

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
JULY 10, 2006**

Present: Chairman George Rohrman; Boardmembers Dan Armstrong, David Rush, Mike Manteo, Chuck Tessmer, Tom LaPerch; Town Planner Siobhan O’Kane; Town Counsel Tom Jacobellis, Esq.; Secretary Laurie Fricchione. Boardmember Phil Wissel was absent and excused.

**REGULAR SESSION:**

- 1. EEC PLUS, Commerce Park Lot #1, Route 6** – This item was on the agenda for a review of the revised lighting plan. There was no one in the audience at the time it was being discussed. Boardmember Manteo commented that if the motion sensor lighting will be high pressure sodium or mercury vapor lights, they do not come on instantaneously but rather take approximately 5 minutes or so to be fully illuminated, which might be a security concern. The Town Planner’s review letter requested clarity as to the amount of hours these lights will be on as well as the amount of spillage emanating from them.
- 2. QUINN SUBDIVISION & LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT, Turk Hill Road** – This item was on the agenda for a referral to the Town Board for the Establishment of a Performance Bond and was represented by Theresa Ryan of Insite Engineering. The motion was introduced by Boardmember Armstrong, seconded by Boardmember Manteo and passed 6-0 in favor, 1 absent.
- 3. PROSPECT HILL ESTATES II (f/k/a AUGUSTA SUBDIVISION), Prospect Hill Road** – This item was on the agenda for an Intent to Declare Lead Agency for purposes of SEQRA. There was no one in the audience representing it. The resolution for the Intent was introduced by Chairman Rohrman, seconded by Boardmember LaPerch and passed 6-0 in favor, 1 absent.
- 4. STATELINE RETAIL CENTER, Route 6** – This item was on the agenda for a public scoping session regarding what items will be included and discussed, evaluated and analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Theresa Ryan and Jeff Contelmo of Insite Engineering and Chris Robbins from Tim Miller Associates, the firm that will be submitting the DEIS, spoke before the Board. Ms. Ryan started out describing the project particulars. The acreage of this site is 44.7 and is located on Route 6 East situated between it and Interstate 84. The majority of the property contains meadows and woods with Town regulated wetlands and watercourses with associated buffers. The largest [anchor] building is 135,000 square feet with the second, third and fourth buildings proposed are 35,000 square feet, 10,000 square feet and 3,000 square feet, respectively, for a total of 183,000 square feet. Parking regulations dictate 1 spot for every 200 square feet (retail use); therefore, 915 parking spaces are required with 6 loading spaces. Stormwater management facilities are also proposed to handle the runoff. There are two wells proposed with an on-site SSDS. There will be two entrances, each with two egress lanes and one ingress lane. This project meets all of the Town of Southeast’s bulk requirements and will not need any variances. A Special Use Permit will also be sought from the Town Board to permit retail use. Other approvals will be sought from the NYCDEP, NYSDEC, NYSDOT as well as the PCDOH. Mr. Robbins briefly summarized the scope of this project. Boardmember Manteo addressed a list of items he suggested be incorporated into the final scoping document that is a part of the permanent Planning Board file. These items

## **TOWN OF SOUTHEAST PLANNING BOARD MINUTES JULY 10, 2006**

include, but are not limited to, the following: architectural design concepts, view sheds from Route 6E/W, I-84, Dingle Ridge & Joe's Hill Roads, graphic horizontal 3D views, location and screening of refuse and recyclable containers, shopping cart storage, traffic volume and movement scenarios throughout the interior parking lots, maximum vehicular trips generated per hour, fire lanes, alternate designs, profiles of retaining walls, mitigation measures, security patrols, accident histories from both local and state police authorities, future intentions of roadway and possible commitment to project as it relates to traffic signaling, and project name concepts that fit into the community spirit. Boardmember Armstrong stated that this project is the first significant gateway project under the new zoning ordinance. He also stated that whatever buildings are proposed, they must have good architectural details with broken facades. Boardmember LaPerch stated that he would like the applicant to investigate the possibility of having a "green roof" which not only would aid in the stormwater runoff, but also take away the harshness of the rooftops from the I-84 view shed. In the audience, the following people spoke: Lynne Eckhardt, Ann Fannizzi, Joe Schaub, Jim Rei, Bill Heath, Kitty O'Connor, Marion Rose, Mike Santos, Cathy Croft and Peder Scott. Ms. Eckhardt reiterated Boardmember LaPerch's comment regarding the green roof and asked that it be seriously considered and what the cost would be. She also asked if the comment period could be extended beyond the 10 days within which to submit to the Planning Board. Chairman Rohrman stated that it is a common request, but no, he will not allow more time beyond the 10 days. Ms. Eckhardt asked if CRSE could be included on the list of "Interested Parties" on the draft scoping document. Jeff Contelmo responded that the DEIS will be downloaded onto the internet as it is now a SEQRA requirement. She went on to ask if a power point graphic could be demonstrated, if pervious pavers could be used in the overflow parking area, if landscaping plants could be native to this area as they will not require as much watering as other types of vegetation; what the economic impact would be with this development as far as other smaller businesses are concerned and show how you will not be able to hear traffic noise once you are inside any of these four buildings. Ms. Fannizzi reiterated her concerns about the cumulative economic impact this development will bring and how patrons would have to get back into their car to get to another store that not necessarily would be an easy or short walk. She also would like to see a very extensive traffic report which should include not only the immediate roads leading to this site, but also Routes 312 and 22. Mr. Schaub asked about the traffic impact and how this development will impact upon the development at the former Union Carbide site in Danbury. Mr. Rei informed the Board that the project at the former Union Carbide site is proposed to have a large residential development. Mr. Heath commented on the economic impact. Ms. O'Connor asked who the tenant will be at the anchor store. If this future tenant would be someone along the lines of a Target, BJ's or Sam's Club, feasibility studies would have already been performed and stated that the Planning Board should be privy to these reports. Chairman Rohrman responded that he did not think the Planning Board could legally request these feasibility reports. She was informed that no tenant has been identified. Ms. Rose had concerns about the quality of the water in the nearby East Branch Reservoir since it is already impaired and the phosphorous levels are rising. She suggested that impacts should not be viewed from within the site, but from all around the site to include all scenarios. She would like to see the environmental features of this and all projects not be cut off at the boundaries of the site, but rather beyond them so as to see the cumulative effect on all aspects of wetlands and wetland buffers. She also suggested acetate overlays each depicting wetlands, slopes, streams, etc. so

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
JULY 10, 2006**

that each impact will be clearly shown. Also, a survey of rare and endangered animal species as well as rare and endangered vegetation should be identified. Mr. Santos would like to see public transportation incorporated and utilized in an effort to reduce single car traffic trips. Ms. Croft stated that she encouraged any and all possible green practices. Mr. Scott stated that he believed bus service would be a viable alternative to added traffic. He also asked if this project will adhere to the new lighting regulations and how the project will meet them. A motion to close the scoping session was introduced by Chairman Rohrman, seconded by Boardmember LaPerch and passed 6-0 in favor, 1 absent. Chairman Rohrman reminded the audience of the 10 day comment period within which comments and questions may be submitted to the Planning Board office. All inputs will be forwarded to the project's engineers and consultants.

A motion to accept the minutes from the last meeting was introduced by Boardmember LaPerch, seconded by Chairman Rohrman and passed 5-0 in favor, 1 abstention, 1 absent.

A motion to close the meeting was introduced by Boardmember Rush, seconded by Chairman Rohrman and passed 6-0 in favor, 1 absent.