The August 20 Planning Board Meeting was held REMOTELY BY ZOOM and BROADCAST LIVE ON FACEBOOK in accordance with Executive order 202.1

Call to order:

- Chairperson Douglas called to order the Planning Board Regular Meeting at 7:02 p.m. on August 20, 2020, broadcast via Zoom Meeting on Facebook Live for the South Blooming Grove Village Hall located at 811 State Route 208, within the Village of South Blooming Grove, and having a mailing address of Monroe, New York. Chairperson Douglas opened the Board Meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll call:
 - o Chairperson Douglas conducted a roll call. The following persons were present
 - o Manny Aleixo Member
 - o John Giovagnoli Member
 - o Eric Vogelsberg Member
 - o Michelle Rivera Member
 - o Raleem Brodhead Moses Alternate Member
 - o Daniel Kraushaar, Esq. Special Counsel
 - o Michael Weeks Village Engineer
 - o Bonnie Franson Village Planner

Correspondence:

- o Revised Site Plan for 14 Dallas Drive received on July 20, 2020
- o Technical review comments received July 31, 2020, from Engineer Mike Weeks of McGoey, Hauser and Edsall for 14 Dallas Drive
- o Technical review comments received August 3, 2020, from Planner Bonnie Franson of Nelson Pope and Vorhees for 14 Dallas Drive
- Correspondence from the Department of Transportation for Stonegate Drive application received via email on August 10, 2020
- o Technical review comments from Maser Consulting for Stonegate Drive application received via email on August 10, 2020

Business

14 Dallas Drive

- o Chairperson Douglas opened the floor to discussion about the 14 Dallas Drive application.
- o Mike Weeks reviewed his technical comments for July 31, 2020. Cited multiple discrepancies between the site plan and the provided architecturals including building footprint.
- O Bonnie Franson reviewed her comments. Mentioned that the application is originally from May 2019. Concurred with the comments from Mike Weeks regarding the inconsistencies with the site plan and the architecturals. Site plan states building is 2500 square feet and the architecturals
- Application is deemed incomplete without consistent plans.
- Ms. Franson reviewed possible considerations for the driveway to not be in the center of the property. Since there is not a proposed garage, parking in front of the home does not match the neighborhood.

1

- o Is there a proposed basement? Mr. Petroccione answered there would be no basement on the plans.
- o Mr. Petroccione explained there was miscommunication about the building footprint and that information will be updated and corrected.
- o Building height and parking area requests will be updated and addressed as per recommended by the Planning Board.
- o Mr. Vogelsberg asked if there have been any additional technical comments responses since the July submission. There have been no technical comment responses since the July submission.
- o Dan Kraushaar, Esq. asked if an EAF was required. The action is Type II and an EAF is not required.
- o Signature block needs to be added to the site plan.
- Map note describing the temporary material stockpile to be added to the site plan and mention to be removed prior to the issuance of CO.
- Discussion ensued regarding the setbacks and the determination by the building inspector from May 2, 2019 meeting. To be researched.
- o Member Vogelsberg asked the applicant to answer technical comments in writing to the Planning Board for the next meeting.
- o Discussion ensued about storm water mitigation. Mike Weeks offered this project does not fall under this requirement since the parcel is .30 of an acre.
- o Member Rivera asked about construction vehicles being parked on Dallas Drive.
- The applicant will include on the plans details regarding construction vehicles and include requirement for two individuals to direct traffic during hours when school buses would be running.
- Member Giovagnoli asked about the proposed staircase although the plan does not include a second floor. Mr. Petroccione offered the site plan will be remove the stairs and replace with pulldown stairs for access to the crawl space.
- o Member Vogelsberg requested that the applicant to add to site plan that crawl space is uninhabitable space; the applicant agreed to the request.
- Member Giovagnoli asked about actual building height; the applicant advised the total height from ground to top of building is 25 feet.
- Chairperson Douglas recommended that the applicant provide a new submission with responses to the comments made at this meeting and addressing all setback requirements.

Stonegate Drive

- Phil Greely of Maser Consulting reviewed a letter dated May 29, 2020 from the Department of Transportation discussing the traffic intersection at the Stonegate Drive LLC project.
- Comments were reviewed about trip generation being satisfactory, site distance clearing is required to improve visibility. The applicant would agree to a contribution to the development of a traffic light at the Mountain Road intersection.
- Under current policy of an intersection with no traffic light, the DOT prefers no turn lane on Stonegate drive.
- o The DOT further recommends the addition of a left turn lane on Route 208 into Stonegate Drive.

2

- o Mr. Greely offered that the applicant would like to request a donation from the village to widen the road.
- o Member Vogelsberg asked for verification of who is the owner of the property that would be needed to widen the road.
- o Mr. Greely explained there would be significant work needed including a retaining wall, a drainage swale and utility easement considerations. The east side of Route 208 is private property and there is no way to widen the road on the eastern portion of 208. The applicant is looking to make improvement to the west side of Route 208. The land needed is
- o Member Giovagnoli asked who is expected to pay for such roadway improvements.
- Mr. Greely offered the cost of the project is over \$500,000 and asked if the municipality would consider looking into widening the road due to the fact that future projects will incur increase traffic flow along route 208.
- o Mr. Greely explained that the need is similar to that of the light needed at Mountain Road.
- o Mr. Vogelsberg expressed that the situations are not of the same scale.
- o Mr. Greely offered that the applicant would prepare the plans and contribute to the traffic signal project at Mountain Road.
- o The applicant is asking for a five-foot dedication by the village to the State of New York to widen the road.
- Dan Kraushaar, Esq. asked Mr. Greely if the village would have to give its property to the applicant. Mr. Greely explained the DOT recommends these improvements in order to handle future traffic.
- o Mr. Kraushaar asked why this pertains to the left-hand turn, Mr. Greely explained that the road needs to be widened and cannot be done on the eastern side of the road.
- The applicant asks
- o Member Aleixo explained the land has an extensive drop off and will require a large retaining wall. Mr. Greely further described where the applicant proposes a retaining wall.
- o Mr. Vogelsberg asked if any tree line would be removed, Mr. Greely offered it would be a 12 by 200 feet swath of land.
- o Mr. Greely explained the DOT is requiring by current standards that the village would have to widen the road and the cost would be incurred by the village.
- o Mr. Kraushaar explained that the Planning Board cannot decide on the dedication of land and that this is a village board matter. Additionally, Mr. Kraushaar offered that if the village were to fund a private developer's project it would be in violation of the New York State constitution.
- o Mr. Greely explained that the applicant is looking to enter an agreement with the village and all applicants that are building along the Route 208 corridor.
- o Mr. Vogelsberg asked how the applicant will reimburse the village for such a development. Mr. Greely explained that this is a recommendation of the DOT and not the request of the applicant.
- o Mike Weeks asked if a developer's agreement would be drafted for this project, Mr. Greely explained that this would be something that would be considered.
- o Member Vogelsberg asked about the analysis for left turns into Stonegate Drive. Mr. Greely said all the data is included in current traffic reports that have been submitted to the board.
- o Planner Bonnie Franson asked about the other proposed drawing. Mr. Greely reviewed the drawing but explained it would not help traffic in the area. This alternate view offered an exit

3

that would access Stonegate Drive from Sgt. Matt Kelly Way. After researching the area, DOT preferred the proposal to widen Route 208.

- o Member Vogelsberg again expressed concern about losing village property. Mr. Kraushaar again recommended this a Village Board issue. The land would have to be declared surplus, it would have to be appraised and sold. Mr. Kraushaar explained this would have to be proven to benefit the public as a whole and not the applicant singularly.
- o Mr. Greely asked if the DOT does not require the land to be taken, but if the village could grant an easement.
- o Member Broadhead Moses expressed her disapproval of this propose from the DOT. Explained that condominiums have been there for year and this would be for a provide applicant.
- o Mr. Greely explained the DOT would want this type of improvement regardless of the new project. Discussion ensued further about the project.
- o Mr. Kraushaar again said this is a Village Board matter.
- Mike Weeks expressed concern over setting precedence for other projects that come before the village.
- Village Board to be made of aware of what the DOT is making the applicant and the village be held accountable for and what would be required by the applicant and the village.
- o Applicant will reach out to the Village Board.
- o Member Aleixo recommended the referral to the Village Board. Further discussion would take place when Mike Morgante of Arden Consultants is in attendance.

Public Comments

- Comments were read from Facebook.
- o Dawn Salka expressed concerns about costs to the village.
- o John Salka expressed concerns about costs and private property.

> Adjournment:

- o Next meeting scheduled, work session, September 3, 2020.
- o Motion to adjourn the public hearing by Chairperson Douglas at 9:04 p.m., seconded by Member Aleixo. 4 *Ayes*, 0 *Nays*, 1 *Absent*.

Minutes respectfully submitted by: Christine Bodeker – Deputy Clerk

4