

## Planning Board Minutes November 9, 2015

---

A meeting of the Planning Board, Town of Yorktown, was held on November 9, 2015, at the Yorktown Town Hall Board Room, 363 Underhill Avenue, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598. The Chair, Richard Fon, opened the meeting at 7:00 pm with the following members present:

John Flynn  
John Savoca  
Darlene Rivera  
John Kincart

Also present were: John Tegeder, Director of Planning; Robyn Steinberg, Town Planner; Tom D'Agostino, Assistant Planner; Bruce Barber, Town Environmental Consultant; Anna Georgiou, Planning Board Counsel; and Lisa Hochman, Special Counsel to the Planning Board for the Costco application.

**Courtesy of the Floor:** Tegeder addressed the Board regarding the Staples Middle Building parking. As approved there was going to be a parking island to the south of the existing Dunkin Donuts building. As shown on two drawings submitted by engineer John Meyer Consulting, the truck would be able to enter the parking lot and back up to the loading area, however exiting would require a movement over the proposed parking island. The applicant has requested to change the island to a striped area. The light pole can be relocated further to the east in the same parking row. The plantings proposed for the island will be relocated on the site. The Planning Board accepted the minor change to the plan. The Planning Department will write a memo to the Building Inspector.

**Minutes – October 19, 2015:** Kincart pointed out that on page 1, the second vote taken regarding the executive session was to close the session.

**Upon motion by Rivera, seconded by Savoca, and with all those present voting aye, the Board approved the October 19, 2015 minutes with the change as shown on the chair's copy.**

**2016 Meeting Schedule:** The Planning Board reviewed and accepted the 2016 meeting schedule.

### REGULAR SESSION

#### **Mongero Properties, LLC**

**SBL: 37.14-1-44**

#### **Site Plan Reapproval**

Location: Saw Mill River Road

Contact: Al Capellini

Description: Applicant in seeking reapproval of a site plan due to a second one-year time extension expiration on October 29, 2015.

The project attorney Al Capellini was present. Capellini informed the Board of the necessity to lower the fiber optic cable that crossed the proposed property entrance. In addition, the applicant does not currently have a tenant for the proposed building. Therefore the applicant is requesting the site plan be reapproved at this time.

**Upon a motion by Rivera, seconded by Kincart, the Planning Board reapproved the Mongero Properties Site Plan.**

## Planning Board Minutes November 9, 2015

---

### **Fieldstone Manor**

**SBL: 15.11-1-17**

#### **2nd 90-day Time Extension**

Location: Lexington Avenue

Contact: Al Capellini

Description: Applicant is seeking a second 90-day time extension for a 21-lot cluster subdivision on 22.94 acres in the R1-20 zone that received Preliminary Subdivision Approval by Res 14-02 on February 10, 2014.

The project attorney Al Capellini was present. Capellini stated this project has received Board of Health and approval of a NYSDEC wetland permit. The applicant has submitted to staff all of the documents required for final approval. These documents must be reviewed with staff therefore the applicant has requested a 2<sup>nd</sup> 90 Day Time Extension of the preliminary subdivision approval.

**Upon a motion by Flynn, seconded by Rivera, the Board approved a 2<sup>nd</sup> 90 Day Time Extension for the Fieldstone Manor Preliminary Subdivision approval.**

### **Bonsignore**

**SBL: 36.05-2-57**

#### **Public Hearing**

Location: 2483 Hunterbrook Road

Contact: Site Design Consultants

Description: Public Hearing on an application looking to subdivide existing 3.422 acre lot with an existing 2-story dwelling into 3-lots with 2 1/2 story dwellings.

The project attorney, Al Capellini; project engineer, Joseph Riina; project wetland consultant, Bruce Donahue; and the applicant Brian Bonsignore were present. Capellini stated the application is for a subdivision into three lots where one residence already exists. Two new homes will be built. The two proposed new homes are on lots that meet all of the zoning requirements. This application requires a wetlands permit for construction of a driveway to access Lot 2. Both new driveways will meet the Fire Inspector's requirements.

Riina described the land being subdivided. The driveway for Lot 2 is within the wetland buffer. There is approximately 8,900 sf total disturbance in the buffer and 3,200 sf impervious area in the buffer proposed. Mitigation for this disturbance will be presented by Bruce Donahue. The applicant is required to mitigate 100% of the runoff from the property. The applicant is proposing to retain even more runoff in an effort to help any existing runoff issues in the area. Both proposed homes will be connected to public water and public sewer. Riina asked the Fire Inspector about the memo regarding the driveway. Riina clarified that the Inspector was referring to accessing Lot 2, not Lot 3. Also Riina checked the drainage along the roadway and found a large pipe that was blocked and needs maintenance.

Fon asked about the Planning Board's request to study a shared driveway among the three lots and with the neighbor. Riina described the several alternative plans that included shared driveways. The neighbor was not interested in sharing a driveway or removing his existing driveway across Lot 1. Riina stated the alternative plans revealed that there was no significant change in the amount of

## Planning Board Minutes November 9, 2015

---

disturbance on these plans. In addition, increasing the slope of the driveway on Lot 2 did not significantly change the amount of disturbance required to construct the driveway.

Donahue stated that he had delineated the wetland and analyzed its function using the Hollands-Magee method. The mitigation being proposed is to first remove all the invasive species from the controlled area using a cut and swab method with Rodeo, as aquatic herbicide. This is most effective when done in the Fall and can be repeated the next year if required. Donahue proposes small native shrub plantings to replace the invasives. The plan also proposes planting a row of trees and shrubs along the frontage of Hunterbrook Road and up the driveway on Lot 2 to recreate a woods edge effect. A conservation easement is proposed over the controlled area to further protect the area from being used as a lawn by future homeowners. The row of trees is to be planted behind the stone wall and Donahue chose a cousin of a native tree because it exhibits an upright growth and should not interfere with the power lines.

Flynn asked if given the proximity of this wetland to the reservoir, how much Rodeo will be necessary to use. Donahue stated that only a few gallons would be used on a wetland this size and the use of Rodeo results in no water use restrictions.

Tegeder stated that the wetland boundary must be confirmed by the Town's wetland consultant. Riina stated that the permit was applied for and the fees were paid so this should move forward.

Helena Rodriguez – 2464 Hunterbrook Road

Rodriguez expressed concern for the construction already underway to the west of the proposed site. A lot of runoff is coming towards her driveway. Also concerned about the drainage pipe Riina mentioned being blocked. Rodriguez does not think this pipe is connected across the street anymore since the Town installed the sewer. This wetland goes to Quarry Brook, then Hunterbrook. Rodriguez thanked the Highway Department for adding a lip to her driveway to try to divert water away from her home.

**Upon a motion by Kincart, seconded by Rivera, the Board voted to adjourn the Public Hearing.**

### **Hanover Corner Inc.**

**SBL: 37.18-2-78**

#### **Public Hearing**

Location: 1803 Commerce Street

Contact: Site Design Consultants

Description: Public Hearing for a site plan application in which the property owner is proposing on-site parking to accommodate the existing two-story building.

Project attorney, Al Capellini, and project engineer, Joseph Riina were present. This property is located in the old urban renewal area and therefore had different parking requirements. The existing two upper floor apartments have been completely renovated. This project is on the same site as the former Fertucci Site Plan approval. This proposal is different from that plan because it does not remove any buildings and provides an additional site access.

Riina stated the main building is approximately 1,900 sf footprint and garage is approximately an additional 400 sf. The proposed plan is to provide parking for the existing building. In the C-2R zone, there must be 13 parking spaces for the office space and two apartments. The existing driveway will be

## Planning Board Minutes November 9, 2015

---

a one-way in access. The three parking spaces in the front along this access will remain. Twelve additional parking spaces are proposed. A new main two-way access is proposed at the end of the new parking lot.

There is currently no garbage enclosure on the site. A garbage enclosure is proposed and the truck turning plan shows the three movements it will require for the truck to exit the site after picking up the trash. This will be in the early morning hours so the parking spaces should not all be filled.

The applicant will cut down the slope on the south corner of the site to provide site distance at the new main access. The cut area will be approximately 8 feet back from the street and be prepared to enable extension of the sidewalk in the future.

Subsurface infiltration is proposed under the proposed parking lot. Once a SEQR determination is made by the Board, the applicant can make a formal application to the NYCDEP.

Flynn asked if any zoning variances were required for the site. Riina stated there was not.

**Upon a motion by Kincart, seconded by Rivera, the Planning Board closed the Hanover Corner Public Hearing.**

### **Ryder Subdivision**

**SBL: 48.6-1-12**

#### **Public Informational Hearing**

Location: 532 Underhill Avenue

Contact: Ciarcia Engineering

Description: A Public Informational Hearing on an application proposing to subdivide a parcel with an existing residence into 2 building lots.

Project engineer, Dan Ciarcia, and applicant, Andrew Ryder, were present. The property is over 6 acres in size, extending from Underhill Avenue up to French Hill. The proposed development is along Underhill Avenue. The applicant has worked with the Board and this plan disturbs the least amount of area in the wetland and wetland buffer. There is a common drive that serves both homes. Each lot has a sewage disposal area proposed in the front and in the rear of the lots. The Health Department has witnessed the test holes.

Michael Beakes – Darby Street

Beakes asked what the depth of the planned developed area was in feet. Ciarcia stated it was approximately 300 feet, which leaves approximately 600 feet from the development to the homes on French Hill and Darby.

Marty Costello - 535 Underhill Avenue

Costello asked what the proposed size of the homes was. Costello was concerned about runoff and crossover pipe in Underhill Avenue. He asked about the two septic areas.

Ciarcia stated that the Board of Health requires a primary septic area and an expansion area should the primary area fail. A gravity septic system is preferred so the front yard areas would be used now and the rear yard areas used if expansion is necessary. The site is in the watershed and is held to high

## Planning Board Minutes November 9, 2015

---

standards for stormwater runoff by the NYCDEP for both water quantity and water quality. The plan proposes modest colonials with footprints approximately 2,400 sf in size.

**Upon a motion by Savoca, and seconded by Flynn, the Planning Board closed the Public Informational Hearing.**

### **Stonegate Town Houses**

**SBL: 16.10-2-64**

#### **Discussion Resolution**

Location: 1121 Stonegate Road

Contact: Robert Marshal

Description: Review of the rear setback requirements.

Tegeder explained that this project is in front of the Planning Board because the Stonegate development was approved using the town's flexibility standards and the Planning Board reduced the side yard setback from 10 feet to 0 feet. At that time decks were considered part of the main building so there was no setback issue. Since then, changes to the town code now consider decks as accessory structures and therefore subject to the 10 foot side yard setback. At a previous work session, the Board discussed the issue and wanted to review the entire development as a whole and not just the one building permit application for a deck. The Board had discussed setting a setback of 3 to 4 feet for accessory structures.

**Upon a motion my Rivera, seconded by Savoca, the Planning Board approved a 3'-0" inches setback for accessory structures in the Stonegate Town House development.**

### **Costco Wholesale Warehouse**

**SBL: 26.18-1-17, 18, 19 & 26.19-1-1**

#### **Discussion Resolution**

Location: 3200 Crompond Road

Contact: TRC Engineers

Description: Application to construct a 151,092 square feet Costco Wholesale Club store and member only gasoline filling station.

Planning Board Special Counsel Lisa Hochman representing the Planning Board for this application. Nick Panayotou and Tom Holmes from TRC Engineers, Al Capellini, project attorney, Bob Rosenberg of Breslin Realty, and Michael Bogin, counsel from Sive, Paget & Riesel.

Flynn gave the rest of the Board members a copy of an email regarding the installation of solar panels that he sent to the Director of Planning at the end of October.

Flynn referenced the ABACA memo dated October 14, 2015 which discusses the type of light fixtures to be used on the site. Tom Holmes stated that TRC submitted a memo dated October 21, 2015 stating that the ABACA recommended all light fixtures on the site be the same and the applicant agreed. Hochman stated that under requirement #1 on page 13 of the resolution, the submission of the light fixture specs can be added.

## Planning Board Minutes November 9, 2015

---

Flynn summarized his email regarding solar panels in which he expressed that he did not understand the applicant's response to the issue of not wanting to install solar panels. The applicant not being able to tell what the incentive plans will be at the time of construction does not seem to make any sense. Flynn asked Tegeder to contact New York State to find out what the available programs are. Tegeder spoke to NYSERDA was given information regarding a single program that incentivizes commercial projects. It is based on zones. The incentive ranges from 50 – 80 cents per watt. The information on the available incentives was easy to find. The only programs ending in 2016 are some Federal tax credits, which are mostly for residential projects. Flynn therefore does not see why the applicant has stated that they do not want to install solar panels because they do not know what the incentive programs will be.

Capellini stated that installation of solar panels has never been a part of this application. Flynn clarified that he just wants to have a clear reason why Costco does not want to install solar panels. Kincart stated that from his view, Costco is not installing solar panels because it isn't cost effective for them at this time. Fon recapped that the applicant just needed to clarify their original memo on solar panels and we have received a new memo from the Costco company. The building is being constructed to accept solar panels in the future. Savoca added that the proposed resolution includes all the green technologies the applicant will be using on this project on pages 10 and 11.

Fon asked the applicant for their comments on the resolution. Bogin stated the applicant has some comments on the timing of some elements within the resolution. The requirement that no site work shall commence until endorsement. This concerns the applicant because the applicant most likely would like to obtain a demolition permit as soon as possible. The proposed change to the 5<sup>th</sup> Resolved statement on page 12 is: "RESOLVED, that no site work (except for demolition of structures up to but not including slabs) shall commence prior to Endorsement." The Planning Board was okay with demolition occurring sooner. Tegeder stated staff has been open minded on this issue, we would like to include that a demolition plan be required to be submitted. Barber, stated that not only leaving slabs, but also that there is no disturbance greater than 5,000 sf be allowed on the demotion plan. The Planning Board accepted the applicant's proposed language change including Barber's addition. To carry this change forward to the terms & conditions section, a section titled "Prior to Demolition of structures to (but not including) slabs, the following shall be completed:" was added before the Prior to Endorsement conditions. This new section requires submission of a demolition permit and plan.

Bogin: Under the Prior to Endorsement section, the applicant would propose to move items now listed as numbers 2-5 into a separate section that would now read: "Prior to removal of hazardous material (other than as part of demolition activities) pursuant to HC-1, Existing Hazardous Conditions Plan, the following shall be completed:". The Planning Board agreed to move #2-5 to the new section proposed by Bogin. Tegeder clarified then that prior to endorsement the applicant will demolish the buildings and remove the hazardous materials.

Capellini requested Tegeder define the term endorsement for the public. Tegeder stated that after the approval and all the conditions are met, the site plans are signed. The signing of the plans is the endorsement. Hochman stated that her interpretation is that the town code states to the extent there are additional conditions that these items be enumerated tonight, these items can be required prior to endorsement. More specificity about what is going to happen between the vote and the signing of the plans.

Bogin then proposed the Prior to Endorsement section consist of items #1 and #6, but only including the fees that are known, which are the ABACA Review Fee and the General Development Fee.



## Planning Board Minutes November 9, 2015

---

Tegeder stated that typically for hazardous waste removal an erosion control bond will need to be in place. Bogin stated that is why he would suggest the erosion control and performance bond be moved to the prior to removal of hazardous waste.

Hochman and Tegeder explained that the use and occupancy permit must be obtained or the site plan must be amended. If that is added as a condition, Tegeder is okay with moving that requirement further down the list. Bogin stated the applicant agrees that if the use and occupancy permit is not obtained or is materially different from the approved site plan, as determined by the Planning Department, the applicant must return to the Planning Board.

Bogin proposed the prior to building permit section be subtitled, "Prior to insurance of a building permit (other than for demolition of structures or remedial activities), the following shall be completed:" and the items under this section would begin with:

- The Applicant shall obtain a Use and Occupancy Permit from the NYSDOT, which permit shall ensure that Applicant will maintain all landscaping to be planted within the NYSDOT right-of-way.
- Applicant shall submit the following as per Town requirements in the form of separate checks made payable to the Town of Yorktown:
  - Construction Inspection Fee [Amount TBD]
  - Five (5) Year Wetland planting Bond [Amount TBD]
  - Wetland Inspection Fee [Amount TBD]
- Bogin requested the glycol refrigeration system requirement be edited to mirror Costco's consent decree with the US EPA. The Planning Board decided to leave the requirement as is and add, "or as approved by the US EPA."

On page 14, #13, requiring submission of the NYSDEC Notice of Intent must move up to prior to hazardous waste section.

On page 13, #8, Bogin requested changing the requirement to read: "Except as otherwise noted above, except for transportation-related improvements and signage from the NYSDOT and inclusion in the Peekskill Sanitary Sewer District, all Necessary Permits shall be secured prior to the issuance of a building permit." Tegeder did not understand why these permits should not be obtained before a building permit is issued and in addition, stated that the Building Inspector cannot issue a building permit without a Board of Health approval for either a septic or sewer system. The applicant withdrew the proposed change.

On page 14, #11, the attached document was in the Draft EIS as Appendix B4.

On page 5, in sub i, add the word "plan" to read: stormwater pollution prevention plan permit. In sub iii change the word "connection" to "extension" to read "Sanitary sewer extension to include..."

On page 11, correct the spelling of Boulevard in #4 second bullet. Also on page 11, in the last sentence of #1, correct the spelling of the word fluorescent.

Panayotou: On page 9, add the second NYSDOT letter dated 10/02/15 to the reports received.

Bogin: On page 14, #20, insert "between April 1 and September 30". Also change "Coordinator" to "Consultant."

## Planning Board Minutes November 9, 2015

---

Bogin: On page 17, substitute “concentrations of particulate matter” for the word “pollutants”. Barber suggested there are other pollutants besides the particulates. The other pollutants are attached to the particulates. Substitute “concentrations of pollutants of concern identified in the Environmental... on a biweekly basis.” It is required for the pollutants to be identified and measured.

Hochman stated that the wetlands chapter 178 requires the Board to make specific findings. Those specific finding have been lifted from the Town Code and added them as a Resolved. This will be inserted at the beginning of the resolves. Also added a Resolved that this application is approved subject to the requirements of Chapters 178, 195, 200, 248, and 270. Hochman added a reference to Section 195-39(C) to the endorsement resolved clause. Finally Hochman suggested adding a requirement from the tree ordinance. The language suggested about cutting trees during construction is already a requirement of the town code, therefore the Planning Board agreed not to add this language to the resolution.

The Planning Board agreed to leave the use & occupancy permit requirement in the prior to building permit section.

Fon asked the Board if it was ready to approve the resolution as edited this evening.

**Kincart made a motion to approve the resolution as amended. Fon called for a roll call vote which resulted as follows:**

<b>John Kincart</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>John Savoca</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>John Flynn</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Darlene Rivera</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Rich Fon</b>	<b>aye</b>

**Resolution adopted.**

**Upon a motion by Rivera, and seconded by Savoca, the Board closed the Regular Session.**

### WORK SESSION

**PEG Realty Corporation**

**SBL: 16.08-1-2 & 5.19-7-2**

**Discussion Approved Site Plan**

Location: 3699 Hill Boulevard

Contact: Architectural Visions

Description: Approved site plan granted by resolution number 14-11, dated August 11, 2014.

Project architect Joel Greenberg was present. Greenberg stated that the applicant is requesting the Board change the curbing along the street from concrete to asphalt since the rest of the street has asphalt curbs. An email from the Highway Superintendent indicates he is okay with this change. The interior of the site will still be concrete. The Board was okay with changing the curbing along the street be all asphalt. The Planning Department will write a memo to the Building Inspector.



## Planning Board Minutes November 9, 2015

---

### **Marathon Development Group**

**SBL: 37.18-2-51**

#### **Discussion Site Plan**

Location: 322 Kear Street

Contact: Site Design Consultants

Description: A three story commercial/residential building with associated parking and walks.

Project attorney, Al Capellini, project engineer, Joseph Riina, and applicant Mark Beida were present. Riina presented additional alternative plans moving the building into the front yard setback. The first plan shows 34 spaces with 5 land banked (29 spaces built) and a gated connection to the Food Emporium site. The second plan centers the building and provides one way access around the building. A setup area for fire apparatus is shown on the east side of the building. This area would be grass pavers, which adds additional green space to the site. There are 28 parking spaces shown on this plan. The applicant still requests the Planning Board reduce the required parking by 25% reduction.

Riina stated that during the meeting with staff, the Fire Inspector questioned if street parking could be eliminated because Kear Street is tight. Riina stated that he investigated this and the double yellow line just needs to be adjusted from the center of the road to allow for the parking.

Tegeder recommended the Board focus on the height of the proposed building. This analysis will give the Board a better idea of how tall the building will be in relation to the adjacent buildings and also help the Board to determine if the section of code regarding main building line (Town Code Section 300-13(H)) can be used for establishing the front yard or if a variance would be required. The Board requested the applicant present a visual analysis of what the building will look like within the streetscape.

The Planning Board preferred the second alternative plan showing access around the building. The pavers for the fire access adding more green space was also beneficial. Several members were still not sure if the building was too big for the site.

### **Crown Delta**

**SBL: 48.07-2-2 & 48.11-1-49**

#### **Discussion Proposed Lot Line Adjustment**

Location: 1550 Front Street

Contact: Anthony Konopka

Description: Approved site plan granted by resolution number 05-16, dated July 18, 2005.

Dan Ciarcia was present with the applicants for the JCPC Holding application, John & Patty Cerbone. Crown Delta would like the lot line changed to retain ownership of their parking spaces when they sell the second parcel to the Cerbones. Crown Delta wants assurance that conveying the property does not affect Crown Delta's site plan approval. The Planning Department and Georgiou will review the site plan approval. The Planning Board had no issue with the lot line adjustment.

### **Brookside Village Subdivision**

**SBL: 37.11-1-20&21**

#### **Discussion Approved Subdivision**

Location: Landmark Court

Contact: Sharon Kamhi

## Planning Board Minutes November 9, 2015

---

Description: Request for approval of a Stormwater Permit and a Wetland Permit to build remaining homes within the Brookside Village Subdivision.

Project developer, Sharon Kamhi, was present. Tegeder explained that the subdivision only 2 of the 8 approved homes had been built before the developer was caught in the sewer moratorium. The project did have a wetland permit that was approved with the subdivision however, regulations have changed and therefore a stormwater, wetland, and tree permit is now required to complete the construction. Barber stated that he did inspect the site and believes the wetland is still the edge of the stream. Some fill and debris needs to be removed from the conservation easement. The Board added this requirement to the draft resolution.

**Upon a motion by Savoca, seconded by Rivera, and with all those present voting aye, the Board opened a special session.**

**Upon a motion by Savoca, seconded by Rivera, and with all those present voting aye, the Board approved a resolution approving Permit #FSWPPP-WP-T-087-15 as edited by the Board.**

**Upon a motion by Rivera, seconded by Kincart, and with all those present voting aye, the Board closed special session.**

### **Crompond Terraces**

**SBL: 26.18-1-9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16**

#### **Discussion Site Plan**

Location: 3258 Old Crompond Road

Contact: Ciarcia Engineers

Description: The Applicant has petitioned the Town to rezone 6 parcels to multi-family residential (R-3) and commercial (C-2R) from single family residential (R1-20). The Town of Yorktown wishes to consider 2 additional adjacent parcels in the rezoning action that the Applicant does not control, for a total of 8 parcels, encompassing a total area of 23.61 acres. The Applicant is requesting rezoning for the purpose of developing up to 80 residential townhouse units, 16 affordable rental apartments, a 12,000 square foot multi-purpose recreational facility, up to 45,000 square feet of office space and up to 32,000 square feet of small scale retail space.

Project engineer, Dan Ciarcia, Ann Cutignola of Tim Miller Associates, Richard DeAndrea from Maser Consulting, Ann Kutter from Red Tape Rescuers, were present.

The Board requested paper copies of the expanded EAF that they previously received on CD. Cutignola summarized the plan for the proposed development. The conceptual site plan includes the potential for development of up to 80 town houses, up to 16 affordable apartments, up to 32,000 sf of small scale retail space, and up to 45,000 sf office space. The plan is modeled after the hamlet plan that town staff put together. The new information is the full and expanded EAF looking at the maximum impact. A full complete SEQR review of the site plan would occur by the Planning Board during the site plan approval process.

Georgiou asked Cutignola to discuss segmentation as it applies to the proposed rezoning. Cutignola stated the rezone action was not segmentation because the plan is based on the town's concept plan, it is the town's request to rezone this area of town as supported in the Comprehensive Plan, and there are multiple property owners. Tegeder recommended segmentation be addressed in the Town Board's record and the Town Board should make a finding in their resolution that this action is permissible segmentation.

## Planning Board Minutes November 9, 2015

---

Cutignola overviewed the economic benefits of hamlet development including taxes, construction job creation, and permanent job creation. A commercial real estate market analysis performed for the entire Town of Yorktown. This analysis showed that the vacant store fronts are mostly within properties where space is leased, not for sale. The analysis showed that office space that is “for sale” is 91% filled. The issue with vacancies is with for rent properties; specifically with lease requirements that are too high.

The town homes are proposed as a condominium, instead of fee simple ownership, in order to keep the project more market rate.

Alternatives included in the expanded EAF are: no action, C-2 vs. C-2R, RSP zone, R1-20 single-family, and industrial.

DeAndrea stated the expanded EAF includes a traffic study. R1-20 zone yields approximately 40-50 new trips. The proposed concept plan yields approximately 100-200 trips. The study included all proposed development in the area and identified many improvements that can be done over time to mitigate traffic impact. DeAndrea reviewed the improvements shown on Figure 7-3 in the expanded EAF.

Tegeder asked if the traffic light at Old Crompond is necessary. DeAndrea stated that there would likely be a desire to add this signal if all the developments shown in the Bear Mountain Triangle occurs. The intersection would meet the warrants. The State Land site was also included in the study even though that is unknown.

The applicant is looking for the Planning Board to send a memo to the Town Board stating that development of a hamlet is the right use for this area and complies with the Comprehensive Plan.

Tegeder stated there is language in the Comprehensive Plan that supports this hamlet development. The Board could request the Town Board leave the written comment period open so the Planning Board could write a memo after the next work session.

The Board was concerned that the Comprehensive Plan does support mixed use development in the Bear Mountain Triangle, however the concept plans seem to show too dense of a development for the site.

The Planning Department will provide the Board more information to either write a memo or ask for more time.

### **Bridle Ridge – (Cancelled)**

#### **Discussion Subdivision**

Contact: Planning Department

Description: Accessory uses in the side and rear yards.

**Upon a motion by Kincart, seconded by Savoca, and with all those present voting aye, the Board voted to close the meeting at 11:30 pm.**