

**Village of Brewster
Planning Board
April 22, 2014**

Board members in attendance:

David Kulo, Chairman
Mark Anderson
Renee Diaz
Tyler Murrello

Also present, Mr. Greg Folchetti, Counsel to Planning Board.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, whereupon the proceedings were called to order at 7:30pm.

Public hearing

Mr. Kulo made a motion to open the public hearing. This was seconded by Mr. Anderson and passed 4-0.

Mr. Kulo stated that the public hearing was in reference to 876 Route 22, map 67.36-2-19, review of site plan and planning board as lead agency SEQR.

Mr. Kulo asked if there was anyone present for this project.

Mr. Folchetti stated that he expected the Applicant to be present.

Mr. Folchetti pointed out that he didn't see this project as a Type 2 action.

Mr. Anderson asked Mr. Folchetti if he disagreed with Applicant's analysis, and Ms. Diaz said that she did, also.

Mr. Folchetti further questioned the EAF re: the size of the project because the building, tanks, canopy, pumps (all existing add up to more than 4000 sq. ft.) and that the rehabilitation of existing structures and facilities should be an Unlisted Action and the Board could consider this as negative declaration when the time comes.

. Mr. Murrello stated that the building itself is about 1500 sq. ft. And then one needs to add all the rest to it.

Mr. Folchetti reminded the Board that the Applicant wasn't present to address this one way or the other.

Mr. Anderson asked about pausing on this project. Mr. Kulo responded saying that the public hearing was scheduled for this date at 7:30pm, so if the Applicant wasn't present the public hearing should be held over.

Mr. Anderson asked about question 17 on Appendix B, asking about what the Applicant checked off re: storm water discharge going to adjacent property. Wanted to know if this was allowed.

. Mr. Folchetti responded that Yes, this allowed, but Applicant will need to submit a storm water pollution prevention plan SWPP(?) if there is 5000 sq. ft. of disturbance total (not part of site plan).

Ms. Diaz asked about one of the criteria to determine Type 1 significance: 'Will there be a creation of hazard to human health'. If sinking in new oil tanks, that would fall under Type 1, wouldn't it?

. Mr. Folchetti said, No, but an Unlisted Action.

Mr. Folchetti reviewed difference between Type 2 and Type 1. Type 2 means no further action and the Board is just making a determination on the Applicant's plan. Type 1 often requires an environmental impact statement. This is not required for this project since it's the rehabilitation of a property that has been established for years.

He said if it's an Unlisted Action, the Planning Board can make a coordinated review, declare intention to act as Lead Agency, circulate the notices and after the thirty day period is up, a determination can be made (e.g., negative or positive declaration, conditional declaration). Up to this point, the Board hasn't done this.

. Therefore, Mr. Folchetti suggested that the Board make a Coordinated Review.

Mr. Anderson also mentioned that drywells were no longer the right thing, yet on the plans it shows a drywell for roof water.

. Mr. Folchetti said that the comments on all of the improvements and their impact on storm water, waste water, potable water were all engineering comments.

Mr. Murrello stated that this was minor because what's going on in the

gutter will go into the drywell.

Mr. Folchetti reiterated that the Applicant wasn't present to respond to or provide answers to any of these questions.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to hold over the public hearing. This was seconded by Mr. Murrello and approved 4-0.

Regular meeting

Mr. Kulo made a motion to open the regular meeting. This was seconded by Mr. Anderson and passed 4-0.

Mr. Kulo took attendance showing that Ms. Diaz, Mr. Anderson and Mr. Murrello were present.

First order of business – New business

Saint Lawrence O'Toole – 67.26-2-15(16) – Recommendation regarding the waiver of the moratorium and site plan review.

Mr. Draj Chachkovich (sp?), a principle at DCK (sp?) Architects and Engineering responsible for the architecture and engineering for this project took the Board through the site plan.

. Site is located between Prospect St. and Eastview Ave. Site includes the church, gymnasium and former school, which is now CCD religious education.

The site plan shows the adjacent lot that the church purchased, but subject of this presentation was the renovation of the church and the addition to the church on the main lot.

Re: Tax parcels

Mr. Anderson asked if this was all on one tax parcel, and there was a discussion on whether this project was on one or two parcels.

. Mr. C. was to verify that there were two parcels and where the division is.

RE: Renovation

. The church would be renovated in the interior only; nothing on the exterior of the building.

. There will be an addition that enlarges the common spaces in the church. Not expansion of the assembly space, more elbow room for pastor and parishioners.

- . Will also allow for the warm access to the gymnasium from the church.
- . And a courtyard will be installed between the three buildings, which will be an entry courtyard to this addition.
- . There will be a change to the entrance or plaza on the outside to the church.
- . And the installation of several new light poles comparable to what exists on Main Street.

Mr. Anderson asked about how many stories.

- . Mr. C. responded that there will be 2 levels (one story with basement).

RE: Drainage and utilities

- . New underground service (opposed to current above ground electrical service) will be brought into the church from Eastview (the pole is already there). The current service goes to the pole in the parking lot to the building.
- . Could keep existing service and increase amperage, but Father thought it best to eliminate the pole and get extra parking spaces.
- . All existing utilities would be used for the addition.

RE: Storm water drain

- . Only need to tie in to the existing storm water drain which is on the property which discharges into the storm sewer on Eastview.

RE: Lighting plan

- . Adding four bollards projecting down to the ground in the courtyard to provide low light level.
- . New light on the front of the rectory; lighting projecting down to the ground.
- . Otherwise all existing church lighting.
- . Four new light poles on the street. In process of talking with the Department of Public Works to see if they would allow them to do this since they would be on village property. Would be connected to existing power that is serving the existing light pole.
- . The arm that is shown projecting onto the property off the pole would be eliminated and replaced with residential scale lighting that is softer/lower in scale to bring some ambiance to the street.

Mr. Anderson questioned using the word rectory, and Mr. C. clarified that he misspoke and the rectory is, in fact, across the street.

RE: Floor plan

Main level of the church

- . Two confessionals will be moved, made larger and wheel-chair accessible.
- . The wall between the narthex and the church will be replaced with a glass wall.
- . Replacing massive columns with slimmer columns to help parishioners see the mass in the sanctuary, is one of the major expenses of this project.
- . The current sacristy will become a larger sacristy and moved.
- . The small space with some additional space will become a daily adoration chapel. Currently the main space in the church is used for the adoration chapel; not ideal when this entire space needs to be heated and air conditioned. In future, door will be closed and only that space will need to be heated or cooled.
- . There will be an elevator; stair to get up and down.
- . The rest of the space is utilitarian (closets, disabled access restroom, access to the gymnasium).

Lower level underneath the church is primarily storage, in addition to:

- . Mechanical equipment area.
- . Underneath the sacristy will be work sacristy and storage.
- . Access to cross the parking lot with canvass canopy to cross over to the school without getting wet.

RE: Parking lot – essentially the same.

RE: Elevations

- . Mr. Anderson asked about the grade level from the parking lot at the school on Eastview to come into this new building which would provide access to the elevator to bring one up to church level. Mr. C. confirmed this. Also change in floor to eliminate one step to make it one level and more friendly to seniors.
- . Mr. Kulo restated that there is only one elevator. (Mr. Anderson reminded the Board that they already approved the installation of the elevator).
- . Mr. C then presented a few photos to show what the additions would look like.
- . Mr. Folchetti reminded the Board that their only purpose this evening was to make a recommendation to the Village Board to waive the moratorium.

Mr. Kulo commented that this was a nice summary. Asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Anderson said that the church doesn't change anything in the Village; there are no radical changes.

Mr. Murrello said he didn't see a problem.

Mr. Kulo stated that he saw this as an improvement to the aesthetics of the street.

Mr. Murrello made a motion to make a recommendation to waive the moratorium. This was seconded by Mr. Anderson and passed 4-0.

Second order of business

El Dorado bar application

. Mr. Kulo said that he hasn't heard anything from El Dorado and the current application is incomplete.

. Mr. Folchetti suggested that they make a motion to take no position.

. Ms. Diaz made a motion to take no position on the application of El Dorado bar expansion.

This was seconded by Mr. Murrello and passed 4-0.

Acceptance of draft minutes of March 25, 2014

Ms. Diaz stated change on page 2, under First order of business – new business, second bullet. Should be from:

The original notice was published in error by the Town Clerk.

To:

The original notice was published in error by *the Village Clerk and needs to be reposted.*

Mr. Anderson made a motion to accept amended minutes from the March 25, 2014 Planning Board meeting. This was seconded by Mr. Kulo and passed 4-0.

Mr. Murrello made a motion to adjourn the meeting. This was seconded by Mr. Anderson and passed 4-0.

Meeting adjourned.

