

NOWICKI_SUBDIVISION_(07-14)

MR. ARGENIO: Nowicki subdivision. This application proposes subdivision of the total 116 plus acre lot into 8 single family residential lots. Application was reviewed on a concept basis only. It's my understanding that this is the project, Neil, that if you come out of your house, make a left, go passed my house, it comes up maybe a third of a mile passed the trestle on the left side to come out of your house, make a left. What's your name for the record, please?

MR. MARSHALL: Lawrence Marshall.

MR. ARGENIO: What firm are you with?

MR. MARSHALL: Mercurio and Tarolli.

MR. ARGENIO: Okay, can you tell us about this application please?

MR. MARSHALL: Previously we submitted a much larger plan that included a proposed road off of Station Road that is the connection into Highview Estates. Since that time, we actually got contacted by the New York State DEC regarding the wetlands on the easterly side of the property, they had requested that they become state wetlands.

MR. ARGENIO: Point to them again, please.

MR. MARSHALL: It's the orange line, it basically follows this corridor here and through all the legal proceedings it's taken some time and they have designated that as state wetland. Since that has become a state wetland the Nowickis have re-thought that what they'd like to do with this property at this point they would as previously shown in previous submissions we show the I believe 8 lots here now we have shown 7 lots and basically we have just removed

the proposed road into Highview Estates so what we have now is a 7 lot subdivision with a lot line change.

MR. ARGENIO: Do you have Mark's comments?

MR. MARSHALL: No, I don't.

MR. ARGENIO: Mark, does somebody have a spare set?

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you.

MR. ARGENIO: So you're not proposing the link to the back to the Rackowiecki project?

MR. MARSHALL: Not at this point. The Nowickis just wanted to use their existing road frontage along Station Road or attempt to use it at this time and save the potential for the connection later.

MR. ARGENIO: How big is lot 8?

MR. MARSHALL: It's 92.11 acres.

MR. ARGENIO: You got perc out there?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. ARGENIO: You're sure?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, we did all the soils testing, percs were between 12 and 24 minutes.

MR. VAN LEEUWEN: That's pretty good for out there, that's very good.

MR. ARGENIO: Mark?

MR. EDSALL: Sir?

MR. ARGENIO: You guys out there partying with them?

MR. EDSALL: This is an application that will be sent to the Orange County Department of Health, we did not witness any testing.

MR. ARGENIO: I don't know if you were here last time representing this frankly I don't know who was. One of the big concerns in this area and tell your boss this whoever you have to tell, the drainage alongside Station Road is problematic in this area on your side of the road. I don't want to have to repeat myself so tell whoever you need to tell and Neil and I live out there so when this road, when we get a heavy rain, the water certainly comes up on top of the road. I don't know so whatever dance you're doing with your culverts you need to make sure that they're sized appropriately. Got any other thoughts on that?

MR. VAN LEEUWEN: If he's got like he said between what's your perc you said on the average?

MR. MARSHALL: They were between 12 stabilized perc rate, between 12 and 24 minutes.

MR. VAN LEEUWEN: Awful big septic for that kind of perc.

MR. MARSHALL: All the information is provided on sheet 3.

MR. VAN LEEUWEN: Awful big septic for that kind of perc.

MR. ARGENIO: Neil, anything? I want to read this to you, sir, just so you know that this issues not dead, the board should note, this is from Mark's comments, The board should note that they previously identified the benefit of a cross-connection from this property to the adjoining Rackowiecki major subdivision now that the roadway has been eliminated from this application,

such crossconnection should be considered should lot 8 be further subdivided.

MR. MARSHALL: Right.

MR. VAN LEEUWEN: Ninety-four acres is a lot of land to lose.

MR. ARGENIO: What do you want from us tonight?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, we just wanted to present this to the board and get your comments.

MR. ARGENIO: Check the slope on the driveways for lot 7 and 5, might be a little steep, I'm not sure. Municipal highway's concerned with the driveways entering Station and the sight distance, we'll be looking for some sight distance information and that driveway culvert business you're going to have to make sure Mr. Fayo's buying in on that package there.

MR. MARSHALL: The driveway sight distance is, the proposed locations are provided on sheet 2, there's a chart.

MR. ARGENIO: What's the sight distance on lot 8 maybe using the old driveway?

MR. MARSHALL: Lot 8 is using the existing driveway.

MR. ARGENIO: Okay.

MR. VAN LEEUWEN: I'd like to see what the sight distance is.

MR. MARSHALL: On the old driveway?

MR. VAN LEEUWEN: Yes.

MR. EDSALL: Do these sight distances reflect both

directions?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, sight line one and two, one would be to the right, two would be to the left.

MR. EDSALL: So it just so happens that 1, 2, 3 and 4, 6 and 7 are identical?

MR. MARSHALL: I believe they were taken because the entrances are essentially common.

MR. EDSALL: They're paired so they took it between.

MR. MARSHALL: They took it between them, if you'd like them to be--

MR. EDSALL: No, I just want to understand it so the lines 1 and 2 are just the two directions from that one point between the drives?

MR. MARSHALL: Right.

MR. EDSALL: Cause I know Mr. Fayo will want to sit down and go over those.

MR. ARGENIO: If anybody sees fit there should be no reason why we shouldn't be able to issue a lead agency.

MR. VAN LEEUWEN: So moved.

MR. SCHLESINGER: Second it.

MR. ARGENIO: Motion has been made and seconded that the Town of New Windsor Planning Board issue a lead agency coordination letter to begin SEQRA. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

MR. SCHLESINGER AYE
MR. BROWN AYE

MR. GALLAGHER AYE
MR. VAN LEEUWEN AYE
MR. ARGENIO AYE

MR. ARGENIO: You need to get ahold of Anthony. Did anybody have anything else on this? I mean, I think what they have done is they have pulled the project back and they have turned it into 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 cheap lots they can get a lot easier than they could get approval with a lot easier than they could have the original project and also it's substantially less impact than the original impact. Wouldn't you agree?

MR. EDSALL: Yeah, there's a lot more construction activity on the other one.

MR. ARGENIO: Dominic, do you have something?

MR. CORDISCO: Just in terms of the lead agency circulation now we should include DEC on that because they're proposing crossing DEC wetlands at multiple points and I'm sure they'll be interested in the project.

MR. EDSALL: Perhaps the other thing you can do is clarify for us unless Mr. Chairman you're aware of the correct designation if it's NB or MB because both appear on the plan.

MR. ARGENIO: I believe it's MB.

MR. EDSALL: Cause it's showing both ways on the plan. And the other thing Mr. Cordisco pointed out which I had not seen is that the NB 29 has the date for the delineation but the 59 does not so we would need to have that verified.

MR. CORDISCO: Just seemed a little confusing and I think it needs to be clarified as to whether or not there's two different wetlands systems involved here or

one and when the delineation was, so looks like it may be a holdover from another plan perhaps.

MR. ARGENIO: How does this dance with the redefine of the wetlands, what are they reflagging, the wetlands, the limits?

MR. CORDISCO: I could talk about that.

MR. ARGENIO: That's why I'm asking Mark.

MR. EDSALL: I think Mr. Cordisco has a lot more information if he could condense it.

MR. CORDISCO: It's a good thing that you pay me.

MR. ARGENIO: They're re-flagging the wetlands I guess Dominic.

MR. CORDISCO: In regards to this without going into a long history.

MR. ARGENIO: No, please.

MR. CORDISCO: When these numbers reflect the wetlands that are shown on the map that's on file with the County Clerk's Office that map is based on aerial topography originally and that was done in the late '70s and early '80s, those maps have only been updated in very limited circumstances since that time and so the maps are known to give you an approximation of where the wetlands are but it's not a precise boundary.

MR. ARGENIO: Somebody goes out and walks it, looks at the fauna and puts flags.

MR. CORDISCO: They put flags down and then you invite the DEC out, the DEC says yes, I agree with those or they don't, they say move them over then you tie those flags down to a survey and then they--

MR. ARGENIO: When do they find the Indian arrowheads and caveman artifacts?

MR. CORDISCO: That's a whole different story, how much time do you have cause I get paid by the hour?

MR. ARGENIO: That's fine.

MR. CORDISCO: But that's how it's done and the DEC of course has re-mapped some wetlands in this area in New Windsor and up in Crawford and those maps have just been finalized, so I don't know if this particular one was affected by that but that's something that should be clarified as well.

MR. ARGENIO: Okay, anybody have anything else? I think we can't go any further so did it go to county?

MS. MASON: Yes.

MR. EDSALL: Well, it would go to the county planning and it will go to Blooming Grove under that new Section 239 NN which is the intermunicipal because it's within 500 foot of the boundary. Once you're done from a preliminary standpoint, it will need to go to Orange County Health.

MR. ARGENIO: Thank you for coming in, sir.

MR. MARSHALL: So we'll make the changes and then resubmit?

MR. ARGENIO: Yes, you've got to get, Myra will get your plans out to the county and make the changes we talked about, we'll get you back in here and we'll have another chat.

MR. MARSHALL: Great, thank you.