

1 PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY

2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3 \*\*\*\*\*

4 BORDEAU CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION  
103-107 CONSAUL ROAD  
5 SKETCH PLAN REVIEW

6 \*\*\*\*\*

7  
8 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled  
9 matter by NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, a Shorthand  
10 Reporter, commencing on March 10, 2015 at 8:35 p.m.  
at The Public Operations Center, 347 Old Niskayuna  
Road, Latham, New York

11 BOARD MEMBERS:  
12 PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN  
13 TIMOTHY LANE  
14 LOU MION  
15 TIMOTHY LANE  
16 SUSAN MILSTEIN  
17 CRAIG SHAMLIAN

18 ALSO PRESENT:  
19 Kathleen Marinelli, Esq., Counsel to the Planning Board  
20 Michael Tengeler, Planning and Economic Development  
21 Joe LaCivita, Director, Planning and Economic Development  
22 Christopher Longo, PE, Ingalls and Associates  
23 Joseph Grasso, PE, CHA

24  
25

1           CHAIRMAN STUTO: We'll call up the next item on the  
2 agenda. Bordeau Conservation Subdivision, 103 - 107  
3 Consaul Road. This is a sketch plan review. This is an  
4 18-lot residential subdivision.

5           Joe LaCivita, any introductory remarks?

6           MR. LACIVITA: No, we're here for sketch, so I'd  
7 just like to turn it right over to the applicant's  
8 engineer and move forward.

9           MR. LONGO: Christopher Longo from Ingalls and  
10 Associates, representing Mr. Bordeau and Bordeau  
11 Builders.

12           As the Chairman mentioned this is a proposed  
13 conservation subdivision. It is within the single  
14 family residential zoning district. It's not within  
15 the conservation overlay, so that's what we are  
16 asking for from the Board tonight is to adopt the  
17 conservation overly standards to this subdivision.

18           To narrow in on the location of where we are,  
19 we are in the western portion of Town along Consaul  
20 Road and we're just west of 155, so we are at where  
21 Central Avenue and 155 come together, we are just  
22 west of that along Consaul. The majority of the  
23 proposed subdivision enters from the residential  
24 subdivision to the south which is, I believe, Lester  
25 Drive and I believe that this would be Crosby

1 Street. There would be a crossing of the Niagara  
2 Mohawk or National Grid lands and then a quick  
3 crossing of wetland draw into the predominantly  
4 agricultural portion of the site where the majority  
5 of all the development has been concentrated and  
6 that's why we are here in front of the Board  
7 considering a conservation subdivision because of  
8 the landscape of this site and how things lay out  
9 and where that agricultural field is today and what  
10 we are trying to avoid in terms of environmental  
11 features within the site. The site is a little bit  
12 over 16 acres and we are proposing to develop about  
13 six of it which would include all the lots and  
14 roadway and stormwater. Of that 16 acres, there is  
15 a little bit less than five which are constrained  
16 lands so as part of the density calculation we  
17 removed those five acres from our calculation and  
18 came up with almost 22 allowable lots by the  
19 conservation standards which would be two dwelling  
20 units per acre. We are only proposing 18 units and  
21 we are also proposing almost 10 acres of open space  
22 lands out of the total 16. Of those 10 acres, we  
23 are well above the minimum required 40% of  
24 unconstrained lands that would be conserved and that  
25 would be a little bit more than 5.3 acres of

1 unconstrained lands that we would be conserving as  
2 well.

3 The water connection to the site would be to  
4 the stub at Crosby Street. There is a hydrant right  
5 at the end of that roadway and then the sewer  
6 connection would be along -- this is a tributary to  
7 the Lishakill. Lishakill is a little bit further to  
8 the south and west of this site. There is the truck  
9 sewer main that runs along that stream. So, there  
10 would be a connection to that sewer as well.

11 What we would propose as part of this  
12 conservation subdivision are lot minimums of  
13 approximately 7,000 square feet. I think that our  
14 smallest lot actually shown on this plan is even  
15 about 7,700 square feet. It's pretty much in  
16 keeping with the lot sizes which are just to the  
17 south here on Lester (Indicating) as well as just to  
18 the north of this site which is Wicken Square.  
19 That's a subdivision that is just north of here.  
20 So, we are trying to stay in keeping with the  
21 character of those neighborhoods and those lot sizes  
22 there.

23 Also, the minimum lot width we proposed would  
24 be 60 feet. Again, this is in keeping with the  
25 south and to the north and also a highway frontage

1 minimum of 20 feet to allow for the one key hole lot  
2 over here (Indicating) to utilize the agricultural  
3 field that is currently plowed and serves as  
4 agricultural. Then, with one additional lot here,  
5 kind of along where the waterline connection would  
6 be - this lot would also have the 20-foot width.

7 For setbacks, we are proposing a 20 foot front  
8 setback, five foot side setback and a 20 foot rear.  
9 The open space we would proposed to be owned and  
10 maintained by an HOA. They would ensure that all  
11 the open space including those critical  
12 environmental features which I mentioned that we are  
13 avoiding -- those would be held within a  
14 conservation easement and under the ownership of an  
15 HOA to ensure that they would be kept in perpetuity  
16 as open space and permanently preserved.

17 I guess I'll back up a little bit and explain  
18 how we came about the conservation subdivision and  
19 what we were looking to conserve. The main feature  
20 that we focused in on was this tributary which is on  
21 the parcel for a portion and then it goes off of the  
22 parcel. Here are the limits of our parcel here. It  
23 goes off the parcel and almost gets back on where  
24 the parcel comes from Consaul Road. So, that area  
25 and really the wetlands that flank that stream as

1 well as the Town's imposed 100-foot stream setback  
2 are really the focal point of what we intended to  
3 avoid here. Plus, there is a development in the  
4 existing agricultural fields.

5 We are also avoiding this wetland draw which  
6 feeds from the National Grid lands and a portion  
7 of -- this is Wembley Court, just off of Route 155.  
8 This is kind of an office park area. So, off of  
9 those parking lots and buildings - that as well as  
10 the National Grid lands drain what turn into a draw  
11 and a small ravine in here which feed that tributary  
12 (Indicating). So, we have avoided that with a  
13 minimal amount of crossing as possible with just one  
14 roadway crossing to get into that agricultural  
15 field.

16 I mentioned the clustering and the permanent  
17 preservation within the HOA. We also met with the  
18 Town at the Development Coordination Committee and  
19 received very detailed feedback from them as far as  
20 the water and sewer utility hook-ups, as well as  
21 stormwater which we certainly would dive right into  
22 once we received a favorable recommendation from  
23 your Board as far as the conservation overlay  
24 standards are concerned.

25 So, if there are any questions -

1           CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm going to ask for our Town  
2           Designated Engineer, CHA, Joe Grasso to give his  
3           comments. We don't see these very often to repeat what  
4           this conservation subdivision is and what the standards  
5           are and how the calculation is made and whether you  
6           agree with how the calculation was made. We understand  
7           it. I think that it bears repetition. There is no real  
8           narrative in here to explain that.

9           MR. GRASSO: This is up for a sketch plan review so  
10          this is the first time that the Board is seeing the  
11          project. We haven't done a formal review letter, but we  
12          do have comments on it.

13          CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is this in a conservation overlay  
14          district or not?

15          MR. GRASSO: It is not.

16          CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, he's trying to do a cluster  
17          development.

18          MR. GRASSO: Exactly. It's not in a conservation  
19          overly district, so they aren't required to come in with  
20          this kind of subdivision. The reasons why they are  
21          coming in with a subdivision - let's call it a cluster  
22          subdivision, is because they want to allow smaller lot  
23          sizes than the zoning - the SFR - zone would require  
24          which would be 18,000 square foot lots.

25          CHAIRMAN STUTO: What does our Land Use Law call a

1 conservation subdivision, or do they call it a cluster?

2 MR. GRASSO: A conservation density subdivision.

3 MR. LONGO: Conservation subdivision or  
4 conservation overlay district.

5 MR. GRASSO: I think that it's conservation  
6 subdivision. It's a conservation development.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do we have a cluster development,  
8 or this is our cluster development?

9 MR. GRASSO: This is really the way that cluster is  
10 administered within the Town. It directs you to this  
11 conservation development type of design. The purpose of  
12 a conservation development is to protect sensitive  
13 resources on the project site. This is really important  
14 for where the Planning Board needs to understand what  
15 those resources are within the project site that are  
16 worthy of protection. About 75% of the project site, we  
17 would consider worthy of protection.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: About how much?

19 MR. GRASSO: About 75%. Now there is a certain  
20 calculation that you go through that are going to  
21 require a certain amount of constrained land to be taken  
22 out of a density calculation and there is also a certain  
23 amount of constraining land that factors into how much  
24 open space or deed restricted land you need to provide  
25 as part of a project. So, in terms of maximum allowable



1 density, the things that you have to pull out of the  
2 equation are state and federal wetlands - which are the  
3 wetlands, which are pretty sensitive on the site but not  
4 the 100-foot buffer. The 100-foot buffer doesn't get  
5 subtracted. You take out the protected watercourse area  
6 which this is a major branch to the Lishakill and it's  
7 got a 100-foot buffer on either side of the banks of the  
8 creek. So, that whole watercourse area comes out. So,  
9 not each of those areas, in and of itself, are what  
10 factors into those. A lot of times you'll see a state  
11 and federal wetland that would also occupy the protected  
12 watercourse area. You pull that area out and when you  
13 go through the density calculation, it would allow a  
14 maximum of 22.8 lots to be developed. They are only  
15 proposing 18 lots. They meet that density requirement.  
16 The other thing is providing enough open space. You  
17 actually go through the calculation and you pull out all  
18 the constrained lands and then what you have left is  
19 your unconstrained area. You need to take 40% of that  
20 and protect that as open space as well as everything  
21 that you already pulled out as being constrained lands.

22 So, Chris, you need 4.5 acres?

23 MR. LONGO: The 4.5 would be the 40% of  
24 unconstrained lands.

25 MR. GRASSO: So, overall it's about 10 acres of

1 open space that you need on the property. So, it's 10  
2 acres out of 16 acres of the project site area.

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: That's not on your site plan,  
4 right?

5 MR. LONGO: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Why don't you start at the top of  
7 that note?

8 MR. GRASSO: So, the total site area is 16.2 acres.  
9 So, they have to pull out the wetland areas and the  
10 steep slopes and that gets you down to an unconstrained  
11 area of 11.4 acres; 40% of that going down to the open  
12 space is the 4.56 acres. Then you have to add back in  
13 the 4.68 acres of constrained lands and that gets you to  
14 10 acres of open space.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Right, but you calculate your  
16 number of units before you take that out.

17 MR. GRASSO: There are two calculations that you go  
18 through. The other one that they're showing here is the  
19 base density calculation. If you've got the total site  
20 area of 16.2 acres and you take out the constrained  
21 lands, you're left with 11.4 acres of unconstrained  
22 area. When you go through the density calculation,  
23 you're allowed two units of unconstrained acre. So,  
24 11.4 times 2 is 22.8 units allowed, maximum. They're  
25 proposing 18 units. So, there are two separate

1 calculations that they go through.

2 So, we feel that they have met those two  
3 thresholds. Our concern when we look at the plan is  
4 that there is a lot of wetlands on the site. There  
5 is a protected watercourse area. These wetlands are  
6 DEC wetlands. We would consider them high quality  
7 wetlands and they have 100 foot wetland adjacent  
8 area that is regulated by DEC. Any disturbance  
9 within that 100 foot buffer -- any disturbance at  
10 all; tree clearing or grading requires authorization  
11 from DEC. It's up to the Board to understand  
12 whether or not that buffer has significance in terms  
13 of the environmental protection because if it does,  
14 it's one of the resources that the plan needs to  
15 respect and restrict development. Right now some of  
16 the buffer area is farmed agricultural areas that  
17 the Board may feel that maybe it doesn't feel that  
18 it has any conservation resource value.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Let me ask you this: If we didn't  
20 go through this, do they have enough room for viable  
21 lots here outside the 100-foot buffer?

22 MR. GRASSO: We're looking at about 80 lots; we  
23 would think. That would still encroach within the  
24 buffer, but would still meet the general intent.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Whose decision is it if they can

1 build within the DEC buffer?

2 MR. GRASSO: The Planning Board as well as DEC.  
3 Obviously, any work within the buffer will require DEC  
4 approval. There is nothing in the file yet from DEC.  
5 You probably had some conversations with them. Sometimes  
6 permits within previously developed disturbed areas of a  
7 buffer -- they can get permits from. But this is where  
8 the Planning Board needs to also factor in. A lot of  
9 the development that they are proposing is within this  
10 wetland buffer area (Indicating). I would say that  
11 probably 50% of the lots fall within this buffer area  
12 that we would typically say development should be  
13 restricted from. You want to respond as to why you  
14 think that the plan works.

15 MR. LONGO: Certainly. And that was why we  
16 provided the Board with a second plan which is kind of  
17 spoken of within that conservation subdivision  
18 guidelines of the Code which talks about considering a  
19 conservation analysis of the site. Before we located  
20 this road and located the proposed lots, we performed  
21 this conservation analysis of the site. As I mentioned,  
22 a very critical part of that conservation analysis was  
23 the wetlands and the tributary as well as the 100-foot  
24 stream buffer as part of that stream. Also there are  
25 other jurisdictional wetlands within this draw and this

1 ravine.

2 The point that we wanted to make with this  
3 conservation analysis and why we located the  
4 development the way that we did was to take note of  
5 where that treeline is today and where that  
6 agricultural field is active and where there really  
7 isn't vegetation or really isn't that buffer that  
8 DEC intends to preserve by imposing their 100-foot  
9 buffer from any New York State DEC wetland. So, we  
10 wanted to show the difference between where it was  
11 forested and where there is current agricultural  
12 field. After performing that conservation analysis  
13 of the site, that's when we located these lots and  
14 attempted to avoid those forested areas or more  
15 mature wetland buffer areas as we could. That's how  
16 the majority of all this development is up here in  
17 this agricultural field.

18 I would also like to note that there is some  
19 actual some agricultural field which is proposed to  
20 be included in the HOA lands which would be  
21 permanently preserved. So, even though the land,  
22 which is also within the 100-foot stream setback --  
23 on top of being an agricultural field and really not  
24 having the vegetation that one would expect to see  
25 within a stream or wetland buffer, this agricultural

1 field would be preserved as permanent open space and  
2 would go back to that natural buffer that you would  
3 expect to see flanking that stream. We have  
4 attempted to avoid that corridor as much as possible  
5 and again, avoid the wetland draw also and really  
6 concentrate the development in the agricultural  
7 area.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: How many curb cuts are you  
9 proposing to have on Consaul Road?

10 MR. LONGO: Three cuts.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: On lot number 4 there is going to  
12 be a drive way on the cul-de-sac road?

13 MR. LONGO: Yes, there would be a driveway right  
14 here (Indicating) that would be the southside of the  
15 wetland crossing.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I am going to give an  
17 instantaneous opinion that I would feel better about  
18 it and no objection except for the three curb cuts on  
19 Consaul.

20 MR. LONGO: I don't know if I followed you.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I would go along with it except  
22 for the three separate lots, unless Joe gives me reason  
23 why not. If you're going to have a conservation area  
24 and you're going to encroach to some degree on the 100  
25 foot buffer, I think that it should be an isolated

1 development and not have three curb cuts on Consaul.  
2 It's a visual thing in a way, but it's also a traffic  
3 thing. It mitigates some of the impact by knocking out  
4 these three lots as sort of a trade off for allowing you  
5 -- I'm not saying quid pro quo. I'm saying that in  
6 terms of environmental impact. If you got rid of those  
7 three lots, the total environmental impact would be  
8 less. That's kind of my view.

9 MR. GRASSO: It's important to note because the  
10 Lishakill Creek or a branch of the Lishakill Creek goes  
11 out to Consaul Road there so you have a protective  
12 watercourse in close proximity there so there is a  
13 wetland corridor. Obviously, there is a Lishakill Creek  
14 so you have the 100-foot buffer. So, probably over half  
15 of those three lots is within that 100-foot buffer area.  
16 When you talk about his 100-foot buffer area or wetland  
17 adjacent area, you have to remember that 50 feet of  
18 buffer will provide the same protection as 150 feet some  
19 place else. That's why it's important to try not to get  
20 hung up on that you can't get hung up on the 100-foot  
21 buffer with a 100-foot buffer. You have to look at how  
22 it factors into other aspects of the project, which is  
23 what I think you brought to the table.

24 The other thing that I just wanted to mention  
25 is that I think that it's important to understand is

1 to start to think amount the lots sizes that we're  
2 looking at. These are 7,000 square foot lots and  
3 although they may be consistent with the lots sizes  
4 that you see on Crosby and Lester, they are  
5 relatively small lots. If you look at the air photo  
6 like a lot of homes there, the development may even  
7 add garages. We're talking about very small lot  
8 sizes. So, these lots, when they get developed,  
9 will be developed wall to wall. There will be very  
10 little open space within the lots after you develop  
11 a 7,000 square foot lot with a home that is  
12 marketable today. We're going from an 18,000 square  
13 foot minimum lot size in an SFR zone down to 7,000.  
14 That's something that the Board needs to feel  
15 comfortable because that's one of the things that  
16 will direct them into this type of cluster  
17 subdivision.

18 MR. LONGO: If I could make just one more comment -  
19 just to back up a little bit about the Consaul Road  
20 lots, I do want to point one thing out over there. That  
21 is where there is an existing barn. There is an  
22 existing barn on the parcel, kind of in the location of  
23 this third lot as well as behind the barn is kind of  
24 been over time a lot of piling of hay and other grass  
25 clippings and that kind of stuff. So, there is a fairly



1 decent size portion of this that could use some cleaning  
2 up as well as the barn and I guess if those proposed  
3 lots weren't there, there would have to be some thought  
4 as to what to do with that portion of the land,  
5 especially if it is to be owned by an HOA and  
6 permanently preserved. I guess that is why we intended  
7 to utilize that portion as well as the existing growth  
8 frontage.

9 MR. MION: I believe that barn used to be a house.  
10 With those curb cuts, you have to be going east to bump  
11 into the driveway. I've tried to go and out of there at  
12 that particular driveway and it's a tough turn as it is  
13 now. That's only one curb cut. You have that right  
14 smack dab in the middle of that curve.

15 Then when you talk about back here where they  
16 back up to here (Indicating) -- some of the things  
17 that we do look at is what kind of barrier are you  
18 going to put up so that they won't see the  
19 commercial buildings. I was over there the other  
20 day and we're not very far from the office  
21 buildings. You can see them and I don't know if  
22 people will want to see that. We should talk about  
23 a buffer there. You are also very close to wetlands  
24 there. They are very small lots.

25 MS. MILSTEIN: What size houses would be going in

1 these different lots?

2 MR. LONGO: What is shown on the plan is about a  
3 1500 square foot footprint. By the time that you got a  
4 garage in there and you had two floors, you're probably  
5 not too large in the actual footprint size of the house.  
6 You may be between two and 3,000 of actual square  
7 footage.

8 MS. MILSTEIN: Will that include a garage or not?

9 MR. LONGO: Of interior of habitable square  
10 footage, probably about 2,000 and 3,000 - not including  
11 the garage. Between the two floors.

12 MR. GRASSO: The homes on Lester and Crosby --  
13 those are typically single story homes?

14 MR. LONGO: I think so. Most of them are more of  
15 the Cape Cod style in this neighborhood. It's a little  
16 bit wider than what we would propose with this. These  
17 would be a little bit more narrow and then the  
18 two-story.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, how big are the houses?

20 MR. GRASSO: It's hard for me to picture a 2,500  
21 square foot two-story home on a 7,000 square foot lot.  
22 One of the things is the floor plans and this would be  
23 one that you may want to see some representative floor  
24 plans.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you have a builder in mind yet?

1 MR. LONGO: Yes, Bordeaux Builders.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Where have they built?

3 MR. LONGO: They have built up in Charlton.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Have they done any product like  
5 this?

6 MR. LONGO: They actually have a new product coming  
7 that is this up in Clifton Park on Route 146 which is a  
8 pretty similar size unit.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What about the lots?

10 MR. LONGO: I don't know the exact square footage,  
11 but they're not too far off between this. Right now  
12 we're showing the smallest lot size to be ,7,700. Those  
13 are in the range of 10,000 or 12,000. Those houses are  
14 a little bit bigger and wider. So, this would  
15 definitely be a different style and certainly I believe  
16 that this is part of the conservation requirements that  
17 we would provide your floor plans and architectural of  
18 the buildings. But they certainly feel that they could  
19 fit a nice looking style house on these lots 60 foot  
20 wide.

21 MR. MION: The lots on Lester Street and Crosby  
22 Street - they are about 7,000 square feet?

23 MR. LONGO: I believe that they are. They are  
24 pretty close. You can see that there is one lot and  
25 they are pretty consistent with what we are showing.

1           They may even be only 7,000. As I mentioned, the 7,700  
2           is the smallest lot size that we have. Typically, these  
3           lots are all in the range of 8,000 to 10,000. Those  
4           look to be in the 7,000 range.

5           MR. MION: The houses that are on there - most of  
6           them all started out as single story, two-bedroom homes.  
7           They're all very small houses. I'm not sure whether  
8           they had a basement or they were a slab. That's what  
9           they were. We're talking about very small houses.

10          MR. LONGO: As well as near Wembley Court to the  
11          north, they are a little bit more narrow than what we  
12          would propose here, but those are the two-story ones. I  
13          believe that those have a little bit more square footage  
14          than you see down here on Lester.

15          CHAIRMAN STUTO: How old are the houses that are up  
16          there now?

17          MR. LONGO: I think that they were somewhere in the  
18          early 90s that both those subdivisions were done.

19          MR. MION: The one over near Lester is 1940s or  
20          1950s. That's when those houses were built.

21          MR. LONGO: I'm sorry. The ones near Wembley Court  
22          were done in the very early 90's with those two-story  
23          homes.

24          MR. MION: There were some fires over there and it  
25          burnt one house and then they replaced it. When they

1 replaced that one, they put in two or three other  
2 houses.

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Does the Board want to see house  
4 placement?

5 MR. SHAMLIAN: I think that we need to see a little  
6 more of the houses and maybe even the floor plans.

7 MR. LONGO: We certainly envision the floor plans  
8 and the need to show the architectural of these  
9 proposed homes and what the builder envisions here to  
10 build. I guess we stopped a little bit short of that  
11 because we knew that there was some discussion to be had  
12 about the conservation and the conservation subdivision  
13 and the open space that we were providing with the HOA  
14 and applying those standards to this parcel. That's why  
15 we came to the Board for that directive to make sure  
16 that we could move forward and show you guys some nice  
17 looking architectural where the builder intends to put  
18 on these lots.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Our agenda doesn't call for a  
20 vote. It's just called for a sketch plan. It just  
21 means that we talk and I think that the Board is saying  
22 that we're open minded to it, but we need a little more  
23 detail before we can commit to what you are saying. I  
24 think that we're skeptical, or at least asking questions  
25 about whether the lot sizes are adequate. That's going

1 to be determined on how it slopes and whether it  
2 actually works or not. I think that we're not totally  
3 closed minded to it, but we need more to make sure. I  
4 think that's the feedback that I'm hearing.

5 MR. SHAMLIAN: Generally speaking, the idea of  
6 expanding beyond the defined 100-foot DEC buffer into  
7 some of the area that has already been cleared --  
8 personally, I think that within reason that's  
9 acceptable. I'm not speaking for anybody else --  
10 reasonably acceptable. It already has been cleared.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you know the Marini development  
12 - the one between Spring Street and Watervliet Shaker  
13 Road? It's East Hills. You know the smaller lot as  
14 you're going toward Watervliet Shaker there are smaller  
15 lots on the right? They are carriage homes. How big  
16 are those lots?

17 MR. LACIVITA: I'd have to see.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: They're nice looking. I think  
19 that the retired people that live there - there is less  
20 maintenance and so forth.

21 Are you providing an HOA to maintain  
22 everything; the lawns and so forth?

23 MR. LONGO: I'm not sure that we've delved into how  
24 far they'll reach onto the individual parcels.  
25 Certainly with an HOA in existence, there could be those

1 amenities provided, but we haven't really discussed too  
2 many details about that yet. There will be one in  
3 existence, definitely for the open space.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Does anyone have any other  
5 questions?

6 (There was no response.)

7 I guess we're going to need a few more details  
8 and we're going to do a little bit more homework as  
9 well.

10 MR. LONGO: Certainly we can come back and show you  
11 other examples within the Town. I know that there  
12 certainly may be a few others, even if they aren't in  
13 Town that are this width and this type of style home  
14 that work well that we've seen.

15 Just one other question that I would have is  
16 along Consaul. Would the Board be open to at least  
17 utilizing that existing cut that is there for the  
18 barn and the former home -- at least utilizing that  
19 existing cut even if we pulled away from the string  
20 a little bit more but still utilize that for one  
21 lot?

22 MR. MION: That would be more toward the houses.

23 MR. LONGO: There is a little bit of a gravel  
24 access there to the barn and house.

25 MR. MION: That's what I'm talking about.

1           MR. LONGO:  If we could at least utilize that area  
2           for one proposed lot -

3           MR. MION:  That makes more sense.

4           CHAIRMAN STUTO:  We will take a look.

5           MS. MILSTEIN:  Any visuals that you have will be  
6           helpful.

7           CHAIRMAN STUTO:  You already have those houses laid  
8           out, so you could probably superimpose that.

9           MR. LONGO:  We can definitely get the houses shown  
10          on the lots that you're looking at in your packet.  
11          Obviously, it is a little bit tough to see 60 foot wide  
12          and to envision that house within that width.  As I'm  
13          showing here, it doesn't quite do the justice yet, but  
14          we can certainly get this on plan view as well as some  
15          elevations that might show or real photographs that  
16          might show those houses next to each other.

17          MR. GRASSO:  Does the adjacent residence - that's  
18          the [SIC] Timula residence and they own the project  
19          site.  Their property line on Consaul Road.  If the  
20          Board is wrestling with the appropriateness of lots on  
21          Consaul Road, that property line comes in at such a  
22          skew.  Is there any ability to take 30 or 40 feet that  
23          could become part of a lot area?

24          MR. LONGO:  I wish that there was.  At this point  
25          that's not part of the subject parcel.  It's separate.



1           Although it is the same owner, it is separate and not  
2           part of this proposed project. But yes, it would help  
3           and probably if that happened, maybe those three lots  
4           could fit with no problem but as it stands, maybe we're  
5           looking at one if that triangle can't be acquired.

6           MR. GRASSO: For the Board, is it appropriate for  
7           them to come back with a full concept submission or are  
8           there things that you would like to see still at a  
9           higher level like a sketch review before they make a  
10          commitment to this type of project because concept  
11          submission in this Town - there is a lot of work  
12          involved to put that together.

13          CHAIRMAN STUTO: I would prefer another sketch.

14          MR. LANE: I agree with that.

15          MR. GRASSO: Is that something that you're  
16          comfortable with - coming back for a sketch with  
17          additional detail?

18          MR. LONGO: I think that I would definitely be  
19          comfortable coming back for another sketch if you guys  
20          aren't sure that this is what you want and you're going  
21          to definitely be okay with it. I don't think that we  
22          should come back with a concept leaving the Board as it  
23          is. If that's what you're asking for and we do need to  
24          show a little bit more and not quite advance too much  
25          until you guys are a little bit more comfortable, then I

1 think that we can certainly do that.

2 MR. LANE: Do you have other elevations that are in  
3 mind which you have a model or plans? It may not be the  
4 one, but maybe you could bring back something?

5 MR. LONGO: We will certainly put together some  
6 floor plans and elevations and I'll attempt to get some  
7 photographs if we can of similar sized homes and similar  
8 sized widths of parcels that you guys can get a little  
9 bit more visualization on.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

11

12 (Whereas the above entitled proceeding was  
13 concluded at 8:50 p.m.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATION

I, NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, Shorthand  
Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of  
New York, hereby CERTIFY that the record taken by me  
at the time and place noted in the heading hereof is  
a true and accurate transcript of same, to the best  
of my ability and belief.

\_\_\_\_\_

NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART

Dated March 30, 2015.

