

Town of Dover Planning Board

Town of Dover
Historic Tabor Wing House
3128 Rt 22
Dover Plains, NY 12522



(845) 877-4271

(845) 877-4273 fax

Planning Board Meeting
Monday - July 6 2009
7:00PM

- Ⓟ Co-CHAIR David Wylock
- Ⓟ Member Barbara Kendall
- Ⓟ Member John Fila
- Ⓟ Member Brian Kelly
- Ⓟ Member James Johnson
- Ⓟ Member Valerie LaRobardier
- Member Peter Muroski

Also, in attendance representing the Planning Board were Planning Board Attorney Victoria Polidoro, Planner Ashley Ley and Engineer Joseph Berger.
For the Applicants: Ed Loedy for Lydia Odunsi, Jim Fletemeyer Lloyd Scharffenberg Jose Cortez II, Hector Perez, and Walter Harris for Camp Berkshire as well as other interested Members of the Public.

Meeting Called to Order

The regular monthly meeting of the Town of Dover Planning Board was called to order by Chair Wylock at 7:05 PM and began with the Pledge of Allegiance

Public Hearing:

A. SINGH DBL - 7160-00-001179

Applicant: Baljit Singh
Plans Prepared by: Jordan Valdina of Synergy Design Engineering
Property located at 1827 Route 22, Wingdale
Applicant in front of Planning Board for Site Plan approval
Simultaneously submitted to ARB

Project Name: SINGH DBL - 7160-00-001179

Applicant: Baljit Singh

Plans Prepared by: Jordan Valdina of Synergy Design Engineering

Property located: at 1827 Route 22, Wingdale

Applicant seeks: Site Plan and Special Permit approval to replace gas tanks and

pumps

The Town of Dover Planning Board will hold a Public Hearing for Site Plan and Special Permit on the application known as Singh DBL GAS Station on Monday July 6, 2009, at 7:00 PM at the Town of Dover Town Hall, 126 East Duncan Hill Road, Dover Plains, NY 12522.

The property is bounded on the North by n/f Guenther and Patterson Acres, West by n/f R. Keller, South by n/f Square Merchant, East by n/f Board Of Education Union Free Dist #2

As an adjoining property owner, The Town of Dover Zoning Law requires that you be notified when a public hearing is scheduled before the Planning Board. If you are the property owners and another party resides at this adjoining parcel, you may choose to notify them of this hearing as a courtesy.

TAKE FURTHER NOTICE, all interested residents and persons are invited to attend.

There was no one present representing the project for the Singh DBL gas station

Motion made by Barbara Kendall to open the Singh DBL Public Hearing 2nd by James Johnson

VOTE: DAVID WYLOCK - AYE MEMBER BARBARA KENDALL - AYE MEMBER JOHN FILA - AYE
MEMBER BRIAN KELLY- AYE MEMBER JAMES JOHNSON- AYE MEMBER PETER MUROSKI- absent
MEMBER VALERIE LAROBARDIER- AYE

The Consultant for the applicant has not provided the documents requested for the circulation for Lead agent. This Board can not proceed until that circulation is complete and a SEQRA determination is made.

Motion made by James Johnson to continue this Public Hearing until August 3, 2009 2nd by Barbara Kendall

VOTE: DAVID WYLOCK - AYE MEMBER BARBARA KENDALL - AYE MEMBER JOHN FILA - AYE
MEMBER BRIAN KELLY- AYE MEMBER JAMES JOHNSON- AYE MEMBER PETER MUROSKI- absent
MEMBER VALERIE LAROBARDIER- AYE

Chair Wylock will also contact the applicant about revising the date of the Public hearing on the road sign

Discussions:

A. ODUNSI SITE PLAN- 7059-02-734525

Applicant Heather Anderson of Edmond Loedy Architects for
Lydia Odunsi Property owner
Property located at 1531 NYS Rt 22, Wingdale
Application for Site Plan Special Permit

Applicant seeks the conversion of an existing mixed use (2) story building to (5) apartments Property located in the HC district on .74 acres
Circulation for Lead Complete

Circulation for Lead Agency is complete
Letter from Dover ZBA:

Odunsi

7059-02-734525

Z 2007-08

WHEREAS, An area variance was issued on November 14, 2007 to allow the applicant to convert an existing mixed-use building to five apartments, two of which will not meet the required 800 square feet of minimum floor. area as stated in the Dimensional Table; and

WHEREAS, more than one year has lapsed since the variance was granted; and

WHEREAS, a request was made by the Town of Dover Planning Board to reaffirm

the validity of the area variance; and

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Member Wittman and seconded by Member Fusco to re-affirm the validity of the variance;

VOTE: Chair Marilyn VanMillon: AYE
Member George Wittman: AYE
Member Anthony Fusco: AYE

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the Town of Dover Zoning Board of Appeals has declared that the two variances issued for Mrs. Odunsi on November 14, 2007 is still in effect.

Dated: June 17, 2009

Engineer Berger:

Still need DEC approval

Area of disturbance- Erosion Control should be completed Chapter 65 application

DOT permit needed

Existing conditions map references a survey done by Ernie Martin- Either the survey should be added to the site plan, or the Surveyor stamp the existing map, which is something that has been done in the past- to validate conditions

Lighting- lower lighting is now shown (lower than 3 foot candles)

Planner Ley- Some planting issues have been addressed

Planting bed enlarged

Additional plantings shown along wetland buffer

Attorney Polidoro-

Building A is stated as 1 unit and then shown as 2 units- is it 1 or 2

A: Single family 2 story house as 1 unit

Date of packet being reviewed- May 13, 2009

Fence has been moved on to the owners property, this will allow them to renovate the fence

Attorney Polidoro- Just a reminder that since their are new units being created and there is no recreation land onsite the recreation fee will need to be applied to this application

After review of the Environmental Assessment Form the following resolution was read:

DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE RESOLUTION

ODUNSI SITE PLAN AND SPECIAL PERMIT

DATE: July 6 2009

Tax Parcel # 7059-02-734525

WHEREAS, a revised application for site plan and special permit approval was submitted by Lydia Odunsi, the owner of property at 1531 Route 22, Wingdale, New York, tax parcel number 7059-02-734525 (the "site") on April 8, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the owner seeks to convert an existing mixed-use building located on the site into multi-family housing consisting of 5 residential units; and

WHEREAS, on May 4, 2009, the Planning Board classified the action as an unlisted action under SEQRA and circulated notice of its intent to serve as lead agency in a coordinated review of the action, to which no other agency has objected; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has reviewed the EAF provided by the applicant, dated April 4, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has thoroughly analyzed the information concerning relevant areas of environmental concern both submitted by the applicant and gathered by the Board through its consultants and considered the criteria contained in 6 NYCRR 617.7.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town of Dover Planning determines that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment and that a Draft Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared and directs the Secretary to the Planning Board to send notice of this determination to all involved agencies.

David Wylock	<u>Aye</u> -Motion
Barbara Kendall	<u>Aye</u>
John Fila	<u>Aye</u> -second
James Johnson	<u>Aye</u>
Brian Kelly	<u>Aye</u>
Valerie LaRobardier:	<u>Aye</u>
Peter Muroski:	<u>absent</u>

David Wylock, Planning Board Chair

Motion made by John Fila to set Public Hearing for the Odunsi Site Plan on August 3, 2009 2nd by Valerie LaRobardier

VOTE: DAVID WYLOCK - AYE MEMBER BARBARA KENDALL - AYE MEMBER JOHN FILA - AYE
MEMBER BRIAN KELLY- AYE MEMBER JAMES JOHNSON- AYE MEMBER PETER MUROSKI- absent
MEMBER VALERIE LAROBARDIER- AYE

B. COPPOLA- ACCESSORY APT 7061-02-611874-0000

Applicant: Peter Coppola

Plans Prepared by P.W. Scott

Property located at 2504 Route 22, Deveron 5.33 acres in the SR district

Application for Special Permit for a 1,000 square ft Accessory apartment

On the second floor of new garage

New information from Building Inspector G.T. Hearn- rain gardens-

Site further inspected by J. Berger

No one was present for this application Engineer Berger communicated with Mr.Coppola by sending him a list of suggested plantings appropriate for rain gardens as well as how a rain garden is to be planted and how they work

**RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING RELEASE OF PERFORMANCE BOND
COPPOLA**

Date: June 29, 2009

Project Address: 2504 Route 22, Dover Plains, New York

WHEREAS, by Resolution dated November 8, 2007, the Town of Dover Planning Board granted the Mr. Coppola a Chapter 65 Erosion & Sediment Control Permit in connection with certain remedial work on its property; and

WHEREAS, the Code Enforcement Officer of the Town of Dover conducted a final inspection on June 26, 2009, and confirmed that the remedial work has been completed and all provisions of the Permit have been met and issued a certificate of compliance; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Town Code Section 65-11(C), “such performance guaranty shall continue in full force and effect until a certificate of compliance shall have been issued by the authorized official after such consultation with any agencies or individuals as he deems necessary to ensure that all provisions of this chapter and of the permit have been met”; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to Town Code Section 65-11(C), the Town of Dover Planning Board has no objection to the release of the performance bond.

Moved By: Brian Kelly Seconded By: John Fila

Resolution Approved/Disapproved:

David Wylock	<u>Aye</u>
Barbara Kendall	<u>Aye</u>
John Fila	<u>Aye</u>
James Johnson	<u>Nay</u>
Brian Kelly	<u>Aye</u>
Valerie LaRobardier:	<u>Aye</u>
Peter Muroski:	<u>absent</u>

Planning Board Chair David Wylock

After a discussion about the adequacy of the rain gardens installed, it does not contain the correct workings for a rain garden, it is currently a depression with plants, they do not meet the standards of rain garden requirements. The application for the apartments pending will be contingent on the rain garden being corrected. The Cert of compliance was issued by the code enforcement officer, after his inspection of the site.

Future site should be inspected by either Planner Ley or Engineer Berger to assure they meet the standard

This resolution was rescinded by motion of James Johnson Second by Valerie LaRobardier

David Wylock	<u>Aye</u>	Barbara Kendall	<u>Aye</u>	John Fila	<u>Aye</u>	James Johnson	<u>Aye</u>
Brian Kelly	<u>Aye</u>	Valerie LaRobardier:	<u>Aye</u>	Peter Muroski:	<u>absent</u>		

C. CAMP BERKSHIRE 7161-00343242 & 7161-00-285018

Applicant Lloyd Scharffenberg Plans Prepared by Fletemeyer & Lee Associates
Application for Site Plan Special Permit
Applicant seeks Site plan & Special Use permit to allow for renovations and redevelopment of pre existing camp facilities
Parcels located on 283.26 acres in the RU district

Jose Cortez II, Chair of Strategic Planning Committee, Also present Hector Perez camp manager, Walter Harris Associate manager of the camp, Lloyd Scharffenberg and Jim Fletemeyer of Fletemeyer & Lee Consulting

Jim Fletemeyer- The back ground work for this project has been in the process for over 1 year

History of the Property:

- The Camp Berkshire Property has been owned by the SDA —Greater New York Conference since April 1963
- The Town of Dover adopted the current zoning standards in September 1993
- Currently, Camp Berkshire has no Special Permit or Site Plan review under the 1993 zoning standards
- In 2008, Camp Berkshire retained FLA to provide redevelopment master plan
- In 2009, Camp Berkshire is now prepared to submit for the Special Permit/Site Plan review

Existing Conditions and the Master Plan Concept

- Facility Disposition & Historic Locations
- Land Use & Relationship to Neighboring Properties, and strategy to limit site disruption by selective building type
- Proximity to the Lake — Cut off by Berkshire Road -
- Elements of a Camp Master Plan (Sleeping Accommodations, Dining and Meeting Space, Recreation, Support and Maintenance Facilities)

Disposition Evaluation done by a local engineer- All structures on the site have been evaluated and given a rating to deem whether they are still viable or if there is a need to renovate or replace

*There is 250' set back around the property- healthy but undevelopable. There is an abandoned rail road easement, which traverses the site in a diagonal
The Con Ed transmission line property is excluded
Berkshire road divides the road and there is a 40' ROW*

Not lot of traffic at this time

Set backs from the water are significant- wetlands on the lower right hand corner have been recently flagged by the DEC.

They are aware of slope s in excess of 30% and they understand it is not good to develop there and think paths and smaller prefab cabins might work

*Auditorium, and center of camp to be clustered, swimming pool, bath house already exist, administration building, camp store infirmary with immediate emergency access, club house, adult assembly area, youth assembly area, air dome structure, possibly seeking permanently seeking a location, dining hall,
Possibly 50 unit youth dorms, remote tent village, maintenance building on the southern portion of the site, equestrian events and waste water, 25 cabins 6 people each, conference center 5 mini lodge retreat buildings for 48-50 people each
Camp Staff- 4 residential houses, small chapel, nature center, zip line to the boat dock, amphitheatre, equestrian center, possible bridle path with the reserve tennis, soccer, soft ball, trails, camporee areas there is a rear access fire access road, go cart area, band shell, tent camping, over flow parking for 300 cars, all is looped to bring all service and emergency vehicles in and out of the road safely.*

*Natural water concerns, waste water concerns slopes will all be taken into consideration
Landscape will be bermed f or additional sound mitigation*

Waiver Requests & Clarifications

- Environmental Impact Assessment (DEC visits)

- Density Calculations
- 6000 sq ft Footprint Rule
- 35' Height Rule
- Over Lot Grading Rules & Re-vegetation
- Off-Street Parking Requirements & Overflow Conditions
- Modification to Berkshire Road

Looking to slow down traffic on Berkshire road to allow better access to camp and utilize lake side area- also separate the centralized camp as well as slow traffic patterns

- Visual Impact information – *will be available at some point in a 3-D type of presentation*
- Civil Engineering Studies

Member Kendall- The application states Camp type 1- and you mention a conference center- with the mention of lodging facility- in the RU district- it is not permitted.

Attorney Polidoro- The uses listed need to be reviewed and it needs to be looked at to see if it meets the definition.

Member-This might be something for the Town Board for possibly a zoning amendment

Planner Ley- One thing to be considered is that there is currently a recreation overlay district being *Lodging Facility –Any hotel, motel, inn or other establishment providing sleeping accommodations for transient guests, with or without a dining room or restaurant, excluding bed –and-breakfast establishments*

Camp Type 1- Any area of land or water on which are located two or more cabins, tents, recreational travel vehicles, shelters, houseboats, or accommodations designed for seasonal or other temporary living purposes, regardless of whether or not such structures or accommodations are occupied seasonally

Q: *How many building exceed the 6,000 square foot limitation? A: The “O” dome- which is a temporary structure possibly seeking a home Club house, auditorium is currently, dining hall, Administration are.*

The ZBA concerns with the Camp Ramah concerns were mentioned as well as the Town Board would have to review, for the zoning as well as the possible changing of the road.

The idea of the Zoning change already submitted to the Town Board was recommended to the Applicant Also for the Applicant to talk to the Building inspector about the cabins concerning fire code on sleeping areas for 4 people with fire suppression this includes camps sprinklers may be needed

Lake Ellis- - are there water rights-

Be sensitive to the Appalachian Trail- they might be sensitive to roof colors and visibility from their trails

Sound origins and mitigation was discussed- the “Temporary” Air Dome contains the sounds better than a tent. They picked a brown color to help it blend in instead of a white as well as right now it goes up in June and comes down in November

Water playground area/ storm water basin- Are they the same thing as the wading pool? A: No, it's a natural collection there is drainage by the sir dome and the parking lot that goes through the camp then water collected will go to the storm water pond and other water will naturally shed to the west. There will be a depressed area where the water will be treated and also be able to handle flooding - they will present all storm water management practices as the process progresses.

Fire Hydrants- There are 2 presently- they were tested a while aback and re adequate, as the project is developed they will change, right now there is a 6” line. Access to the lake was improved and fire trucks can make it through better.

An endangered species study will need to be done.

A Master plan was submitted and for SEQRA it would make sense for the Board to review the master plan then go through the stages. A coordinated review would take place.

A discussion as to the uses and the definitions of Camp type 1 and lodging facility / Conference Center as well as the structures on the site having multiple uses took place

This applicant can look at the "Wind Rose" Zoning Overlay district submitted for reference or approach the Zoning Board of Appeals for variances as well as an interpretation

Q: Is the Facade of the pink stucco building still standing? **A:** The foundation remains, but will be removed when the road work takes place, the structure itself is gone.

The general look of the camp will be more park like when not in use.

Q: How many people can the site currently hold **A:** Currently on a Saturday approximately 4,000 people, on a one day thing; weekend camping around 2,000; during the week with a capacity of 1,100 people around half. Most campers come to the site by busses or taking the train. The maximum under the proposal- if we go over 5,000 there would have to be a different health department permit issued. With the rooms it's 1,100 people over night. They are trying to get back to the original numbers the site had held.

Q: What is the BOH capacity now? **A:** SPEDEDS- 60,000 gallons per day 2,000 people per day use. The lagoons have never overflowed. There is no tertiary treatment; it is set up for a chlorinated treatment as needed. They are the 2 lakes presently on site. There is a current permit, which should not need increasing. There may be a modification of the DEC permits. DEC would need to be brought in to make the call as to whether a tertiary treatment system needs to be in place.

There is a chlorinator set up for over flow discharge, but it has not gotten to that. There has never been an over flow since they usually do not have as many guests as the system can handle. If there's 2,000 people one day then 500 the next, the system balances out.

DEC and DOH will look at this and make a determinations to whether or not there is a change of use or modification of purpose.

Traffic Peaks- flow sat am possibly increasing not much more than current peak.

Use of lake- There was a large dock now there is a boat house- What are the plans for that area? Will there be dredging? **A:** No plans to do dredging, they would like a dock and a more functional boat house.

Member- I believe there is an agreement of no power boats.

Q: How long will this project take- the phases? **A:** It depends on the funding, but there is a commitment of the initial phase, which has not been identified. There is a goal of complete build out of 10 years.

The Planning Board should approach the ZBA for an interpretation of whether all of the uses match the definition of Camp type 1 and Lodging facility and description of the RU district. § 145-8(A) (1)

Engineer Berger- The storm water plan although conceptual- now is the time to look at newer methods to keep with the new rules coming out next year. Camps tend to typically try to collect detain and treat, which is 10 year old technology, it's preferred to see disperse, treat at the source and infiltrated if necessary when possible, then detain discharge when all others have been accomplished or tried. A series of rain gardens swales and many other wonderful processes that could be incorporated within a park lie environment. It's much easier to do at the design stage. **A:** There are already many of those things in the plans now.

Zoning map in the application- Is the Northeast corner in the RC district? A: A small portion of the site is in the RC district, but in an area of 30% slopes and no work is proposed in that area.

Motion made by James Johnson to set escrow for \$5,000.00 2nd by John Fila

VOTE: DAVID WYLOCK – AYE MEMBER BARBARA KENDALL – AYE MEMBER JOHN FILA – AYE
 MEMBER BRIAN KELLY- AYE MEMBER JAMES JOHNSON- AYE MEMBER PETER MUROSKI- absent
 MEMBER VALERIE LAROBARDIER- AYE

**RESOLUTION REFERRING APPLICATION TO THE ZBA FOR AN INTERPRETATION OF THE DOVER TOWN CODE
 CAMP BERKSHIRE MASTER PLAN**

Date: July 06, 2009

Property Address: 680 Berkshire Road, Dover Plains, NY

WHEREAS, an application for a Site Plan and Special Permit with a Master Redevelopment Plan for an existing Camp Facility located at 680 Berkshire Road, Dover Plains, NY, Tax Parcel Nos. 7161-00-343242 (Parcel 1) 196.536 acres and 7161-00- 285018 (Parcel 2) 86.724 acres (the “Site”), located in the RU District was submitted to the Planning Board on June 11, 2009 by Lloyd Scharffenberg (the “Applicant”); and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Dover hereby refers to the Camp Berkshire Master Plan to the Zoning Board of Appeals for an interpretation of the Town code on the following issues:

1. Is the proposed use a “Camp Type 1” or is it a “Lodging Facility”, Which is not permitted in the RU District
2. Is this use consistent with § 145-8(A) (1)?

Dated: July 06, 2009

Moved By: Valerie LaRobardier Seconded By: Barbara Kendall

Resolution Approved/Disapproved:

Dave Wylock: AYE
 John Fila: AYE
 James Johnson: AYE
 Brian Kelly: AYE
 Barbara Kendall: AYE
 Peter Muroski: absent
 Valerie LaRobardier: AYE

Planning Board Chair David Wylock

In the future Site walk is encouraged and will be set- will take 1 1/2 – 2 hours

D. SINGH DBL - 7160-00-001179
 Applicant: Baljit Singh

Chair Wylock Addressed Mr. Singh- the Public Hearing was opened and it was continued to August 3, 2009. This was done because the Engineer for this project had not yet provided the necessary documents to the Planning Board Secretary for circulation of Lead Agent.

It was further explained to Mr. Singh, that the documents needed for circulation are over due, they were requested in June and the Planning Board can not move forward, nor can any other Board, until the circulation is complete and a SEQRA determination is made. The longer it takes for the

circulation to begin the longer he is holding up his own project. This was explained to Engineer Valdina multiple times. No other Board can grant any form of approval until this process is complete. The delays have not been caused by this Board.

The Public Hearing sign needs to remain in place and the date on the sign will need to be revised, this is something Mr. Singh can do himself.

E. Discussion on Dover Knolls report as compiled by Planner Ley

Chair Wylock- If a draft report can get to the Planning Members by July 13, have the Board get back to the Planner by the 16th of July, it should be enough time to have the final report ready for July 20.

This will allow the board to vote on the 20th of July. The Town Board did not vote to grant and extension to the 21st of July for the Planning Board to submit their response but we have an email from the Town Attorney as well as the Supervisor that if the Planning Board takes action on Monday July 20th it will be adequate to file with the Town Clerk's office on the 21st of July.

Planner Ley- Passed out a memo created with previous notes as well as comments made by Planner Trelstad from the previous Planning Board meeting. She now seeks further comments on this report to insure all concerns and comments from the Planning Board are reflected in the report.

Ashley Ley, AICP
July 6, 2009

Re: Knolls of Dover Master Development Plan and DEIS
cc: Victoria Polidoro, Joe Berger

The following memorandum summarizes the comments presented at the June 15, 2009 and June 29, 2009 Planning Board meetings. These comments will form the basis of the Planning Board's report to the Town Board regarding the Knolls of Dover Master Development Plan and DEIS. Please review this summary to ensure that it accurately and completely reflects the position of the Planning Board.

KNOLLS OF DOVER MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN

VISION OF THE TOWN FOR THE SITE

The Planning Board has determined that the proposed Knolls of Dover Master Development plan generally reflects the Town's vision for the site as presented in the Town of Dover Master Plan. The Planning Board would like to ensure that an appropriate and viable mix of commercial and residential uses are constructed on the site. The Planning Board is concerned that as proposed, there would be insufficient retail on the site.

As the Town has envisioned this site becoming a new Town center, the use of the Administrative as a new Town Hall and court room could be considered. This would place the Town's primary services within the center of the new community and help establish a daytime population to support the new businesses. The current Town Hall could be set aside for senior citizens and the recreation department.

PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS

The Planning Board finds that certain neighborhoods, such as the Meadow Hamlet and portions of the Millpond Hamlet are underserved by the proposed system of sidewalks and trails. In general, additional trails that are sensitive to the on site natural resources should be proposed to better connect these hamlets and provide additional onsite recreation. All trails should be limited to pedestrian and bicycle traffic. ATVs should be prohibited.

ONSITE RECREATION

As mentioned above, the Planning Board finds the proposed trail system insufficient. In particular, additional trails should be proposed in the vicinity of the reservoir. New trails should be environmentally sensitive to the surroundings and should be constructed of materials appropriate for the location. The former track should also be restored for walkers and joggers.

In addition, more information on the proposed membership structure of the golf course should be provided. The Planning Board finds the golf course to be an important community resource, and would like its availability for public use to be consistent with the current structure. More information, specific information is needed regarding the fee structure/membership of the golf course. In addition, the anticipated future of the existing golf club (HVGCC) both as an entity and for individual members should be described.

The Planning Board also finds that the proposed onsite recreation is insufficient to meet the demand of the new residential population that would be generated by the proposed project. Therefore, the Planning Board recommends that the Town require recreation fees to be paid. Recreation fees could be paid prior to the issuance of a building permit for each individual residence or multi-family building, as opposed to subdivision approval.

FLOODPLAIN

FEMA recently issued new floodplain maps for the Town of Dover. These new maps indicate that a significant portion of the project falls within the floodplain. The Planning Board recommends that the site plan should be adjusted to relocate residences outside of the floodplain.

TRAIN STATION

Since it is a single track that serving the Harlem Valley-Wingdale Station, the Planning Board recommends that the existing train platform be retained when the new platform is constructed on the opposite side of the track. This way, a passenger can enter the train from both sides of the track, and the potential safety issue of a person attempting to cross the track to catch a train can be avoided.

PHASING

The Planning Board recommends that the grocery store be constructed as part of Phase IA. The Planning Board also recommends that more detailed information on the phasing of the remediation and demolition/restoration of the existing buildings be provided.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The Planning Board recommends that more detailed information on the area near the store house be provided. In particular, what is the classification of this site? Could it be considered a brownfield? Is the applicant or NYSDEC going to clean it up?

RESERVOIR

The Planning Board strongly recommends that all development be removed from the watershed of the reservoir. The reservoir and surrounding area should be used strictly for passive recreation such as hiking and fishing. No motorized vehicles or other potential pollutants should be utilized in the vicinity of this reservoir. No development shall be permitted within the reservoir watershed, except as necessary for the provision of potable water and maintenance and/or replacement of the dam.

PROJECT SITE MAINTENANCE

The Planning Board recommends that a special tax district be formed to ensure the long-term maintenance of site roadways, water and sewer systems, and stormwater management features. The

Planning Board is concerned that the Homeowners Association will lack the oversight necessary to ensure the maintenance of the features and does not want these items to become a burden on the Town.
Town of Dover Planning Board 3 July 6, 2009

ONSITE PARKING

The Planning Board recommends that more information on the parking be provided. In particular, how will fire lanes and no parking zones be enforced? Will there be metered parking?

WORKFORCE HOUSING

The Planning Board requests that more information on the workforce housing component be provided. In particular, where will the housing be built and in what phase will it be constructed?

LANDSCAPING

The Planning Board recommends that all landscaping comprise native plant species. These native plant species should be tolerant of the onsite native soils, particularly the limestone based soils of the Harlem Valley region. In addition, native plants should be utilized for wetland mitigation and low-impact development landscape features. This requirement should be integrated into the Master Development Plan and Design Guidelines. The Master Development Plan should include a plant species list.

RETAIL

The DEIS should indicate the size of the supermarket.

VISUAL IMPACT

Proposed Residential Neighborhood near Reservoir

The FEIS should include a visual analysis of views from Schaghticoke Mountain. It is currently possible to see the existing hospital from this location, therefore view of the proposed residential development in this area may be visible as well. In addition, a cross section from Route 22 through this neighborhood should be provided.

Overall Site

The birds eye view of the Proposed Project should include views of the project at the time of planting. The images included in the DEIS utilize mature trees, therefore the FEIS should clarify what the project will look like as it is built.

DESIGN GUIDELINES

A comparative analysis of the proposed design guidelines versus the Dutchess County Design guidelines should be included. Any deviation from these guidelines should be to be more restrictive of the Proposed Development. The ARB should be consulted in the development of these guidelines.

USE OF TERMS

The Master Development Plan should be consistent in its use of terms. The following terms should be more fully described:

- Great Swamp versus Great Swamp River
 - In particular, the use of the word Great Swamp River versus Great Swamp should be clarified as the desire of the Planning Board is to protect the Great Swamp as a whole and including the river.
- Age-targeted versus age-restricted
- Affordable Housing

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Pg. 1-2, 5th paragraph - Proposed parking lot for train station - should have heightened stormwater

controls to protect wetlands and Swamp River. Bioretention areas could double as stormwater management and landscaping elements in the parking lot.

Pg. 1-5 - Table 1-4 - Town of Dover Planning Board should retain subdivision approval and site plan approval should be given back to the Planning Board.

Pg. 1-7 - Town of Dover Planning Board should be an involved agency.

Pg. 1-12 - 6. 3rd paragraph - need clarification on per pupil costs and revenue from the project. Isn't it closer to \$10,000 annual per pupil cost to the school district??

Pg. 1-15 - 4th paragraph - Best management practices for control of soil erosion and sedimentation - hay bales are not included in the list of approved practices for inlet protection in NY Standards and Specifications for Erosion & Sediment Control. Approved practices are excavated drop inlet protection, filter fabric drop inlet protection, stone and block inlet protection, and curb drop inlet protection.

Pg. 1-19 - Table 1-5 - Community services - What is the percent reduction in population for Alternative D? It is given for alternatives B and C but not for D.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Pg. II-20 - Infrastructure - Maintenance of stormwater management basins - Experience in New Jersey and Maryland over the last 15 years has shown that maintenance of stormwater management basins and other stormwater practices by an ROA does not work. The Town Board should put in place a drainage district for the entire site where an assessment on each property would provide a dedicated funding stream to the town for maintenance of the stormwater management practices. The Town can use the funds to either contract out the maintenance to a private firm or conduct the maintenance with town staff.

Pg. II-20 - Second paragraph - I recommend that the existing Town of Dover Sign Regulations be used for the proposed development to provide visual continuity between the proposed development and the rest of the Town of Dover. The existing sign regulations could be amended, if needed, to reflect sign applications in the Dover Knolls hamlet that may not be present in other areas of town.

Pg. II-21, II-29 (Table) and III A 20 - Proposed zoning changes - Subdivision approval should remain with the Planning Board to reflect state law for planning and zoning boards (Section __ of the Town law). There is no rationale given for taking subdivision approval from the Planning Board and giving it to the Town Board.

Exhibit II-7 - Conceptual Site Plan:

- East side reservoir area - The disturbance necessary for roads, utilities, and construction would pose too great of an environmental threat to the reservoir, which is the back-up water supply for the entire hamlet. Long-term, road sanding and salting, fertilizers and pesticides would also pose a threat to the reservoir. The houses and the stormwater basin in the reservoir watershed should be removed, and the development in this area revised so the loop road is outside of the reservoir watershed. The remaining houses should be changed to single family homes on 5- acre lots to reflect the RC zoning that is typical of environmentally sensitive areas in the Town of Dover.

- East side - areas with soil with severe erosion potential (SkD and RoF soils) - these areas should be limited to 5-acre lots with single family homes to reduce the potential environmental impacts from severe soil erosion.

- West side - multi family homes in the 100-year floodplain should be removed.

Town of Dover Planning Board 5 July 6, 2009

- West side - Potential habitat areas ES -1 and ES-5 - houses should be removed from these areas to eliminate impacts on amphibian habitat.

CHAPTER III-NATURAL RESOURCES

The DEIS should include more information on the preservation of existing trees.

CHAPTER III-STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

Pg. III-10 - (2) Flood Zones - The multi-family homes, single family homes and other structures proposed to be in the 100-year floodplain west of the Powerhouse on Wheeler Road should be removed. Filling and encroachment of the floodplain will increase flooding potential upstream and downstream. Storm events have become unpredictable, with 150 - and 200 year floods occurring in the Town of Dover over the last 5 years, therefore it is critical that all floodplain areas be protected, especially when so much adjacent residential development is proposed. There are enough opportunities for residential development outside of the floodplain.

Exhibit III.I-6 - Stormwater BMPs - Proposed parking lot for train station - Porous pavement will help with water quantity control, but provides little for water quality. The parking lot should have additional stormwater controls to protect wetlands and Swamp River. Bioretention areas could double as stormwater management and landscaping elements in the parking lot.

CHAPTER III-COMMUNITY SERVICES

The FEIS should further evaluate the need for additional Fire Department personnel and equipment as a new fire truck and paid staff may be required. In addition, the FEIS should further clarify which aspects of the proposed onsite community facilities would be open to the public. More detail on the ownership, management, and fees for these facilities should be provided.

CHAPTER V-ALTERNATIVES

The rationale for dismissing Alternative E should be more thoroughly explained. It seems counter-intuitive that more commercial would generate less tax revenue.

Chair Wylock- The referring repeatedly in the document the "irreversibly degraded sites" - He would like to see added all such sites to be inspected or investigated by the Federal EPA and/or the NYS DEC to determine if they should be classified as Brown Fields, hazardous waste sites, etc. If it is determined, deemed by any of these agencies, a full remediation should be performed prior to site plan approval. Since our last meeting, he took an article out of the NY Times, "EPA lists 'High Hazard' Coal Ash Dumps" We do know that there were coal ash dumps near the store house, the ERA is rating this as a high hazard, coal ash contains toxic material... This is a big issue with the EPA and should be looked into

Performance Guarantee- To insure that the developer does not abandon or close the project after completing phase 1, the governing Town Bodies shall require the developer to post a performance guarantee as a condition for site plan approval for phase 1. The amount of this guarantee shall be significant enough to encourage the developer to proceed with phase 2 in a reasonable time. Mutually agreed upon with the developer and the town of Dover, This will protect the Town of Dover against any failure of the developer to continue the project.

Member Johnson- Retail- It says "The DEIS should indicate the size of the supermarket" _ that was indicated we had discussed it should be increased 65,000 or 75,000 square feet not 40,000. It was noted that Hannaford's in Pawling is 30,000.

CHAPTER III-COMMUNITY SERVICES

The FEIS should further evaluate the need for additional Fire Department personnel and equipment as a new fire truck and paid staff may be required. *This should not only be fire but ambulance also*

Member Kelly - This was mentioned, but no one mentioned a new fire truck.

What was said was that during the day time hours the Town of Dover may have to go to a 12 hour day - 7 days a week Fire Service, paid staff, and paid ambulance service may have to go from 12 hours a day to 12 hours a day.

Commercial Retail Conversion Units- There are no comments in this draft showing those comments. We had asked if they were going to have commercial retail conversion units as apartments, when were these going to be converted, which I feel they shouldn't be. What year will they turn back into commercial once an apartment there? Will it be 5 or 30 years down the road?

The use of the swamp river as a water source and the reservoir area there are no comment here from that conversation -

It was recommended that Planner Ley watch the video from the previous meeting due to concerns that all comments made are not reflected in the document being reviewed this evening.

There was a problem with the video taping of the last meeting and the Secretary of the Planning board will forward the audio of the last meeting t the Planner.

Members:

The Study from the School was over 10 years old

There concerns that there were many comments from the Board that were not addressed. Written comments were again urged to be given to the Planner.

Planner Ley- Will review the audio as well as Planner Trelstad's notes to make the report more complete for the next review.

Schedule for review:

- 1) Friday, July 10—Planning Board members receive full draft report from AKRF
- 2) July 11 through July 16—Planning Board members review and comment on draft report
- 3) July 17—AKRF amends draft report and re-submits to Planning Board members
- 4) July 20—Planning Board makes any final tweaks to draft report, and approves as amended
- 5) July 21—Planning Board submits Final Report to Town Board.

The Planning Board would like the following letter from Metro North Railroad to be a part of the record.

June 30, 2009

Mr. Ryan Courtien, Supervisor
Town of Dover Town Board
126 East Duncan Hill Road
Dover Plains; NY 12522

Dear Supervisor Courtien:

The DEIS for Knolls of Dover has been reviewed by MTA Metro-North Railroad (MNR). MNR recognizes that Transit-Oriented Development in the vicinity of our Railroad stations, as embodied in the proposed Conceptual Development Plan for the Knolls of Dover, may have great benefits if planned appropriately. The proposed action to redevelop the site with residential and commercial development can stimulate ridership at MNR's Harlem Valley Wingdale Station, increasing ridership and reducing vehicle miles travelled. These are objectives that MNR supports.

However, we do have specific concerns on this proposal and comments regarding the project's potential impacts on the Railroad:

1. The developer's plan relocates the existing station commuter parking to a new

parking lot just south of the station platform as part of the proposed action. The timing, cost and funding of this action are not addressed, which potentially puts the station and its access at risk. MNR cannot allow the loss of a New York State asset that is critical to transportation in the region. The proposed action seems to assume that MNR would make a significant capital outlay to replace its own parking and even relocate the station. This is not an option. MNR does not intend to expend capital funds to relocate stations and parking in order to facilitate a private development. If we approved such an action, we would expect this cost to be borne by the developer.

2. The plan proposes to build a new train station building and relocate the existing platform to the west side of the tracks and it is apparently expected that MNR would pay for the capital cost of these improvements as well. These improvements are not needed or required for Railroad operations. Given the severe economic constraints presently confronting the MTA and the Railroad, MNR is not in the position to make any commitments to these projects.

3. MNR could potentially support the project if the Railroad is kept whole and our operations are not negatively impacted. This could be accomplished by a commitment from the developer to assume all of the costs involved in implementing their proposed plans.

4. In light of the issues raised in # 1 and #2 above, we request that the Alternatives Analysis section of the EIS be modified to include an alternative that leaves the station parking and platform in place.

5. Although MNR has a train station and commuter parking lots located within the proposed project area and its Railroad right-of-way bisects the project, MNR is not listed as either an Involved or Interested Agency. We request that the Final EIS reflect MNR's interest and involvement.

Sincerely,

Linda Corcoran, Deputy Director Business development, facilities & Marketing Department

CC:

R. Fleischer, MNR
 M. Mannix, MNR
 J. Sedore, Jr., MTA
 K. Timko, MNR
 Building Inspector, Town of Dover Building Department
 Dutchess County Department of Health
 Dutchess County Water and Wastewater Authority
 Dutchess County Department of Public Works
 Highway Superintendent, Town of Dover Highway Department
 NYSDOT Region 8
 NYS Depart. Of Environmental Conservation, Region 3
 NYS-Attorney General Office
 Town of Dover Architectural Review Beard
 Town of Dover Town Board
 Town of Dover Planning Board
 Town of Dover Zoning Board of Appeals
 Town of Dover Conservation Advisory Council
 US Army Corps of Engineers

It was noted by a member of the audience that this particular train station was note downed by Metro North- It was commented that it was the only one that was owned by the stet of NY and it is now owned by the applicant.

There was then a discussion as to who owned the actual train Station on Rt 22 and Wheeler Road and the concerns of parking.

Clarification as to who owns this rail station is needed.

Chair Wylock- Before we have a member who submitted a letter to the supervisor - and he read:

Memo

Re: Dissenting 'comment regarding Proposed Amendment to Section 145-16 of the Zoning Code.

Date: June 30, 2009

From: Planning Board Member Valerie LaRobardier

To: Supervisor Courtien and Members of the Board of the Town of Dover

Via: Email and USPS

It is with regret that I admit that I placed too much hope in the process of the Planning Board's deliberations regarding the Dover Knolls project. I had thought we could engage in an honest effort to fully consider all the issues, thus demonstrating that we could move past the unfortunate events that politicized our board. In the end I am forced to accept the reality that the Planning Board's comment will just be one of many, as will my comment. It will be considered by the Town Board and the Applicant, as will all other comments. My hope had been that our comment process would demonstrate that we were indeed fully capable to handle evaluating this and other large projects in the best interest of the town.

I am a firm believer in majority rule. As such I would have supported a joint opinion that differed from mine had I felt that a legitimate attempt was made to hear and consider all views. This was not the case. We can all continue to learn from every single person we encounter. It is therefore advisable to listen carefully, even to dissenting views, and where parts of those opinions have merit, to give those views credence. Our Planning Board is charged to act as a team. We did not do so regarding this amendment. The proper way to act would have been to arrive at the meeting without a predetermined result in mind, listen to all views and ask questions to see whether or not any part of what was said might be incorporated into our opinion, and then use the remaining time on our 62 day clock for individual members to consider all the opinions before them prior to voting-not necessarily that we would continue discussing it the entire time. Had a good faith attempt been made to follow this process, I certainly would have strongly considered voting yes, for some of the points counter to mine that were brought out last night may well have merit-but in point of fact, I did not have time to consider this before I was rushed into a preconceived vote. It is for that reason that I abstained. No other conclusion should be drawn from my refusal to vote. The first problem that I see here is the degree to which our business is carried out in secret, without knowledge of -the public, or even of all our members. As an illustration 1 point to the letter from Michael Zarin regarding the outcome of the June 15th meeting. This letter was received apparently June 17th, nearly two weeks ago. It was not circulated to the Planning Board members to whom it was addressed until we sat down at our meeting June 29th. (I should say not circulated to all members-I can only speak to the fact that it was not circulated to me.) In spite of this fact, a response went out from Planning Board Co-Chair David Wylock on June 21st, also not circulated to me until last night. It appears that actions are being taken on behalf of the board outside the meeting and without full knowledge of every

member of the board.

Secondly, our determination to accept an opinion that was set forth outside the meeting shows a pre-existing bias. While it is admittedly difficult, possibly impossible, to go into a meeting without feelings one way or another of a desired outcome, alternative views should still be examined for merit. This is not the first time I have ever advocated a minority view, and certainly as such I would not expect to sway everyone. Seeing that, I harbor no hurt feelings or surprise over not winning. However, if indeed we are performing as a team, then in good conscience opposing opinions of all board members must be considered prior to dismissal. Refusal to do so demonstrates that we have not moved beyond politics, and indeed we are not capable of deliberating on projects of this scale where each and every decision has the power to dramatically affect good for our town for all time to come. My hope was not that my opinion would prevail-that would be unrealistic in this case. I did imagine however, that we would be able to demonstrate an honest effort showing that we could move beyond the bad faith actions that politicized this board. We instead demonstrate that we cannot move forward. While it is understandable, seeing as how the Planning Board was kept in the dark under the prior administration, it is nevertheless frustrating that the board members cannot grasp the reality that the code was designed to give the Town Board control of the project, that lead agency status is mandated by that code and was never "taken away from us", and that this all happened during the prior administration. The current Town Board that is continually critiqued for the situation did not bring it about. We cannot grasp that we are not supposed to be designing or redesigning the project-and this would not be our role regardless of lead agency status-but rather we should be commenting on the content that exists. We demonstrate the inability to recognize the scope of this project with claims such as individual site plans can be effectively studied by individual town residents-they cannot, which is why all projects of this size require hiring a full compliment of qualified consultants. This view shows that we do not understand that the term "lead agency" implies a management or leading function, not that every activity need be personally carried out by a board member-a process that would stall a project of this size for decades. We even demonstrate that we do not understand that Graham Trelstad and Ashley Ley are part of one team at AKRF and are both fully qualified to consider these comments. Though this was clearly laid out at the meeting that introduced AKRF as Town Planners when the Town Board hired them, we still find it necessary to compartmentalize and call Ashley "our" planner and Graham "the Town Board's" planner. Besides demonstrating that we are not paying attention to detail and that we are capable of serious rudeness, it shows that in spite of our mandate to "serve at the pleasure of the Town Board", we have set ourselves up as a separate and contentious entity. We find it appropriate to question the intentions of the Town Board to honor our extended comment period, although clearly it has already been enacted into law. We consider it acceptable to doubt other's motives at every turn, but we are outraged that they could ever doubt our motives or our sincerity. And finally, I still have not received an answer to my question regarding how the Planning Board is being prevented from contributing its expertise to this review process. As long as this pattern continues, it demonstrates to me a clear reason why the Planning Board must never have a controlling role in this project.

For all of these reasons I cannot in good conscience support our alternative

amendment, though elements of it no doubt are well thought out. To the extent that the Town Board and their consultants find it applicable I have faith that they will incorporate the relevant elements and discard those that are inappropriate. The basis for our opinion was that the Planning Board should have more control over the project not less. Though my comments herein may appear to be reporting a series of events and critiquing them, this is not the case. The series of events unfortunately demonstrates that our case is invalid, and therefore reiterating those events here is relevant. In spite of everything, I continue to hold out hope that we will continue to grow and educate ourselves and learn to interact as a team, both within our board and with other civic entities. I regret that it appears this may not happen in time to contribute properly to this review.

Chair Wylock- To add to that:

I HAVE RECENTLY BEEN THE SUBJECT OF PERSONAL ATTACKS ABOUT MY CHARACTER, INTEGRITY, ETC. WHILE I LEARNED EARLY ON IN MY TWO CAREERS IN LIFE, SPANNING OVER 45 YEARS, NOT TO DIGNIFY COMMENTS LIKE THIS, BUT TO EITHER IGNORE THEM OR TAKE THEM FROM WHENCE THEY COME. HOWEVER I AM IN RECEIPT OF AND I BELIEVE ALL OUR MEMBERS HAVE A COPY OF A MEMO THAT A FELLOW BOARD MEMBER SENT TO THE TOWN SUPERVISOR ATTACKING NOT ONLY ME AS CHAIRMAN, BUT THE PLANNING BOARD ITSELF. FOR THIS I AM COMPELLED TO RESPOND. I WILL TRY TO MAKE MY POINTS BRIEF, BUT RIGHT TO THE POINT.

PARAI- REFERS TO THE PLANNING BOARD BEING POLITICIZED. THIS COMMENT IS TOTALLY WITHOUT MERIT. I HAVE WORKED DILIGENTLY AS CHAIRMAN TO KEEP POLITICS OUT OF OUR BUSINESS. IF THE WRITER CAN PROVE OTHERWISE, I CHALLENGE HER TO COME FORWARD.

WRITER RAMBLES ON ABOUT PREDETERMINED RESULTS. I REMIND HER THAT SIX BOARD MEMBERS VOTED LOUD AND CLEAR IN FAVOR OF THE RESOLUTION OBJECTING TO AMENDING THE ZONING LAW IN THIS MATTER. THEIR VOTES WERE CAST WITHOUT ANY PROMPTING, COACHING OR SECRET BUSINESS BEING CONDUCTED WITHOUT KNOWLEDGE OF THE PUBLIC. HER REFERENCE TO MY LETTER TO MICHAEL ZARIN- DATE JUNE 21, 2009 WAS A PRIVATE LETTER FROM ME TO HIM, NOT ON PLANNING BOARD STATIONARY AND POSTED PERSONALLY BY ME. I WAS UNDER NO OBLIGATION. TO MAKE THIS LETTER AVAILABLE TO THE PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS, HOWEVER I DID SO. I

PARAIII- REFERENCE TO PRE EXISTING BIAS. THIS APPEARS TO BE A PLAGIARIZED COMMENT FROM MICHAEL ZARIN'S LETTER. STATEMENTS THAT WE HAVE NOT MOVED BEYOND POLITICS IN OUR BUSINESS. NO BASIS OR FOUNDATION OR JUSTIFICATION FOR SUCH COMMENTS.

PARA IV- STATES THAT BOARD MEMBERS CANNOT GRASP THE REALITY THAT THE CODE WAS DESIGNED TO GIVE TOWN BOARD CONTROL OF THE PROJECT. THIS ALLUDES TO OUR ABILITY AND/OR INTELLIGENCE WHICH I CONSIDER INSULTING TO THE ENTIRE BOARD. WE ARE ALSO WELL AWARE OF THE TERM LEAD AGENCY AND ITS MEANING AND THEREFORE DO NOT NEED TO BE LECTURED ON THIS.

THE WRITER GOES ON TO MAKE A SILLY AND FRIVOLOUS REMARK ABOUT THE BOARD NOT UNDERSTANDING THAT GRAHAM TRELSTAD AND ASHLEY LEY ARE PART OF THE SAME TEAM. NO ONE QUESTIONS THEIR QUALIFICATIONS AND CREDENTIALS. I, PERSONALLY LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH EITHER OF THESE FINE PEOPLE.

PARAV- COMMENTS ON OUR OPINION THAT THE PLANNING BOARD SHOULD HAVE MORE CONTROL OVER THE PROJECT, NOT LESS. IN FACT OUR OPINION IS THAT THERE IS NO JUSTIFICATION OR RATIONALE FOR AMENDING THE ZONING CODE AS PROPOSED OTHER THAN THE APPLICANT DOES NOT WANT TO HAVE THE PLANNING BOARD INVOLVED IN THIS PROJECT.

I IN CLDSIING I WANT TO STATE FOR THIS RECORD THAT THIS DOCUMENT IS WITHOUT MERIT, IT BORDERS ON SLANDER AND I BELIEVE THAT THE WRITER OWES THE PLANNING BOARD AN OPEN AND PUBLIC APOLOGY FOR HER COMMENTS. TO ME THIS IS NOTHING MORE THAN "SOUR GRAPES" BECAUSE THE BOARD VOTED BY AN OVERWEHELMING MAJORITY TO OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENTS WE HAVE MUCH MORE IMPORTANT THINGS TO DO THAN TO BE SUBJECTED TO THESE KIND OF PERSONAL ATTACKS.

There was a discussion as to the letter and comments written between the Chair of the Board as well as the Members of the Board

The Author had made comment that their comments were mis-understood as well as taken out of context.

Member Kelly stated these were the reasons he did not attend that meeting- He feels that many still believe that he and Member Johnson are wrong accused of being political and involved. The things he believes in are clearly stated.

Attorney Polidoro- As of this date the Planning Board as a whole has not responded to Mr. Zarin's letter and recommended the Board to respond to the legality of their actions.

- 6) FYI- Up coming dates: Friday, July 10—Planning Board members receive full draft report from AKRF
- 7) July 11 through July 16—Planning Board members review and comment on draft report
- 8) July 17—AKRF amends draft report and re-submits to Planning Board members
- 9) July 20—Planning Board makes any final tweaks to draft report, and approves as amended
- 10) July 21—Planning Board submits Final Report to Town Board.

Motion made by Barbara Kendall to adjourn 10:22 2nd by John Fila

VOTE: DAVID WYLOCK - AYE MEMBER BARBARA KENDALL - AYE MEMBER JOHN FILA - AYE
 MEMBER BRIAN KELLY- AYE MEMBER JAMES JOHNSON- AYE MEMBER PETER MUROSKI- ABSENT
 MEMBER VALERIE LAROBARDIER- AYE

Respectfully submitted,

Betty-Ann Sherer

This meeting may be viewed in full on the Town of Dover web site by going to www.townofdover.us
 Full Audio may be requested for a fee by completing a FOIL request form from the Dover Town Clerk