

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

**ATTENDANCE:** Chrm. Conero, Mbr. Weeden (absent), Mbr. Crowley, Mbr. Steed, Mbr. Romano, Atty. Kevin Dowd, Eng. Dawn Kalisky of Lanc & Tully, Maria Beltrametti, Steve Hodge, Michael Gironda, Howard Weeden of Weeden Surveying, Kyle Ahern of Chazen Companies, Walt Lindner, Maryanne Lindner

**OPEN:** Chrm. Conero opened the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

**RE: OLD BUSINESS**

**MONTGOMERY FIRE DEPARTMENT 202-1-8.2**

Chrm. Conero said SHPO had no problems with the project. Atty. Dowd said the County indicates that they need a variance regarding the setback. Under our code it requires special permit and that the setback requirement is 50ft and they only have 47ft. Ms. Kalisky asked if the building could be shortened by 3ft to make it more narrow? Mr. Weeden asked if they have to, isn't it up to this Board? Atty. Dowd said no, not if it requires a setback with variance and they don't want to send you to zoning unless you don't meet the setback requirement.

Mike Gironda, President of the Montgomery Fire Department said they are trying to break ground April 1st. They can take 3ft off of it. It was originally 60 x 60 and the architect made it 65 x 60 for "play room." They can go back, no problem. They will make it 62ft. Mr. Weeden will make the adjustment on the site plan with a 50ft setback on the one corner. Mr. Gironda asked if there would be a problem for them to go 3ft on the back of the building. Ms. Kalisky said as long as they meet the 50ft front yard setback and 50ft side yard setback, they would be fine.

**A MOTION was made to DECLARE A NEGATIVE DECLARATION, TYPE 1 ACTION by Chrm. Conero and seconded by Mbr. Steed and carried 4 Ayes, 0 Nays.**

**A MOTION was made for CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN / SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT FOR THE MONTGOMERY FIRE HOUSE ADDITIONAL BAYS, SUBJECT TO THE REVISED BUILDING WITH THE SETBACK REQUIREMENTS AS INDICATED BY THE COUNTY, SUBJECT TO APPROVAL BY THE AHRB AND ALL FEES ARE PAID IN FULL, by Chrm. Conero and seconded by Mbr. Romano and carried 4 Ayes, 0 Nays.**

**RE: LOOSESTRIFE FIELDS – PHASE II 204-1-2.22**

Kyle Ahearn is representing the applicant. The goal was to have the SWPPP submitted and to have the Board schedule a public hearing, but unfortunately, it was not completed for this meeting so he is here to keep discussion open and answer any questions they may have. The road alignment itself, was changed to accommodate a 24ft drive aisle width. At the entrance, there was a jog in the parking here (indicates on site plan) that had to get around this property line. That was the biggest change that was realigned to get a more straight alignment to the width. The utility profiles were provided. The walls, a couple locations on the eastern side of the project where they are straddling the wetlands on both sides here (indicates on site plan), were right up to the wet-

line. So to construct it, they needed space there so they were pulled back. The actual details on the bridge were in the packets. There is landscaping, lighting. Those are the main highlights.

Ms. Kalisky asked Ms. Murphy to forward a copy of this to the Fire Department for their review. They need to confirm that their apparatus will be able to turn around in the turn-around. It is just past the bridge. Ms. Kalisky requested an auto-turn. Mr. Ahern will provide to Lanc & Tully for her review.

The Chrm. referred to Lanc & Tully's letter regarding the SWPPP in the back. Ms. Kalisky said they are waiting to see how the layout will be impacted. She is not sure what they have shown can actually meet the standards for the DEC but they are working on justification. As far as water quality findings for the eastern portion they have been discussing for months. They put a small bio retention area there—waiting for the sizing that the area is...(indicates on site plan). She isn't quite sure how it is constructed, they are waiting for that, as well. Mr. Ahern said it will be a step wall on the side and an actual retaining wall on the backside. The main thing, Amy contacted Lanc & Tully about the approach to treat the impervious areas from building 10 on the existing area in lieu of some of the impervious area here (indicates on map). That was the determination the DEC had made that as long as it's from the same watershed, impervious area to impervious area, as long as you're treating the correct amount, you can take that area instead of that area, but still need to show that the attenuation marks and peak discharge rates work, a separate part of it. Ms. Kalisky said they had a meeting at her (Lanc & Tully) office, at the applicant's request, they went over a few things. They discussed the SWPPP, the drainage, watershed areas—the approach they'd like to take. They know the requirements; as long as they have a document that demonstrates compliance with the document, then they're good to go. Chrm. Conero said so that is what we are expecting at the next meeting. Mr. Ahern said yes, by then next submission.

Ms. Kalisky said they included in their letter...the retaining walls were relocated to stay away from the wetlands to ensure no disturbance. The one area on the east side of the site on the other side of the bridge where the wall is—a retaining wall all the way from the bridge to the rear property line, of varying heights, over 4ft in a lot of areas that will have to be reinforced. That wall is 3ft from the back curb where that parking space is (indicates on site plan and explains to Chrm.). It will require fencing and a guide rail. Mr. Ahern suggested the guide rail right in front of the wall or on top of the wall or be pushed back. Ms. Kalisky said any retaining wall in excess of 4ft high whether there is a side wall to it, must have a fence on top; it's building code.

The Chrm. asked about the lighting for the bridge. Mr. Ahern said the bridge is now going to be a steel truss bridge so a light on top will not make sense, so lights will be at each end of the bridge. He is not sure how high the bridge will be yet. The Chrm. asked how long the bridge would be. Mr. Ahern said about 100ft. The Chrm. asked Ms. Kalisky if that was allowable. She said they could adequately light both ends of the bridge; they may have to revise their lighting plan—different lumens.

Atty. Dowd confirmed the weight load of the bridge. Mr. Ahern said it is designed for the heaviest truck, which is a fire truck. Ms. Kalisky said what has been submitted for the bridge is standard detail.

Building 12, they have a retaining wall that runs right into the deck of the last unit on building 12. Chrm. Conero asked if that would come off the deck. Mr. Ahern said it will go into the foundation of the building. Inaudible...

Chrm. Conero reiterated, we need the turn-around for the fire department, the lighting and the SWPPP.

Maria Beltrametti and an unidentified man questioned the Board about the Zafir, LLC building on Dunn Road but the Board referred them to the Building Inspector and the Board of Trustees.

**RE: MINUTES**

**A MOTION was made to ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 27, 2017, by Mbr. Crowley and seconded by Mbr. Romano and carried 4 Ayes 0 Nays.**

**RE: ADJOURNMENT:**

**A MOTION was made to ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:56 pm by Mbr. Romano and was seconded by Mbr. Crowley and carried 4 Ayes 0 Nays.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tina Murphy, Deputy Village Clerk