



TOWN OF  
**BEEKMAN**  
New York

4 Main Street  
Poughquag, NY 12570  
[www.townofbeekman.com](http://www.townofbeekman.com)  
(845) 724-5300

## **TOWN OF BEEKMAN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of Thursday, December 19, 2024**

The Town of Beekman Planning Board met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, December 19, 2024 at 7:00 PM at the Beekman Town Hall.

The following members were present:

Chairman- John Frustace

Robert Lopane

Faye Garito

Peter Poltrack

Jayson Abbatantuono was absent.

Also present:

Town Engineer - Dan Koehler

Town Attorney – Craig Wallace

Recording Secretary- Aletha Bourke

J. Frustace - Noted the emergency exits

Led the Pledge of Allegiance

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

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

Brian Watts, Day Stokosa Engineering – Subject parcel has long history with various iterations and revisions.

C. Wallace – Asks for summary for the record of public hearing being re-advertised.

Brian – Started public hearing in August. Motion was made to adjourn to the October meeting. Timely request for adjournment was not submitted and no one was present in October to represent the project so there was a break in continuance. Notice was recirculated for this meeting.

C. Wallace – Motion was made at the last meeting to instruct the applicant to re-advertise so everyone had the opportunity to comment.

J. Frustace – Asks what is the distance for notification for this application and explains there is a certain radius depending on whether the application is for subdivision, site plan or special use permit.

C. Wallace – 500ft. Asks secretary if mailing was verified.

Secretary – Affirmative

Brian – Project has had some improvements per previous agendas and project approvals related mostly to earthworks, grading, clearing and allowed to go back to field meadow a little. Lower portion by Route 55 mostly clear. Bischoff Ln. is existing and cuts through the lower portion of the property serving residential houses in the rear. Pond in the front is man-made as part of previous works. There's a ditch that collects all runoff, discharges to a culvert under to a pond and then an outlet from the pond that discharges towards the neighbor's property. Most of the water comes in and goes right back out. Moves from podium to projector as suggested by Chairman to point out details for public.

J. Frustace – Asks for explanation of how treatment of water flowing down towards Stop and Shop on the property will work.

Brian – Currently everything going to pond which was put in some time ago. Points out path of water flow on projector. There's going to be 2 lots with a right of way. This will extend all the way to the property line for any future expansion. Nothing is proposed at this time. However, as part of the zoning goals, it will be one lot split in half by the road. Will provide easement so existing driveway is still accessible by the homeowner. Has gone through a couple of iterations but basically each lot is proposed to have its own multi-family unit. Parking in the rear behind each building. Providing play courts and amenities, storm water fire retention area which will allow some of the water to absorb as best we can. High water table area so we can't do a lot of deep infiltration, just have to control the flow as much as possible. Gone through some traffic studies, hired some consultants and they've stated after analysis that it's not intended to have any impact or meet any thresholds for improvements to Route 55 but proposing left turn lane. Any future development of changes may bring it over the threshold. Because we're already going to be doing work in the area, contractors agree that we'll just put in left turn lane. DOT agrees and are happy. Points out crosswalks and pump station. Big concerns of water. All the water will flow down and catch into some catch basins and swales diverting everything to that bioretention area. What can't be mitigated through this will go through a hydrodynamic separator to further treat before discharging to this pond. We are enlarging the pond boundaries, increasing the overall height so there's a spot for the water to build up and have control of discharge and relocate that discharge, directing it towards that paved flow. Mitigating it so there's less discharge and it's higher quality water. Need sewer and water on site. Dalton Farms up in the hill will bring down and around to the end in case there is ever a need for expansion. Sanitary sewer and pump station shown on projector. Improvements farther on 55 or the corridor could potentially tie into. DCWWA will be involved. They've stated there is capacity but the age of the system requires improvements. Been allocating 10,000 gallons that they have the capacity to handle. We're proposing just under 9,000 gallons per day hydraulic floating so we are under the threshold and working with them to make needed improvements. It's understood due to age of the system, they will be making improvements regardless so with this included in the district, some of that cost could be spread around. Proposing street lighting. Light is isolated to areas and no light spillage. Some building mounted lighting where required. Will cut off go compliant dark background lighting. All 15ft tall poles that will match. In conjunction with the Planning Board's request for full landscaping plan, had landscape architect go through and improve landscaping in areas. Plants are all viable to soil types. Project currently with regulatory authorities. Waiting for feedback from DOT on specifics for the entrance. Modifications had been requested to the traffic analysis, not anticipated to change the conclusion but just for housekeeping measures. DCWWA is waiting for a report on specific usage needed. Finalizing SWPPP details.

**J. Frustace – Asks for motion to open public hearing. So moved by R. Lopane. Seconded by P. Poltrack. All in favor. Motion carried.**

J. Frustace – Reviews public hearing rules of conduct.

Bill Crain, 254 Gardner Hollow – In speaking with a lot of people, the opinion is that they like the idea of affordable housing which this would provide. You can also preserve the natural environment at the same time. Distributes photos to board members and indicates where the applicant sees clear land with a few shrubs, I see a beautiful meadow that is rich in flowers and wildlife and a natural sponge for water that takes in a lot of carbon absorbed by plants. Would eliminate pickle ball courts and preserve meadow. If required to have recreation, put trails or gardening raised pits. Have a road going to Stop and Shop for the elderly or

handicapped can avoid busy Route 55. Would keep all permeable surfaces and preserve the trees. Would redesign to protect natural environment and views as much as possible.

David Garlan, 62 Sterling Dr. – Both the federal government and NY state will give money to do exactly what Mr. Crain has suggested to increase permeable areas and manage wetlands. Where is environmental impact study? Not clear why there was a gap in the public hearing.

Nick Sowul, 29 VanScoy – Agree with wildlife assessment by Mr. Crain and would be a shame to destroy. Concerned with visuals and drainage. Would like to know what the buffer is going to be between the parking lot and VanScoy in terms of distance and type?

Brian – Don't have that distance. Everything on the hill we are proposing to maintain as-is condition with exception of path to cover utilities. Tried to lessen the cut that back building has been raised up over the various iterations.

Nick – Vaguely understand.

J. Frustace – Asks where the existing cut is right now that cuts down off of the edge of the vegetation.

Brian – Points out retaining wall on drawing where it meets grade, and peak elevation.

R. Lopane – Asks if representative will be available after the meeting to answer questions as there are other items on the agenda and this is the kind of thing you want to sit down with the engineer with the map.

J. Frustace – Indicates he will leave his copy of the drawing in the back for public viewing.

Nick – Understand comprehensive plan developed 15-20 years ago and up to 100 apartments were initially proposed and that would've fit within the town master plan. If the original plan was to put 100 apartments on that tiny property, there may be a problem with the town master plan. Not the board to address but there should be a considerable amount of study before project moves forward.

Andrei Szeghy, 170 Roosevelt Dr. – Talking to neighbors in Dalton Farm and all seem to be upset about this. Seems when you get to this point, there's this massive machine moving ahead that people are throwing money at and it's inevitable. Is this a done thing and we're just here to hear what's happening?

J. Frustace – No. The applicant has quite a bit to do before he breaks ground but he owns the property, this is Town Center, it is addressed in the comprehensive plan that the area is meant to be developed under certain conditions and the public is here to express concerns that can be worked in to the project. The idea of suggesting that this can't happen is like saying you can't build a shed on your property if it's zoned for that purpose. Density of 100 apartments was found to be too much. The applicant came back with a proposal more in line and reasonable for the density of that acreage and space. Many applications come before the board and a small percentage of them actually end up breaking ground and coming into fruition. Project is at a point after extensive analysis over three years where the board feels comfortable presenting it to the public for feedback.

F. Garito – Indicates when Dalton Farms was proposed, the objection was unbelievable. You couldn't stand in the room and there had to be police escorts, yet it's an asset to the community. There is a need for apartments and affordable housing.

Harold Fetzer, 2496 Route 55 – What parts of Route 55 will be expanded for the turn lane? Why 500ft radius for notification? A lot of Dalton residents attended last public hearing and not this one.

R. Lopane – It's the law. Only compelled to notify within 500ft.

P. Poltrack – Asks the resident if he has had water and runoff problems on his property.

Harold – Lost driveway four times. A lot in the back coming down the hill and the field between property and pharmacy plaza. Also supposed to provide environmental impact study from last meeting.

J. Frustace – He is proposing storm water management just on his property. He can't do everything that's around his property and beyond.

Bougades, 2470 Route 55 – House on the other side of the pond. If the project gets done, they're addressing the pond and redirecting the water down. If this doesn't get done, are they still going to fix that pond because it has been destroying 2470 Route 55. It's destroying the septic system. When it's really flowing, it also goes in the front of the house and comes across the front lawn washing out the driveway. Never in the gulley. How will the pond be addressed?

R. Lopane – We are here to hear the subdivision. If the subdivision fails, you have an issue with your neighbor to work out.

P. Poltrack – Disagree. The state says you need a turn lane so there's going to be a modification in the area of Bischoff Ln. They are going to have to address the water problem and drainage in that area. The state should be made aware of and address the drainage for what comes down from the plaza towards Cumberland Farms as well as address the water flow in front of Bougades, which would affect the water flow at Stop and Shop.

Bougades – That property was all level. When they built the holding pond they lifted it up like 5ft so now it just comes down and floods the property. Shouldn't have been done to begin with but if the project isn't going to be done, something still has to be done with the pond.

R. Lopane – Appreciate your issue and trying to address with this project. This project is a submittal of an application to the town for a subdivision. If it doesn't come to fruition, we only have authority over decisions we make with this subdivision. It would remain an undeveloped property and just one of your neighbors. We don't have authority to request undeveloped parcels to conduct improvements.

Tom Shost, 2473 Route 55 – Live across the street. Water is the issue on both sides. Just want the water to flow the right way. Been getting flooded out for years.

J. Frustace – We're having a couple of hundred year storms a year. In addition, there's wetlands behind Dollar General and some of these things are just going to continue to be a problem, especially as the environment continues to change. Suggests representative address some of the public comments/questions.

J. Frustace – Asks representative to discuss the items Mr. Crain commented on regarding eliminating the meadow and wetland areas that are pre-existing as well as permeable surfaces.

Brian – Some on-site soil testing done over the various iterations. In reference to the current topography, once you start going uphill, you don't run into any water, but the very tight soils don't allow much infiltration into the soil so you're going to get a lot of runoff at the bottom. Raising up some of the site to mitigate slope and create distance between groundwater and final surface. Added bioretention. Added storm water planters.

R. Lopane – Clarifies Mr. Crain was inquiring about how to redesign to protect wildlife areas.

J. Frustace – Asks representative to detail what bioretention means and what it will look like.

Brian – Minimized the cut in the back to preserve the land. That's really the only spot we can maintain what's there. Everything else will have to be removed during construction. Finished phase will be green but during construction, it's going to have to be disturbed. As much landscaping as we can but beyond that, there's not a lot you can help if you're going to try to develop this property.

J. Frustace – What will the pond look like?

Brian – At the end you should see a berm with vegetation all around. There will be a fence, probably chain link, behind the vegetation.

J. Frustace – Not sure if code allows chain link. Recall it is not preferred.

Brian – Can use a different style of fencing. Purpose is for safety.

J. Frustace – Asks for density and variety of plantings.

Brian – Defers to landscape architect. Understands large variety and density.

P. Poltrack – Water flow will be directed so that it does not affect Bischoff Ln?

Brian – The upper parking lots are all curved with catch basins so any impervious surface is going to be surrounded by at least a 6 inch curb that will capture the water with gradual slopes and be directed back around towards the proposed driveway on the other side before it crosses bioretention area in the center of the site.

J. Frustace – Many residents are concerned with what is being done to mitigate viewshed.

Brian – Landscape plan shows trees added along border of disturbance.

J. Frustace – Suggests sharing landscape plan with those affected and toward the back of the property, the trees that are being planted to mitigate that view. Suggests public view plans to see what is actually happening. Asks Dan to speak to EAF.

D. Koehler – Full Environmental Assessment Form has been prepared. We had comments. Waste water authority had comments. That's the tool the planning board uses in order to make a determination of environmental impact based on State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). That is a living document that changes as the plan changes so an updated EAF has been requested with the next submittal. Always available to the public by submitting FOIL request.

J. Frustace – Asks representative to explain the gap in public hearing.

Brian – At the August meeting, the public hearing was adjourned to October and there was no representation at that October meeting. There was no letter to the board requesting adjournment to November. The submission was a couple of days late for the October deadline and we missed the adjournment requirement. Due to the break in continuity, adjournment was requested in November, and it was required that we recirculate the public notices for December.

J. Frustace – Asks representative to explain current and proposed use of property.

Brian – Currently vacant. No other development besides the existing driveway from a previous approval. Now proposed to have just two multi-family structures with landscaping and amenities.

J. Frustace – Clarifies zoning for legal use. What is permitted within that area.

Brian – Not prepared to answer.

D. Koehler – The use being proposed is specially permitted by code meaning there are additional requirements that the planning board looks at during the review process. They are below the maximum for impervious surfaces and building coverage. It is zoning compliant.

R. Lopane – Comprehensive plan did not allow this many units but was a predecessor to the zoning changes. Original proposal of almost 100 units was not consistent with comprehensive plan or zoning ordinance but now more in compliance.

Brian – Actually allowed more units than showing but it doesn't work for parking or coverage.

J. Frustace – Asks Rob if he feels comfortable addressing landscape work and mitigation.

C. Wallace – Indicates that should be done by the applicant.

R. Lopane – Not here to defend application but the board requested a robust landscape plan and they followed up with a more intensive robust landscape plan. Needs to be explained in the EAF how you're mitigating for the loss of open space.

J. Frustace – Explains that it is a balancing act to satisfy laws and regulations as well as the board, the public and the applicant.

F. Garito – Adds that there have been tremendous mitigation efforts as a result of public comment

D. Koehler – In 2018 it was 90 units proposed. Code allows 12 units per acre in town center which would allow this property to have 64 units and they are proposing 48 so they're below the maximum allowed.

Bill Margiotta, 6 Mt. Pleasant Dr. – Asks about development tapping into Dalton water and sewer and if the plan to replace the aged system prior to tapping in.

J. Frustace – Explains that although it is called Dalton Farms water and septic plant, it is unrelated and they take care of not only Dalton but other developments who all pay toward servicing of the plant. Suggests resident review video from the August public hearing for additional information from DCWWA who was present to answer questions. Cannot currently answer questions regarding timing of replacement as there are many moving parts and application is still in progress.

Bill Crain, 254 Gardner Hollow – Questions permeable surfaces and pavement being added.

D. Koehler – Code calls for maximum of 50% and they are at 43%. There's discussion about permeable paving but needs to be incorporated into storm water plan to see if viable.

Bill – It was asked meetings ago if trees on top of hill could be preserved and the answer was no. Still don't know how many trees are coming down. Trees provide benefits. Code is catching up in this area and should be revised to be more in line with the comprehensive plan.

J. Frustace – Don't recall discussing that on this application. Would like to see tree plan for the back area to address the concern.

J. Frustace – Question was asked by a member of the public which part of Route 55 is going to be expanded.

Brian – Doesn't have to change in terms of right of way. Where the stripe islands are the pavement will be expanded slightly to make room. The increase in the width of the road has been minimized but need to double check the details as the traffic is working directly with DOT. DOT has required SWPPP and drainage plans to review as well.

J. Frustace – Asks representative to address the concerns of the resident that has lost his driveway four times and wants to know what will happen with the water coming down from Beekman pharmacy.

Brian – Will get some specific numbers on the DOT approved width improvements. Creating swale for drainage on upper side.

R. Lopane – Clarifies DOT is not designing but reacting to development that's occurring on their road. Resident wants to know is this turning lane going to widen the road and consequentially affect the drainage structures on the side of the road and neighboring properties. These are answers we need to have before closing the public hearing.

J. Frustace – The board does not feel there is enough information to close the public hearing.

D. Koehler – By code the board would have to make a decision on the application for preliminary as well as environmental within 62 days. More information is needed to make that decision.

J. Frustace – Adjourning will allow them to come back with answers to satisfy the questions for the public. There is information that can be made available to the public by January 21<sup>st</sup> such as the tree plan and maybe some other items. If other interested agencies haven't responded, it may need to be adjourned again.

**R. Lopane – Motion to adjourn public hearing to January 16, 2025. Seconded by F. Garito. All in favor. Motion carried.**

P. Poltrack – Indicates there will not be another notification for the adjourned public hearing.

D. Koehler – That is why it is adjourned to a specific date.

J. Frustace – Information related to meetings can be found on the website.

D. Koehler – Asks for next submittal to include update of latest FEAF per comments. Despite DOT review of SWPPP, copy of latest to us as well. Continue to advance grading utility plans. Furniture and waste receptacles are for you to propose. Could help to have landscape architect provide number of trees proposed. Recall typical request for location of trees is if 8" or greater. Seem to recall asking for existing but it was determined none over 8 inches. Should have an idea of net loss versus net gain.

J. Frustace – Advises public they can submit FOIL request to view any part of the plans and send comments or questions to planning secretary that can be read at the next meeting.

## **DISCUSSION**

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

Brian Hildenbrand, PE – Public hearing closed at last appearance. Resubmitted based on town engineer memo. Feel remaining comments are minor. Also received comments from town attorney but hoping if board is satisfied, could move towards a resolution with conditions to satisfy remaining comments. Once we get a resolution, we can move on with health department and other steps.

C. Wallace – When the applicant initially applied, they applied as trustees. There's a trust that owns the 83-acre parcel and Don Pozzuto owns the 2.5 acre parcel. Research into deed concludes two life estate tenants, granters of the trust which I believe are parents and still alive. Need to be added to application and sign off. Need trust instrument for powers within conveyance. Need to consult title company as to whether life estate tenant can consent. You have trustees that have signed the application that are contingent beneficiaries of the property. It's contingent upon the death of the life estate tenants. It's a legality and rare but was an estate tool. Asks Mr. Pozzuto for trust instrument.

Don Pozzuto, Applicant – Provides attorney with requested signed document.

R. Lopane – Questions if trustees are allowed to make the subdivision application.

C. Wallace – Confirms they are not. They need consent from the owner and life estate tenants. Suggests applicant retain legal counsel.

Further discussion regarding trust instrument and ownership.

D. Koehler – Indicates it was #17 on the subdivision application and was signed by the trustees but the life estate tenants need to sign as well. Two parts. They have to sign off and the instrument needs to be review to make sure it doesn't restrict any changes to the property.

C. Wallace – Reiterates recommendation to consult attorney as well as amend application to include them. Life estate tenants will need to authorize you to speak on their behalf and sign the deed to convey the acreage.

D. Koehler – Once you took the crossing out for the DEC issues, there's the rear lot on the other side of the railroad that will become part of the 2.5 acre parcel bringing it up to 85. How does that property get accessed is part of the questions that we've had. Want to make sure if there's intended use of that property that there is access. Asking you to put a note on the plans that if the crossing ever has to come, you have to come back with the planning board for the water resource permit. Easement shown on filed map 1679 cannot be used because there's no DEC permit to cross the stream. Adding acreage but no nexus on how to access it. Can't access that lot unless you use the crossing which goes through lot 2.

Further discussion regarding parcel reconfiguration and access for clarification. Applicant points out easement on drawing and indicates he has a legal easement.

Brian – Indicates confusion as to whether board is referring to DEC crossing or Metro North crossing.

D. Koehler – Points out areas on projector and provides explanation of access issues.

R. Lopane – Instructs applicant if there is a legal easement to produce it.

## **2. Jett Management – Site Plan/Special Use**

2561 Route 55

Grid # 6759-00-676251

Zone TC

William Besharat, Applicant Representative – Prior discussion with Planning Board, received comments and attended zoning board for variance. Trying to legalize existing two apartments on a property that is zoned commercial. It's allowed with special use permit so here to obtain. Many comments back and forth and been addressed. Gone to zoning board and granted variance for minimum square footage requirement in town center of 800 sq. ft. No issues with addressing most recent comments. Regarding discussion about second floor Item #2 on comments, will consider but cannot finance until revenue is incurred from apartment rental. Item D. Will take down sign. Will change lighting to comply. No dumpster on property. Will specify. Item G talks about proposed evergreen screen. A lot of trees existing. Will clarify. Will be working with DOT regarding access and sidewalk. Item 3b confirms interior landscaping means bumpouts or islands. Will provide parking detail. Resolving issue with knox box with fire department. ZBA granted variance. Will indicate date. Item #10 will indicate where easement will be reserved for the town for future water and sewer. Will indicate wires on plan. Did not understand #13. Thought setbacks were shown. Will clarify.

D. Koehler – Suggested adding fake peak for now. Add notes to specify cans must be brought in each night. Should be an opportunity behind the sidewalk to put some street trees and nice landscaping. County noticed it's probably overparked and you could lose space.

J. Frustace – Circles back to second floor appearance.



William – Will propose façade, reverse gable or wall. Will be costly. Seems like a waste if constructing something more compliant in the near future.

R. Lopane – Asks if town code has any provisions for waiver or phasing.

C. Wallace – There are provisions for de minimis changes.

Board members discuss other projects where the board had the ability to exercise discretion.

C. Wallace – Reads aloud standard for waiver for special use permit. Discretionary call whether substantial.

**R. Lopane – Motion to grant waiver for Item 2b requiring the applicant to add second story façade appearance. Seconded by F. Garito. All in favor. Motion carried.**

William – Will address remaining items. Requesting sketch site plan approval.

D. Koehler – Requirement of §155-59D have been satisfied, just need topography source note. Ok with concept.

**F. Garito – Motion to grant sketch plan approval. Seconded by P. Poltrack. All in favor. Motion carried.**

**3. Samana Estates** – Subdivision  
Beekman Rd. & Greenhaven Rd.  
Grid # 6658-00-777635  
Zone R-45

Aime Patane, LRC Group – Representing applicant LMDH Property Holdings. Continued coordination with DPW and DOH since meeting last month. Received DPW comments and addressing. Asked to reduce number of trees to be removed and was reduced by 80. Updated plans submitted. Seeking negative declaration and possibly preliminary plat approval.

D. Koehler – Comments on good progress. Reference to local law passed in 2020 by the town board that overwrites a part of the code. §155-51 was timber harvesting but related to tree removals and included guidance for site plans and subdivisions that limited tree removal to within 60 ft of principal structure and 10 ft of other improvements. They've tightened up the tree removal. Easements can be addressed between preliminary and final or even as a condition of final approval. A few things on the SWPPP. Comments on free board. Landscaping plan was added. Do not believe it is appropriate to plant trees in an easement that has piping.

Board members review and discuss landscaping plan and trees. Agree language should be added; stormwater drainage and conservation easement, show trees offset and increase width. Also should indicate trees no closer than 5 ft off edge of drain line.

D. Koehler – Adds that vehicular access needs to be preserved. Generally want improvements to be made in the beginning. Applicant submitted Part 1 EAF with a lot of info. We have prepared a Part 2 for consideration in which you can answer differently. Part 3 lists a number of items the board was concerned with and how the applicant has addressed or mitigated those concerns.

R. Lopane – Indicates EAF may not be properly completed with regard to moderate versus large impact.

Further discussion regarding SEQRA requirements and considerations for varying levels of impact.

**R. Lopane – Motion to declare negative declaration. Seconded by F. Garito. All in favor. Motion carried.**

**F. Garito – Motion to grant preliminary subdivision approval. Seconded by R. Lopane. All in favor. Motion carried.**

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **1. 2025 Planning Board Proposed Meeting Dates - As stated on agenda**

F. Garito – Suggests future dates added to agenda.

P. Poltrack – Suggests capping number of applications per meeting.

**P. Poltrack – Motion to approve 2025 meeting schedule. Seconded by R. Lopane. All in favor. Motion carried.**

## **PRE-APPLICATION**

### **1. Poughquag View – Site Plan**

Beekman-Poughquag Rd. (CR7)

Grid # 6758-02-724723, 745731, 747718, 713705, 702716 & 700728

Zone PH

Brian Watts, PE – Current contractor working on Alaina Estates, cul-de-sac shown on the left of the map, is in talks with owner of adjacent parcel who originally went through the process of Alaina Estates. Comprised of a 4 or 5 smaller parcels. Looking to potentially buy them all and build out a couple of multi-family units.

Board members discuss location.

Brian - Confirms Poughquag Hamlet zone off Corey Rd. Semi modern farm house type look, parking in rear. Have not done in depth code analysis, just want boards opinion of potential challenges. Limitation would be how much water and sewer can get through Alaina Estates. Most were 3 and 4 bedrooms. If minimized or eliminated 4 bedroom houses in Alaina Estates, could reallocate. Fire access through Corey Rd. Not aware of any wetlands but have not done deep dive. Storm water up in the corner somewhere.

Additional discussion regarding location.

R. Lopane – Appears there may be issues with steep slopes. Also appears to be a lot of trees in the area. It's a lot of units to pack into a small area, allocation of storm water and a lot of pressure on the road and no way out.

Brian – Could potentially connect to Corey Rd.

D. Koehler – Confirms Corey Rd. is a private Rd. There may be some legalities. Suggests researching road maintenance agreement.

J. Frustace – Asks about impervious area and building size.

Brian – Still preliminary. Showing two and a half stories. May need to reorient based on Alaina Estates and sewer and water limitations.

R. Lopane – Questions the inconsistency and why multiple units when single family units with circle would be less density.

Brian – Based on water and sewer limitations.

J. Frustace – Asks what is the purpose of a half story. Does it increase density?

Brian – Appearance. Looks better than flat roof.

D. Koehler – Maximum building height is 35 feet.

Board discussion regarding road, rotary and cul-de-sac access.

R. Lopane – Asks if a variance will be needed for density.

D. Koehler – Its 11,250 sq ft per unit with public water and sewer. Assuming it is public water and sewer, they can have a little less than 4 units per acre. That would be 16 units for 4 acres and he has 21 so would need a variance or cut it down.

Board discussion regarding views.

P. Poltrack – Suggests visiting the property.

Brian – Hearing reservations on density. Is there an objection to possibly two multi-family buildings?

J. Frustace – Can propose. Affordable apartments needed.

R. Lopane – While in agreement with need for affordable housing, there are steep slopes. Community is concerned with trees. That should inform decision. More opportunities open space with design similar to Alaina. Have reservations.

J. Frustace – Asks what it would take to get a variance for the third floor and get rid of the other building.

D. Koehler – As long as the height is still 35 ft. It's based on the average elevation around to the midpoint between the eve and the peak so you could still have a third story that meets 35 ft. More of a building code issue with egress.

Brian – Shallow angled roof on a tall building may not be as appealing.

J. Frustace – Indicates representative should have a good

P. Poltrack – Reiterates importance of site visit.

**P. Poltrack – Motion to adjourn meeting. Seconded by F. Garito. All in favor. Motion carried.**

Meeting adjourned 10:23pm.

Respectfully submitted.

Aletha Bourke  
Planning/Zoning Secretary