a lot line there. Mr. Peragine states it shows the setback. Mr. Peragine states he cannot answer to that. Cynthia states none of us can, as we weren't there at the time. Mr. Peragine states his companies responsibility back in 2004 was the design of the Water Treatment System inside the building and

that is not something that would have received Site Plan Approval. Mr. Lopez states they will take these concerns back to the ownership.

Mr. Peragine refers to the MDRA Memo and states he had a few questions regarding Zoning requirements for completeness he would like to obtain clarification on. Mr. Peragine refers to the request in regards to providing a concept plan to show the angular parking. Mr. Peragine refers to Page 2, Item 2 and asks for an explanation of exactly is being asked for. Will states on the Parking Chart there was a 25% reduction listed and he is looking for a reference as to where that was granted. Mr. Peragine confirms with Will that this information would come from a prior Planning Board Resolution. Will states language should be provided with respect to what provision in the Code it relates to. Will asks whether the reduction will be applied to the total. Mr. Peragine states they are applying it to the existing which was previously approved and are now applying it to the new total. Will states an update should be done to be inclusive of all the parking. Cynthia states the Applicant is now proposing parking in an area that counted as part of the previous approvals required parking. Cynthia asks where the overflow will be moved to. Cynthia asks how Mr. Peragine is going to get the full count of parking spaces that are required. Mr. Peragine refers to a Section on the Plan and asks if it was deemed as overflow parking. Cynthia states yes, it was. Cynthia states she mentioned this to Mr. Zorn when they first met. Cynthia states she confirmed with Mr. Zorn that this is the area where people would park if they run out of spaces. Cynthia states when she pulled the Site Plan it is clearly identified as the overflow area. Cynthia states another overflow area will need to be shown in order to get to the count. Will states a diagram should be submitted which shows inclusively all of the parking on the Site that meets the total amount whether it be physically built, overflow/reserve, or permanent. Will states that right now the Applicant is just showing the front area. Cynthia refers to the Mylar's she brought with her tonight and states there is permanent parking in an area that the Applicant has not shown on their latest Plan. Cynthia states she thinks Mr. Peragine is going to need a copy of the signed Mylar's. Mr. Peragine states he would appreciate a copy. Cynthia points out the overflow areas on the Mylar. Cynthia states the Planning Board back then agreed to a total number of parking spaces, and wanted to see spaces built, but did not make it a requirement, it was understood that if the spaces were needed, they would be built, and that is where they would be located. Cynthia states when there is a huge tournament people do pull up in this area. Mr. Peragine states he cannot speak to the tournaments. Cynthia states now that the proposal is to make an area permanent parking, it is necessary to show where the overflow will be. Mr. Peragine states they were looking to construct the parking as part of the new development in order to accommodate the additional amount of lockers. Mr. Peragine states although there may not be additional members, they still have to accommodate it based on the amount of lockers and parking. Christopher asks what the total number of parking spots are on the new Plan. Cynthia states it is actually correctly listed on their Site Development Plan, but we are not seeing them because the Applicant is only showing us a portion of the Plan. Mr. Peragine states they had zeroed in on the area of work and the limits of work. Mr. Peragine refers to a comment from MDRA as to what the impact will be to 60 degree angle parking. Mr. Peragine states there will be a substantial loss in the number of parking spaces, and to incorporate end islands as was recommended, would result in a 25 space net, when they were previously at 32. Mr. Peragine refers to the second concept of putting in a linear island and states they would end up with a net of 32 spaces, however, they would be pushed 20 feet into the front yard setback. Will states he prefers the first option Mr. Peragine referred to on the Plan. Mr. Peragine states they are discounting the linear island because they feel they would encroach too far into the front yard. Mr. Peragine refers to perpendicular parking and states they would still encroach approximately nine feet. Christopher asks how many spaces there will be. Mr. Peragine states 27, so they are still at a loss. Mr. Peragine states their final option would be to have perpendicular parking with a retaining wall and then take a level of parking and pinch it back towards the existing lot, having a mountable curb, and pitching it back to the existing edge of the pavement so that the water will run the mountable curb. Mr. Peragine states they will have a 12 foot island with perpendicular parking and a 20 foot isle with one-way circulation. Mr. Peragine states they have suggested a small turn around. Mr. Peragine states there will be a minimal impact on disturbed areas. Mr. Peragine states if they

incorporate the end islands as has been suggested they are looking at a net of 30 parking spaces. Will asks whether there is a demand for the spaces. Mr. Peragine states he is not sure they need to physically have the spaces if they can agree on the proposed layout. Mr. Lopez states that membership is down and it is uncertain if it will ever go back up to where it was. Mr. Lopez states that Mr. Zorn did an analysis and even with the club membership being higher than it currently is, and the pool membership being what it is, if you look at what the Golf Course itself can accommodate, it is unrealistic to assume that the full membership of the golf community could ever be on the course at one time. Mr. Lopez refers to large tournaments and talks about a better way to control parking which he wanted to talk to the Board about. Mr. Lopez states he talked with Mr. Zorn about coming up with something that would work, and if there were to be a problem, some sort of mechanism could kick in, such as the Building Inspector telling the Golf Club they have exceeded a certain set parking bar, and he wants the construction of additional spaces to be implemented. Mr. Lopez states this could be incorporated into the Resolution. Mr. Lopez states to construct parking that may not be used will create a lot of stormwater runoff, and push the development and pavement closer to the road. Mr. Lopez states they prefer to work within the previously approved required paved parking and overflow parking. Will asks whether anyone has counts on parking lot usage in the last year or two. Mr. Peragine states he would need to defer that question to Mr. Zorn. Cynthia suggests that this information should be provided to the Board to demonstrate if there were tournaments or the like how many cars could be parked valet-style in a utility-type area. Mr. Peragine confirms Cynthia is referring to the maintenance area. Will states they will need to come up with a Plan that has the number of spaces, whether built or reserved, to accommodate compliance. Will talks about weekend parking and states there may be a need for more spaces for the people just desiring to use the pool. Mr. Peragine states that peak usage would be during a golf outing. Charlotte states yes, or a fundraiser. Cynthia states the parking lot is typically full for fundraising events. Charlotte states people will not be using the pool in the evening. Cynthia states she does not want to see all of these parking lots built and not used and talks about there being some way of triggering repeated usage of the grass area, such as if every Saturday and Sunday during the summer, the overflow cars are parking there, something would get triggered and a parking lot would have to be built. Will agrees and talks about looking hard and fast at how the parking has been used. Mr. Lopez states it would be similar to what they have done with other projects when they have submitted a letter to the Building Inspector. Mr. Peragine states he agrees that it should be up to the Building Inspector to make that decision. Cynthia states the Planning Board needs to reach a comfort level to authorize so many parking spaces, and so many non-built parking spaces. Will states that those details can be worked out, and it is more appropriate to get to the correct number of spaces first to see if more need to be added. Will states there are Zoning provisions and it is necessary to reconcile with the Code. Christopher states he would think that peak usage would be during a Saturday summer evening. Cynthia asks what the capacity of the dining room is, and states the Ambulance Corp. dinner was held there recently. Christopher states he has been there when there were approximately 200 people. Cynthia states she has been there for an event and had to park on the grass. Cynthia states occasional parking on the grass is fine, but if it is going to happen every Saturday night, maybe the parking lot should be built. Charlotte asks what time the pool will close. Mr. Lopez states he believes it will close at 7:00 p.m. Charlotte states the pool will not impact evening events. Cynthia states that the Board should list in the Resolution that the pool will close at 7:00 p.m. and if the Golf Club changes their mind, and want to have evening pool hours, they would have to come back and talk with us. Will states that people will stray from the pool if there is a large function. Cynthia asks if the thought is to have the pool facility and still use the parking lot as it exists. Mr. Lopez states the pool and golf course membership together are unlikely going to reach what the golf course membership along was when the parking plan was approved. Mr. Lopez states they will talk with Mr. Zorn about special events. Mr. Lopez states that the membership on Site will not exceed the previous membership for the facility when the facility's last Plan was approved. Cynthia states the last Plan that was approved had built parking and un-built parking, and asks if Mr. Lopez is including the un-built parking. Mr. Lopez states yes. Mr. Lopez states the total pool and golf club membership will not exceed the number when the last Plan was approved. Will states the owner should go back and see how the parking lot has been used. Will states if the overflow parking has been used a

lot, then this proposal is not acceptable, because that means more parking should be built. Mr. Lopez states his guess would be that overflow parking would be used for special events. Cynthia states there are quite a few special events. Mr. Lopez states yes, not always in-season. Cynthia states there are quite a few weddings during the summer which would be considered in-season. Cynthia states that is why she asked what the dining room capacity is because it would translate to parking spaces, especially if it can hold 200 guests. Christopher states the room is big. Cynthia states it would be helpful to know the frequency of the events, the number of people, and how many people the dining room holds. Cynthia states we don't need to have parking built for multiple tournaments, but if they were to take place, it would be nice for the Board to be told that in the utility area, another 50 or 75 cars could be valet parked. Mr. Peragine refers to the current practice area in terms of accommodating parking. Mr. Peragine states it is a green space not currently used for practice and it may be used. Cynthia states that justifies for the Board that they cannot require the parking to be built because they know there is space for the overflow. Cynthia states she believes that area is shown on the 2004 Plan as overflow. Mr. Lopez asks whether copies of the 2004 Plans may be made in-house. Cynthia states no. She will look to see if she has a set. Mr. Lopez states they could have them scanned. Cynthia states we will figure out how to have a set made. Christopher asks if they could be shared with the Board once scanned. Cynthia states sure. Cynthia asks Dawn if we took in electronic copies back in 2004. Dawn states she does not think so.

Mr. Peragine states exterior lighting will be on the pool house and will be provided. Mr. Demasi states they will be matching what is on the building itself now and shows the Board and Will a sample of a fixture. Cynthia states they do flare out and asks if the bulb could be up so that the lighting is down. Mr. Demasi states they could look into a different fixture but wanted to match what is on the building now. Mr. Demasi states the fixtures will not face the street. Mr. Demasi states that some of the fixtures will go at the entrances for the doors. Mr. Demasi states he would minimize by having one instead of two but wanted to have a balance. Mr. Demasi states they would be 60 watts each. Christopher states he sees seven fixtures on the front. Will talks about not seeing the bulb or glass. Cynthia states the bulb should be up in the dark sky. Mr. Demasi states the ARB might want to see something that matches the existing club house fixtures. Cynthia states the Planning Board's primary concern is to have dark sky, down lighting, so that needs to be achieved first. Will asks how old the lights on the club house are. Mr. Peragine states those are from the 2004 expansion. There is a discussion about having adaptable bulbs.

Mr. Peragine refers to the off-site wells within 200 feet of the lot and states due to the size of the lot they were wondering if the requirement could be waived because the availability of that information is very difficult to obtain and is not something they could just go online for. Mr. Peragine states the County will require them to file a Foil Request for each and every parcel. Will states there probably are none within the disturbance area. Mr. Peragine states just the on-site wells. Will suggests language such as there are no wells within a certain amount of feet of disturbance limits. Mr. Peragine confirms that will be an acceptable response.

Mr. Peragine refers to the MDRA comment about blasting and states when they were excavating for the test pits for the septic, and the stormwater, rock was not encountered. Cynthia asks if it was encountered when the dining room addition went in and states it would be helpful to check with the Building Department. Mr. Peragine states that Mr. Zorn is looking into doing a few test pits, but that information will not be available due to the weather and ground cover for at least a month. Mr. Peragine points out the elevated tee on the Plan and states it was based on fill. Mr. Peragine states the potential for blasting is minimal, but he cannot guarantee that without geo-technical. Mr. Peragine asks if this could be waived to a later date or does it need to be addressed at this point. Will talks about limiting the area and providing a protocol for blasting. Mr. Peragine states he can provide one. Mr. Peragine states if they do hit bedrock it will be in the deepest corner of the foundation. Mr. Peragine states they are flexible in this area with the foundation and if they do encounter rock, they will either go to a crawl space or minimize the basement in that location. Cynthia states

that would then be the response. Will states to qualify it with the discussion in terms of how it is limited and provide the geographic area. Christopher states to modify the Plans to avoid blasting if possible. Will states to follow the Blasting Code for the Town.

Mr. Peragine refers to the Stormwater Management Control for the expanded surface parking and states it is actually porous pavement. Mr. Peragine states the way it is designed, anything that falls on the pavement will go down to the sub-soil and there will be almost no runoff. Will states that will depend on the soils. Mr. Peragine states they did a test pit in this area to detect the type of soils and estimated the percolation soil. Mr. Peragine states a comment from the Town Engineer was to do perk testing and that is something that cannot be done now, and could be done when the weather breaks. Mr. Peragine talks about that being a Condition of the Approval, to design and coordinate perk tests. Will states they will need to satisfy the Town Engineer. Mr. Peragine states they understand, but it is weather dependent.

Mr. Peragine refers to the engineering comments and states one has to do with the retaining walls and typically they are design-build and the contractor gets a cut sheet or a manufacturer's design for the wall, and they are installed based on the engineer's design. Will states the Applicant should be picking out the materials and discusses the walls. Mr. Peragine refers to the sienna stone proposed. Will talks with Mr. Peragine about putting it out to bid. Mr. Peragine states they pick a manufacturer and tell them what product they want to use and the manufacturer provides a detail of a design and calculations showing all the wall sections. Mr. Peragine states he could provide a typical detail off the website. Cynthia states ideally we are looking for a full design. Cynthia asks approximately how tall the retaining walls will be. Mr. Peragine states there is a four foot maximum on one side and about an eight foot maximum on the other side. Will asks whether there will be fencing. Mr. Peragine states he believes anything over four feet would require a fence, but he will confirm that. Post and rail fencing is discussed. Christopher asks if the retaining wall next to the pool is needed. Cynthia states yes. Cynthia confirms landscaping will be in front of the wall and states otherwise she would ask for a field stone wall. Mr. Peragine states there will be a two or three foot wall near the staircase. Cynthia asks if this will all be manufactured block stones. Mr. Demasi states it will have a split face to it. Mr. Peragine states it is a Unilock manufactured product called Sienna Stone which will blend into the natural landscape. Cynthia asks if the end result will look like field stone or brick. Mr. Peragine states they will provide a catalog cut sheet. Cynthia refers to the wall in the parking lot and asks whether it will be landscaped. Cynthia confirms the wall will be tiered back. Mr. Lopez states there is room for landscaping at the top of the wall. Mr. Peragine states there will be a three foot separation between the wall and the parking. Christopher states he has never seen a manufactured wall that looks good. Mr. Peragine states the Board may want to go to the Unilock website to see what the Sienna Stone product will look like. Christopher states they are not attractive products. Mr. Peragine states that Unilock has the most attractive products. Cynthia refers to Golden's Bridge where Route 22 intersects with Route 138 and states there is a field stone wall that has a repetitive pattern and confirms that is not a Unilock product. Christopher refers to the Chappaqua Train Station and states that work was nicely done on the retaining walls. Mr. Demasi states that is real stone. Mr. Lopez states he will work with Mr. Peragine as he has seen many stone products. Cynthia states cars will be parking and there will be a wall that will be seven or eight feet tall with a little bit of space for plantings and a fence. Mr. Lopez states there will be a split rail fence. Mr. Peragine states there will also be a guide rail.

Mr. Peragine states he understands most of the comments from the Town Engineer and will address all of them with the exception of a comment on Page 3, No. 11. Mr. Peragine states they are being asked to amend the Maintenance Agreement which was a legal document that came out of the Town Code and any language that should be supplemented probably should come from the Town Attorney. Cynthia asks if Mr. Peragine is talking about the Stormwater Control Facility Maintenance Agreement. Mr. Peragine states yes. Cynthia states there is a model. Mr. Peragine states that he used the model but the Town Engineer is asking for modifications. Cynthia states she will check with the Town Engineer and wonders if Mr. Peragine had an

earlier sample form. Mr. Peragine states he took it right off the E-Code website a few weeks ago.

Cynthia states that Mr. Zorn had requested direct contact with the Town Consultants and we don't normally do that unless there is a specific reason to do so. Cynthia states Mr. Peragine and Mr. Lopez have now read the two Reports and from what she is understanding they understand what is being asked of them. Mr. Lopez states he thinks Mr. Zorn was asking about direct contact as a way to expedite the flow of the Application materials. Cynthia states if there was a question about engineering, since the Town Engineer does not typically come to our Meetings, she would ask the Board for approval to have a separate meeting where she would sit in and Dawn would take notes. Cynthia states the Applicants have the advantage to work with Will. Mr. Peragine states he went through the engineering items he had issues with tonight. Will states questions could also be run through Cynthia as well.

Mr. Lopez refers to Page 4, Item 8(e) in the MDRA Memo regarding indicating the caliper size of the proposed trees. Will states they only listed heights, not caliper size. Mr. Lopez states they will outline the trees to remain. Mr. Lopez refers to Page 5, Item I and states there are two sections in the New EAF where they list those questions to be responded to if the Application is commercial or industrial. Will states he considers this to be commercial and either way the answer would be yes. Mr. Lopez refers to O on Page 5 in regards to clarifying the presence of wetlands and/or watercourses on and within 100 feet of the larger subject Site. Mr. Lopez states the Site is 84 acres and from the topo we see everything flows down toward Bloomer Road. Will states there are wetlands there. Mr. Lopez states they will have to go to the Army Corp. of Engineers and the NYSDEC mapped wetlands for the overall Site. Will asks whether there are wetlands on the Site. Mr. Lopez states yes, one on the second two-acre lot. Will states that Mr. Lopez should acknowledge whether there are wetlands on the Site. Will states a desktop analysis could be done. Mr. Lopez states his concern would be to do an analysis of the overall Site. Will states if there are wetlands or watercourses on the Site it should not be difficult to do a desktop analysis. Will states Mr. Lopez should look at DEC Maps and Soil Maps. Will states what he is talking about is not a lot of work. Christopher states the confusion was whether they had to define the whole Site. Mr. Lopez refers to Page 5, Item P regarding potential species habitat reports from a nearby Site. Mr. Lopez states they have received a response about one species that is not endangered, called the Long-eared Bat. Will states he is surprised the Indiana Bat was not mentioned because they came up on the cell tower proposed just down the street.

Mr. Lopez talks about obtaining an extension of the submittal deadline date since it was today and asks if it would be possible to have an extra week. Cynthia states the Board has had a lot of these requests lately. Cynthia asks Dawn if there are other submittals lined up for the April 1st Meeting. Dawn states that two submittals came in today and two more may be coming in. Cynthia states the Board would possibly consider an extension in order to place this matter on the April 15th Work Session. Mr. Lopez states if everything goes well maybe a Public Hearing could be scheduled for May 6th. Cynthia states maybe, if everyone can move that fast. Cynthia states it is unlikely that this matter could be placed on the April 1st Agenda. Cynthia states the Applicant may try, but the Board has to give consideration to everything else that has been submitted. Christopher states the lot line situation could be the biggest issue. Mr. Peragine asks what type of an Application would be needed. Cynthia states a Lot Line Application, and it is very simple. There is a discussion about the preparation of the Map and the existing lot line to be abandoned is discussed. A prior Lot Line Application by the name of Gotham is discussed. Cynthia states the Applicant may want to take a look at their filed Map.

Mr. Demasi asks if the Board will make a Referral to the ARB. Cynthia states that will be done when the Application is considered Complete, and it may be sent over with the next submission. Cynthia states it will eventually go to the Fire Department, CAC, and ARB. Cynthia asks Will if a SEQR Circulation has to be done. Will states it could be done as an uncoordinated review. Mr. Lopez states that Department of Health

approval is needed for the septic and well, and the County Health Department internally refers them to the DEP. Cynthia states the lot line should be resolved because when the Plan goes to the Department of Health they will see the septic on a residential lot. Cynthia states if the Department of Health pulls their 2004 File and see that the line wasn't there then, this will be an issue. Cynthia suggests Mr. Lopez and Mr. Peragine encourage Mr. Zorn to take care of this.

Cynthia refers to the April 15th Meeting and states in the setting of the Public Hearing we will also send the Plans out to the people we previously mentioned, so all of their comments can come in prior to the Hearing. Cynthia states that some of the individuals require a comment period of 30 days, so the Public Hearing will need to be kept open that long.

Will asks how big the development area is. Mr. Lopez states the development area is just under two acres. Will asks what the disturbed area is. Mr. Lopez states it is 1.9 acres which meets the 2 acre threshold for a SWPPP Approval from the DEP. Mr. Demasi states the building footprint is 3,000 square feet. Cynthia confirms with Will that this could still be an uncoordinated review. Mr. Lopez states there are no ZBA issues.

4. Proposed Amendment to Schedule of Fees – Pre-Application Escrow:

- Consider Draft Resolution of Approval

Cynthia states that several people have come in with Pre-Applications in order to be placed on an Agenda. Cynthia states this does involve Will's time at our Meetings, and sometimes a couple of phone calls between the two of them. Cynthia states she would like the ability to be able to bill that back to the client. Cynthia states that right now, the way the Fee Schedule is written in the Code, there is no taking of an escrow for a Pre-Application. Cynthia states that now the Fee Schedule can be amended by a simple Resolution to the Town Board and they do not have to set a Public Hearing anymore. Cynthia states she would like the Board to consider sending a Resolution over to the Town Board for a proposed Amendment of the Standard Schedule of Fees to allow a \$500.00 escrow to be taken on all of our Pre-Applications. Bernard asks if it will be an escrow. Cynthia states yes. Bernard asks if it will be returnable. Cynthia states absolutely. Cynthia states the escrow will be used if there is billable time from Will, Frank, or Roland. Cynthia states we have a bill right now from Roland for the Lakeland Lumber Site, and there is no escrow. Cynthia states if the escrow is not used it is returned. Cynthia states usually a Pre-Application goes into an Application so the escrow would roll over if it is not used, and the Town is not stuck with a lot of bills. Gary, Chris and Charlotte agree. Bernard states he questions some of the items listed as opposed to subdivisions and lot line changes and asks if they are equal in fact, in regards to a flat fee of \$500.00. Cynthia states the key word is Pre-Application which means an Applicant wants to come in and have one session with the Board to run by their idea, whether it is how they are going to subdivide, change their lot line, or cut down trees. Cynthia states there will be one Meeting in front of the Planning Board which may also entail conference calls, such as between she and Will, and he does bill those calls, and she should be able to bill those calls in order to charge them to the Applicant rather than the taxpayers picking up the charges. Cynthia states the only way to do this is to have an escrow. Charlotte inquires as to whether the Applicant may be billed. Cynthia states the Fee Schedule is so specific that she would feel a lot more comfortable to have the \$500.00 Fee in the Code and Dawn can point to it and say she needs to collect it. Cynthia states we can bill Applicants without an escrow, which has to be done in the Lakeland Lumber case. Will states the difference is that if you take in an escrow, you will not be chasing after the money. Will states when he worked in Lewisboro, whenever anyone came in to talk about anything, the first thing they had to do was put in an escrow so that he could go to a Meeting or have a conference call with them.

Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Approve the Draft Resolution Which Proposes to Amend the Standard Schedule of Fees – Schedule B to Include a \$500.00 Escrow for all Pre-Application Submittals. Christopher seconds. All in favor. No opposed.

5. Financial Report:

- February, 2015

Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Approve the Financial Report for February, 2015. Gary Jacobi seconds. All in favor. No opposed.

6. Next Meetings:

- Work Session – March 18, 2015
- Regular Meeting – April 1, 2015

7. Resolution:

Chairwoman motions to adjourn the Planning Board Meeting. Bernard Sweeney seconds. All in favor. No opposed.