

North Salem Planning Board Minutes

June 3, 2015

7:30 PM – Annex

PRESENT: **Cynthia Curtis, Chairwoman**
 Charlotte Harris, Board Member
 Christopher Brockmeyer, Board Member
 Gerald Reilly, Esq.
 William Agresta, AICP

ABSENT: **Gary Jacobi, Board Member**
 Bernard Sweeney, Board Member

ATTENDANTS:	Salem Golf Club:	Todd Zorn Stephen Lopez Ralph Peragine
	39 Fields Lane:	Merv Blank Joseph Lazarcheck David Feureisen
	Hawley Woods:	Peter Gregory Alan Pilch Kevin McKenna Steve Bliss
	Verizon Wireless:	Cara Bonomolo
	Sprint Corporation:	Cara Bonomolo

Chairwoman Cynthia Curtis calls the June 3, 2015 North Salem Planning Board Meeting and states we will not have the cameras on tonight, but we do have a tape recorder, so anyone who wishes to address the Board should speak loud and clear towards the front.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 1. Salem Golf Club:** Todd Zorn (owner – Salem Golf Club)
Amended Site Dev. Plan/Cond. Use Permit (location – 18 Bloomer Road)

- Continuance of Public Hearing

Cynthia states last month when we heard the proposal for Salem Golf Club it was slightly different, as the 14 parking spaces that they were proposing to build were in one area and when they submitted new materials they had changed that. Cynthia asks Todd Zorn to introduce his Team, have someone explain the new configuration for the parking, and give us a brief overview of the parking calculations that were submitted.

Todd Zorn states Steve Lopez from Tim Miller Associates and Ralph Peragine from TRC Engineers are here with him tonight. Mr. Zorn states the ownership of the Club has agreed to merge all of their lots. Mr. Zorn states by merging the Lots they were able to reconfigure where the parking could go. Mr. Zorn states he believes the new location is better for everyone as it is away from the road and will not be seen from the road. Mr. Zorn states there is not as much disturbance in the center in regards to retaining walls. Mr. Zorn states once they were able to confirm the Lot merger then they were able to find an alternative location for the

parking. Mr. Zorn states he submitted a copy of the lot line map to the Chairwoman. Cynthia states she didn't forward Mr. Zorn the response from the Town Attorney. Cynthia states the Town Attorney said the map looks fine except there is one typo. Cynthia states she will forward the response e-mail to Mr. Zorn tomorrow.

Cynthia asks if there is anyone from the public here to hear this matter. No one from the public is in the audience for this matter. Cynthia states the Project Team may direct their comments directly to the Board then.

Mr. Peragine refers to the Plan and states in their prior submission the 14 parking spaces were proposed to be adjacent to the existing lot as paved parking spaces. Mr. Peragine states with the lot merger change, the front and side yard lines now allow them to put the parking on the westerly side of the entrance road in behind a row of existing trees that are being used for screening. Mr. Peragine states they will now have 15 parking spaces in a porous pavement design. Mr. Peragine states there was one minor comment in the Hahn Memo regarding the prevention of the uphill water flow. Mr. Peragine states as was previously proposed, they will be installing a mountable curb to direct the water around. Mr. Peragine states with this change they will have the requisite parking. Mr. Peragine states there is a net add based on the layout as they lost four spaces due to the installation of landscape end islands, and one space to provide access to the front of the pool house, and one space for the handicapped parking requirement. Mr. Peragine states he believes they have a net add of 10 parking spaces overall that will give them adequate parking for the pool based on the analysis done in their Parking Report. Cynthia asks to qualify the language "requisite parking", does that include the request for the 25% reduction? Cynthia states she didn't see anything specific about reasoning for the waiver to apply to the pool users and asks if there is anything that could be said about that or should we just rely upon the Monitoring Plan. Mr. Peragine states based on their analysis, they feel the waiver should apply to it, but believe that the Monitoring Plan will be worked out with Will Agresta as to how their recording is done. Mr. Peragine states he believes it would be proper to monitor special events because, based on their analysis, during one special event, the overflow was used. Mr. Peragine states not all of the overflow available parking was used.

Cynthia states she is not suggesting any changes now, but since the proposal is to go into new ground to do the additional 15 spaces of permanent parking, is there more opportunity in this location, as opposed to, in the future, put parking on the beautiful grass area in the front. Mr. Peragine states they chose this area because there is a limited amount of vegetation. Mr. Peragine states there is a fence, and behind it is the existing maintenance yard facility area. Mr. Peragine states the new location will not have a significant impact on vegetation. Mr. Peragine refers to another area and states there is potential, but there are a significant amount of trees, and it is only limited to approximately 100 feet before going into the short game area. Will asks Mr. Peragine to point out the fence. Mr. Peragine shows the fence on the Plan. Mr. Peragine states some of that area behind the fence is disturbed now, and goes in approximately 25 feet. Mr. Peragine states the maintenance yard is still needed. Will states he realizes that but it is too bad it couldn't be pushed a little further to get a double bay across in order to bring the entrance in lower. Mr. Peragine states if they do that then they will have to replace the maintenance yard. Mr. Peragine points out the practice putting green on the Plan and states this area is currently being used as part of the golf facilities, and they do not want to eliminate it, or they would need to find another location for the putting green.

Cynthia states in with the most recent packet there are materials in regards to the stone retaining walls. Cynthia asks Mr. Peragine to remind her where all of the stone retaining walls will be. Mr. Peragine states it is not stone. Mr. Peragine states that Risi Stone is the name of the manufacturer. Mr. Peragine refers to the Plan and states previously they had proposed a wall which will not be needed now. Mr. Peragine states there are no walls for the revised parking area. Mr. Peragine refers to the Plan and states there is a small wall that varies in height, up to approximately 6 feet, near the relocated 10th Tee. Mr. Peragine states this wall is being proposed to prevent fill from being placed over the existing septic system. Mr. Peragine states they are proposing a

small wall that will be approximately two feet tall along the parking lot for the side walk, and a small staircase which will have a wall next to it as well. Cynthia confirms that the main wall disappeared due to the relocation of the parking spaces.

Cynthia inquires about the maintenance of the pool in terms of the backwash and the discharge regarding how often it has to be done. Cynthia asks what the regulation is and where the water will go. Mr. Peragine states it cannot go into the septic system. Mr. Zorn states they will have a recycled system so the water just gets recycled. Cynthia confirms with Mr. Zorn that there is no backwash. Cynthia states that is an interesting item to note. Mr. Peragine refers to the Plan, points out the stormwater system, and states they placed the subsurface detention in this area where the 14 parking spaces were previously proposed to be. Mr. Peragine states this is being done because they do not want to tear up the entire parking lot. Mr. Peragine points out the new location for the 15 parking spaces. Will asks what the consistency is. Mr. Peragine states there will be three lengths of 48" diameter perforated pipe in a 6 or 12 envelope of stone all around. Will asks if that will handle the overflow parking on top of it. Mr. Peragine states no, that system is strictly designed for the pool and pool deck. Will asks whether cars may park on top of it. Mr. Peragine states yes there is no reason why cars could not park on top of it.

Cynthia states there will be no new signage going on the new building nor out front, aside from the little directional signs. Mr. Zorn states that is correct there will be nothing on the pool house itself. Mr. Peragine states they may have traffic signs, and handicapped parking signs.

Cynthia asks the Board whether they have any questions.

Cynthia states the Board did receive a Memo from the Conservation Advisory Council (CAC). Cynthia states it is not necessary to respond tonight. Mr. Lopez states he would like to respond to it verbally. Mr. Peragine states before talking about the CAC Memo, he has a technical question with regard to the subsurface stormwater issue. Mr. Peragine states that Mr. Annunziata believes the system should be off-line, and we believe it should be on-line. Mr. Peragine states he would like to speak with Mr. Annunziata directly to resolve this issue. Mr. Peragine states this item is on Page 3, No. 13. Christopher states it sounds like a technical question. Mr. Peragine states it is strictly a technical issue. Mr. Peragine states he wants to make sure the Board is alright with him contacting Mr. Annunziata directly to resolve this. Cynthia states that would be alright with her, but she will give Mr. Annunziata a call and let him know, because if she doesn't he will not accept the call. Cynthia confirms that the Board agrees with direct contact. Christopher states the parking solution is a lot better. Charlotte agrees.

Mr. Lopez refers to the CAC Memo. Cynthia states that we do have Pam Pooley, the Co-Chair of the CAC here with us tonight. Mr. Lopez refers to the CAC comments and states he was pleased to receive them in order to respond directly. Mr. Lopez asks whether he should reply in a Memo format for the record. Cynthia states that would be helpful. Mr. Lopez states there are two primary items in the Memo, one being the removal of vegetation, and two being the loss of habitat. Mr. Lopez refers to another CAC comment about the potential impact on the two species of bats, one threatened and one endangered. Mr. Lopez states in doing their field work, and looking for wetland areas, and natural vegetation, they did not perceive any natural bat habitats, or see any bats on the Site. Mr. Lopez states they have a specialist in wetlands and wildlife habitat on their staff, and his feeling was that the piece of woods next to the road, considering the extensive woods in the area, and the activity of the golf carts and golfers, probably wasn't an ideal habitat for bats. Mr. Lopez states that the bats would probably find a more secluded location for their activities. Mr. Lopez refers to their tree removal and states they are proposing to take down approximately 24 trees. Mr. Lopez states they are proposing to take down 4 evergreens and 20 deciduous trees. Mr. Lopez states they will be planting 27 new trees, more heavily weighted towards conifers. Mr. Lopez states they will plant 16 evergreens and 11

deciduous trees. Mr. Lopez states they are putting more trees back, and planting a greater number of evergreens back, which gives more of a year round roost and nesting place for all sorts of wildlife, including songbirds. Mr. Lopez states with regard to the bat habitat, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Regulations are against clearcutting. Mr. Lopez states if you read the Regulations, they state that limited removal of plants is not something they consider to be a contributing factor to decline bat populations. Mr. Lopez states that both of these bat populations are on record because of the white nose syndrome that bats get which has run rampant throughout the northeast and other parts of the country. Mr. Lopez states it is a disease problem, not a bat habitat removal problem. Mr. Lopez states that there have been several thousand dead bats discovered. Mr. Lopez states it is better for the bats to get out and into smaller facilities. Mr. Lopez states he pulled a sample of a bat house that they included in with their last submittal. Mr. Lopez states to alleviate any negative impact on bats they are proposing to install a bat house which is a rectangular box with a divider inside. Mr. Lopez states he is proposing to place the box in the meadow, away from the activity of the club house, pool, and tee. Mr. Lopez states the area is mowed and he does not believe there is a great amount of pesticides or herbicides used for the rest of the golf course because this is more of a rough. Mr. Lopez states he believes this is a quite area and a good location for the box. Mr. Lopez states they will provide and create a habitat away from the club activities. Mr. Lopez refers to the sample and states they had a concern as to whether this is multi-family housing. The Board gets a chuckle. Mr. Lopez states that the box will hold approximately 85 bats. Mr. Lopez states they will prepare a written response to the CAC comments. Mr. Lopez states he believes they will have at least as good amount or better environment for all of the wildlife including the bats.

Cynthia asks whether there are any other comments.

Christopher states the CAC had identified or encouraged electric or hybrid vehicle charging stations. Christopher states he believes the Applicant mentioned possibly looking into this. Christopher states he understands the expense that could be involved. Mr. Zorn states they have stated they would look into it, and he cannot say whether it will happen as part of this Project or down the road. Mr. Zorn states they try to use sustainable products at the Club. Cynthia states it probably wouldn't cost anything to designate one or two of the prime parking spaces for electric cars, and since we are going to be monitoring for a year, we could see whether or not they are used. Mr. Peragine asks whether this is in reference to electric cars or low emission vehicles. Mr. Peragine states he believes they are both different. Cynthia states she doesn't know, but thinks this may work as a first step rather than go to the expense of a charger. Mr. Peragine states there are hybrid vehicles, electric vehicles, and low emission vehicles. Mr. Zorn states that they will designate a spot. Mr. Peragine states the percentage in this particular case is probably very low, and there is probably not one present on the Site by a Member. Cynthia states as part of the monitoring, why don't we include observations as to whether or not there are electric cars, or hybrids. Cynthia states as a reward, the Applicant could consider giving them prime parking spaces, and go from there. Mr. Zorn states that is fine. Cynthia states this will be a good first step.

Cynthia states if there are no other questions or comments she believes the Public Hearing may be closed. Cynthia refers to outside agencies and asks Dawn whether any comments were received. Dawn states no. Cynthia states we will consider the Public Hearing for Salem Golf Club closed. Cynthia asks Will if we are waiting for one more submission before the next step may be taken. Cynthia states she knows Will did not have enough time to prepare a Report. Will states he does not have much in the way of revisions to the Plans. Mr. Peragine states the Hahn Memo is purely technical issues that they can work out engineer to engineer. Cynthia states that the Applicant will respond to the Hahn Memo once they have the one question resolved that was discussed earlier. Cynthia states that Mr. Peragine should not go through all of the Hahn comments, because her directive to Mr. Annunziata will be to work with him on his one question. Cynthia states if Mr. Peragine needs a meeting to go over more items he should let her know. Mr. Peragine states he does not think it is necessary to have a meeting, and asks if other questions come up during the discussion will that be an

issue. Cynthia states no, but it would be nice to know, and asks Mr. Peragine to send her an e-mail so she knows what was discussed. Cynthia states if she sees a bill come in for a three hour discussion, she will wonder how one question could take three hours. Cynthia states we like to track this and know what is happening during a private discussion. Cynthia states she is the one who has to sign all of the bills and is the one who gets criticized. Cynthia states the Board wants to know as well. Mr. Peragine checks states his engineer wrote a few notes on the margin of the Hahn Memo about discussing Items 11, 12, and 13 on Page 3. Cynthia states she is glad we cleared that up. Will asks Mr. Peragine if he has a sense as to what the concerns are and takes a look at them. Will states that Item 11 is not a big deal. Mr. Peragine refers to Item 11 and states he believes that details were provided regarding the CDS Model number PMSU20-20 device, but he will double check. Mr. Peragine refers to Item 12 regarding the Hydro CAD model and states Mr. Annunziata believes the model does not use subsurface area, and we believe it does. Mr. Peragine states he will confirm this with Mr. Annunziata. Mr. Peragine refers to Item 13 and states it has to do with the proposed perforated infiltration pipe. Will asks if somehow the Town Engineer convinces Mr. Peragine otherwise that his thinking at this point in time is better, how would that change everything. Mr. Peragine refers to Item 13 and states they would have to modify the piping arrangement to make it off-line as opposed to on-line. Mr. Peragine states it can be done, but it changes the piping arrangements.

Cynthia asks Will to confirm by next week whether he has what he needs to move forward, and anything outstanding may be handled as part of Conditions in the Resolution. Cynthia states the next time the Board meets they could consider a Draft Resolution. Mr. Zorn asks if they may receive a Conditional Resolution tonight. Will states not tonight, he has to prepare it.

2. 39 Fields Lane: Joseph Lazarcheck (owner – 39 FL LLC)
Amend. SDP & Sign Permit/Cond. Use Permit (location – 39 Fields Lane)

- Open Public Hearing
- Consider Report From Planning Consultant

Cynthia states that most of the Board Members made it out there to look at the Site, and she is glad they did because raised a couple of questions in her mind. Cynthia asks whether anyone from the public is here tonight to speak regarding this Project. No one comes forward. Cynthia states a Sign Plan Application was submitted and asks whether the Applicant is aware that there is a limitation on the size of the lettering. Cynthia asks if the lettering is going to be one foot tall. Joe Lazarcheck states the existing sign will be utilized. Cynthia states it is two or three feet tall. Mr. Lazarcheck states it is a little bit taller than what the Regulations allow. Mr. Lazarcheck states it is the existing sign and will be transferred from one building to the other building. Cynthia states her point is that the size of the lettering is only supposed to be one foot high. Cynthia shows a picture of the Air Professional Associates (APA) sign. Cynthia states those letters are not one foot high. Cynthia states the Applicant is showing the Board an area that is 9 by 2 feet on the Sign Plan. Mr. Lazarcheck states the maximum height is two feet tall at the letter P on the sign. Cynthia asks what size the lettering is. Mr. Lazarcheck states two feet tall. Cynthia states the Ordinance states the lettering can only be one foot tall. Cynthia asks whether the size of the lettering will be taken to one foot tall, or whether the Applicant would prefer to go for a Variance. Mr. Blank states the sign would never be seen from the street. Cynthia states there is a sign out by the street for the building, and there is a lovely sign at the current location. Cynthia asks whether the sign will be relocated. Mr. Blank states that is not his sign, it goes with the building. Mr. Blank states they were allowed to use it. Mr. Blank states if he can get the APA lettering up on the building so that it is visible from the street he will be satisfied, and doesn't care about the sign by the street. Cynthia states that a sign has to be down by the street that at least has the building number on it. Charlotte states for 911 purposes. Mr. Blank refers to the current location sign and states it was there because it was a multi-tenant building and there were three or four different occupants listed on the sign. Cynthia states she met the tenant that is

currently at 39 Fields Lane and asks whether he will stay or go. Mr. Blank states he is going. Cynthia confirms that Mr. Blank will have a simple sign by the road with the building number on it. Cynthia confirms that Mr. Blank wants to bring over the big APA sign from the previous building to the current building and states he will have to go over to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for a Variance. Will states if the plan is to rely on the wall sign, then the Applicant may want to seek a Variance which would double the size of the sign. Will asks Mr. Blank if he would agree to forego the sign at the street, and put something in writing. Cynthia asks Will to repeat that. Will states if Mr. Blank wants to rely on the wall sign, and since it is bigger than it is allowed to be, a mitigating factor to the Variance is to forego the street sign. Will states if they wanted a street sign they would need to bring the other wall sign into compliance by having a smaller size. Christopher asks whether this matters in terms of what the ZBA will consider. Will states it does, but would be done as a Recommendation. Gerry states the ZBA always appreciates the Recommendation. Mr. Lazarcheck states the letter P is two feet tall, and the two A's are one foot tall. Cynthia states she was there today and believes they are all three feet tall. Mr. Lazarcheck states he will check them again. Cynthia states if Mr. Lazarcheck is telling the Board that the two A's are one foot tall, and it is just the P that is the issue, we have the ZBA Attorney here with us tonight if he wants to take another look at it. Mr. Feureisen states that Mr. Blank is fine with the recommendation, so he guesses they will need to go to the ZBA. Cynthia states now she needs to know the size and confirms that Mr. Blank wants to use the existing letters. Mr. Lazarcheck states they would like to re-use the letters that are on the existing building regardless of their size. Gerry states the sign by the road will identify the building for the post man. Will states he would want the signs to run with the land. Will states someone else may have the same sign on the wall and not have a street sign, or have them both the same. Cynthia states that Will is making an assumption that the current sign was approved. Will states that Variances run with the land. Cynthia states the current APA sign never came through the Planning Board. Cynthia confirms that once the Applicant confirms the size, the Board will make a Recommendation to the ZBA that the Applicant may take the current sign and mount it on the new building with the Condition that the Applicant will forego the sign out front, exclusive of an E911 sign which must go up. Cynthia states that sign has to be a specific size and at least have the street number on it.

Cynthia states that right now there is a dumpster out front and she would like to know where it will be because she didn't see it on the Plans. Mr. Lazarcheck states he created a new Plan that includes comments from Will. Mr. Lazarcheck states the shed has been relocated to an area with a wood screen around it. Mr. Lazarcheck states they added language regarding the parking requirements and the notes Will requested. Mr. Lazarcheck states even though the shed has been removed, they put a Note on the Plan stating that it will be removed. Will refers to the empty space where the shed was and asks if it was a parking space. Mr. Lazarcheck states yes, they have noted it on the Plan that there will be three parking spaces instead of two. Mr. Feureisen states he believes all of the MDRA comments have been incorporated into the Plans. Mr. Lazarcheck states the only item that is not addressed has to do with the as-built and requested information for the septic. Mr. Lazarcheck states he went to the Building Department and the information is also on record. Will asks Mr. Lazarcheck if he knows the approximate location. Mr. Lazarcheck states there is an as-built in the Building Department and he doesn't want to duplicate documentation. Cynthia states don't we need verification that the Department of Health doesn't require any further action based on the Change of Use. Mr. Lazarcheck states there will be less demand. Mr. Lazarcheck refers to a 1998 letter from the DEP and states it is on file with the Building Department. Cynthia states this letter relates to the existing Uses at that time, but the Applicant is now changing the Uses. Mr. Lazarcheck states yes, to be less. Cynthia states she understands that. Will refers to a document and states it is supposed to be an as-built, but it does not reflect the pavement length. Cynthia asks what the date of that document is and refers to the addition. Mr. Lazarcheck states it is the same date as everything was all done at one time. Mr. Blank states that is the as-built for the septic. Will states he understands that, but it doesn't have a date on it and no one signed it. Will refers to the parking in the front going past the light and states in this as-built it doesn't do that. Will states if you were to take the curb line to where it is today, it would go over, what is labeled on the as-built, as an existing curtain drain. Mr.

Lazarcheck states he cannot go back through the history of the last 20 years to say what was done when. Mr. Lazarcheck states he can tell the Board what is there now. Will asks how long the parking has been widened out. Mr. Feureisen states approximately since 1994. Cynthia asks Will which area he is talking about and states she has the old Approved Plan with her. Will states the curtain drain could be compromised and he isn't sure if it had anything to do with the septic. Mr. Lazarcheck states he knows there was a COO and it was for the whole project which they are not changing. Will states he does not think Mr. Lazarcheck understands what he is saying. Will asks whether the building has always been occupied, or whether it was vacant for a while. Mr. Blank states it has always been occupied. Will states he guesses everything has been fine since the building has been operating. Mr. Feureisen states it actually had several tenants up until recently so it had more occupancy than Mr. Blank will have. Cynthia asks Mr. Lazarcheck to provide the dates again for the documents he previously mentioned. Mr. Lazarcheck states 1998. Cynthia states she believes that after the addition was approved the septic was upgraded. Mr. Lazarcheck states yes, and refers back to the DEP letter. Cynthia states that is why the septic is not showing on the Plan, as she has the 1990 Approval. Cynthia states we only know the location of the first septic system. Cynthia refers to the Change in Use and asks Will whether we need a sign off from the Department of Health. Cynthia states we used to send the Plans down to the Department of Health for them to sign. Will states he doesn't think the flow is going to be different, if anything, it will be less. Will states there are no standing problems and the system has been operating. Will asks Mr. Lazarcheck whether he did Site due diligence on the septic at all. Mr. Feuriesen states as far as it being tested, no. Mr. Blank states the system was upgraded at one point. Mr. Lazarcheck states that no testing was done prior to the purchase. Mr. Feuriesen states the property was purchased at a court sale. Cynthia states when the next submission is made, the documents that are in the Building Department should be referenced so they will be part of the Planning Board record. Cynthia states it is not necessary to have copies as long as the documents are referenced. Cynthia states that Will might want copies.

Cynthia states she should have mentioned in the very beginning that this Notice was in the Newspaper and the Planning Board Secretary received confirmation of the Notice being sent to the neighbors.

Cynthia states there are three lights in the parking lot which are all pre-existing with downward lighting. Cynthia states there is one floodlight to the left of the front door and asks if something may be done with it. Cynthia asks if the lights may be taken out. Mr. Lazarcheck states he does not think that will be an issue as he isn't sure whether they work. Cynthia states there will be a Condition of Approval that the floodlights to the left of the front door disappear. Cynthia states the new bulkhead doors will be added to the end, but you will not be able to drive a vehicle up to these doors. Mr. Lazarcheck states that is correct. Cynthia states it looks as if people will walk out onto a grass or a planted area. Mr. Lazarcheck states that is the sidewalk which is being redone. Cynthia refers to the Plan and asks what will happen to this area. Mr. Lazarcheck states the majority of it is paved, and they are going to in-fill right outside the doors so as to have a concrete sidewalk. Mr. Lazarcheck refers to the combination of gravel and grass area and states it will be repaved to be concrete. Cynthia confirms the path that goes down to the asphalt drive will be removed and repaved. Cynthia states there are three overhead doors proposed, but it looks like the Plan only shows one. Mr. Lazarcheck states there will be three. Mr. Lazarcheck states that there are two existing doors that will remain.

Christopher asks Mr. Lazarcheck whether all of Will's comments have been incorporated. Mr. Lazarcheck states except for the septic and the loading comments. Will asks how often deliveries are received. Mr. Blank states very seldom. Mr. Blank states he has his own trucks that are loading up in the morning. Cynthia asks Mr. Blank what type of trucks he has. Mr. Blank shows a picture of his trucks. Cynthia confirms that Mr. Blank has one small box truck as well. Cynthia asks whether the trucks will park in a designated area. Mr. Blank states yes. Cynthia asks where the trucks will park. Mr. Blank refers to an area near the dumpster. Mr. Blank states that everything will be to the right of the building and the offices will be to the left of the building. Cynthia asks if this may be designated on the Plan as a fleet parking area for the right side. Mr.

Blank states the only hesitation he has is that he has two different operations, one is service and one is installation. Mr. Blank states all the installation trucks work out of the shop. Mr. Blank states there are six service vans that come in at 7:30 a.m. and are out between 8:00 a.m. or 8:15 a.m. Mr. Blank states there is an office door of the left side, so they will be parked there for maybe an hour in the morning and an hour at night. Cynthia states she is less concerned about the small vans, as opposed to the large trucks. Mr. Blank states he doesn't have large trucks. Cynthia states as the business grows there may be large trucks. Mr. Blank states he hopes not. Mr. Blank states his box truck is shot and will be going away. Mr. Blank states he has a fleet of Ford Trucks and Ford Vans and Ford doesn't make any more vans, they make a transit now that comes in three different widths, lengths, and heights. Mr. Blank states if they are forced to stay with Ford, they may end up with a little higher or bigger truck, and maybe a few smaller trucks. Cynthia states she is just hoping that the large vehicles being parked overnight will all be off to the side. Mr. Blank states absolutely. Mr. Blank states the service trucks go home at night with the men. Cynthia suggests a note be added to the Plan so as to state that the fleet parking will be on the right. Mr. Blank states if that is what it takes, they will do it as it is not a problem. Cynthia confirms this makes sense with the Board and Will.

Cynthia asks whether the Board would like to entertain considering the Draft Resolution this evening. The Board agrees. Cynthia asks Will if he thinks this could be done. Will states with a little wordsmithing yes. Cynthia states it will not be discussed immediately, as the Board has one more Public Hearing tonight, and will then go into the Regular portion of the Meeting to discuss the Draft Resolution.

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

- Open Public Hearing

Cynthia states Peter Gregory is here tonight and asks him to introduce his Team and give a brief overview for the benefit of the people in the audience. Cynthia asks Dawn if the Notice appeared in the newspaper. Dawn states yes. Cynthia asks Dawn if she received the Green Cards from the Certified Mailing. Dawn states yes.

Mr. Gregory states he is with Keane Coppelman Engineers in Mount Kisco. Mr. Gregory states that he is here this evening with Alan Pilch who is assisting us with our environmental and stormwater consulting. Mr. Gregory states that Steve Bliss and Kevin McKenna are also here tonight representing Hawley Woods. Mr. Gregory states the Application that is before the Board currently is for a Subdivision on an approximately 48 acre parcel located on Hawley Road. Mr. Gregory states the parcel is located approximately 800 feet of Hawley Road's intersection with Post Road, and the property fronts along approximately 200 feet of frontage at that location. Mr. Gregory states the property also has frontage that occurs along Post Road and that portion of the property is approximately 1,000 feet south of the intersection with Hawley Road and Post Road. Mr. Gregory states the plan is to subdivide the parcel into three Lots. Mr. Gregory states Lot 1 is located on the south side of Hawley Road and fronts on Hawley Road, Lot 2 is in the mid-portion of the property and has frontage on Post Road, and Lot 3 which is up towards the rear portion of the property. Mr. Gregory states that Lot 1 is approximately 9 acres in size, Lot 2 is approximately 14 ½ acres in size, and Lot 3 is approximately 24.8 acres in size. Mr. Gregory states within each Lot the development will be limited to a Development Envelope that is located for the most part in the mid-portion of each Lot. Mr. Gregory states the Development Envelope on Lot 1 would be approximately 8 acres, Lot 2 would be approximately 3.8 acres which is located in the mid-portion of the property, and Lot 3 would have a Development Envelope of approximately 3.95 acres located in the center of the property. Mr. Gregory states those development areas are limited by a wetland corridor located on the east side as well as the western side of the property. Mr. Gregory states the proposal is for individual driveways, houses, pools, septic areas, and wells all contained within the area. Mr. Gregory states there are no intentions of disturbing the areas in grey on the Map which will create a buffer around the

perimeter of the property. Mr. Gregory states the properties will all be accessed off of Hawley Road. Mr. Gregory states there will be access through a 50 foot right-of-way and a 20 foot wide common driveway will serve all three homes. Mr. Gregory states each home will be served by an individual well and septic system, and we will also be providing individual water storage tanks for firefighting purposes. Mr. Gregory states the stormwater runoff from the roofs and the driveway will be captured, treated and mitigated on Site ultimately discharging to Hawley Road through a culvert crossing over it. Mr. Gregory states they have had an opportunity to have preliminary discussions with New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) regarding the stormwater, and had an opportunity to meet with the Westchester County Health Department regarding the investigation and evaluation for their septic areas. Mr. Gregory states they have Applications pending with the Health Department. Mr. Gregory states he will answer any questions.

Cynthia asks what the width of the driveways will be after leaving the common driveway. Mr. Gregory states there will be 12 foot individual driveways off the common driveway to the households. Cynthia asks what the maximum grade is. Mr. Gregory states the maximum grade for the common driveway is approximately 14%, and it ranges from 4% at the entry, and it changes to 18%, and eventually 14%. Cynthia asks Mr. Gregory to point these areas out on the Plan. Mr. Gregory refers to the Plan and shows where it passes through the front portion of Lot 1 and climbs to the upper area of the property. Cynthia asks Mr. Gregory to describe some of the stormwater basins. Mr. Gregory states he mentioned that they are capturing and treating the runoff from the new homes, roof areas, and driveways. Mr. Gregory states that each Lot will have stormwater practices that will capture and treat some runoff from the individual Lots and there are practices that will capture and be shared amongst all three people to capture and treat stormwater runoff on the common portion of the common driveway. Cynthia states the Town's protection will be to make sure that all of these stormwater facilities are maintained and capsulated. Mr. Gregory states yes, in an Agreement that is being prepared.

Cynthia opens the floor up for questions.

Dr. Susan Heuman states they were a bit shocked when looking at the Plans today, and do appreciate all the work that is being done by the Planning Board. Dr. Heuman states the Applicant has included their property in their Plan and the mistake may sound small, but we happen to live at 394 Hawley Road and all of these documents include 394 Hawley Road in them. Mr. Gregory asks Dr. Heuman if she is referring to the address. Dr. Heuman states yes, that is the address and she thinks this is a serious mistake because when you hire people to do this work which she has seen in other places, they may actually start working in the wrong place. Dr. Heuman states they may start tearing things in the wrong place. Dr. Heuman states the other thing is that limited disturbance area runs right through our house. Mr. Gregory asks Dr. Heuman to point out her property on the Plan. Dr. Heuman shows her property on the Plan. Cynthia asks if Dr. Heuman is referring to the control line for the wetland. Mr. Gregory states the wetland control line does run through the house but that is the controlled area associated with the wetlands that are passing through their property. Will states that is the Town's regulated line and that area on Dr. Heuman's property is regulated by the Town's Wetlands Regulations. Mr. Gregory states there isn't any activity or disturbance that is proposed to occur over Dr. Heuman's property line, this is just designating the regulated area to the watercourse and the wetlands that are associated and flowing through the property. Cynthia states the Applicant was asked to identify the neighboring wetlands and controlled areas because if they are within a controlled area they have to obtain a Wetland Permit and at the very beginning there is an area where the controlled area as defined by the wetlands on the Heuman property happens to extend over onto the Applicant's property so that would require a Wetlands Permit. Dr. Heuman states she is neither an architect nor an engineer and can just say that this entire area is a slope and their house is built into the slope. Dr. Heuman states she doesn't know how it is when you are blasting and building a road which is supposed to be below grade it will not disturb or knock our little house to pieces because we have stonewalls that we have built. Dr. Heuman states she does not have a 10 million dollar house. Dr. Heuman states this is a very great concern and they definitely are going to lose all of

their privacy because all of the forest will be taken down and totally destroy what we have in the Town. Dr. Heuman states if there is any way that this driveway could be modified so that it doesn't do that type of destruction to our little space it would be very nice. Dr. Heuman states she realizes that the Applicant is in a money making mode and we are just in a survival mode. Cynthia refers to the driveway and asks Mr. Gregory if landscaping plans are being added or is it just a matter of not taking down trees. Cynthia asks Mr. Gregory if he has those Plan Sheets with him. Mr. Gregory states he doesn't have the landscaping plans with him. Alan Pilch refers to a Plan and points out areas that will remain wooded and states there will be no disturbance within the strip. Cynthia asks whether there will be re-grading due to the driveway. Mr. Pilch states the re-grading will extend a small distance beyond the edge of the driveway. Cynthia states it would be nice if this were to be confirmed. Will states there is landscaping proposed. Mr. Pilch states that is right, but the landscaping is adjacent to the grading area. Dr. Heuman confirms with Mr. Gregory that the address will be corrected. Cynthia states there are many sheets to the Plans and she knows there has been limited time to view them. Cynthia asks Mr. Gregory if he has the landscaping sheet that will show what will happen at the end of construction. Mr. Gregory states he does have a set of Plans with him and he could share them after the Meeting. Mr. Gregory states he will also share the dimensions of the undisturbed area. Cynthia states that would be helpful.

Michael Trencher states he thought it was interesting when a comment was made regarding the amount of open space and forgot the term that was used. Mr. Trencher refers to the grey area on the Plan and states it is actually acting as a buffer for the internal construction areas. Mr. Trencher states he thinks we can assume that a lot of the area in white on the Plan is going to be basically denuded of trees as a result of construction. Mr. Trencher refers to Post Road and states there will be a buffer for those houses. Mr. Trencher refers to the Hawley Road side and states that Hawley Woods will not be Hawley Woods anymore, as there won't be any woods left, because of the house construction of a fairly large house. Mr. Trencher refers to the water mitigation areas in terms of the concrete boxes and states he assumes that trees cannot be planted on top of them. Mr. Trencher states a clear point was made that this will be without the forest, especially when everything is done in terms of construction and blasting of rock. Mr. Trencher refers to other areas and states there are buffers, except for people like him who live along Hawley Road. Mr. Trencher states this is the darkest and narrowest part of the road which makes this a very dangerous place to have a driveway because there is limited sight distance in both directions as we all know from coming in and out of our own driveways. Mr. Trencher states there is a real conflict between the openness necessary in order to create the construction and the visibility necessary in order to have a good view over the Site and obviously to demand the water flow through this very narrow neck. Mr. Trencher states this will have a very big impact for everybody living on Hawley Road because it is suddenly going to be opened up and the forest is going to disappear. Mr. Trencher states all the shadows, shade and protection that the forest canopy brings is going to be eliminated. Mr. Trencher states he understands what the Applicant is trying to do, but they will be putting a road up a very steep incline. Mr. Trencher talks about weaving through the existing rocks as best as possible and not have too great a slope. Dr. Heuman would like to know how deep the road is going to be. Dr. Heuman talks about the need to blast in order to get in. Cynthia states there will be a substantial cut. Dr. Heuman states there will be a substantial cut, but is the road actually going to be below grade, into the land. Mr. Gregory states at the entrance it will, yes. Mr. Gregory states at the entrance when first going into the property it will appear to be below grade. Mr. Gregory states as we come up only a portion of the right side would have an exposed cut, where on the lower side that is not the case, as it will be shelved into the surface. Mr. Trencher states that is the side near his house. Dr. Heuman states if there is any way to think about what the impact is on all the people who have lived there for 25 years it would be very much appreciated. Dr. Heuman states she knows this is a very big project but it will basically destroy her house. Mr. Gregory states the Board has expressed the same concern about the presence on Hawley Road for the people that are passing by or entering the property and they have put together some studies as to how to incorporate landscaping and how the re-grading excavation is going to work in trying to come up with something that is in character with the homes. Cynthia

states it is still an open item that is being worked on. Dr. Heuman and Mr. Trencher thank the Board.

Resident Pam Pooley states she is actually not speaking tonight in her role as the CAC Chair, but as a Landscape Designer with two clients that are in the neighborhood. Mrs. Pooley states one of her clients alerted her to the Public Hearing tonight. Mrs. Pooley states there are a lot of water issues that her clients have on estates in the neighborhood and she wants to make sure that the due diligence has been done for the well excavation. Mrs. Pooley states that a lot of folks have trouble getting water from wells in this neighborhood. Mrs. Pooley states this area, from her own work with the Hudson Housatonic Initiative, which is part of an effort of the Westchester Land Trust, is part of the Biotic Corridor and a highly sensitive area. Mrs. Pooley states it is unusually climatic and resilient to change which is rare these days. Mrs. Pooley refers to the varied terrain in the area and states she would be interested in knowing how many trees are coming down as a concerned citizen. Mrs. Pooley states this is a big impact to those that are concerned with the native character of our Town. Mrs. Pooley states it would be interesting to also understand if there is actually a demand for this sort of housing in this neighborhood. Mrs. Pooley states this is a huge impact project and for the price people would expect to pay for these lots, hopefully there are perspective buyers. Mrs. Pooley states those are her concerns as a citizen that she wanted to mention. Mr. Gregory states in regards to the well, and water supply, the Health Department is going to require them to meet with well drillers who have been familiar with doing work in the area, who are going to have to indicate a profile of what they have obtained in the past in terms of nets and yields for the groundwater supply. Mr. Gregory states that is going to be reviewed during their Subdivision Application with the Health Department. Mr. Gregory refers to the tree removal and states yes, they can quantify the trees. Mr. Gregory states they may have already done it, but he will double check and come up with numbers, sizes, and types of trees that are coming down.

Kurt Genden states as a Hawley Road resident, he is seeing the Plans for the first time tonight, and has great concern for the residents along Hawley Road because there is a narrow portion that serves as the main corridor and construction road during this project, and undoubtedly, those houses that are very close together and very close to the road will be significantly disturbed, as well as the cuts and the blasting happening. Mr. Genden states he was also surprised to see the location of Lot 1 which is really right behind the existing houses, and based upon the clearing, will completely remove the woods that back those houses. Mr. Genden states that what he could tell, from just a brief look at the Plans, is the Easement and area in which that Lot encompasses does not give more than 75 feet between the back of those existing houses and the Lot. Mr. Genden states his concern is that first Lot and the road for the Hawley Road residents and does not see how it won't be disruptive as well as severely impact the settings of where those houses are today. Mr. Genden states his last concern is that anyone who lives on Hawley also knows there is quite a lot of wildlife coming through that area going over to the parks. Mr. Genden states he is not an expert on this, but just from what they observe at their house, that seems to be a major traffic area for all sorts of wildlife to get from other open areas in North Salem through to the park, and he doesn't know if any of that has been taken into consideration, as to how this may disturb what is a highly traffic area for all sorts of wildlife. Mr. Pilch states approximately seven years ago they developed a Natural Resources Assessment and looked at all the wildlife on this property and in the area. Mr. Pilch states there have been extensive studies about this. Mr. Pilch states this is something that the Town is concerned with, and we have been cognizant of, and responded to. Mr. Genden refers to the wetlands and states there is a lot of sensitivity around them. Mr. Genden states from an observation standpoint, and what we see every day in terms of what is coming through our property, this is a giant concern in terms of disruption. Mr. Genden states the proposal is to come in through the narrowest part of the Lot and disrupting what is a very difficult street already. Mr. Genden states rather than the development, his concern is the construction and the impact to the existing houses, and traffic on a street that already has trouble handling both water and traffic given the current setting and position on those properties. Cynthia states we do work with the developers on time of construction and duration of construction. Cynthia states it is a concern the Board takes very highly. Cynthia states at the end of the day there is going to be construction and we all know there is

going to be a lot of noise. Cynthia refers to blasting in terms of how much and states we don't know until it actually happens. Cynthia states the Town has a pretty good Blasting Code and often what we end up hearing is a lot of chipping. Cynthia states the Board tries to have an assessment on just how much blasting a Site like this would entail. Mr. Genden refers to the back two Lots and states there is a good buffer between the existing houses. Mr. Genden states the first Lot and the access road is right up against existing houses and he doesn't see how that can be minimized in any way or if it is being considered. Mr. Genden states for anyone on Hawley there is no getting around the size and scope of the disruption. Cynthia states she will give a very general background. Cynthia states when she was on the Planning Board in the 1980's there was a proposal on this Site, and everyone at that time said it would not be possible to come up from Post Road and it would have to be Hawley Road. Cynthia states the Applicant went away and came back 10 years later. Cynthia states at first there was an approximate 15 Lot proposal, and then an approximate 12 Lot proposal. Cynthia states that everyone made the same analysis, that the only way to get into this Site was through Hawley Road. Cynthia states over the years, while working with the Planning Board, and assessing the potential environmental impact, the Lot count came down drastically, as well as the size of the interior road. Cynthia states that access has always been a major concern. Cynthia states prior to her being on the Planning Board this time, she remembers seeing in the file, with a previous engineer, quite a few attempts with different proposed cuts along Hawley Road. Cynthia states this proposal ended up being the only potential proposal to give the correct sight distance allowances that would be required. Cynthia states this has been a major concern and she believes this may be the only reasonable way to get into this Site, whether it is a small driveway or a small private road, and it does require a big cut. Cynthia states we are trying to envision what this cut is going to do, and how much disturbance there will be. Mr. Genden states he knows firsthand that the Site is a highly rock-bedded area with very little topsoil. Mr. Genden states even in his own yard, when he goes down two feet, he hits rock. Mr. Genden states he is sure this is being well considered and he knows some of the history and considerations, and as a Hawley Road resident's perspective, the amount of disruption and impact to his property, especially with the first Lot, as well as the driveway, are giant concerns from both quality of living to property values. Mr. Genden states he does not know how this gets addressed, but wanted to use this forum to address his concerns, and will be interested to follow the progress. Mr. Genden states this is not an easy feat to develop and he was happy to see the proposal is down to three Lots. Mr. Genden states the placement of the first Lot, and the road are still major obstacles for the residents who have been there a long time. Christopher states the Planning Board is very sensitive to the impact on residents and the cut, as Cynthia said, has been looked at a lot in recent months. Cynthia states it has been a few years since some of the Board Members did a Site Walk out there, and Christopher was not on the Board at that time. Cynthia states the Board may be doing another Site Walk. Cynthia asks Mr. Genden if the Board could walk onto his property if they do a Site Walk. Mr. Genden states yes, his address is 408 Hawley Road. Cynthia states it is always important for the Board to get out there and see this from the prospective of the neighbors.

Dr. Heuman states the places for the water collection, as her Husband previously mentioned, are going to create open areas which cannot have any plantings. Dr. Heuman states the whole nature of that area for people living on Hawley Road will be transformed. Dr. Heuman states it will be a whole different world.

Cynthia states it would be good to see a Landscaping Plan for the beginning to see the road cut, and that is something we are still working on.

Cynthia thanks everyone for their comments. Dr. Heuman and Mr. Trencher thank the Board for all the work they have done.

Cynthia asks whether anyone else would like to speak.

Cynthia states this Notice just basically went out and people are starting to look at it. Cynthia states she would

feel very comfortable if the Board were to keep the Public Hearing open for one more month. Cynthia states the Board has not heard back from the CAC or the County. Cynthia states she put the Plans up in Dropbox, which is how the Board Members got it, and some of the people who are here tonight. Cynthia states if anyone else wants to see the Plans, she can send them a drop box invitation to view them. Cynthia states she would like to keep the Public Hearing open. The Board agrees. Cynthia states she does encourage everyone to look at the landscaping sheets. Cynthia states there are a lot of pages to go through.

Mr. Genden asks what the frontage is on Hawley Road in terms of the Lot width. Mr. Gregory states 250 feet. Mr. Genden states it is still relatively narrow at that point.

Cynthia asks whether there are any other comments. Cynthia states the Public Hearing will be held over to the July Meeting.

Cynthia states she should have mentioned that a couple of people have e-mailed and called. Cynthia asks Dawn to let them know the Public Hearing will be continued. Cynthia states Dawn may want to put a message on her answering machine in case anyone calls in. Mr. Genden asks how he may be included to receive the plans through Dropbox. Cynthia states Mr. Genden should give Dawn his e-mail address. Cynthia states that right now the next Regular Meeting is July 1st, and it may be changed to July 8th. The Board confirms they are all available on July 8th. Cynthia asks Dawn to handle this via E-mail tomorrow and we will get confirmation out. Dawn states sure. Cynthia states to Gerry that this is a problem for his office. Gerry states he is available.

REGULAR MEETING:

4. **Sprint Corporation:** Cara Bonomolo (owner – Heziha Sulcevski)
Amended Site Development Plan (location – 73 Crosby Road)
- Consider Amount of Removal Bond

Cynthia states we did receive a breakdown of the suggested Removal Bond from Sprint for the changes to the cell tower at 73 Crosby Road. Cynthia states the breakdown was reviewed by our Town Engineer Frank Annunziata on June 2, 2015 and he recommended that a \$8,400.00 Removal Bond be posted, so that is what we are going to do. Cara Bonomolo states alright. Cynthia reads the Draft Resolution whereas it states “Resolved, that the North Salem Planning Board hereby recommends to the Town Board that a Removal Bond for Modifications to the Existing Facility at 73 Crosby Road be posted in the amount of \$8,400.00 for Sprint Corp., based on a recommendation, see attached, by the Planning Board’s Consulting Engineer, after his review of the Removal Bond Cost Estimate submitted by Donald Kelly, also attached. This Bond would not cover the costs for removal of the pre-existing tower and facility”.

Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Approve the above-read Draft Resolution. Christopher Brockmeyer seconds. All in favor. No opposed.

5. **Verizon Wireless:** Cara Bonomolo (owner – Croton Falls Fire District)
Amended Site Dev. Plan (location – 40 Sun Valley Drive)
- Discuss Proposed Site Plan Amendment
 - Consider Report From Planning Consultant

Cynthia states she will confess that she was the one who got upset a little bit at the footnote on the first page of

the letter from Leslie Snyder dated May 5, 2015, when she made a reference to twenty feet. Cynthia states she just realized today that all Ms. Snyder was doing was quoting the criteria and that a 20 foot mushroom head is not being proposed. Cara Bonomolo states exactly. Cynthia states it still is unclear. Cynthia states she knows there is a scale there, but it isn't quite clear, and it would be helpful to see actual numbers on there. Cynthia states it appears that everything is approximately six feet away, and being kept within the diameter. Cynthia states that is the reason for the note. Ms. Bonomolo states that is fine. Cynthia refers to the Memo from Will and asks Ms. Bonomolo if she has any questions. Ms. Bonomolo states no, they will revise the Plans in accordance with the Memo. Ms. Bonomolo states she does have with her, in response to some of Will's comments, the RF Emissions Report and the Structural Report that she would like to submit to the Board. Cynthia states in the future, the Board Members will take electronic copies, so only a few hard copies would be necessary. Ms. Bonomolo asks Dawn if she would like an electronic copy of the two documents. Dawn states yes. The hard copies are circulated, except Christopher does not take a hard copy, and prefers to receive it electronically. Ms. Bonomolo states they will submit the revised Plans and have submitted tonight the RF Analysis and the Structural Certification that Will requested. Ms. Bonomolo states with respect to the Bond, there is an existing Bond in the amount of \$68,000.00 that is for the tower, antennas, and ground equipment. Cynthia asks which User the Bond is for. Ms. Bonomolo states the Bond for the tower itself, and she believes it includes the antennas and ground equipment and everyone that is there. Cynthia asks when this was originally submitted. Cynthia states that usually, every time a User comes on, we just do the modification, rather than open up the whole question about the removal of the tower itself. Cynthia states that is only done during the renewal which she believes is in 2017. Ms. Bonomolo states there was a renewal in 2010 or 2011 for the tower and a Bond in the amount of approximately \$68,000.00 and that took into account the tower, antennas, and ground equipment. Ms. Bonomolo states she does not know if there is an individual Bond for Verizon since that tower Bond included the antennas. Ms. Bonomolo states they can get a cost estimate for the difference of the removal cost for what exists now, and include their proposed modifications. Cynthia states the existing Bond may not be adequate anymore and we don't want to open that until renewal time, so it is really a lot easier to deal with the Verizon facility. Cynthia states the renewal is every ten years, and different Boards have done it differently. Cynthia states sometimes when a modification was made the 10 year period was also changed. Cynthia states she doesn't have a definitive answer, but the Board is trying to track the 10 year renewal portion, and sometimes it is easier to deal with the individual Users regarding the Removal Bonds. Ms. Bonomolo states alright. Cynthia states if there are Bonds from individual Users, to her, that is better, because if an individual User goes away, that Bond goes away, and another User may come in. Ms. Bonomolo states she believes all the comments have been addressed and they will do the cost estimate for the Bond, and submit revised Plans. Ms. Bonomolo asks whether it would be possible to be put on an Agenda for consideration of Amended Site Plan Resolution. Cynthia states yes, this should be fairly quick. Cynthia confirms the real dimensions will be added.

6. **39 Fields Lane:** Joseph Lazarcheck (owner – 39 FL LLC)
Amend. SDP and Sign Permit/Cond. Use Permit (location – 39 Fields Lane)

- Consider Draft Resolution of Approval

Mr. Feureisen confirms that a sign having one foot letters or less would not require a Variance. Cynthia states that you could have 15 feet or 30% of the building façade, and she believes there may be two feet of area for the sign but the actual maximum lettering size is one foot. Cynthia states she believes the APA lettering is between two and three feet high. Cynthia states in any event, we all agree the letters are more than a foot, so the Applicant will be sent over to the ZBA. Cynthia states the façade length is for the bump out, not the whole building. Cynthia states the 9 feet is more than 30%. Cynthia states a Variance may be needed for both ways. Cynthia asks Will if he agrees in terms of a building having a bump out. Will states it depends on how much it bumps out. Cynthia suggests to play it safe and apply for a Variance. Will states they will definitely need a

Variance for the height. Will talks about having a clause in the Resolution that the sign would be subject to a separate submission. Cynthia states it is a separate Permit. Will states when they make the separate submission they will detail everything and define the issue. Mr. Feureisen refers to the small sign at the entrance to the driveway, and asks if it may remain while everything is pending. Will states yes. Gerry states lets back up the other way and asks whether another submission needs to be made on the sign and then refer the Applicant to the ZBA, or approve it here. Cynthia states the Applicant has already done a separate Sign Permit Application, but Will is talking about the specifications being handled separately in a separate referral and will not hold up the Approval. Cynthia states the Applicant has to come back to the Planning Board and show them the specifics so they may sign off on them and write their Letter of Recommendation so that it is fully backed up. Gerry states the issue is that the Applicant does have to go to the ZBA unless the sign is changed to be within the specifications. Mr. Blank states he doesn't want it to take six months to get the Approval for the sign. Gerry states his experience in being with the ZBA for 25 years is that this may be handled in one night. Will suggests Mr. Lazarcheck put together the sign details. Mr. Lazarcheck states the sign is existing.

Cynthia asks Will if he would walk the Board through the changes to the Draft Resolution. Will refers to Page 1 and states a third Whereas clause will be added stating that there is an as-built on file in the Building Department and he will characterize the general location for the septic fields as being in the front yard away from the parking lot and the septic tank is in that area with the pipe going underneath the parking lot. Cynthia states there must be three tanks there as she sees three covers. Cynthia states right in the corner on the ground there are three covers and asks whether there are three tanks there. Will looks at the as-built and states there is only one 1,000 gallon tank. Cynthia states it could be something else. Cynthia states at some point they will be opened up and pumped out, so let's find out what they are. Mr. Lazarcheck states there are not three tanks, there is one 1,000 gallon tank. Cynthia states she has heard of two, as she has two. Will states the fourth Whereas on Page 2 will be revised to indicate notice only. Will refers to Page 5, Item 1(a) and states that will come out. Will refers to Page 7 and states we will add in a reference to the deletion of the floodlight at the left of the front door. Will states we will note the fleet overnight parking to be located on the right side by the dumpster. Cynthia refers to the middle of the parking lot and talks about the words "overnight fleet parking" to be written along with arrows. Cynthia states that parking spaces do not need to be specified, just the area. Will asks Cynthia if she would like a Note. Cynthia states that is fine. Mr. Feureisen refers to the landscaped island details. Will refers to Page 6, Item 4 and states the sentence will end with the word "curbing". Will refers to Page 7, Item C1 and states he suggests adding an exception for the interior fit-up work on the inside. Will states he is going to add language regarding the signage. Will states the Applicant will provide a sign plan that is scaled to detail related to the Code identified potential Variance issues. Mr. Feureisen asks whether the sign issue will hold up the Approval. Will states no, it will be a Condition of Approval. Will refers to Page 9 and states Items 6 and 7 will be edited. Will refers to Item 8 and states he will mention the overnight parking of fleet vehicles.

Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Adopt the Draft Resolution of Approval for the Conditional Use and Site Development Plan for Air Professional Associates LLC, Owner 39 F L LLC, as modified this evening. Charlotte Harris seconds. All in favor. No opposed.

After the motion, Mr. Lazarcheck asks how he should go about transferring the Plans. Cynthia states they need a little more modifications. Will states yes, as there were a couple of modifications talked about tonight. Will suggests Mr. Lazarcheck take a look at the final version of the Resolution adopted tonight, and then he could make a submittal based on it. Cynthia states she does not want a copy of the set we talked about tonight. Will states Mr. Lazarcheck should make a formal submission based on the Resolution.

7. Financial Report:

- May, 2015

Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Approve the Financial Report for May, 2015. Charlotte seconds. All in favor. No opposed.

8. Next Meetings:

- Work Session – June 17, 2015
- Regular Meeting – July 1, 2015 – moved to July 8th

9. Resolution:

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