

October 19, 2016

A MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD of the Town of Ossining was held in the Joseph G. Caputo, Ossining Community Center, 95 Broadway, Ossining, New York, on the 19th day of October 2016. There were present the following members of the Planning Board:

Ching Wah Chin, Acting Chair
Greg McWilliams, Vice Chair
Gareth Hougham, Member
Jim Bossinas, Member
Marc Hoeflich, Member

Absent: Daniel Ciarcia, PE, Consulting Town Engineer

Also Present: Katherine Zalantis, Attorney, Silverberg, Zalantis LLP
David Stolman, AICP, PP, Frederick P. Clark Associates, Inc.
Stephen Coleman, Environmental Consulting, LLC
Sandy Anelli, Secretary

Artis Senior Living LLC, Memory Care Facility, 553 North State Road – Site Plan PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED

Mr. Peter Wise, Attorney for the Applicant, Mr. Brian Hildenbrand, Engineer and Mr. Paul Folger, Architect from LK Architecture were present. Mr. Folger presented a design board and material samples to the board. Mr. Folger described screened in porch areas on the ends of the building and the materials and finishes that are proposed. Mr. Bossinas asked if they are going to put mechanical equipment on the roof. Mr. Folger said since changes to the footprint of the building they are not putting on the roof. They are using a lower mansard roof with screening. Mr. Hoeflich recommended using a slightly lighter color for the roof which will improve energy efficiency. Mr. Folger agreed.

Dr. Hougham expressed concern with the second story windows and the escape of light at the back of the building. Mr. Hoeflich mentioned that there is now a new NYS Energy Code which they have to comply with. The lights they have in their living room, kitchen, screened porches, studies, have to be on vacancy and time clocks and if no one is in that area, they shut off. Mr. Hoeflich asked that they follow the code and in all of those areas have them on occupancy/vacancy type switches. Mr. Hoeflich urged that the stairwells don't need windows and asked Mr. Folger to remove those on the north side because this is an area that must remain with lights on all through the night.

Mr. Bossinas was in disagreement with removing day-lighting windows from any areas of the building. He reminded the Board that the lighting from this will be the same as a residential neighbor turning on a light in their bedroom.

Mr. Folger noted that the screened in porch areas are frosted glass up to a point and at the top they are regular windows which, in complying with the NYS Energy Code, are required for a certain amount of daylight needed. The bedrooms will have blinds and drapes. The common areas can be on sensor and most of them will be on a dimmer switch. Dr. Hougham expressed concern with regard to windows on the second level that face the rear. This is common area where the light will be on most of the time. Dr. Hougham asked them to consider blacking out these windows.

Mr. Stolman noted there are certain provisions in the Resolution of Architectural Review Board Approval which say room darkening drapes or blinds shall be installed in any bedroom with a window that faces the rear of the property and motion sensors shall be installed in the first floor studio, the 2nd floor health center and office so that the lights will remain off when not in use. Mr. Stolman read a memo from Mr. Ciarcia, dated October 19, 2016 to the Board. There were two comments on the memo:

1. A blow up of the area in the vicinity of DMH #5 was provided, however there are still some concerns. The existing open concrete structure will be covered in the proposed channel, but it is not clear how the existing pipe will be maintained. The cover may also leak, which could cause the proposed channel to run dry during low flow periods. The option of moving DMH 5 to the location of the existing concrete structure should be considered.

2. The Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) has been reviewed and appears to be complete. A more thorough review will be required prior to signing the MS4 SWPPP acceptance form. Based on the initial review of the SWPPP, I have no objection to the Planning Board adopting a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA

Mr. Hildenbrand agreed to move the manhole per Mr. Ciarcia's recommendation. Mr. Chin asked if the Board had any further comments. Mr. Hoeflich urged that they look at the ADA compliance in the building and basement areas.

Mr. Chin opened the Public Hearing to the public:

Ms. Donna Sharrett, 84 Morningside Drive: The discussion of blasting came up and Ms. Sharrett said she would like more information on that for the safety of their property and their home. She said there was mention of a low power blasting which is something they would be interested in and also there was a change in the pesticide usage plan per Steve Coleman's memo at the last meeting. Ms. Sharrett wants to be sure that the knotweed is going to be manually removed as a first course of action and the pesticide is secondary and thanked Mr. Coleman and Artis for agreeing to eliminate the spraying and the drift of that. Ms. Sharrett asked that the final mitigation plan have the final agreements on that before it is signed and that all the final materials are accurate and that everybody insists that everything is accurate. Ms. Sharrett is asking for a wetlands maintenance agreement which is different than a wetland permit. She spoke with Peter Wise regarding this and does not understand it as he explained it.

Ms. Sharrett said she spoke with David Emerson with Westchester Land Trust and he provided her with an example of a wetland maintenance agreement that runs with the land that is enforceable and protects from future errors and requires changes by the Planning Board. She is requesting that be done.

Ms. Sharrett: Regarding the architectural review submission, our primary concern is about the wetland area and for the visual impact as viewed from our home and our ability to enjoy our property and our property value. The loss of nocturnal wildlife habitat would be a significant loss. The Briar Commons Development destroyed a known bared owl habitat and bat colonies which also exist on our property. It seems very possible to protect the wetlands that is shared by both of our properties 553 North State Road and 84 Morningside Drive, without a significant impact from the proposed building. I am definitely happy to see what that porch looks like which is more like a room which is great and that the light will be on motion sensors which is also good. Also, I sent an email to Mr. Wise suggesting a change in planting instead a lilac behind that porch they have a fast growing evergreen, it is thin one and it will get very tall very fast and it will block out more light.

In reviewing the latest elevations and floor plans, it would be really great that the bedrooms closest to the wetlands in the back just have side windows. I have asked that beauty/barbershop have that window go to the side, if that could be done that would be great and I appreciate all of those room darkening shades and drapes that are being recommended. I would like the stairwell windows be eliminated. I just think that there's going to be a lot of light on our property I would like to explain on those set of diagrams that you have there, page 4 and 5 are really inaccurate. I know that someone explained to me that it is a computer generated thing but I don't want you to assume that that's what we are looking at. It is showing that the trees are higher than the building that is being proposed. That roof line is just at the height of trees that we have, we see now the existing building. The trees lose their leaves six months out of the year there are no leaves but even with leaves from the height of our house we are going to see right into those windows at the top and I just want you to know, those drawings are inaccurate and we are going to see much more of the building than what is indicated in that representation.

I like the darker colors looking at the back fence, looking from our yard. You can just imagine that it is just trees, other than the elevated roof line we are going to see, I would like know if the Planning Board would consider having them lower that center elevation because that is just a big vaulted common space, I don't understand why that has to be so much higher than the side roof lines and that would be really great because that would bring it down closer to the tree line. I heard that during the work session, Gareth brought it up, that there were some resolutions, I just want you to consider that this facility is different than most of the ones on North State Road, it's a 24/7 365-day a year facility so the glow of the light is really something that should be considered whereas other buildings on North State Road shut off at night and you don't get that light.

Ms. Sharrett – continued:

I read the law and Ken has been asking for this and it has never been submitted; it's 55.6.8 under application requirements, that the size, shape, and location of existing and proposed construction and its relation to existing properties, buildings, and structures. I think it would be a good thing for you to know because the buildings on both side and across the street are much smaller than this, so when I am asking for that center to come down, I don't think it is unreasonable request considering how much bigger and how much taller this structure is compared to the other structures.

So for the wetland resolution, using the summer as an example, a one year watering agreement will result in dead plants or could result in dead plants. There needs to be at least a three-year watering agreement for this and every other proposed project. Trees that die in the second year would be required to be replaced but not required to be watered, as the watering requirement is limited to the first year. In theory new trees could be replaced every year until the five year agreement has been met then resulting buffer area without plants. The wetland permit seems to be at a five year end date, the SEQRA Neg. Dec. is in large part hinged on the promise that the loss of the wetlands and the buffer will be mitigated by planting native trees, shrubs and ground cover so that, quote "once successfully implemented it would result in a net improvement to the overall wetland functions", this premise is only valid if the mitigation is maintained in perpetuity. So this whole Neg. Dec. is because you're going to be improving this buffer area, but if the buffer area doesn't establish then it is for naught, there is no improved value on that buffer. There needs to be watering and I really think there has to be a wetland mitigation maintenance agreement.

The other thing with the tree removal permit, all of the trees were never on the plan. They weren't all listed on the existing conditions site plan because there's two that Artis has agreed to preserve that were never listed on that. I think there's quite a few more but my main concern is that looking very carefully, the back line is not surveyed on the property because for whatever reason, the markers got removed. I'm guessing that one big red maple is partially on my property. I want to know how the trees are going to be..... I want to be insured that the trees are going to be coming down, on Zappi's project across the street from this, there was about 2 dozen trees that were supposed to stay on that based on that site plan and they all got chopped down, every single one of them, including a 200 year old oak tree. It happens quickly, and if you're not there, they're gone. So I want to know considering there hasn't been much, and there isn't a tree inventory required and I don't think anyone has double checked that information. So, how am I going to be insured that nothing is going to inadvertently going to get cut down? That is something that we should think about. There is also spice bushes that they want plant so mature ones should stay. Thank you for letting me speak again, since there are so many different things that are coming up, I appreciate that. Thank you for keeping the public hearing open.

Mr. Wise: Just a few things very quickly, with respect to knot weed removal, we certainly don't have any problem with a condition that says "manual removal first then chemical secondarily" that is certainly fine and I've already said that. With respect to blasting, the best way to deal with this is a condition that I have posed to Donna and I have copied the Board as well, which would require us to first use mechanical methods and if we use blasting it would have to be in accordance with all state, federal and local laws. I know that you do have an explosives law I don't know if you have promulgated them, if not, we have a blasting protocol that we have used for the last thirty years and you could review that and that would be protective of all the neighbors as well. With respect to Arborvitae by the porch, we will speak to Dave Sessions about that, I don't think that is a big issue and with respect to plantings I think we have already reviewed that the planting plan will require replacement over the course of five years in addition to watering.

Architectural issues, I'm certainly not going to concede that we are lowering roofs or getting rid of windows right now but we will go back and talk about it and see what we can do and respond to you on those issues. Thank you.

Mr. Coleman said we've asked the applicant to do a five-year monitoring and maintenance plan which is typical for wetland mitigation projects. We have given a sample to the applicant and haven't received that yet so that is something that needs to be submitted. Mr. Wise said he would be getting that to the Board within a day or so. Mr. Coleman said there are several protocols in there in terms of tracking and maintaining the plants where there's a recording procedure, usually the applicant has to retain consulting who can oversees the mitigation plan for the five year period.

Mr. Coleman – continued: It's a standard protocol that 85% survival of all plantings and that is incumbent upon the applicant to maintain the integrity of planting plan for the five year period. Once the five year period is over, I would suggest to the Board is that the resolution doesn't necessarily suggest taking care of the wetland buffer in perpetuity. After the five year period most plants will be successfully adapted to the site and growing and functioning as intended. There are problems in some projects where an applicant may decide not to maintain after that five year obligation and on some planning board resolutions there are clauses that specify that the plantings need to be maintained or that there's an opportunity for the planning board or the building inspection to intervene and check with compliance with the approved plan.

Mr. Stolman pointed out on page 5 item 2 of the wetlands permit approval it says "The applicant shall enter into a landscape maintenance agreement with the Town of Ossining that includes but is not limited to the wetland mitigation plantings. Mr. Coleman said this addresses that item. Mr. Wise added that if they are going to have an obligation to perpetually maintain that vegetation, they feel the deer fence should be there permanently. Mr. Coleman said he is in agreement with this and suggest the Board look at the permanent fencing. Mr. Hoeflich suggested more a mesh type fence not the same material as the other fence something more invisible.

Dr. Hougham asked the applicant if there was a tree inventory plan and if it was accurate based on Ms. Sharrett's concerns with this. Mr. Hildenbrand said yes, there is a tree inventory. It is part of the erosion and sedimentation plan which shows trees to be removed and trees to be protected. Secondly, Dr. Hougham asked applicant to provide a view from the back, from the elevation that is more representative from three of the neighbors on Morningside Drive. Mr. Wise objected to this request as it would require re-surveying private properties. Mr. Wise said if you are asking for something generally illustrative, they can look at that and produce something. Dr. Hougham said it is a trivial matter you can look how far horizontally it is, it wouldn't take a lot of research to find out approximate elevations of Donna and Ken's house. Other neighbors may be interested too, but an easier solution, that we talked about three years ago, is take a 3D of the building save it as a Google file, a KGM file, and create a link Google Earth so any neighbor could look at it from their own house.

Mr. Chin clarified to the applicant that this would not be a survey. Mr. Folger agreed that something from Google Earth is not a survey. It would only be as accurate as Google Maps and understands what Dr. Hougham is requesting. Dr. Hougham said this would solve the problem of everyone having to guess what this would look like from the top of the hill, or North State Road.

Mr. Stolman said at this time the Board could entertain three of the four resolutions. Mr. Stolman reviewed Resolution of Site Plan Approval, Resolution of Wetland Permit Approval, Resolution of Tree Removal Permit Approval, and a Resolution of Architectural Review. Mr. Stolman pointed out that these are all a second draft versions.

Mr. Hoeflich expressed concern about the deer fence that was discussed earlier, whether if it should be permanent, how would that affect the Deer traveling through that area. Mr. Stolman further reviewed resolution changes and amendments. Dr. Hougham talked about tree removal and urged that trees can be removed as necessary. He recommended a longer period for tree removal so the area wouldn't be clear cut all at once. The issue of lighting came up again.

Dr. Hougham suggested blacking out the windows that face the rear. Again, Mr. Bossinas urged that everyone has neighbors now and the lights from their neighbor's homes are not beaming across the yard into your house. In his opinion, this seems to be an overreaction. Mr. Wise agreed that they would not be beaming light in an upward direction aimed at the neighbors. Mr. Hoeflich said that the height of the building is in keeping with the Town Code. Ms. Sharrett and Mr. Kamber disagreed with that.

Mr. Chin said the resolutions are not going to be voted on tonight, however, the Board has sense of what the final reviews are going to be. Mr. Chin asked Ms. Sharrett to put her comments in writing and send them to the Board in advance of the meeting which is a lot more effective that doing it here. Mr. Wise thanked the Board.

Parth Knolls, LLC, Multi-Family Development, 87 Hawkes Avenue – Site Plan PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED

Mr. Beldotti Senior & Junior were in attendance. Mr. Venditti, Attorney and representatives of the project Mr. Tom Kerrigan & Mr. Joseph Riina of Site Design Consultants, Mr. Steve Marino & Mr. James Garofalo of Tim Miller Associates and Mr. Jorge B. Hernandez, ARQ.HT were also present.

Mr. Venditti noted that they are seeking an adoption and approval of the Negative Declaration SEQRA document which was prepared for this evening. Mr. Stolman submitted and reviewed the second draft of the Negative Declaration; the first draft was October 5, 2016. There were two items studied, one with respect to school impact and the other with traffic. After review and discussion by the Board, Mr. Chin opened the public hearing to the audience.

Mr. Ed Sellazzo, President of Woods of Westchester Homeowners Association. Mr. Sellazzo spoke about a water main extension work proposed and the impact on the property of the Woods. He asked to see further details and the drawing C-105.

Ms. Tiia Sahni, 36 Fawn Court: I live next door to the Hagerdorn Property, the property was meant for a single family home and zoned for a home office and now it is stuffed zoned for a multi-family dwellings. It's not that zoning that is so acreages it's the fact that they are attempting to put a village into that particular plot where one family lived, now there's a potential for 250 people and 100 cars going into that small plot. I moved to this area because of the environment and the nature to get away from the workplace and have restful place to look at. This is obviously something that is not going to be happening here. The wetlands in that area will now be cramped into a small space of a flowerbed. The developers have done a great job of dancing around small movement of shrubs, flowerbeds and parking lots but they haven't addressed the whole size of the project. They've never reduced it once by making it smaller, never by that 250 people that could be there. All the trees will be cut down the whole wetland is going to be eliminated and turning into one flowerbed, yes seeding is great but it's got nothing to do with saving our environment. There's another thing about the traffic study, I come out of Hawkes Avenue onto 9A and Croton Dam Road and I have to wait about two lights with cars waiting on either side to get onto the main roads. If there was any kind of accident or emergency, I would never be able to get out of there because that Hawkes Avenue is so hard. A sign is just the most laughable thing nobody stops, everybody races for the light or turn. This would be ludicrous. The developer was also saying that the school was going to get all of these extra funds for the all of school kids going to the overcrowded schools. They may be going to the overcrowded schools and those tax dollars may count for those people and the extra bribe of the \$85,000 for ruining the environment but would that make up for the possible lawsuits of the people? Would that make up for the loss of the environment? Would that make up for all the destroying of the home values and my home for 16 years? I am devastated at the thought of losing my home of 16 years over this proposed project. I am hoping the Board will be considerate of these issues. Thank you.

Ms. Stephanie DiCarrado, 106 Antler Ridge: My husband and I are new to the area, we just moved there. The favorite thing that we love about our house was the beautiful stone structure that we learned dates back to the 1800's it was a mill on a stream and it is gorgeous and to learn that it is going to be torn down is devastating. It's a piece of history to prioritize and profit over history and profit over people's lives and our property value and the fact that we start a family it's going to be in a construction zone. We are going to have transients living next door because that's what rental communities, particularly one-bedrooms, bring. Those aren't families. Those aren't people staying for a long time. Those are people that are probably going to be moving out looking for something better at some point in time. The practical reasons, and again we're new to this, I don't understand what happened with the zoning issue. What happened in 2011 that no one was made aware that the re-zoning was going to happen. When Ossining was asked to show documents to show how they notified their residents, they couldn't find anything. Why is this happening and planning is still going on? Why is nobody asking questions? Why is this not being pursued? It seems like this was an illegal activity that deserves an explanation but no one ever mentions it. I am confused, I'm upset, I'm disappointed beyond belief that this project is to allowed to go this far. The fact that the traffic study only looks at northbound traffic is laughable. I drive northbound everyday to go to Croton Harmon, if you went off of my commute and my experience, there's no problem with traffic. My husband goes south; he has to wait 10 minutes, 15 minutes at the light. You're talking about hundreds of people and hundreds of cars, there is no way there's not going to be significant impact. It is laughable that the traffic study only looks at northbound.

Mr. Stolman reminded Ms. DiCarrado that the traffic study did not only look at Northbound. It looked at the whole intersection and it looked at the northbound part of that intersection as well. It looked at the whole intersection.

Ms. Janet Eisenman, 96 Woods Brooke Circle: I would like to echo my neighbors as they said it is absolutely ridiculous for them to come to the conclusion that adding more cars to that intersection of Hawkes will not impact in a really significant way. As they said, whenever I need to go south, it requires many, many, light cycles. You wait a long time. It's very dangerous and a lot of cars are coming. How can you say many more cars is not going to impact it. It has to. I don't know who did the study survey, unless they did it in the middle of the night or in an off hour. If you're doing during commuting time, it's ridiculous. We talk about it now how bad it is and you're talking about adding a whole lot more cars. That's number one. Number two, my house backs onto Hawkes Avenue, that's in the Woods, I thought it was going to be quiet. It's kind of a country road, it's not and adding that many more cars and school buses going behind there is going to make it louder. I just can't understand how you can say that this would not negatively impact our area because it absolutely would. I'm not a professional traffic person, but you don't have to be, just go try to get across there and you'll see.

Mr. Martin Burger, Woods Brooke Circle: There's another traffic concern that concerns me. The entrance onto Hawkes Avenue is partially blind on the right there's a rise. You can see cars coming up over the rise. It's also blinded by foliage on the left. It's a dangerous entry as it is. The entrance to the Parth Knolls property is practically across the street. Has any provision been made to move the entrance so they're not directly opposite and try and mitigate the danger from entering from a driveway onto a blind intersection. You cannot see cars coming from the north side of Hawkes Avenue and they're coming toward 9A at a pretty frightening rate of speed and they are a bit collisions because I think those blind entry points and it needs to be re-studied.

Mr. Mike Vaughn, 116 Woods Brooke Circle: The end point of this is, the letter you've received from Mr. Beldotti dated October 11, 2016 asks that you give a negative declaration, which I don't know what that means, and prepare a draft resolution of site plan approval and I am asking that you not do so tonight but rather keep the public hearing open. First of all as the first speaker said the document dealing with the water main and the water issue reference a plan that has never been available on the website. Now I heard earlier, if it is there, three different people have looked for it and none have been able to find it. We have not been able to look at it to review. So being able to approve this plan without the public having an opportunity to see the plan would make a travesty of the public hearing in my opinion. Contrary to what Mr. Stolman said, the document specifically eludes to the fact that this won't have a negative impact on northbound traffic and it's referring to the entrance from Hawkes onto 9A heading north.

I think everyone here would agree that is not where the problem is. The problem is where Rte. 134, Croton Dam Road, and Rte.9A come together and there's a traffic light there. So they are proposing that they are going to put out a "don't block the box" sign and paint a big X and I am saying to you good luck with that having any effect whatsoever. To those of us going straight across to Taconic parkway or heading south on Rte. 9A coming from Hawkes, we come around there on Kitchawan and the traffic is all backed up. Once in a while a nice person will signal to one of us to come out because the lights are red. The most that could get out is one car, so there's a "don't block the box", first of all that would make a person that came out in the box and that would be an illegal traffic maneuver, but even if the Town said we're not going to enforce that, one car would be able to get out. The documents say, "This issue isn't volume, it's delay" that distinction eludes me. Everybody is complained that it takes so long because there are tons of cars coming there. Whether this project increases the volume, I don't know. I don't think it's valid to say "well, the pre-existing condition is terrible so they won't make it measurably worse" that's not acceptable. They will make it worse. The proposal for the "don't block the box" thing does mitigate the problem. That is the second reason why I don't think tonight you can approval the site plan.

Ms. Helen Arbor Young, 72 Deerfield Lane: I retired from teaching in New York City and the thing I looked forward to the most was not having to make that turn to get onto 9A. What happened prior to my retirement, there were a lot of complaints about because some people don't look where they're going and there apparently were accidents at that intersection, then a light was added, after that a "no turn on red" was added then it became even more difficult.

Ms. Helen Arbor Young –continued:

I do feel that “don’t block the box” means nothing, it can be frustrating. I have other ways of getting around that intersection, if you want to pay me, I will tell you how to. So that is one of the things because when I moved to Ossining, one of the things I looked at was how am I getting to work because I’m not going to take the railroad. If you want people to move to Ossining, you don’t want to inconvenience them any more than you have to, that’s one thing and the other thing remains, trees. I’m very concerned that this many trees are going to be taken down on the property. It is something that gives us fresh air, it revitalizes people who are coming home from work and it is a place for people and their family to enjoy. We love Ossining and that’s why we live here. I think this is a big mistake, I think you’re crowding people in to a location that is not intended for that. My understanding was that when this property was re-zoned, however that was to MF-I, an inn was supposed to have no more than 15 units/rooms. This has taken things to a whole new level and we surround that property at Deerfield and the moose, the deer, the turtles, and the birds, they’re going to leave and it’s going to leave a big hole in what we are experiencing now by living there.

Mr. John Martin, 21 Fawn Court: I came from Long Island about a year ago precisely to avoid the conditions that are now happening. Better traffic, I came from an area where the traffic was hideous, that’s why I left it. The issue is crowding, and of all the places to have built this particular development, I don’t understand why this was chosen. It’s beyond my comprehension. How this was allowed to go on baffles me. There is so much better areas of land that could have this happen that would have no impact on the surrounding community and they chose this one. The other issue, I heard, that when all these condos were built in the 80’s people around the area complained about the possibility of overcrowding but condos are spaced differently. There’s far less units people own them, they have pride in them. It’s a different deal when you have apartments. I was brought up in the Bronx so I know all about apartments. I’m around apartment all the time, I work in the City. I didn’t want to live in that type of community, I chose Ossining because of how it is. I am very disappointed in the process and in the Town itself for allowing this to happen. I don’t know if this is fait accompli but I think it is going to be a real black mark on the community

Ms. Lillian Nahas, President of Deerfield Homeowners Association: Earlier in the process I heard Jim Bossinas recommend that the applicant scale down size of the project. Somehow that request was again disregarded by the applicant. It also seems to be forgotten about by the Planning Board. I don’t understand why none of the members of the Planning board have stayed on him about downsizing his project or fight the huge public outcry. Most of the members of the Architectural Review Board have now had a chance to visit the property, so why is it that I haven’t heard any one of you comment about the depth of these buildings? At least one of these building has four times the depth of the buildings on their boarder are there no restrictions on depth? How can we say possibly that these buildings are characteristic to the area. They are completely uncharacteristic. They’re unquestionably uncharacteristic.

There are no rental apartments in the area. There are absolutely no rental apartments here and unlike rental apartments, condominiums are managed by a governing document to maintain those properties to certain standards. Deerfield is small but it is very well managed. Our property values, not only hold up to the competition, but in most cases exceed the competition. The imminent decrease to our property values is a concern to our Board, our homeowners, and the community at large. This was already demonstrated by a petition that we submitted to you months ago, we had 380 signatures and I am going to give you an additional 57 signatures tonight to add to that.

The Town Code charges the Architectural Review Board with and I quote “encouraging the most appropriate use of the land” in no way possible that you can convince anyone in this room that this is the most appropriate use of this land. The taxpayers and the voters in our town expect that the members of this Board will take this responsibility seriously and not cave in to the wishes of a businessman how has already profited handsomely from overdevelopment of the area. This is our town and he doesn’t live in our town. At the June hearing I was accused by the applicant’s Attorney of mischaracterizing the Hawkes Avenue as semi-rural, that is completely laughable. We have a plethora of wildlife that live in our community over the summer we’ve added a bear and a moose. Did anyone here see pictures of the moose? There’s no way that I mischaracterized the neighborhood. I think if anyone is trying to delude the planning board, the finger points to the applicant.

Ms. Nahas – continued: In conversations with the president of the Hagerdorn Insurance Company, who owns this property it was discovered in 2011 they were in negotiations with the developer interested in development of 87 Hawkes and relocating Hagerdorn to that developers office building on Executive Boulevard. That same year for no apparent reason, Mr. Stolman recommended re-zoning 87 Hawkes from Office Research Manufacturing to Multi-Family Inn. The truth was this property was re-zoned by the Town with no notice provided to nearby homeowners, no public hearing, and the address of the property was not specified in one printed document until it went into law. The truth is that the MF-I designation was created specifically for this parcel and had not been used in the Town of Ossining before once enacted. Astonishingly, 4 of the 6 zoning changes recommended by Mr. Stolman as part of the comprehensive plan appear to have been for profiteers currently owned by the applicant. The Town of Ossining has been put on notice that 87 Hawkes was illegally re-zoned in 2011 and any project on this parcel must not proceed until that issue is resolved. I understand that there is a statute of limitations that already might have expired but that may not be upheld in the court under the circumstances.

This project as it stands will create intolerable noise, road congestion, and dirt, debris, in a densely populated area during and after construction. Who is going to compensate Deerfield's homeowners for this? The noise created by tree removal, excavating, this is an unnecessary hardship. Does any of the members of this Board know that there is an elderly woman with COPD living in the unit bordering this property and that her husband, her 90 year old husband is recovering from a stroke. Do you know that there is another elderly woman that sits on the north side that borders this property? These are not vacant units. People live here and the decision that you make will greatly affect their lives. Will our homeowners be prevented from using the pool during the construction phase? Will they be able to enjoy their decks and their patios? Who's going to clean up the mess? Who's going to repaint our buildings? Who's going to tell our children that they can't play in their back yards because there might be tree limbs or other debris flying? People live here this is a very densely populated area and he's trying to squeeze too much into it. Once again, I am asking the members of this Board to reject this application as it stands in light of the applicant's refusal to be guided by the concerns of the public with regard to density and footprint. He had more than ample opportunity to take these concerns into consideration and hasn't elected to do so.

Ms. Teach, 35 Fawn Court: I've lived there for 8 years. I come from the city, which I love, but I got used to living in a nice peaceful quiet area which is Ossining and just the other day I was putting my patio furniture away and a hawk landed on my flowerpot. It was exciting to see such a beautiful bird landing on my flowerpot. So building this will obstruct our view, everything that my neighbor said is true. It's upsetting to me coming from the city that now I am going to be living in a city again with this building right next door to me. A swimming pool with half naked people swimming that I have to look at from my patio. I really don't want to see that and I don't think it's fair to homeowners who want that quite life. The traffic, I know you guys heard about the traffic going southbound. I am lucky I go northbound to Croton Harmon Station and everyday sitting next to my husband I say "thank god we don't have to go southbound" because the light on 134 could go almost to Croton Harmon Station. Maybe in the summertime when schools are out and teachers are out, it's a little less. I'm hoping you would side with us and not these multimillionaires that don't live in the neighborhood and have their mansion with nothing surrounding them. I hope you understand where we are coming from and hope this monster building will not be built.

Mr. Peter Kraus, 46 Deerfield Lane: I live at the Deerfield Condos with my wife for 27 years and I am sure you all have heard the numerous statements about the negative effects that this proposed Parth Knolls project will have on the Hawkes Avenue area. I believe that this proposed development will cause what I view is residential oversaturation. I am sure it is not a scientific or a planning phrase but I think it summarizes what is wrong with this proposal and what some of the other speakers have mentioned here tonight. They are already in the immediate vicinity, two condominium developments Deerfield and the Woods, several private homes, and a third large condominium complex, Fox Hill, not far down Hawkes Avenue and another condo development, Spring Pond, which is nearby. It is my opinion that Parth Knolls project is misplaced does not belong where it is being proposed primarily because of the added populous it will produce. It seems to me that this project will be better suited to more urban setting, say somewhere here in the village. In summary I respectfully urge the Board to give serious thought to all of these public comments and keep the public hearing open and saying nay to Parth Knolls.

Mr. Geoff Colquitt, 22 Fawn Court: I live in Deerfield. We've been here for about a year and a half. We moved up here from a very congested neighborhood in Mt. Vernon. Everything that everybody said at this meeting is true. Personally, I'm hearing for the first time is this zoning issue and the lack of resolve to that is very disturbing to me and I don't see how you can proceed with this until that is resolved in satisfaction with everyone in this room. That's number one. Number two, I don't think anybody is saying, ultimately we'd like to keep that land the way it is but eventually somebody's going to build something on it. We just don't want them to build that. Build something that fits in with what's already been built. We have a beautiful condominium complex on one side of the road and a beautiful condominium on the other side of the road and this building absolutely does not fit there. It has no place there and that's all I'm going to say.

Ms. Jenifer Pawliczak, 123 Hawkes Avenue: I want to say that I represent all of the individual homeowners on Hawkes Avenue. There are five or six of us and we do feel just as strongly as everyone else in this room about all the complaints. We talked about the traffic study, one that hasn't been mentioned here is that the other project on Croton Dam Road that is being considered. There could be a traffic study that these guys have done and there can be a traffic study that the other development has done but when you look at them together, it's the together, that the significance is going to be expedient and of course there is the rezoning issue that we, the individual homeowners, really have issue with and were not just going to sit down about it.

Mr. Stolman: I just wanted to mention to the Board and the public that the genesis of this zone and the application of the zone to the Hagerdorn Property, 87 Hawkes Avenue goes back to the 2002 comprehensive plan which was a collaboration between the Comprehensive Plan Committee that has been established, the Planning Board, the Town Board and my firm.

Ms. Zalantis: I would like to add that it is not within this Board's purview to assess the validity of a rezoning that occurred in 2011 by the Town Board. That is not something that can come into this Board's decision making process.

Audience: Whose purview is that under?

Mr. Chin: The short answer is that it is the Town Board that decided this. We can only follow the laws that we've been given.

Ms. Nahas: Excuse me, the Town website states that re-zoning applications are within the purview of the Planning Board.

Mr. Stolman: The Planning Board is an administrative Board whereas the Town Board is a legislative Board. The Town Board does the zoning, the re-zoning, it creates zoning, it amends zoning, it applies zoning, it changes the zoning map and this Board is just an administrative Board that has got to follow the codes that exist in the Town.

Ms. Zalantis: It is a legislative Act taken by the Town Board. It has nothing to do with this Board.

Mr. Hoeflich: When the first woman spoke, I think she made reference to an earlier meeting where Mr. Bossinas, that was a couple of months ago, that we asked the applicant to come up with a few different options of plans. I was at that meeting and we did say, "yes, you have your two buildings" but we did also ask to come up with a few other options of plans and we never did see those. Whether it was as condominiums, individual houses, we asked six months ago to show us how you could break it up into a few different elements. I don't recall we saw any of that.

Dr. Hougham: I want to say in response to one of the speakers from the public who I think unfairly characterized renters as transients and whose families are not real families. I just want to say that I object to that characterization.

Ms. DiCarrado: Can I comment on that because I've been a renter for 15 years and I really never got to know my neighbors. So I can say with 15 years of experience that renters tend not be community oriented, to not know your neighbors, to look at an apartment as temporary until you buy one and especially in an area with one bedroom apartments. Those tend to be couples or single individuals and they are ready to settle down they look for larger areas. So I do think it is an appropriate characterization being that I have 15 years experience in the rental world in different cities because that tends to be the community that I am from.

Ms. Janet Eisenman: I really respected the way that you dealt with the previous question about the memory care facility and Donna's concern about the light and all of that and I respect all of that but now I'm sort of thinking that I am in the twilight zone because this is so much greater of an impact to so many people and that really needs to be considered. It needs to be considered that you requested that they submit other plans and that was not done so in my opinion, that is not in good faith. If the Board requested to see other options and nothing was presented then that is something that you can say "well, we are waiting to see that", not to proceed with what clearly is very detrimental to the area and the traffic and the people who live there. When you're considering that and again I want to commend you on your consideration of those neighbors for the other building that it being planned and now it just seems like our concerns which are legitimate being thought of as well?

Mr. Hoeflich: We had a work session a couple of weeks ago on this same property, we spent well over an hour just talking about traffic, and yes they came back with this little drawing showing block the box and stuff like that. Again, we just saw this the other day, whether or not it works, we don't know yet. As a planning board I do know that we do have major concerns we all have driven in that area, we've all seen it, we all know what it is going south from Hawkes there and we also do know that there is another development being planned that will also possibly affect that and when we were at the work session we went up to the applicant and asked them to combine and talk about the two studies together on the traffic studies.

Mr. Chin: Yes, it was calculated together. We thank the comments to the Board regarding the previous applicant, but I want to point out that we have spent, although I am a late comer here, my understanding is that this Board has spent much time on requesting adjustments and added accommodations from the applicant. Board members come from the same neighborhood, as you do, we know about the issue with the traffic study and the intersection. We also understand, as Board members, we are constrained by our obligations and duties according to what the Town Board has given us. We are not at liberty to overrule what the Town Board has instructed us to do. They have only given us a certain range of discretion and we must operate within that discretion and we cannot exceed it. If counsel has a different interpretation please feel free to comment.

Ms. Zalantis: Planning Board is a creature of statute and can only do what is apprised in that statute.

Mr. Chin: Yes, we do recognize the traffic problem. We discussed it at the work meeting. I believe you were there when we were talking about it. We also have to understand that if the Town Board had already decided that the area is zoned for a particular type of development, the Planning Board only has a certain amount of discretion in terms of what you can adjust in that design that's been given to us by the Town. So we ask that the public understand the constraints that the Planning Board is operating under. Having said that, I believe, we've heard the same concerns over and over again. The issues seem to be density, the possible traffic congestion. I believe we have taken steps to address those issues in Mr. Stolman's drafted declaration.

Are there any other comments from the Board?

Is there any reason that we should not vote on this at this time?

Audience: Excuse me; didn't we just say that there are requests made to the developer to change the sizes, to change the scale of this?

Mr. Bossinas: We have asked many things of the developer. Yes, at one point I did ask him to look at the size of the buildings and density and square footage of the units. He has the right to pursue some of those and not pursue some of those but one thing that falls in line with what the Chairman just said is that he's come to the table with a code compliant proposal and there's only a couple things that we can ask in addition to that. Now has he made other adjustments on the property, yes, he's moved the building out of the wetlands, he's tightened it, he's adjusted parking, they've added landscaping to the property. There are things we have done over that year and half. If he chooses not to adjust those square footages that I asked him to pursue, the apartments are code compliant I can't require that of him. We can ask him to look at and adjust things like he did in other ways.

Ms. Zalantis: Also, didn't the Planning Board request the applicant to produce a streetscape to assess the scale and the applicant reviewed those plans with the Board and there were discussions about the placement of the buildings and you went to the site and looked at the placement of the buildings and came to conclusions about that also. That was something that was requested of the applicant, the applicant produced, and then this Board had the opportunity to review and make determinations about.

Ms. Nahas: What about the depth of these buildings? Four times the size of the other buildings. How is that characteristic?

Mr. Venditti: Number one, it is code compliant, number two, we submitted what was asked of us to show what was superimposed upon one of the Deerfield buildings to show comparison and this Board came to the conclusion that it was not out of character with neighborhood and with that we got complements by a number of members of Board for what the applicant did with respect to the placement and positioning of the buildings, the movement of the parking further back from the site lines available and adjoining neighbors. To reiterate what Town Counsel said, the issue of zoning back in 2011, unless you're going to nullify it, 5 years of approvals on a various properties, that's not really the purview of this Board. That is the purview of the Town Board.

Mr. Chin: We know our administration at this point. I suggest you try to address the concerns of your neighbors as much as possible.

Mr. Venditti: One thing I want to mention is, I understand everyone comes from their own perspective, so you know, I moved to the Town of Ossining when I was 11 years old. I went to Ossining middle school, Ossining High School and so on. I grew intimately familiar with this Town and I have a very vested interest in the Town. I do however, even though I am a homeowner, take a little bit of legal umbrage of what I've heard the last eight months of public hearings are these veiled and not so veiled references to rentals. That's an illegal consideration, deemed by the courts to be economic discrimination.

Mr. Chin: I think this Board has already made clear its position on rentals.

Voice: What about the traffic?

Mr. Venditti: We were asked to discuss the traffic further, we submitted further traffic study, we did numerous traffic studies and the Town has come to the conclusion on every one of nineteen issues that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact. I whole heartedly agree with the portion of the draft that ends with based on the information that was provided in the full environmental assessment form, the Planning Board finds, and I hope that they will find that the project will not have significant adverse environmental impacts on the environment. We went to the school district and the applicant agreed to pay, in addition to the school taxes, to make a payment to the school district which they found as acceptable mitigation. We will have that agreement tomorrow and I believe that maybe this Board has seen that agreement signed by this applicant. Every issue that you have asked us to address, we have addressed and your consultants have found that the manner in which we have addressed them are valid and did not take issue with it and based on that, we respectfully request a vote on the negative declaration.

At this time, Ms. Nahas gave another petition to the Board with 57 additional signatures. Mr. Vaughn asked the Board what right do the citizens have to appeal the decision. Ms. Zalantis said anyone aggrieved by a decision of the Planning Board has the right to bring an Article 78 proceeding and challenging that determination.

Mr. Venditti said there were two questions that came up relating to the water-main and the effect on the Woods and I would like Mr. Riina to come up and address because that was a concern to someone and if he could also address the entrance across from the Woods because that was an emergency entrance, a gated entrance only and it was moved by instructions by consultants.

Mr. Riina said originally the plan was to extend the water-main to the site. At that time, they had flow tests done and it was determined by the Town that they had more than adequate water supply for their project. The Village and the Town together had an issue in this area, east of Route 9A and the Woods development where they are on a dead end water system. A quality of life, health, and safety issue that was a concern. If there was a break in the current system, if there was a fire and a draw off the system, residents could experience either a loss or a drop of pressure.

Mr. Riina – continued: The goal of the Town and Village together was to provide a redundancy in the system, so if there was break somewhere, there was another entry point for water to enter into these areas. The only two logical areas to run this new line was under 9A which was highly unlikely and infeasible to do, or to make this connection between the system in Hawkes Avenue and the system in the woods. That provides a loop system and provides the redundancy needed that if there was a loss pressure, there was still a secondary supply source. It had nothing to do with our project in a sense that we needed that but it was an act on our part to work with the Village and the Town to accomplish that since we were going to be extending the water-main down for an additional 300 plus feet to make this connection. The Village has an easement up through the Woods which will allow this connection to occur. The effect to those developments will be that they have better volume and better pressure and more consistent volume and pressure and supply. It's a life safety issue because if you have a break in the main and you have a fire somewhere and there's no supply, you have a problem. This is quite a benefit to both of those communities as one to have this loop system.

The entrance that Mr. Berger was speaking of is not the main entrance, it is an emergency entrance. It's going to be gated off. The main entrance is actually further north where the residents of Parth Knolls will be entering and exiting. It is not directly across. Through the planning process it was decided that the north location provided the best visibility, site distance, and ingress and egress to the site. The entrance is at the knoll.

Ms. Zalantis: For the public's benefit and the applicant's traffic consultant is here maybe he can go over what he discussed at the work session with regard to traffic, for the public and for the record.

Mr. Garafalo: the Board had asked us to go over a few things. We did a photo simulation of what the "don't block the box" would look like. We did do a comparison of River Knoll and Parth Knolls to the Route 134 intersection. There was a lot of the discussion with regard to volume verses delay. Volumes increased between the two of them, in the mornings 21% for Parth Knolls, 79% for River Knoll. When you look at the actual delay based on many factors, delay is considerably differently compared between the two of them. The delay increased total for the two of them, 95% of that was River Knoll, 5% was actually Parth Knolls. So even though the volumes were greater, percentage wise the reason for lower delay is that Parth Knolls was adding to traffic on the northbound movement as opposed to through and left turning movements that River Knoll was adding to. River Knoll was adding 93% more traffic to the left hand turning northbound movement whereas Parth Knolls is adding 0% to the northbound and 0% to the southbound movement. All of those are conflicting movements which is why a large discrepancy between the large delays that would be found. The relative delay increased from River Knoll on the northbound approach and the southbound approach was 203 seconds compared to increase based on Parth Knolls of 10 seconds. To put this in perspective, one of the ways that we measure delay is called level of service. This goes from A to F, F being the worst. While the service D is the last one that is acceptable that level of service range is 20 seconds long 35 to 55 seconds. The Parth Knolls is adding what would be half of that difference whereas, when you look at River Knoll adding 203 is 2 ½ times what would be from no delay to a level of service F so there is a huge difference, again 95% to 5%. There so little traffic being added to this intersection that this is why it's really not a significant factor in the delay. Yes, it is a congested intersection we've said that from our very first memo.

It is congested there's no question about it but it's where you put the volumes which is very important to this intersection. Parth Knolls is adding to movements that are less congested. To talk about the "don't block the box" the concept there is to help the people that specifically mentioned they have problems getting out making the left turn getting out of Kitchawan Road, making the left onto Croton Dam Road. That is the purpose of doing it. Will it make life perfect? No. Will it help? Yes. That is the concept behind it. There are 24 cycles in that intersection to go through those breaks will allow more traffic to get out onto Croton Dam Road. Thank you.

Mr. Stolman: I would like to confirm that we met with the applicant's traffic consultant and we talked about the work session and we went through all of this. Mr. Garafalo was good enough to provide his computer files, his Syncro files to us. We confirmed the accuracy and agree with the methodology and in my memo dated today we say so and we basically find that it is a non-significant adverse impact.

Mr. Venditti also brought up the issue of the stone structure. They received a letter from the Building Inspector which determined and insisted that it be taken down because of the condition it was in. Not a choice that they made but a mandate of the Building Inspector. The other issue of taking down of more trees Mr. Steve Marino can speak to that.

Mr. Marino spoke about the tree removal plan. They've been very straight forward and forth coming that a number of trees would come down as a result of this. Trees on the far side of the stream where originally they were going to build their pool and pool house are being left intact because they have moved all construction out of that area to the front side of property. We've added a number of trees. The landscape plan reflects landscaping and trees and shrubs being added around the buildings. More trees are being added to the plan than being trees removed.

In response to a question about overcrowding and funding of the Ossining school district, Mr. Venditti said in their study, and in talks with the school district, shows that based on the number of bedrooms it is 7 – 9 children added to the district without knowing if some of those children may or may not go to private and/or parochial schools, or what grades they'll be in. It also doesn't assume that they will all be in the same grade all at the same time. Through extensive discussions and methodology submitted to the Town which is viable and agreed with and then the applicant engaged in negotiations with Mr. Sanchez from the school district and came up with what the school district thought under the circumstances the number children fully mitigating the impact on the schools. The agreement between the school and the applicant is being considered and signed this evening. Mr. Beldotti said that agreement will be available for review tomorrow.

A resident said she finds it difficult that a company that hired to assess the traffic problem caused by this development would say that it has no impact or little impact. If you're talking about 50 units, you're talking about a great number of them that are going to be going to the city to work, the majority of them. So how can a reliable traffic study say it is not going to impact? I'm not a traffic consultant and I'm telling you it is going to have impact. Other traffic comments were made. Mr. Chin clarified that the Board did discuss the left turn from Kitchawan onto Croton Dam Road at the last meeting.

Mr. Bossinas spoke about the "do not block the box" item. One thing to understand is that the Rte. 9A intersection is completely a NYS Department of Transportation issue. We could not put it on the applicant to resolve that intersection, it's completely not feasible. We did ask them to address the intersection before it.

Mr. Bossinas – continued: He uses a similar situation in Cortlandt Manor everyday which absolutely allows someone to get out into the intersection from the residential neighborhoods. Now at the Kitchawan intersection we made need a Police Car occasionally until people get accustomed to seeing that "do not block the box". The intersection on Rte. 9A is a service level F. That part is not going to change but we did make an attempt to try and mitigate the traffic concerns in the little way that they could. I think it won't have a huge impact, but a little impact where when you get there you're not going to need the nice guy to let you in you'll be able to squeeze in regardless of the situation.

Members of the audience continued to insist the Planning Board to deny the project in its entirety.

Mr. Bossinas said that the project is code compliant. Mr. Chin said the gentlemen from the audience that asked whether the public could have an appeal if we did something they did not like, well the applicant has the same right to go to a court and address if we did something wrong according to our obligations. The Planning Board has already described how we are trying to reach as many accommodations as we can get from the applicant. If we had more authority, we could possibly ask for more but I think at this point we feel the Planning Board in its discretion bound by the restrictions given to us by the Town Board through its code and its legislative powers we are just administrative. We are administrative. We just have to follow the rules.

Audience members objected to these statements. Ms. Nahas urged that this is not in keeping the Architectural Review Process. She read some of the issues from the section of the code under Architectural Review. This precipitated and lengthy discussion.

Mr. Stolman explained what a Negative Declaration under State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) is to the public. Ms. Zalantis clarified that at this time, the Planning Board is considering the Negative Declaration document this evening which is different from getting Site Plan Approval, Wetlands Approval if needed, a Tree Permit, right now the Board is only in the process of adopting the Negative Declaration under SEQRA.

Mr. Hoeflich wanted to make one last statement about the traffic issue. He discussed the possibility of a stop light in the intersection to make the left turn to go south which would have to be provided by New York State DOT. He said, this can't be put on the developer. We, the Planning Board, don't really have a say in that.

Mr. Stolman submitted a Negative Declaration document for Parth Knolls dated October 19, 2016. Mr. Chin said that since he is a late comer to this project he will abstain from the vote on the Negative Declaration document.

At this time, a motion was made by Mr. Bossinas, seconded by Dr. Hougham, Mr. McWilliams and Mr. Hoeflich voted to adopt a **Negative declaration under SEQRA for the Parth Knolls Residential Project, 87 Hawkes Avenue**, with abstention from Mr. Chin.

Bethany Arts Community, Arts Center, 40 Somerstown Road – Site Plan, PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED

Mr. Lyons, BAC, Mr. Shuster, Attorney, Mr. Hernandez, Architect were in attendance. Mr. Chin opened the public hearing. There was no one from the public in attendance.

Mr. Stolman read Mr. Ciarcia's memo, dated October 19, 2016 as follows:

The Stormwater Management Plan provided appears to address my concerns related to the design of the stormwater management associated with the Bethany Arts project. I therefore have no objection to the Planning Board adopting a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA. Additional comments may be provided during the Planning Board's site plan review process.

Mr. Stolman submitted a Negative Declaration document for Bethany Arts Community dated September 20, 2016 which was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

Mr. Bossinas made a motion, seconded by Mr. McWilliams, Mr. Hoeflich, and Dr. Hougham voted to adopt a **Negative Declaration under SEQRA for the Bethany Arts Community (BAC) project**, with abstention from Mr. Chin.

DiPiano Subdivision, 2-Lot Subdivision, 60 Croton Dam Road, Extension of Resolution

Mr. Daniel Collins of Hudson Engineering submitted a letter dated October 13, 2016 asking the Board to consider issuing a 90-day extension of the DiPiano Subdivision Resolution of Approval which was originally adopted April 20, 2016 and expires October 20, 2016.

The applicant needs additional time to obtain approval from the Westchester County Department of Health and coordinate with the Village of Ossining Water Department for the proposed water service.

A motion was made by Mr. McWilliams, seconded by Mr. Bossinas and unanimously agreed to extend the **DiPaino Subdivision Resolution of Subdivision Approval** for an additional 90 days.

Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. McWilliams, seconded by Mr. Hoeflich and unanimously passed approve the draft of minutes of planning board meeting held September 21, 2016 with amendments as directed by the Chair.

A motion was made by Mr. Hoeflich, seconded by Mr. McWilliams and unanimously passed approve the draft of minutes of planning board meeting held October 5, 2016.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Planning Board of the Town of Ossining, Mr. Bossinas made a motion, seconded by Dr. Hougham that the meeting be adjourned to November 2, 2016 for a work session.

Time noted 10:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra Anelli

Sandra Anelli, Secretary
Town of Ossining Planning Board

APPROVED: December 21, 2016