

TOWN OF ERWIN PLANNING BOARD MEETING

WEDNESDAY, JULY 6, 2016

7 P.M. ERWIN TOWN HALL

310 TOWN CENTER ROAD

Present: John Gargano, Brian Harpster, Ted Metarko, Wayne Kennedy, Doug Porter, Patricia Thiel

Absent: Matt Maslyn, Joseph Reilly, James McCarthy

Guests: Roger Hawkins, Reverend Daniel Mahler, Dave Iocco, Mark Costanza, Robert Drew, Rita McCarthy, Barb Lucas

CHAIRMAN JOHN GARGANO OPENS THE MEETING AT 7:00 PM.

In accordance with the Planning Board's established procedure, the Board will hear all matters up until 9 PM. Any matters not completed by that time will be held over to the next regular meeting. As is the usual practice, the Board's consultants have met with the applicants prior to this meeting and have gone over the applications to ensure that they are as complete as possible and to point out any errors or omissions that can delay approval.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2016 MEETING

MOTION BY: PATRICIA THIEL

SECONDED BY: DOUG PORTER

DISPOSITION: 6-0

<p>1. APPLICATION FOR A TWO LOT SUBDIVISION/RESUBDIVISION FROM MARK & MICHELLE COSTANZA AND ROGER HAWKINS TO TAKE 448 SQ FT OF THE LOT AT 139 MAIN ST AND COMBINE IT WITH THE LOT AT 19 RACE ST. WITH PUBLIC HEARING</p>

POINTS TO CONSIDER:

The project is located in an R12.5 Residential zone.

The applicants seek to take 448 sq ft off of the Costanza parcel, 139 Main St, and add it to the Hawkins parcel, 19 Race St so that the existing house on the Hawkins parcel will meet setback requirements.

The existing Costanza lot is 18,208 sq ft. The 448 sq ft will not alter lot size, setbacks, lot coverage, or width at building line in regard to zoning requirements. The addition to the Hawkins parcel will make it conforming by providing a 10 ft side yard setback for the existing Hawkins house.

Additional items necessary:

SEQR needs to be signed

Need signature from Hawkins on application

The application was presented by Roger Hawkins. Mark Costanza was present. Mr. Hawkins noted that a corner of his house actually sits on the property line. The additional land would provide for the required setback.

THE PLANNING BOARD DECLARES THE APPLICATION TO BE COMPLETE.

PLANNING BOARD REVIEWS THE EAF.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM (EAF) – Part 2 – Impact Assessment

- | | |
|--|----|
| 1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations? | NO |
| 2. Will the proposed action result in a change in use or intensity of use of land? | NO |
| 3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community? | NO |
| 4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)? | NO |
| 5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway? | NO |
| 6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities? | NO |
| 7. Will the proposed action impact existing: | |
| a. public / private water supplies? | NO |
| b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities? | NO |
| 8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources? | NO |
| 9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)? | NO |
| 10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems? | NO |
| 11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health? | NO |

THE PLANNING BOARD CLASSIFIES THIS AS AN UNLISTED ACTION SINCE IT INVOLVES A RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF LESS THAN 50 UNITS WITHOUT PUBLIC WATER AND SEWER, DECLARES ITSELF LEAD AGENCY, AND MAKES A NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE.

MOTION BY: TED METARKO

SECONDED BY: BRIAN HARPSTER

DISPOSITION: 6-0

CHAIRMAN GARGANO OPENS THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:11PM.

CHAIRMAN GARGANO CLOSES THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:12PM.

UPON HEARING NO APPLICABLE ADVERSE COMMENT FROM THE PUBLIC, THE PLANNING BOARD APPROVES THE SUBDIVISION/RESUBDIVISION APPLICATION.

MOTION BY: WAYNE KENNEDY

SECONDED BY: PATRICIA THIEL

DISPOSITION: 6-0

The applicant is advised that the approval expires if the plat is not filed with the County Clerk within 62 days of signature.

2. SITE PLAN AMENDMENT APPLICATION FROM ST. MARY'S ORTHODOX CHURCH TO 24' x 22' ONE STORY ADDITION TO THE EXISTING HOUSE AT 61 CANADA RD. WITH PUBLIC HEARING.

The applicant seeks to construct a two story, 24' X 22' addition to the existing house which will serve as the parsonage.

POINTS TO CONSIDER:

The project is located in a B-2 Office Commercial District.

The addition to the existing house will not change lot size, setbacks, or width at building line in regard to zoning requirements. Lot coverage is 58% where 75% is allowed.

DEC approval of area to be disturbed/SWPP or no SWPP is required

The application was presented by Dave Iocco, engineer for the applicant. Engineer Iocco noted that after approval had been granted for the site plan at 61 Canada Rd, it was determined that an addition to the existing house was necessary. Changes in the site plan also include making the church smaller and revising the driveway and parking area. The total area of disturbance was recalculated and determined to be less than or equal to the disturbed area in the original plan, which had been approved by the DEC.

THE PLANNING BOARD DECLARES THE APPLICATION TO BE COMPLETE.

PLANNING BOARD REVIEWS THE EAF:

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM (EAF) – Part 2 – Impact Assessment

1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?	NO
2. Will the proposed action result in a change in use or intensity of use of land?	NO
3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?	NO
4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?	NO
5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?	NO
6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?	NO
7. Will the proposed action impact existing: a. public / private water supplies?	NO
b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities?	NO
8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?	NO
9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?	NO
10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?	NO
11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?	NO

RESOLUTION TO DECLARE THE PLANNING BOARD LEAD AGENCY AND TO MAKE A NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE.

MOTION BY: DOUG PORTER

SECONDED BY: TED METARKO

DISPOSITION: 6-0

CHAIRMAN GARGANO OPENS THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:20PM.

CHAIRMAN GARGANO CLOSES THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:21PM.

UPON HEARING NO APPLICABLE ADVERSE COMMENT FROM THE PUBLIC, THE PLANNING BOARD APPROVES THE SITE PLAN AMENDMENT.

MOTION BY: PATRICIA THIEL

SECONDED BY: WAYNE KENNEDY

DISPOSITION: 6-0

RESOLUTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

MOTION BY: DOUG PORTER

SECONDED BY: BRIAN HARPSTER

DISPOSITION: 6-0