



A MOTION was made by Bill Olsen, seconded by Kerry Boland and carried to extend the site plan approval until Sept. 10, 2022. (5 Ayes)

15 MAPLE AVE.

AMENDED SITE PLAN  
APPROVAL

ST. ANTHONY'S

---

Mr. Stastny – The radiology expansion is slated for the alcove near the parking lot on Van Duzer, the area along Maple Ave. is where the OR expansion is going to be.

Mr. McKnight – I was curious about the back parking lot.

Mr. Rizzo – Currently there exists 2 trailers where the new building is going to go along Van Duzer. The intent is to remove the existing trailers and construct a new building with an MRI and a CT.

Mr. Olsen – So the Boiler Plant stays.

Mr. Rizzo – Yes.

Mr. Olsen – Will this increase the number of people working?

Mr. Rizzo – No, the same workload and no change in parking.

Mr. Patterson – Do you have a schedule for all this work?

Mr. Rizzo – Not yet we are waiting to see if we get approval before we start putting schedules together. Obviously, the hospital would like to get it done as soon as possible and once we get those approvals. The building will be bricked to match the existing brick and limestone that goes around the building and matching windows.

Mr. Getz – The way it will project out will not interfere with the traffic?

Mr. Rizzo – No, we are not going out that far.

Mr. Stastny – We are looking to re-landscape the area along Maple Ave where the expansion of the OR is taking place and the new expansion for the radiology, we will be improving the drainage system there by relocating at least one of the basins and extend the system to capture some of the water that takes place on either side of the building.

Mr. Olsen – Is there any hazardous waste generated?

Mr. Stastny – No, whatever was there before is staying the same. The addition has no hazardous waste, there will be some industrial type of stuff with the hospital but they will handle it in the same fashion that they are doing now.

Ms. Boland – What about increased radiation if everything is moved into one area? Are there extra protections?

Mr. Stastny – Yes there will be shielding of the building to contain all...

Ms. Boland – And for ongoing employees who work near the area?

Mr. Stastny – Yes, it has to have shielding to handle all of the radiation and everything to go along with it. The OR addition is a small addition that is going to go along the side of the existing building and off the back. The basic concept is to create more storage for the OR. The addition is proposed along the side to give the employees and staff the ability to walk along the outside so you don't have to gown up inside and go through the OR to get through to get to the storage.

Mr. Rizzo – We are taking the existing trees and going to ball them and re-plant them. We are not touching the roadway; we are just wrapping around the building. We will not be doing anything to change traffic patterns or anything with the roadway.

Mr. McKnight – Will the sidewalks be disturbed on the Maple Ave. side?

Mr. Rizzo – The intent is not to do that.

Mr. Getz – But you will be moving trees from one side of the sidewalk to the other?

Mr. Rizzo – Yes, anything that is along the path where we have to put the addition is what we are looking for and I think there were 8 trees.

Mr. McKnight – You are not changing the location of the sidewalk.

Mr. Rizzo – No. It may get damaged during construction, but we are not moving anything relative to where the sidewalk is, the curbing, the road, none of that.

Mr. Stastny – We are trying to keep the same profile with the stone and when we realized that the road is a little bit closer, we are going to put a chamfer on it.

Ms. Boland – Are there any other reasons besides growing up on why this addition is important?

Ms. Anita Volpe – One of the reasons is we are expanding. We do about 4,000 surgeries per year, we do total joint replacement surgery and when we are doing those replacements, the implants are in very large cases, the OR was designed in 1970 and we are growing out of it. Our wards have to be regulated because everything must be sterile and when they are stored in a different place and if we had the storage, we can put them where we need them and we will be doing something with the HVAC too. For the radiology project, the MRI right now is in a trailer, and we have to take patients outside to get into the trailer.

Mr. Getz – Are you set up to add a potentially add a 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> floor in the future?

Mr. Rizzo – No, it was discussed at some point, but it is just a same story addition.

Mr. Olsen – Would it be strong enough to have a 3<sup>rd</sup> floor?

Mr. Rizzo – Right now it is not the intent to design it to have a second floor. Could it be done? Yes, if the hospital feels that is what they want to do and design it in the fashion and support to go up on it, then it could be done.

Mr. Getz – The property is in the CCRC zone, and it is within the Village's Historic District. The properties holdings appear to have 3 separate tax lots. What we would like is an overall plan, maybe will less detail of what is going on inside and a simplified version to understand where the lot lines are, what the setbacks will be, existing driveway locations, parking spaces, etc. A Bulk Table on the plan is very important. I believe that by adding onto the site towards Maple Ave. may not meet the setback requirements which if it is the case a ZBA variance would be required. I believe the previous addition may have needed the same variance. I noticed in several places the plan shows references to the Town of Warwick, that should all read Village. It was mentioned about potential work within the State right of way which is the Maple Ave. side, so, if any work is proposed and it sounds like the tree planting would be within the right of way so the applicant should coordinate with the DOT.

Mr. Rizzo – I believe that most of the landscaping is outside of the right of way.

Mr. Getz – We noticed on the revisions to the stormwater drainage system that there was a typo on one of the elevations. Regarding the EIS, we did EAF mapper in the office and we found that it comes up with a positive hit for several items, archeological, endangered species, etc. so that will need to be addressed as part of the application.

Mr. McKnight – On page 5 of the EAF, it states that there will be no excavation other than site preparations. If that is the case, does it still need a long review for archaeological?

Mr. Getz – Yes, the archeological could be limited to the project area, it does not have to include other parts to the site. But to really sign-off on the EIS we should make sure that any of the items that come up as potential issues are addressed.

Mr. Dickover – In the CCRC zone, hospitals are a Special Use Permit with approval of the Village Board. The Village Board has previously on applications for amended site plan conducted a Special Use Permit procedure and issued the permit and I think it should be done again this time because these additions are bigger and greater than prior ones. It may be that the Village Board will give you a pass and say that no further Special Use Permit is required, that you are covered under the existing one, but I think that would be a prudent thing to do. It is also required to go before the ARB and the procedure calls for that Board to report to the Village Board on the Special Use Permit and once, we get the site plan they may have to do before the ZBA. This is a Type 1 Action with a coordinated review under SEQR because it is located in the Historic District. Once we receive the site plan, we can conduct the environmental review. You said there is no additional parking and that you are servicing the same number of patients or maybe a few more with one additional operating room, so there will probably not be any impacts on traffic.

Mr. Getz – Are there any State agencies that have to approve your plans or actual operating room...

Mr. Stastny – The Dept. of Health has to review and approve everything.

Mr. Getz – What is the typical time frame for that?

Mr. Stastny – About 90 days.

Mr. Dickover – That is nothing that involves this Board, that is a medical, health dept. regulation that they must meet.

Mr. Getz – For the additions, will water and heat and wastewater all be connected inside the building?

Mr. Stastny – Yes.

Mr. Olsen – Any increase in stormwater?

Mr. Getz – Minimal and where the radiology is going all of that is impervious surface.

Mr. Olsen – The stormwater will go where?

Mr. Getz – It will follow the existing drainage pattern. There will be a very slight increase but not enough that would trigger any kind of study needed. One of the calculations we will need is the disturbance area. If that is under 1 acre that keeps all the stormwater requirements simple.

A MOTION was made by Bill Olsen, seconded by Jesse Gallo and carried to declare Intent of Lead Agency and to circulate it to the Village Board and Zoning Board of Appeals. (5Ayes)

A MOTION was made by Jesse Gallo, seconded by Tom McKnight and carried to go into an executive session to discuss pending litigation at 16 Elm St. (5 Ayes)

A MOTION was made by Bill Olsen, seconded by Jesse Gallo and carried to reconvene public meeting. (5 Ayes)

A MOTION was made by Jesse Gallo, seconded by Tom McKnight and carried for the Board to authorize the Planning Board Chairman to sign the stipulation for pending litigation by Patrick Gallagher opposing 16 Elm St. on behalf of the Board. This authorization is premised upon the stipulation being in it's current form with respect to it's material aspects and if the terms of the stipulation change in any material aspect in the opinion of the Chairman or Counsel that the authorization be thereby rescinded until further discussion by the Board. (5 Ayes)

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

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen J. Evans,  
Planning Board secretary