

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, May 2, 2011
7:00PM

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

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, Rich Rennia for Dover Village Expansion, Joel Chase of Zarecki & Associates and Bill Dachille for Dachille, Wayne Neckles and Michael Bodendorf for Madava Farms, 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: As of the last meeting there were questions from Con Edison regarding the ROW. We have submitted a revised map showing the road frontage being 75' off of rt 22 to lot #6. Iroquois has responded stating, they had no problems but to have included on the plat a "call before you dig", which we have no problem with.

Co-Chair Wylock- We also received a letter today from Con Edison, did you get a copy?
A; Yes we did, and we agree.

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

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
MEMBER TOM HOLMES– AYE	

Motion approved

There were no comments from the Public
Engineer Berger- The map is fine.
Planner Ley- the access we requested has been provided.
There were no further comments from the Board

Motion made by Valerie LaRobardier to close the Public Hearing 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
MEMBER TOM HOLMES– AYE	

Motion approved

**RESOLUTION GRANTING PRELIMINARY LAYOUT AND CONDITIONAL FINAL
SUBDIVISION APPROVAL**

OAK HILL SUBDIVISION

May 2, 2011

Dover Furnace Road, Dover Plains

WHEREAS, the applicant, C. Gerard 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, although each new lot will have the potential for at least one single-family residence; and

WHEREAS, on April 4, 2011, the Planning Board, serving as lead agency in a coordinated review of the action, acknowledged that the 333 acre site contains potentially significant environmental resources but determined that the proposed action would not result in a significant adverse impact on the environment; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 277 of Town Law and Section 125-13 of the Code of the Town of Dover, before the Planning Board may approve a subdivision plat containing residential units, such subdivision plat shall also show, when required by such board, a park or parks suitably located for playground and other recreational purposes; and

WHEREAS, such land for parks and other recreational purposes may not be required until the Planning Board makes a finding that a proper case exists for requiring that a park or parks be suitably located for playgrounds or other recreational purposes within the town; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing on the application was opened on April 4, 2011, and continued to May 2, 2011, during which all those who wished to speak were heard.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board finds that a proper case exists for requiring parks and playgrounds to be suitably located and that a park of adequate size cannot be located on the site and the applicant shall be required to pay a fee of \$ 3,000.00 for each of the five new lots, to be deposited into the Town Recreation Fund; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby grants preliminary layout approval and final plat approval to the subdivision plat entitled “Lands of Vincent”, prepared by John H. Decker LS, dated October 13, 2010, last revised April 11, 2011, subject to the following conditions:

1. **Payment of all fees and escrow.**
2. **Revision of the plat to delete the phrase “Lot 6 ROW to 75” and replace it with “Lot 6 frontage on Route 22 to 75”.**
3. **Revision of the plat to include the following note: “Prior to any construction and/or excavation, the owner or excavator or their agent must notify Dig Safely New York at least 2 working days prior to starting work.”**

Moved by: Michael Villano Seconded by: Valerie LaRobardier

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>
Tom Holmes	<u>AYE</u>

Planning Board Co-Chair David Wylock

Discussions:

- II. **DOVER VILLAGE PLAZA EXPANSION - 7063-00-562258**
 Applicant Cedar Dover Plains LLC Plans Prepared by Renna Engineering Design
 Property located at 3042 Rt 22, Dover Plains, NY
 Application for Site Plan / Special Permit / Subdivision to subdivide a 11.9acres lot and install a 35,814 sf retail grocery store on 5 acres of a 11.9 acre lot in the HC /AQ districts

Co Chair Wylock- Last week we had a balloon test scheduled, the first day did not work out due to weather, and the second day was successful.

Rich Rennia- We had worked on other concepts which we have now submitted concept C, the building is on the south end, a new main entrance to the shopping center, just south of the post office. Also there is more of a green buffer area along rt 22. The over all asphalt area was reduced. There is also the proposal of native landscaping on the south end of the site to provide screening to the rear of the building.

Balloon Test- The balloons were flown at 29' to represent the highest point of the building.

Co Chair Wylock noted, he did drive north by the site and as he came across the bridge, was surprised the height of the proposed structure did not seem as high as he had expected.

There were 37 of photos submitted from the balloon test taken on April 28, 2011. Each photo was displayed and the view described

Questions from the Balloon test

Planner Ley the area in which the most exposed view would be from the Veterinary office across the road on rt 22. If the parapet were done right, it would cover the roof top mechanicals

Attorney Polidoro - The Board may request the applicant pick 1-2 photos and superimpose the building to give an even better building display.

Co- Chair LaRobardier- Are there alternate profile and designs being worked on in keeping the building surroundings

Engineer Rennia- Yes, if the Board seems to agree with the location then working on the Architectural easier.

Co Chair Wylock- felt the Board agreed Concept C was the best alternative.

Attorney Polidoro- There was a meeting with County Planning, could someone who was in attendance please summarize it?

A: There was a meeting with NYS DOT, Engineer Berger did attend. What also 'drove' concept C was the new main entrance, just south of the existing post office. There was speed testing and it was agreed that the design would be for 45 mph although it is a 35 mph zone. It was found that cars generally travel through this area at a higher speed than what they should be. There will be a lane taper and a left turning lane into the site. DOT was in favor and have requested more information to be put into a final traffic study with the numbers from Dover Knolls be worked in. That is being worked on and will be submitted to the Board.

The meeting from Dutchess County Planning- John Clarke, Noela Hooper- the different options were discussed and how we got to concept C. They felt given the site conditions, there was no other opinion as to what to do with the building. John Clarke did feel he would like to see things as close as possible to the hamlet area, given the conditions, there is no place and the actual zoning is here. Over all they did feel we were doing well with the existing site. They did feel the back side of the Post Office was barren and they asked if street trees or some kind of landscaping could be submitted to dress it up.

The parking areas were also discussed along with additional landscaping.

Co - chair Wylock- Did DOT have comments on a traffic light?

A: Right now it is not warranted, the numbers are close, and they are requiring the intersection be designed as if a traffic light would be there. In time if it were needed, then it would be further discussed.

Engineer Berger- At both of the meetings with DOT and the County- there were discussions on sidewalks. If no side walks were proposed on rt 22, then sufficient ROW should be there, and there is at this time, so no change in the plan is needed for that.

John Clarke from the County would like to see connectivity. There is one major one from the proposed market through to the existing plaza; he was looking for additional ones.

Engineer Rennia- Based on the DOT comments and the County they wanted to have access. A sidewalk was proposed at the edge of the side that would connect to the other properties. This would bring people in from the other sites in front of Dunkin donuts. When discussed it came up that a side walk might not work on rt 22, the focus was interior.

Q: is there a sidewalk from the center of the village to the Plaza?

A: no, it ends before Fresh town.

Engineer Berger- The soils testing for the site was looked at and the soil is difficult. The most favorable location is as proposed in plan C.

Q: Any idea what the water table is on site?

A: It varies; it's more the peat bog and material that you can't get a good stable foundation on, not necessarily the water, but the soils themselves.

Q: How far down did the borings go?

A: The deepest 168' and that would have been off one of the building corners on building B. And we seemed to encounter water at about 5'.

III. 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-Since the last meeting we revised our habitat survey. The Town of Dover CEO has confirmed we are not in the Stream Overlay District. We are here to continue the SEQRA process.

Planner Ley's review:

AKRF, Inc. has reviewed the letter from Karol Knapp, Aspen Environmental, to Mr. Chase, dated April 4, 2011 and offers the following comments:

1. The habitat study has been revised to substantially address the comments of AKRF's March 30, 2011 memorandum.
2. The study concludes that the site does not have the habitat to support threatened or endangered species found within the Town of Dover (e.g. Indiana bat, bog turtle, New England cottontail, or timber rattlesnake). As such, significant adverse impacts to threatened or endangered species are not anticipated from the proposed project.
3. The study provides a description of the wetland, wetland buffer, and the intermittent stream. The stream is considered a NYSDEC Class C watercourse, and Aspen Environmental describes the wetland community as one "commonly found" in New York State. Although the wetland and its buffer may be common to New York State, it is not degraded. It is protected by both NYSDEC and ACOE, and has some environmental value. As such, mitigation for the approximately 1,000 square feet of wetland and watercourse area, and 2,800 square feet of wetland buffer area, that would be directly impacted by the project should be provided. As stated in AKRF's November 12, 2010, memorandum, a wetland and wetland buffer mitigation plan should be prepared for the proposed project and submitted to the Planning Board.

4. It is important to note that the proposed impacts to the wetland, wetland buffer, and watercourse areas are avoidable. The site is already improved with a single-family house, and although the applicant was granted a variance, the proposed Lot 2 would be substandard for the Zoning District. The proposed project will require a discretionary action by the Planning Board, and impacts could be avoided by the Planning Board denying the subdivision application.

We are still waiting for the Wetland Mitigation Plan

Engineer Chase- We will submit that when we submit for a DEC permit, they will also review the mitigation measures.

Planner Ley- Right, but there will be an impact to these wetlands and they will be directly disturbed to get to this site. Since this Board is lead agent, they must conclude that no significant adverse impact would result, they would have to have some review of this mitigation plan prior to issuing the SEQRA determination or they can issue a conditioned negative declaration. This could be conditioned on the DEC approval of the wetland mitigation plan. It is something the Board should have a look at prior to DEC

Engineer Chase- We do plan on submitting it to the Board as well for review

Co- Chair Wylock- Before we do SEQRA we would like to review that report.

Attorney Polidoro- As part of SEQRA the Board needs to be able to determine that there is no adverse environmental impact. They need the mitigation report to make that determination.

Engineer Berger- Typically the purpose of neg dec is so the project can proceed to the Health Department there is really no reason why the health department can't start the review. They just have policy based on that, if the Board requests the Health Department begin the review to aid in furtherance. This is on the wetland buffer movement and relocation of the septic system and any location may actually have some of the wetland mitigation issues, maybe this will move the project forward as well as getting more information for the Board. So if the Board asks the Health Department to start their review, typically they will start earlier. It allows for some deep tests and percolations in preparation of the wetlands mitigation plan.

Attorney Polidoro- there is no issue with the Board sending a letter to the Board of Health requesting initiating review, they might not want to move forward with out the negative declaration but this will just help the Applicant.

IV. Meadowbrook Extension request

RESOLUTION TO EXTEND TIME IN WHICH TO SUBMIT A FINAL PLAT

Meadow Brook Estates Subdivision

May 2, 2011

WHEREAS, on November 8, 2007, the Planning Board granted preliminary plat approval to the subdivision entitled "Meadow Brook Properties, LLC" for property located on New York State Route 22, Tax Parcel No. 7063-00-511774 (the "site"); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 125-8(A) of the Dover Code, a final plat must be submitted to the Planning Board within six months of preliminary plat approval; and

WHEREAS, the applicant was not able to submit a final plat for the Board's consideration before the expiration of approval and five six-month extensions of time; and

WHEREAS, by letter dated April 12, 2011, the applicant timely requested an additional extension of time in which to submit a final plat from May 8, 2011 to November 8, 2011; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Town Law § 276(5)(h), the Planning Board hereby grants the applicant a six-month extension of time to November 8, 2011, to submit a final plat for the Board’s consideration.

It is the responsibility of the applicant to track the time frame within which this extension of approval will expire. There will be no written or verbal notification to the applicant from the Planning Board office prior to the expiration of this extension of the approval.

Moved by: Peter Muroski Seconded by: Valerie LaRobardier

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>
Tom Holmes	<u>AYE</u>

Planning Board Co-Chair David Wylock

V. **Kunzelman** Extension request:

RESOLUTION TO EXTEND TIME IN WHICH TO SUBMIT A FINAL PLAT

Kunzelman Subdivision

May 2, 2011

Tax Parcel No. 7161-00-698116

WHEREAS, on June 3, 2008, the Planning Board granted preliminary plat approval to the subdivision entitled “Kunzelman Subdivision” for property located on Weil Road, Tax Parcel No. 7161-00-698116 (the “site”); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 125-8(A) of the Dover Code, a final plat must be submitted to the Planning Board within six months of preliminary plat approval; and

WHEREAS, on December 2, 2008, the Board granted the applicant a 6-month extension of time within which to submit the final plat, to June 3, 2009; and

WHEREAS, on June 1, 2009, the Board granted the applicant a second 6-month extension to December 3, 2009; and

WHEREAS, on January 6, 2010, the Board granted the applicant a third 6-month extension of time to June 3, 2010; and

WHEREAS, on May 17, 2010, the Board granted the applicant a fourth 6-month extension of time to December 3, 2010; and

WHEREAS, on November 15, 2010, the Board granted the applicant a fifth 6-month extension of time to June 3, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has timely requested an additional extension of time in which to satisfy the conditions of preliminary plat approval and submit a final plat for the Board’s consideration; 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 6-month extension of time to submit a final plat to the Planning Board for the Board’s consideration to December 3, 2011.

It is the responsibility of the applicant to track the time frame within which this extension of approval will expire. There will be no written or verbal notification to the applicant from the Planning Board office prior to the expiration of this extension of the approval.

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>
Tom Holmes	<u>AYE</u>		

Planning Board Co-Chair David Wylock

VI. Madava Maple Farm- 6962-00-333200 & 6961-00-370940

Applicant Wayne Neckles For Robb Turner **Plans prepared by** Hudson Land Design
Property located at 47 McCourt Road, Dover, NY

Application for Site Plan amendment, revision changes the previously proposed horse barn to a maple syrup production facility. Parcels are a combined 512 acres in the RC and Stream Corridor Overlay district

Co Chair Wylock- There was never a site plan approval by this Board, this was an erosion control permit, and the applications will need to be revised.

Before you make your presentation, I would hope this Board was not mislead a few years ago when you came before us for an erosion control permit for what consisted of a 40,000 residence, an 8,000 square fool guest house , renovating an existing cabin, a 20,000 horse stable with the bridge over the stream. In the past few weeks we have heard of a 20,000 square foot building that was erected not on the same foot print as was shown on the original maps for the horse stable; perhaps you can explain

Wayne Neckles- After we had gotten the original approval, and we were getting ready to start the development there. We looked at the property, the owner originally wanted to do so agricultural as well as some house and a horse farm. We noticed there was a large amount of maple trees on the property. This led us to doing some studies on the quantity of the maple trees and the quality. At that point we realized we had a large amount of maple. We had contacted Mike Farrell from Cornell University to validate the quality of the sugar maples. He led us to Phil Caminsky from the University of North Carolina who was doing a study of trees in the northeast. Around 60 trees were sampled looking at the age and quality to see if they were good for maple harvesting. We found that not only were they good for maple harvesting, not only were they god but they weren’t as old as we had

thought. The coring showed us the actual age of the trees was 90 years old and very good for producing maple syrup.

The trees were very healthy and there was little evidence of tapping, over approximately 800 acres. At that point he had a meeting with George Hearn, the Building inspector and asked him if they were to shift gears and put up a sugar house in lieu of a horse farm would there be any problem with doing that? And he said we were doing agricultural and since it fell within those guidelines there wouldn't be an issue with it. So that pushed a whole series of research. We on building the best maple sugar house, we went throughout the north east looking at different sugar houses. We spoke to the three major manufactures of sugar making equipment and put together a plan that was filed with the Town to build the sugar house that we're working on right now. The building is pretty much verbatim to the plans submitted almost 1 year ago may 2010. Ground was not really broken until early July. They really weren't going to tap trees this year. A series of computer models was done to see how much syrup they could get out of the 800 acres they have. The model showed, with the quality of the trees we could do well. They decided to do a short tapping this year. It really got started in October, there were 18,000 taps done. The sugar house has not changed in design from what was filed.

There were photos of the site displayed and described to the Board

The photos displayed the tapping, tubing, equipment, structure.

The flow inside the plant is to make the production the most energy efficient, they are able to process approximately 9,000 gallons of maple sap per hour. Electricity is used to reduce the amount of water content and increase the sugar content from 2% to 22% prior to the evaporation process. The evaporation process began in February and the last collection was April 4. Many neighbors have stopped in to see the production.

Co- Chair Wylock- Is the product distributed form the site?

A: no, sales are on line and there is restaurant distribution in Manhattan. No retail from site.

Q: Are all of the trees tapped on their property?

A: yes

The building is roughly 1,700 feet from McCourt road, and not viewed from the road.

Q: During production is there a lot of noise?

A: Is side, some but you would not be able to hear it from outside the building. The yarrow system which runs on electric motors is very quiet. The loudest noise is the evaporator.

Q: Does production run 24 hours?

A: No, only at night, collect during the day and the evaporation is done at night. It begins around 6:00 and end around 10:00.

Member of the Public: Sir, can I say something right now?

Co -Chair Wylock- No, not right now, there will be a Public Hearing on this and then the Public will have an opportunity to speak

Q: Will that be published in the paper?

A: Yes it will and all adjoining property owners will be notified as well as posting on the property and the Poughkeepsie Journal.

Co-Chair Wylock- Is there a waste production that you dispose of from this product?

A: Steam is the only thing and water.

Q: When you bring sap into the plant, is that brought in on your property, or do you have to go out on McCourt road to bring it in?

A: For this year $\frac{3}{4}$ of the sap is pumped directly into the building, there are 2 satellite collection stations that are temporary for this year, only because there was no time to tie them in to the system.

For the tapping, the taps that are used are some of the smallest of their kind, the system is run under vacuum so not as many are needed on the trees. Work was done with a Forrester who put together a forest management plan to be able to do sustainable tree harvesting within the network of the maple grove, to thin out some of the completing species of the trees. This will encourage the growth of the maple trees. Every year they will be able to go in and thin out some trees in each acre. There is no real clear cutting and the canopy of the forest doesn't really change.

The tubing used is 5/16 blue tubing tied into the branches, which gravity feeds into a collection station. From there it gets pumped up the property. They hope to have only 2 collection houses. They sit at the lowest point of the property, the vacuum system allows for less and smaller taps. These tie into the extractors and go to the holding tank, when it reaches a full point; it gets pumped to the main building.

Q: Is there a problem with the deer running into the lines?

A: No, the wildlife is really unaffected; squirrels do more damage than anything else, by chewing on the lines.

Q: - Do you package and ship from that site?

A: yes. They use USPS as well as major shippers for internet shipping options.

Q: How much syrup was produced this year?

A: This year there were ½ million gallons of sap collected to produce 7,100 gallons of syrup. 1,800 trees are tapped and there is potential of just under 30,000.

Q: There have been complaint by some of the neighbors about the road being abused by the large trucks going in and out, what size trucks are being used?

A: there is a Dodge 5500 pickup truck for the sap. There were deliveries for the building, the lumber and supplies to build. There are the 2 satellite locations being used that was the only sap trucking being done. They hope to not do that next year. With any damage done to the road, they spoke to JoAnne, the Highway Superintendent, and improvements were done on the road. Ken went out and put down stone, and did some back dragging. The road is in need of work, he was there last year before the production and work was being done on the road. He did not think the sap trucks did that much damage to the road.

Q: On the original permit there was a \$50,000 bond, is that still in effect?

A: yes it is.

Engineer Berger- This is a chapter 65 amendment, the plans are preliminary, it is understood from discussions with the Engineer that the ESC aspects will be presented. It is encouraged to follow the green practices that were in the original plan.

Has an NOI been filed with the changes to the DEC? A: Not yet.

Have there been the weekly inspections? A: Yes

An updated SWPPP is expected.

Planner Ley- Clarification on truck traffic- it sounds like there are 2 kinds of trucks- ones for construction, the larger trucks and the others are regular pick up trucks for the business, the sap. After the construction period is finished do you anticipate having any trucks larger than a pick up truck visiting the site?

A: Probably a delivery truck on occasion, like a fed ex truck. They would like to eventually harvest sap from adjoining properties, then possibly some concentrate will be trucked back. They would like that ability, possibly an oil truck size container.

Q: when do you anticipate finishing the building?

A: probably before mid summer, possibly July. There was a bad winter, now that the harvesting and processing is done, the work on the interior will speed up.

Attorney Polidoro- The Board has been provided with some information on the project. If they are coming in for an erosion control permit, then the Board will only be looking at the amendment, which is the changes, from the horse barn, the road way and now the larger sugar barn and the road layout. The erosion techniques associated with that.

Co-Chair Wylock- The Board first learned of this was about 3 weeks ago when someone referred a Troy NY news article to us. It said there were future plans for an inn and restaurant on site.

A: that was done on the cuff. One of the sub contractors that worked there had a neighbor who worked for The Saratogian. He was invited down, there's a lot of talk about things we would like to do, but they would get approvals. Everything they have done to date was exactly what they had applied for in the Building permit. They would like to do Agro Tourism. As far as a restaurant they don't know where. They are just focusing on production right now. Anything else they will be coming back to discuss with the Board.

Q: the pumps from the pumping station, how loud are they when they run and how often?

A: The transfer pumps don't make a lot of noise at all, in the future you won't hear as much. The neighbors might have heard the ones in the satellite locations, but are low decibel, and the vacuums are electric. There was one collection station on ridge road they could not get electric to so a generator was used. It was kept inside the building, but probably made more noise than anything else.

Q: The tubing- does it remain year round?

A: yes, once it's in it stays year round. With any luck they may get 1-15 years of use before replacing it. The system gets flushed, and remains dormant.

Q: is there any reason why it's blue that seems to be a real bone of contention

A: you don't really see it that much in the snow, just during a certain time of the year; there is also some that is a lighter green color, which blends better.

Q: are the other pumping stations going to be near the neighbors too?

A: no, the one where there is a temporary station is where they would like to build a station, a 20X30 building, just enough to hold a vacuum pump extractors, and holding tank. They were housed in a tent this year and they hope to enclose them

Q: If you still had problems with electricity, would you still have generators?

A: yes, there are back up generators. The generators are diesel, low rpm; they run at a slower speed to have less decibel output. They hope not to have that next year.

Q: Because you're dealing with a food product, can you explain the inspection process, to make sure there are no bacteria or contaminants.

A: Every time they process the syrup, it gets put into the barrel and the temperature gets brought up to 250° it gets to sterilizing temperature, when it gets ready for bottling, they're a finishing process, it gets brought up to 195 then it gets filtered and bottled at 195. the bottles are sterilized when they are brought to us. They received their organic certification about one month ago.

Q: So there is no requirement of an inspection?

A: no not the Board of Health. The water that is being used is the Permian water from the R/O system. The temperature the syrup is handled at is over the sterilization temperature. All food grade diameters earth is used, like in the wine industry. No well water is used, it's all permeating water.

Q: How many employees are there?

A: Right now there are about 12, 8 from the Town of Dover.

What we would like to do is set a site walk.

Site walk set for Thursday May 19th at 6:00

For the Public- there will be a Public Hearing, before action is taken, there will be an opportunity to speak. There will be a notification, by mail, signs on the property and in the newspaper.

Clarification: This will be on the building not being on the original foot print as on the original plan and on the access road.

VII. MINUTES 04/04/2011

Motion made by Valerie LaRobardier to approve the minutes of April 4, 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
MEMBER TOM HOLMES– AYE	

Motion approved

Motion made by Peter Muroski to adjourn at 8:23 2nd by Tom Holmes

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
MEMBER TOM HOLMES– 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

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