

MINUTES

VILLAGE OF CHESTER PLANNING BOARD

DECEMBER 18, 2012

REGULAR MEETING

PRESENT: Richard RAMSDELL, Chairman
Anthony LASPINA, Member
John REILLY, Member
Robert JANKELUNAS, Member
Gene WINTERS, Member
John ORR, Code Enforcement Officer

REGULAR MEETING 7:00 PM (Chairman Ramsdell opened the Meeting at 7:03 PM)

1. **Minutes**

Review Draft of October 2012 Planning Board Meeting Minutes

***MOTION** was made by Member Reilly, second by Member Jankelunas, to ACCEPT THE OCTOBER 2012 MEETING MINUTES AS DRAFTED. Motion passed 5-0.

2. **Correspondence**

3. **Code Enforcement Officer Report**

Presented by John Orr (**copy attached**).

- Member LaSpina asked about the shed by Cumberland. CEO John Orr advised that the shed is in violation of the Code and the property owner was notified. CEO John Orr will be following up on the violation.
- Member Reilly asked about the PODS being stored at the Lumber Yard. CEO John Orr advised that they attended a Work Session to review the request. It was determined that the PODS storage was similar to the previous business, so no Planning Board application was necessary. CEO John Orr also confirmed there is no activity inside the building in connection with the PODS storage.

4. **Projects for Review**

Project # 12-08	Project Name: Meadow Hill Apartments
Applicant/Owner:	John Sorrentino
Location:	NYS Route 94 / 44 High Street, Chester (SBL 102-1-1.2 / RS Zone)
Re:	108 Unit Apt Complex in 6 Buildings, incl. parking & ancillary facilities.
Presented By:	Mark Siemers, PE, Pietrzak & Pfau, PLLC

[Background Note: This project follows a previous application by the same applicant and consulting engineer on the same property for a Senior Citizen Housing project given Conditional Ste Plan Approval by the Planning Board on June 26, 2007.]

It was noted that Mark Edsall provided comments, but as there is a question regarding the zoning of the property, his detailed review would be continue once the zoning status is clarified (**copy attached**).

Chairman Ramsdell provided an overview of the zoning discussions held earlier in the day trying to clarify if the property is in the RM or RS Zone.

Discussion was held regarding:

- It was clarified by the Village Board Meeting Minutes of February 13, 2006 that the property if not developed as a Senior Citizen Housing Project is in the RS Zoning District;
- The applicant may make an application to the Village Board to request a zoning change or make an application to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance;

- Mark Siemers, PE, provided background information on the previous project and an overview of the current project;
 - The zone was changed from RS to RM at the 02-13-2006 Village Board of Trustees' meeting with the condition that the project would be used for Senior Housing.
 - He advised the applicant will go before the Village Board to request a zone change or a revision of the original zone change. The applicant was provided with an application.
 - Mark Siemers, PE, requested the Planning Board send a recommendation to the Village Board for when they appear before the Village Board.
 - Chairman Ramsdell gave an overview of the process for the Planning Board on zoning changes. After an application submitted to the Village Board, the Village Board would refer it to the Planning Board for a report prescribed by the Zoning Law. The Planning Board then has 30 days to provide the report to the Village Board, and then the Village Board would hold their Public Hearing.
 - The applicant was advised that the Village Board's earliest opportunity to make a decision would be in March 2013, pending submittal of documents and review.
 - The original site plan was conditionally approved in June 2007 as a Senior Complex; the applicant returned in 2009 for an amended site plan approval, but the project was not viable for the applicant with the economic times;
 - The project consists of 6 buildings; there will be 18 units per building; 3 floors with 6 units on each floor; 3rd floor will have loft space; 2nd and 3rd floor will be accessed by stairs; each unit will be approximately 1200 square feet.
 - The applicant is hoping to rent the units at \$1200, \$1300 and \$1400 per unit depending on which floor they're on;
 - All parking will be outside;
 - There will be 1 access road;
 - Member LaSpina expressed a concern about the traffic pattern and the vehicles coming out of the apartments onto Route 94, specifically the headlights of the vehicles streaming into the neighboring residents at night;
 - The applicant advised that they have proposed turning lanes from both directions;
 - The number of units was reduced from 142 (as proposed in the previous application) to 108;
 - The units will be 1 & 2 bedrooms without an age designation, but preference will be given to seniors;
 - The overall disturbance will be reduced by 15% from the previous application as there is less proposed infrastructure;
 - The applicant advised that he will be renting the units now, but will build them with the possibility of selling them as condos once the economy gets better;
 - The same entrance is being proposed as was proposed in the previous application;
 - It is possible that the applicant will request to phase the project;
 - It was noted that the project is smaller than previously submitted – this project will only be \$8 million with the buildings and infrastructure
 - The applicant advised that they have eliminated the proposed retaining walls from the previous project and have proposed building with the topography.

Chairman Ramsdell asked if the Board had any questions. The following questions were addressed:

- Will the buildings be 2.5 stories?
 - The applicant advised the building will be 3 stories with the first story on grade.
- Is it correct to say that ½ of the units will have grade access?
 - The applicant advised that all first floor units have grade access from the front and a patio in the rear. There will be 36 units with grade access.
- What is the estimated cost of Public Improvements?
 - The applicant advised that there is no cost of public improvements – only offsite improvement is the drainage.
- The applicant was asked if the drainage pipe would be 12" down the hill.
 - The applicant advised that there is a proposed drainage pond that will be scaled down from the previous proposed project.
- CEO John Orr asked if this was considered a special use.

- It was confirmed that in the RM Zone, it is considered a special use.
- CEO John Orr asked about any proposed sidewalks.
 - The applicant advised he was trying to keep costs down and is not proposing any sidewalks.

The applicant was referred to the Village Board of Trustees for either an interpretation of their previous decision or to request a change to the Zoning District.

- The applicant advised they would apply to the Village Board of Trustees for a change in the Zoning District.

5. General Discussion

Chairman Ramsdell asked if anyone had anything else to discuss and as there were no other comments, ***MOTION** was made by Member Jankelunas, second by Member Winters, to ADJOURN THE MEETING. Motion passed 5-0. Meeting adjourned at 7:52 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

**Sandra VanRiper
Planning Board Secretary**