

May 6, 2015

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 6th day of May 2015. There were present the following members of the Planning Board:

Ingrid Richards, Chair
Dennis Kirby
Gareth Hougham
Jim Bossinas

Absent: Greg McWilliams, Vice Chair

Also Present: Wayne Spector, Town Attorney
David Stolman AICP, PP, Frederick P. Clark Associates, Inc.
Daniel Ciarcia, PE, Consulting Town Engineer
Sandy Anelli, Secretary

High View Farm, 123A, B & C Morningside Dr. & Barnes Rd., Scoping Outline, Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

Mr. Brandon Zappi, Mr. Brian Zappi, and their Attorney, Mr. Adam Wekstein, were present. Mrs. Richards announced that the second draft of the scoping outline for this project has been prepared and Mr. Stolman will provide a brief summary of the changes.

Mr. Stolman submitted and reviewed the Planning Board's Second Draft dated May 5, 2015 of the Scoping Outline of Issues to be Addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for High View Farm Subdivision, Ossining, NY.

Dr. Hougham stated that he has read through the document and it looks complete and in good order. He said he is happy with it. Mr. Ciarcia commented on the requirement of doing a phosphorous loading study in the Storm Water section. He said this is something the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) used to require. New York State guidelines contemplate nutrient removal in their design guidelines and looking at phosphorous in particular or any type of nutrient loading is all factored into their design guidelines for the water quality body. This may not be necessary. Addressing potential impacts, theoretical impacts from fertilizer is appropriate but there is no empirical way to analyze phosphorous.

Dr. Hougham urged that doing an initial phosphorous and nitrate analysis gives a baseline to compare later runoff values to. It is a simple set of tests and inexpensive. Dr. Hougham noted that he would like to see that as a requirement left in, just an initial water quality baseline study. Mr. Ciarcia said this is a typical residential development and this type of analysis is frequently done on large scale water quality models. He further noted that in this case, we need to design practices based on standards that have been applied throughout and practices that NYS DEC has come up with which, in a very sensible way, sizes storm water practices to address that. Dr. Hougham noted that this is a standard panel and it will probably be included anyway. He would like to leave this item in the document.

Ms. Donna Sharratt, EAC Acting Chair, thanked the Board and said the document is amazing and the Board did a great job putting all of the comments in and organizing it. She said this is good for the Town because the environment has been ignored for a really long time. Her question is regarding tributaries. How they will be impacted? Mr. Ciarcia noted that the storm water analysis that the applicant has to provide will be studied in pre-development condition as well as post condition. The waterfall, mentioned by Ms. Sharratt, is or may be part of the farm property. Either way, the applicant will be required to prepare watershed maps and quantify runoff volumes from each of these areas, so if it is affected, it will be analyzed. Ms. Sharratt also mentioned a stream on her property which is not shown on the watershed map and it is unclear if it comes from that property.

Mr. Ciarcia said the analysis that the applicant is going to be required to do is look at pre and post conditions. His obligation is to size practices that meet the criteria for treating nutrients that the DEC has come up with in terms of sizing these practices and also to demonstrate that the post development runoff generated by the site is at, or less than pre-development levels. The analysis generally stays within the property and some of the surrounding areas to verify particular points where confluence of different watersheds come together.

May 6, 2015

Ms. Sharratt asked if less water can be anticipated with the installation of the water storage tanks and if the water amounts will stay the same and how those tributaries will be receiving water. Mr. Stolman said the basins are not going to be so oversized that the rate will be so low that it adversely affects tributaries. Mr. Ciarcia also explained that the water is held in the basin then released. It continually empties itself. Mr. Stolman clarified that these are detention basins, not retention basins.

Mr. Wekstein submitted and reviewed his letter dated May 6, 2015 as follows:

*Re: Draft Scoping Outline for the Environmental Impact Statement
for High View Farm Subdivision, Ossining, New York
Planning Board } Meeting of May 6, 2015*

Dear Chair Richards and Members of the Board:

*As you are aware, we represent the applicants, Zappico Carwash, LLC and Zappico Construction, LLC (the "Applicants"), with respect to their application for approval of the High View Farm Subdivision (the "Subdivision"). We are writing to comment on the Draft Scoping Outline dated May 5, 2015 (the "Draft Scope"). By this letter we also reaffirm all positions the Applicants advanced in our letter of April 29, 2015 and in the comments I made at the scoping session held on that date. We regret that the Draft Scope has retained requirements for study of topics that the Applicants submit go beyond what is reasonable and/or legitimately within a lead agency's authority under the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQ RA"; collectively referring to Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law and 6 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 617). The following constitutes our additional comments. The primary defects in the Draft Scope are requirements for study of an excessive number of alternatives and the inappropriate nature of at least two of those alternatives. The Applicants' position regarding alternatives was set forth in our letter of April 29, 2015 and my comments at the Board's scoping session. Rather than contracting the number of alternatives to be studied, as would have been appropriate under SEQRA, the Draft Scope expands them even further. The alternatives section of the Draft Scope, Chapter V, now calls for inclusion and analysis of at least 16 alternatives - a number that is grossly disproportionate to the magnitude of the Subdivision and its potential impacts. Under SEQ RA, the alternatives section of an Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") "need not identify or analyze every conceivable alternative, and need not be exhaustive, particularly where, as here, the various options lie along a continuum of possibilities." *Halperin v. City of New Rochelle*, 24 A.D.3d 768, 777, 809 N.Y.S.2d 96, 109 (2d Dep't 2005), app dismissed, 6 N.Y.3d 890, 817 N.Y.S.2d 604 (2006), *lv. denied*, 7 N.Y.3d 708, 809 N.Y.S.2d 98 (2006). Of course, the Planning Board is not required to analyze any particular alternative suggested by project opponents or members of the community. *Halperin*, *supra*. Here, there is no need for the burdensome requirement that conventional plans be studied at six different density levels and cluster plans at five different densities (in addition to the 28-lot cluster subdivision which is the proposed action). While the Applicants recognize that alternatives need not be studied in the same degree of detail as a proposed action, as written, the Draft Scope could be read to require the preparation of 16 different grading plans and 16 different lighting plans. The expense associated with such efforts cannot be justified. The best way to rectify the problem is to reduce the number of required alternatives. 1*

*Furthermore, as the proposed cluster and conventional alternatives each present a continuum of densities, under controlling case law there is no rationale for requiring five separate density levels along that spectrum for both cluster and conventional alternatives. Particularly those alternatives at dramatically reduced scales should be eliminated from the draft scope. See generally *Save our Open Space v. Planning Board a/Town a/Newburgh*, 74 A.D.3d 1350, 1352, 904 N.Y.S.2d 188, 191 (2d Dep't 2010), *lv. denied*, 15 N. Y.3d 711, 910 N.Y.S.2d 36 (2010)(noting that a planning board's consideration of a smaller scale alternative is permissive, not mandatory and that "alternatives are to be considered in light of the developer's objectives"(emphasis added)).*

*At least one alternative, raised at the scoping session and now included in the Draft Scope as an alternative, specifically warrants mention. The inclusion of a wooden pedestrian walkway traversing the Subdivision, which would be open to the public, seeks analysis of a requirement that, if imposed by the Planning Board, would be unconstitutional. Under *Nollan v. California Coastal Commission*, 483 U.S. 825 (1987) and *Dolan v. City a/Tigard*, 512 U.S. 374 (1994), the United States Supreme Court held that the imposition of a condition in a development approval, such as one mandating the suggested raised wooden walkway, violates the takings clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Specifically, under *Nollan* and *Dolan*, a condition imposed with respect to a land use approval must have a substantial nexus to a legitimate state interest and be roughly proportional in both nature and scope to the impact of the proposed development. The walkway would fail to meet either of these prongs. Imposition of the condition would not have the required close nexus to the same governmental interest as would denial of the Subdivision (e.g., denial would not create a public thoroughfare through or in proximity to the Subdivision) and the condition is not a mitigation measure that is roughly proportional to the impacts of the development.*

See Nollan, 483 U.S. at 837 (relying on such principles to invalidate a requirement that a homeowner provide a public easement along the beach as a condition to approving replacement of his beach-front bungalow with a larger home); Dolan, 512 U.S. at 395 (invalidating the required dedication of a bicycle/pedestrian path imposed as a condition for approving enlargement of a store within a flood-plain as failing to be roughly proportional to potential impacts of the larger retail facility).

Consequently, the unconstitutional wooden-walkway alternative should not be required in the DEIS.² Several other issues raised by the Draft Scope warrant discussion as well. As your Board is aware, under the applicable storm water management regulations the Subdivision must, among other things, be designed to insure that there is no increase in the peak rate of runoff associated with the new impervious surfaces. Therefore, as the Subdivision will not exacerbate existing conditions, the requirement for discussion of past off-site drainage problems (Chapter III, Item C. 1), which present community-wide, rather subdivision-specific issues, that requirement should be eliminated. For similar reasons, the Draft Scope and, in particular, Item C. 1, should not be read to require any measurements of the existing quality of off-site waters.

Item A3 in Chapter III, which requires no road or lawn runoff onto even upland areas and habitat, turns the SEQ RA process on its head. It imposes a requirement before the analysis of the issue has even begun and should be deleted. Read literally, the requirement would be contravened by application of a pesticide or fertilizer to ones own lawn. Of course the EIS process does not require the elimination of all potentially adverse impacts, but rather compels the lead agency to "weigh and balance relevant environmental impacts, with social, economic and other considerations". 6 N.Y.C.R.R. 617.11 d(2)³ The topic of runoff of such chemicals is more properly subsumed in Chapter III, Item C2, rendering the offending language in Item C1 superfluous in any event. While the DEIS will, as noted, look at the impact of the Subdivision on the surrounding neighborhoods, the reference in the draft scope implying that the homes on Tavano Road have historic significance should be omitted. While Tavano Road certainly constitutes a nice residential neighborhood, the fact that the homes on that road were built in the mid to late 1960s does not imbue them with historic significance. It is just one of hundreds, if not thousands, of residential streets in Westchester County which were developed during that time frame. Please note that the Draft Scope already adequately addresses neighborhood impact by, among other things, calling for description of the surrounding properties and discussion of their current state of development, supplemented by evaluations and photographs of existing views establishing the character of the community.

*We look forward to addressing your Board at tonight's meeting.
Respectfully submitted,
Hocherman Tortorella & Wekstein, LLP*

Mrs. Mary Jean Cavanaugh-Cristello, 28 Tavano Road expressed her love for Tavano Road. She is concerned with the traffic on Tavano and Route 133 and in her opinion; the new homes should be a high-end homes. The homes should not sell for less than \$650,000. She noted that this neighborhood is one of the most upscale and historically significant neighborhoods in all of Ossining, all of Westchester and Putnam. Also, in preparation of the project, she is planting very large trees in her backyard, but wants to see homes that maintain or increase the value of other homes in the neighborhood.

Mrs. Richards asked the public to make comments as they relate to the scoping document. She said this is the first step in the process and the review and analysis happen when we are dealing with the DEIS. So she urged that the public make comments tonight as they relate to the scoping document that is in front of the Board tonight.

Mrs. Masserman, 10 Morningside Court said she was pleased that much of the EAC's comments were included in this second draft. However; terms in the DEIS such as, "shall", "should be discussed", "as necessary", "as feasible", these appeared 7 to 10 times with no further steps mentioned. The new draft also included many of these terms. On page 6 it reads, "where reasonable" and "possible", "as necessary". On page 3 of the EAC report they requested a runoff study, watershed history study, and water quality study. The runoff study was asked to be down to North State Road, which includes Morningside Drive where the waterfall is and can run very strongly and then end up slugging on North State Road. It seems that these studies might address some of these issues and should be included in the second draft. At last week's meeting, Mrs. Masserman requested the inclusion how storm water from impervious surfaces including exposed rock will be directed and controlled during the construction phase and after construction is complete. In addition, to document how post development pollutant loading will be addressed. Post development areas should include a best estimate of impervious surfaces from building rooftops, roadways, parking lots, driveways and sidewalks. Mrs. Masserman said perc tests have to be included on all adjoining properties. Deep hole testing be done every 50 on center of proposed roads to verify rock to excavate and determine that roads can support the traffic including heavy equipment for construction and fire emergency vehicles.

Mrs. Masserman – continued. The other issue that was not addressed in the scope in the fiscal impact section is, although taxes will be generated, the construction of two-bedroom homes adjacent to four-bedroom homes will cause a reduction in the value of these existing homes and could cause a reduction in our taxes. So what is going to be the benefit here? We're going to question our taxes, because we shouldn't be putting two-bedroom homes behind these beautiful three, four, and five-bedroom homes. This affects the community character. On page 10, under traffic, weekday afternoons need to be studied at 2:30 p.m. when busses leave from the schools at Ossining. If this FDEIS is the driving document, if something is not included in it we will not be able to address it at a later date. Because of that, we need to make sure that this is an ironclad document, not vague in any way. We cannot take a chance that Zappico can legally circumvent the steps necessary of the proper treatment this unique property as stated by Mitzi Elkes, EAC Chair. Mitzi also stated that particular statement be put in the description, It's not there. This is a very unique property. It doesn't read that anywhere.

Mrs. Masserman also noted, at the March 25, 2015 Planning Board meeting David Gordon, Legal Counsel for the Concerned Citizens Of Ossining, stated we have a high level of concern over this particular applicant. What we've seen is a pattern of a very aggressive approach and at that meeting seeing a minimalist approach to a hostile approach at the level of scrutiny that is necessary as a result of this application. As I have said in the past, we respect the builders right to build but not at our expense. Although at the close of last week's Planning Board meeting, Mr. Wekstein asked the Board not to micro-manage what these studies will look like based on what some of the people who spoke said someone else told them to be studied. We are asking you to consider all of our concerns now before it is too late to include them.

Mr. Rich Seminski, 52 Edgewood Road, also said certain language in the document is still very unclear. There is a sense of vagueness such as where it says "as feasible", where it talks about mitigation measures on page 5. Mr. Seminski also expressed concern with the proposal of two-bedroom homes. He asked if anyone knows what the square footage of the homes will be.

With respect to mitigation measures, Mr. Ciarcia clarified that following both NYS Storm Water Design Manual, which lays out the framework for designing permanent storm water treatment practices as well as the what is referred to as the "Blue Book" which lays out the during construction practices and how to proceed with that. That is all pretty well laid out and both documents are where it is going to end up. When he prepares a Storm Water Protection Plan (SWPP), he'll have to follow both of those guidelines and because of the size of the project he will have to phase it to some degree to minimize the impacts. In terms of road construction, test holes will have to be done. In terms of his storm water management practices, percolation tests, deep holes will be required, but it won't be going off site. Percolation off site is not something that is relevant to the design of the storm water practices. It is not something that is typically done.

Mrs. Masserman insisted that this is the most unique property in the Town of Ossining. She is concerned that if these things are not in the document they won't be done, the Town has no bearing. Mr. Stolman reiterated the fact that off site perc tests will not be done. There will be performance guarantees to make sure everything gets replaced or repaired. Mr. Stolman noted that there is a standard practice for this. The standard operating procedure for this type of thing does not require testing all the roads in advance. It would be wonderful to put anything we wanted to in the document but we have to follow a certain standard operating procedure. There will be performance guarantees in place to make sure that anything that gets disturbed is repaired. Again, the practice is not to test all of those roads in advance to see what they can tolerate. The practice is to get performance guarantees in place so if a pothole is created or something like that it gets repaired. Mr. Stolman urged that the document goes as far as it can really go under the law. The way things are characterized in this document is the way they are done and the way they're characterized in scoping outlines. There are words like "feasible" and "practical" and that's entirely up to the Planning Board. It's the Planning Board's judgment as to what is feasible and practical. It's the Planning Board, not the applicant, who determines what is feasible and practical. Regarding upland areas, we have wetlands on site and everything else on this site are upland areas. We cannot say that we will not have any lawn chemicals or pesticides into any upland areas. If you take away the wetlands and you take away the upland areas there is nothing left. So I think we have to take that part out.

Dr. Hougham said his interpretation of the language concerning the addition of chemicals meant to say, "no chemicals would be added that would be able to find their way into the wetlands or into the wetland buffer area". The language, rather than be removed can be changed to clarify that so we can be sure that the runoff design will not allow any lawn chemicals to migrate into the buffer zone or wetland. This is an important point.

Mr. Fleischer, 22 Tavano Road, said chemicals that are not absorbed by moisture are able to migrate by wind which can go to upland areas. Mr. Stolman noted that there is no method in place to measure that.

Mr. Carlos Desmaras, 78 Somerstown Road, referred to certain language on Page 13 where it talks about existing conditions, current service and service levels of municipal facilities. He said that the school district is very unique, but it is at full capacity now. When there is not enough capacity or rooms at the district, you incur very significant capital expenditures. How is this studied? Does the process capture that? Is there a mitigation fee if the school has to put in 50 or 60 million dollars in additional school facilities? How will this be shared among taxpayers? School district taxes are a big component of our taxes. If the units being built are two-bedroom homes but have this substantial square footage, how can this study be done accurately?

Mr. Stolman referred to the top of Page 14 where the report says “Governmental costs, including an analysis of service costs including but not limited to the Town of Ossining and the school district associated with providing services to the development will be identified.” Mr. Stolman also further outlined the method of how a school district study is typically done and what steps are taken by the applicant and the district.

At this time, Mr. Wekstein explained to the audience that there is a process; a beginning, a middle and an end. He said all that is being done right now is the creation of an outline of what has to be studied. They will be coming back to the Board and the Public when the study is done and at that time it will have how many bedrooms there will be, what size the homes will be, what the alternatives will look like. They come back to the Board with this and the Board will say “has this study met the things that we said have to be in the scope” if it doesn’t, the Board will send the applicant back out to redo it. When the Board is finally satisfied with it and they adopt it, the public will come and have a hearing; or multiple hearings, and be able to make written comments on it. When that process is complete, the applicants have to get all of those comments and comments from the Board and then put together a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FDIS) which addresses all of the concerns being talked about now. Mr. Wekstein further noted that members of the audience are asking for a level of detail from the Board and the applicant that is many months down the road. The Board has to tell the applicant what to study first; then they need to go out and study it. It is not the other way around. The Board doesn’t make a conclusion about what the study will show before they study it.

Mr. David Gordon, Attorney for the Concerned Citizens of Ossining, said he would like to make a couple of points pertaining to the document. First on Page 5, Paragraph 3, mitigation, where it specifies a one-to-one mitigation, he advises that this is inappropriate. One-to-one is not even the bare minimum. According to Mr. Gordon, wetlands recreation is an inexact and unreliable science. Most programs never specify one-to-one. Mr. Gordon respectfully requested this be re-worded. DEC typically requires 2 to 1. His suggestion was to reconfigure this section. Mr. Gordon also asked for consideration of the wording on Page 8, Item 3. Mitigation, he urged that this shouldn’t say “mitigation as feasible” it should say to “mitigation necessary to avoid any significant vegetative habitat”. Further, on Page 10 where it outlines potential impact, his recommendation is to say “any impact” as this applies to community character. Also, “Alternatives” Mr. Gordon said this section seems appropriate. He urged to keep the number of alternatives but if some of these were to be removed, keep the range and look at the low end alternatives. He further raised the point that was discussed earlier in the meeting by Ms. Sharratt with regard to the possibility of dewatering of existing streams. He urged that there needs to be something in place to ensure that this will not occur. Mr. Gordon complimented the Board for providing the level of detail in the scope.

Mr. Fleischer, 22 Tavano Road, thanked the Board for the document as presented. He said the document is a far greater improvement over earlier versions. Secondly, he asked the board to consider the issue of going off site and looking into areas like North State Road where it will impact everyone on that road. He asked for clarification of where it says under SEQRA timeframes “public comment must remain open until ten days after the close of hearing”. This was footnoted at the 60 day period.

Mr. Stolman noted that once the Planning Board is satisfied that a draft environmental impact statement that is complete with respect to scope, content and adequacy, which may require a number of iterations, it will file the DEIS along with the notice of completion and will schedule a public hearing on the DEIS. Which is not this period right now; this is the public scoping session.

Mr. Wekstein pointed out per Mr. Gordon's suggestion regarding mitigation, that it be avoided, is not an available option, this is inconsistent with SEQRA. Also, the point to say "any impact" on the neighborhood should be studied. This is not what SEQRA is about. It is about what the Board identifies to be relevant. The way the scope is currently written on that topic is the way it should stay. Mr. Wekstein is also opposed changes related to dewatering as mentioned by Mr. Gordon earlier; these determinations are to be done by an engineer. In response to the question regarding New Castle, it is an already developed property with six different buildings on it. The two acre parcel is owned by an entirely different entity. The applicants do not have to build an access road through this.

Mrs. Richards asked the Board for additional comments on the scope. Dr. Hougham said he would like to encourage the applicant, when hiring consultants for the wildlife and vegetation studies in particular, to hire a specialist with unassailable credentials and reputations and not intending to do the absolute minimum. This would serve us all in the end so we won't have to send them back to do follow up work which would just delay the process.

Mrs. Richards said there are a number of comments which were made tonight. The storm water provision we believe will suffice as we analyze this project. There will be rigorous analysis with the water from impervious surfaces on site. We are confident that the Planning Board will do an appropriate analysis of storm water. The applicant, working collaboratively with the Planning board will ensure that all requirements are met. There was comment with regard to this being a unique property. Mr. Stolman said the property doesn't have to be characterized in any particular way. If the experts do their job, and if the Planning Board's experts, and the Planning Board may hire a number of different experts to review what the applicant has done, if all of the experts on the preparation side and on the review side do their work, the property doesn't have to be characterized in any particular way. As far as the traffic study, weekday afternoon was mentioned; the traffic experts know which times of day are the peak hours that need to be analyzed and we believe they are appropriate times.

Mrs. Richards noted at this time, the Board is going analyze the traffic surrounding the property and the development. This is an outline scope. We have the ability to ask questions through the process. This is the first step. We want to ensure the public that this is an outline. There's going to be in depth analysis of these items and other items through our conversations with the applicant. It's a very intense process. It's very collaborative between the applicant and the Planning Board, our consultants and their consultants. There's a lot of work that goes into developing the DEIS and ultimately the FEIS. At this point, we have to move forward with the document and we believe it is a wonderful document and we are thankful to David Stolman, we're very thankful to our Engineering Consultant, Dan, and Wayne our Attorney and our all of our Planning Board members, the Applicant and the Public for assisting with their thoughts. It's a document that we believe represents how we are going to move forward in this process.

With regard to the traffic study, Mrs. Masserman said she feels it is important that the traffic section read 2:30 p.m. School buses are on the roads at 2:30 p.m. from six different schools.

Mr. Marc Hoeflich, 98B Morningside Drive, thanked the Board and Mr. Stolman for putting together the document. His concern was something Mr. Gordon mentioned earlier, where the wording of the document said "Croton Aqueduct" but should say "New Croton Aqueduct". Little words here and there that need to be changed. He asked if this can be held over for a week for these changes.

Mrs. Richards noted that the public has to have trust in the Planning Board. Trust that the Board is going to do the right thing to balance the needs of the applicant and the public. We have demonstrated that through a number of meetings. We will determine what's appropriate and feasible. Both parties will be happy with the ultimate outcome. The Board has power and authority over the process and will exercise it as we move forward.

Ms. Janet Brand, Barnes Road, stated that the bus stop in her neighborhood is at the base of her driveway. If she is coming home at the wrong time, she sits behind the bus. This may be the same for Tavano Road. Her concerns are that knowing the High School gets out at 2:26 p.m. and that's the first bus, it is important realize that in this area there are no walkers every school is outside of the walking area. The bus schedule is crucial from 2:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. There is a lot of different movement with a lot of different buses. She asked that the Board consider this in the traffic study.

May 6, 2015

Mrs. Richards assured Ms. Brand that through the process the Board will have a good understanding of the busses and the traffic and 4:00 p.m. is a time when we have a lot of people coming home from work and things like that. Through the process we can speak to the applicant.

Mr. Kirby recommended on Page 5, Number 3, where it says “mitigation measures to include a one-to-one ratio, if the words “at least” can be added. This would say “mitigation measure to include at least a one-to-one ratio”. Mr. Stolman agreed. Dr. Hougham suggested nitrates and nitrites would automatically be included in a base panel but he would like these listed specifically. It will be changed to include “nitrate, nitrites, and ammonia”. Mr. Stolman agreed.

Mrs. Richards asked for a motion to approve the scoping document as amended. Mr. Kirby made a motion, seconded by Dr. Hougham and unanimously passed to adopt **Scoping Outline of Issues to be Addressed in Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), High View Farm Subdivision, Ossining, NY**, as amended, May 6, 2015.

Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Kirby, seconded by Mr. Bossinas and unanimously passed to approve draft minutes of Planning Board meeting held March 25, 2015.

A motion was made by Mr. Kirby, seconded by Dr. Hougham and unanimously passed to approve draft minutes of Planning Board meeting held April 8, 2015.

A motion was made by Dr. Hougham, seconded by Mr. Bossinas and unanimously passed to approve the transcript of public hearing and Planning Board meeting held April 29, 2015, as amended.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Planning Board of the Town of Ossining, Mr. Kirby made a motion, seconded by Mr. Bossinas that the meeting be adjourned to May 27, 2015.

Time noted 9:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra Anelli

Sandra Anelli, Secretary
Town of Ossining Planning Board

APPROVED: June 24, 2015