www.courtreportingny.com

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND
PLANNING BOARD
X
X
Town of Stony Point 19 Clubhouse Lane Stony Point, New York December 12, 2024 7:21 p.m.
R ER R
ORANGE REPORTING Road, Suite 2 New York 10956 634-4200

Proceedings

2

14

19

20

21

2.2

1

3 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: All right. Next on 4 the agenda is 52 Wayne Avenue.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Hello again. 52 Wayne

Avenue. It is the four-lot subdivision on

Wayne Avenue. We have the cul-de-sac in the

back of Walter Drive.

As you may recall, this was a five-lot subdivision. It's been decreased to four lots with all the frontage towards Wayne Avenue, and propose the main water line

extension. Since the last TAC meeting, we

retained an engineer for specifically

designing the water and to be in contact --

excuse me, the water line to Wayne Avenue, to

be in contact with Veolia, to get the

willingness to serve letter.

And we're in receipt of the comments from John Q, which there seems to be at a small error. He revised the 9/5/2024 plan. We've since submitted, I believe it was

23 | 11/8/2024. I think it was probably a

24 mis-issue with the email. But we've done

25 significant, some changes to the plan that

3 1 Proceedings 2 some of these comments can be addressed. 3 So I quess today is opening of SEORA. 4 And I'm not sure if you need to do an 5 additional site visit since the five-lot 6 subdivision, we had some site visits, so. 7 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yeah. And you're in 8 agreement with the questions on the map he 9 was just discussing? 10 MR. QUEENAN: The questions in regard to 11 the changes? I don't think they really 12 affect the comments that I currently have. 13 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. 14 MR. QUEENAN: But just so the Board --15 this used to be a five-lot subdivision. Now 16 it's back to four. They removed the lot 17 coming off of Walter Drive, I'm assuming. 18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes. 19 MR. QUEENAN: And you're back to 20 everything off of Wayne. I'm on board with 21 all the comments, but just the more 22 significant ones, please check the driveway 23 designs --24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes. We revised that.

MR. QUEENAN: -- for maneuverability.

25

4

1	Proceedings
2	Some of them make, you know, 180-degree
3	turns. So improve that, either the turning
4	radius or something to that effect, that we
5	can do that.
6	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah.
7	MR. QUEENAN: It's a county road. But
8	they should come into the road perpendicular.
9	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
10	MR. QUEENAN: And not at a skewed angle.
11	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
12	MR. QUEENAN: All right. And then just
13	for the Board's knowledge, the Lots 3 and 4
14	will be combined as a common driveway coming
15	in. So that is a proposal on here that I
16	think might have been slightly different than
17	the original one.
18	And then they are going to be over the
19	one acre disturbance. So they will require a
20	SPDES permit from the state for stormwater
21	coverages. They don't need a full SWPPP, but
22	they need to do erosion sediment control
23	plans and get permit coverage from that. So
24	that will be part of this

And then my other comments have to deal

25

Proceedings

with the water main and the actual design for that. That should be included and provided on the plans, and how that's going to lay out in terms of the subdivision. The rest of the comments were technical in nature. Details, some plan clean up, the site for the lines, et cetera.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Thanks.

MR. QUEENAN: Yup.

2.2

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Max, any?

MR. STACH: Yeah. The only comment that I had was when we went over this at the TAC meeting, was they had put a line of Norway spruce between the lot that has the existing home now and the next proposed lot to the west. Because the home that's already there is so far back, they didn't put that they'd be looking into the new lot's backyard.

My comment was only that they break up the line of Norway spruces because when you have that, it can be sensitive to light. I wasn't going to make too much of the issue because I think that was something that the applicant had put in to address the concern

6 1 Proceedings 2 rather than something that, you know, really 3 needed to be required by code. 4 Other than that, I did, I do recommend you reissue a notice of intent. 5 The 6 applicant does have to make a correction on 7 their EAF Part 1, or a clarification, rather. 8 The EAF referred to impoundment by a concrete 9 roof leader with dimensions of six feet high, 10 about five feet long. And I think you were 11 going to --12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah. I sent that. 13 MR. STACH: You sent the reviewed one 14 in. 15 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes. 16 MR. STACH: Okay. I did notice that the 17 lead agency NOI that I sent with this memo of 18 mine is not the correct one. So I will get 19 Mary a revised one to use if you want to 20 notice your intent tonight. 21 That work for you, CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: 22 Mary? 23 THE CLERK: What?

I'm going to get you a new

24

25

MR. STACH:

lead agency NOI.

```
8
1
                 Proceedings
2
    John agree, GML ready?
3
          MR. HAGER: I don't see any reason the
4
    GML can't be made.
5
          MR. QUEENAN: Yeah.
6
          CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: All right.
                                         Do I need
7
     to make a motion to approve the GML to go
8
     out, or that was the notice --
9
          THE CLERK: No. Just want to make sure.
10
          CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: All right, cool. All
11
     right. Thank you very much.
12
          MR. RODRIGUEZ:
                          Thank you.
13
          MR. HAGER: Mr. Chairman?
14
          CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes, sir.
15
          MR. HAGER: Since we're meeting early
16
     this month, is there any provision to
17
    possibly set this up for public hearing in
18
     January?
19
          CHAIRMAN JOHNSON:
                             In January.
                                          Does
20
     anybody have any issue with that?
21
          MR. STACH: We haven't even done a
22
     Part 2 or seen a Part 3 on this yet. I don't
23
    believe -- have you submitted a Part 3 for
24
     52?
25
          MR. RODRIGUEZ: I don't think we got
```

9 1 Proceedings 2 there yet. 3 MR. STACH: Yeah, no. This is too early 4 for that. So I'll have a Part 2 prepared for 5 next meeting. And then by then, 30 days will 6 have run. You should be able to adopt that 7 in January. 8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. 9 MR. STACH: And then the applicant would 10 be able to address those issues in February. 11 And that would be the earliest I would think 12 we would be looking at a public hearing, and 13 then a potential decision or action by this 14 Board at the earliest. 15 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: All right, cool. All 16 right. Thank you very much, Kevin. 17 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, guys. Have a 18 good night. 19 (Time noted: 7:29 p.m.) 20 21 000 22 23 24 25

www.courtreportingny.com Proceedings THE FOREGOING IS CERTIFIED to be a true and correct transcription of the original stenographic minutes to the best of my ability.