

TOWN OF WALLKILL PLANNING BOARD

MEETING

APRIL 20, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT: G. Lake, W. Capozella, R. Carr, A. Dulgarian,
T. Hamilton, C. Najac, H. Ross

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: J. Bacon, D. McGoey

1. **HOMEWOOD SUITES** - SITE PLAN/SPECIAL USE PERMIT - 600-610 Route
211 East (41-1-60.21) #48-10

G. Lake: Your name for the record, please.

B. Meddenbach: My name is Barry Meddenbach. I'm a professional engineer with offices in Stone Ridge in Ulster County, New York.

Go ahead.

B. Meddenbach: We've prepared this concept development plan for the Homewood Suites. This is the old Town Hall site. I'm sure you're all familiar with it. I did bring a location plan if anybody needs to refer to that. The proposal is predominately a hotel of ninety nine rooms. It's a Homewood Suites and would be this building here. It has a lobby and an indoor pool. It would be on a separate parcel of land and then there would be another site for a proposed bank. There's no specific tenant for this bank at this point. The developer is negotiating so it is very likely that there would be a bank there with a drive-thru teller machines. There's also a parcel on the back here that would be retained by the Town.

G. Lake: Is that beyond the one that the Community Center is on?

B. Meddenbach: No. The Community Center is on a separate parcel.

G. Lake: Right.

B. Meddenbach: That's already on a separate parcel. This whole green area here is one

parcel. The Town would retain this piece which has frontage and develop-able area over here.

G. Lake: Okay.

B. Meddenbach: There are wetlands in between which is a Department of Environmental Conservation wetland area with a one hundred foot setback area. We had this flagged and talked to them about some activity in this area. Right now, if you're familiar with the Town Hall site there is a common area that's actually back in this one hundred foot setback area. We would restore a lot of that and build our stormwater facility in there. This is where the existing entrance is. We would develop this into three lanes, one in and two out. There would be a traffic light here. This is, I believe, referred to as the Fisher Retail which is a proposal and I'm not sure where they stand with approvals but . . .

G. Lake: They're working. They're about where you are right now.

B. Meddenbach: Okay. We would share the traffic light there. There is already a left turn lane into here. We've had a lot of discussions with maybe moving this over and to share it with Cosmo's. We don't see any benefit to that. We see some drawbacks to that. Number one, it shortens up the left turn lane into here. It really doesn't give them a whole lot of benefit because you don't want to have a connection close in where somebody would be coming in and making a left turn and then an immediate left. If they're stopped because of traffic exiting you would back up traffic so the Department of Transportation would not have a favorable response to that. You would have to come in and exit back here. We have already shown the connection here so they would have access to that light. We feel that this is the best plan.

D. McGoey: What if you moved it to the property line?

B. Meddenbach: We looked at that. We looked at several locations. We've spent a lot of time on trying to move this over here and what it does is it restricts our use of the property and there's really no benefit. What would the benefit be?

D. McGoey: If you use Cosmo's everybody makes an illegal turn. You would avoid that illegal turn.

B. Meddenbach: Well, they would be able to come through our site and go to the light and make that turn. They would still have access to the light. The situation is that if we were to

move this over here they wouldn't be able to access that up front here and because their building is so close to the property line they wouldn't be able to access to that driveway until they got to the back which is where they are now.

G. :Lake: Mr. McGoey, right now they're using the present cut coming out of the old Town Hall that goes onto Route 211 heading towards Middletown and we have the Fisher project kind of lined up to that.

D. McGoey: Right.

G. Lake: But moving that down, did they get the permit from the Department of Environmental Conservation?

D. McGoey: Fisher can move. Why not line them all up at the same location.

B. Meddenbach: What it does is it restricts the ability to develop this site.

T. Hamilton: The lot lines don't exist at this point.

B. Meddenbach: We looked at it as if there is no lot line here and we looked at the various uses and configurations of this and we don't come up with a plan that allows us to use this lot adequately that has any benefit to them. We were briefed to make a connection and allow them to have access to the light.

T. Hamilton: We could end up with a problem too if the State comes in and has an issue.

B. Meddenbach: One of the things we're trying to do is schematic. They also have access over to this Town road here but here you're restricted to a right turn only. I think that problem would be solved by providing a connection to the light that we show. So, we're prepared to do that.

G. Lake: And, Cosmo's have you talked to them a little bit?

B. Meddenbach: I haven't personally but the developer has had many conversations with them. I'm not sure. He says that it doesn't look like any kind of relationship works because he would have to give up too much to develop this.

G. Lake: Right.

B. Meddenbach: So, he's against it at this point. Quite honestly from an engineering point of

view I don't see the great benefit of moving this over here. If you moved this entrance right over to here you couldn't have them connect right here that close to the highway because cars coming in making a left and then having to make another left if they are stopped because of exiting cars they're going to be backing traffic out into the highway. The Department of Transportation won't approve that connection on the exiting side that close to the highway. They will say push it back. We can't push it back sufficiently because they're building until you get behind their building so then you end up connecting it here. You end up having the whole entrance the whole length of this so that they can accommodate the traffic light. We're accommodating them with very little difference in travel. We've spent a lot of time.

D. McGoey: You may have spent a lot of time but you haven't shown us a sketch plan. We've had work sessions.

B. Meddenbach: You asked me to try and work something out with them and we haven't been able to do that. We never came up with a plan that works for them. We don't want to submit something we don't want.

D. McGoey: I don't think we can force them to do it.

G. Lake: Without being able to talk to the Department of Transportation and I just think about what we went through with Middletown Park Manor with their left hand turn.

T. Hamilton: Mr. McGoey, do we still have (not clear).

D. McGoey: I don't remember the accommodations . . .

B. Meddenbach: Some of the other features, there is an easement through the site now with a connection here and we will honor that. Water and sewer is on-site so it's an easy connection. I think the whole issue here is the traffic and before we go ahead and do a lot of site design details, we're looking to the Planning Board to give us a blessing with this layout

T. Hamilton: That property line . . .

B. Meddenbach: We made a request and we haven't heard anything. We only recently made it.

G. Lake: I think they're waiting for sketch from us. You did make the request though?

B. Meddenbach: Yes, we did. It wasn't very long ago. It was probably within a month.

G. Lake: Right. I think Mr. Ward is looking so they can continue moving forward.

B. Meddenbach: I want to point something out to you. I realized this evening I made a typo here on the zoning requirements where we have a little asterisk shown where we need the relief and we reversed the side and front yard for lot #2. The canopy here would sit thirty seven feet from the front yard where it's required to be fifty. We called that a side on the chart which is wrong. On the side which is over here we have twenty three feet and we called that thirty seven. So, we reversed those two numbers in that chart.

G. Lake: Let me go through the Board to see if they have any comments?

A. Dulgarian: I would like to see this thing line up and accommodate existing properties as well as the new development. I just don't know what the best way to do that is. The first thing at looking at this plan Route 211 I believe is three lanes in both directions there, correct?

B. Meddenbach: I don't believe so. There's a left turn lane

A. Dulgarian: No, it's three lanes. You're showing a left turn lane. Is that taking one of the existing three lanes?

B. Meddenbach: No, that's there now. What we show on this plan is what's existing now.

A. Dulgarian: I have a question on the setbacks, frontages and everything. If it's three lanes, I didn't measure the width of the two lanes they have there but I know it's three lanes in both directions.

B. Meddenbach: This is based on what our surveyor's came back with. You're saying there are three lanes here?

A. Dulgarian: Yes, because it goes down to two after Cosmo's.

B. Meddenbach: You're saying in one direction?

A. Dulgarian: In both directions.

B. Meddenbach: There are two in each direction.

A. Dulgarian: There are three in each direction.

B. Meddenbach: I know there's three here but one of them is a left turn lane.

A. Dulgarian: No.

B. Meddenbach: Well, maybe you're right. I will go look when I leave here tonight.

A. Dulgarian: Mr. Lake, I don't have a problem with the uses here. Like all projects we get to review and approve we have one shot of getting it right. Of course, I know we're looking strictly at sketch and not at the final with landscaping and everything but I think there is a lot of opportunity here to get things right. I think there is something better. I will rely on our professionals.

H. Ross: I agree largely with Mr. Dulgarian. As long as we get the best outcome regarding the traffic. I'm a little bit concerned that there is no way to make the neighborhood agreeing but if perhaps the bank were a little smaller and a little further back there may be a way. It is doable but I think we need to look hard on the traffic.

R. Carr: The twenty five foot easement, does that exist now?

B. Meddenbach: Yes.

R. Carr: I will tell you as Mr. Dulgarian said, the uses I think they work there. I also feel this is ambitious for this piece of property. Regarding the traffic, with the light there I think that could work. I just think it's a pretty intense of use for the amount of the traffic. I would be curious to see what the traffic study shows. To have only one major way in and out and as far as using the other ways, I really don't like when traffic is supposed to flow through some other parking lot, especially a parking lot that was never designed to be a through road. I don't like that idea. Also, wouldn't the connection to the little plaza, where is that? I don't know where the building is. I know this is a lot further down than where the old connection used to be.

B. Meddenbach: I'm not sure what you're referring to.

R. Carr: Going out toward where the Olive Garden is.

D. McGoey: It's on the lower level

R. Carr: Does it line up with anything?

D. McGoey: It lines up with their main access road to the red light.

B. Meddenbach: Although really, it lines up. I don't know if you can see it here. It's Petco.

R. Carr: Yes. Right in front of Off-Track Betting.

B. Meddenbach: Right in front of the building we extend right into the site.

R. Carr: That's a pretty good elevation.

B. Meddenbach: There's an elevation change we have to deal with.

R. Carr: About the U-turn, I know when I'm coming out of North Galleria Drive I'm heading out that way I come around and I take that up and go out through where the Olive Garden is. I don't think that's a great idea for us to make that a major way.

B. Meddenbach: We don't want that either. You're talking about coming down here shooting up this whole length and a right turn over here.

R. Carr: Yes.

B. Meddenbach: This is a hotel. We don't want to encourage people although because of the building and everything it kind of pushed it so it's not necessarily easy for people. They would have to come in and go through.

R. Carr: If it were me I just wouldn't go through the plaza. I would just shoot out to . . .

B. Meddenbach: Is that easier? You could do that now.

R. Carr: Than waiting on North Galleria Drive?

B. Meddenbach: No. Than coming up here and going out because you can do this now.

R. Carr: I don't know. My point is I wouldn't want it. I don't know if that is what we want.

B. Meddenbach: We would have no problem taking this away.

R. Carr: Again, this is what it comes down to and this is my problem. You have one main place where you come in and out of. I question whether your project should have that. At the same time, your other two ways in and out aren't really things I would be in favor of. I

will look at your traffic study.

B. Meddenbach: That's a good point but you look at the ways hotels operate, it's not like a retail store where you have people coming and going all the time. People generally arrive in the evenings and they leave in the morning. During the day, there is very little traffic. They don't all come together in the evening and they don't all leave together in the morning. It's a different use. We have ninety nine rooms here with potentially ninety nine cars but even when they have full occupancy they really never have ninety nine cars because multiple people will come in one car and take up a couple of rooms. You're not talking about large volumes of traffic here. It's not a traffic generator.

R. Carr: That's what I would be looking for, is the traffic study. I would be curious as to who your customers will be?

Unidentified Person: Mostly corporate firms with guests and spends up to two or three nights.

R. Carr: The other thing, there is no place for food here?

Unidentified Person: We only have a complimentary breakfast in the mornings and usually once a week we have an evening reception but no restaurant.

R. Carr: The other thing that I would be curious about is the stormwater. The topography drops off rather steeply and see the water running there now.

B. Meddenbach: There's nothing on the site now. We would have to comply with the State stormwater regulations. We have to control all of the runoff. It would be reviewed by the Department of Environmental Conservation because of the wetlands. They have an adjacent area which runs right through here. We met with an official out on the site and verified the boundaries of their wetlands and discussed with them informally what they would do. The fact that we would be reclaiming some of this adjacent area because it's all fill now we would create this adjacent area that would be much more desirable for them. We would have our stormwater facility which would be down lower. We haven't designed the stormwater system yet. We may include some recharge areas in the parking lot and maybe some rain gardens or bio-retention zones to take advantage for some of the landscaping. Ultimately, the water would work its way down to the wetlands but it would be a full state of the art designed stormwater system. We are prepared to do that.

R. Carr: I look forward to seeing it.

W. Capozella: I just want to make a comment about the light. Mostly it would be a benefit for Cosmo's.

B. Meddenbach: I have not been involved in the negotiations with them. I've just been told they haven't come to an agreement. I only speculate that it would be a lot of benefit to Cosmo's but very little benefit to us.

W. Capozella: We're talking about a traffic light . . .

B. Meddenbach: We looked at this very seriously at running the driveway right in along here and Cosmo's wouldn't be able to really make this connection up here. I don't think the Department of Transportation would approve that. I will repeat again, with cars coming in making a left turn in and then wanting to immediately make a left turn into Cosmo's would potentially block traffic out into the highway if they weren't free to make that turn. The Department of Transportation does not like a driveway coming in immediately on the exit lane where people can make left turns into it. So, they would say we can't put this driveway here push it back a couple of hundred feet or whatever the stacking may be which will probably put it back to where their building is which they couldn't make the connection so they would have to make the connection back here. We're giving them the connection back there.

G. Lake: Anything else, Mr. Capozella?

W. Capozella: That's it.

C. Najac: Nothing. I like the concept and I'm not going to beat up on the traffic light now.

T. Hamilton: I like the concept. We will also have to wait for the State to see what they say.

G. Lake: I'm happy with the concept I have to agree. I'm not really sure there is enough room to make that stand. I will surely wait to see what the State has to say.

W. Capozella: Are we going to approve this today when they need variances?

G. Lake: They need now to go to the Town Board if we give them sketch and they will go to the Town Board to request clustering.

W. Capozella: Okay.

MOTION for SKETCH PLAN subject to all of Mr. McGoey's comments and this

Board's comments made by R. Carr and seconded by T. Hamilton.

A. Dulgarian: Aye

H. Ross: Aye

R. Carr: Aye

W. Capozella: Aye

C. Najac: Aye

T. Hamilton: Aye

G. Lake: Aye

MOTION CARRIED. 7 AYES

2. **WALLKILL ACQUISITIONS** (Sports Bar) - SITE PLAN/SPECIAL USE PERMIT
360 Route 211 East (50-2-36.11) #03-11

G. Lake: Your name for the record, please.

D. Higgins: My name is David Higgins with Lanc & Tully Engineering.

G. Lake: Go ahead.

D. Higgins: I was here to make an application for the Sports Bar. During the discussion last month when we had several applications before the Board the Sports Bar was considered at the time in conjunction with the Teen Center which was very near in the vicinity. Two members of the Planning Board indicated that they did not want it in the vicinity where children were. The Sports Bar is located right here colored in blue adjacent to Colandrea's Pizza. When we were here last month we also talked about the Next Generation Teen Center which is also on the agenda tonight. The teen center when we discussed this last month had the main entrance located right here approximately thirty feet from the Sports Bar. During the discussion that we had last month there were concerns voiced by the Planning Board regarding the patrons from the bar hanging around outside and being able to watch the teens coming in and out. The application went to a vote and was ultimately denied. The teen center last month was approved as it was proposed at that time. After that meeting I had a

discussion with the owner and also both applicants and we talked about a way we may be able to address the concerns of the Board. What we decided was instead of having the main entrance for the teen center up here which was in the vicinity of the Sports Bar entrance what we would do is re-locate the entrance to the teen center basically to the side of the building which is behind the pizza place. The members of the teen center would be picked up and dropped off over here. It was mentioned at the last meeting that entrance could be made by members only. Basically with the new application that we're presenting tonight for both the Sports Bar and the teen center. The entrance for the teen center has now been moved to over here to eliminate the patrons from the bar. The other thing we did was put no smoking signs within sixty five feet to discourage patrons from doing that in the front of the building. Those are the changes that have been made.

G. Lake: I think, and I know it's next, but point out the drop off area for the teens to enter the facility. I had the advantage of being at the work session but this would be for the rest of the Board members so they have an idea.

D. Higgins: There were a couple of things that we had changed since the last time we were here. One of those, if you remember there is an existing entranceway that comes off of Carpenter Avenue located in this corner of the site. We talked about how we might be able to do a number of things if we basically sealed that off and re-arrange the parking. We could provide additional landscape areas and also still promote traffic movement through the site. The other thing that we looked to do was stormwater treatment areas as part of that. So, what we're proposing here is a bio-retention swale similar to what we did for the Federal Valley Credit Union. A bio-retention swale within this landscaped island here which basically is going to treat surface runoff as it comes off the parking lot. Obviously all these green shaded areas would all be landscaped islands. Obviously I haven't shown all the other landscaping because there will be landscaping along Carpenter Avenue that is proposed as part of the overall scheme of the project. We also propose a landscaped island over here essentially to make this side of the building more like the front. What we did with regard to the teen center is when we were here last month there was no parking proposed within this area and there was no delegation for a turning lane. We arranged a turning movement to this area so people could come in and drop the kids off and go on their way. The circular movement is to create a quick drop off.

G. Lake: Thank you. I know that was really more for the next applicant but I think it was important for the Board to see the differences from last month and this time. I will go through the Board.

A. Dulgarian: First off, I appreciate the applicant's attempt to try and make something and

give us something that we're looking for on this particular application. For me, I still have a problem with it but what I look at and again it's for me, is your pattern of development of this mall has been Jumping Jakes ten thousand square feet for the kids, Superland which you have down here as thirty eight thousand square feet for kids, a snow board shop which is primarily targeting teenagers and then a proposed teen center in this one building and then you put a sports bar in. I look at the pattern of development that we have here and the welfare of the community. Just good planning in general, I still have a problem with it. I know it has improved tremendously but that's just my feeling. I do believe you could end up getting approval tonight but I still have an issue with changing that type of pattern of development and changing that whole characteristic.

H. Ross: I think it has been improved from the last time we saw this. I find it acceptable. I have to tell you this. I wouldn't want to hurt his business and a rental is a rental. The code does not specifically forbid this. For me, it's not acceptable.

R. Carr: I have to say I think this is so much better a proposal than the last time. I also like the proposed drop off for the kids now. It's definitely an improvement. The property where you're talking about the landscaping along Carpenter Avenue is that outside of your property line that you're proposing that?

D. Higgins: I would have to go back to the original map to see if it was drawn within that. It's very narrow.

R. Carr: Yes. That is a very narrow strip and I don't know whose property it is. At this point I'm not sure if you can do your landscaping in that particular area.

W. Capozella: I think it comes down to that the code doesn't have anything against bars. Again, this proposal improves the situation.

C. Najac: I'm glad they came back with a different proposal. I do want to put it on record about the sidewalk.

G. Lake: I thought we would talk about this with the next applicant the teen center. In general you're not against it?

C. Najac: No.

T. Hamilton: I'm glad the entrance for this has changed to the side so it's a little further away from the teen center. I'm not sure. I haven't really been in that pizza parlor. Don't they sell

beer in that pizza parlor?

D. Higgins: I think so.

T. Hamilton: I was thinking we've got a business that has been there a long time and they do sell beer there. I don't see a problem. One other question I have is has anybody looked at the soon to be abandoned credit union building if they could put something else in front of the parking lot? It will be empty very shortly.

D. Higgins: They are planning on opening the new one very soon. The existing building is still obviously owned by the credit union and I'm not quite sure what the plans are. I haven't heard anything.

T. Hamilton: The other thing I went into that project today and that parking lot. I had all I could do to get to the dry cleaners. It's in a horrible condition with huge potholes. There is no reason for that.

D. Higgins: Which part?

T. Hamilton: When you come in to make that right in that new section that connected over to the dry cleaners, it's like a mine field.

Unidentified Person: I'm one of the principals. We've started finally. We started on the left side and are starting around the back of the building repairing with patches and we will be going over it in about ten days with asphalt.

T. Hamilton: Yes, but why not concentrate on an area where you have a business opened.

Unidentified Person: I think the real reason from the vendor was because of the traffic and having more work to do on the credit union. They advised to stay away from that until they finished up. It is scheduled to be done.

G. Lake: Anything else, Mr. Hamilton?

T. Hamilton: That's all.

G. Lake: We already talked about the Public Hearing and we don't need one, correct?

J. Bacon: Basically it's a use within the uses approved previously.

MOTION for a NEGATIVE DECLARATION subject to all of Mr. McGoey's comments and this Board's comments made by W. Capozella and seconded by T. Hamilton.

A. Dulgarian: Aye

H. Ross: Nay

R. Carr: Aye

W. Capozella: Aye

C. Najac: Aye

T. Hamilton: Aye

G. Lake: Aye

MOTION CARRIED. 6 AYES, 1 NAY

MOTION for SITE PLAN/SPECIAL USE PERMIT subject to all of Mr. McGoey's comments and this Board's comments made by R. Carr and seconded by T. Hamilton.

A. Dulgarian: Aye

H. Ross: Nay

R. Carr: Aye

W. Capozella: Aye

C. Najac: Aye

T. Hamilton: Aye

G. Lake: Aye

MOTION CARRIED. 6 AYES, 1 NAY

3. **WALLKILL ACQUISITIONS** (The Next Generation Teen Center) - SITE PLAN/SPECIAL USE PERMIT - 360 Route 211 East (50-2-36.11) #04-11

G. Lake: Your name for the record, please.

D. Higgins: My name is David Higgins with Lanc & Tully Engineering.

G. Lake: Go ahead. You've already explained the parking lot and why you're back for this..

D. Higgins: Basically we had to make changes to the plan and incorporate some changes to make it work with the sports bar. The dumpsters would be enclosed with dumpster enclosures. We've got signage and striping for the handicap spaces. In the middle we have the striped island. Also with regard to the entrance to the building there are some steps and the doorway is actually below the pavement elevation. What we would be doing is filling that in and raising the doorway up to grade. The interior elevation of the building is not going to change with the exception of the handicap ramp.

G. Lake: And, you're making it bigger?

D. Higgins: Yes. When we came here last month I think it was about five thousand square feet less than it is now.

G. Lake: The parking lot came up already and the landscaping and the sidewalk. I know you guys submitted a letter and I don't know if you're prepared to talk about this or have another meeting and talk to everybody about it. Basically your letter is asking for a little bit more time and I'm just a little concerned about the sidewalk and losing any permits you have out there for the drainage. I think the Board would like to be re-assured that it's going to get done and no permits issued by the Department of Transportation would be lost. I just wanted to make sure it was in the record that it's going to get done. I don't know how the whole Board feels about giving you a little extra time but I guess you're indicating 2012 to finish up?

D. Higgins: That's what we're requesting, yes.

G. Lake: I also realize with the economy the way it is and you explained to us in a work session. The sidewalk connecting to the sidewalk going up and especially with the amount of

activity there we just want to make sure we don't lose that due to any time restrictions on permits from the Department of Transportation.

D. Higgins: We were proposing this section here and we had never obtained permits from the Department of Transportation for that work. We still have to design that.

D. McGoey: The point is that at the time there was discussion with the Department of Transportation to allow a narrower sidewalk where the stream goes across. We don't want to lose their goodwill and their approval of that by delaying the process.

D. Higgins: We can certainly reach out to them and confirm that. We hadn't actually drawn up any of the engineering drawings.

G. Lake: I think that's important. That's going into another sidewalk that's already there and as was said earlier the owner came up earlier and had said that they started their patch operation which at a work session that was brought up and they were going to do that. We also brought up in the work session that they re-cap the whole thing once the magic number was reached for the tenants. Let me go through the Board but I just wanted to bring that up and make sure that we don't lose that.

A. Dulgarian: I like the project. I like the use. I think it's needed around here. I liked the way the applicant said it would be run there. I also want again to thank the applicant and the mall owner for re-designing this. I think it is a better design than what was previously approved. I'd love to see some other site improvements but I don't think we can add anything to this because we already approved it and now it's even better than it was. I know the next time we're going to be looking at all that stuff. I like it.

H. Ross: I'm fine with this. Regarding the site improvement delay as long as you take whatever steps necessary so that the sidewalk doesn't get lost in the process. That's all I have.

R. Carr: Regarding this application this is much better than before. I'm good with that. When you talked about delaying site improvements what exactly so we know when the site improvements will get done?

B. Middleman: There was a letter that we submitted to the Planning Board.

R. Carr: I'm just looking for an idea of what you're talking about here.

B. Middleman: I think early on when we got our approval there was a thresh hold that was given, I believe at fifty percent leased that pretty much the entire balance of all site work would be underway. We're not talking about avoiding any of that. It's just a matter of staggering it a little bit.

R. Carr: I have no problem and I understand. My problem with this and starting with Jumping Jakes, it's not the landscaping I had in mind. During the end of the summer, the weeds were much taller than the shrubbery. I have no problem holding off it is does get done. I think it could be much more attractive. On the other side by Friendly's, it's not attractive and that's done.

B. Middleman: We just re-stripped that but we haven't brought in new landscaping. We realize it's pretty barren and unappealing.

R. Carr: That is for me. If we do it right I have no problem with it.

W. Capozella: I like the entrance now and the drop off area to help with the traffic flow. Regarding the sidewalk (not clear).

C. Najac: Thank you for bringing up about the sidewalk. What about a walkway for the kids to walk through rather in between cars?

D. Higgins: In this area?

C. Najac: I wouldn't want to have my car there and having two hundred kids walking by it.

D. Higgins: We can make that wider. We can have a striped area on the far end right here and basically I would move this space over and make this wider.

C. Najac: It would be better having an actual walkway area rather than walking between cars.

T. Hamilton: I have nothing further.

G. Lake: Do you have parking spots there?

D. Higgins: From a technical standpoint we have enough parking all the way around. We don't really need them. The owner would rather not have them park in front of the entrance.

G. Lake: Anything else, Mr. Hamilton?

T. Hamilton: No.

G. Lake: I don't have anything else.

MOTION for a NEGATIVE DECLARATION subject to all of Mr. McGoey's comments and this Board's comments made by A. Dulgarian and seconded by H. Ross.

A. Dulgarian: Aye

H. Ross: Aye

R. Carr: Aye

W. Capozella: Aye

C. Najac: Aye

T. Hamilton: Aye

G. Lake: Aye

MOTION CARRIED. 7 AYES

MOTION for MODIFICATION to SITE PLAN/SPECIAL USE PERMIT subject to all of Mr. McGoey's comments and this Board's comments made by W. Capozella and seconded y C. Najac.

A. Dulgarian: Aye

H. Ross: Aye

R. Carr: Aye

W. Capozella: Aye

C. Najac: Aye

T. Hamilton: Aye

G. Lake: Aye

MOTION CARRIED. 7 AYES

4. **CROSSVIEW REALTY** - 36 LOT SUBDIVISION- Scotchtown Collabar Road (19-1-10 & 3.2) #16-10

Cancelled.

5. **RANDALL PLAINS** - SUBDIVISION & SITE PLAN/SPECIAL USE PERMIT - Schutt Road & East Main Street (73-1-33, 12, 26.1, 22, 21, 5.2 & 35.21) #44-10

G. Lake: Your name for the record, please.

J. O'Rourke: My name is John O'Rourke with Lanc & Tully Engineering.

G. Lake: Go ahead.

J. O'Rourke: I just want to thank the Board for having us back so quickly after our last meeting. Since that time at the last meeting the Board had requested a couple of options for the sketch plan which we attempted to make. The first being the development of a proposed phasing plan for our proposed project. We have a total of I believe six phases which meets the Town Code for the loop or the length of the cul-de-sac. Again this is a sketch and once we go further on but again Phase I would be along the existing road of Meadows Road. Phase II would be the hotel site and the first cul-de-sac. Phase III would be a section of the loop road off of Rolling Meadows and then the remaining phases. They all meet your code. We have demonstrated that we can break the project up into phases.

G. Lake: Why is, I'm just curious why are the (not clear) homes Phase V? Isn't that the meet of the project?

J. O'Rourke: It most certainly is and that's why our intent was always to build the main road but in order to meet your code for phasing we have to break it off to a maximum of one thousand feet for the temporary cul-de-sac.

G. Lake: Okay.

J. O'Rourke: By doing that we can't get that extension until we get the interior loop road in. This is not our favored plan but we're try to demonstrate that we can break the project up.

G. Lake: Unfortunately I saw Phase V.

J. O'Rourke: Unfortunately because of this layout we can't get this section in. The second thing we submitted at the work session and we were directed that potentially what the Board would be looking for is a larger sized park rather than the smaller ones so we provided that for you. Basically the townhouse portion over here in this section we could provide the Town with a four acre park. It would be enough for a combined soccer field and baseball field in that area.

G. Lake: Swings?

J. O'Rourke: Excuse me.

G. Lake: Swings.

J. O'Rourke: I'm sure we can put some swings in the park somewhere. We haven't designed it but its over four acres so we have plenty of room for both of those facilities.

G. Lake: Did you just throw them in just to show us something or is this a new thought?

J. O'Rourke: No. At the last meeting . . .

G. Lake: That's what I'm saying, this is just to satisfy us for the different things we asked for and could possibly be done.

J. O'Rourke: Yes. All of these are going to be reviewed under the scoping so they will probably all be modified but when we're done hopefully we get a project that everybody likes. This is just one of the options we provided to the Board on the four acre parcel for the park. This plan I think is from our viewpoint is where we envision going through the concept. This is a clustering plan where we reduced the lot areas, basically the lot widths. They are smaller lots in the area and with this layout it actually provides two park settings. One, an eight acre parcel along Rolling Meadows Road into this area here which is a much larger park. In addition and again just for demonstration purposes we have a 1.75 acre parcel in this area here. So, this would be for your swings and your smaller area and this would be the larger or actually a multi-field. We've provided water and sewer and we really have no

issues. The last plan is showing the blow-up

G. Lake: Let me go through the Board. Again, we're just looking tonight basically just a conditional sketch and maybe become Lead Agency so they can get to the Town Board.

A. Dulgarian: This is just in order for them to move forward on the conditional sketch.

G. Lake: Yes and to see the different things and then they can go to the Town Board to see how they feel. They will have to go back to another work session but Mr. McGoey knows what they have to do in order to get to the Town board.

A. Dulgarian: Well, I like it that he came back with a couple of options for us. I have no problem with the project and I like that we still can change the site around or the applicant can change the site around actually to kind of get us what we're looking for. I'm not that familiar with conditional sketch but I have no problem with that just so the applicant can move forward. I do have one question. Your east hangars, how do you get there?

J. O'Rourke: There is an access road that we're proposing from behind lots thirty to twenty five. That will be a taxiway.

A. Dulgarian: Okay, that's the double line in there. Thanks.

H. Ross: I also agree to conditional sketch although there is a great more to be done.

R. Carr: Which one are we considering for conditional sketch?

G. Lake: I think they have to do a little work. I find it tough because we don't know if they're going to get the sewer extension.

R. Carr: I have no problem.

G. Lake: Personally if we can get the clustering and more parkland for the whole community. When you think about that part of Town there are no parks.

R. Carr: Well, I have no problem.

R. Carr: The other concern I have would be the traffic.

J. O'Rourke: As we go through the traffic analysis that's certainly something that we have no problem looking at.

W. Capozella: I like the project and I have no problem with the conditional sketch so they can move forward. I like the idea of the parkland areas.

C. Najac: I like the project.

T. Hamilton: Looking at the different alternatives none of the alternatives (not clear) phase wise. I don't know if it's the same phasing shown on the old one.

J. O'Rourke: Are you referring to the construction phases?

T. Hamilton: Yes.

J. O'Rourke: We can add that but yes it would be tweaked a little bit but generally it would be the same. If we get the clustering then obviously Phase I would change because we would not have any houses on Rolling Meadows. So, basically this would end up being Phase I and then we would do this loop road as Phase II.

T. Hamilton: I don't want to find in your phases and say you go to six phases and you have a bunch of people living in the first three phases that don't have a parkland.

J. O'Rourke: The phasing plan was developed.

G. Lake: And, in all fairness the applicant (not clear) and that is something that came up at a work session and common sense is telling us this isn't going to get built in one shot. Tell us how you're going to do it.

T. Hamilton: I don't want to see the parklands in the last phase.

G. Lake: I think as we get through this we will keep track of it.

MOTION for CONDITIONAL SKETCH subject to all of Mr. McGoey's comments and this Board's comments made by A. Dulgarian and seconded by R. Carr.

A. Dulgarian: Aye

H. Ross: Aye

R. Carr: Aye

W. Capozella: Aye

C. Najac: Aye

T. Hamilton: Aye

G. Lake: Aye

MOTION CARRIED. 7 AYES

MOTION for the Planning Board to send out notices to become LEAD AGENCY made by H. Ross and seconded by C. Najac.

A. Dulgarian: Aye

H. Ross: Aye

R. Carr: Aye

W. Capozella: Aye

C. Najac: Aye

T. Hamilton: Aye

G. Lake: Aye

MOTION CARRIED. 7 AYES