

### Town of Dover Planning Board

Town of Dover  
126 East Duncan Hill Road  
Dover Plains, NY 12522



(845) 832-6111 ext 100

Planning Board  
Monday, April 4, 2011  
7:00PM

- Co-CHAIR David Wylock
- Co- Chair Valerie LaRobardier
- Member James Johnson
- Member Peter Muroski
- Member Michael Villano
- Member Sharon Ipavich

Also, in attendance representing the Planning Board were Planning Board Attorney Victoria Polidoro. Planner Ashley Ley & Engineer Joseph Berger

For the Applicants: - Steve Vincent & Chris Vincent for Oak Hill Subdivision, Attorney Rick O'Rourke for Zingaro Subdivision, Rich Rennia for Dover Village Expansion, Amy Rosuck & Curt Johnson of Zarecki & Associates for Camp Ramah, Joel Chase of Zarecki & Associates and Bill Dacheille for Dacheille, John Kalin of DC Engineering for 22 West Properties ARB Member Brigid Casson, 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 at 7:05 pm by Chair Wylock and began with the Pledge of Allegiance

**Public Hearing:**

**I. OAK HILL SUBDIVISION- 7061-00-608644**

**Applicant** Steven Vincent      **Plans Prepared by** John Decker  
**Property located** at 62 Dover Furnace Road on 333 acres in the RU district  
**Application for** Subdivision to create 5 new large acreage parcels with no plan for development, construction or change of use

Steve Vincent: The plan is to create 5 new lots ranging from 49 to 65 acres. There are no plans for construction or further subdivision; the use will stay the same.

Co-Chair Wylock - As Mr. Vincent said, it is a simple subdivision; by right the eventual owners of these parcels can build one house on each parcel. If they desire to build more than one home on any of the parcel, they will need to return to the Planning Board for subdivision and environmental review.

The secretary sent out the letters to surrounding properties a few weeks ago, and last Thursday we heard from Con Edison. They had questions on the easement.

Secretary- They did not have specific questions on the easement itself, but needed more information as to how this subdivision affected them. The maps were sent to them again, this time through email, and have not received comments.

Attorney Polidoro- we do have a concern with the access to the one land locked parcel on the south east portion of the parcel, you did provide an access way over the adjacent lot, it is also over the Iroquois Gasoline easement, so we would like to see a copy of the easement to make sure it allows you access over the easement.

Planner Ley- Is there any way for you to move that line 25' beyond the edge of the easement, so it can be free and clear.

Mr. Vincent- There's no need because we have full use over that. Iroquois only has the easement for the gas line itself.

Planner- But if you ever needed to put a driveway or road in-

Mr. Vincent- The easement is we did 50' the one for Iroquois is 35'

Planner- On the map it shows as less than the width of the easement, it's 25'. So the Board would prefer the property line would go beyond the easement in terms of making the property lines more even then you could possibly move the rear property line back

Mr. Vincent - Thought the reason for doing this was so the rear parcel would have road access on rt 22. So later on if someone wanted to get a bank loan, they would have road access.

Planner- That is exactly why, but now the only road access you provided is over another easement, which we have not seen

Mr. Vincent- There are 3 easements on Con Edison line from Cricket Hill road, that we currently have.

Attorney - We're not talking about the Con Ed line

Mr. Vincent- I realize that but I thought that was done so in the future someone would have road frontage on rt 22. There are currently 3 easements from County rt 26 that do provide access for that parcel, there's a driveway there now.

Attorney- We're not looking for another easement, we just need to be sure that the land that you provided the access way to the back lot actually provides access, because some easements restrict use by others. We need to see that easement. As Ashley said the Board would prefer if you moved it past the easement to make sure that there is a free and clear strip of land that provides access.

Mr. Vincent- Ok

**Motion made by Valerie LaRobardier to open the Public Hearing 2nd by Peter Muroski**

VOTE: CO-CHAIR WYLOCK – AYE	CO-CHAIR VALERIE LAROBARDIER- AYE
MEMBER JAMES JOHNSON - ABSENT	MEMBER PETER MUROSKI – AYE
MEMBER MICHAEL VILLANO– AYE	MEMBER SHARON IPAVICH-AYE

*Motion approved*

There were no comments from the Public

*In view of the question of the easement this Public Hearing will be continued.*

Mr. Vincent- In the early stages we talked about the easements going across through Con Edison- I did send Con Ed a copy of our deeds, and I have not heard back from them  
Co-Chair Wylock- Understood, the circulation was sent December 6, 2010.

**Motion made by Michael Villano to continue the Public Hearing to May 2, 2011 2nd by Sharon Ipavich**

VOTE: CO-CHAIR WYLOCK – AYE  
MEMBER JAMES JOHNSON - ABSENT  
MEMBER MICHAEL VILLANO– AYE  
CO-CHAIR VALERIE LAROBARDIER- AYE  
MEMBER PETER MUROSKI – AYE  
MEMBER SHARON IPAVICH-AYE

*Motion approved*

**RESOLUTION DETERMINING SIGNIFICANCE  
OAK HILL SUBDIVISION**

April 4, 2011

Dover Furnace Road, Dover Plains

WHEREAS, the applicant, C. Gerald Vincent, has submitted an application for approval of a conventional subdivision plat to create 6 lots from an existing 333 acre lot located on 62 Dover Furnace Road, Dover Plains, Tax Grid No. 7061-00-608644 (the “site”); and

WHEREAS, the property is located within the RU Zoning District, with portions of proposed lots 1, 2 and 3 are located within the Soil Mining Overlay District; and

WHEREAS, the Great Swamp, a Class C(T) stream, traverses proposed Lots 1 and 2; and

WHEREAS, the parcels contain a mix of industrial, agricultural and mining uses and the applicant has indicated that he is not seeking a change in use at this time; and

WHEREAS, on December 6, 2010, the Planning Board classified the action as an unlisted action and circulated notice of its intent to serve as lead agency in a coordinated review of the project to the agencies set forth in the attached list, to which no agency has objected; and

WHEREAS, by letter dated January 10, 2011, the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) responded that it did not object to the Planning Board serving as lead agency and identified 6 environmental concerns in connection with the application; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has reviewed the DEC’s list of concerns and has evaluated the likelihood of environmental impacts arising from the proposed subdivision and the potential for 6 new single-family homes, located on proposed lots ranging from 49 acres to 66 acres.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby acknowledges that the 333 acre site contains potentially significant environmental resources but determines that the proposed action, the subdivision of 333 acres into 6 lots ranging from 49 acres to 66 acres and the potential for 6 single-family homes, with no other proposed development, will not result in a significant adverse impact on the environment.**

Moved by: Valerie LaRobardier      Seconded by: Peter Muroski

David Wylock                      AYE      Valerie LaRobardier                      AYE

Sharon Ipavich	<u>AYE</u>	James Johnson	<u>Absent</u>
Peter Muroski	<u>AYE</u>	Michael Villano	<u>AYE</u>

Planning Board Co-Chair David Wylock

Involved and Interested Agencies:

1. NYS Department of Environmental Conservation,
2. NYS Department of Transportation,
3. Friends of the Great Swamp,
4. Consolidated Edison,
5. Dover School District,
6. MTA,
7. Dutchess County EMC

Discussions:

Zingaro- Extension of Final plat

Attorney Richard O'Rourke of Keane & Beane- The Board examined this application extensively. Conditional final was granted and they are now requesting an extension of that approval. The Legislature last year by law adopted and had signed by then Governor Patterson, a law that permits extensions at 90 day intervals. This is in recognition of the economic circumstance. We are here requesting an extension.

**RESOLUTION GRANTING 90 DAY EXTENSION OF TIME IN WHICH TO SATISFY THE  
CONDITIONS OF FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAT APPROVAL**

**ZINGARO (ROUTE 55 CORP.)**

**April 4, 2011**

**Tax Parcel No. 7259-00-088958**

WHEREAS, on August 2, 2010, the Planning Board granted an erosion and sediment control permit and conditional final approval to an eight lot flexible subdivision plat entitled "Final Subdivision Plat known as Route 55 Corp.", for property located on New York State Route 55, Tax Parcel No. 7259-00-088958 (the "site"); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 276(7)(c) of the NYS Town Law, conditional approval of a final plat shall expire within 180 days after the resolution granting such approval unless all requirements stated in such resolution have been certified as completed; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 276(7)(c) of the NYS Town Law, a planning board may extend for periods of 90 days the time in which a conditionally approved plat must be submitted for signature if, in the planning board's opinion, such extension is warranted; and

WHEREAS, on January 3, 2011, the Planning Board granted the applicant a 90 day extension of time in which to meet the conditions of final plat approval to April 29, 2011; and

WHEREAS, by letter dated March 17, 2011, the applicant's attorney requested a second 90 day extension of the time in which to meet the conditions of final plat approval; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has considered the particular circumstances of the applicant which warrant an extension thereof.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby grants the applicant a second 90 day extension of time in which to satisfy the conditions of final plat approval to and including July 28, 2011.**

**Moved by:** Valerie LaRobardier    **Seconded by:** Michael Villano

David Wylock	<u>AYE</u>	Valerie LaRobardier	<u>AYE</u>
Sharon Ipavich	<u>AYE</u>	James Johnson	<u>absent</u>
Peter Muroski	<u>AYE</u>	Michael Villano	<u>AYE</u>

Planning Board Co-Chair David Wylock

**II. DOVER VILLAGE PLAZA EXPANSION - 7063-00-562258**

**Applicant** Cedar Dover Plains LLC      **Plans Prepared by** Rennia Engineering Design

**Property located** at 3042 Rt 22, Dover Plains, NY

**Application for** Site Plan / Special Permit / Subdivision to subdivide a 5 acre lot and install a 35,814 sf retail grocery store on 5 acres of a 11.9 acre lot in the HC /AQ districts

Rich Rennia- Here to discuss the follow up from the site walk which was held on Wednesday March 30<sup>th</sup>. There was discussion of a third concept, concept C.

Co-Chair Wylock - No one has reviewed this concept and he would prefer the discussion to be focused on the site walk.

Member Muroski- The steep portion of rt 22 needs more substance than just grass. There were a few erosion areas noted from the hill, one thought was a conservation seed mix; something that is salt tolerant, and is more adaptive to this location. It would stabilize the hill. He felt the hill was mowed too short, large shrubs and small trees could help mask the big building and act as a soil stabilizer. There are a few mixes he had in mind and he will discuss them with the board.

Planner Ley- In line with Pete’s comments, keeping a more natural appearance would work better than the defined row of trees that was on the original plan. The trees within the parking area and the pathways connecting the parking area to the exiting village, making more of a curved path, bringing in more shrubs and planting to soften the site.

Member Muroski- Not that we’re commenting on the plan you just gave us, but it seems like you addressed some of this on plan C.

Co-Chair Wylock - We also discussed the soil content on the borings and if you could share that information with Joe (Berger) **A:** Yes.

Engineer Rennia- there were soil and geotechnical tests because 2 out of the 5 existing buildings are pile supported buildings as well as the McDonalds in the area. What they are finding is that the central area of the site is the worst place for building. The better place so far is at this end of the site (pointing to the map) they would like to pursue concept A and thee will be a better job in a natural screening approach along rt 22. The Applicant will do an upgraded job in working with the Board in more Architectural details. There will also be more consideration to shielding the roof and roof top units. There will be paving removed and an increase of green space closer to rt 22 the parking can be pushed more east. There was also discussion with the tenant about modifications to the loading dock, possibly turn it to remove paving and they would work with the Fire Company to see if this is the access they would want and possibly use grass pavers as a fire lane only.

Attorney Polidoro- The Board discussed a possible “balloon test” for the height of the building. There was also discussion of “greening “of the project, which the developer had said he would look into these techniques.

Co-Chair Wylock - the balloon test is to give us a visual of how the roof line would be as you come up rt 22

**A:** We can do that; just let us know when you would like to see it.

Co-Chair Wylock-By our next meeting

**A:** We can schedule it before hand so the members can drive by.

Co-Chair Wylock- Yes, get that and the EAF done by the deadline we can discuss the revision on May 2.

Attorney Polidoro- As far as the balloon test, it might be helpful to provide Public notice either in the paper or on a sign on site so at public hearing people can comment.

The balloon test will aid the Board in their SEQRA determination.

Co-Chair LaRobardier- This should be photographed from every angle so we can show the photos during the Public Hearing.

Attorney Polidoro- This can just be a community Notice, not a legal notice.

**III. Camp Ramah 7161-00-610450**

**Applicant Jewish Theological Seminary Plans Prepared by Curt Johnson of Zarecki & Assoc. Property located at 91 Ramah Road Wingdale, NY 12522**

**Application for a Site Plan / Special Permit for their Master Plan and Specific site plans for review- High Ropes and Gymnasium**

Curt Johnson

**Master Plan-** The 30 days for circulation has ended. Comments from the Planner were received today

There will be revisions made to the Large Event Management plan and it will be resubmitted CT Maile has gone back to the site and are coordinating with DEC on the wetlands study and for the validation and flagging.

Based on the DEC response for lead agency Strata have been contracted For Cultural resources the testing will begin this coming week.

Tim Miller is working on finalizing the noise study as well as the expanded limited habitat study- We had timber rattlers last time and we're putting bog turtle on it this time

Q: Is there Indiana bat? A: No

Q; New England rabbits? A: no

Engineer Berger- For the master plan- he reviewed the SWPPP, and it is acceptable for a master plan. There are no other comments other than items pointed out by the Planner.

Attorney Polidoro- It has been over 30 days since circulation, so the Board can declare Lead agency if they choose.

There have also been 2 site plans submitted, the site plans are the detailed look at some of the things being proposed as part of the master plan, so while it is too early to take action since SEQRA has not been done on the entire master plan, we could get a head start by getting those 2 applications referred to the County.

Planner Ley

AKRF, Inc. has reviewed the following documents and plans for the above referenced application:

1. Large Event Management Plan (LEMP)
2. High Ropes Course Site Plan application and supporting documents
3. Gymnasium Site Plan application and supporting documents

**COMMENTS**

***LARGE EVENT MANAGEMENT PLAN***

1. Since this LEMP will govern all large events on the site for the duration of the Special Permit, the date should be more generic. For example, it could state that "Annual Visiting Day will be held each year on the 3rd Thursday in July" (or if the date is not as regular, it could include a statement of how the Town will be notified of each year's date).

2. The LEMP should also include a provision as to how the Town would be notified of any other large events that may occur. For example, "Should any other large events be planned, the Camp will notify the Town of

the time and date of that event in writing a minimum of two (2) weeks before the event.”

3. Section 6.7. Noise should include the hours of operation for the PA system.

4. There should be a statement at the end of the document regarding how the LEMP will be kept current. For example, “An updated copy of the LEMP will be provided to the Building Department on an annual basis informing them of the date(s) of the event(s), current contact information, current insurance information, and any other relevant administrative information that may have changed since the previous year.”

5. The first page of the excel sheet in Appendix A includes a number of unanswered questions which should be completed. In addition, the plan should include provisions for taking the signs down (e.g. “a staff member will be responsible for removing all off-site directional signage within 48 hours of the end of the event”).

#### *HIGH ROPES COURSE*

1. It appears that the proposed ropes course will be out of the stream buffer. However, the 100 foot stream buffer should be shown on the site plan.

#### *GYMNASIUM*

1. The proposed gymnasium would be located approximately 50 feet from a wetland. As previously discussed, it should be confirmed whether or not this wetland is regulated by NYSDEC. If NYSDEC previously inspected this wetland, a copy of the stamped map should be provided to the Town. Depending on when this wetland was inspected, the map may need to be updated.

2. As per the recently adopted § 145-45.G, the Planning Board may increase the maximum footprint of a camp structure up to 20,000 square feet, provided that the following conditions are met:

(1) The structure is not located on a ridgeline; and

(2) The structure would not create an unmitigated adverse impact to any scenic view sheds, in particular, views from public recreational resources such as the Appalachian Trail, Swamp River, and/or scenic byways; and

(3) The building is appropriately located on the site, and landscaping is utilized to minimize its visibility from adjacent residences and public roadways; and

(4) The structure is subject to review by the Town of Dover Architectural Review Board; and

(5) Any adverse impacts on water resources shall be mitigated to the maximum extent practicable.

3. Based on the site walk, it is likely that the proposed gymnasium would only be visible within the camp property. As such, visual impacts to sensitive receptors such as public recreational areas, or adjacent residences are not anticipated. However, the building would be located in close proximity to a wetland. As such, additional native plantings appropriate for a wetland buffer should be provided between the proposed gymnasium and the wetlands to mitigate potential impacts to water resources.

Engineer Johnson- In the previous study the wetlands near the gym were not DEC.

Attorney Polidoro- How high is the ropes course?

A: Approximately 40' - there's a series of poles, ropes that connect them and then there is a zip line to the south of the site.

Attorney Polidoro- we'll need to discuss whether or not you'll need a variance for the height.

Co-Chair Wylock- You had posed the question if approval could be moved forward on the rope course for this season, but it doesn't seem to be possible.

**Motion made by Valerie LaRobardier to refer this ropes course and gymnasium to County Planning  
2nd by Peter Muroski**

VOTE: CO-CHAIR WYLOCK – AYE  
MEMBER JAMES JOHNSON - ABSENT  
MEMBER MICHAEL VILLANO– AYE  
CO-CHAIR VALERIE LAROBARDIER- AYE  
MEMBER PETER MUROSKI – AYE  
MEMBER SHARON IPAVICH-AYE

*Motion approved*

**Motion made by Michael Villano to Declare the Planning Board as Lead Agent 2nd by Sharon  
Ipavich**

VOTE: CO-CHAIR WYLOCK – AYE  
MEMBER JAMES JOHNSON - ABSENT  
MEMBER MICHAEL VILLANO– AYE  
CO-CHAIR VALERIE LAROBARDIER- AYE  
MEMBER PETER MUROSKI – AYE  
MEMBER SHARON IPAVICH-AYE

*Motion approved*

The question as to whether or not the ropes course (poles) classify as a structure and whether or not a variance would be needed.  
The poles will be driven into the ground, no footings.

**This application will be forwarded for a determination to the Code Enforcement Officer/ Building Inspector.**

Engineer Johnson- The Gymnasium is a 16,000 square foot building, a small gravel parking area on the north side of it. It will be open on 2 sides, drawings of the building are being done and we will go to ARB as well.

Attorney- A visual analysis, a mock up from the roadway would also be very helpful

A: When we were before the Zoning Board and ARB in the past we did look at the site from the AT and it pretty much won't be visible, there are some very large trees that shield it, it's also set in a sort of bowl area of the site.

Co-Chair Wylock - The Planning board did have an extensive site walk/ ride and we have a pretty good sense of the site.

Engineer Berger- There will be no new septic, no increase in population, just a new usage. As a condition this will have to be discussed with the Health Department. . Other than that the drainage and erosion control look good and I have no problems with them.

Brigid Casson- ARB Member- Is this a new structure and are they coming to the ARB?

A: Yes it is and they will be referred to the ARB, we don't have drawings on it yet, just the location

**IV. DACHILLE SUBDIVISION 6959-00-383093**

Plans prepared by Zarecki & Associates  
Property locate at 51 Dugway Drive, Wingdale  
Application to subdivide a 5.98 acre parcel with existing residence, detached garage and pool  
Into 2 lots, Parcel is located in the RC and the SR districts

Joel Chase- We have tried to tie up as many loose ends as we could. A pull off was added in the driveway, DEC has said this stream is a class "C" and the wetlands have been revalidated. Natural Heritage Program have said that the Cotton Tail Rabbits are in the vicinity of the site, not necessarily

on the site. Also an environmental consultant was hired to perform a limited habitat survey. According to her she does not believe this site houses any endangered, threatened or special concern species.

Co-Chair Wylock - What is the length of the driveway? A: approximately 400'.

Planner Ley

AKRF, Inc. has reviewed the letter from Karol Knapp, Aspen Environmental, to Mr. Dacheille, dated March 30, 2011 and offers the following comments:

1. As discussed in AKRF's 11/12/10 memorandum, given the proposed disturbance to wetland buffer area, wetlands, and stream corridors, we recommended that a limited habitat survey be conducted to identify the potential for threatened or endangered species to be located on the project site prior to the issuance of a SEQR determination. The letter provided by the applicant's representative only addresses the potential presence of the New England Cottontail, as the potential for that species to be on site was identified by NHP. However, as NHP's letter notes, their database is not definitive and should not be substituted for on site surveys. Therefore, the habitat survey should have addressed the potential for other threatened, endangered, or special concern species to be located on site. The conclusive sentence that "No additional species or habitat which would be of special concern was noted during Aspen's site evaluation" is insufficient in this regard. There should be a more substantive description of the property and its habitat. The survey should include an assessment of the ability of the on site habitat to provide (or to not provide) usable resources for other protected species. The evaluation of the property for the potential presence or absence of threatened, endangered, or special concern species should utilize NYSDEC or other recognized scientific methodology.

2. The habitat study failed to address the presence of the wetland, wetland buffer, and stream corridor. It should have included a discussion of this habitat area, including the dominant plant species, and quality of the wetland and stream corridor.

3. The habitat study did not include any figures to document the bounds of the study area investigated in the field by Aspen Environmental and should be provided. Photographs of the on site habitat should be included in the report to support its conclusions.

4. The qualifications of the personnel who conducted the species assessment should be provided.

5. The date of the survey, and any future assessments or surveys, should be indicated.

\*\*

Engineer Chase- We did get another letter today and I can give that to you. Also, the focus was on the cotton tail because of the DEC and she still does not feel there is any threatened, endangered of species of concern, this is not a habitable environment for them.

Planner- We would just need to see that in writing.

Attorney - The Board needs to consider impacts to streams and wetlands.

Engineer Berger- the pull off is there, the drive is wide enough and further away, as soon as the health department and dec approve the crossings I'll be satisfied.

Typically DEC won't give anything before they are approached for a permit. Until they get a neg dec, dec won't move. If you begin submitting to DEC and DOH in advance, and tell them you're moving through SERQA.

Planner- A preliminary meeting would be warranted in this case to see if DEC would even approve it

Mr.Dacheille- The DEC and Army Corps of Engineers has already approved crossing of the wetlands 50' away from where we are proposing.

Q; was that the only house on that property A: yes but it's the same stream, same wetland as we are This is not some thing that hasn't been done

Attorney Polidoro-Some times there is different criteria when they are looking at a parcel that has not been develop as opposed to one that has been and is looking to be further developed.

Mr. Dacheille- The DEC representative who flagged the parcel, Mike Clancy, had commented that there was no way possible for them to deny me since my neighbor is doing the same thing. They also won't consider it unless there's preliminary granted. They can't approve something for a lot that does not exist.

Attorney Polidoro- There is a response letter March 9, 2011 to some of the comment. One Engineer comment was is this stream regulated and if so the site might be regulated by the Stream Corridor Overlay district. The response referred to that this is a class C stream and that it didn't need a protection of waters permit. The question really was, does the Town of Dover, Stream Corridor Overlay District apply 145-14 of the Town Code. It says 'all streams classified by the NYS DEC as shown on the overlay district map. It would be best for you to review that overlay district map.

A: We have and it doesn't show that stream. Do we then need a permit from the Town?

Attorney -Not a permit, it just triggers, the stream corridor overlay. We should discuss this with the Code Enforcement Officer.

If it is in the district, all of the conditions DEC would impose are the same as what we would impose. It would have to be noted on the map and there are certain findings the Board would have to make will not result in degradation of scenic character, will not result in erosion, etc, it's just the additional findings

Engineer Chase- Also what is a limited habitat survey, it's a broad term and there are different opinions, you asked for pictures and other items.

Planner Ley- I would think if they were on the site, they would have brought a camera, and taken pictures of any significant habitat that was noted while they were visiting the site, the date, there was no description of the predominant features of the site this is basic information.

Q: So pictures are required?

A: If you are describing an area of the site and you are classifying it as a certain type of habitat, having a photo to support that conclusion to show the board is a reasonable request.

Co-Chair Wylock - Most of the environmental reports include photo, I would hope she would have taken pictures while she was there.

Engineer Berger- Did we give direction to the applicant about meeting with the DEC?

Attorney Polidoro- It would be helpful to have a meeting; I know DEC is understaffed at this time

Engineer Berger- Maybe to request one, because sometimes when moving a project forward it would help, meetings are being set sometimes by the size of the project and at this time of the year it could take 3-5 months or more and then you're limited to 1 meeting per project. This would be it, they meet at their office.

Attorney Polidoro- I think it should be set before SEQRA

Co-Chair Wylock-(To Engineer Chase) - I think you should set it up and keep Engineer Berger posted.

Engineer Chase- So we're going to set up a meeting with DEC, revise the habitat study and the stream corridor overlay.

#### V. 22 West Properties lot line adjustment 7059-04-739389

Applicant John Kalin PE for Shawn Goff property owner

Property located at Rock Hill & Route 22 Wingdale, NY

Application to merge 2 lots to gain access to main site for site plan approval

John Kalin- Last before the Board for an aspect of this project involving the lot line adjustment with Mr. Hamilton All of it is done, he went to the County today and there was a problem with filing the maps due to a tax issue Mr. Hamilton was having.

We are now here to eliminate the lot line between the .028 acre parcel and the 3.75 acre parcel. This will allow an entrance onto the site. He has met on site with DOT and they are moving forward

with the entrance. The timing was good because it was during the flooding event, and it helped with the review of the piping.

Attorney Polidoro- You received approval in October and if you don't get your map signed, you may want to request an extension. The second concern was that this was originally proposed with the development of the site, the 2- 5,000 square foot buildings.

We were able to separate the environmental review of the lot line adjustment between Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Goff, because that was going to go forward, whether or not this project moved forward. Now these two need to move forward together.

Engineer Kalin- Ok, we are working on both and next time you see this it will be populated with the site plan.

Attorney Polidoro- it has to be approved separately but reviewed together. This was proposed originally when SEQRA was done, so no further SEQRA needs to be done.

Co-Chair Wylock:

**RESOLUTION GRANTING 90 DAY EXTENSION OF TIME IN WHICH TO SATISFY THE  
CONDITIONS OF FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAT APPROVAL**

**Goff / Hamilton**

**April 4, 2011**

**Tax Parcel No. 7059-04-739389**

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby grants the applicant a 90 day extension of time in which to satisfy the conditions of final plat approval.**

**Moved by:** Valerie LaRobardier **Seconded by:** Sharon Ipavich

David Wylock	<u>AYE</u>	Valerie LaRobardier	<u>AYE</u>
Sharon Ipavich	<u>AYE</u>	James Johnson	<u>absent</u>
Peter Muroski	<u>AYE</u>	Michael Villano	<u>AYE</u>

Planning Board Co-Chair David Wylock

Next meeting we can pick up and continue where we were on SEQRA

Planner Ley- there were wetlands- were they flagged by DEC?

A: Yes they were, delineated and on a map.

Were there habitat concerns?

A: No, the wetland was by the train tracks, but not much there.

**VI. Minutes**

**Motion made by Valerie LaRobardier to approve the minutes of March 7, 2011 2nd by Michael Villano**

VOTE: CO-CHAIR WYLOCK – AYE	CO-CHAIR VALERIE LAROBARDIER- AYE
MEMBER JAMES JOHNSON - ABSENT	MEMBER PETER MUROSKI – AYE
MEMBER MICHAEL VILLANO– AYE	MEMBER SHARON IPAVICH-AYE

*Motion approved*

**Dover Knolls** - Site plan has been submitted, the Board has 3 sets, one for Victoria, 1 master and one for the Board to pass. We have 62 days to make comment and submit a report. We can meet at our second meeting set for May 16, to discuss and recommend.  
Stormwater - we will rely on Joe. Escrow is available for our Attorney, Joe & Ashley will share their comments

**Motion made by Michael Villano to adjourn 8:57 pm 2nd by Sharon Ipavich**

VOTE: CO-CHAIR WYLOCK – AYE	CO-CHAIR VALERIE LAROBARDIER- AYE
MEMBER JAMES JOHNSON - ABSENT	MEMBER PETER MUROSKI – AYE
MEMBER MICHAEL VILLANO– AYE	MEMBER SHARON IPAVICH-AYE

*Motion approved*

Respectfully submitted,

***Betty-Ann Sherer***

Betty-Ann Sherer

PlanningARB@TownofDoverNY.US

This meeting may be viewed in full on the Town of Dover web site by going to [www.townofdoverny.us](http://www.townofdoverny.us)

Full Audio may be requested for a fee by completing a FOIL request form from the Dover Town Clerk  
This meeting may now be viewed at Cablevision Channel 22 for residents who have that provider-Please check local listings for meeting re broadcast times

All reasonable accommodations will be made for persons with disabilities. In such a case, please notify Betty-Ann Sherer in advance by phone at 845-832-6111 ext 100 so that arrangements can be made

Please call the Planning Board Office with any questions 845-832-6111 ext 100