



**TOWN OF BEEKMAN PLANNING BOARD  
Minutes of Thursday, August 15, 2024**

The Town of Beekman Planning Board met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, August 15, 2024 at 7:00 PM at the Beekman Town Hall.

The following members were present:

Chairman- John Frustace

Robert Lopane

Faye Garito

Peter Poltrack and Jayson Abbatantuono were absent.

Also present:

Town Engineer - Dan Koehler

Town Attorney – Craig Wallace

CAC Chair – Cliff Schwark

Recording Secretary- Aletha Bourke

J. Frustace - Noted the emergency exits  
Led the Pledge of Allegiance

**J. Frustace – Asks if board members had a chance to review meeting minutes for September 2022, March 2023 and June 2024 and asks for motion to approve.**

**R. Lopane – So moved. Seconded by F. Garito. All in favor. Motion carried.**

J. Frustace – Indicates there were staffing changes during Covid and minutes in print are still being caught up. Videos can be viewed. Info can also be FOILED.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

- 1. Pozzuto Lot Line – Lot Line Adjustment- Continuation**  
110 Frog Hollow Rd.  
Grid # 6757-00-445645 & 563722  
Zone R-45

J. Frustace – Asks Dan to speak to application.

D. Koehler – Email was sent to the board indicating that they are still in DEC review and have asked to be adjourned.

**R. Lopane – Motion to adjourn public hearing to September 19, 2024. Seconded by F. Garito. All in favor. Motion carried.**

- 2. Dutchess Contracting Corporation** – Subdivision/Site Plan/Special Use  
Bischoff Ln & Route 55  
Grid # 6759-00-494352 & 478317  
Zone TC

J. Frustace – Introduces project as subdivision proposed off Bischoff Ln and Route 55. Indicates this is a public hearing and architect will provide background. Reviews rules for public comment and adds DCWWA will also speak and hear questions.

**R. Lopane – Motion to open public hearing. Seconded by F. Garito. All in favor. Motion carried.**

D. Koehler – Notes for the record that the planning department provided positive confirmation of the mailing and public notice.

J. Frustace – Explains this is purely legal as property owners within a certain distance must be notified.

Brian Stokosa, Day Stokosa Engineering, Project Architect – Summary of process. Step 2 of very many. Not seeking approvals but public and various agency input on what problems may be and how to mitigate. Been working on the project for a number of years. It is in town center which has a master plan that speaks to a secondary road along Route 55 that serves some of the existing vacant properties. Project fits that concept, pushing buildings toward Route 55 and the proposed town road. (Points out on plans). Buildings are architectural style feature to break up the length of the building. (Architecturals displayed). Early stages, done preliminary drainage analysis, preliminary traffic study, and gotten feedback from county planning and DCWWA. Proposing two buildings, 48 units in total, parking in rear, sport court and recreation area features. Will be secondary road requiring left turn lane into site. Traffic study under DOT review. Will require road widening and will be drainage improvements along Route 55 corridor. Site will have to meet NYSDEC stormwater requirements. Cannot impact downstream neighbors. Understand issues with Dalton Farms has issues with capacity and will be working with DCWWA to do additional analysis for improvement. Original analysis spoke to 10,000/day commitment. Analysis likely outdated. Feasibility and soil testing done. Master plan identifies presentation of landscaping features and those concepts have been followed. Project not geared toward a specific demographic. (Elaborates on architectural features).

J. Frustace – Provides brief introduction of board members and opportunity for each to comment. States public hearing is now open.

Brian – Indicates responses will be made in writing to all public comments but due to submission deadlines, the package is not likely to be put together for the September meeting. Requests public hearing is deferred to October to respond to public comment.

Bill Crain, 254 Gardner Hollow – Applicant and architect have been very professional. Speaks to parks and wildlife and the meadow being destroyed by development. Comprehensive plan wants development but larger plan is to protect the environment. Would put it somewhere else.

Gloria Dineen, 39 VanScoy – Backyard faces 55 and can see lights and hear traffic. Moved to Beekman to get away from city living. Expressed concern with increased traffic, noise, crime, and additional students in area schools increasing taxes. Questions would like answered: Is the applicant installing street lights or lamp post and what kind? Is the town considering how it would curb the influx of student enrollment? Would the applicant consider renting only to adults 55 and older to prevent the overflow of students? How does the applicant plan to manage curfew, litter and noise after a certain hour? Is there going to be a tax abatement on this property that will ultimately affect everyone else in the community? Will the applicant be residing in or around the apartment complex? Does the applicant own other properties similar to this one and where? Is the

applicant open to decreasing the number of apartments or other options such as commercial or office space to create jobs?

Dan Hubecky, 23 Osborne Glen – Live very close to water treatment plant. Concerned with support of additional units. How do we know if wells can support additional expansion? How will waste from that complex be treated? Has anyone considered tapping the water system along Route 55 to support the units? Board needs to pay attention to what the county is proposing to do to expand the water system as existing source cannot be compromised.

Sue Christiansen, 8 Osborne Glen – Proposed subdivisions will have impacts on roads, schools, taxes, volunteer fire department, security, etc. Also wetlands and streams. Water and sewer already mentioned. Facility is old and we don't want to be hit with capital improvement for new system for subdivision. Will community lose country feel? What is the benefit to the community?

J. Frustace –Original proposal was close to 100 units and has been scaled down considerably. Property owners in zones following laws and regulations have rights as well. The planning board does not have authority to arbitrarily deny an application. Asks town counsel to clarify scope of Planning Board's authority for the public.

C. Wallace – Town code dictates what projects can come before a Planning Board and zoning designations. If a project fits within the zoning designation, it can proceed as of right. This is one of those projects. However, there are environmental considerations under SEQRA and this board will look at the environmental aspects of the project.

James Mahoney, 127 Roosevelt Dr. – Does not seem like smart development. Pump station is constantly spilling water. Not confident in DCWWA. Is there a study independent of DCWWA? Infrastructure does not seem to be there to support 48 condos.

Scott Pidgeon, 62 Sterling Dr. – Grew up in Beekman, left, came back. Like small town feel. Concerned with traffic. Feel cart was put before horse if just now reviewing environmental. Community deserves to see environmental impact studies that are likely outdated as environment has changed.

Jeryes Freih, 128 Indian Pass – Echo comments on smart development. Would like to see mixed use. Is entire parcel being developed or just a portion?

Wanda Newell, 22 Tibbett Way – Don't see how planning board can guarantee usage of overloaded water system will remain functional. Expresses further concerns with water supply and why applicant cannot create own water supply.

John Halpin, 3 Bush Creek Ln. – Smart building seems to be answering a problem. What is the problem? DCWWA will benefit from additional customer so they want them.

J. Frustace – DCWWA will address public. Adds Dalton Farm is only one of the users of that plant, there are plant updates in the works and would like DCWWA to address.

Harold Fetzer, 2496 Route 55 – Project is right next door. Not happy with project. Tore out survey markers during excavation as well as issues with runoff and drainage pipes. Driveway has been lost four times. What will happen with water runoff? How many 3-story buildings do we need in the town of Beekman.

Manny Bougades, 176 E. Meadow Brook, Mother at 2470 Route 55 – Owns multiple properties near site location. Confirms issues mentioned at last meeting carry over. Concerned with water coming out of holding pond and flooding. Did not receive certified letter for this meeting.

Linda Genovese, 34 Tibbett Way – Echoes concerns with water. Also concerned with sidewalks. Who will be responsible for cleaning, snow removal, etc.? If town, how will that affect taxes?

Mary O'Connell, 12 Mount Pleasant – Hearing a lot of natural and infrastructure impacts. Need more studies on these as well as tax impacts and results published for the community.

Gloria Hadley, 38 Thomas Rd – Agree with water concerns. Neighbor in townhouse recently spent thousands replacing sewage drainage due to inadequacy. Will DCWWA be doing anything to remedy that? Regarding Union Vale project, architecture looks similar. Will projects border both sides of town? Will they share utilities?

J. Frustace – Clarifies that project is not within Beekman jurisdiction.

D. Koehler – Clarifies project and any development is completely located within Union Vale planning board jurisdiction. Not aware of any correlation. Believe different owners. May have similar architecture. Architects tend to use similar design characteristics in the buildings they design.

Lori DeRosa, 161 Palmer Circle, 2643 Route 55(Business) – Mainly concerned with left turn into Bischoff and widening of roadway. Drainage is poor. Sometimes have to wait a week after a storm for landscaping. What is the jurisdiction to be notified of planning projects?

D. Koehler – Town code requires notification to property owners within 250 feet of subject property for subdivision. Site plan and special use permits are within 500 feet of subject property.

John Halpin – Although Union Vale project not within jurisdiction and authority, it is important and will have impact on the overall environmental and traffic studies if there are going to be that many more people residing in the surrounding areas. Will be part of the impact and should be included in future info.

Lori DeRosa – Reiterates traffic concerns using Barton Orchards as an example of lack of traffic control.

J. Frustace – Confirms public comment will stay open. Introduces DCWWA rep to address public.

Jonathan Churins, DCWWA Deputy Director – Other DCWWA engineers present who can also answer questions. Will provide background on DCWWA, speak to applicant's project and current status, and then speak to Dalton Farms water and sewer system and answer questions. DCWWA is a public benefit corporation created by the state at the request of the county, consisting of professionals who go into communities and acquire water and sewer systems that can be developer built, previously developed by municipalities typically needing significant upgrades. Small group of engineers, staff operators licensed to manage facilities and administrative staff. Water authority has 21 water systems and 9 sewer systems across the county of various sizes. Dalton system was 20 years old when it came to the water authority in 2004 and now 20 years later. Answering one question, there is debt that goes along with both the water and sewer system that's been levied on the customers' tax bill every year. Now nearing the end of the loan. Water authority does not advocate for or against the project but here to answer questions regarding needs for water and sewer. The applicant will provide an escrow account to allow for the evaluation of needs and whether it fits with existing systems. Escrow was set up in 2019 and in 2021 activities completed to evaluate capacity of water and sewer systems and has been determined over time up to a certain amount. Will continue to evaluate as project changes and work with applicant. Any evaluations of the water or sewer system will be developed in technical reports available through the authority. DCWWA is a public entity subject to FOIL. Both existing systems are 40+ years old and are reaching end of service life. Some components are maintained and replaceable, others requiring complete replacement. Water system in relatively good condition. Math on total amount of flow in theory leaves the developer with 10,000 gallons which could be gone if not locked in and another developer comes along. The developer needs to engage with the authority, go through evaluation process and series of memorandums of understanding and a decision made whether they can interconnect with water and sewer. Status of waste water treatment; facility is 40+ years old most components and at end of life. The Authority, separate from the applicant, is engaging with engineering firms to evaluate the facility and determine how to

best move forward with the system using fund balance that comes out of the budget of the system, seeking grants and loans and ultimately replace the facility. Possible timeline for replacement of waste water treatment plant of 3-5 years based on potential award of grants and loans. Water system currently has sufficient capacity for development. Applicant is projecting 9,900 gallons out of 10,000 gallon allotment. For an applicant to connect to Dalton Farms water and/or sewer means they would be responsible for all costs for distribution system and upgrades required for both systems. Those costs would not be borne by the Dalton Farms community. This includes improvements to systems and additional wells. Nice part for the community is bringing developments in adds to customer set and allows costs to be spread out.

J. Frustace – Indicates the public may approach the podium with any questions for the DCWWA representatives.

Harold Fetzer, 2496 Route 55 – Indicates sound system needs improvement. Asks for confirmation if 75 gallons per person per day is typical.

Jonathan – Cannot speak to that specifically but in experience, the average single-family detached home typically uses 165-250 gallons per day, usually on lower side unless watering large lawn. Apartment complex is more like 100 gallons per day. According to the math, 9,900 gallons per day divided by 48 units is about 206 gallons. Estimating they're using DEC standard or other conservative metric and actual flow is probably half of that.

Dan Hubecky, 23 Osborne Glen – Concerned with timing. How do you match this project with what you have to do with the utility plant. If executed, would there be pumping stations added now to support the construction because if not, it will affect our community initially until you have pumps in the plant.

Jonathan – First question on timing: There are two components. First, existing ageing out waste water treatment plant. Work needs to be done there, focused on the future, independent of the applicant's needs. Current water treatment plant and waste water treatment plant have the capacity for what the applicant is proposing. They run on separate paths. The second part regarding pump stations, whatever the development needs in terms of pump stations for water or sewer, that cost will be borne by the developer, the applicant. Evaluations and reports will be made available to the public. Confirm there is no water or sewer main on Route 55.

Gloria Hadley, 38 Thomas Rd. Dalton Farms – Water and sewer were free 22 years ago. Taxes assessed for 20 years. Will new construction and add-ons be perpetuated on taxes?

Jonathan – Developers, applications' cost are all theirs and will not be borne by the Dalton Farms community. The waste water treatment plant would be a complete replacement will be borne by the Dalton Farms community as it is your plant and it is necessary for it to be fully functional. DEC consent order requires action to make improvements. Based on the age, it's the best expenditure of dollars to replace the entire facility. Working on an evaluation to understand that and seek funding. Will return for progress reports.

J. Frustace – Asks for clarification on Dalton Farms community in terms of HOA versus plant users in absorbing cost of upgrades.

Jonathan – DCWWA works with legislature to define areas to proportion costs. May not be a user in a defined area. Not the same set of customers on the water and sewer side. DCWWA defines as Dalton Farms as a service area.

Bill Crain, 254 Gardner Hollow – Concluded waste water treatment plant has reached end of life. You're applying for grants. It's tentative. How do you provide solid reassurance that the grants will go through?

Jonathan – You wouldn't want to replace something before it's at the end of its life or before you have a scenario where you have the ability to access grants and loans. Explains it is similar to a lottery with a scoring

method, competing for funds, and in a good position. Provides additional information on potential grants and loans.

Jeryes Freih, 128 Indian Pass – If getting grants/loans, possibly consider upsizing whatever the service requirement engineered out for coming down Bischoff and providing stub out for future use of area coming through 55.

Jonathan – Don't have an answer tonight. Also welcome written comments.

James Mahoney, 127 Roosevelt Dr. – Don't paint such a great picture of the Dalton Farms water system. Holding tank on Roosevelt Dr. needs to be replaced. Does it make sense to plug in 48 units into infrastructure or common sense would dictate you would fix the infrastructure to accommodate this.

Jonathan – Waste water treatment plant separate from application. Sufficient capacity now. Collection system evaluations being done. Application being addressed here and improvements to waste water treatment plant will be in the future. Storage tank inspected annually. Applicant stands alone and will have to provide engineering report which will be evaluated and carried forward.

Maryann Russo, 56 Vanderberg Rd. - Ask if there are legislators or anyone else residents could write to encourage award of grants.

Jonathan – Letters from the community are always helpful.

Linda Genovese, 34 Tibbett Way – Aquifer inquiry. Are below ground water levels monitored? Water pressure very low. What can be done to improve?

Jonathan – Indicates 20 psi is the minimum and other issues that could contribute to low pressure. Records resident's info for follow up. Aquifer hard to evaluate. Hydrogeologist goes through evaluation using wells to determine. There are 5 wells with more than enough to meet community needs.

**F. Garito - Motion for 5 minute recess. Seconded by R. Lopane. All in favor. Motion carried.**

J. Frustace – Indicates public hearing will continue after recess.

**F. Garito – Motion to resume meeting. Seconded by R. Lopane. All in favor. Motion carried.**

J. Frustace – Asks engineer to go through list of questions to be addressed.

Brian – Majority is water and sewer. Analysis has to be done on our end. Two issues; ageing system and project tying into it. Can't impact the system and we're responsible for any improvements on our end to tie into that system. They are independent of each other and we have to fund analysis and review on our own as the applicant. Comments on location and density we have worked with the board and following town code concept. In beginning stages and gathering information. Would like to adjourn. Comments seem to align.

R. Lopane – Speaks to apartment shortage and need for apartments as well as sidewalk maintenance. Confirms environmental impact studies are recent.

D. Koehler – Particularly in town center, all the owners are required to maintain the sidewalks.

Brian – Taking into account future development of town center, working with DOT and Collier's engineering on traffic study for entrance and lane improvement.

R. Lopane – A lot of storm water questions and concerns. Looking for reassurance retention is being contained within project site.

Brian – Extensive NYS DEC process. Suspect drainage improvements along corridor to help downstream neighbors. Beginning states but will address and include in resubmission.

R. Lopane – As members of the community, board members had a lot of the same questions and will continue to hold the applicant and professionals accountable for minimizing impact. Application has been significantly reduced down.

J. Frustace – Indicates some residents were inquiring about light pollution.

Brian – Current code is full downcast lighting. You see a fixture and not a bulb. All lighting is pointed downward fully shielded from neighboring properties. Analysis is done as part of the plan set that is on file detailing each individual light pole. Fixtures, height, and develop schematics that show intensities. Will be lit to minimum standard. Streetscape lighting will be downcast.

J. Frustace – Appreciate as many ballard lights as possible. Also concerns about litter. Will there be outdoor garbage receptacles and coverings match architecture of the building in appropriate areas?

Brian – Confirms there will be trash receptacles. Project will be owned by a development agency so a set of restrictions will be put in place for maintenance and landscaping and can be enforceable by violation.

J. Frustace – Will recreation area be open to Beekman residents or exclusive to tenants?

Brian – Intent is to be specific to the development.

J. Frustace – Have any tax abatements been negotiated?

Brian – No

J. Frustace – Will the complex be landlord occupied or near the development?

Brian – Step 2 of 10 but they will be rental apartments. The owner currently is a local business owner and lives in the town.

J. Frustace – Can impact to schools be addressed?

Brian – Will provide documentation specific to projections for schools in Arlington and what is predicted.

R. Lopane – Suggests considering, especially for storm water pond area, some type of meadow mix that has pollinator species in it as a way of mitigating the loss of pollinators on the site.

Brian – Will incorporate if in line with DEC.

D. Koehler – With next submittal, provide updated environmental assessment form and supporting studies. Understanding is school enrollment has been declining.

**F. Garito – Motion to adjourn to October 17, 2024. Seconded by R. Lopane. All in favor. Motion carried.**

**3. Town Center Grove – Site Plan/Special Use**  
Town Center Blvd.  
Grid # 6759-00-500438  
Zone TC

Brian Stokosa, Day Stokosa Engineering – Representing project on western side of Town Center Blvd. Proposing a single, 4-unit apartment building, 2-bedroom apartments. Permitted in Town Center zoning, supported by individual well and septic on site. Originally was a two lot subdivision with two units. Has been revised to one building with four units. Following Town Center concept pushing building forward with small parking lot in the back. Access to a standard commercial entrance. Sidewalks along Town Center Blvd. connected to the newly developed site to the north. Landscaping throughout. Under an acre of disturbance for storm water regulations. Preliminary soil testing done with board of health to ensure septic system works on site. Septic shown in the back. Intent to keep site vegetated and save trees with limited disturbance. Displays architectural drawings. Hoping board is comfortable moving to public hearing for input.

D. Koehler – Plan has been refined with more detail. Suggests it would be appropriate to move forward.

**R. Lopane – Motion to open public hearing. Seconded by F. Garito. All in favor. Motion carried.**

D. Koehler – Indicates for the record that the public hearing notification was noticed and published as required.

Gloria Hadley, 38 Thomas Rd. – Approximate rents?

Gina Ragusa, 23 Fairhaven Ct. – Location clarification. Is project already approved? Will public be notified of next hearing? Area being closed off with too many apartments. Don't think anybody realized this was coming. Same builderr?

R. Lopane – Not approved. This is the hearing. This is your opportunity to speak unless it is adjourned because the board needs more information.

J. Frustace – The radius for notices is 250ft. Also on town website and Poughkeepsie Journal. Can also comment in writing to Planning Secretary

D. Koehler – Different owner, same engineer. Indicates no reason to keep public hearing open and confirms applicant has worked well to address comments to satisfaction to date.

**R. Lopane – Motion to close public hearing. Seconded by F. Garito. All in favor. Motion carried.**

D. Koehler – Will need to work on determination for environmental. Can provide responses to EAF Parts 2 and 3 for the board's consideration at the next meeting. Confirms SEQR determination has not been made.

**DISCUSSION**

**1. Pellegrino Lot Line – Lot Line Adjustment**  
9 Cottage Rd.  
Grid # 6659-00-948078 & 934054  
Zone R-45

Lesley Pellegrino, Applicant – Looking to move lot line. Bought vacant adjacent lot but not financially viable. Looking to secure portion of it and sell the rest. Understand procedurally considered a subdivision. Recently renewed board of health approval for surveyor to include but do not intend to do any building. Thought it would be more simple.

D. Koehler – In general, particularly when you're taking land away from the vacant lot, we want to see how it can be physically and feasibly developed so we're not creating a lot that won't be able to be developed in the



future. There are a number of rules and regulations which are outlined in the letter. The board will need to evaluate the merit of taking away land from the vacant parcel. They need to make sure a driveway can safely get in there without too many disturbances. Appreciate the approved septic location and would ask for a copy of that documentation.

Lesley – Asks if the bare minimum is everything in the letter.

D. Koehler – Confirms yes. The code requirements are used as a checklist. There is a process in which waivers can be requested.

Lesley – Familiar with section. Unsure of level of disturbance.

D. Koehler – That is part of showing feasibility of it. Need to show existing and proposed contours and we can determine limits of disturbance and if meeting code requirements. Can meet to go over.

Lesley – Asks about concluding SEQRA review per letter.

D. Koehler – Simple lot line realignments are within Part 16 of Environmental Conservation Law dictating that it can be a Type 2 action in accordance with SEQRA.

R. Lopane – It's in your interest when you sell this lot, that there's no issues with potential buyers. You can create an undevelopable lot by shifting a lot line. We are trying to prevent that.

Lesley – Seems like quite an undertaking just to put on market. Confirms the board can conclude SEQRA review.

**F. Garito – Motion to deem Type 2 action in accordance with SEQRA. Seconded by R. Lopane. All in favor. Motion carried.**

**2. Green Hill Farm Holdings – Subdivision**  
Hynes Rd. & Beach Rd.  
Grid # 6759-00-912540  
Zone R-45

Ernie Martin, Project Engineer – Parcel located on Beekman Rd. and Hynes Rd. Applicant's intent to do a seven (7) lot subdivision. There's a main house and a house close to the road. The intention of the application is that the main house would be on a larger parcel and the house in front on its own separate lot as well as five additional new lots. Zone is R-45. All parcels exceed that. Soil testing has been done. All were good but Lot 2 had heavier clay type. That lot had been subdivided and merged back in the past. No issue with comments. One item calls for delineation and location of wetlands. There are federal wetlands primarily follows drainage ditch and runs southerly. Would still have room to make improvements with 100ft wetland buffer. Would ask board to waive delineation and location of wetland. Subdivision would be served by either wells that are there or new wells on each lot.

J. Frustace – Why would you want the board to waive delineation of wetlands? Asks for CAC to weigh in.

Ernie – Where it's located, it just follows the drainage ditch and nothing is proposed.

Cliff – Haven't looked at this in detail.

R. Lopane – The maps are only a general indication and would not be an accurate representation. Those maps are used as a red flag indicator that there are likely wetlands as well as other things. Not accurate enough for the board to make an assessment on whether the project will have an impact to wetlands and has to be signed off. Don't see the justification for this application. F. Garito and J. Frustace concur.

D. Koehler – Indicates there was also a waiver request on tree location. Board should weigh in.

Ernie – Suggests locating outside of grove and determine disturbance.

R. Lopane – Asks what percentage of the site has trees.

Board members locate and discuss areas of trees on drawings.

Cliff – Indicates the applicant should comply with the actions requested in the letter.

R. Lopane – Board will reserve judgement for further development of the plans. Are there steep slopes?

D. Koehler – They are responsible for showing any steep slopes over 15% under §130-12. If so, must go into §155-53 steep slopes ordinance. Wetlands, water bodies, and water courses §155-52 was mentioned as well because of the streams and wetland showing on NRI map. There are DEC wetlands to the west and south. They are increasing regulation that is already more stringent.

**3. Cemco Development Group – Lot 2 & 3 Boyd Re-Subdivision**  
Pleasant Ridge Rd.  
Grid # 6859-00-434759  
Zone R-135

J. Frustace – Reads aloud resolution written by town counsel authorizing retainage of consultant for wetland delineation. (Enclosed)

D. Koehler – Indicates multiple proposals were obtained and the applicant chose Cornerstone.

Board members review consultant proposal and discuss details.

Cliff – What is the expert expected to find? A lot of money is being spent. Don't understand what the consultant could come back with other than there is no wetland which there clearly is.

R. Lopane – There have been disputes as to the delineation and faith was lost in the information. Consultant is independent. Applicant funds through escrow.

D. Koehler – It is a lengthy process under the code and the onus is on the applicant to provide the board with information to make a decision on whether the action is acceptable. The consultant will verify the flags and delineation and advise the board of how they meet the standards. Reiterates the onus is on the applicant.

J. Frustace – Suggests specific concerns can be addressed with consultant.

D. Koehler – Reviews permitting process for wetlands and public hearings running concurrently due to shot clock, option to waive and how work will be paid to consultant.

R. Lopane – Don't want to take rights away from the owner, but they should not be talking to the delineator. Inquires if engineer or code enforcement officer can be present.

D. Koehler – Yes. Owner has also offered planning board members, not necessarily when the consultant is there.

J. Frustace – Clarifies there should be no interference between the applicant and consultant. Can notify board members.

D. Koehler – Ask for date and time and send out notification. No more than three members at a time. Consultant works for the planning board.

**R. Lopane – Motion to adopt resolution as read. Seconded by F. Garito. All in favor. Motion carried.**

**EXTENSION**

- 1. Grape Hollow East Subdivision-** Subdivision  
233 Grape Hollow Rd.  
Grid # 6756-00-731467  
Zone R-135

D. Koehler – Prepared a draft resolution for the board’s consideration. The applicant submitted a package with some activity but would like to see more urgency. Working to put together storm water practices for each lot. Don’t need DEP permit unless disturbance is more than two acres, still MS4. Looking at comprehensive package next week.

**F. Garito – Motion to grant extension of conditional subdivision plat approval to November 11, 2024. Seconded by R. Lopane. All in favor. Motion carried.**

**PRE-APPLICATION**

- 1. Plum Court Lot 9 – Lot Line Revision**  
Filed Map 8002B  
Zone PH

Adam Wekstein, Engineer, Victor Martinez, Surveyor, Labella Assoc. – Summarizes purpose of the application is to correct a historical surveying problem relating to the properties being surveyed incorrectly. Mostly worked out with owner. Propose realignment to Lot 9 (illustrates on drawing). Provides description of utility easement also on property due to surveying error.

Board members discuss location of easement and houses on drawings

Adam – Looking to take the two strips and joining them into the other lot. Basically redrawing lines in the field and making it legal. Looking for input and direction to apply for preliminary and makes mention of waivers.

J. Frustace – First step is to get the application in to counsel and the engineer can review and advise accordingly.

C. Wallace – Indicates the applicant should be able to proceed with most of the waivers.

R. Lopane – Would have no issue with waivers as there is no disturbance.

D. Koehler – Suggests indicating the reason why it is Type 2 in the cover letter as justification, and not submitting an EAF.

**F. Garito – Motion to adjourn meeting. Seconded by J. Frustace. All in favor. Motion carried.**

Meeting adjourned 10:34pm.

Respectfully submitted.  
Aletha Bourke