

Minutes of the Planning Board Meeting held October 2, 2019 at 7:30PM

Members Present: Christopher Gerver, Chairperson
Robert Anzalone
Joseph Buglino
Sandra Capriglione
Richard Cataggio

Members Absent: None

Consultants Present: Richard Golden, Attorney
Dennis Lindsay, Engineer
Michael Musso, Telecommunications

1. Acceptance of Minutes:

Motion was offered by Mrs. Capriglione, seconded by Mr. Anzalone, to accept receipt of the minutes of the meeting held September 18, 2019.

ADOPTED AYES 5 Gerver, Anzalone, Buglino, Capriglione, Cataggio
 NOES 0

7:31PM - Woodbury Commons – Review decision for an amended site plan, special permit and ARB for an outdoor dining patio. Said property is located off of Route 32 in Central Valley and is known on the Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 225, Block 1, Lot 70.2 and Section 226, Block 1, Lot 1.

John Villapiano, Vice President of Development for Simon, stated this issue has been before the Board a few times now and a public hearing has been held. He is available to answer any questions the Board may still have. Mrs. Capriglione stated at the rear of the building Engineer Lindsay was going to check about the siding being visible from Route 32. Engineer Lindsay stated he did not do so but he will. Mr. Gerver asked Attorney Golden to go over the changes/edits that were made to the resolution which were: (1) correcting the number of this site plan amendment to being the eighth throughout the document; (2) adding the Fire Department correspondence dated September 30, 2019; (3) adding "19th" to the date the ARB application was received in September; (4) adding the date of September 4, 2019 to recognize the second application to appear; (5) adding "beyond the approved GLA" to a paragraph in the findings section. Attorney Golden then stated the resolution contains the following conditions: (1) all applicable conditions attached to the site plan, special permit and ARB approvals from 1997 to the present and any subsequent amendments thereto are incorporated into the resolution and are to remain in full force and effect noting the approval is subject to, and conditioned upon, satisfaction of those conditions as they were set forth; (2) the applicant shall comply with the memorandum of the Village Engineer dated September 10, 2019 to the Engineers satisfaction; (3) during construction safety shall be the sole responsibility of the applicant and their contractors with all appropriate safety measures provided to the satisfaction of the Village Building Department.

Motion was then offered by Mr. Cataggio, seconded by Mrs. Capriglione, to approve the resolution.

ADOPTED AYES 5 Gerver, Anzalone, Buglino, Capriglione, Cataggio
 NOES 0

7:38PM - Homeland - Public Hearing for site plan and special permit application of a proposed new wireless telecommunications facility located on approximately 7.72 acres at 11 Abrams Road in Central Valley. Said property is known on the Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 226, Block 1, Lot 38. Further, pursuant to Chapter 165 ("Freshwater Wetland") of the Village Code, an application

has been received from Homeland Towers LLC and Orange County Limited Partnership for a permit to allow certain activities regulated by Chapter 165 on a parcel of land located along Abrams Road in Central Valley identified as Section 226, Block 1, Lot 27. Mr. Gerver noted the public notice was published on September 22, 2019.

Robert Gaudio, Lawyer with Snyder and Snyder, stated since the last meeting a number of additional documents were submitted as requested by Engineer Lindsay and Consultant Musso. They are as follows: (1) a wetland permit application; (2) a letter from APT Engineering confirming hinge point and structural design; (3) generator specification cut sheets; (4) a letter from Vincent Xavier supplementing his prior area analysis; (5) additional visual renderings with the tower depicted to resemble a tree; (6) a letter from Michael Crosby, Verizon Wireless RF Engineer; (7) a letter from APT detailing site plan changes; (8) a revised site plan. He then listed the following documents that were submitted previously: (1) application to appear before the Planning Board; (2) Orange County disclosure form; (3) statement of compliance; (4) RF Compliance report by Pinnacle Telecom Group; (5) RF Justification report by Verizon Wireless; (6) full environmental assessment form; (7) structural certification letter by APT Engineering; (8) FAA opinion letter; (9) alternative area analysis by Vincent Xavier of Homeland Towers; (10) visual resource assessment by Saratoga Associates; (11) site plan.

Mrs. Capriglione noted on the plans it references "municipal antennas" and she asked what that means. Mr. Gaudio stated there are none now but they make their towers available, free of charge, to the local municipality EMS services. Mrs. Capriglione asked if this would be for Woodbury only and Mr. Gaudio stated yes. Mrs. Capriglione stated on the new set of plans it shows the tower and a tree but there is nothing addressing the hinge on the tower. Mr. Gaudio stated it is a note on the plans. Mrs. Capriglione stated the design is not shown and Mr. Gaudio stated once the Board selects a design and approve the hinge it will be provided with the building permit application. Mrs. Capriglione confirmed there would be no lighting and Mr. Gaudio stated there would not be. Mrs. Capriglione asked if any carriers have responded. Mr. Gaudio stated AT&T has possibly shown interest but nothing is concrete, Sprint as well. Mrs. Capriglione asked if Verizon would be the major carrier and Mr. Gaudio stated this application is from Verizon. Any co-locators would need to submit their own application. Mrs. Capriglione then noted the memo from APT states two trees will need to be removed that are greater than 6" and she asked what their actual size is. She was told they are two maples approximately 24" in diameter.

Consultant Musso stated he will be providing the Board with a tech memo after this meeting. He feels the additional filing in June and the supplemental filing in September causes the applicant to largely be in compliance. He feels the 110' is an adequate size for the tower and agrees that co-location is likely. There has been discussion about a fall zone and public health/safety as well. 60' of the surface is needed for a catastrophic failure. The pole will need to be designed with wind gusts in mind and believes installing a fall zone hinge is a very good idea. The fall zone hinge point and design for co-location will be included in his memo/review. He noted there is a possibility that a co-locator will want to go higher than the 110' being requested and the FCC requirements in some ways handcuff municipalities as they address substantial changes to an existing tower. The maximum additional height allowable would be 20' or 10% of the towers height. He feels it is a very strategic site that has been chosen and agrees co-location at higher heights will be desirable by a carrier. He then described the reports that have been submitted and provided his comments on each of them. He feels the site will be in compliance with radio frequency emissions and noted there is a cellular tower on Arden House Road that Verizon is looking to decommission at some point. He noted it appears the higher coverage is not working well based on all the usage and the applicant has been very responsive to the information requests that have been made. Information about the generator has been provided and a testing schedule should be part of the conditions imposed, which should be done weekly for a period of twenty minutes. A stealth tree simulation was requested and he feels it has merit at this location. He had

requested information about the alternate site analysis conducted and it surprised him that the alternate location was 3000' from the proposed site. He feels that location should not be permitted due to the power lines. He will provide more testimony in his tech memo. He is very interested in getting an alternate height coverage map. He also asked Verizon to provide their own modeling and to show other carriers that operate at similar frequencies. He feels this will help him feel better about the co-location at lower heights. He feels more conditions would be needed with a stealth tree model as opposed to a traditional model.

Mr. Anzalone asked if there are height limits to a stealth tree model and Consultant Musso stated he has seen a variety of heights and it is all about the foundation design and the structural capacity. He believes it is a well tried-and-true practice and there are a lot of models like this in the area. Mr. Anzalone asked what the heights of the other towers in the area are and Consultant Musso stated the Arden Tower is about 120', Maher Lane is about 150' and Cemetery of Highlands is about 150'. These are all rough numbers but he is sure they are taller than 110'.

Mr. Gerver asked that the hinge point be explained. Consultant Musso stated the Village Code requires a fall zone and setbacks in case a wind gust causes the tower to topple. The hinge point provides for a preferential weakness (fail point) in the tower which would dictate the side of the fall zone the tower would fall.

Engineer Lindsay stated he has reviewed the site plan and provided a four page memo to the Board. He noted with similar applications the Board had provisions to provide some indemnity to the Village and posting of signage to alert those parking near or in the fall zone. He noted the compound will block an existing gravel path to an existing storage tank. A response was received from the Fire Department stating they have no concerns. The Village Code desires co-location so there are not poles all over but if there are issues there should be an emergency contact number so it is clear who should be contacted, which could be made as a condition in the resolution. The site is adjacent to a Federal wetland and the applicant has applied for the required local permit. They note that they are limiting any disturbance to the adjacent area to satisfy the requirements and the Board will need to approve the permit as part of their approvals.

Attorney Golden stated he will include the indemnification and the signage as noted by Engineer Lindsay as well as the need for an emergency contact in the resolution. He will also note that space needs to be available for the EMS and tree removal dates consistent with Fish and Wildlife Services letter. He noted the Orange County referral has not been received yet so action cannot be taken until they report back.

Mr. Gerver then asked the public if they have comments on this application.

Vincent Costello (Estrada Road) stated he owns property adjacent to the site and he has a lot of questions. He does not understand why the other alternative properties looked at were deemed not suitable. His cellular phone has a full signal and he does not believe there is a need for the tower, adding he feels it will have a negative impact on the whole neighborhood. The area is a residential neighborhood and the tower will decrease the value of his property by 20% and reduce the number of potential buyers by 80%. He tried to do a market analysis for a comparison but could not find another tower that was approved to be erected in a residential area. He noted he will do whatever he can to appeal this if the Board approves it. Consultant Musso stated the Code requires an alternative site analysis and the applicant did look at eight other sites. This site chosen is not technically in a residential zone even though there are residents nearby. He is also looking at alternative sites but nothing has been found. There are a lot of things to balance what the Planning Board will need to consider and he has heard testimony of differing opinions about towers effects on property values. Mr. Gerver stated there are visual renderings of how the tower will look if/when erected.

Bernadette Mulvey (Florance Drive) asked if the pole can be increased higher than the requested 110' after erected and finished and Consultant Musso stated the FCC has standards for rulings

that favor the carrier. There are substantial changes the FCC can permit which could allow 20' but it cannot just happen overnight. The Village has a process that needs to be followed with the Building Department and he feels the aesthetics discussed by the Planning Board recognize this. Mrs. Mulvey asked where the other eight locations that were looked into were located and Mr. Gerver stated the information is available on the village website or with the Building Department. Mrs. Mulvey stated she is a realtor and when a potential buyer sees a tower they walk away from the home. Mr. Anzalone stated an application was received for an extension to the Arden Tower a few years back for an additional 15'. Consultant Musso agreed and stated it was approved but that was for a different type of tower. Mr. Anzalone asked, regarding the propane tank, if it is one that could be seen from the road for the existing building on the site and Consultant Musso stated this will be for a new one that will just be for the tower and will hold 120 gallons. Mrs. Mulvey asked if the propane tank currently on the site will also be maintained by Homeland and Consultant Musso stated it would not. Mrs. Mulvey asked how much of the property will be used for this tower and Consultant Musso said 2220 sf (34' x 76') at the rear of the property and it will be located between the existing building and the NYS Thruway.

Elke Rittger (Florance Drive) asked what date the balloon test was performed and Consultant Musso stated he believes it was on April 29. Mrs. Rittger stated there would have been significant foliage on the area trees at that time which would obscure the tower and asked if another balloon test would be done when there is less foliage. Consultant Musso stated the Village Code requires a single ballot test and an attempt was done to be sure it was conducted prior to full foliage but weather conditions cause delays (wind gusts). He noted Saratoga Associates did prepare virtual simulations showing the tower in other seasons. Mrs. Rittger stated if the structure is designed to blend in by looking like a tree she feels it will stick out in the winter. Consultant Musso stated there is a dense set of trees at the location, some of which are pine. The height of this tower does not cause it to be above the tree line so he believes it will blend in. Mrs. Rittger asked how much money the property owner is receiving for permitting the tower on their property and Mr. Gerver stated that information does not need to be provided as part of the application. Mrs. Rittger asked if the roots will be removed with the two trees that were previously discussed and Consultant Musso stated yes and explained there are underground utilities that lead into this compound and the tower will sit in the middle in a secured area. He noted there will be no storm water runoff issues and that the applicant will be planting five new trees to replace the two that are being removed which he believes are spruce. Mrs. Rittger stated spruce trees have a shallower root structure and she has concerns about that. Consultant Musso stated there will be a maintenance plan which will address the upkeep of the tower and ground base area which can include the landscaping so that it is continually addressed. Mrs. Rittger stated she has Verizon as her carrier and she has excellent coverage and does not believe this is warranted in a residential area that does not have a deficit in service. She tried to research as much information as she could about health concerns that come with a 5G tower but that information is scant. Of the few articles she found there is merit about the concerns of living in close proximity to a tower of this nature, noting an issue in Syracuse. She asked if the Board has looked into this aspect of the application. Consultant Musso stated Verizon will be operating at its current frequencies and 5G is not part of this application. If there are any changes to their frequencies they will need to appear before the Board again. He noted the issue in Syracuse is a deployment of small cells that sit on top of telephone poles, which is something that could come to Woodbury in future but not what this application is for. Mrs. Rittger asked if the frequencies have been tested to see how they affect pets and wildlife and Consultant Musso stated there are 300,000 - 400,000 cellular towers erected across the United States and no issues have been reported. He noted there is a big debate about health effects but he is not aware of anything out there containing specifics. Mrs. Rittger stated she feels it is because this technology is fairly new so there are no long term studies that address health effects. She asked what the contingency plan is and how is the public health issue addressed if there shows to be an issue. Consultant Musso stated the

frequencies being proposed with this application are not new and have been around for decades. Information is always asked to be provided by the applicant regarding the effect to health. Mrs. Rittger stated she understands the effects of one tower are addressed but what about the effects of several towers all at once and Consultant Musso stated the results address that. Attorney Golden noted a Planning Board cannot legal deny an application for a cellular tower based on the concern of health due to Federal law and regulations provided it falls within the normal parameters. Mrs. Rittger asked if the compound will be secured so no children can access it and Consultant Musso stated it will be fenced with motion detection lighting and vegetation planted. The fence will be locked at all times and only the owner will have access. Mrs. Rittger asked if there will be security cameras installed and Attorney Golden stated no.

Ann McGuinness (Estrada Road) stated she has concerns about the waves that will be coming off the tower and the types of business that is being conducted at the existing building on the site. She noted this is primarily a residential area and this building is the only business there. She noted there are certain things she is required to follow at her business, which is in a mixed use zone. She wants to be sure the Planning Board is doing their due diligence. Mr. Gerver stated the Board has written consent from the property owner and the application has been reviewed by counsel.

With no further comments, a motion was offered by Mr. Gerver, seconded by Mr. Anzalone, to close the public hearing. Written comments on this application will be accepted until noon on October 11, 2019.

ADOPTED AYES 5 Gerver, Anzalone, Buglino, Capriglione, Cataggio
 NOES 0

Attorney Golden asked if the Board would like this issue on the agenda for the next meeting and Mr. Gerver stated that would depend if the GML referral is received since action cannot be taken until it is or thirty days have lapsed. Attorney Golden then stated, regarding the Part 2 of the EAF, the Board needs to review and decide what action to take. The Board then reviewed the document page by page and obtained input/comments/explanations from Attorney Golden and Engineer Lindsay.

Motion was then offered by Mr. Gerver, seconded by Mr. Buglino, to declare a negative declaration.

ADOPTED AYES 5 Gerver, Anzalone, Buglino, Capriglione, Cataggio
 NOES 0

Vincent Costello asked how the residents in the area will be notified of the written comment period and Attorney Golden stated by watching the video. Mr. Costello asked if a mailing will be done addressing it and Attorney Golden stated no. Mr. Gerver explained public hearings are usually closed but due to additional documents being submitted the Board decided to allow for a written comment period.

8:49PM - Gai Yi - Review and discuss revised site plan for Bed and Breakfast to be located within an existing single family home. Said property is located in the R1A Zoning District at 38 Buena Vista Terrace and is known on the Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 227, Block 6, Lot 4.1 and 4.2.

Jason Pitingaro, President of Pitingaro & Doetsch, stated he has appeared before the Board for his client a number of times with this application for a five-bedroom Bed & Breakfast. He has submitted revised plans and there is no site work being done with this application and no changes since the last meeting. The plans presented this meeting show the landscaping as recommended by the Board's consultants and approved by his client.

Engineer Lindsay stated there will be no outdoor amenities included as part of the Bed & Breakfast use (there is a pool on site but there will be a sign posted that states guests are not permitted to use the pool). There are five guest bedrooms in the building and one bedroom for the owner since the Village Code requires Bed & Breakfast to be owner occupied. The resolution will make that

abundantly clear and enforceable by the Building Department. The applicant has revised the plans to show an existing central sewer connection and updated the EAF accordingly and he recommends compliance with the Water/Sewer Administrator be a condition of the action taken by the Board. The applicant has revised the plans to show the existing public community water supply system and have advised a sprinkler system is not required and the existing water service is adequate to meet the domestic demands of the proposed use. He recommends the Board's action require an adequate source be provided meeting all Code requirements and the requirements of the Water/Sewer Administrator. All ingress and egress will be through an existing driveway which will have a circular pattern in a clockwise direction and the applicant has revised the plans to show directional arrows and signage. He feels the driveway is of adequate width (10') but if congestion becomes a problem the Building Inspector has recommended a special permit requirement for widening (or a bump out). Regarding lighting, the applicant has advised existing flood lighting is present at the corners of the building which should provide sufficient lighting for guests. He recommends the typical standards limiting lighting levels to 0.1 footcandles at property lines with no off-site glare. A sign detail has been added to the plan indicating the house number. The applicant advises this is to be mounted on a gated entrance. No further review is required as long as the sign falls under the restrictions included in the Village Code for exempt signs (Section 310-30.E). An existing fence is shown bordering the northern and eastern edges of the property and it encroaches onto the adjacent lot and into the road right-of-way. The fence is existing and there is no change proposed. The Board does have the authority to approve encroachments and he does not believe the encroachment is part of this action and if required can be relocated at any time in the future under existing site conditions. He recommends the Board also discuss this with counsel to confirm you are not approving any encroachments.

Mrs. Capriglione asked if the lights are motion censored and Mr. Pitingaro stated not at this time. Mrs. Capriglione asked if they should be and Engineer Lindsay stated he does not recommend them to be in a residential area due to wildlife setting them off at all hours. He noted the Board can request they be put on a timer so they turn off at a reasonable time as to not to disturb any neighbors. Mr. Pitingaro stated this is a secluded area and lighting would have no effect on the neighbors. Attorney Golden asked what was the intent of the Board regarding the lights and Mrs. Capriglione stated she is concerned the parking area will be too dark. Mr. Pitingaro stated the lights are at the property line so he does not know how that would help the parking area. Mrs. Capriglione stated she is concerned about the safety of those that are in the lot when it is dark. She doesn't think the lights need to be on all night but something should be in the parking area. Engineer Lindsay stated the Board can require that minimal safety lighting be in the parking area and Attorney Golden suggest it be added to the plans. Mr. Pitingaro stated he does not feel that additional lights are necessary and Attorney Golden stated the Board feels that they are. Engineer Lindsay added that details should be noted that the lights would remain on as well. Mrs. Capriglione stated she is confused about the traffic pattern and signage and Mr. Pitingaro stated there was a typo and it should be noted the circulation will be clockwise. Engineer Lindsay stated he feels one sign is adequate and if more is need it can be addressed by the Building Department. Mrs. Capriglione stated there is still an error in the EAF as it states the application includes more than one lot. Mr. Pitingaro stated he will submit an amendment and he was told to clearly note the date of the amendment.

Mr. Anzalone asked how many full baths are in the building and Mr. Pitingaro stated there are three existing with no plans to add any additional. He noted there is no laundry to be done there and guests will not be living there full-time.

Mr. Gerver asked if the next step would be to schedule the public hearing and Attorney Golden stated yes. Attorney Golden stated he will also prepare a condition for the resolution that proof of residency is required showing that the owner is actually living at the site (driver's license or voter registration). He will also include times for serving breakfast and the GML local determination. Mr.

Gerver asked if the proof of owner occupancy will be required annually and Attorney Golden stated yes. Mr. Pitingaro requested the hearing be scheduled for November 6.

Motion was then offered by Mr. Gerver, seconded by Mr. Anzalone, to schedule a public hearing for this application to be held on November 6, 2019.

ADOPTED AYES 5 Gerver, Anzalone, Buglino, Capriglione, Cataggio
 NOES 0

9:06PM - Andruszkiewicz/CVPM - Review and discuss proposed amended site plan to permit personal service use in existing structure (old TD Bank Building). Said property is located at 252-260 Route 32 in Central Valley and is known on the Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 230, Block 7, Lot 17, 18 and 19.

Steven Esposito stated this application is to amend the previously approved site plan that this project received in July 2018. The amendment is to add personal uses to the schedule of uses that was approved. When the project was first approved, the applicant indicated the TD Bank building would be for either retail or office space. There is a prospective tenant that would like to have a childrens indoor playground there. There is also a lot of interest in the other locations for a nail salon, beauty salon or barber. The application also includes an additional 360 sf in the mezzanine of the TD Bank building which will require an additional two parking spaces. The building code would permit a maximum capacity in this location to be 49 people and there is no anticipation that there would be that many people there at one time. The hours of operation would be 10AM-6PM (peak being 3PM-6M) six or seven days per week and there will be three full-time staff members. Children will not be dropped off as the requirement is for the parent or guardian to be present.

Mr. Anzalone asked if there would be party events at this venue and Mr. Esposito stated there could be but no food will be prepared at this location. Engineer Lindsay asked how many children at one time would be on-premises and Alicja Andruszkiewicz stated there would be about 20-25 children at one time and each child will have a parent/guardian with them (siblings only one parent/guardian required). She is planning to have enrollment via a website so once capacity is reached it cannot be exceeded. Attorney Golden stated the expected impact per person per hour is important as it will affect the other uses that are already permitted there. This information is needed so the Board can analyze it to make their decision. Mrs. Andruszkiewicz stated the maximum would be 25 children. Mrs. Esposito stated the building code has a maximum of 49 at one time that the CO can be issued for. Regarding parking he believes the past studies conducted can be utilized since the other proposed uses would peak prior to 2PM. Engineer Lindsay stated the Code calls for fourteen parking spaces and if the proposal is to have 20-25 children, with parents, and three full-time staff members, then an updated analysis should be conducted of the time issue. He feels this updated analysis would provide a comfort level to the Board and then some discussion could be held. Mr. Esposito stated that could be provided. Mr. Gerver asked if there is a tenant and Mr. Esposito stated not yet. Mr. Anzalone asked what the age group aim would be and Mrs. Andruszkiewicz stated two - eight years of age. Mr. Gerver stated he is concerned about the parking spaces and overlapping peak times since it is unknown what other entities will be in the location. Mr. Esposito explained how the parking has been analyzed based on the proposed uses. In the updated analysis parking will be identified by the needs of the uses. Engineer Lindsay stated he believes it was established that a restaurant will be at this site and it would have a higher need for parking. He believes Mr. Gerver's concerns are well founded but he also believes the previous discussions held on this issue addressed the size of the restaurant being such that the parking would be adequate.

Engineer Lindsay noted the applicant has also requested a modest field change to the site plan - drainage to be connected to a pipe and a ramp for an ADA path to the front of the building. He noted it could be a field change but since there is an application for a use addition these changes could be included in this application. Mr. Esposito stated the applicant would like to have an additional catch

basin with roof leaders and also stairs with a ramp due the inch differential from the sidewalk to the entrances as part of the 10' transition to the building. Engineer Lindsay stated all of these items will need to be drawn on the site plan including the roof leaders. Mr. Buglino asked how many steps are being requested and Mr. Esposito stated three sets. Mr. Buglino asked if the front access to the units were ADA accessible and he was told only the back entrances were since that is where the parking is located. Mr. Buglino stated he feels the front entrances should be ADA accessible as well. He suggested the sidewalk sloop instead of steps and Mr. Esposito stated the Site Engineer looked into the possibility of a reasonable slope and it was deemed not possible due to space. Engineer Lindsay agreed that a straight sloop could not be done at this location as it would not meet regulations. Mr. Gerver stated he is having a hard time visualizing what is being requested. Gerald Casesa, the builder, stated he spoke with the Building Department and Inspector Thomasberger agreed there are not enough feet available to make an ADA ramp in compliance. It was also noted the building is only 52' deep which is within the code requirement of 75' distance to travel from the parking lot to the building.

Mr. Gerver stated there are two different things being discussed now and Engineer Lindsay stated he would speak to the Building Department about the steps and other items. Regarding the new use request to amend the site plan, a hearing will be required. Since documentation still needs to be submitted the hearing cannot be held at the next meeting. Mr. Casesa asked if two separate applications should be submitted and Engineer Lindsay stated he did not think that was necessary.

Motion was then offered by Mr. Gerver, seconded by Mrs. Capriglione, to schedule a public hearing to be held on November 6, 2019.

ADOPTED AYES 5 Gerver, Anzalone, Buglino, Capriglione, Cataggio
 NOES 0

Engineer Lindsay stated the additional documents will need to be submitted by October 23, 2019. Attorney Golden stated previously a negative declaration under SEQRA was issued for this project. He noted the Board can either declare it again now or have him prepare an amended negative declaration. Mr. Gerver asked that an amendment be prepared.

6. Adjournment:

With no further business to discuss, a motion was offered by Mr. Gerver, seconded by Mr. Buglino, to close the meeting at 9:40PM.

ADOPTED AYES 5 Gerver, Anzalone, Buglino, Capriglione, Cataggio
 NOES 0

Respectfully submitted,
Desiree Potvin, Village Clerk