

TOWN OF WARWICK PLANNING BOARD

July 1, 2015

Members present: Chairman, Benjamin Astorino
Roger Showalter, Vice-Chairman
Dennis McConnell, Beau Kennedy,
Christine Little, John MacDonald, Alternate
Laura Barca, HDR Engineering
J. Theodore Fink, Greenplan
John Bollenbach, Planning Board Attorney
Connie Sardo, Planning Board Secretary

The regular meeting of the Town of Warwick Planning Board was held Wednesday, July 1, 2015 at the Town Hall, 132 Kings Highway, Warwick, New York. Chairman, Benjamin Astorino called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC HEARING OF Cove Point Marina

Application for Site Plan Approval and Special Use Permit for the construction and use of a restaurant and marina reopening of existing facilities formally known as “The Castle”, located within “A Designated Protection Area” of Greenwood Lake, situated on tax parcel S 76 B 1 L 33.12, 105, & 116; project located on the northern side of Forest Avenue 0 feet north of Lake View Place (13 Castle Court), in the SM zone, of the Town of Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York.

Representing the Applicant: Robert Pereira, Steve Ostromogilsky, Applicants. Stuart Strow, Engineer.

Connie Sardo: Mr. Chairman, we just received the certified mailing for the Cove Point Marina public hearing.

Mr. Astorino: Thank you.

The following review comments submitted by HDR:

1. Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.
2. Applicant to discuss project.
3. Conservation Board comments: 03/05/14 urges proper review of septic, potential stormwater runoff into lake, and overall community impacts
4. Architectural Review Board comments: pending
5. OC Planning Department: 02/08/14 two advisory comments: parking in the ROW and use of lawn/grass care chemicals near the lake; maybe use a low maintenance ground cover
6. TW Building Department: Applicant has an open permit for commercial renovations.
7. The Planning Board to determine if additional screening is necessary for areas where parking is proposed and other properties in close proximity to the property.
8. Applicant to submit letter to Town Assessor to combine the three parcels into one parcel so building, septic system, and parking are located on the same lot.
9. Applicant to clarify the location of the 12” drainage pipe with regard to the property line.

10. Trash enclosure should be turned so that it aligns better with the truck movements that are shown.
11. Applicant to clarify if the boat launch will ever be utilized.
12. Applicant to clarify if the stockade fence detail (Sheet 5) is the proposed fence enclosure shown on Sheet 1.
13. Lighting fixture details have been added (Sheet 3), although no photometrics have been provided.
14. Applicant to demonstrate proposed overhead sign complies with Town of Warwick Signage Code.
15. The mounting height for the handicapped signage must be included in the detail on Sheet 5.
16. The water supply system will require review and approval by Orange County Department of Health.
17. The septic system will require review and approval by Orange County Department of Health.
18. Modify the note on Sheet 1: Existing septic tanks to be removed to state Existing septic tanks and piping to be removed in accordance with NYSDOH requirements.
19. A note should be added to the plan stating that at no time shall there be more than 90 patrons onsite.
20. On Sheet 5, the stockade fence detail should specifically call out appropriate backfill material and the note for the NY State Thruway should be removed.
21. On Sheet 5, the split rail fence should clarify if pressure treated wood is proposed to be used.
22. Applicant to clarify need for the locked gate at the entrance to the parking area; the concern is emergency services.
23. The private road agreements for Castle Court must be submitted to the Planning Board Attorney. The Attorney is currently reviewing the notes on the plan.
24. A copy of the survey, showing any and all easements and/or rights-of-way signed and sealed by the project survey must be included in the plan set.
25. Payment of all fees.

The following comment submitted by the Conservation Board:

Cove Point Marina – None submitted.

The following comment submitted by the ARB:

Cove Point Marina – None submitted.

Comment #1: Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.

Mr. Fink: Under SEQRA, the Planning Board classified this application as a Type 2 Action. No SEQRA review was necessary for this application.

Comment #2: Applicant to discuss project.

Stuart Strow: I am the engineer for the applicant. The parcel is a 1.7-acre parcel. It is located on the northern side of Forest Avenue. It is in the SM zone. The rear of the property abuts Greenwood Lake. The property in its current state includes a building that we use as a restaurant. It also includes a two-family dwelling and a marina. The restaurant has been closed for several years. The applicant wants to re-open the restaurant and operate it as a seasonal business. It would be open from May through September. The applicant and the Board Members are aware of some of the history of this property. The applicant has a commitment to run this as a family oriented business.

They want to run a nice friendly operation that would be a nice inviting and proper member of the community that surrounds it. The restaurant would be open for lunch and dinner services. There would also be occasional special events such as weddings and birthday parties and even potentially outside of the season. The project does include a marina. The marina had a permit from the ACOE. That permit was transferred to the current owners. It is a valid permit. It allows 57 boat slips. The owners want to operate that marina. There would be no daily boat or Jet Ski launches. It would be only the people that have their boats in the slips at the marina that would be allowed to launch their boats from the property. The applicant has invested a lot of time, money and energy in upgrading this property. Some of the upgrades and improvements include completely renovating and refurbishing the restaurant. As far as the site itself, they are rebuilding in its entirety the septic system which is under review and subject to approval by the Orange County Health Department. We feel that we are close to obtaining approval from that at this point. They are also going to more clearly delineate the parking and install curb stops to make it more organized. There will be installation of grass and landscaping. We will be restoring some of the graveled areas that are on the property. The owners had appeared before the Board at several Workshop meetings. Hopefully you understand as I do that they are committed to running a nice business there. They are looking forward to restoring this. They are looking forward to get the business up and running. We are looking to providing a nice facility within the Town and within the smaller Greenwood Lake community. We would be glad to answer any further questions as we go along.

Comment #3: Conservation Board comments: 03/05/14 urges proper review of septic, potential stormwater runoff into lake, and overall community impacts

Mr. Bollenbach: That has been addressed.

Comment #4: Architectural Review Board comments: pending

Comment #5: OC Planning Department: 02/08/14 two advisory comments: parking in the ROW and use of lawn/grass care chemicals near the lake; maybe use a low maintenance ground cover

Mr. Bollenbach: That has also been addressed.

Comment #6: TW Building Department: Applicant has an open permit for commercial renovations.

Mr. Astorino: That has been granted by the Town of Warwick Building Department.

Comment #7: The Planning Board to determine if additional screening is necessary for areas where parking is proposed and other properties in close proximity to the property.

Mr. Astorino: That is something we will see with what happens this evening.

Comment #8: Applicant to submit letter to Town Assessor to combine the three parcels into one parcel so building, septic system, and parking are located on the same lot.

Stuart Strow: The applicant is requesting that to be a condition of the approval.

Comment #9: Applicant to clarify the location of the 12” drainage pipe with regard to the property line.

Stuart Strow: There is an existing 12” drainage pipe that runs along the westerly side of the property line. It has a very slight encroachment into the lot next door. We are not proposing any work involving that pipe. It is to remain in place.

Laura Barca: The reason why I have that comment there is because you will need to provide the actual survey. I believe that the survey doesn't show the full length of the pipe because they don't know exactly where it is.

Mr. Bollenbach: We could do an approximate location.

Laura Barca: Correct.

Stuart Strow: Ok. So you want us to label it as an approximately location.

Laura Barca: Just like the survey.

Stuart Strow: Ok.

Comment #10: Trash enclosure should be turned so that it aligns better with the truck movements that are shown.

Laura Barca: I believe that is there. Is that correct?

Robert Pereira: Yes. That is pre-existing.

Laura Barca: The truck turning shows a vehicle the size of a garden truck could get to it.

Stuart Strow: I could make a slight improvement in the diagram that shows how the truck backed up to it. We could show it at a little straighter angle. There is room to do that.

Laura Barca: Ok. Since we are already talking about the trash enclosure, I believe you are proposing landscaping and/or fencing around it. Is that correct?

Robert Pereira: Yes. Presently there is a 4x4 post around the slab. There is a chain-link fence around it. We are going to change the chain-link fence to be an enclosed fence.

Mr. Fink: You will add landscaping in front of it.

Mr. Astorino: Yes.

Laura Barca: Ok.

Comment #11: Applicant to clarify if the boat launch will ever be utilized.

Mr. Astorino: You said in a statement that would be for the people that are having slips there.

Robert Pereira: Correct.

Mr. Astorino: So it is not going to be a public boat launch.

Robert Pereira: It is private for the marina itself.

Comment #12: Applicant to clarify if the stockade fence detail (Sheet 5) is the proposed fence enclosure shown on Sheet 1.

Stuart Strow: Yes.

Comment #13: Lighting fixture details have been added (Sheet 3), although no photometrics have been provided.

Stuart Strow: We will provide photometric. The lighting fixtures are all building mounted.

Mr. Astorino: Are they all shielded according to the Code?

Stuart Strow: Yes.

Mr. Fink: Regarding lighting, would there be lighting for the sign that you have proposed?

Stuart Strow: I don't think we are proposing a lighting for the sign. There is a street light right at that intersection. That provides adequate lighting for the sign.

Mr. Fink: Ok.

Comment #14: Applicant to demonstrate proposed overhead sign complies with Town of Warwick Signage Code.

Stuart Strow: There was a comment that it was slightly larger. I think the way I measured it, it was around the perimeter of the lettering and not the perimeter of the sign. The perimeter of the sign was slightly larger. We will squeeze the perimeter of the sign to make it comply.

Mr. Astorino: Ok. Just make it comply to the Town Code.

Comment #15: The mounting height for the handicapped signage must be included in the detail on Sheet 5.

Stuart Strow: We will amend that.

Comment #16: The water supply system will require review and approval by Orange County Department of Health.

Stuart Strow: That will be taken care of.

Comment #17: The septic system will require review and approval by Orange County Department of Health.

Stuart Strow: Yes.

Comment #18: Modify the note on Sheet 1: Existing septic tanks to be removed to state Existing septic tanks and piping to be removed in accordance with NYSDOH requirements.

Stuart Strow: We will amend the note.

Comment #19: A note should be added to the plan stating that at no time shall there be more than 90 patrons onsite.

Stuart Strow: We will add the note.

Comment #20: On Sheet 5, the stockade fence detail should specifically call out appropriate backfill material and the note for the NY State Thruway should be removed.

Stuart Strow: We will correct that.

Comment #21: On Sheet 5, the split rail fence should clarify if pressure treated wood is proposed to be used.

Stuart Strow: I will clarify that.

Comment #22: Applicant to clarify need for the locked gate at the entrance to the parking area; the concern is emergency services.

Stuart Strow: We spoke about that at the Work Shop. The applicant talked about having security for that area.

Mr. Astorino: That would be something you would go through with the Emergency Services.

Stuart Strow: Ok.

Comment #23: The private road agreements for Castle Court must be submitted to the Planning Board Attorney. The Attorney is currently reviewing the notes on the plan.

Stuart Strow: Ok.

Comment #24: A copy of the survey, showing any and all easements and/or rights-of-way signed and sealed by the project survey must be included in the plan set.

Stuart Strow: Ok.

Comment #25: Payment of all fees.

Stuart Strow: Ok.

Mr. Astorino: Do any Board Members or Professionals have any comments?

Mr. McConnell: Regarding the rental of the slips, I understand that it won't be for people pulling up with their boats and launching them there. Do you anticipate people leasing the slips for the season? Not even for the shortest month?

Steve Ostromogilsky: If you have space and somebody is renting a house, they might ask if there is a slip. That would be the extent of it.

Mr. McConnell: I am worried about slippage into something that looks like daily.

Steve Ostromogilsky: No. We have no interest in daily. What I am saying is if you have the slip open and someone wants a slip for a month because they are renting a house, then that would be fine.

Mr. McConnell: What would the Board think about making monthly the minimum?

Mr. Astorino: Do you mean adding a note to the plan?

Mr. McConnell: Yes.

Mr. Astorino: That would be a good idea.

Mr. McConnell: Yes.

Steve Ostromogilsky: That would be fine.

Mr. Astorino: I don't have a problem with that. It would make sense for the other business around there. They would know that it wouldn't be a daily type of thing.

Mr. Bollenbach: We could add that note to Note #11.

Mr. Fink: I have a comment on something. We talked at a Workshop meeting about the signage that is shown on the plan is slightly larger than what is permitted. You have listed here 13 feet. It is 12 feet that is allowed by the Code. You will need to downsize that.

Stuart Strow: Yes. We have agreed to do that. We will decrease the size.

Mr. Astorino: Ok. Do any other Board Members or Professionals have any other comments? Before we open the public hearing, we received 2 letters from residents that are addressed to the Planning Board. I will list them for the record. The first letter is from William and Carole Brancato, dated 6/30/15. The letter is stated as follows:

Thank you for presenting this at the public hearing. Unfortunately we had a death in the family and are unable to attend.

The Castle Tavern has a long history of problems and want to make sure they are not repeated.

The new owners started work on this site before having a permit. Work was done on weekends and nights. They were reported and rec'd a stop work order. This alone makes us somewhat concerned about how in compliance will they be. They certainly did not start off, "on the right foot."

There was never talk about a Marina , however it looks like it's a foregone conclusion since the slips are out and being rented. Don't you need to wait for approval before putting slips out? Isn't this what this hearing is for?

Mr. Astorino states that they have ACOE approval already. Laura Barca stated that they also have permits from the Building Department for the work that they are doing on the lake.

Are jet skis going to be allowed? Everyone knows how loud they are when just circling round and round. Does our noise ordinance apply to this?

Mr. Astorino states that he doesn't know what the noise ordinance on Greenwood Lake is for the jet skis. He thinks that would be something that goes through Greenwood Lake. We don't have jurisdiction on Greenwood Lake.

Since the septic is still not approved or functioning, where have the workers been going to the bathroom? There's no visible Port-A-Potty.

Mr. Astorino states that they are using the bathroom facilities in the house as the applicant has told us. There is an approved and functioning septic in the house.

The new owners assured the town this establishment would not be a rowdy bar scenario (loud music, etc) but rather a "classy" restaurant and/or a small wedding venue. IS THIS STILL THE CASE?

Mr. Astorino states yes, it is still the case that it would be a restaurant and/or small wedding venue.

I look forward to the Castle finally being utilized I believe it has tremendous potential but it needs to conform with our town's laws and should be addressed before not after the fact.

Mr. Astorino states that we agree with that also. That is why they are here. Rest assure, they will be addressing the Town Code before any approvals are granted. The applicants are well aware of that.

Thank you once again for reading this,

William & Carole Brancato
PO Box 84
Sterling Forest NY 10979

Mr. Astorino: The second letter is from Emanuele Intorrella, dated 7/1/15 addressed to the Planning Board. The letter is stated as follows:

Attn: Town Of Warwick Planning Board.

I just received a notice for "Cove Point Marina" and their request for site plan approval and special use permits for construction of a restaurant and marina. I am not able to

attend this meeting, so I decided to write this letter to be read at the meeting by a board member.

I live on West Cove Rd. I did want to ask one thing of the board and new owners. The main path to access West Cove road is via the Cove Point Marina parking area. You can note our street sign above the rock in the picture below. Years ago, there used to be railroad ties and a sign for our community. I believe at the time it was called Broadview acres. I always speculated the idea of another name, something like "The West Cove". Either way, There used to be railroad ties and a sign there on the left side near that sign and behind it. I would estimate about 8 feet wide from the sign and to the left of it if I were to guess. The previous owner, a few years ago, removed the old railroad ties, and the area that the sign used to be, and the sign I believe and added a cement slab for a dumpster, those wooden railroad ties, and placed a dumpster area there.

I mention this because it's a terrible look and feel at the entrance of our community to greet visitors with a dumpster, that was often overloaded and had Vultures sitting on it often, picking at the garbage.

I was hoping the new owner would be kind enough to re-landscape that entrance and make it look like a nice neighborhood entrance, that perhaps one day, we can add a sign again.

That is my only request. I am happy a new restaurant is coming and I look forward to spending time there with my family. I would like to reiterate that we are happy that the new owners are reopening the business, welcome them, and I wish them the best of luck with your new business.

Emanuele Intorrella

Mr. Astorino: Those are the letters that we have. This is a public hearing. If there is anyone in the audience wishing to address the Cove Point Marina application, please rise and state your name for the record.

John Valenta: I live on West Cove Road. My main concern is about runoff from the septic and going down to West Cove Road. If there is some way to re-direct that water even if it is cleaned process water, if there is a way to get it so it doesn't run through the actual septic field.

Mr. Astorino: I believe that has been addressed. I will have Laura explain.

Laura Barca: In order to get the system approved by the Health Department, they put in a curtain drain above the system and dry out the entire field area so that clean water that is coming down is being routed around the system and not through it. They are also putting in a brand new septic system for the restaurant and a separate new smaller system for the two-family house.

Mr. Astorino: Is that the El-Jen system that we are talking about?

Laura Barca: Yes.

John Valenta: That is great.

Steve Ostromogilsky: There will also be catch basins put in. It is not like a blind ditch. There are two massive catch basins.

Laura Barca: Right.

Mr. Astorino: In the parking calculations, Ted, we did add for parking to collect any surface water and put it back in the ground before it goes directly into the lake from the parking area.

Mr. Fink: Right.

John Valenta: It has just been always an ongoing issue not only with the septic the way it was. It was also even with the way the water that comes down from East Shore Road, then it runs through. It's being directed down West Cove Road right now. It is deteriorating the Private Road. I had always envisioned possibly a drainage pit right at the corner for the clean runoff with a pipe underneath. That would be fantastic if you could do something like that.

Steve Ostromogilsky: If you look at the corner, there is a new catch basin over there.

The applicants show Mr. Valenta the site plan and explains where the catch basins are located.

John Valenta: The past couple of heavy rainfalls that we had, I noticed that it still comes out onto West Cove Road as it stands currently.

Mr. Astorino: Laura, maybe we could do a 2x8 trench drain across there before it gets to West Cove Road. Maybe, you could take a look at that.

Laura Barca: Ok.

Mr. Astorino: We could add a note to that effect if the Board agrees with that. That would stop any water about 99% of it as it comes down, it will catch it.

John Valenta: That would be fantastic. Over the years, I had to put my own catch basins in.

Mr. Astorino: That would be something that would deter a lot of the water coming down. It would benefit your property.

John Valenta: That is what I had envisioned. If we could do something like that, that would be great. That would make me happy. Thank you.

Mr. Astorino: Laura, you could look into that. We will add a note to the plans.

Laura Barca: Ok.

Mr. Astorino: Is there anyone else wishing to address the Cove Point Marina application?

Ms. Little: I have a question. Regarding the letter from Mr. Intorrella, the area that he is describing in the picture, is that where the dumpster is located? You will be enclosing that with a fence.

Laura Barca: Yes.

Ms. Little: Ok. So as far as the fencing and landscaping, you are addressing Mr. Intorrella's concerns?

Robert Pereira: Yes.

Steve Ostromogilsky: Yes.

Ms. Little: Ok. Thank you.

Mr. Astorino: Is there anyone else wishing to address the Cove Point Marina application? Let the record show no further public comment.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to close the public hearing.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 5-Ayes.

Mr. Astorino: Laura, we did receive comments from the OCHD. Is that correct?

Laura Barca: Yes.

Mr. Astorino: Did you speak to the OCHD?

Laura Barca: Yes. I read through their comments when I received them. My read of them is that they are more administrative. There is nothing really technical in nature in these comments.

Mr. Astorino: Ok. Do you feel comfortable?

Laura Barca: Yes. Especially after I talked with the Health Department. He agreed with the same.

Mr. Astorino: Ok. Do any Board members have any questions with that? I think it makes sense. Do we want to add a comment about that trench drain?

Mr. Bollenbach: Yes. I have a few revisions here. Comment #7 regarding the additional screening. Let's add to the end of that. Provide supplemental screening to the Town Planner's specifications.

Mr. Astorino: Ok.

Mr. Bollenbach: Regarding Comment #9 that discusses the location of the 12" drainage pipe. We will add to that, provide supplemental drainage to the Planning Board Engineer's specification.

Mr. Astorino: Ok.

Mr. Bollenbach: Regarding Comment #11 that discusses the boat launch. We will add to that. Add monthly minimum slip rental map note.

Mr. Astorino: Ok.

Mr. McConnell: I would like to make a suggestion to the Planning Board's Engineer. To the extent that you had a conversation clarifying points on this letter from the OCHD. I would suggest the clarifications that you are received the understandings that you had arrived at with the OCHD that it should be added to this as an addendum to say that on such a day you had a conversation regarding this matter.

Mr. Astorino: I agree. We will get another clarification from the County.

Mr. McConnell: Ok.

Mr. Astorino: Just to let the Board know, before the maps are signed there will be an actual approval.

Laura Barca: There will be a Town permit that I have to approve with the Building Department.

Mr. Bollenbach: That would be Comment #16 and #17 where that permit would have to be in place.

Mr. McConnell: John, I don't think that the fact that the OCHD issues the permit necessarily addresses those understandings that were arrived at in a telephone call. That is why I would like to see a memorialization of the telephone call and the points that were addressed. That way when we have the permit, we could compare it to what the conversation was. This way we would have it on the record of what went on.

Laura Barca: Right.

Mr. Astorino: I agree. We need to add another comment regarding the 3 year Landscape Bond and Inspection Fee.

Mr. Bollenbach: Yes.

Mr. Kennedy makes a motion on the Cove Point Marina application, granting Site Plan Approval and Special Use Permit for the construction and use of a restaurant and marina reopening of existing facilities formally known as "The Castle", located within "A Designated Protection Area: of Greenwood Lake, situated on tax parcel S 76 B 1 L 33.12, 105, & 116; project located on the northern side of Forest Avenue 0 feet north of Lake View Place (13 Castle Court), in the SM zone, of the Town of Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York. Approval is granted subject to the following conditions:

1. The Planning Board to determine if additional screening is necessary for areas where parking is proposed and other properties in close proximity to the property. Provide supplemental screening to Town Planner specifications.
2. Applicant to submit letter to Town Assessor to combine the three parcels into one parcel so building, septic system, and parking are located on the same lot.
3. Applicant to clarify the location of the 12" drainage pipe with regard to the property line. Provide supplemental drainage to Planning Board Engineer's specifications.

4. Trash enclosure should be turned so that it aligns better with the truck movements that are shown.
5. Applicant to clarify if the boat launch will ever be utilized. Add monthly minimum boat slip rental map note.
6. Applicant to clarify if the stockade fence detail (Sheet 5) is the proposed fence enclosure shown on Sheet 1.
7. Lighting fixture details have been added (Sheet 3), although no photometrics have been provided.
8. Applicant to demonstrate proposed overhead sign complies with Town of Warwick Signage Code.
9. The mounting height for the handicapped signage must be included in the detail on Sheet 5.
10. The water supply system will require review and approval by Orange County Department of Health.
11. The septic system will require review and approval by Orange County Department of Health. Reference HDR Letter of Understanding dated 7/1/15.
12. Modify the note on Sheet 1: Existing septic tanks to be removed to state Existing septic tanks and piping to be removed in accordance with NYSDOH requirements.
13. A note should be added to the plan stating that at no time shall there be more than 90 patrons onsite.
14. On Sheet 5, the stockade fence detail should specifically call out appropriate backfill material and the note for the NY State Thruway should be removed.
15. On Sheet 5, the split rail fence should clarify if pressure treated wood is proposed to be used.
16. Applicant to clarify need for the locked gate at the entrance to the parking area; the concern is emergency services.
17. The private road agreements for Castle Court must be submitted to the Planning Board Attorney. The Attorney is currently reviewing the notes on the plan.
18. A copy of the survey, showing any and all easements and/or rights-of-way signed and sealed by the project survey must be included in the plan set.
19. Payment of all fees.
20. Provide 3-Year Landscape Maintenance Bond and Inspection Fee.

Seconded by Mr. McConnell. Motion carried; 5-Ayes.

Robert Pereira: Thank you.

Steve Ostromogilsky: Thank you.

Stuart Strow: Thank you.

Review of Submitted Maps:***George Brunjes***

Application for Site Plan Approval for the construction and use of a bridge and single-family residence located within a “Designated Protection Area” of Longhouse Creek, situated on tax parcel S 65 B 1 L 15.11; project located on the northern side of Buttermilk Falls Road (18 Buttermilk Falls Road), in the MT zone, of the Town of Warwick.

Representing the applicant: Dave Getz, Lehman & Getz Engineering. George Brunjes, Applicant.

The following review comments submitted by HDR:

1. Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.
2. Applicant to discuss project.
3. Conservation Board – pending comments
4. Architectural Review Board – pending comments
5. OC Planning Department – pending submittal
6. Building Department – 06/10/15 no violations
7. NYSDEC – approval required for bridge installation
8. USACE – approval may be required for bridge installation
9. A ZBA variance is required for access to a private road (Buttermilk Falls Road).
10. Planning Board to determine if they would like a site inspection.
11. A note shall be added to the plan stating that the plan will be in compliance with lighting §164-43.3.
12. The deed for the property must be submitted.
13. On the Agricultural Data Statement form, applicant must respond to Question 4: Is there a farm within 500-ft.
14. A note must be added to Sheet 1 stating that if the slope of the driveway exceeds 10%, then the driveway must be paved in its entirety.
15. Applicant to clarify location of house on the hill, instead of at a lower elevation.
Applicant to clarify if house location was selected based on a Dam Safety Plan for the existing dam located within Long House Creek.
16. Cross-sections of the driveway at critical points shall be provided.
17. Pull-offs to be provided along the driveway for emergency purposes.
18. The FEMA floodplain should be shown on the drawing.
19. Applicant to reconfigure driveway so that it is not located within the 100-ft designated protection area.
20. Applicant to clarify the extent of the drainage area that flows into the back of the proposed house and the proposed driveway. A map shall be provided of the entire drainage area.
21. Applicant to provide means to protect the house from sheet-flow stormwater from higher on the hill.
22. Applicant to provide means to protect the driveway from sheet-flow stormwater from higher on the hill.
23. Applicant to clarify how to prevent erosion of neighbor’s property from the stormwater that will be routed around the driveway.

24. The declaration information for the Ridgeline Overlay must be added to the plans.
25. Proper language shall be added for a use and maintenance agreement for the private road (Buttermilk Falls Road).
26. Surveyor to certify that iron rods have been set at all property corners.
27. Payment of all fees.

The following comment submitted by the Conservation Board:

George Brunjes – None submitted.

The following comment submitted by the ARB:

George Brunjes – None submitted.

Comment #1: Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.

Mr. Fink: The applicant has submitted a short EAF. It is an Unlisted Action. There are 2 other agencies involved. They are the NYSDEC & ZBA. My suggestion to the Board is to do an Intent to be Lead Agency. We will send it to the DEC to get comments from them. It would also relieve the DEC from having to do its own separate SEQRA review process. There would only be one SEQRA review that would have to be undertaken for the application. I have prepared a Draft Resolution for the Board's consideration for the Intent to be Lead Agency.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion for the Intent to be Lead Agency.

Seconded by Ms. Little. The following Resolution was carried 5-Ayes.

617.6

State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR)

Resolution Establishing Intent to be Lead Agency

Unlisted Action Undergoing Coordinated Review

Name of Action: Brunjes Dwelling and Bridge

Whereas, the Town of Warwick Planning Board is in receipt of a Site Plan application by George Brunjes for a ± 16.3 acre parcel of land located at 18 Buttermilk Falls Road, Town of Warwick, Orange County, New York; and

Whereas, an Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) dated June 3, 2015 was submitted at the time of application; and

Whereas, after comparing the thresholds contained in 6 NYCRR 617.4 and 5, the Planning Board has determined that the proposed project is an Unlisted action ; and

Whereas, the Planning Board has determined that the proposed project is not within an agricultural district and, therefore, the requirements of 6 NYCRR 617.6(a)(6) do not apply ; and

Whereas, after examining the EAF, the Planning Board has determined that there are other involved and/or federal agencies on this matter including the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and Town Zoning Board of Appeals.

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Planning Board hereby declares its intent to be Lead Agency for the review of this action; and

Be It Further Resolved, that the Planning Board hereby authorizes its Chairman to circulate the attached lead agency coordination request letter(s) to all other involved agencies and to discharge any other SEQR responsibilities as are required by 6 NYCRR 617 in this regard; and

Be It Further Resolved, that unless an objection to the Planning Board assuming lead agency status is received within thirty (30) days of the date of mailing the EAF, the Planning Board will become lead agency for the review of this action.

Comment #2: Applicant to discuss project.

Dave Getz: Mr. Brunjes lives at the property that is adjacent to this site at 16 Buttermilk Falls Road. The property that we are here for is a long flag lot that extends up to Cascade Road. It is accessed by Buttermilk Falls Road. They want to construct a driveway and house that is proposed on the lot. It crosses the Longhouse Creek which is a Designated Protection Area. The plan is to proposed a driveway bridge across the creek and a driveway up to the house location where Mr. Brunjes has been planning for many years to put a house.

Comment #3: Conservation Board – pending comments

Comment #4: Architectural Review Board – pending comments

Comment #5: OC Planning Department – pending submittal

Comment #6: Building Department – 06/10/15 no violations

Comment #7: NYSDEC – approval required for bridge installation

Comment #8: USACE – approval may be required for bridge installation

Comment #9: A ZBA variance is required for access to a private road (Buttermilk Falls Road).

Dave Getz: We request from the Planning Board a Positive Recommendation to the ZBA.

Mr. McConnell: This lot was created how many years ago?

George Brunjes: The year 1975.

Mr. McConnell: I have no problems with giving him a Positive Recommendation to the ZBA.

Mr. Astorino: I don't have a problem with it either. Is the Board in consensus of giving a Positive Recommendation to the ZBA?

Mr. Kennedy: Yes.

Mr. Showalter: Yes.

Ms. Little: Yes.

Comment #10: Planning Board to determine if they would like a site inspection.

Mr. Astorino: We will set up a date and let you know.

Comment #11: A note shall be added to the plan stating that the plan will be in compliance with lighting §164-43.3.

Dave Getz: No problem.

Comment #12: The deed for the property must be submitted.

Dave Getz: Yes.

Comment #13: On the Agricultural Data Statement form, applicant must respond to Question 4: Is there a farm within 500-ft.

Dave Getz: There are none. We will correct that.

Comment #14: A note must be added to Sheet 1 stating that if the slope of the driveway exceeds 10%, then the driveway must be paved in its entirety.

Dave Getz: Ok.

Comment #15: Applicant to clarify location of house on the hill, instead of at a lower elevation. Applicant to clarify if house location was selected based on a Dam Safety Plan for the existing dam located within Long House Creek.

Dave Getz: The location is really based on Mr. Brunjes knowledge of the property and the most desirable spot.

Laura Barca: We will probably see that at the site inspection.

Dave Getz: In terms of scheduling a site inspection. Mr. Brunjes will be going away until sometime in August.

George Brunjes: I will going away around August 18th or 19th. I could come back.

Dave Getz: What would be the best way to set this up? Should I go through Connie?

Mr. Astorino: You could do that through Connie.

Connie Sardo: Just send me an email when you come back. Then we could set something up.

George Brunjes: Ok.

Dave Getz: Ok.

Comment #16: Cross-sections of the driveway at critical points shall be provided.

Dave Getz: Will do.

Comment #17: Pull-offs to be provided along the driveway for emergency purposes.

Dave Getz: Ok.

Comment #18: The FEMA floodplain should be shown on the drawing.

Dave Getz: We will add that.

Comment #19: Applicant to reconfigure driveway so that it is not located within the 100-ft designated protection area.

Dave Getz: Once we cross, we should stay out of that.

Laura Barca: We will see that at the site visit.

Comment #20: Applicant to clarify the extent of the drainage area that flows into the back of the proposed house and the proposed driveway. A map shall be provided of the entire drainage area.

Dave Getz: Ok.

Comment #21: Applicant to provide means to protect the house from sheet-flow stormwater from higher on the hill.

Dave Getz: Ok.

Comment #22: Applicant to provide means to protect the driveway from sheet-flow stormwater from higher on the hill.

Dave Getz: Ok.

Comment #23: Applicant to clarify how to prevent erosion of neighbor's property from the stormwater that will be routed around the driveway.

Dave Getz: Ok.

Comment #24: The declaration information for the Ridgeline Overlay must be added to the plans.

Dave Getz: Ok.

Comment #25: Proper language shall be added for a use and maintenance agreement for the private road (Buttermilk Falls Road).

Laura Barca: I think we have some. I have a file on my desk. I will take a look at that.

Dave Getz: Ok.

Mr. Showalter: That side of Buttermilk Falls Road in the last 25 years has gone through some major improvements. That entrance is almost as good as one our Town Roads.

Dave Getz: Yes.

Comment #26: Surveyor to certify that iron rods have been set at all property corners.

Dave Getz: Ok.

Comment #27: Payment of all fees.

Dave Getz: Yes.

Mr. Astorino: Do any Board members or Professionals have any questions? We will give you a Positive Recommendation to the ZBA. You are off to the ZBA.

Dave Getz: We ask if the Board could set us for a public hearing. We understand that we have to wait until after we get back from the ZBA.

Mr. Astorino: I don't see a problem with that.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to set the George Brunjes application for a Public Hearing at the next available agenda.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 5-Ayes.

Dave Getz: Thank you.

George Brunjes: Thank you.

Lands of Korwan

Application for “**Amended**” Final Approval of a proposed 1-Lot subdivision, situated on tax parcel S 63 B 1 L 9.1; parcel located on the western side of Warwick Turnpike 600± feet south of the intersection with Conklin Road (122 Warwick Turnpike), in the MT zone, of the Town of Warwick. Original Final Approval was granted on 6/20/07.

Representing the applicant: Kirk Rother, P.E. Zach Hancock, Potential Purchaser.

The following review comments submitted by HDR:

Comment #1: Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.

Mr. Fink: This application is an amended approval to a previously approved subdivision that was approved in the year 2007. SEQR has been complied. No SEQRA review is necessary for this project.

Comment #2: Applicant to discuss project.

Kirk Rother: As the Board would recall, this was a 2-Lot subdivision located off Warwick Turnpike. Looking at the map, the lot to the right of this property standing on the road looking at it was next to a site that we had done for Ray Carlisle which was a dog kennel. He ended up purchasing that lot. That would leave Lot #1 available. Mr. Hancock and his wife would like to buy that lot. When we did the original design the house and septic was pushed pretty close to the road just for the ease of doing the soil test at the time. The property is approximately 2.6 acres. They would like to move the house further down the hill. Since the property is within the Ridgeline Overlay, we are back before the Board to simply move the house location.

Mr. Astorino: Ok.

Mr. McConnell: Where is this in relation to Carlisle? Is it down the hill?

Mr. Showalter: It is more towards Jersey.

Kirk Rother: It is one lot towards Jersey. This was a 2-lot subdivision. Both lots were approximately the same size. Looking at the map, Carlisle purchased this lot.

Mr. McConnell: Ok. Thank you.

Mr. Astorino: Laura, are all of these comments here from the previously approved plan?

Laura Barca: Yes. At the time, it didn't have the same note for lighting as to what we have now for lighting. There is nothing major.

Mr. Astorino: Ok. That was what I expected.

Comment #3: Conservation Board – pending comments

Comment #4: Architectural Review Board – pending comments

Comment #5: OC Planning Department – pending submittal

Comment #6: Building Department – pending comments

Comment #7: Planning Board to determine if they would like a site inspection.

Mr. Astorino: No. I don't feel it is needed.

Mr. Showalter: I agree.

Comment #8: A note shall be added to the plan stating that the plan will be in compliance with lighting §164-43.3.

Kirk Rother: No problem.

Comment #9: The area of disturbance must be shown on the plan.

Kirk Rother: Will do.

Comment #10: The proposed septic system and well must be shown to be connected to the new house location.

Kirk Rother: Right.

Mr. Bollenbach: Would you be relocating the septic and well or not?

Kirk Rother: Regarding the well, we will not be relocating the well. Regarding the septic, we probably will not be relocating the septic. We will probably just pump to it. It is possible when Mr. Hancock goes for his building permit, we will move it. At that time, we will go through the process with the Building Department.

Comment #11: The previously approved septic system was a gravity system; the new house location will require a revised septic plan with a pump system (assuming that the septic system location does not change).

Kirk Rother: Yes.

Mr. Astorino: That can be done before the issuance of a building permit. Laura, you would have to review that anyway.

Laura Barca: Yes.

Comment #12: A note must be added to Sheet 1 stating that if the slope of the driveway exceeds 10%, then the driveway must be paved in its entirety.

Kirk Rother: I will add the note. Just to make the Board aware, we could grade that at less than 10%.

Comment #13: A driveway profile section shall be provided for the critical location where the grading for the driveway and septic system are very close. Applicant to show the soil testing locations for the septic system on the plan to determine if the septic area can be shifted slightly away from the proposed driveway location.

Kirk Rother: Ok.

Comment #14: Applicant to clarify that emergency vehicles can access property as needed without driving over the septic system.

Kirk Rother: Ok. They can. We will demonstrate that.

Comment #15: Proper erosion control must be added to the plan.

Kirk Rother: Yes.

Comment #16: Applicant to provide a means to protect the house from sheet-flow stormwater from higher elevations.

Kirk Rother: We will add that. We will add a swale around the house.

Comment #17: Provide a map note stating that "No construction or proposed use shall begin until the maps are signed by the Planning Board Chairman and Building Department permits are obtained."

Kirk Rother: Will do.

Comment #18: The shared driveway agreement must be submitted for attorney review.

Kirk Rother: Yes. There isn't one. For some reason graphically on this map, the lot line had shifted about 2 feet. That should be in between the 2 driveways. That is just typical from the County. We had one curb cut. One peels off one way and the other peels off another way. We will correct that on the map.

Comment #19: The declaration information for the Ridgeline Overlay, Agricultural, and Radon Reduction notes must be added to the plans.

Kirk Rother: They are on there. I think Laura just needs a copy of that.

Laura Barca: Right. We just need a note for the file.

Kirk Rother: Ok. That is the recorded document.

Laura Barca: Yes.

Comment #20: Surveyor to certify that iron rods have been set at all property corners and stone cairns have been set at all conservation area corners.

Kirk Rother: The Planning Board has that. We will give you another copy.

Comment #21: Payment of all fees.

Kirk Rother: Yes.

Mr. Astorino: Do any Board members or Professionals have any comments or concerns?

Mr. Bollenbach: Does the applicant request a waiver of the public hearing?

Kirk Rother: Yes.

Mr. Astorino: How does the Board feel?

Mr. McConnell: You are moving the house where you are making it less visible from the road as a result.

Kirk Rother: That is correct. It is away from the road. It is going to be downhill.

Mr. McConnell: Ok. Ted, do you agree with that? Do they need to do any site analysis or anything?

Mr. Fink: They have done that already. They have provided a line-of-sight profile on the map. The house will be at a substantially lower elevation than it was up here.

Mr. McConnell: I am good with it.

Mr. Kennedy makes a motion to waive the public hearing.

Seconded by Ms. Little. Motion carried; 5-Ayes.

Ms. Little makes a motion on the Lands of Korwan application, granting ***“Amended”*** conditional Final Approval for a proposed 1-Lot subdivision, situated on tax parcel S 63 B 1 L 9.1; parcel located on the western side of Warwick Turnpike 600± feet south of the intersection with Conklin Road (122 Warwick Turnpike), in the MT zone, of the Town of Warwick. Original Final Approval was granted on 6/20/07. Approval is granted subject to the following conditions:

1. A note shall be added to the plan stating that the plan will be in compliance with lighting §164-43.3.
2. The area of disturbance must be shown on the plan.
3. The proposed septic system and well must be shown to be connected to the new house location.
4. The previously approved septic system was a gravity system; the new house location will require a revised septic plan with a pump system (assuming that the septic system location does not change).
5. A note must be added to Sheet 1 stating that if the slope of the driveway exceeds 10%, then the driveway must be paved in its entirety.
6. A driveway profile section shall be provided for the critical location where the grading for the driveway and septic system are very close. Applicant to show the soil testing locations for the septic system on the plan to determine if the septic area can be shifted slightly away from the proposed driveway location.

7. Applicant to clarify that emergency vehicles can access property as needed without driving over the septic system.
8. Proper erosion control must be added to the plan.
9. Applicant to provide a means to protect the house from sheet-flow stormwater from higher elevations.
10. Provide a map note stating that “No construction or proposed use shall begin until the maps are signed by the Planning Board Chairman and Building Department permits are obtained.”
11. The shared driveway agreement must be submitted for attorney review.
12. The declaration information for the Ridgeline Overlay, Agricultural, and Radon Reduction notes must be added to the plans.
13. Surveyor to certify that iron rods have been set at all property corners and stone cairns have been set at all conservation area corners.
14. Payment of all fees.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 5-Ayes.

Kirk Rother: Thank you.

Other Considerations:

1. **BCM Development Co.** – Letter from Tony Ciallella, BCM, dated 5/12/15 addressed to the Planning Board in regards to BCM Subdivision – requesting a 6-Month Extension 4th Re-Approval of Final Approval for filing a 42-Lot Subdivision in sections. Section I to consist of a 12-Lot subdivision, situated on tax parcel SBL # 44-1-133; parcel located along the northerly side of Ketchum Road and Pumpkin Hill Road, in the SL zone, of the Town of Warwick. Conditional Final Approval was granted on 9/1/10. *The applicant has stated that due to the continued depressed state of the economy the extension is needed.* The 6-Month Extension on 4th Re-Approval becomes effective on 3/1/15.

Mr. McConnell: John, it seems that I have heard that either it's the ownership of the control or whatever of this property is subject to litigation.

Mr. Bollenbach: Yes. It is.

Mr. McConnell: If that is the case, is it proper for us to grant something like an extension if renting it to someone who perhaps doesn't have control of the property?

Mr. Bollenbach: But perhaps they do. It is undetermined. The applicant has requested an extension.

Mr. McConnell: Would it be appropriate to ask them? You have done this a lot longer than I have.

Mr. Bollenbach: I will give Tony a call to find out what the status is.

Mr. McConnell: Yes. Do you follow my concern about bifurcating the ownership and control and the approvals?

Mr. Bollenbach: Yes. It is really the ownership of the property that is one of the elements. The ownership of the subdivision rights could be another issue where the property could be sold with those subdivision rights or without. I will talk to Tony to find out the status of the litigation.

Mr. McConnell: Ok.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion on the BCM Development application, granting granted a 6-Month Extension on the 4th Re-Approval of Final Approval for filing a 42-Lot subdivision in Sections, Section I to consist of a proposed 12-Lot subdivision. SBL # 44-1-133. Conditional Final Approval was granted on, 9/1/10.

The 6-Month Extension on the 4th Re-Approval of Final Approval becomes effective on, 3/1/15.

Seconded by Ms. Little. Motion carried; 5-Ayes.

2. **Ernhout Lot Line Change** – Letter from Brian Friedler, Lehman & Getz Engineering, dated 5/13/15 addressed to the Planning Board in regards to the Ernhout Lot Line Change – requesting **“Re-Approval”** of Final Approval of a proposed Lot Line Change, situated on tax parcels SBL # 49-1-17.12 & 17.21; parcels located on the eastern side of Covered Bridge Road and Francher Road (101 Covered Bridge Rd & 25 Francher Rd), in the SL zone, of the Town of Warwick. Conditional Final Approval was granted on 4/2/14. *The applicant has stated that they are still in the process of trying to complete the lot line change and finalizing the plans for signature.* The Re-Approval of Final Approval becomes effective on 4/2/15, subject to the conditions of final approval granted on 4/2/14.

Connie Sardo: The final plans are in. I just received them. They are ready to be signed by the Planning Board’s Chairman. The Re-Approval is needed because it is passed their final approval date.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion on the Ernhout Lot Line Change application, granting granted **“Re-Approval”** of Final Approval for a proposed Lot Line Change, situated on tax parcels SBL # 49-1-17.12 & 17.21; parcels located on the eastern side of Covered Bridge Road and Francher Road (101 Covered Bridge Rd & 25 Francher Rd), in the SL zone, of the Town of Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York, subject to the conditions of Final Approval granted on 4/2/14.

Re-Approval of Final Approval becomes effective on 4/2/15.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 5-Ayes.

3. **Masanda-Luft Properties, LLC.** – Letter from William Brown, dated 6/15/15 addressed to the Planning Board in regards to the Luft Subdivision – requesting **(2) 6-Month Extensions** and **7th Re-Approval** of Final Approval of a proposed 22-Lot Cluster subdivision + 2-Affordable Homes, situated on tax parcel SBL # 26-1-6.5; parcel located on the northern side of Newport Bridge Road and at the intersection with Blooms Corners Road, in the RU zone, of the Town of Warwick. Conditional Final Approval was granted on 4/16/08. *Mr. William Brown purchased the Luft property on 8/27/14. He is in the process of putting the Luft property into PDR. In order to do the PDR, the subdivision must be kept active. Mr. Brown is requesting the extensions and re-approval so he could complete the PDR process.* The 1st 6-Month Extension becomes effective on 10/16/14. The 7th Re-Approval of Final Approval becomes effective on 4/16/15, subject to the conditions of final approval granted on 4/16/08. The 2nd 6-Month Extension becomes effective on 10/16/15.

Mr. McConnell: Just to clarify this, when it says in order to do the PDR, do I understand it that the subdivision is the manner in which it is part of the process of determining the value for purposes of the PDR?

Mr. Bollenbach: It is just one of the factors to show development pressure within the area.

Mr. McConnell: Ok.

Mr. Bollenbach: It to show that this property that does have development potential, this is how many lots that had been preliminary approved. This is one of the criteria for Ag & Markets funding.

Mr. McConnell: Ok. I understand. Thank you.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion on the Masanda-Luft Properties, granting granted **(2) 6-Month Extensions** and **7th Re-Approval** of Final Approval of a proposed 22-Lot Cluster subdivision + 2-Affordable Homes, situated on tax parcel SBL # 26-1-6.5; parcel located on the northern side of Newport Bridge Road and at the intersection with Blooms Corners Road, in the RU zone, of the Town of Warwick. Conditional Final Approval was granted on 4/16/08.

The 1st 6-Month Extension becomes effective on 10/16/14. The 7th Re-Approval of Final Approval becomes effective on 4/16/15, subject to the conditions of final approval granted on 4/16/08. The 2nd 6-Month Extension ON 7th Re-Approval of Final Approval becomes effective on 10/16/15.

Seconded by Ms. Little. Motion carried; 5-Ayes.

4. **Fusco Subdivision** – Letter from Dave Higgins, dated 6/29/15 addressed to the Planning Board in regards to the Fusco Subdivision – requesting “**2nd Re-Approval**” of Amended Final Approval for filing a 12-Lot Cluster subdivision in Sections. Section I to consist of a proposed 3-Lot Cluster subdivision, situated on tax parcel SBL # 18-1-31.2; parcel located on the southern side of Taylor Road 900± ft east of Taylor & Jessup Rd in the RU zone. Conditional Amended Final Approval for Section I was granted on 7/17/13. *The Applicant has stated that they are still working on the conditions of the approval such as payment of fees and legal descriptions.* The 2nd Re-Approval becomes effective on 7/17/15.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion on the Fusco Subdivision, granting granted **2nd “Re-Approval”** of Amended Final Approval for filing a 12-Lot Cluster subdivision in sections. Section I to consist of a proposed 3-Lot Cluster subdivision, situated on tax parcel SBL #18-1-31.2; parcel located on the southern side of Taylor Road 900± feet east of the intersection of Taylor Road & Jessup Road, in the RU zone, of the Town of Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York, subject to the conditions of amended final approval granted on 7/17/13. (See attached)

The 2nd Re-Approval of Amended Final Approval for Section I becomes effective on 7/17/15.

Seconded by Ms. Little. Motion carried; 5-Ayes.

5. Planning Board Minutes of 5/6/15 for PB Approval.

Mr. Kennedy makes a motion to Approve the Planning Board Minutes of 5/6/15.

Seconded by Ms. Little. Motion carried; 5-Ayes.

6. The following PB Members still need to earn 5-Hours of Credits for 2015: Beau, Chris & John.

Mr. Astorino: Just a reminder that there are 3 Board members that have to get their credits before the end of the year.

Connie Sardo: There will be the fall courses coming out in October.

7. Planning Board to discuss the 7/6/15 W.S. & 7/15/15 PB Meeting.

Mr. Astorino: Connie, is there a need for it?

Connie Sardo: We have the Kubinec application on. But they are not ready. We are still waiting to hear from OCDPW.

Mr. Astorino: These other ones are not ready yet. Is that correct?

Connie Sardo: Yes.

Ms. Little makes a motion to cancel the 7/6/15 Work Session & 7/15/15 Planning Board Meeting.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 5-Ayes.

Correspondences:

1. Letter from William & Carole Brancato, dated 6/30/15 addressed to the Planning Board regarding the Cove Point Marina application.
2. Letter from Emanuele Intorrella, dated 7/1/15 addressed to the Planning Board regarding the Cove Point Marina application.

Mr. Astorino: I have read those 2 correspondences earlier. We will list them for the record. Connie, do we have any other correspondences?

Connie Sardo: No.

Privilege Of The Floor For Agenda Items!!

Mr. Astorino: If there is anyone in the audience wishing to address any of the agenda items, please rise and state your name for the record. Let the record show no public comment.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to adjourn the July 1, 2015 Planning Board Meeting.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 5-Ayes.