

MINUTES of the Village of Montgomery Planning Board meeting held in the Conference Room of the Village Hall, Clinton Street, on Wednesday, September 27, 2017, at 7:30 pm.

ATTENDANCE: Chrm. Conero (absent), Mbr. Weeden, Acting Chrm. Crowley, Mbr. Steed, Mbr. Romano, Atty. Kevin Dowd, Eng. Dawn Kalisky of Lanc & Tully, Maria Beltrametti, Walt & Maryanne Lindner

OPEN: Acting Chrm. Crowley opened the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

OLD BUSINESS

RE: LOOSESTRIFE FIELDS 204-1-2.22

Amy Haight is representing the applicant, Tower Management for Loosestrife Fields. They are proposing 38 residential units with 4 buildings and 76 parking spaces on 6.66 acres on Patchett Way; the extension of the existing Loosestrife. They created a bridge to avoid wetland disturbance and are showing areas of storm water treatment on site. They no longer need a grading easement from the Village. All of the required parking is now on site. She is working on addressing Lanc and Tully's comment letter, specifically the roadway and storm water-getting the calculations together and preparing it.

Ms. Kalisky said the biggest concern is that they cannot see where DEC requirements are being met when the entire east side of the site has no storm water quality features. Ms. Haight said the existing building is not being treated at all; it was built in the 90's or early 2000's. They are thinking of treating the runoff; they met the water quality volume for the impervious of everything over here, (she indicates on site plan). They are planning on installing storm water planters in the back and in the front of the building to address the roof runoff and a portion of the road runoff. Ms. Kalisky said they really need to see that unless you're going underground. Ms. Haight said yes, with the whole second unit underneath the parking area for retention. It wasn't submitted because they needed additional soil testing in order to do that. She is looking for a general blessing of layout so they can move ahead with the swip and storm water design and do additional soil testing.

Ms. Kalisky asked if the Board is okay with the basic concept. Atty. Dowd mentioned the roadway width. Ms. Haight said they can bring the roadway in closer and realign the center line.

Atty. Dowd asked about the wetland delineation. Ms. Haight said it isn't DEC wetland. Ms. Kalisky said they do not need an Army Corp. permit because they are not disturbing any of the wetlands. Ms. Haight said she will reconfirm the jurisdictional determination. It was flagged by their in-house wetland specialist and she isn't sure if it was sent to the Army Corp, however, it isn't that old and it shouldn't have changed. It is good for 10 years.

Ms. Haight said the retaining wall was in question. They are going to use prefab Unilock or something like that. Most of the walls are under 4 ft. in height and will need 2 ft. insulation below grade. There are areas where they can tighten the wall up and get it further away from wetland and they'll do that...it may make the wall higher. Ms. Kalisky said where the layout of the wall is, they are right up against it (the wetlands) and even against the adjoining property line, in some areas. Again, Ms. Haight said they could tighten it right up to the roadway. It just makes the wall higher.

Atty. Dowd asked if the bridge would be 20 ft. wide and for two-way traffic. Ms. Haight said it's two-way traffic; 22 ft. wide with a foot on each side for the railing and the installation of the light pole. They may be able to do solar lighting under the railing so they wouldn't need to mount a pole. Atty. Dowd asked if there was some place for pedestrians to walk over. Ms. Haight said that is not proposed but could go another 4 ft. wide. The site distance is good.

They are proposing horizontal drilling underneath the wetlands to get the utilities (water & sewer) across; with possibly a pump station. Ms. Kalisky doesn't think they need one. Ms. Haight will check the ingress on the existing to see. The other utilities, electric, cable, phone can be run along the side of the bridge.

Acting Chrm. Crowley said the members of the Board like the concept of the plan and the changes that have been made and you can move forward.

RE: SUBDIVISION OF VILLAGE LANDS

Atty. Dowd said the Village has undertaken the alienation of parklands that has now been approved by the Legislature and signed by the Governor, to allow the Village to alienate 4.74 acres of land near the sewer plant. This is part of the park that the village purchased back in the 90's, to put in a solar field for the purposes of generating electricity to run the sewer plant and whatever else has to be run down there. As part of the alienation process, the State requires us to replace the alienated parkland with new parkland of equal or greater value. The Village owns a piece of property that is behind the Village DPW and the Village Police Department. The entrance is on Bridge Street. The Village proposed to subdivide that 5 acre; keep the front part of it for Village purposes and the back portion of it, which adjoins the current parkland. He indicates on site plan. The Village could do it on their own but feel it's better to have it before the Planning Board and do a formal subdivision of the property. Lanc and Tully prepared a proposed map, they had appraisals on the parcel and it was equal to or greater to the surrounding property. The fact that it adjoins the existing park makes it useful and expandable.

A MOTION was made to SET A PUBLIC HEARING FOR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2017, FOR SUBDIVISION OF VILLAGE LANDS TO REPLACE PARKLAND BEING USED FOR A SOLAR FIELD, by Mbr. Steed and seconded by Mbr. Romano and carried 4 Ayes 0 Nays.

RE: MINUTES

A MOTION was made to ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF August 30, 2017, by Mbr. Weeden and seconded by Acting Chrm. Crowley and carried 3 Ayes 0 Nays.

RE: ADJOURNMENT:

A MOTION was made to ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:55 pm by Mbr. Romano and was seconded by Mbr. Weeden and carried 4 Ayes 0 Nays.

Tina Murphy, Deputy Village Clerk