

**PLANNING BOARD
TOWN OF BETHLEHEM
APRIL 15, 2003**

A **regular meeting** of the Planning Board, Town of Bethlehem, Albany County, New York, was held on Tuesday, April 15, 2003, at the Bethlehem Town Hall, 445 Delaware Avenue, Delmar, NY. Chairman Douglas C. Hasbrouck presided and called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Douglas C. Hasbrouck, Chairman
Howard Engel
Parker Mathusa
Dan Odell
Brian Collier
Katherine McCarthy

Keith Silliman, Counsel to the Board
Jeff Lipnicky, Town Planner
Janine Saatman, Deputy Town Planner
Randall Passmann, PE, Dept. of Public Works

Mr. & Mrs. Riede, 70 Harvest Ridge Rd., Glenmont
Paul E. Hite, LLS, Delmar
Gregg Swift, Foxfire Townhomes, LLS, Glenmont
George Williams, Milltowne Plaza Inc.
George Hascotes, Milltowne Plaza Inc.
Bernie Watkins, Glenmont
Tim White, Real Estate Financier
Dominic Arico, Land Solutions
David Riedman, Riedman Development Group
Jacqueline Owen, Land Solutions, 133 Mohawk Ave.
James Villasenor, Bethlehem Realty, 533 Rt. 9W
Mark Platel, Building Dept.
Michael Lipnick, 522 Huron Rd.
David Blaustein, 526 Huron Rd.
Marie Capone, Delaware Ave.
Kristen Olby, The Spotlight

CLEARVIEW SUBDIVISION—lot line revision for 19 and 21 Eileen Lane for Jacquelyn Stricos, Donna and Donald Riede (co-owners of 21 Eileen Lane) and Jonathan & Kitty Summers at 19 Eileen Lane, was the first item on the agenda. A map prepared by Smith & Mahoney dated 3/21/03 was referred to for the presentation.

Ms. Saatman noted that letters were received from all parties concerned agreeing with the request. Also, on Aug. 7, 2002, the Board of Appeals granted an Area Variance under

For an official copy of the minutes, please visit the Town Hall, 445 Delaware Avenue, Delmar, NY or call 439-4955, extension 158.

Article XII, Percentage of Lot Occupancy for 21 Eileen Lane to reduce the existing lot size of 13, 022 sq. ft. to approximately 12, 016 sq. ft. for the single family residence in the "A" Zone. The Engineering Dept. has verified that the minimum lot size for the zone is exceeded. The request is to transfer a 1,000 sq. ft. area to 19 Eileen Lane. Mr. Collier asked for clarification of the square footage requirements and was advised that the Zoning Code requirement for 12,000 sq. ft. lot area was met. Ms. Saatman asked Mrs. Riede about recent clearing at the rear of 21 Eileen Lane. Mrs. Riede said they had work done last fall. Ms. Saatman said the submitted photo was not up-to-date, as it does not show the limits of clearing. Mrs. Riede said the overgrowth was cleared but it will come back. She said there were raspberry bushes in the area.

Mr. Passmann said typical survey closure checks were done on the boundaries of the properties and no errors were discovered. The Clearview Subdivision records were also reviewed and no municipal drainage easements were found. A site visit was also made to observe conditions.

Chairman Hasbrouck asked if members had any questions. Mrs. McCarthy asked if there were any plans for the land. Mrs. Riede said she intended to keep it in its current condition and wanted to prevent any future homeowner who may purchase the property from placing any additional buildings in the area. She felt the rear of the home looked natural and they wanted to keep it that way. Dividing the area makes it official, she concluded. Mrs. Riede said her mother, Mrs. Stricos, moved in approximately a year ago and the adjacent homeowner was there 2 yrs. before and they maintained the property in question.

Counsel Silliman indicated that based on the submitted documentation from the owners of the property, he found the application in order.

Referring to draft approval document, Chairman Hasbrouck said the action was a Type II under SEQR. A motion was made by Mr. Mathusa, seconded by Mr. Collier and passed by all present to classify the action a Type II, such action requiring no additional SEQR involvement (see item 7B of the draft approval document).

Attention was next directed to remaining portions of the draft approval document. Ms. Saatman noted owner information on the map would have to be updated to reflect additional owners. There being no additional changes, a motion was made by Mr. Mathusa, seconded by Mr. Collier and passed by all present, to grant a lot line revision to lots 19 & 21 Eileen Lane as presented on a plat entitled "Proposed Subdivision of 21 Eileen Lane, Clearview, Town of: Bethlehem, County of Albany, State of New York" dated Mar. 21, 2003, prepared by Smith & Mahoney, P.C., Albany, NY—plat to be further revised.

- - -

THE MEADOWS, SECTION 2C, 2 undeveloped lots on Bender Lane & 2 revised lots on Foxfire Lane was next considered for subdivision approval. The map presented at the

April 1, 2003 public hearing was displayed. Chairman Hasbrouck said at the hearing there were no public comments, however, a letter was submitted by the property owner (living @ 25 Sage Lane) with respect to their viewscape. Referring to the map, Mr. Hite addressed the distance (468+ ft.) from the house at 25 Sage Lane to the proposed duplex buildings and existing landscaping in the area, some of which is on Town ROW. He said his client was willing to plant trees to accommodate the individual's concerns. The proposed duplexes, which require Site Plan Approval, will fit into the neighborhood. An effort will be made to retain trees in front of the proposed units.

Ms. Saatman said the reason for placing the item on the Board's agenda was to obtain feedback from members on the letter that was submitted. Was a condition in the approval needed, she wondered? Mr. Mathusa said if the developer was willing to plant trees to insure that the issue has been addressed, he felt it was reasonable. Mr. Collier did not feel it was necessary to add an item in the approval document.

Mr. Gregg Swift explained that years ago the Town cut a 30 ft. wide opening for safety reasons. Trees were on the site and with construction activity, a few died. In turn, the Town placed trees in their ROW to replace those that were gone. He suggested installing three 6 ft. white pine trees ending up with two rows of trees. If it is a condition in the approval, Mr. Swift said he would want it to be specific. There was a discussion amongst the Board, staff and the developer on the question, the end result being that as a condition of approval the Board would require three (3) trees of the same variety/height as the two existing trees placed in the Town highway ROW. Ms. Saatman suggested that contact be made with the Highway Superintendent since placement would be on Town property. She added that Mr. Swift would be receiving a copy of the draft approval and if he had any questions, he could call.

Mr. Passmann mentioned that in terms of engineering, comments were sent to the applicant with respect to storm water management and engineering-related issues shown on the drawing. He said the Engineering Dept. was awaiting a submittal.

Ms. Saatman said Mr. Hite mentioned that Bagdon Environmental would be making a site inspection with respect to possible wetlands along the ditch on Bender Lane. Mr. Hite said a site visit was scheduled for Wednesday to determine if Federal wetlands are present. If so, it would be located on the map. The impact, Mr. Hite assessed, would not qualify for Federal review/permitting and a letter would be submitted to the Board in that regard.

There being no additional concerns, a motion to table the discussion was offered by Mr. Collier, seconded by Mr. Odell and passed by all present. Chairman Hasbrouck said as soon as all issues have been addressed (wetlands, landscaping, etc.), Ms. Saatman would prepare draft documents for Board action.

- - -

WILLOW ESTATES, a proposed four (4) lot residential subdivision on Willow Dr. was the next item on the agenda. The map presented at the April 1st public hearing was displayed for reference purposes. Chairman Hasbrouck recalled issues raised at the hearing—namely headlight glare along properties fronting Huron Rd. from the proposed cul-de-sac; building size and architecture; drainage; tree cutting and ownership of a paper street leading to Huron Rd., a parcel which is encumbered by an easement. In terms of architecture, the Chairman requested that the developer be sensitive to the resident's concerns. He asked Mr. Hite if he had any comments.

Mr. Hite addressed the headlight concerns. He said in assessing developability of the parcel, he looked at the impact of installing a roadway from the end of Willow Dr. to connect with Huron Rd. With the cul-de-sac design the impact will be lessened, he felt. Trees will remain and the proposed houses can be changed in terms of location of driveways/garages. He said he developed a worst-case scenario. Chairman Hasbrouck said the issue was the fact that there will be headlights shining through nearby windows. Mr. Hite said anywhere development takes place there will be headlights. He questioned whether the residents were unaware of development potential; the lots exceed Town requirements. Mr. Collier wondered if the elevation could be altered, by installing a berm, to address the concern. Mr. Hite said in order to do what was being suggested existing landscaping would have to be removed. He said he preferred to move the driveway to another location. It was estimated that perhaps 20 cars per day would likely travel the lane, not a major impact.

Mr. Lipnick and Mr. Blaustein, affected property owners on Huron Rd., felt some evergreens and perhaps a berm would be acceptable. The prospect of fencing was also discussed. Mrs. Capone raised issues with berming and suggested they were dangerous. The one at the Town Hall along Delaware Ave. was altered because children would use it to skate board and bike down. There was continued discussion with respect to the issue of glare onto the homes. Mr. Collier suggested as a condition, the developer could be required to install low level screening or earth berm to block headlights coming around the cul-de-sac. As far as a berm was concerned, if trees would have to be removed, residents found it unacceptable. Ms. Saatman said grading was shown behind 522 Huron Rd. and felt it should be looked at to see if less grading could be shown. Mr. Hite said it was a surveying error on their part and it would be corrected. The area will not be touched, he said. Chairman Hasbrouck said as far as the berm was concerned, it appears not to be acceptable and it was a non-issue. He suggested the Board was considering installation of more trees or possibly a fence to screen the headlights.

Mr. Passmann commented that the Engineering Dept. visited the site with the Planning Dept. There are a number of existing pine trees along the south edge of the site. Since mapping is being revised to address engineering concerns, perhaps the developer could propose evergreens in the area as an attempt to mitigate headlight glare, as opposed to berming. He cautioned that a drainage easement to accommodate the Town's storm sewer will be located at the southerly boundary and the Town will not want landscaping with trees planted on the Town's easement. The property owners may want to

supplement their plantings to stave off headlight glare. Based on the discussion, fencing was seen as unsuitable in this instance.

At the meeting, Chairman Hasbrouck noted that Mr. Mathusa asked Mr. Hite to identify trees which are likely to remain and plot trees to serve as screening and show it on the next map. Mr. Collier suggested an alternate—that as a condition of the Board's approval it state that approximately 16 trees at 6 ft. height be planted. It would serve the same purpose as opposed to identifying them on the map. He said his concern was that with the road close to the rear line, it was hard to imagine that many trees will remain given conditions of construction activities. Trees could be planted once site conditions are conducive to planting. Members were satisfied with Mr. Collier's recommendation. Chairman Hasbrouck directed Ms. Saatman to include in the approval that the developer be required to locate 12-15 evergreen trees, at a minimum height of 6-8 ft.

Mr. Lipnick asked about plans to correct the drainage situation across from his property on Huron Rd. Mr. Hite said he discussed the problem with Mr. Sagendorph, Highway Supt., and he indicated it would be taken care of this summer. Mr. Lipnick talked about a blockage of the drainage on Huron Rd. He said there appears to be cinder blocks in the gully and the pipe seems to be blocked. Mr. Hite said he did not see the situation Mr. Lipnick was referring to. He said he shot an elevation at the top of the pipe and one at the invert and there were no cinder blocks around. Mr. Passmann said to answer Mr. Lipnick's question, Mr. Hite's map shows that as part of their work they will be installing an end section on the pipe and riprap protection of the pipe. The area will be reconstructed to care for existing/proposed drainage. Mr. Hite added that as part of the drainage work in the area, Mr. Sagendorph said he would be using a high-pressure pump to clean out the pipe for positive drainage.

Mr. Hite said concerning staff's question as to whether there was a stream in the paper street area at Huron Rd., it is not a stream. A letter is being prepared by Bagdon Assoc. and it will be submitted to the Town. A permit will not be required from the Army Corps of Engineers.

Chairman Hasbrouck asked if there were any remaining issues. None were mentioned at this point. A motion was then made to table the discussion by Mr. Odell, seconded by Mr. Mathusa and passed by all present. Chairman Hasbrouck thanked Mr. Hite for his input.

- - -

THE HAMMOCKS SUBDIVISION/SITE PLAN, re: a 36+ acre parcel on northeast corner of Wemple Rd. and Rt. 9W to be subdivided into two parcels, one consisting of 32+ acres and the remaining house lot at 4.8+ acres, the larger parcel to contain a 200 unit apartment complex, area zoned Light Industrial, was the next item considered, basically to update the Board on schematic changes to the site plan.

Chairman Hasbrouck asked Mr. Arico to present the changes and then staff and the Board would comment. Mr. Arico introduced David Riedman, developer/builder. Referring to a map dated 4/1/03, Mr. Arico said each unit would contain 10 units in 20 buildings. Based on comments from staff, adjustments were made to roadways, elevations and utilities. Concern was raised re: emergency vehicles. Curves were widened in the main driveway as well as increased radii at all intersections, exceeding Town standards by 3 ft. Because the roadway is private, it has been designed according to the need for emergency vehicles turning and not according to Town highway standards. The width of the pavement has been extended to 28 ft. from edge of pavement with a driving surface to 24 ft. Access is being provided on Wemple Rd. and Rt. 9W. The buildings were originally 20 ft. off the pavement—that has been adjusted to 25 ft. and on the corner the setback is greater. Mr. Arico noted that the Zoning Code Administrator has ruled that the garage could be utilized as a parking space and based on that calculation the space inside and outside the garage will guarantee meeting the Code requirement of 400 parking spaces. There are approximately 120 excess parking spaces throughout the complex. Near the clubhouse additional parking is being proposed, however, it is the developer's preference to make this particular parking area reserved parking to be constructed at a later date, if needed. Concerning utilities, in discussing the matter with the Engineering Dept. and Public Works Dept., water and sewer connections will be shown from Rt. 9W to exit onto Wemple Rd. These utilities will be Town-owned/maintained with easements throughout the property, the reason for this is to accommodate future development of adjacent parcels. A pump station is being proposed on other lands of Haseotes across the street and discussions are underway with Mr. Secor on this aspect of the plan. Concerning the Water District, the line is shown and based on conversation with the Albany County Health Dept., they will allow construction of the water line, however, they will not allow water taps outside the service area until the restriction on extension of the Water District has been lifted by DEC. Seven buildings fall outside of the Water District. The property basically contains perimeter trees. As far as landscaping, Mr. Arico said his plan was generic at this point and would be more specific as they progress with the plans. He then deferred to Mr. Riedman. Mr. Riedman said he would address any concerns of the Board/staff.

Chairman Hasbrouck asked staff for an update at this point. Mr. Passmann said as the design progresses, the Engineering Dept. would have to see details for grading, drainage easements, additional ROW along Wemple Rd., plans for the sewer system that will become part of the Town's system. He also asked for correspondence from Albany County confirming that they will approve installation of the water system outside of the existing District.

Ms. Saatman said the Planning Dept. viewed the discussion as an opportunity for the Board to give input on the layout and whether it is satisfactory at this point. One issue raised by Mr. Arico was that the buildings were moved back from the roadways. For a comparison, the least restrictive front yard setback in any zone in the Town for residential dwellings is 25 ft., which Mr. Arico said he tried to meet from the edge of pavement, but that would not normally be from a highway ROW, which would give a minimum distance between buildings of 100 ft. In this case it is almost 80 ft. for their closest space

and some would be slightly more. The Board would have to decide whether 80 ft. is sufficient between buildings. Ms. Saatman said in her memo to the Board she forgot to mention that the Building Inspector has given the interpretation that the front yard requirements of the code do not apply to private streets which is why the buildings are being shown closer to the roads than they would be if they were on Town Streets. There are no additional sidewalks or paths shown, nor is there another road connection. She was not certain if the Board wanted to pursue these issues further. The Board is dealing with a subdivision and not site-specific information at this point. There is little additional parking in the main central area. She raised a concern with some parking spaces that were close to the curve. If there was a pile of snow or other obstruction such as a car parked in the area with another one pulling out, with someone coming around the curve, there could be a safety issue involved. The setback issues, the number of buildings and close spacing are broader issues that could be addressed at this point. Density is not met on the plan at this time and neither is the ROW to be deeded to the Town shown.

Concerning the ROW issue, Mr. Arico said in speaking with Mike Cirillo from the Engineering Dept., he stated that Wemple Rd. is a user roadway, which means that the property line is at the center line of the road. Mr. Arico said he would have to rewrite the description and formalize it with the Town. The house lot will be reduced in order to meet the density requirement for the larger parcel. Mr. Cirillo has also asked for a 25 ft. corner curve at the corner of Rt. 9W and Wemple Rd. Mr. Arico said he hoped to obtain feedback from the Board on his latest proposal in order to move forward with the design.

Mr. Mathusa asked for an explanation on the advantage of the private road system. Mr. Riedman commented that most communities want private systems. As a landlord, he said they would retain maintenance control over the entire property. He said he's never been involved in a multi-family project where roadways have been dedicated. If that were to be the case, he said it might impact density. Concerning setbacks, the density requirements are met in the Light Industrial zone. There is no question setbacks are close in comparison to single-family construction. Multi-family are generally more dense but as opposed to single family, the open space is greater. The private roads will be maintained in terms of infrastructure, long-term maintenance and repair, as well as plowing, etc.

Ms. Saatman said she was not comparing the project to setbacks for single family but more so to any residential use, which includes multi-family. Some single-family units require 35-40 ft. setback from the property line. Mr. Riedman said he did not intend to be argumentative. Ms. Saatman said it was merely a clarification to the Board.

Mr. Mathusa said at the northeast end of the property if an easy-pass exit was proposed from Rt. 9W to the Thruway to accommodate truck movement from the Selkirk area, how would it impact the proposed development. Mr. Riedman said if it was not linked in any way to his development, he saw no problem. It would not be unlike what has occurred with his development in the Rochester area (on Long Pond Rd.). If that were the case, landscaping/berming would buffer the area, he said.

Mr. Collier recalled Mr. Arico's comment about density and the Town's requirements for additional ROW along Wemple Rd. and that if calculations were tight, he would have to revise lot lines. Mr. Arico said the requirement was 7,000 sq. ft. per unit and they were at 1.4 million sq. ft. Losing one sq. ft. of land would require reducing density by 1 unit. Since the buildings are 10 units, if 1 unit is lost it would mean a whole building would have to be removed. He said he preferred to take area from the corner lot because it would not impact the parcel. Mr. Collier recalled asking that a concept to bring another driveway through what is now called a detention pond to the back section of 70 apartments. There is the prospect of 140 cars traveling past a number of buildings to reach the back circle. He asked the justification for not providing another driveway access from Wemple Rd. Mr. Arico responded that an attempt was made to contain traffic to the front of the buildings. It would require splitting buildings and would affect wetlands and the privacy of the buildings. He said they preferred not to change the concept. The emergency personnel did not see it any different than a long cul-de-sac. Mr. Collier responded that it was his view that the buildings were close to the road, creating a tight community. With that in mind he didn't think it would benefit the developer to have 140 cars in the a.m. and p.m. driving past the majority of the development to reach the back section. He said he was looking at it more from a design point of view. Mr. Arico said adding a 2nd access street, as proposed, would cause the loss of 2 buildings, which would be a significant impact, he felt. He added he was also trying to avoid impacting wetlands. Mr. Arico also spoke of meeting DEC's new storm water management requirements. Mr. Collier said he would have to be more comfortable with the concept of not having a secondary access to 70 apartments. Mr. Riedman suggested he did not want a new driveway to become a "raceway". Concerning the closer setbacks, they provide a street calming effect because things appear closer. It also tends to slow traffic down, he felt. Installation of speed bumps would also help to slow traffic down. Mr. Collier said it was "food for thought." Ms. Saatman asked a question about the plan for speed bumps. Mr. Riedman said if they saw a problem on the main road, it was another way to calm traffic.

Mr. Collier said the detail shows the parking space width at 11 ft. He wondered about the length of the space. Mr. Arico said the length is 20 ft. The depth is 40 ft., or greater, from the edge of pavement to the front of the garage. In terms of access drive and maneuvering space, he did not see a problem. Mr. Collier asked if detention ponds could be located in Federal wetlands. Mr. Arico said they were adjacent to the wetlands. The new storm water management plan is detailed and addresses filtration, sedimentation and shallow areas. Mr. Collier said if the property along Wemple Rd., in the vicinity where he was suggesting another driving lane where the detention pond is shown, was not in a wetland, if the road concept was acceptable the detention pond could be reshaped. Mr. Arico said, "I guess". Mr. Collier said he liked the idea of the upper parking lot that Mr. Riedman said he wanted to hold for future construction but did not find the location suitable from an aesthetics point of view. He imagined campers, boats, etc. being parked in the area. Mr. Riedman said one of the things he would like to propose is design the area but not construct it and post a letter of credit for the cost of the improvement, if needed. Mr. Odell said the Town had experience with this type of an arrangement (at the Van Allen Senior Apartments on Rt. 9W). Mr. Riedman said 30% of the units will be 1-

bedroom apartments and he did not envision a problem with parking. He said he, too, found it aesthetically unpleasing but wanted to show that it could be done. The lease would restrict uses of the site.

Chairman Hasbrouck talked about density and about the overall concept of 10 unit housing and asked if it was based on economics and architectural consistency. He asked the purpose of adhering to only 10 units per building. Mr. Riedman said it not necessarily a package arrangement. A building below 10 units poses some economic challenges. Construction costs per building start to escalate significantly on a per unit basis. Every building then has a mix of units and you are able to incorporate 10 garages in a larger building and make them somewhat disappear.

Mr. Engel voiced concern over the lack of sidewalks. He said it was a major concern of his in a complex of this size where there will likely be many children. People will likely want to walk to the clubhouse. The trend is towards various forms of exercise—walking, bicycling, etc.—and no substantial provisions are made on the plan. Mr. Riedman said a sidewalk was provided a short ways to the clubhouse. He asked if he was looking for sidewalks along the main roads. Mr. Engel said he was correct. The area where the sidewalk is being provided is the widest section of roadway. Where roadways are narrow, no sidewalk is being provided. The only area to walk will be in the driving lane and this is a major concern. He said he would be reluctant to approve a plan anywhere in Town lacking adequate sidewalks. Mr. Riedman said serious consideration would be given to the walking public. He asked if he would be agreeable to walking paths behind the buildings. Mr. Engel said walking areas need not be in front of the buildings throughout but some type of connecting footpath needs to be provided.

Mr. Odell asked about the internal parking regulations along the roads. Mr. Riedman responded, "It won't happen." Mr. Odell added that service people and delivery vehicles and their own maintenance equipment might park in the roads. Mr. Riedman said as far as a UPS deliveryman running in, it is was something that could not be controlled, however, maintenance vehicles would not be parked in the roadways. Mr. Odell asked where someone would park when they bring in lawn mowers, snow removal equipment, etc. Mr. Riedman said they would park in a parking spot. Chairman Hasbrouck noted that all lawn/maintenance work was being done by the developer. What Mr. Odell was getting at was that 95% of the lawn care workers park their equipment in the streets around Town all day long. The side parking areas likely will not accommodate this type of traffic and they will park in the roadways. Mr. Riedman said he would be in a position to exercise more control as a private landowner. The Chairman said it was a matter of what their opportunities are from a practical point of view as to where to unload equipment, etc. Mr. Riedman said equipment would be unloaded in one location. They will not put the equipment back on the trailer to relocate from one section of the site to the other. They will drive/push the lawn mowers down the street quicker than putting it back on the truck.

Mr. Passmann asked about residential waste/recycling. Mr. Riedman said residents would have a tote in their garage. They will be responsible for placing the tote on the

street, which will be picked up curbside, similar to a homeowner. He explained the process but said he has not yet contacted a local hauling agent. A trash compactor may be used, but nothing has been firmed up as yet. Mr. Collier said on the issue of parking on the roadway, with the 24 ft. wide pavement, he was fairly comfortable that it would not be a problem. Mr. Riedman said being a single property owner, he would have more ability to enforce rules and regulations with respect to parking on the street than in a single-family neighborhood.

Mrs. McCarthy wondered if additional trees would be planted along the northeast boundary line abutting the soccer fields. Mr. Riedman said the plan before the Board was not the final landscape plan and that would be addressed.

Concerning the issue of snow removal, the Chairman said he had hoped the Zoning Code interpretation would have been different and he was surprised and disappointed to find that a parking space in front of the garage door met the intent of the Zoning Code. It then raises his concern to a different level, he said. There is a single garage door for each of the apartments. If the average occupancy is less than 2, there will be some places where it is not a problem. However, it also suggests that in 70-80% of the buildings, there will be 2 vehicles in each of the units at any given time, which means that one vehicle will be in front of the garage. The problem with that is that because the driveways are single width and side-by-side, a second car would have to be parked side-by-side. If the neighbor also has a second car, they, too, will have to park on their side. The problem then exists if the renter is out of Town and the other renter wants to exit his garage, one car would have to be moved in order to accomplish this. The other issue relates to snow removal. It will be extremely difficult regardless of how snow removal is going to be handled, if the winters are similar to this past winter. Snow removal will be a monumental task if cars have to be removed/moved in order to have maneuverability in the streets and in the parking areas. With driveways as short as they are, the only way to remove snow will be to pull a plow up to the front of the garage door, drop the blade and back it out and push the snow at an angle into the corner of the lots, resulting in tearing of the sod which will have to be replaced in the springtime. He saw a real problem with snow removal and was not sure how it would be handled. Obviously the Board has some flexibility with the density aspect or setbacks, but the interpretation has been made on the use of the driveway in front of the garage doors. The Chairman believed it would create a much less attractive layout because when someone is driving down the street any time of day, there will be an overabundance of vehicles parked near or on the street.

Mr. Riedman explained the operation of snow removal as he saw it. Streets will be cleared first and then typically the driveway will be cleared, if no cars in the way. If there is a car, the maintenance personnel will wait until they have left for work and then come back and clear the driveways once the vehicle has been removed. If the winter is similar to this year, a loader will be used and the snow can be stored on site. It is a mammoth job and constitutes one of the largest operating expenses of the project. He understood the Chairman's point.

Mr. Passmann commented that because of the tight parking arrangement, collecting and conveying the storm water will require a great deal of thought and planning. He said the Engineering Dept. would like to see some ideas on this aspect of the plan, to see that there is adequate pitch on the parking areas as it relates to storm water management.

Mr. Odell said with respect to storm water management, he wondered about the impact of the proposed wing curbs as opposed to normal curbing. Mr. Passmann supposed they would act to channel water between the high and low points along the roadway to the nearest catch basins, however, he said he could not specifically address it because no profiles have been submitted. Mr. Arico added they would also avoid roadside rutting. He said he had a good idea of how drainage will be accomplished, however, details are sketchy at this point because if there is a slight movement or adjustments made, it changes the entire drainage concept and it could change it significantly in some areas.

Chairman Hasbrouck asked Mr. Riedman to expand on trash removal plans. Mr. Riedman said he would contract with a hauler. People will have a garbage tote in their garage, which is quite deep. Most garages are 12 ft. wide and over 20 ft. in depth, leaving ample room for the totes and other storage. On pick-up day, which will likely be 2 days a week, the tote is left out for the refuse company to pick up. The Chairman said most of the major haulers in the Town pick up once a week and they provide the units with the containers because of their equipment. He felt it was something Mr. Riedman should look at because of the number of totes that will be left by the street. In the wintertime it could be problematic. Mr. Riedman said his company has the ability, since they would be entering into a bulk contract, to have pick up on more occasions than with a single-family dwelling. The Chairman said his concern was not with the number of pick-ups but with the number of units. Is there room for the totes because there could be overcrowding. Mr. Riedman said he would be exploring the trash-compactor option, which is a more efficient way to handle trash.

Chairman Hasbrouck asked about mail delivery. Mr. Riedman explained that he has yet to meet with the local postal authorities who will make the decision. It is up to the manager of the local post office on how this is handled. He could require construction of 10-12 unit boxes at strategic locations to accommodate incoming and outgoing mail at each building. Authorities want fewer drop sites because of today's conditions. Chairman Hasbrouck said the issue of snow removal is complicated in the wintertime if mailboxes are in the way. He described how mailboxes are set up in his development. Out of 50 in the neighborhood, up to 20 were damaged by Town plows because the snow became heavy and damage ultimately occurred. The locations of the boxes can limit snow removal/storage capabilities.

Chairman Hasbrouck asked Ms. Saatman if she had any additional comments. Ms. Saatman believed she covered major items. She said she hadn't heard any comments from the Board relative to changes to the setbacks and wondered if members were satisfied.

Concerning the density issue, Chairman Hasbrouck asked the Board for their thoughts. He recalled Mr. Arico's statement that because ROW will be needed along Wemple Rd., that sufficient area will be taken from the corner lot to meet density requirements for the apartment complex. At this point the developer is looking for a consensus that it is acceptable for them to proceed with the proposal and prepare details, or does the Board want to see significant changes before moving ahead? Ms. Saatman said reference has been made to Mr. Riedman's existing apartment complexes in the Rochester area, however, nothing concrete has been submitted in that regard. She asked if the setback was typical in his existing projects. Mr. Riedman said he would provide the Board with the information. Mr. Odell said he was interested in seeing the Rochester site and said he would be in the area over the Memorial Day weekend. Mr. Collier said he would be in Rochester the day after the meeting and welcomed a site visit. Mr. Riedman said his complex was located on Rt. 250 and Rt. 31, and the project was called The Hammock's at Southern Hills and was north of the Eastview Mall. The entry is brick and is very prominent, however, there is no street address. Hammock's Drive intersects Rt. 250, he said. The entrance to the development is approximately 1000 ft. south of Rt. 31, and it is a major intersection in the area. There a number of townhomes with garages in front, similar to the proposed layout. Mr. Odell asked the width of the roadways in his Rochester development. Mr. Riedman said he would supply the Board with a plan of that development and if he knew when members were coming, he would meet them at the site. Mr. Riedman volunteered that the manager's name was Phil Kettel, area code (585) 425-4444.

Chairman Hasbrouck again asked the Board for their comments on density. Members preferred to wait until they have seen the site in Rochester and report back to the Board on conditions. Mr. Odell said he appreciated Mr. Passmann's model but he felt it would be best to see the site. Mr. Riedman said the project in Rochester was denser and parking was off the loop road. He said he could take Mr. Odell on a tour of others he has built in the area. The architecture is basically the same, he added, although the buildings were slightly different and are 4, 6 & 8 units. Mr. Riedman said his phone # was (585) 232-1000 and he welcomed showing members his projects. Chairman Hasbrouck thanked Mr. Riedman for his input.

At this point a motion to table the discussion was offered by Mr. Collier, seconded by Mr. Odell and passed by all present.

- - -

Minutes of the April 1, 2003 public hearing (The Meadows, Section 2C) were edited and approved on a motion by Mr. Collier, seconded by Mrs. McCarthy and passed by all present. The second public hearing (Willow Estates) held April 1st was also approved on a motion by Mr. Mathusa, seconded by Mr. Engel and passed by all.

- - -

At the conclusion of the meeting, Chairman Hasbrouck expressed his regret and thanks to outgoing Planning Board Secretary, Alice A. Cirillo, for her dedicated service to the Board.

Mrs. Cirillo is planning to retire on April 25, 2003.

- - -

All business concluded, a motion for adjournment was offered by Mr. Mathusa, seconded by Mr. Odell and passed by all present. Chairman Hasbrouck declared the meeting closed at approximately 9:45 p.m.

- - -

Minutes of the April 15, 2003 meeting were transcribed by Alice A. Cirillo, C.P.S. The minutes were edited and approved by the Board on May 6, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah M. Kitchen
Acting Secretary to the Board