

Planning Board Meeting Minutes – July 14, 2025

A meeting of the Town of Yorktown Planning Board was held on Monday, July 14, 2025, at 7:00 p.m. in the Town Hall Boardroom.

Aaron Bock called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following Board members present:

Rob Garrigan
Bill Lascala
Bob Waterhouse
Judy Reardon, Alternate

Also present were:

John Tegeder, Director of Planning
Ian Richey, Planning Assistant
Nancy Calicchia, Secretary
Councilman Sergio Esposito, Town Board Liaison

Correspondence

- Yorktown Heights Fire District (YHFD) - Notice of intent by the YHFD to act as SEQRA Lead Agency for the Fire District headquarters replacement project located at 1916 Commerce Street; 37.19-1-24 & 25. The Board had no issues.
- Planning Department draft memo to the Planning Board dated 7/14/25 with respect to the Navajo Street (Hidden Valleys) proposal. The Board will review the memo and comment back to the Planning Department.

Motion to Approve Meeting Minutes of June 30, 2025

Upon a motion by Bill Lascala, and seconded by Bob Waterhouse, and with all those present voting “aye”, with the exception of Rob Garrigan who was not present during this meeting, the Board approved the meeting minutes of June 30, 2025.

Motion to open Regular Session

Upon a motion by Aaron Bock, and with all those present voting “aye”, the Board opened the Regular Session.

REGULAR SESSION

Colangelo Major Subdivision

Discussion: Request for Two 90-Day Time Extensions
Location: 35.16-1-4; 1805 Jacob Road
Contact: Geraldine Tortorella of Hocherman Tortorella & Wekstein, LLP
Description: Approved 6-lot subdivision in the R1-160 zone by Resolution #21-01 dated February 8, 2021.
Comments:

Joseph Riina, Principal of Site Design Consultants, was present. Riina was present on behalf of the applicant to request two 90-day time extensions as described in the Hocherman Tortorella & Wekstein letter dated 6/24/2025 to the Planning Board. Bock asked the Board and Planning Department if there were any comments and there were none.

Upon a motion by Bob Waterhouse, and seconded by Bill Lascala, and with all those present voting “aye”, the Board approved two 90-day time extensions for the Colangelo subdivision.

Dorchester Glen Major Subdivision

Discussion: Request for a Second 90-Day Time Extension
Location: 15.20-3-6; 1643 Maxwell Drive
Contact: Joseph Riina of Site Design Consultants
Description: Request for a first 90-day time extension for a 5-lot subdivision on 24.26 acres in the R1-20 zone previously approved by Resolution #22-28 dated November 14, 2022.
Comments:

Joseph Riina, Principal of Site Design Consultants, was present. Riina was present on behalf of the applicant to request a second 90-day time extension. They received verbal approval from the Health Department and are now waiting for the plat to be signed. Bock asked the Board and Planning Department if there were any comments and there were none. *Upon a motion by Rob Garrigan, and seconded by Bill Lascala, and with all those present voting “aye”, the Board approved the second 90-day time extension for the Dorchester Glen subdivision.*

Lamp Minor Subdivision

Discussion: Decision Statement

Location: 70.08-1-8; 357 Crow Hill Road

Contact: Zarin & Steinmetz LLP

Description: Proposed 2-lot subdivision of a 4.463-acre lot in the R1-80 zone.

Comments:

Evan Lamp, property owner, was present. Bock asked the Board and Planning Department if there were any comments with respect to the draft resolution and there were none.

Upon a motion by Rob Garrigan, and seconded by Bill Lascala, and with all those present voting “aye”, the Board declared themselves Lead Agency.

Upon a motion by Rob Garrigan, and seconded by Bill Lascala, and with all those present voting “aye”, the Board adopted the Negative Declaration.

Upon a motion by Bob Waterhouse, and seconded by Bill Lascala, and with all those present voting “aye”, with the exception of Judy Reardon who voted “nay”, the Board approved the subdivision plan titled Lamp Subdivision.

Poggioreale – Site Plan

Discussion: Public Hearing

Location: 26.20-2-3; 2829 Crompond Road

Contact: Vincent & Christina Poggioreale

Description: Proposed Daycare Center/Preschool on a 33,403SF lot in the R1-80 zone.

Comments:

Upon a motion by Aaron Bock, and with all those present voting “aye”, the Board opened the Public Hearing.

Steve Marino, Principal of Tim Miller Associates; and Vincent and Christina Poggioreale, property owners were present. Marino gave an overview the proposal. The property is located at 2829 Crompond Road and is zoned R1-80. The applicant is proposing a 2,000sf addition behind the existing building with 19 parking spaces to accommodate a proposed daycare center. The parking spaces are proposed to be pervious pavers with a paved center aisle. Originally there were two separate driveways (ingress and egress) but after discussions with the town’s traffic consultant and informal discussions with the NYSDOT, the plan was revised to show one 24ft wide access to the site for both ingress and egress at the same curb cut. The Fire Commission discussed the proposed project and had no significant objections.

The proposed daycare center is a relocation of an already existing center in Yorktown that has been in business for more than 12 years and currently serves up to 50 families. Children will vary from full to part-time care; the schedule is maintained so that drop-off and pick-up times are staggered. The operating hours are Monday thru Friday from 6:30AM to 6:00PM. The practice will be for the cars to enter the site, park in one of the 19 spaces provided, escort the child into the facility and then depart.

There is an existing watercourse along the western edge of the property that has been delineated and confirmed by the town’s wetland consultant; and a NYS regulated wetland off site to the south with a 100ft buffer that extends onto the property. They are within the wetland buffer along the western part of the property so they will require a wetland permit. No tree cutting is proposed within the buffer. Stormwater practices are proposed in the southern portion of the property. They are anticipating the consideration of a right turn in and right turn out that will be flushed out with the NYSDOT. There were some recent modifications to the engineering and wetland mitigation plans that will be submitted formally to the Planning Department for the August meeting. Marino asked the Board if there were any questions.

Reardon asked if the entrance was wide enough to accommodate the right turn in and out. Marino responded that it was and is now 24ft wide. Bock asked about the NYSDOT with respect to the turns. Marino said that when they apply for the curb cut application with the NYSDOT they will see what their concerns are. He noted that they haven’t formally

met with them yet so there is a possibility that they will require a right in and out only but because there is a light further to the west it does create a gap for making a left turn. Bock noted that there is correspondence from the NYSDOT dated 7/2/25 which states that they would support the town's decision if they chose to restrict a left turn. Marino noted that the applicant is proposing a right turn in and right turn out; the left turn was an option. Waterhouse asked if the existing building will remain. Marino said that it will remain and is currently rented; a breezeway will connect to the new building and further to the south will be the playground area. Garrigan asked about the parking lot design and drop-off. Marino showed the plan and noted that the parents will pull in, park, and escort their child into the facility as opposed to the previously proposed drop-off plan.

Bock asked if there were any comments from the public. Public comments as follows:

1. Catherine Feder, 2594 Old Yorktown Road (at the corner of Routes 202 and 132) – Feder noted that she submitted correspondence to the ZBA on Dec 12th asking for it to be read to the Board members and is not sure if this was done. She attended the May 19th Planning Board meeting but arrived late so she didn't have a chance to speak during the public informational hearing. She did forward another email dated 7/14/25 to the Planning Department for the Board but wanted to speak this evening. Her concerns are traffic flow, noise, creek and wildlife. They moved to their current residence 11 years ago and since then there has been at least 15 to 20 accidents at the corner of 202 and 132. She noted that it is a very busy intersection and cited some examples. She and her husband are in favor of a daycare and feel that it is a wonderful and noble profession but are concerned about this particular location. Their main concerns are the traffic flow on Route 202 and 132, they often go around the block to pull into their driveway rather than make a left turn across the traffic. They can only hypothesize that the proposed daycare would lead to many parents turning in and out of the driveway at rush hour between 7 and 9AM and in the evening between 4 and 6PM which is already a very busy time on the road adding to the high school and middle school traffic which could cause back-ups and honking. She feels this would be very hazardous for the parents picking up and dropping off their children. She noted that during the morning they have the easterly sunrise and during the afternoon they have the westerly sunset and thinks this contributes to some of the accidents. She noted that the June 27th plan showed a circular drive which she was excited about and thought at least there was a flow but saw this evening that there was a different plan. She fears that there will be a backup on 202. She is also concerned about the noise with respect to the building construction and the outdoor play for the children throughout the day. She added that although they live at a hectic intersection they still enjoy the peace and quiet of a residential neighborhood and is concerned about having this type of facility in their neighborhood. Another concern is the creek and wildlife. She did see that accommodations were made for the wetland consideration but again she feels that the previous plan with the circular driveway would be safer. She feels that if the Board decides to move forward with the project they will need to decide which will be sacrificed – the wetland or the safety.

Bock noted that the Board is considering a right turn in and right turn out only and not allowing a left turn into the driveway.

Feder said that this would be helpful and noted that she worked at many schools, daycares and camps and knows what the traffic flow is like during drop-off times and it is very intense. She feels that removing the circular drive would cause congestion but she will read the traffic study and look at the revised plan. She noted that she never received a notice for this hearing. Poggioreale responded that the notices were mailed out late. Feder again noted that she is in favor of this type of business but not in this location.

2. Susan Siegel, resident – Siegel said she was speaking as a resident and not on behalf of the town. She would like clarification with respect to the Planning Board and NYSDOT's responsibility on the left turn decision. The NYSDOT said it will be the Planning Board's responsibility so if the Board approves a resolution at what point does the applicant apply for a curb cut permit and could they possibly change something. She questioned if there could be a barrier of some sort to prohibit left turns, possibly within the driveway itself.

Reardon noted that this may be the same traffic issue that they dealt with when reviewing "The Seed" daycare center expansion and believes the procedure was a right out only. She thought they should look at how they addressed the issue as it would be helpful.

3. Aura Villagran, 2821 Crompond Road – Bock read an email dated 5/19/25 by Villagran stating her concerns for the record.

There were no other public comments.

Bock read the DOT letter dated July 2, 2025 for the record. Marino said their proposal is for a right turn in and right turn out and the town's consultant did show a diagram of how that would work. He added that the applicant does not oppose this. Marino said they will submit the revised plans and answer any questions discussed this evening for the next meeting.

Upon a motion by Bob Waterhouse, and seconded by Rob Garrigan, and with all those present voting "aye", the Board adjourned the Public Hearing.

AMS Yorktown Active Adult Community

Discussion: Public Informational Hearing

Location: 5.19-1-15; 800 East Main Street

Contact: Janet J. Giris, Esq.

Description: Proposed redevelopment of a 35.53-acre parcel with 180 dwelling units in 2, 4-story buildings consisting of 60 one-bedroom units and 120 two-bedroom units. The property was rezoned from OB to RSP-2 by a Town Board Resolution dated May 13, 2025.

Comments:

Upon a motion by Bill Lascala, and seconded by Rob Garrigan, and with all those present voting "aye", the Board opened the Public Informational Hearing.

Peter Feroe, Vice President of AKRF; Ryan Sutherland, Director of Design with AMS Acquisitions LLC; Joseph Riina, Project Engineer and Principal of Site Design Consultants; Colin Grotheer, Architect of Beinfield Architects; and Samantha Stewart, Landscape Architect of SLR Consulting, were present. Feroe said that they started the project in October of 2022 with a petition to rezone the property from OB to RSP-2 that was subsequently approved by the Town Board in May of 2025 allowing them to move forward with their site plan application to the Planning Board. During the SEQRA review process with the Town Board, the project was reduced in size and scope to stay within the existing disturbed footprint on the site. The existing buildings are proposed to be removed and replaced with the installation of two new buildings, reconfiguration of the parking lots, and driveway expansion.

Feroe continued that the review process also included a full traffic study that studied 11 intersections for traffic impacts. With this project there would be an impact to two of those 11 intersections at Route 6 and East Main Street and at East Main Street and Old Route 6 which is the drive up to the project site. The proposed mitigation for the traffic impact is to signalize the intersection with a clustered traffic signal; the traffic signal would have two heads on the main line of Route 6 and again at East Main Street but would run as a single traffic signal with single control. This will protect the traffic movements off of Route 6. These traffic lights will be coordinated with the lights at the Taconic and have the option to be coordinated with the traffic lights at Lee Blvd. as one system. With this improvement along with some restriping, the traffic conditions at these intersections will operate better than existing conditions with their project and also taking into account four other no build projects that could happen within this corridor. It also has the potential to reduce cut thru traffic. The Town Board approved the traffic impact mitigation and they are currently in the process with the NYSDOT to permit this improvement.

A full SWPPP was prepared; the existing basins will remain and are proposed to be resized and modernized; the sewer pump station on East Main Street that currently serves the project site and a few other homes within the area is proposed to be replaced. A construction management plan, and pre-construction survey and vibration monitoring at the Hyatt House to ensure there is no damage from the construction will be in place. Site lighting is proposed to be LED, full cut-off, Dark Sky compliant. The landscape plan is designed for climate resiliency and sustainability. All of these measures were mandated through the SEQRA process with the Town Board.

The proposal is for the development of an age-restricted residential rental community consisting of 180 dwelling units (60 one-bedroom units, and 120 two-bedroom units) around a central courtyard. Two buildings are proposed to be constructed with 271 parking spaces. The building on the right is the south building and to the left is the north building. The site plan is zoning compliant. On-site amenities include a clubhouse, pool, walking trails, open space, etc. The existing access, entry way, ring road and majority of the parking lots will be maintained. Two of the existing parking lots are proposed to be slightly reconfigured. The existing entry drive is proposed to be widened with a center median to allow clear access for emergency vehicles. The southern building is now one story lower. Elevations of the buildings were shown; from a visual impact it doesn't change much and still can't be seen as it is below the tree line. A walking

trail is also proposed at the site to take advantage of the natural topography and is about $\frac{3}{4}$ miles in distance that will complement the site's amenities. Approximately 240 trees are proposed to be removed; most of the trees are within the existing footprint of the building and stormwater basins. Of those 240 trees, about 45 are dying and others are invasive. The proposed landscape plan is robust that includes the planting of native trees, shrubs and grasses as detailed in the plan submitted. The interior court includes passive spaces, pathways, pool, outdoor areas, water feature, existing rockout cropping, etc.

Feroe noted that they were before the Conservation Board and received their positive comment memo dated 7/7/2025. They are currently scheduled to meet with the ABACA tomorrow evening. They also received a comment memo from the Planning Department which they will address. At this point, if the Board agrees, they are seeking to move forward with a public hearing and are happy to answer any questions this evening.

Bock asked if there were public comments. Public comments as follows:

1. Susan Siegel, resident – Siegel said she was speaking as a resident. Siegel asked if the application was referred to the Recreation Commission for input. She is asking because there was a reference in the rezoning resolution or findings statement about the Planning Board considering the recreation component.

There were no other public comments.

Reardon asked about the traffic study date and the DOT application. Feroe said the traffic study was dated July 2024. The DOT made preliminary comments on the study to which they responded in the FEIS. They are now responding to the technical comments for the next stage of the application.

Reardon asked about the recreational component and if the proposal is for what is on the site. Feroe said that they are proposing a robust interior and exterior amenity package that includes a clubroom, fitness room, game rooms, meeting rooms, etc. for the occupants. He noted that the section of the town law SEQRA was referring to talks about the adequacy of the on-site recreation facility to meet the needs of the residents living there. Reardon asked if currently there is no proposed contribution to the municipal recreational program. Feroe responded that this was correct and added that it was studied in the EIS and put into the planning process for review of the amenities proposed in the context of the demands placed on it. Bock asked if this was studied and the impacts determined. Feroe said it was analyzed and the impacts were assessed from an environmental review and it was determined that there wouldn't be any significant adverse environmental impacts but the site plan process would determine this. Tegeder informed the Board that the determination is under the Planning Board's authority. Feroe added that the proposed walking trail amenity is new to the plan.

Garrigan said that he walked the site with the applicant and noted that it is a gem of a site; he feels that the applicant and all involved did a wonderful job in outlining the possibilities of what it could be. He noted that what shouldn't get lost here is the reuse of the existing footprint and creating an environment to use what is there. He is impressed with all of the recreational facilities provided (pickleball court, gym, etc.), and added that the walking path is a bonus. He can't imagine that whoever is living there is going to need anything other than what is on the site. Bock added that it fits into the topography as well. Feroe said that as they went through the process the design became more sensitive and fine-tuned.

Waterhouse asked about the heritage site on the hill past this property and asked if it was protected. Feroe said nothing is being impacted by their project; they coordinated with the State Historic Preservation Office but because they are staying within the footprint of the existing disturbance they didn't have any issues. Waterhouse asked if they would make note of this site. Feroe said he wasn't sure of the site he was talking about. Waterhouse said it was between their site and the Taconic off their property. Tegeder said it his understanding that the state did not identify any potential archeological areas on this site whether undisturbed or not. Feroe said this was correct. Tegeder informed the Board that if any were identified the state would have acknowledged it and this Board would know about it. Tegeder noted that across the Taconic there is the Capelli project with a known site in which that site plan was designed around. This didn't happen here. There may be a site on the northern part in the state park that may already have measures to protect it.

Upon a motion by Bob Waterhouse, and seconded by Bill Lascala, and with all those present voting "aye", the Board closed the Public Informational Hearing.

Bock asked Tegeder about the next steps. Tegeder thought they should review the traffic mitigation scheme to understand it fully; the recreational component also needs to be discussed. Feroe said that they would be happy to bring in their traffic engineer for the next meeting. Councilman Esposito suggested showing the animated video that was provided to

the Town Board as it is a valuable tool. Feroe asked if it was appropriate to schedule a public hearing this evening. Bock thought they should have another work session and then move forward with a public hearing for the September 8th meeting and the Board agreed.

Upon a motion by Aaron Bock, and with all those present voting “aye”, the Board closed the Regular Session and opened the Work Session.

WORK SESSION

Toll Brothers

Discussion: Site Plan and Minor Subdivision

Location: 35.12-1-2 & 35.08-1-45; 2302 & 2448 Catherine Street

Contact: Zarin & Steinmetz

Description: Proposal to subdivide the 50.51-acre lot into two parcels (48.05-acre parcel and 2.46-acre parcel). The 48.05-acre parcel is then proposed to be developed with a 118-unit townhome active adult community with associated amenity clubhouse and pool, roads, utilities, stormwater management infrastructure, landscaping and related improvements. The smaller 2.46-acre parcel will remain with the existing Field Home building.

Comments:

David Cooper, Esq.; Diego Villarealle, and Paul Dumont, Project Engineers of JMC, were present. Cooper said that they were present this evening for continued review and discussion. He noted that at the previous meeting the Board agreed to schedule a public hearing for the August 11th meeting.

Villarealle said that they provided a submission to the Planning Department dated 7/3/2025 that included more detail on the wetland and tree mitigation. They superimposed the topography on the existing conditions to give them a sense of what is happening on the land area. The high point is on the southern portion of the page and then everything dives off the east and north. The wetlands and associated buffer is located on the eastern side of the property in addition to a watercourse and associated buffer that runs in a north-south direction. There are existing utilities that run through the property that were taken into consideration when developing the site plan.

Part of the application is to subdivide the lot into two parcels creating a 2.46-acre parcel for the existing Field Home and the remaining acreage of a little over 48-acres is for the Toll Brothers development. They are also providing a restrictive easement along the eastern side of the property for a conservation area that will be included on the plat.

The project includes 118 townhomes centrally located on the property. The access will be via two curb cuts; one on the northern portion that loops around toward the southern portion of the property and comes out further south into Catherine Street. Most of the proposed development is a continuous loop with the exception of the small leg that extends to the south that terminates in a cul-de-sac. All of the driveways are designed to be 24ft wide and take into consideration fire access and code requirements. All of the buildings are situated in 3 and 4 pack clusters each with their own driveway access to their own garage.

The site plan has been designed to work with the grades of the property. The bottom left hand side is at the high point of the site and everything slopes off from there. The driveway follows the topography and allows them to tuck the units into the grades in some areas and allows them to have walk-out units on the downhill side. There are some retaining walls scattered throughout the site to make up some of the grade changes between the different areas along the different sides. Improvements are proposed along Catherine Street that includes curbing and riprap as detailed in the plans. A robust landscape plan was developed for the site which also meets a number of conditions of approval attached to the rezoning process. Screening was required for the amenity space on the northern portion of the site; supplemental screening along the frontage of the property; and screening between the development and the Field Home building to the south.

Since the last meeting, they separated the landscape and wetland mitigation plan to provide more detail. They are only disturbing the wetland buffer areas. The plans submitted specifically identify plantings and improvements proposed within the buffers and the areas on the eastern portion of the site. A table was provided breaking down the disturbances within the buffer area and areas to be mitigated. They also provided detailed information that identifies the trees to be removed. As part of the mitigation for the tree removal they are proposing to plant over 800 trees and contribute just under \$250,000 to the tree bank fund.

A detailed utility plan was developed showing all of the sewer and water improvements. They also developed a detailed stormwater management plan working with the Town Engineer and DEP. A number of different stormwater practices are proposed throughout the property that includes a bio-retention area, stormwater basins and infiltration basins all of which are being used to mitigate the new impervious area. There is a large detention basin located on the eastern portion of the site that is consistent with the previous plan presented during the rezoning process. In working with the DEP, they were able to make some changes in that area and stay away from the wetlands. The Planning Director indicated that there was a watercourse in that area that was impacted so they revised the plan to stay away from the watercourse; they are adjacent to it but not disturbing it. They also preserved the wetland buffer to the east. Tegeder asked if they still have a retaining wall in that area. Villarealle confirmed that there is a small retaining wall about 2.5ft high. He noted that they need to provide a maintenance access path around the perimeter of the stormwater basin itself. The wall is proposed to line the area and provide separation from the watercourse and still provide the path. Tegeder said that the design shows a long leg that pushes to the north of the basin and seems to wedge itself between the watercourse and its 100ft boundary. He noted that the wetland buffer is coterminous with it and wondered why they are so close to this watercourse when they can split the difference between the two buffers and possibly do less damage to the wetlands. He is also concerned that some of the hydrology may be interrupted by the wall in some fashion as it seems to hook around into the watercourse; he is not sure how that watercourse is informed. He questioned if they could straddle the two. Villarealle said that they could do this but it would be a balancing act between the two. They took the approach that the wetlands is specific to that area and the buffer is an area that protects that wetland and is utilized with specific plantings. This is just the start of a watercourse where the water collects and makes its way further north. It does not traverse the entire property like the eastern side of the property; there is no wetlands associated with this watercourse. They could look into shifting it over slightly to see if it will be a better strategy. He added that it will increase the wetland buffer disturbance and decrease the watercourse buffer disturbance the same amount. Tegeder felt that it seemed close to the watercourse and was concerned about the long-term effect. Tegeder also questioned the impacts for the construction of the retaining wall. Villarealle said the retaining wall was about 2.5 to 3ft at its highest point and is used to make up the grade to create the path.

Tegeder asked about the disturbance difference for the wetland, buffer and watercourse in this plan compared to the DEIS plan. Villarealle said that they provided a comparison chart in their submission showing the zoning petition submission, the site plan approval submission, and the difference between the two. The total disturbance in the zoning petition submission was about 2 acres, the current plan shows about 1.3 acres so they are about .7 acres less. They reduced the wetland and buffer disturbance based on the improvements to the plans.

Tegeder informed the Board that they should consider having the environmental consultant review the revisions as it is now different from the DEIS plan. Reardon asked if they would be able to see this during their site visit and Tegeder said that he thought they could. Bock felt they should engage the consultant to review the difference between the DEIS plan and the current plan. Villarealle again noted that a comparative analysis was provided for the disturbance areas and added that the unit counts and driveway layout remain the same to what was approved.

Tegeder asked about the slope stabilization and treatment in terms of landscaping. He noted that the slope looks to be about 32 to 38ft near the maintenance road and retaining wall. Villarealle explained the topography of the site, the high point is on the southwest portion of the site and then everything slopes down away from it to the north and west. They took advantage of the grade changes and set the roadways and units at different elevations. Cross sections were shared with the Board, specifically profile section A-A. The topography and the slope is consistent, they flatten out in the middle where the proposed roadway is with units on either side. The slope and grade change shows about 25 to 35ft depending where you are along that area that is being done at a 2.5 or 3 to 1 slope ratio so although it sounds steep it is a relatively gradual grade. The lower portion of the site meets the existing grade. Stabilization for the slope will be a combination of grasses and different seed mixtures on the uphill and downhill sides as it is being constructed. Tegeder's understanding was that the slope percentage is between 32 and 34ft and Villarealle said this was correct. Tegeder asked if a Geogrid was proposed for stabilization. Villarealle said there wasn't and that they are not expecting any structural reinforcement of those areas.

Tegeder asked about the purpose of the retaining wall in the middle of the uphill slope. Villarealle showed the wall on the plan and said it was to make up the grade change between the two buildings in this area. They are proposing a small

retaining wall. He added that there is a swale that will be constructed behind those units that will be designated to take the stormwater to the bio-retention area.

Tegeder asked if the cut and fill was balanced. Villarealle said it will be and noted that a lot of work went into it from an earthwork standpoint. When they have a site of this size they always strive to be balanced. Tegeder asked about the area onsite that received dumping of organic material from offsite. He noted that this came up earlier on in the proposal and was tested. Villarealle said he didn't know about this but will look into it and report back to the Board.

Reardon asked if the buildings will have basements. Villareale said some of them are designed with a lower level. Reardon asked about the roof drainage. Villarealle said all the water will be picked up via the drainage system. Because they are in the DEP watershed they had to develop a detailed SWPPP. The roof drain leaders are picked up via drainage pipes and are taken to different stormwater management practices; they don't spill off. Tegeder asked about the footing drains. Villareale said they are different from the roof and are daylighted.

Tegeder asked the Board if they agreed to engage the consultant for review of the changes. The Board agreed. Villarealle noted that they provided the comparative analysis but were fine with the review.

Tegeder reminded the Board of the site visit scheduled with the applicant for tomorrow along with the meeting place. Cooper said they that are scheduled for a public hearing during the August meeting and will mail the required notices.

Meeting Closed

Upon a motion by Rob Garrigan, and seconded by Bob Waterhouse, and with all those present voting "aye", the meeting closed at 8:35PM.