

DRAFT

CHAIRMAN: GEORGE AULEN

MEMBERS: WILLIAM OLSEN, JAMES PATTERSON, JESSE GALLO & KARL SCHEIBLE

Alternate: Kerry Boland

VILLAGE OF WARWICK
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
JUNE 11, 2019

The monthly meeting of the Village of Warwick Planning Board was held on Tuesday, June 11, 2019. Present were: George Aulen, Bill Olsen, Jim Patterson, Karl Scheible, Jesse Gallo, Village Engineer, Dave Getz and Planning Board attorney, Robert Dickover. Others present: Larry Wolinsky, R.J. Smith, Kirk Rother, Jay Myrow, Robert Silber, Susan Roth, Steven Esposito, Paul LeDuc, Keith Woodruff, Ron Charlton, Mr. and Mrs. Mahr and others.

The Board recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

A MOTION was made by Jim Patterson, seconded by Karl Scheible and carried to accept the minutes of the May 14, 2019 Planning Board meeting. (5 Ayes)

WARWICK COMMONS

**EXT. OF SITE PLAN
APPROVAL**

STERLING BANK

Mr. Wolinsky - I would like to introduce Mr. R.J. Smith. He represents the buyers of the property and he can update the Board on the property.

Mr. Smith - We had to re-negotiate the contract but my clients are ready to proceed. They would like to come before the Board for an amended site plan in early Spring. They want to maintain the footprint but they have some thoughts on updating the plan.

Mr. Wolinsky - The DEC is aware of what is happening with this project and they are holding back until the property is sold so the dam can be done.

Mr. Patterson - When do you anticipate them coming in with the plan?

Mr. Smith - I would say within a couple of months or so.

A MOTION was made by Bill Olsen, seconded by Jesse Gallo and carried to grant an extension until September 11, 2019. (5 Ayes)

Mr. Rother - As you know, the applicant at pursuing a Cluster type subdivision as a possible alternative and while that project is before the Board the applicant wishes to maintain the existing preliminary subdivision approval for the 28 lots.

A MOTION was made by Karl Scheible, seconded by Jim Patterson and carried to grant an extension until September 11, 2019. (5 Ayes)

Mr. Aulen - Apparently you have revised the Long EAF based on communications with the attorney?

Mr. Rother - Yes, there were some minor revisions. The changes we made I summarize in the e-mail which I see is attached.

Mr. Aulen - Did you received the letter dated June 10 from Mr. Dickover?

Mr. Rother - With regard to the ratio of one family to two family townhouse?

Mr. Aulen - Yes. This was pointed out by Elizabeth Cassidy an attorney for the public in a letter dated May 29, 2019.

Mr. Getz - How does that change your layout?

Mr. Rother - We were aware of the somewhat ambiguity in the way that section of the code is written. This is the layout as presented to the Board last month showing 9 two-family lots and so based on the conclusion that Mr. Dickover put in his memo, that he thinks that the 25% calculations should be based on dwelling units and not number of buildings, which is what this plan was based on. We are entitled to 10 2-family buildings which would be 5 2-family structures. We just prepared a sketch and this is what it might look like if we were to switch from single family to two family it is a very similar layout and for all intents and purposes the SEQR impacts are the same.

Mr. Getz - Is the total number of units the same?

Mr. Rother - The total number of units is still 42. It would be 5 2-family houses...

Mr. Aulen - The single family has been increased to 33.

Mr. Rother - Yes, up from 24. It is the same number of dwelling units.

Mr. Olsen - The open space is smaller.

Mr. Rother - It has shrunk a little. On the plan our open space is roughly 220% of what we are required to have and here we are still in the neighborhood of 200% of what we are required to have. The biggest change is in this area in the middle.

Mr. Aulen - It looks like you added a cul-de-sac with 5 two-family homes.

Mr. Olsen - Are you increasing the road surface? Because one of the good things was there was less impervious roads compared to the original.

Mr. Rother - That is correct. This might be slightly more than this plan.

Mr. Myrow - We are more than double what we are required to produce for open space. But there are still no stream crossings, a 100 ft. buffer of wetlands, roughly double the amount of open space that we need to have, traffic, water, sewer impacts would all be the same. We like that plan but apparently the Code doesn't allow that plan.

Mr. Dickover - With respect to ownership, are you proposing now that the HOA will just encompass the 2-families?

Mr. Rother - Yes plus the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Dickover - Will be owned by the HOA?

Mr. Rother - Yes.

Mr. Olsen - This will be a Village road?

Mr. Rother - Yes.

Mr. Olsen - And in the other plan it would not have been.

Mr. Rother - Correct. All of the open space will be owned by one HOA.

Mr. Dickover - The open space, there appears to be 3 areas of open space.

Mr. Rother - Yes.

Mr. Dickover - Is this a fourth one? Or is that part of this area?.

Mr. Rother -No, I think that will all be contiguous to the open space that is connected to the stream.

Mr. Dickover - They would all be owned by one HOA which would be separate and apart from the Townhouse's HOA?

Mr. Rother - Yes.

Mr. Dickover - The townhouse HOA would simply own the lot that the houses are locate upon.

Mr. Rother - Yes and they would be responsible for the maintenance of any common areas.

Similar to what was proposed on the other plan.

Mr. Dickover - What about the utility service for the water and sewer? What is the proposal with respect to that.

Mr. Rother - Servicing the five units?

Mr. Dickover - Yes.

Mr. Myrow - They will have water and sewer.

Mr. Getz - Would there be mains?

Mr. Rother - That is something that was brought up at the last meeting too. If there are mains in those areas, there would be easements to the benefit of the Village over those mains.

Mr. Getz - They would be public, correct?

Mr. Rother - Yes.

Mr. Getz - What about the cul-de-sac itself?

Mr. Rother - I think the cul-de-sac would stay as part of these townhouses. When I got the feedback from the Village Board, it seems that they would prefer to not inherit a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Aulen - Then you are no longer considering annexing that little piece of property?

Mr. Rother - The annexation petition is in front of both Boards and we will do whatever the

Boards ask us to do. Unlike the plan that was the subject of the first DEIS with a house here, we are not proposing the house. So that annexed land would be used for just this portion of the street and if annexed the rest of it will become open space.

Mr. Dickover - The stormwater pond that you are showing down at the intersection of the new road and Woodside, is that part of your drainage improvement?

Mr. Rother - Yes. The stipple hatch that you see on this plan is what we are using to compute all of the open space. Stormwater Management ponds and any grading that is beyond the lots that is in land that would ultimately be owned by the HOA as opened space is not used in the calculation of the percent of open space, but it would still be part of the HOA.

Mr. Olsen - So does this agree with the Zoning Ordinance now? Do you feel that this plan agrees with your calculations? Are you comfortable with that?

Mr. Dickover - Yes.

Mr. Patterson - Everything seems to be falling downhill and somehow or another it needs to be figured out on how you would get the sewer lines back, do you bring them down the road?

Mr. Rother - Your right it comes down, collected and then the line comes out this way and then down the road?

Mr. Patterson - What about stormwater for that cul-de-sac as well? When you have a lot of water coming in that direction, towards those houses, you either want to by-pass the houses and get to the open space or are you going to pipe it from the cul-de-sac through or let it wash over those properties?

Mr. Rother - No, we would most likely catch it at the bottom of the cul-de-sac and pipe it out.

Mr. Olsen - In earlier plans you indicated that there were some springs around here.

Mr. Rother - It is right on the plan, it is in the center of that open space.

Mr. Aulen - There was a second one that appeared somewhere.

Mr. Rother - I only remember seeing the one.

Mr. Olsen - I remember 2.

Mr. Aulen - I remember 2, however...

Mr. Rother - We would just let the spring go out this way on the road into a culvert.

Mr. Aulen - It was not much of a spring.

Mr. Rother - I have been on the property in August and it is a lot drier...

Mr. Olsen - August is dry but we have had a very wet Spring.

Mr. Rother - It has been unbelievably wet, 18 months.

Mr. Dickover - The lot size is 10,000 sq. ft. on the single family homes and there is also a lot size or square footage requirement for these townhouses, are you aware of the provision in the code?

Mr. Rother - Yes, it is 5,000 sq. ft. per dwelling unit.

Mr. Dickover - Do you have a design to meet that as well?

Mr. Rother - Yes. This one parcel is greater than 50,000 sq. ft. We did this sketch fairly quickly based on Mr. Dickover's memo but this sketch is where we head with the DEIS and the engineering. In the DEIS and it was included in the last DEIS on the existing resources plan we show all of the slope shading of slopes of 15% and slopes of 25% .

Mr. Aulen - I am sure you are in the conceptual stage now but the houses will be facing the street?

Mr. Rother - Yes, these houses here are all the same design and architecture which was presented in the DEIS the first time around.

Mr. Dickover - The Notice of Intent to Re-affirm or re-establish Lead Agency was sent out on May 14, 2019 and 30 days have not transpired for objections. You have received a number of consents not to challenge it but you are missing some so for purposes of making any kind of decisions as a Lead Agency your time to do that has not yet expired. I suspect that most of the answers on the Long EAF are awfully similar if not the same that were provided previously and once your Lead Agency is confirmed or re-established I am suggesting that you reaffirm the Positive Declaration that was previously issued by this Board, then the Scope can be finalized and the DEIS then for the Supplemental can be finalized. We can discuss the Scope this evening and move that along but in order to approve it we still need to wait for that Lead Agency time.

Mr. Aulen - How many have we not received?

Secretary - OCDP, NYS DEC, NYS DOT & US Army of Engs.

Mr. Olsen - Did you said we could have a public hearing on the Scoping?

Mr. Dickover - It is optional with this Board.

Mr. Olsen - At this point I think it is probably useful.

Mr. Dickover - That decision needs to be made after your Lead Agency is re-affirmed. But if you want to try and keep this moving there is no reason you can not discuss Scope as it has been presented. I don't think this re-alteration to the plan changes anything within the Scope but that is your determination not mine.

Mr. Getz - I agree I think the past Scope is very comprehensive and they know what they need to study.

Mr. Rother - When we prepared this Scope we literally used the Scope that was used for the DEIS the first time around and in section 4 - we reiterated all of the same topics and the need to discuss them as it relates to the reduced scale alternative and well as the conceptual subdivision in the Town of Warwick. Sec. 4 (b,c,d,e) we added the phrase "a discussion from possible future development of adjacent land owned by the Sponsor in the Town of Warwick will be included". That is really the most significant addition to the Scope from the one which was approved by the Board.

Mr. Aulen - This Scope appears to address most of the concerns. We are looking for an update on the traffic and drainage.

Ms. Roth - In regards to the SEIS, it is not the intention to write a new DEIS to cover that, it is to supplement the information in the DEIS.

Mr. Aulen - I am aware of that and the prior one was accepted although any changes must be discussed in this Scope.

Mr. Rother - I think the biggest concerns that most folks have is traffic and the traffic study is being re-done, all of the same intersections are being re-analyzed, including the density from this project which slightly lower than the study the first time around and also including traffic from 25 single family homes in the Town of Warwick.

Mr. Aulen - And the additional road...

Mr. Rother - And it will analyze the intersection, the elimination of the intersection down on Sleepy Valley and the addition of the intersection further up. Drainage is what it is, we have to engineer it to meet the Village and DEC's regs. This project was the subject of an archeological

study and the first time around they found some foundations in this corner, we had the same archeologist go out and do shovel tests on any proposed disturbance for the road connection through to the Town and that work has been completed and should have his report in a matter of days and we have also asked a biologist to update flora and fauna study for any new disturbances in the Town that was not part of the original design.

Mr. Dickover - With respect to the Town Planning Board, have you finalized the conceptual drawing for the road and where are you at with respect to their process?

Mr. Rother - I think we are good with the concept, the next step for me would be to submit the fully designed drawings. I don't know how far they can get until this Board can get going on SEQR because they said that they would take a backseat to this Board.

Mr. Dickover - What was the issue of crossing under the power lines?

Mr. Rother - I don't know that there is an issue but we had to contact Central Hudson which we have done but have not gotten an answer yet. I have crossed that power line a few times in the past, not with this project, but generally speaking and they want us to cross as perpendicularly as possible and maintain grade as much as possible particularly they do not want to see a fill because that will close the gap between their power line and the ground, but as long as we are close to at grade and we are crossing it as perpendicular as we can they usually just go ahead and issue.

Mr. Dickover - Is that something you think you are going to be able to do?

Mr. Rother - Yes, the layout as it is presented to the Town was largely governed by the that criteria.

Mr. Dickover - Are they requiring you to design a full build-out on that parcel as part of this?

Mr. Rother - No.

Mr. Dickover - They are going to take it just as a road development?

Mr. Rother - Yes and they expressed that any approval they issue will explicitly state that, that is all they looked at, at this time.

Mr. Dickover - Is 25 lots on the Town parcel the maximum that would be permitted under any Cluster concept as well as conventional?

Mr. Rother - I believe so.

Mr. Dickover - I think you should comment on the maximum build out by whichever it is by cluster or by conventional subdivision. I think the numbers should be addressed in your supplemental.

Mr. Rother - In the Town you get a density bonus if you cluster and we prepared a yield plan which is based on taking advantage of the density bonus. So I think our yield plan does represent maximum build out in the Town. In the Town in addition to whatever the number of lots you get from your yield plan they have a mandatory 10% additional affordable housing requirement. Our yield plan was 23 lots and we would have to add 2 more for affordable housing with is 25.

Mr. Dickover - That's the number with the density bonus.

Mr. Rother - Yes, that is taking advantage of the density bonus.

Mr. Aulen - And you are not addressing any affordable in this particular plan?

Mr. Rother - Not by means of fitting a formula. It would be that having the diversity of housing and the two family homes would provide affordable housing letting the market govern what is affordable.

Mr. Dickover - When you are going through the comments of the Supplemental will you be referring back to pages of the DEIS already drafted so that people can find it?

Ms. Roth - Yes.

Mr. Rother - We are going to be on the Village Board agenda next Monday to talk about this plan so we are seeking their input much earlier on in the process this time.

18 ELM STREET

SITE PLAN APPROVAL

WARWICK CAR WASH

Mr. Getz - This application includes the demolition of 2 residential buildings and several accessory buildings.

Mr. Esposito - Along Elm St. there are two existing dwellings that Paul purchased and owns so those will be demoed, there is a small framed building where they do the car detailing now and a steel & fabric building and a shed in the back that will also be removed.

Mr. Getz - You are proposing the construction of a new auto detailing building.

Mr. Esposito - Yes, it is 76' x 30'.

Mr. Getz - You are proposing to modify the existing driveways and construct new vacuum stations.

Mr. Esposito - Right now you exit the car wash and the existing vacuums are along the northern property line adjacent to the creek and we are proposing 8 more vacuum spaces on the right hand side of the south of the building when you exit so they would be on both sides of the building when you exit.

Mr. Olsen - So there is one entrance in and out?

Mr. Esposito - You will come in off of Elm St. which is where the existing dwellings were and you will exit out the existing exit.

Mr. Getz - The applicant is proposing new landscaping too and has provided details. As far as the site itself, it is located in the LI district adjacent to Residential. It is not located in or adjacent to the Historic District. The site is within the 100 year flood plain and I believe the floodway occupies either the entire site or most of the site and that is the most significant aspect of the project in terms of the floodplain application that is required. In the floodway which is the corridor along the stream within the 100 year floodplain you are not allowed to make any changes unless you demonstrate that it is not going to raise the water surface in any location. If you are developing in the flood plain outside the floodway you can do it without that proof but once you touch the floodway you have to demonstrate that you will not raise water surface.

Mr. Esposito - We actually have it mapped.

Mr. Getz - I included what FEMA calls a Firmette.

Mr. Olsen - Are they going to build in the floodway?

Mr. Getz - Yes.

Mr. Esposito - A portion of the building will be built in the floodway. We tried to stay of it to the greatest extent practical.

Mr. Aulen - It has to be built to certain specifications.

Mr. Esposito - Right.

Mr. Getz - You also have to have an engineer's report about the impacts on the flood elevations.

In their favor, they are knocking down several buildings so the net result could be fine but they have to demonstrate that.

Mr. Esposito - The building kind of lines right up to an existing house.

Mr. Aulen - Yes, there is the fence.

Mr. Getz - In terms of the floodway regulations, if this was a vacant site they would not be allowed to put the building there unless they could demonstrate that there would be no impact on the water surface which I don't believe they could do. The applicant is showing 3 lots and according to the County Tax records, they have 3 different owners. I believe the lots need to be merged as part of this application otherwise you are dealing with setbacks and other...

Mr. Esposito - Mr. LeDuc owns the 3 lots, which are the car wash and each of the two dwellings as part of this application we intend to merge the 3 lots. The lots are under 2 different entities and they will be transferred and titled to M & L Auto and the lot lines will be deleted. How does the Village handle merging of lots?

Mr. Dickover - It is not a subdivision. We have adopted a lot line change law a number of years ago so it is worth a look and at worst case it would be a lot line change.

Mr. Getz - Additional information needs to be added to the plans for example the Zoning District limits especially because adjacent to the proposed building there is a change in zone to Residential. We would like to see existing parking spaces to get a better idea about circulation and along the northern edge of the property there are recent improvements with a sidewalk and the new vacuum stations, those should be shown too. The existing and proposed utilities and floodplain, floodway limits. The Bulk Table should be amended to indicate that for minimum side yards within 25ft. of a residential district 20ft. are required. The applicant is proposing 10ft. so I believe a variance is needed for the proposed building location. Can you explain why you want 10ft?

Mr. Esposito - 1) is because of the floodway and avoiding it to the greatest extent possible and 2) we are also holding the existing 10ft. setback of the existing dwelling and we don't meet the 20ft. setback required because this is the boundary line between the commercial and the residential zone and just in terms of safety and circulation inside the site itself that extra 10ft. makes a big difference in the building in terms of when cars come out they can hand dry them and get them into the vacuum stalls. So we are hoping that we are successful at the ZBA in getting the reduction in the side yard. If we are not we will come back with an amended plan.

Mr. Getz - The exit driveway, I am not sure if it is just exiting but to me it is too wide and it is not well defined, it seems too much like a free for all. I think the plan needs to be either redefined or clarify what is going on. The proposed vacuum stations, I thought they were parking spaces.

Mr. Esposito - We will label those.

Mr. Olsen - The vacuums will move from this side to the other?

Mr. Esposito - No, the existing 10 vacuums will remain we are adding another 8.

Mr. Aulen - Show and label them both.

Mr. Getz - The applicant must file an application for the Flood Hazard Development permit for the floodway impact and also that the new building elevation meets FEMA and Village standards.

Mr. Aulen - There is a well shown on the plan and it is used for water. Please show and explain it on the plan. It has to be a pre-existing well because the Village does not permit wells.

Mr. Esposito - Yes we will put a note on the plan.

Mr. Olsen - Do they need more parking? I thought the vacuums were parking.

Mr. Esposito - There is plenty of parking, there is parking on the side, in the rear, there is plenty of parking.

Mr. Gallo - Are these proposed parking spots adjacent the building?

Mr. Esposito - Yes.

Mr. Gallo - A car can actually pull into these spots?

Mr. Esposito - No, this will be striped so you will pull in this way and they are designated spots for detailing.

Mr. Dickover - What is the brown line on the landscape plan that runs along the creek? Can you label it.

Mr. Esposito - It is the existing curb line.

Mr. Dickover - The utilities and service lines need to be labeled...

Mr. Aulen - There is a new fence too.

Mr. Dickover - You show a storage container encroaching either on you or your neighbor. Can you figure out who owns it and if it is yours maybe get it located within the property line.

Technically this should be considered an amended site plan application so it should be labeled Amended Site Plan application. The property benefits from a previous variance granted in 1990 in which there conditions of hours of operation, there are prior variances and they should be referred to on your site plan. The variances should be added to the plan. The car detailing facility, is that part of the car wash operation? Has it been there?

Mr. LeDuc - Yes and it has always been there.

Mr. Dickover - This application will need to be referred to the OCDP. Is this under 4,000 sq.ft.?

Mr. Esposito - The building is but the improvements would not be.

Mr. Olsen - I know this is pre-existing but how is stormwater handled here?

Mr. Esposito - It is primarily all surface run-off.

Mr. Olsen - Where to?

Mr. Esposito - Either Elm St. or the creek.

Mr. Getz - Is the water that you use in the car wash recycled?

Mr. Esposito - Yes.

FORESTER AVE. SUBDIVISION APPROVAL 77 FORESTER AVE. LLC

Mr. Getz - It appears that COBL Corp. is the owner but the plan shows Mechanical Rubber for the 2 lot subdivision and it should probably read COBL Corp. The subdivision itself requires no construction or physical changes.

Mr. Dickover - We should classify this as a minor subdivision. Because a subdivision requires a site plan and there is a site plan application already before the Board the applicant can just superimpose the site plan onto the subdivision map. The Board can waive any site plan elements

that you don't feel are necessary, we have already done that for the site plan application. Have we ever had the topography on the site plan?

Mr. Getz - Not on the back lot or maybe just the edge of it.

Mr. Woodruff - Yes, just, we did the topo for the apartments.

Mr. Dickover - The Board can waive that requirement for the topo on the town portion if you wish.

Mr. Getz - I don't see a problem with doing that, nothing is proposed to be changed.

Mr. Dickover - The Town does not have any concern about the application and I suppose we would only be doing it for them.

Mr. Patterson - Do we need to worry about water flowing onto the Village?

Mr. Getz - The land slopes down towards the back.

Mr. Woodruff - It slopes away from Forester toward the park land.

Mr. Myrow - We have done the stormwater analysis, correct?

Mr. Woodruff - Yes, just the Village portion.

Mr. Dickover - The Board had previously declared yourselves Lead Agency on this project and issued a Neg Dec and the Lead Agency designation continues onto this application but the question is whether or not this subdivision changes any or makes any adverse environmental impacts as a result of the subdivision which were not considered as part of your previous determination. If there are none then you can re-affirm the previously issued Neg Dec. for this project. This should go before OCDP for comments.

Mr. Myrow - How do it get to the ZBA without the Neg. Dec.

Mr. Dickover - You can't get a Neg Dec from this Board until we get a 239. Let's talk about the public hearing timing and the variance application. The variance is triggered by Sec. 145-70 A(13) for the driveway because it states "No driveway shall provide access to a lot located in another district, which lot is used for any use prohibited in the district which such driveway is located". The driveway will be located in a R zone and is servicing a parcel of land in the Town which is used for something other than residential and that use is not permitted in the zoning district where the driveway is located, hence the variance.

Mr. Olsen - This building may not always exist, so will this serve whatever is back there? Apts.?

Mr. Myrow - It is a residential zone in the Town. It would be a significantly less of an impact.

Mr. Dickover - The driveway easement for the Mechanical Rubber building, the meets and bounds for the driveway should be called out on the plat so it is identified so any other future building on the Village parcel does not impact that. Any approval from this Board should be conditioned up the current level of usage of the driveway as it serves Mechanical Rubber site. Any future change in the usage of the Mechanical Rubber site and any change in the level of service/traffic would need to be subject to approval by the Village Planning Board. If that building becomes used by 10,000 cars a day and it is coming through a Village parcel, that is something that this Board would need to concern itself with. In the absence of a Resolution for the driveway you would not have any control over it in the future.

Mr. Aulen - Mechanical Rubber is the only business in that particular building?

Mr. Dickover - No, I know there is a gym.

Mr. Myrow - Crossfit, and I am not sure that there is anyone other than them in there.

Mr. Woodruff - I believe it is just Crossfit.

Mr. Dickover - A Declaration would need to be recorded preserving to the Mechanical Rubber building to right of access and egress across the driveway, the service lines to the Mechanical Rubber building need to be located. Note #4 on the subdivision plat recites that they are approximate, is that good enough?

Mr. Getz - It would be impossible to know their exact location.

Mr. Woodruff - The utilities shown on the plan as far as water and the gas main locations, those were per mark-outs but the surveyor wants that note to relieve himself of any due diligence so that in the event something on his map subterranean that was not excavated to verify the location.

Mr. Dickover - Shouldn't the exception say other than utilities actually shown?

Mr. Myrow - Ultimately the power line will remain, the gas will be abandoned somewhere in the roadbed, there will be a new gas line. The existing water service will be moved...

Mr. Woodruff - It will be tied in somewhere near the property line and then relocated and then tied back in.

Mr. Dickover - Are you doing that work as part of this project?

Mr. Woodruff - It is part of the site plan application.

Mr. Getz - The proposed utility lines, those are approximate because field changes could be made during construction.

Mr. Dickover - But an as-built is then required.

Mr. Getz - Yes.

Mr. Dickover - We need an easement in favor of the Mechanical Rubber building and recorded for the utility service lines. You also need to put on the map that the subdivision approval is by the Village of Warwick only. The approval/signature block should be changed to read Subdivision Plat.

Mr. Myrow - Will you be issuing an additional Neg Dec for the subdivision?

Mr. Dickover - We will re-affirm it.

Mr. Myrow - The provision of the code that we need a variance from is not necessarily tied to the subdivision, it is as relevant to the site plan as it is to the subdivision so we should be able to proceed with the Neg Dec that we have on the site plan.

Mr. Dickover - I will agree if Mr. Fink will.

A MOTION was made by Jim Patterson, seconded by Bill Olsen and carried to adjourn the meeting. (5 Ayes)

Neither Mr. Patterson nor Mr. Gallo will be in attendance at the July 9th meeting.

Respectfully submitted;

Maureen J. Evans,
Planning Board secretary