

Minutes
January 8, 2007

Meeting convened at 7:45 PM. Present: S. LaBruna, K. Fox, K. Sumner.

First order of business was a subdivision proposal known as Foxwood Enterprises II. Engineer John Atzel representing the applicant joined the meeting and described the proposal. It is an eight-lot subdivision, with one large (~40 acre) lot and 7 smaller lots ranging from 3 to 5 acres. The land slopes fairly strongly, existing cover is grass, brush and woods. Extensive wetlands occur in rear of the smaller lots. On-site septic systems are proposed, some driveways will be quite steep and will slope towards the rear of the lots. The applicant proposes to collect road drainage at the front of one of the lots and pipe it to the rear of the lot – directing a concentrated flow towards the wetlands.

We asked Mr. Atzel to consider the following:

- 1) Add details and notes to specify that driveway water is to be dispersed to lawn or woods areas in a fashion that avoids erosion and promotes infiltration (as opposed to releasing a concentrated flow towards the rear of the lots and the nearby wetland areas).
- 2) Provide signage to alert the new homeowners to the existence of the wetlands and the legal protections they require.
- 3) Study alternatives to piping the road water as currently proposed. A grass swale would be preferable in terms of water quality, but the steepness of the land may make a grass channel difficult to use. Conservation Commission will try to visit the site then make additional suggestions, site's engineer is asked to consider alternatives as well.
- 4) Refine the erosion and sediment control provisions. For example, the current plans show a continuous line of silt fence across the back of several of the lots. It appeared to us that the proposed layout would not meet the intended use of this practice for un-concentrated sheet flows.

Mr Atzel indicated he felt our comments were reasonable, and that he would look into making the requested changes.

We then reviewed several other site plan sets forwarded to us by the Planning Board.

- a. Hair By Sebo - no issues emerged we felt we could comment on.
- b. A 2-lot subdivision on Scotchtown-Collabar Road. Not much to comment on, except maybe the house site could be moved a bit further from the wetland edge.
- c. 2-family proposal on Mud Mills Road. Masonic Creek runs through the property. We recommend that a clearing and grading limit be established as close as practical to the down-slope side of the proposed dwelling to provide a buffer to the Creek.
- d. A commercial proposal on York Road. The plans include a fair number of parking spaces. The plans indicate proposed disturbed area of .96 acres. We found the clearing limit line shown on the plans to be unrealistic. Its depiction immediately

- next to proposed improvements such as parking areas, septic system and well does not appear to allow for necessary equipment operation and would be difficult if not impossible to maintain. One acre happens to be the threshold at which NYS stormwater permit requirements would be triggered. Even if the State requirements were not an issue, we believe that some stormwater runoff control measures should be provided on this site. We believe said measures could be provided without imposing unreasonable expense on the applicant. We note that the soils depicted on the plan set suggest that a wider-than-usual choice of practices should be available to the designer (for example, the use of infiltration practices could be considered because of the expected good drainage characteristics of the soils). In the event that it is determined that the project will not be required to meet NYS stormwater permit requirements, we would still urge the Planning Board to ask the applicant to provide stormwater *quality*, if not quantity, control measures.
- e. Golden Triangle – We submitted comments on this project previously. As far as we could tell, these comments have not been addressed by the applicant yet.
 - f. Bruce’s Carpets – Even though this project does not appear to trigger the State’s stormwater permit requirements, it is located right next to the Shawangunk Kill – a State-protected Trout stream. We urge the Planning Board to ask the applicant to consider some reasonable measures to mitigate stormwater runoff from this site to the Kill.
 - g. Tower Drive Self-Storage – We had no comments on this project specifically, although we hope that a strategy is being discussed by the Town to ensure that the stormwater ponds commonly employed on projects such as this are built in an aesthetically pleasing and functional manner, and receive future attention and maintenance.
 - h. Sal distributed a letter from the Orange County Planning Department critiquing a Wallkill proposal submitted under the Conservation Subdivision provisions. As has been noted on other projects, there were serious questions about whether the intent of the conservation subdivision provisions were being met. We hope to secure and review the plan set for next meeting.

We reviewed Sal’s proposed letter to the Town Board regarding use of solar technologies for Town facilities. We concurred to send the latter.

PDR – We discussed how to handle applications. Should we set one annual deadline; twice a year? We don’t want to be unfair to potential applicants, but the designated Town review body will need ample time to rank applications, develop grant proposals, etc.

We had a brief discussion on the NRI project. Montgomery has a fully executed contract in place for the grant monies. We still need an agreement between Montgomery and Wallkill to allow for pass-through of grant funds.

We adjourned at 9:15. Submitted by Kevin Sumner