

**Village of Cornwall on Hudson
Planning Board
Tuesday, December 17, 2013- 7:00 p.m.**

Present Were:

Lee Murphy
Jeffrey Small- chairperson
Vishwa Chaudry
MaryAnn O'Dell
Wynn Klosky

Also Present:

Andrew Fetherston- PB/Village Engineer
Richard Hoyt- Planning Board Attorney

OLD BUSINESS

Storm King School- Mountain Road- Informal Board Discussion of proposed future improvements contained in their master plan

Charles Frankel-Attorney for Storm King School – Showed revised plans and went over the site plan application.

The Village Engineer will email his comments for distribution. This information can also be found in the file. He also stated that he will be more than happy to meet with the applicant to go over the plans. At the meeting, the Village Engineer requested that new plans for the sewage collection and treatment improvements include utility plans, profiles and details of the proposed sewers and the disposition of any existing sanitary disposal systems to be abandoned or removed. The phasing of these improvements should be provided to show how the improvements will be performed on this campus.

The applicant's engineer should confirm the need to provide a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as required by the Village and the NYSDEC.

Mr. Rajeev Raina- Project engineer from Langan Engineering- stated that the treatment plant is needed to meet NYS standards. They have to meet the proper standards to minimize the sources of INI. There will need to be relocations and reconstructions of some of the pipes. Permits to discharge into the streams are already on hand. The permits do need to be modified in which the school is applying for. The plan is for 20,000 gallons per day. Currently the permits are for 16,000 to 18,000 gallons per day. The flows need to be measured daily to meet the DEC standards. The permit modification is the first step of the plan. Once the modification is received there is a public comment period once that happens then the modification is allowed to move forward. The DEC will need to be notified under SEQR as well.

Mr. Hoyt stated that under SEQR the board needs to know about the basics of the entire project even if not seeking approval for the entire project at this time. In certain cases, segmentation is allowed provided the lead agency makes certain findings.

Mr. Small stated that the timeline is very tight for this project. There is a lot to talk about, but thinks separating out the sewer treatment plant to meet that deadline is probably best.

Mr. Frankel stated that Phase One of the project will run parallel with the sewer treatment plant. The school is looking to have these renovations done over the summer.

There was a conversation regarding screening needed to protect the neighbors on the sides of the treatment plant from any noise and odors. Members of the Board stressed that the screening should be substantial. Mr. Small suggested that the landscape plan be reviewed by an independent landscape architect engaged by the board. Mr. Fetherston states that his firm's landscape architect could do that review.

There was a conversation about the new entrance. Members of the Board felt that this was a very important aspect of the plan and were concerned about the traffic and safety impacts of the proposed new entrance, especially if cars were to back up onto 9W.

Access for emergency vehicles is a concern as well and the school has advised that there will be adequate access.

There was conversation regarding not moving the maintenance shed and changing parking.

Mr. Murphy asked what happens if the school can't treat the amount of water needed per day. The Project Engineer explained that there are flow trains to bypass any problems with a back up system. The engineer stated that you can also get temporary pumper trucks in an emergency.

Mr. Chaudhry asked if there could be verbiage in the plan to put measures in place incase the system goes down. The architect for the project stated there are several tests that these plants go through before putting the system in. Language will be added to the SOP for the school as to what needs to be done in case of a failure.

There was a conversation regarding the buildings and stairways.

Mr. Hoyt suggested having a regular meeting in January, and not hold a public information meeting until all the issues are ironed out and the Board has their arms wrapped around the project. It would not be beneficial to the Public to have questions up in the air.

Mr. Murphy stated that the applicant should pour all their resources into this to have the full project details as it is needed.

Mr. Small stated that public outreach should be a part of this process. Neighbors will likely have concerns that the board hasn't even thought of. The project team therefore may want to have the public information session early on, to benefit from public input.

Mr. Hoyt stated that the Public will need to be told that there may be other hearings for the other phases.

Mr. Hoyt stated that part 1 of the EAF needs to be circulated in order to declare lead agency. He went over the list of 9 Agencies needing notification, which needs to be done by December 21, 2013. Some of the agencies are being notified just as a courtesy. There was a lengthy conversation regarding the EAF. The applicant filled out part of part 2 which will be pulled off as that is for later on to be filled out by the Board.

A motion was made by member Murphy, and seconded by member Klosky to declare the Planning Board's intent to seek lead agency under SEQR and all voted in favor.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

W & B Reality- Hudson & Church St

Dominic Cordisco, Attorney for the applicant, explained that the applicant acquired the lot on Church Street and applied to the Zoning Board accidentally. However, he now realizes that was an error and is coming before the board informally to discuss the plans.

Mr. Small and Mr. Murphy had gone to see the site with the applicant to discuss this application. Mr. Small stated that it was risky to purchase an extra parcel without prior approvals and it doesn't seem this is a great place for a house.

Mr. Cordisco stated that a front yard setback variance is needed. That was the nature of the premature application. The lot as shown is actually conforming.

Mr. Small asked if there was adequate street frontage as it is a private road. After some discussion it was confirmed that required street frontage must be along a public road.

Mr. Hoyt stated that the subdivision regulations contain the applicable rules and that regardless of the action of the ZBA, the Planning Board may have to decide on a waiver request. Mr Hoyt suggested that the applicant review the subdivision regulations.

Mr. Cordisco went over the history of this project and its changes since the first approvals were given. The applicants feel this is an improvement. The house would be Cape Cod style with dormers and a porch on the front. The Applicant has not yet finalized square footages, but it will likely be less than 2,000 square feet.

Mr. Murphy stated that when Mr. Small and he met with the applicant, it was agreed that this could be a cottage type home. It was also agreed that the area would be around 1,200 square feet.

The Planning Board awaits a formal application from the applicant.

Mr. Whalen stated they are just talking right now and this isn't set in stone.

Mr. Small stated that the landscaping and buffer is very important. It will need to be very well designed.

The new application would be for access to the 4 lots along with the new 5th home.

With no further business before the board, the meeting was adjourned with a motion and a second. All voted in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristen Boyle
Recording Secretary