TOWN OF SOMERS
CONSERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
APRIL 12, 2011

The April 12, 2011 regular meeting of the Conservation Board was called to order by Chairman Gary Meixner.

Attendance: Eric Evans, Shoshana Hantman, Michael La Gue, James Moriarty, Gary Meixner

Absent: Dr. Edward Merker, John Purcell

Guests: None

Announcements:

Board member Dr. Edward Merker phoned the C.B. Chairman to inform him that he would not be able to attend the meeting tonight.

Approval of Minutes:

A motion was made by Michael La Gue and seconded by James Moriarty to approve the minutes of the March 22, 2011 regular meeting of the Conservation Board. All members present approved.

Board member James Moriarty made amendments to the Conservation Board Minutes of March 22, 2011 on page 18.

Chairman Gary Meixner made amendments to the Conservation Board Minutes of March 22, 2011 on page 19.

Old Business:

A) Guerrero/#213 Rte. 100/Update/Building Inspector/Principal Engineering Technician/Permit-driveway: (GM)
The Conservation Board discussed the above administrative application for Guerrero regarding a permit for their newly constructed driveway on Rte. 100.

The Board members are waiting to hear from the Principal Engineering Technician Steve Woelfle regarding the State DOT granting the permit for the driveway to the new garage.

Ms. Davis noted that she spoke to Mr. Woelfle and he advised her that the permit from the DOT has not come through to date.

This item would be kept on the C.B. agenda until such time as the applicant receives a permit from the DOT.

Old Business:

A) Guerrero/Update:

Board member Eric Evans asked if the Board knew for a fact that there is an application pending at the DOT?

Chairman Meixner responded affirmatively noting that he was told that there was an application submitted by the applicant. He mentioned that the applicant built the garage and driveway without an approved DOT permit.

C.B. Secretary Ms. Davis advised that Principal Engineering Technician Woelfle had informed her that the DOT had an application pending for this project. However, to date there has not been an approval submitted by the DOT.

Discussion ensued among the Board members with reference to this application and the subject matter was tabled until the next meeting.

The Board members took no further action at this time.

B) Critical Environmental Areas in the Town of Somers/Discussion/Report; Board member Hantman will be looking into this subject matter on behalf of the Board: (SH)
The Conservation Board discussed the above subject matter concerning the implementation of Critical Environmental Areas located in the Town of Somers.

Old Business:

B) CEA/Discussion:

Board member Shoshana Hantman is in the process of reviewing information that would encompass some future site locations in the area that are suitable for the designation of CEA.

She informed the Board that she will continue to obtain guidance from Mr. Michael Rubbo and the Environmental Leaders Learning Alliance noting that they have numerous resources that can be accessed from their website.

Ms. Hantman reviewed and discussed some information made available to her by ELLA and gave a report to the Board. She explained that at present she is in the initial stages of this endeavor, but she wanted to share her progress to date. She also mentioned that she would like input from the Board with reference to their ideas on the creation of CEA's in Somers.

*

Report:

- Board member Hantman noted that a CEA is a specific geographical area designated by a state or local agency as having exceptional or unique environmental characteristics. The town, county, state or a private individual can own this property; there are no restrictions on ownership.

- She went on to explain that exceptional or unique environmental characteristics include a benefit or threat to human health. She noted that C.B. Secretary Ms. Davis had pointed out that up until now the only CEA in the Town of Somers has been Baldwin Place Shopping Center, which was considered a potential threat to human health sometime in the past.

Old Business:

B) CEA/Discussion:

- Ms. Hantman advised that it should encompass a natural setting that has agricultural, social, cultural, historic, recreational or educational value or ecological, geological or hydrological sensitivity to change.

- Board member Hantman noted that the ELLA workshop that she and Ms. Davis attended suggested that the difficult part was identifying the locations for designation along with the reasons. The Town Board has the ultimate decision on the matter she said. Some reasons for a CEA might be a rare species in an area; groundwater recharge areas or supply; a biotic corridor; esthetic or scenic areas or large tracts of undeveloped land.

- Ms. Hantman said that she started with plants and animals as the list encompasses many items. She specified that she reviewed the ELLA website where she found the presentation and workshop that took place on March 5, 2011.

- As this is just the beginning she said it certainly indicates that there are some real possibilities for CEA's here in Somers especially since one third or more of our town is located in a biotic corridor.

- Ms. Hantman advised that she searched the DEC's HERP (herpetology) map. From 1990 to 1999 a sub-agency of the DEC mapped out the amphibians and reptiles that exist in New York State. This activity was accomplished by asking individuals to submit reports of sightings of the various species (40 to 50 species) to the DEC.

Old Business:

B) CEA/Discussion:

- She decided to start her investigation by listing about 10 to 12 species out of the group that exist in Somers and are not very common. She looked up their conservation status and noted that there was only one that was not listed as LC (least concerned). Government biologists have created a spectrum of conservation status that range from extinct to least concerned (i.e. raccoons, etc.). In the middle are two wide areas threatened and lower risk; vulnerable is the lowest end of the threatened part of the spectrum.

- Ms. Hantman noted that the threatened species she found, which is listed as vulnerable and located in Somers is called the spotted turtle. In the State of New York there were 124 reports out of 1,000 submitted that said they had seen a spotted turtle.

- The spotted turtle is black with yellow spots and is active from March to October and starts nesting in May; the female buries the eggs and disguises the nest site she said. They reach sexual maturity in 8 to 10 years and live 25 to 50 years.

- The DEC says that habitat destruction and the pet trade are two of the greatest threats to that specie she said. The spotted turtle is not listed on the Federal Endangered species, but it is listed in the IUCN Redbook (International Union for Conservation of Nature & Natural Resources).

- Approximately 100 years ago the spotted turtle was the most common turtle in the New York City area and now it is vulnerable she said. They are very sensitive to pollution and disappear rapidly when the water gets bad. They eat slugs, spiders and worms and spend the daytime basking in the sun and the night at the bottom of the pond.

Old Business:

B) CEA/Discussion:

Board member Michael La Gue agreed and noted that in his own observation they have clearly gone down in population.

Ms. Hantman asked the Board members what areas in Somers come to mind when she says agricultural values.

Mr. La Gue responded Stonewall Farms and Stuart Fruit Farm.

Chairman Meixner noted Muscoot Farm, North Farm (end of Plumbrook and Rte. 139), Anglefly Preserve.

Board member Hantman asked what areas in Somers come to mind regarding cultural or historic values.

Chairman Meixner responded the Town House (Elephant Hotel), Knights of Columbus (Mahopac Avenue).

Mr. La Gue noted the Stone House, Zion Church and Tomahawk Church on Rte. 118 (across from Charles Inn).

Ms. Hantman asked what areas come to mind when she mentions ecological, geological or hydrological sensitivity to change.

Chairman Meixner said that the main aquifer in town is located under the Elephant Hotel and continues through Croton Falls.

Old Business:

B) CEA/Discussion:

Ms. Hantman mentioned the Lakes in town i.e. Lake Shenorock, Lake Lincolndale, etc.

Board member Eric Evans noted the wetland area behind Somers High School.

Ms. Davis mentioned that the Leonard Skipper butterfly was located off Rte. 202 near the Somers Chase development (reference former C.B. member John Behler). She said that Mr. Behler was very active in Somers tagging and tracking turtles in this area, in particular Muscoot Farm. He wrote some books on turtles, amphibians, etc.

Chairman Meixner noted that Mr. Behler's photos having to do with reptiles are located in the Autobahn books.

Ms. Hantman advised that the Autobahn Society in Katonah probably would have maps on bird activity in the area. She went on to say that the priorities that are generally observed with regards to creating CEA's are stream corridors, grasslands, shrub lands, wetlands, large forests (not fragmented), estuary shoreline (not Somers) and caves and cliffs.

Chairman Meixner mentioned that Somers has the Plumbrook (between Shenorock and Lincolndale) for a stream corridor.

Ms. Davis commented that Mickey Oliver, the Town Historian would know about all of the historic locations. Also, former Board member Grace Zimmermann might be able to advise you on this matter she said as she is involved with the Historical Society.

Old Business:

B) CEA/Discussion:

Chairman Meixner specified that the old railroad beds could be considered for classification as a CEA.

Board member Michael La Gue informed the Board that there are beavers and a large beaver den near the railroad bed off Plumbrook Road. He went on to say that the beavers have also cut down several trees at that location. He noted that there are otters in that area as well.

Board member Hantman inquired about beavers being endangered.

Chairman Meixner said that as far as he knew they were not.

Ms. Hantman specified that there was an area at the Bronx Zoo that was dedicated to beavers and she was wondering if they might be endangered in certain areas of Westchester.

Some discussion ensued among the Board members with reference to Critical Environmental Areas and what can be considered for listing as a CEA in Somers. They also discussed the Westchester area with reference to beavers and wildlife activity.

The Board members took no further action at this time.

Old Business:

C) 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini/Wetland & Stormwater Management, Erosion & Sediment Control Permit Application; Site Plan/Planning Board (Existing-Proposed) dated January 5, 2011; Prepared by Spearman Architectural Design PC; Section 48.18-1-10; Survey/Alexander Bunney; *Other – Wetlands Investigation by Steven Danzer PhD dated 10-14-10;* Short EAF; Site Plan/S-1, S-2, S-3; Proposed Plan/S-4; Garage addition to home/landscape improvements within buffer zone of 6534 sq.ft. Man-made, clay bottom, non-contiguous retention pond; Plans include hydro-dredging acidifying sediment from the pond & creation of bog area to improve the environmental viability of pond without increasing size; activity area/19, 700 sq.ft., *(#102 Moseman Avenue/So side/intersection Stuart Lane)*: (GM)
The Conservation Board reviewed the above Planning Board application for 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini site plan, wetland and stormwater management, erosion-sediment control permit, and wetland investigation at their meeting tonight.

Chairman Gary Meixner reviewed the information submitted, perform a site inspection of the property and give a report to the Board.

*

Report:

- The Chair informed the Board that he phoned the Engineering department and advised them that the Block and Lot numbers for the application were reversed. He said that he spoke to the architect for the project and was told that the information submitted would be corrected. The architect mentioned that he would be monitoring the property throughout the process.

- He explained that at present the house is an unoccupied ranch style building. The house can not be lived in until the rebuilding takes place. The owner is going to square off the house he said, as the back corner does not exist right now.

Old Business:

C) 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini/Site Plan:

- The applicant has the zoning approval for a 40-ft. setback and part of the existing house is located in a 25-ft. setback right now he said.

- The Chair noted that the applicant will be installing new septic fields and there will be gravel driveway as well as rain gardens. The applicant will be putting in erosion fabric to hold the grass.

- Chairman Meixner informed the Board that the applicant has a tree permit, as they took down some trees on the corner of the house.

- Board member Moriarty also went to the site and advised that the house has an elevator by the garage. He said that it is a low-rise ranch with tarps on the roof and logs holding them down.

- The Chair advised that there is a two-car garage and the elevator goes from the garage area up to the living area. There is also an in-door swim spa located inside the home. He explained that this application involves a lot of work and the applicant wants to make it look nice and has hired the John Jay Landscape Development for the site.

- Chairman Meixner said that there is an existing man made pond on the site and the rain gardens will be emptying into the pond.

Board member Eric Evans inquired about the tree permit that the applicant applied for from the town. Do we know what kind of trees or where they were located or if there will be any clear cutting on the property?

Old Business:

C) 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini/Site Plan:

- The Chair responded that the trees that were taken down were located on the corners of the house. He noted that there were other trees on the edge of the property and to his knowledge the applicant is going to leave them undisturbed. He said that the predominant trees were silver maples and swamp maples.

Board member Evans inquired about extending a back yard and was wondering what was involved in the process.

Chairman Meixner said that if there are trees then a permit is needed and the permit would be for trees that are eight inches (or more) at breast height.

Board member La Gue added that if the applicant could furnish proof that they planted the tree then they can take it down without a permit.

Mr. Evans inquired about the process of getting a tree permit and what was involved in clear-cutting trees and what would be the basis for denial.

The Chair responded that the person would need a permit and in most cases a homeowner could only cut a certain number of trees per year.

Mr. Moriarty said that he thinks a homeowner could cut eight trees per year. However if there is a danger to your property (house, etc.) then a tree can be cut down he said.

Old Business:

C) 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini/Site Plan:

- The acreage on this lot is R-80 zoning said Chairman Meixner, which is approximately two acres of land.

- The Chair specified that there is watershed property across the street, but the applicant does not need a permit until they start the building process.

Mr. La Gue noted that in this case the plans exhibit 1.849 acres.

- Chairman Meixner advised that the water is running out of the pond and there is no stream going into the pond area.

- He confirmed that there is a 6 x 6 ft. square on the property that look like it might be some sort of structure, but he did not know what.

Board member Hantman suggested that it might be a well.

Chairman Meixner agreed and said that at one time it could have been a well with a building over it.

Board member La Gue inquired about a notation on the plans saying INV-100 and INV-101.

Ms. Hantman asked if there was an existing rock wall.

Old Business:

C) 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini/Site Plan:

- The Chair noted that some of the stone walls are not located on this parcel of property. He went on to say that the applicant might need to improve the exit of the driveway to the left, as it is potentially dangerous with regards to site distance.

Ms. Hantman wanted to know where the driveway was dangerous and asked if it was presently or it would be.

Chairman Meixner responded that he had to edge out onto the road to be careful and the potential problem is there presently.

Board member Evans inquired about what the applicant is going to do to the pond.

- The Chair responded that the owners would be dredging the pond and that would fall under the wetland permit. He noted that the applicant estimated the total value of the site work is approximately $550,000.

**

Discussion ensued among the Board members with reference to this application and they noted that there were two more parts to the report on 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini, a wetland report and landscape report.

The Board members took no further action at this time.

Old Business:

D) 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini/Wetland Activity Permit/Planning Board; Wetland Stormwater Management, Erosion-Sediment Control Permit Application; Section 48.18, Block 1, Lot 10, Complete package submitted March 14, 2011; Findings & Reasons FR2010-41 dated 10-12-10; Short EAF; Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan; Erosion-Sedimentation Control Practice during Construction; Post-construction Stormwater Management Practice; Landscape Management Plan/Map; Wetlands Investigation by Steven Danzer, Ph.D. dated 10-14-10; S-1/Stormwater Pollution-Prevention Plan; S-2/Site Plan-Contoured; S-3/Site Plan-Details; S-4/Proposed Plans & Elevations; Letter to Planning Board dated January 18, 2011, Prepared by Spearman Architectural Design PC, *(#102 Moseman Avenue/ So side/intersection-Stuart-Lane)*: (JM)
The Conservation Board reviewed the above Planning Board application for 102 Moseman LLC Gaggini, wetland activity permit, stormwater management, stormwater pollution-prevention plan, erosion-sediment control permit, and wetland investigation at their meeting.

Board member James Moriarty reviewed the materials submitted, performed a site inspection of the property and gave a report to the Board.

*

Report:

- Mr. Moriarty informed the Board that the Stormwater Pollution Prevention document for the Erosion & Sediment Control did not provide numbered pages, which makes it difficult for reference purposes.

- He noted that the report has a section entitled *Sediment Fencing* (on page "3") and it does not match the drawing regarding the same. One says wood staked vinyl sheathing and the other says woven wire fence with filter cloth backing fastened to steel, which is what we recommend.

Old Business:

D) 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini/WAP:

- On the section entitled *Stabilized Construction Entrance* (on page "4") the document states, *the existing gravel driveway will serve as the stabilized construction entrance*. This statement may be inaccurate, as the size of the gravel for an anti-tracking pad is not correct he said. The anti-tracking pad would not function as required. The goal of the pad is to keep the mud out of the road (which runs into the streams).

- Board member Moriarty explained that the anti-tracking pad to stabilize the construction entrance is normally 50' x 20' with a 1.5" gravel on filter fabric. The 3/8" gravel for the driveway as depicted is not a stabilized entrance. There will be rocks and dirt all over the street from the trucking; at present there is 3/8 and 3/4-inch stone in the driveway he said.

- Mr. Moriarty mentioned that the anti-tracking pad and associated details are missing from the plans submitted and it should be noted on the site plan/S-1.

- On page "4" the document discusses the geo-textile fabric that they are going to use. This should match the information on the drawing page where it says filter cloth. The plastic based (as noted in this document) is not ultraviolet stable; it should be the fabric based, which won't break down he said. The written descriptions do not match the drawing.

- The above items all have to do with the Town Code Chapter 93, Section 2, Subsection C: . . . *to minimize increases in stormwater runoff from land development activities* said Mr. Moriarty.

Old Business:

D) 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini/WAP:

- On the *John Jay Landscape Development Plan* they spelled process wrong. The documents should be checked for errors.

**

After much discussion on the matter the Board members decided to write a memo to the Planning Board stating their recommendations and concerns.

*
A memo (#11-18) will be sent to the Planning Board stating that the Conservation Board reviewed the above Planning Board application for 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini site plan, wetland activity, stormwater management, erosion-sediment control, wetland investigation and stormwater pollution-prevention plan at their meeting on April 12, 2011.

The Board members reviewed the materials submitted, performed a site inspection of the property and discussed the application among them.

The C.B. has the following concerns and recommendations:

1) The applicant's Stormwater Pollution Prevention document for the Erosion & Sediment Control did not provide numbered pages, which makes it difficult for reference purposes.

2) The report has a section entitled *Sediment Fencing* (on page "3") and it does not match the drawing regarding the same.

Old Business:

D) 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini/WAP:

- One says wood staked vinyl sheathing and the other says woven wire fence with filter cloth backing fastened to steel.

- The latter is what we recommend.

3) On page "4" the document discusses the geo-textile fabric that they are going to use. This should match the information on the drawing page where it says filter cloth.

- The plastic based (as noted in this document) is not ultraviolet stable; it should be the fabric based as it would not break down.

- The written descriptions do not match the drawing.

4) In the section entitled *Stabilized Construction Entrance* (on page "4") the document states, *the existing gravel driveway will serve as the stabilized construction entrance*.

- This statement may be inaccurate, as the size of the gravel for an anti-tracking pad is not correct. The anti-tracking pad would not function as required; the goal of the pad is to keep the mud out of the road (which runs into the streams).

- The anti-tracking pad to stabilize the construction entrance is normally 50' x 20' with a 1.5" gravel on filter fabric.

- The 3/8" gravel for the driveway as depicted is not a stabilized entrance.

- Presently there is 3/8 and 3/4-inch stone in the driveway.

Old Business:

D) 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini/WAP:

5) The anti-tracking pad and associated details are missing from the plans submitted and it should be exhibited on the site plan/S-1.

6) The above items all refer to Town Code Chapter 93, Section 2, Subsection C: . . . *to minimize increases in stormwater runoff from land development activities*.

7) On the *John Jay Landscape Development Plan,* the applicant spelled 'process' wrong.

- Documents should be checked for errors.

The Conservation Board will continue to review the above application for 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini as revisions are submitted.

**

The Board members took no further action at this time.

D)a 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini/Landscape Plan/review/report: (ML)
Conservation Board reviewed the above Planning Board application for 102 Moseman LLC Gaggini, landscape plan/landscape development plan at their meeting tonight.

Old Business:

D)a 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini/Landscape:

Board member Michael La Gue conducted a review on the landscape section of the plans for the above application and gave a report to the Board.

*
Report:

- Mr. La Gue informed the Board that he reviewed the landscape plan, which was a sketch prepared by John Jay Landscape Development and noted that he had both positive and negative reviews.

- He said that if installed as described it would be a good naturalized setting that involves native and exotic species.

- The plan minimizes the amount of lawn area, which is a good thing because it cuts down on the amount of water, fertilizer, etc. that would be used by the homeowner he said.

- Mr. La Gue indicated that there are 'no mow zones' on the plans submitted, which is a good thing as it allows insects, birds, etc. to use the area without problems.

- On the plant list he said that there are no invasive species recommended for planting, which is a good thing also.

- The negative elements he said appears to be that certain of the species stated are not specified on the paperwork submitted as to the amount of plantings the applicant stated *quantities to be determined.*

Old Business:

D)a 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini/Landscape:

- In and of itself this statement is reasonable however, in the bog area the landscape architect is extremely precise i.e. 310 Bull rushes, 22 Hibiscus.

- Board member La Gue pointed out that in one area the landscape architect is very specific and in a rather large area he is not specific at all. The plan would be better served to be more specific with the approximate number of plantings (shrubs) to be planted and the location.

- Mr. La Gue noted that the applicant has many notations of Hawthorne Trees (7) and it happens to be a species that is very disease-prone, which the applicant might want to reconsider.

- Some of the species that are being recommended on this plan are heavily browsed by deer. The applicant might want to consider deer fencing to preserve all of these plantings he said.

- Certain areas of the plans are not labeled, in particular the east side, bordering Moseman Avenue. Some areas say 'no mow' and other areas are not labeled at all.

- The plan appears to suggest that farming activities will take place on the site said Mr. La Gue.

**

Board member Hantman asked why the deer issue was in the purview of the Conservation Board.

Old Business:

D)a 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini/Landscape:

Mr. La Gue responded that if the applicant is going to all of the trouble to disturb the soil and replant it with all of these nice things, if you don't fence out the deer then some of these plantings will last about 2 months.

Ms. Hantman noted that they would not serve the function and reason that they are being planted.

Board member La Gue said that the landscaper could respond that they are going to spray regularly, but if they do not then there will be a big problem.

Discussion ensued among the Board members with reference to spraying for deer in this region. They noted the products that could be used that do not poison the environment.

Mr. La Gue specified that the deer do not like most things that have a scent to them and that is why spraying could work (as long as it is done regularly).

Board member Eric Evans said that he purchased a product that has a peppermint smell that works very well against the deer.

After some discussion on the matter the Board members decided to write a memo to the Planning Board stating their recommendations and concerns.

*

A memo (#11-19) will be sent to the Planning Board stating that the Conservation Board reviewed the above application reviewed the above

Old Business:

D)a 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini/Landscape:

Planning Board application for 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini site plan, landscape management plan at their meeting on April 12, 2011.

The Board members reviewed the materials submitted, performed a site inspection of the property and discussed the application among them.

The C.B. has the following concerns and recommendations:

1) The Board commented that if installed as described the landscape plan would be a good naturalized setting that involves native and exotic species.

2) The plan minimizes the amount of lawn area, which cuts down on the amount of water, fertilizer, etc. that would be used by the homeowner.

3) There are 'no mow zones' on the plans submitted, which allows insects, birds, etc. to use the area without problems.

4) The plant list states that there are no invasive species recommended for planting, which we applaud.

5) The negative elements appear to be that certain of the species stated are not specified on the paperwork submitted as to the amount of plantings as the applicant noted *quantities to be determined*.

Old Business:

D)a 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini/Landscape:

6) In the bog area the landscape architect is very specific however in a rather large area he was not specific at all.

- The plan would be better served to be more specific with the approximate number of plantings (shrubs) to be planted and the location.

7) The applicant has many notations of Hawthorne Trees (7).

- This species is very disease-prone.
- The applicant might want to reconsider.

8) Some of the species recommended on this plan are heavily browsed by deer.

- The applicant might want to consider deer fencing to preserve all of the plantings.

9) Certain areas of the plans are not labeled, in particular the east side, bordering Moseman Avenue.

- Some areas say 'no mow' and other areas are not labeled at all.
- The applicant should clearly label all areas on the plan.

10) The plan appears to suggest that farming activities will take place on the site.

Old Business:

D)a 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini/Landscape:

The Conservation Board will review the above application for 102 Moseman LLC/Gaggini landscape plan as revisions are submitted.

**

The Board members took no further action at this time.

E) Heritage Hills of Westchester/Sewage Treatment Plant/Site Plan/Planning Board; Map of Visitors Center-Model Area dated March 26, 1973, revised April 3, 1973; Prepared by Alexander Bunney Land Surveyor, PC; Re-Subdivision Map dated February 14, 2011; Prepared by Bunney Associates Land Surveyors, Preliminary Subdivision-Abbreviated Procedure; Letter to Planning Board dated 2-11-11; Applicant to subdivide 18.582 acre parcel into two parcels; Lot-1A/7.571 ac Lot-1B/11.011 ac; transfer 9 acre parcel with sewage treatment plant to Heritage Hills Sewage-Works Corp.; R-40 & DRD; Application; Short EAF; Site Plan-Parcel 1 & 2; Re-subdivision Map of Parcel 1 dated 2-14-11; Section 17.10, Block 10, Lot 18, *(Rte. 202 & Heritage Hills Drive)*: (ML)

The Conservation Board reviewed the above application for Heritage Hills Sewage Treatment Plant re-subdivision at their meeting on March 8, 2011. A memo (#11-14 dated March 18, 2011) was sent to the Planning Board stating the C.B. concerns and recommendations.

This item will remain on the C.B. Agenda until the Planning Board makes a decision on this subdivision application and the Board members decide to remove it from the agenda.

Old Business:

E) Heritage Hills/Subdivision:

The Board members took no further action at this time.

New Business:

A) Mitchell Subdivision/Conventional Subdivision Plan-4 Sheets; Preliminary Subdivision/Planning Board dated March 14, 2011; Preliminary Plat - Conservation Subdivision Plan/PP-1; Erosion Control Plan/EC-1; Profile –Misc. Details/D-1; Stormwater Details/D-2; Prepared by Bibbo Associates, *(#197 Tomahawk Street/Rte. 118)*: (JM)
The Conservation Board will review the above Planning Board application for Mitchell Subdivision/Conventional Subdivision plan and Conservation Subdivision plan, stormwater details and erosion control plan at their next meeting.

Some discussion took place among the Board members with the fact that this application continues to be a four-lot subdivision when the Board members had recommended that it be a three-lot subdivision in a memo that was submitted last year.

Board member James Moriarty will review the materials submitted, perform a site inspection of the property and give a report to the Board.

A report will be forthcoming at the next Conservation Board meeting.

New Business:

B) Homeland Towers, LLC/New Cingular Wireless PCS/LLC (AT&T); Santaroni/2580 Rte. 35; Site Plan/Planning Board; Section 37.13, Block 2, Lot 3; Letter to Zoning Board dated 3-28-11; Letter to DEP dated 3-14-11 from Tectonic; Environmental Mitigation Report/Tectonic dated 3-10-11; Full EAF & SEQR EAF – Addendum; Additional Radio Frequency Information/Site 4506.N-575 dated 3-18-11; Partial Topography Survey/SU-1; Title Sheet/T-1; Plot Plan-Adjoiners-Notes/Z-1; Site Plan/Z-2; Setback-Bulk Req. Table Z-3; Site Detail/Z-4; Tree Removal/Z-5; Wetland Buffer Mitigation/Z-6 & Details/Z-6A; Steep Slopes/Z-7; Elevations/Z-8, Z-9; Equipment Details, Notes/Z-10; AT&T Equipment-Details/Z-11; Erosion Control/Z-12/Ph1; Z-12A/Ph2; Stormwater Mgmt Plan/Z-12B; SWM-Notes-Details/Z-13, Z-14; EC-SWM Details-Notes/Z-15, Z-16, Z-17; On-Line Diagram, Details/E-1; Routing-Grounding Plan-Details/E-2; Prepared by Synder & Synder, LLP; *(#2580 Rte. 35; Santaroni)*: (JM)
The Conservation Board will review the above Planning Board application for Homeland Towers, LLC/New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T); Santaroni/2580 Rte. 35, site plan, full EAF, wetland buffer mitigation, stormwater management, steep slopes and tree removal at their next meeting.

Board member James Moriarty will review the materials submitted, perform a site inspection of the property and give a report to the Board.

A report will be forthcoming at the next Conservation Board meeting.

C) MetroPCS New York @ Towne Centre/Site Plan/Planning Board dated April 6, 2011, Section 17.15, Block 1, Lot 13; Proposed Co-Location of Wireless Telecommunications Facility (NY6136); Application for Special

New Business:

C) Permit, Site Plan Approval, Wetland Permit, Stormwater Management, Erosion-Sediment Control Permit, Special Permit for Groundwater Protection Overlay District Activity; Proposed Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan dated 4-6-11; As-Built Survey dated 12-21-10; T-1/Title Sheet; CM-1/Constraints Map; SM-1/Soils Map; SP-1/Overall Site Plan; SP-2/Enlarged Site Plan-South; Sp-3/Enlarged Site Plan-North; Sp-4/Stormwater & Sec Plan; Sp-5/Wetland Mitigation Plan; A-1/Compound Plan & Elevation; C-1/Equipment Plan, Details & Specs; S-1/Structural Details & Specs; Prepared by Cuddy & Fedder, LLP, *(#325 Rte. 100/Somers Towne Centre)*: (GM

The Conservation Board will review the above Planning Board application for MetroPCS New York @ Towne Centre site plan, proposed co-location, wetland permit, stormwater management plan, erosion-sediment control permit, constraints map, soils map and groundwater protection overlay permit at their next meeting.

Chairman Gary Meixner will review the materials submitted, perform a site inspection of the property and give a report to the Board.

A report will be forthcoming at the next Conservation Board meeting.

******

There being no further business to discuss, a motion to adjourn was made at 9:30 PM by Board member Shoshana Hantman and seconded by Board member Eric Evans. All members present approved.

The next regular meeting of the Conservation Board will be held at the Town House on April 26, 2011 at 7:30 PM.

Subsequent Conservation Board meetings are tentatively scheduled to be held at the Town House on May 10, 2011 and May 24, 2011 respectively.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosetta Davis
Secretary
Conservation Board

Cc: Town Board
Town Clerk
Town Engineer
Town Planner
Planning Board
Zoning Board
Open Space Committee
Architectural Review Board
Landmark Committee