

Environmental Review Board

July 11, 2007

Present: Phil Dropkin
David Gawronski
Carol Laskos
Wally Ganter
Tom Burnham

Absent: Norm Stein
Susan Cleaver

also present: Neal Halloran

Discussion of proposed zoning:

1. Motion made by Phil Dropkin: that in lieu of the elimination of bonus density that the bonus density be kept with the added procedure that any decision by the planning board could be reviewed administratively by the town board in consultation with the ERB. If it disagrees with the planning board it would be reviewed by the Town Board then referred to the Zoning Board of Appeals.
Seconded by David Gawronski, all in favor
 - a. Bonus density is a valuable planning tool that should be continued to allow the planning board the flexibility to exchange proposed public benefits for cost effective compensation to the developer.
 - b. The further administrative review by the Town Board allows for the board to review, comment, and appeal for further consideration of the value of the public benefit. .
 - c. This could allow greater flexibility of type, style, and affordability.
 - d. This allows for creative community improvements that might otherwise never be considered, funded, or approved.
2. Buffer width should be increased based in the corridor needs of the biodiversity within the area.

Mulrad

Building renovation

No comment

Warehouse expansion

Where is the loading area? It should not be that the loading dock seen from roads.

Lacking lighting plan, landscaping details, Is any processing to be done,

Spensierri

Traffic intersection concerns, water use, stormwater, septic, pervious surface, public water supply, well locations, DOT curb cut, left turn only

Owens road associates

Consider removing Lot 11 for proper separation of stormwater ponds from the wetlands.

Hendler

Motion made by Tom, Wally second, all in favor

In the public interest, and in that the project is located adjacent to the nature preserve, Applicant should be required to mitigate or remove the pollutant run off for all those constituents identified on page 63. Provide the documentation that the discharge of the pollutants will not adversely impact the nature preserve, wetlands, surface and groundwater, and biota.

There was further discussion of the sewer treatment plant and the proposal to discharge into a small stream, suggested that consideration be made to discharge to subsurface in those common areas in the project that the applicant is already going to disturb the vegetation of the entire area there will be very little negative to it. The use of absorption trenches and fields should be calculated and the feasibility determined. This is just another aspect of the LID considerations that the applicant was told to consider.

The applicant should be required to document and justify why further improvements to recharge and stormwater treatment cannot be made within this project. Again “they are already destroying the entire area of groundcover” so they make this just so much more viable and with no further adverse impact.

NH