

**Village of Woodbury
Planning Board Meeting
October 5, 2022**

Minutes of the Planning Board Meeting held on October 5, 2022, at 7:30 PM.
(Meeting held via Zoom)

Board Members Present: Christopher Gerver, Chairman
Richard Cataggio
Thomas DeLuca
Michael Pastel
Evan Yan

Representing for the Village of Woodbury Planning Board:

Kelly Naughton, Attorney
Natalie D. Barber, Engineer
Philip Grealy, Traffic Consultant

Board Member(s) Absent: None

Chairman Gerver opened the meeting with this statement. "The Board has determined that the circumstances necessitating the emergency declaration would affect or impair the ability of the public body to hold an in-person meeting." The Chairman then continued with the Pledge of Allegiance.

1. **Executive Session:** No Executive Session was necessary.
2. **Public Comment:** No member of the public had comments.
3. **Regular Agenda:**

- A. **Neuman/ARB** – Review and discuss proposed ARB modifications to a single-family dwelling to include removal and enclosure of garage doors adding windows and entry door. Said property is located at 19 Hill Avenue in Highland Mills and is known on the Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 219 Block 10 Lot 5.

Due to the holidays, the Applicant requested to be placed in the next Planning Board meeting.

- B. **Boselli/ARB** – Review and discuss the proposed ARB for a sunroom addition to a single-family dwelling on the existing rear deck. Said property is located at 191 Roselawn Road in Highland Mills and is known on the Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 213 Block 1 Lot 103.

Present Mr. John Boselli and Mrs. Diane Giordano Boselli, the Applicants.

Mr. Boselli proceeded to summarize his application. Engineer Natalie Barber referred to the H2M memo dated September 29, 2022.

H2M Memo:

1. *Zoning* –

a) *Use* – Single-family homes are permitted in the R-2A zone.

b) *Bulk* – The applicant submitted a survey of the property that was prepared in 1986. The survey includes a bulk table that is not reflective of the current zone requirements. The following table describes the differences:

Requirement	1986 Survey	Current Zoning	Actual or Proposed
Lot Area	30,000 SF / 0.69 AC	2 AC	30,537.6 SF / 0.7 AC
Lot Width	125-FT	175-FT	127.24-FT
Front Yard	40-FT	40-FT	102-FT
Side Yard / Both	30-FT / 60-FT	30-FT / 60-FT	> 30-FT / > 60-FT ¹
Rear Yard	50-FT	50-FT	> 50-FT ¹
Coverage		20%	< 20% ¹

We recommend the applicant revise the plan to reflect the current requirements of the Zone. As noted in the table above, the lot area and lot width are under sized per current zoning. We recommend you review with Counsel if these are legally pre-existing nonconforming conditions.

2. ARB – In your role as ARB, the Code (§8-4) specifies your review and consideration of structures or alterations to structures and the following:

A. Excessive similarity, dissimilarity or inappropriateness in relation to itself or to any other structure existing or for which a permit has been issued or to any other structure included in the same permit application, facing upon the same street or within the same or surrounding neighborhood, including neighboring developments, in respect to one or more of the following features:

(1) Exterior façade of all building sides, including, but not limited to, building materials, mass, roof line, architectural style and authenticity, colors, size, proportion, roof design and height.

(2) Size and arrangement of doors, windows, porticoes or other openings or breaks in the façade, including reverse arrangement.

(3) Footprint and gross floor area, including all or portions of the structure.

We have the following comments on ARB:

a) As mentioned above the applicant proposes to construct a sunroom within the same footprint of the existing 25x23 deck. To support this application for architectural review the applicant provided a photo of the existing deck, description of the scope of work, proposed elevations (illegible), and your required ARB form.

b) Our copy of the proposed elevations is illegible, if the Board's materials are similar, we recommend the applicant provide a larger scale drawing with clearer visuals for you to consider.

c) The scope of work submitted with the application indicates the roof and windows will match existing and proposes a Certainteed vinyl siding. The applicant's ARB form describes Double 4 Tuscan Clay siding by Anderson. We recommend the applicant confirm whether the siding for the sunroom will match the siding on the existing home and if needed, update the application materials for consistency.

d) The ARB form should be updated to reflect the total area of the home after the addition. The square footage listed is for the sunroom addition only.

e) We recommend you confirm visibility of the existing deck from the street through a site inspection. The sunroom is proposed at the rear of the applicant's home in the location of the existing deck. If the existing deck is not visible, the proposed addition would likely not be visible. Additionally, according to Google Earth imagery the rear yard and frontage of the property are heavily vegetated. If the deck is not visible, we recommend you consider whether photographs of neighboring homes are necessary for you to consider your similarity, dissimilarity criteria listed above for this application.

3. Ridge Preservation – This property ranges greater than 800-ft above mean sea level (AMSL) triggering your review under the Code (§310-13) requirements for Ridge Preservation (threshold 600-ft AMSL). The nearest view corridor is County Route 105. Our comments on Ridge Preservation follow:

a) *The applicant should confirm whether the home is visible from the view corridor for you to consider applicability under this section of your Code.*

b) *Non-reflective windows are a requirement of your Code (§310-13.B.4). The applicant should include this as a note on the elevations. We recommend you also include this as a condition of your potential action.*

c) *The Code (§310-13.B.(2)) requires the use of materials that blend the structure into the natural environment and have earth tone, neutral colors. This section of the Code allows the Planning Board discretion to permit the use of non-natural building materials in connection with applications where the existing structure is constructed with non-natural materials. Upon confirmation from the applicant whether the proposed materials will match the existing, we recommend you consider compliance with the Code or waiver under this circumstance.*

4. *Projected Water and Sewer Demand Form – This form was submitted with the application. The applicant should confirm no bedrooms are proposed in the sunroom space and if so, revise the form to indicate “no new bedrooms”.*

5. *Public Hearing – At your discretion a public hearing should be scheduled or waived as permitted by your Code ARB (§314-8.A.) “upon determination that there is no apparent significant impact to the surrounding neighbors or neighborhood, given the mass and/or architectural features of the proposed project and that a public hearing is not necessary in the public interest.”*

6. *SEQRA – We defer to Counsel’s direction on SEQRA.*

There was further discussion on what was missing from the application. Chairman Gerver listed what needs to be submitted, including the Applicant addressing Engineer Barber’s comments regarding the ARB application. Mr. Boselli clarified that the plan is to remove the existing deck and build a new deck room. T. DeLuca asked if the addition would be a three-season room, and Mr. Boselli answered yes. R. Cataggio questioned the history of the existing deck and whether the new deck would be insulated. Mr. Boselli said the deck was there when they purchased the home, and the new deck will be insulated.

Chairman Gerver noted that as soon the applicant makes their submissions, the sooner they are placed on the agenda.

A motion was offered by Chairman Gerver, seconded by T. DeLuca, to type this as a Type II Action under SEQRA for Boselli/ARB. Chairman Gerver conducted a roll call of the Board which resulted in the motion being:

ADOPTED

AYES	5	Chairman Gerver, R. Cataggio, T. DeLuca, M. Pastel, E. Yan
NOES	0	

- C. Ideal Design/65 Catskill High Rail/ARB** – Review and discuss proposed ARB and Ridge preservation for modifications to a single-family dwelling to include a 2-story rear addition and partial conversion of garage to mudroom and seasonal kitchen. Said property is located at 65 Catskill High Rail in Central Valley and is known on the Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 255 Block 3 Lot 41.

Present Engineer Steven Spisto

Engineer Spisto gave a summary of the proposed addition. Engineer Barber addressed the H2M memo dated September 29, 2022.

H2M Memo:

1. Zoning –

a) Use – Single-family homes are permitted in the CCDOD/R-1A zone.

b) Bulk – The applicant should provide a plan based on a survey of the property that shows the existing home and site features (including all impervious surfaces) as well as the proposed addition. The plan should include a bulk table demonstrating compliance with the requirements of the zone. The plan should show the required setbacks (front, rear, and side-yard) from the property lines. If any trees, 8-inch diameter or greater, are proposed for removal within the location of the proposed addition, they should be shown on the survey and marked for removal.

2. ARB – In your role as ARB, the Code (§8-4) specifies your review and consideration of structures or alterations to structures and the following:

A. Excessive similarity, dissimilarity or inappropriateness in relation to itself or to any other structure existing or for which a permit has been issued or to any other structure included in the same permit application, facing upon the same street or within the same or surrounding neighborhood, including neighboring developments, in respect to one or more of the following features:

(1) Exterior façade of all building sides, including, but not limited to, building materials, mass, roof line, architectural style and authenticity, colors, size, proportion, roof design and height.

(2) Size and arrangement of doors, windows, porticoes or other openings or breaks in the fa. (çade, including reverse arrangement.

(3) Footprint and gross floor area, including all or portions of the structure.

We have the following comments on ARB:

a) The applicant provided colored renderings of the front and rear of the home, floorplans, elevations, and your ARB form for you to consider the Code ARB criteria.

b) We recommend the applicant confirm the size of the proposed addition – narrative suggests 1,092- SF, a scaled calculation based on the drawings indicates the size of the addition may be less (approximately 860-SF). Nonetheless, in accordance with your typical practice, we recommend the applicant provide a table indicating the existing (footprint and gross floor) areas of the home, proposed (footprint and gross floor) areas and within the same table provide area information on neighboring homes for you to consider your similarity/dissimilarity criteria above.

c) The applicant should confirm whether they intend to match the color and material of the existing siding and roofing or if all façades of the home are to be treated with new materials. If new is proposed, you may wish to see photos of neighboring homes to consider your similarity/dissimilarity criteria above.

d) The ARB form should be updated to reflect the total area of the home after the addition. The square footage listed is for the addition only.

e) The ARB form should list the materials and color of the proposed decking for you to consider.

3. Ridge Preservation – This property ranges greater than 850-ft above mean sea level (AMSL) triggering your review under the Code (§310-13) requirements for Ridge Preservation (threshold 600-ft AMSL). The nearest view corridors are County Route 105 and NYS Route 32. Our comments on Ridge Preservation follow:

a) The applicant should confirm whether the home is visible from the view corridor for you to consider applicability under this section of your Code.

b) Non-reflective windows are a requirement of your Code (§310-13.B.4). The applicant should include this as a note on the plans. We recommend you also include this as a condition of your potential action.

c) The Code (§310-13.B.(2)) requires the use of materials that blend the structure into the natural environment and have earth tone, neutral colors, and specifically excludes white as a permissible

color. This section of the Code allows the Planning Board discretion to permit the use of nonnatural building materials in connection with applications where the existing structure is constructed with non-natural materials. Upon confirmation from the applicant whether the proposed materials will match the existing, we recommend you consider compliance with the Code or waiver under this circumstance.

d) The applicant should confirm if any trees are to be removed to construct the proposed addition and deck. We note the Code (§310-13.B.(5)) requires trees greater than 8-inch diameter at breast height be preserved except where essential to the location of the structure. Applicant to confirm.

4. Projected Water and Sewer Demand Form – This form was submitted with the application. The interior layout of the home is changing, in order to confirm no bedrooms are being added, we recommend all of the rooms shown on the existing floor plans (Sheet A-2) be labeled. If no new bedrooms are proposed, this should be indicated on the Water and Sewer Demand Form.

5. Public Hearing – At your discretion a public hearing should be scheduled or waived as permitted by your Code ARB (§314-8.A.) “upon determination that there is no apparent significant impact to the surrounding neighbors or neighborhood, given the mass and/or architectural features of the proposed project and that a public hearing is not necessary in the public interest.”

6. SEQRA – We defer to Counsel’s direction on SEQRA.

Chairman Gerver explained the request for photos should be of the current state of the home as well as the surrounding homes. Those photos would help the Board in determining excessive similarity or dissimilarity. The Applicant was also advised photos can be submitted digitally.

A motion was offered by Chairman Gerver, seconded by M. Pastel, to type this as a Type II Action under SEQRA for Ideal Design/65 Catskill High Rail/ARB. Chairman Gerver conducted a roll call of the Board which resulted in the motion being:

ADOPTED

AYES	5	Chairman Gerver, R. Cataggio, T. DeLuca, M. Pastel, E. Yan
NOES	0	

- D. **Homewood Suites** – Review and discuss the revised site plan submitted for the proposed 97-room hotel to include guest amenities parking and associated utilities. Said property is located at NYS Route 32 and Turner Road in Central Valley and is known on the Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 226 Block 1 Lots 6.1, 7. and 8.

Present Attorney Frank William, Engineer Steve Esposito, and Traffic Consultant Carlito Holt from DTS Provident.

Engineer Esposito explained this application had been revised to reflect Homewood Suites as the Applicant as it used to be the Marriott. The number of rooms has been revised as well, instead of 122 rooms it will be 97 rooms. He continued to say they have been communicating with the Department Of Transportation (DOT). The DOT approves the current plans but is still working out the details. Traffic Consultant Holt spoke of the improvements with the plans regarding Rt 32 and how the DOT has approved some of the improvements. He’s also noted since the reduction of rooms, the traffic generator shows less intense traffic.

Traffic Consultant Phillip Grealy agreed with Traffic Consultant Holt regarding the cooperation with DOT. He then referred to the memo from Collier’s Engineer & Design dated September 29, 2022. He noted some items for the Applicant to be addressed in their next submissions.

Collier’s Memo:

We have received a copy of the submission and site plan dated July 13, 2022 and have the following comments:

Our previous review letter dated February 10, 2022 had several items relative to this project. Many of those are still appropriate and will need to be added to the plans. These include:

- Item 1 identify on the site plan the location of existing and proposed driveways for other existing and proposed developments on the west side of NYS Route 32.*
- Identify the exact location of the driveway from the Martial Arts on Turner Road and its relationship to the proposed access.*
- Providing some additional details on improvements to Turner Road as it relates to the Turner Road driveway. See Item 5 of our February 10, 2022 letter should be addressed in more detail.*
- Based on the last correspondence from the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) as outlined in their January 12, 2022 email, they are in conceptual agreement with the left turn widening and alignment of Turner Road at NYS Route 32. Have there been any further plans advanced relative to the work permit for this and have those areas along NYS Route 32 where land dedications are needed been identified in more detail?*
- It is unclear whether or not a sidewalk is required by NYSDOT or proposed along the site frontage on NYS Route 32.*
- Has there been any other further correspondence with NYSDOT on the Highway Work Permits or regarding future signalization? If so, this should be provided to the Village.*

Traffic Consultant Holt noted they are not proposing any signalization off Rt. 32 at this time, the previous thought was that the other applications along Rt. 32 would initiate the idea of adding a signal pole, but it doesn't seem to be the case. At this time, this application stands alone. Traffic Consultant Holt and Traffic Consultant Grealy continued to speak about the signalization as well as the sidewalk.

T. DeLuca asked if there was a way the Board could enforce a signal pole in the plans. Chairman Gerver mentioned a meeting he attended with the Applicant along with the DOT asking for the signalization. This topic was discussed further, and to answer T. DeLuca's question, Chairman Gerver said the Board could not force the DOT to place a signal. DOT has been approached with this idea several times and has tried to show how much of a signal pole would be needed. The DOT has yet to be in agreement with this idea. Traffic Consultant Grealy asked that the Applicant place a potential location for a signal pole in the plans. In case this is something the DOT will approve sometime down the road.

R. Cataggio reminded the Applicant that in a previous meeting he asked that they provide a digital simulation. Traffic Consultant Holt was asked to provide that information to the Board, and he agreed to forward the simulation.

Before going over the H2M memo, Engineer Barber noted that she did not receive the updated traffic plans that were brought up in this meeting. She then proceeded to point out key items in her memo.

H2M Memo:

1. Zoning – The applicant is proceeding in accordance with the provisions of the Hotel Overlay Zoning District detailed in the Code (§310-7.1).

a) Use – Hotels are permitted in the Hotel Overlay District with special permit and site plan approval by the Planning Board.

b) Bulk/Area – The plan lists the density, parking and bulk requirements of the Overlay District. We note the following:

i. Area – The net lot area per the Code (§310-2, "Lot Area") should be confirmed on the plan. Deductions for wetlands and utility easements (among other considerations required by Code) should be included within the applicant's calculations.

ii. Density – The Overlay District permits one (1) hotel unit for each 700 square feet of lot area with a maximum of 200 hotel units. The applicant proposes 97 rooms and is complying.

iii. *Setbacks* – The structure setback satisfies the required 50-foot minimum from the State Road as well as the rear and side yards for the access and ROW dedications currently proposed. The overlay zone allows parking in the required setbacks (subject to landscape buffering – see below).

iv. *Coverage* – The applicant should confirm the coverage listed on the site plan includes all impervious surfaces proposed. The applicant should discuss the surface treatment of the courtyard at the rear of the building and include this within the coverage calculations as needed.

v. *Height* – The plans note the building height will be less than five (5) stories/54-feet, 60-ft is the maximum permitted. However, the Code (§310-7.1.D.(3)) also requires “The maximum height permitted shall not apply to rooftop bulkheads, elevator penthouses, cooling towers or air-conditioning or heating equipment, provided that such features shall not occupy, in the aggregate, more than 10% of the area of the roof of a building and are set back from the edge of the roof at least one foot for each one foot by which such features exceed the maximum permitted height. All mechanical equipment located on the tops of buildings shall be visually screened to the satisfaction of the Planning Board.” The applicant should provide additional detail as required for you to evaluate this Code criteria.

vi. *Buffer* – The Code (§310-7.1.D.(4)) requires a 15-foot-wide landscaped buffer on all boundary lines with the exception of access drives and sidewalks. This should be shown on the plan. Currently the plan is noncomplying, if the applicant cannot accommodate this along the proposed front and rear property lines a variance may be required. The Board previously discussed the southeasterly corner of the property that contains wetlands and compliance with this criterion; At that time, the applicant was advised they should provide additional details regarding the existing vegetation and show whether this provides a sufficient buffer. Applicant to advise.

vii. *Access* – We defer to your traffic consultant on access improvements but note the following as a general description of what is provided and follow-up from prior discussions. Two entrances to the site are proposed. One is off Route 32, which appears to be a right-in/right-out only configuration. The second is off Turner Road and is proposed for full movement in and out of the site. The applicant’s plan also shows a proposed left hand turn lane for Southbound traffic on Route 32 into Turner Road. The applicant is coordinating proposed access and traffic improvements with the NYSDOT and Village Traffic Consultant. We recommend the applicant describe the changes to the plan since their last appearance and discuss the right-of-way dedications proposed for you to consider. As mentioned above, the plan set submitted for your review indicates roadway improvements are provided on plans by others. We recommend these be provided for your review.

b) *Utilities* – A projected water and sewer demand form should be provided for this plan, supporting calculations should be submitted as required by the form. The Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) previously advised an Engineer’s Report for sewer capacity should be provided as well as confirmation that the proposed water withdrawal is within the approved capacity of the Village. (See additional requirements below). The proposed details and plan for water and sewer should be reviewed with the Water and Sewer Department and compliance confirmed.

i. *Water* –

a. *Water System Notes on Sheet C-302 reference Village of Goshen, this should be revised.*

b. *The applicant should confirm the size and material of the water service connection. The plan identifies a 6-inch ductile iron pipe water line, but some details reference 4-inch fittings (Valve and Valve Box). Consistency among details (material and size) should be provided.*

c. *The water pipe trench with encasement detail references “profiles for actual depth” of construction. The applicant should provide a profile of the water main that shows the various storm and sewer crossings and depth in relation to this service.*

d. *The location of the Fire Department Connection should be referred to the ESO’s for their consideration.*

ii. Sewer – *The existing on-site sewer system which the applicant proposes to modify is part of the Consolidated Sewer Area. The portion of sewer that is existing on site conveys wastewater that is collected from the elementary school, homes and businesses along portions of Buena Vista Terrace and that area through to Oakland Avenue, and those developments along Turner Road. This is an important piece of infrastructure for the Village and a sewer relocation plan with additional details should be submitted. The plan should discuss demolition and/or abandonment of existing facilities no longer in use, a bypass plan during construction and/or temporary facilities required, details for tie-in to existing sewers and/or manholes, etc. The construction sequence and personnel required for inspections, and notification procedures should be identified.*

With respect to the information that is already submitted, we have the following comments:

- a. A profile and invert information (new and existing) should be provided.*
- b. The applicant proposes the minimum slope (0.4%) that is permitted for 8-inch pipe. This will need to be strictly adhered to.*
- c. The inverts (IN/OUT) on PR-SMH-1 appear to be switched.*
- d. The applicant identifies existing inverts (SE/SW) on EX SMH, please show these connections on the plan.*
- e. Applicant to confirm the inverts shown were verified by survey.*
- f. The applicant should provide the inverts for the manhole downstream of PR-SMH-1 and include the downstream manhole on the profile.*
- g. As mentioned in prior memoranda, we believe there is an existing easement (not shown) for the sewer main across the applicant's property. If the plan proceeds, the existing easement would need to be extinguished and a new easement created for the new sewer. The proposed easement is shown, at the appropriate time language for the easement and metes and bounds description should be provided for Counsel to review. If the new and old easements do not align, you may wish to discuss an opportunity to improve the 20-ft on center requirement.*
- h. As-builts will be required for the proposed sewer improvements.*

Once all the information above is confirmed, the plan and proposed construction should be reviewed with the Sewer Administrator.

Engineer Barber continued mentioning items that need adjustment or have yet to be provided for instance a revised SWPPP, easements, construction phasing plan, lighting plan, and landscaping among other things.

Attorney Kelly Naughton followed by reading and going over her remarks on the Full Environmental Assessment Form Part 2. Per T. DeLuca's questions Attorney Naughton explained how part 2 is based on part 1 and noted there weren't many revisions to part 1. She was also able to advise the Board of options they can make as per the Environmental Impact Statement. The Board agreed to do a study on a global scope due to the impact on the size of the area, a study should be done through EIS.

Chairman Gerver asked how will items for the indoor pool be stored. Engineer Naughton shared some information but referred to the Applicant to provide even more information. Attorney Frank introduced the Applicant for he has other hotels with indoor pools, and he was able to share how certain items/chemicals will be stored whether it's fresh or salted water. It's based on the filtration system they choose to use.

A motion was offered by Chairman Gerver, seconded by M. Pastel, to accept the Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) Part 2 as presented by Attorney Naughton. Chairman Gerver conducted a roll call of the Board which resulted in the motion being:

ADOPTED

AYES 5 Chairman Gerver, R. Cataggio, T. DeLuca, M. Pastel, E. Yan
NOES 0

A motion was offered by Chairman Gerber, seconded by T. DeLuca, to adopt a positive declaration with items noted on the Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) Part 2, and authorize counsel to draft the declaration as addressed in this meeting. Chairman Gerver conducted a roll call of the Board which resulted in the motion being:

ADOPTED

AYES 5 Chairman Gerver, R. Cataggio, T. DeLuca, M. Pastel, E. Yan
NOES 0

- E. **Hamaspik of Orange** -Review and discuss the proposed Site Plan and Special Permit for change of use to an indoor commercial recreation facility. Said property is located at 8 Laura Lane in Central Valley and is known as Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 226 Block 1 Lot 24.2.

Present Engineer John Petroccione, Attorney Jay Myrow and Mr. Mostafa Azatullah.

The Chairman announced that the Applicant had reached out to the Board saying they would not be able to attend tonight's meeting, although Attorney Jay Myrow was present to represent the Applicant. Attorney Myrow confirmed receiving comments from Engineer Barber. The Applicant at a later time, will address does comment.

To confirm T. DeLuca asked if this application entails a salvage yard to be turned into an indoor recreation center for special needs. He also asked how long it has been a salvage lot. Attorney Myrow said yes, the auto salvage would be terminated upon the transfer of the property and Mr. Azatullah added that the lot was first an auto salvage, it later became a salvage lot for about 30 years.

Engineer Barber commented that she wasn't aware of how the lot would be used. To her understanding, it was to be a partial conversion which her memo is based on. The plan doesn't show any site improvements as per Attorney Myrow's comments on the property being converted once transferred. T. DeLuca expressed his concerns on how there may be some contamination issues on a lot that was used for salvage for the amount of time to then be converted into a recreation facility.

Engineer Naughton wanted to address a point in the 2015 approval, involving water.

H2M Memo:

2. Site Plan –

a) Utilities –

i. Water/Sewer Demand – The applicant provided their calculations for water and sewer demand based on 75 children (currently 50 proposed with 10 staff). The applicant should discuss what the current water and sewer needs are for the site so you can consider how the proposed use will impact demand.

ii. Water/Fire Needs – The 2015 amended approval required the applicant to install a 6-inch ductile iron water main with fire hydrant to replace the existing water services that extend from Valley Avenue under the railroad overpass to this and neighboring properties. Nationwide Auto

Parts is currently operating under a temporary certificate of occupancy until the watermain is installed. The purpose of the watermain extension is to improve fire protection capability to the facilities along Laura Lane including Nationwide Auto Parts.

According to our records, the applicant advanced the permitting required for the watermain installation with both the Department of Health (application endorsed in 2016) and AECOM railroad facility (received 02/2020); however, due to the cost of installing the main via directional drill versus traditional trenching, the required improvements have not been installed.

The applicant's plan provides two alternatives for fire protection improvements including water main extension and 25,000-gallon fire storage tank with fire pump. We have the following comments on these proposals:

a. Watermain Extension –

- The plan shows an 8-inch main similar to the plan that was approved by the Department of Health, but that varies from the plan presented to and approved by the railroad facility. If a jack and bore is required, the plan with casing, receiving, and launch pits with separation distances required should be provided to the Board.*
- This alternative provides benefit to this property and the others on Laura Lane.*
- We discussed the two alternatives with your Water Administrator and this is the preferred option.*

b. Fire Storage Tank and Pump –

- This proposal only benefits the Nationwide Auto lot, versus the previously approved alternative that provides global benefit.*
- The applicant's calculations describe a need for 150,000 gallons in fire storage, where a 25,000-gallon tank is proposed. To supplement flows, the applicant's correspondence suggests the water level in the tank would be maintained by fire house connection to existing hydrant near 20 Perrone Ave. The tank would be capable of providing 20-minutes of fire flow (based on applicant's calculations indicating 1250 GPM required) prior to needing supplement from the hydrant. Standards require 120-minutes (2-hours) fire flow for planning purposes.*
- The hydrant on Perrone Ave is greater than 400-ft away from the proposed location of the storage tank. The fire hose would need to cross Valley Avenue and Laura Lane and would cause traffic impedances during a fire emergency.*
- It appears access easements would be required for the fire storage tank and fire pump. Maintenance responsibilities would presumably need to be prescribed to the property owner, with frequent inspections (as determined necessary in consultation with the Building Department and ESO's). Redundant fire pump capabilities should be considered, and details of the proposed tank/pump and associated facilities and connections provided for further review.*
- The potential for cross-connection should be considered, especially if the tank will be filled by any means other than Village water supply.*
- The applicant should discuss the proposed cost of installing a 25,000-gallon fire storage tank and fire pump for you to consider the variance in financial hardship the applicant claims is the cause for not having the water main installed as approved previously.*
- After discussion with the applicant and consideration of the comments above, if the Planning Board chooses to further consider this alternative, we recommend you solicit feedback from your Building Inspector and fire emergency organizations on the configuration.*

Engineer Petroccione added that the Applicant previously agreed to extend the water main at the time of the approval, thinking it would cost somewhere between \$50,000 to \$75,000, which he was willing to do. The Applicant has been dealing with the railroad for about two years, he is now over \$300,000, which brought the Applicant to discuss with the Village of Woodbury Board of Trustees alternatives to installing a water main under the railroad. The Applicant then met with the Building Inspector who then advised the Applicant to go before the Planning Board.

Due to safety issues, Chairman Gerver noted that the Board would have to speak with the Fire Chief, they are not comfortable in proceeding until they hear from the ESO, there's a lot of missing information and issues the Applicant needs to address as well.

Traffic Consultant Grealy had a few questions about what would remain on the site, the number of students and staff, hours of operation, and traffic flow. He advised that the Applicant should hire a traffic consultant to document traffic movements at the intersection of Laura and Valley. He noted there are a lot of questions to be answered for instance on operations, the use of the rest of the property, the type of traffic it would generate, and so on. Once he receives the ESO's input, he can get a better understanding.

T. DeLuca expressed how there's a huge disconnect between the plans considering the building may have been built on land that was used for auto salvage. Attorney Myrow clarified saying there won't be any outside recreation, to his understanding all will take place within the building. Chairman Gerver added that the reason for the site plan is for the Board to carefully review the site and the use of what will be there, and as of now this information has not been submitted.

There were no more questions or comments from the Board or consultants.

Adjournment:

With no further business to discuss, a motion was offered by Chairman Gerver, seconded by T. DeLuca, to adjourn the meeting at 9:30 PM.

ADOPTED

AYES	5	Chairman Gerver, R. Cataggio, T. DeLuca, M. Pastel, E. Yan
NOES	0	

Claudia Valoy-Romanisin, Planning Board Secretary