

OGDEN PLANNING BOARD

October 9, 2008

Members Present

Lee Sinnebox
Tom Coburn
Linda DelRegno
Tony Halaris
Mary Lou Hetzke
Gary Parker
Marc Robinson

Members Absent

Others Present

Jack Crooks, Building Inspector
John Freel, Town Engineer
Dave Pulhamus, Conservation Board
John Gizzi
John Shields
Bob Davies
John Carruso
Pam Johnson

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. PUBLIC HEARING – None

III. OLD BUSINESS – None

Boulder Point Subdivision: application of John Gizzi, 4415 Buffalo Road, N. Chili, NY 14514, for concept approval to subdivide a 64.2+/- acre parcel into 10 Single-Family Residential lots. This parcel is located on the north side of Stony Point Road and to the west of Hutchings Road. This property will be serviced by public utilities and private leach systems and will be titled Boulder Point Subdivision. *Tax Acct. #117.03-4-9.111*

John Carruso; Passaro Associates: Mr. Gizzi has been working with us for several years, and we have designed this subdivision for him. Back in 2004 and we came before this Board and showed you the same plan. Mr. Gizzi was not ready to take the project forward but now he has several of his own children that want to come back and build in this area. The parcel is about 60 + acres. Our proposal is to try to subdivide it up into 6 big lots in the back on a private road. It would be served by public water and there is 4 two-acre lots that we are going to build. The subdivision of land would create a parcel for Johns house to sit on, right now it is the whole parcel.

Some of the other improvements we would like to do is, on the private drive we would have an island, about 200 feet long and 8 foot wide. In that we would have a lamppost, landscaping on the ends and then grass in the middle. It would be broken up so that there is 50 to 60 foot segments in between the islands as you went down the road for turning around. We have a cul-de-sac with a grass area here in the middle. We will be planting in that. All of this road way will

be on a private drive maintained by a homeowners association, snowplowing, maintenance and lawn cutting. The lighting will be on a circuit for that, the same for these 4 lots.

We have recently done a wetland delineation. It was to make sure that there was not an encroachment of the wetland. This was as of yesterday, so we have a fresh wetland update. It was a good point that came out of one of the staff meetings that we had with the Town. We also have the new flood plain line on there. We are making sure that what we are proposing is not in any trouble. We are not going for any permits.

We have one stormwater management area that we are going to use to service the rear 6 lots. This existing pond that sits in front of Johns house was sized to take this whole project. One of the problems it has is that it was designed so big that it does not keep water. With this development we are going to cut some swales in and bring water down and feed it into the pond. We will show you this and how it will work in the preliminary design plans.

We have had all the septic systems witnessed by Monroe County Health Department. We are in the process of designing that now. Our schedule is to submit for preliminary and final at the next cut off which is tomorrow. The reason we were going to ask for preliminary and final is that this will be our third time before the Planning Board, pretty much for the same project. It is only 10 lots on 60 acres.

Mr. Sinsebox: Is it planned to be phased?

Mr. Carruso: No.

Mrs. Hetzke: Are all the lots taken?

Mr. Carruso: About 3 are taken. That is one of the driving forces, John's sons have families now and where they are living, their houses are not big enough.

Conservation Board – Dave Pulhamus

We noticed that lot 11, the driveway goes through the wetland buffer. Lot 5, the proposed septic system and house is within 20 feet of the wetland buffer. There would be no room for expansion because it is pushing up right next to the buffer.

Mr. Carruso already addressed one of our concerns regarding the existing ponds. We wondered if they were sized to hold the increased runoff and storm water.

The 100-year flood plain goes right next to lot 5. That is another thing to keep into consideration.

Will the fill come from onsite or will you need to bring it in?

Engineering Comments – John Freel

See letter dated October 5, 2008. I have 4 concerns and the major one has to do with the sight distance for the private driveway on that hill. It has been a problem with all the applications that have been submitted for this project.

What the town requires is that basement floors be above the 100-year flood elevation. I do not know if you knew that, it is Town Code. I am giving you a heads up.

Lot 5, the code requires lot grading of no steeper than 1 on 5. You might wind up moving that house so that you can do some grading on that house.

The key thing is the sight distance.

Mr. Sinsebox: I recall that concern at the last submittal.

Building Department – Jack Crooks

The only thing I would like to ask is that the existing houses as well as the barn that currently sits behind his pond is that going with Lot 5 or are you going to try to retain it with the existing house.

Mr. Gizzi: That is going with lot 5.

Mr. Sinsebox: Could we get that shown on the plan.

Mr. Carruso: Yes, it will be shown on the next submittal. This lot 5 what we are trying to do, the maps that you have do not show the most recent wetland and flood plain information. What we are trying to do is put Joes house here to overlook the pond. If we do not do that it winds up behind the barn and has no view at all. It is either all or nothing. It is tight but it will be beautiful.

Mr. Sinsebox: You mentioned a homeowners association. Will the 3 existing homes be a part of that association.

Mr. Carruso: No.

Mr. Sinsebox: How can you do that if one of the ponds that is going to control some of the site is not part of the association.

Mr. Carruso: We will get an easement to the association for that.

Mr. Sinsebox: Have you discussed that water main with the water authority?

Mr. Carruso: Right now they would submit it and they would let us know if they will change their mind. The last time I was asked that they wanted a meter in the back and now this time we called them and they look like they are allowing it. They are not too far back.

Mr. Sinsebox: The plan showed a gate are you still planning a gate out front.

Mr. Carruso: We are talking about a gate. It might be an amendment that comes in later. I do not have it shown because I do not have the details worked out as to how it will be controlled. Our inclination is to have it be a gated community. The problem is that it creates problem with the water authority to get in and fix their main. Who gets a key? I am happy to put it on the next rendition of drawing so that you can approve it or would it be better to leave it off and if we want we come in and modify it.

Mr. Sinsebox: I think it is good to have it discussed. The Fire Marshal might have concern because of emergency access. I think it is helpful to know those concerns up front to help make

your decision. Leave it as part of the proposal till we are done. Mr. Freels concern on site distance. Have you done any sight distance calculations or profiles?

Mr. Carruso: Yes. Here is what we found. We looked to put a driveway right on top of the road and what we found is that there is a little lull where you lose a car from the east. What we decided to do is move the driveway down the road. What we tried to do is improve this site distance. We are hoping this is acceptable to you. There are only four lots and there was a driveway here before.

Mr. Freel: I was there on Sunday and I did not lose any cars. You are going to have to provide me with a profile that is going to go down the road several hundred feet.

Mr. Carruso: We would prefer that if we would have to move it that we would move it that way.

Mr. Freel: I want to have the optimal sight distance. If you have to move it that way I want to see exactly what you have. I am going to want that profile down the road the other way so that we can look at the top of the hill also. You have to have these things worked out before you submit for preliminary.

Mr. Sinsebox: If your calculations reveal that the road needs to be shifted we need to know that up front.

Mr. Freel: I think you are going to have issues with the grading on lot 5. You may be moving the house farther south. If that does not work would you want to put the house where the septic system is and maybe relocate the septic farther north? If it is the location you want to maintain.

Mr. Carruso: We talked about that.

Mr. Freel: How did that perk?

Mr. Carruso: They are all large systems. The basement and the flood plain elevation can you tell me about that?

Mr. Freel: That is the code. The code requires that you be above the elevation of the flood plain. I think that is 585.

Mr. Coburn: Is it a foot?

Mr. Freel: Yes.

Mr. Carruso: It is a foot above even if you are not in the flood plain.

Mr. Freel: Yes.

Mr. Carruso: So a building that is out of the flood plain has to have the basement out of the flood plain.

Mr. Crooks: First floor level including the basement must be 1 foot above the flood plain.

Mr. Carruso: What is the reason for that.

Mr. Crooks: I expect you would talk about saturation but if you do have a storm event where the flood plain is saturated and the water level is near and your basement is below that area then you are going to have to have a significant number of sump pumps to keep up.

Mr. Freel: Do not keep your faith on a line on a map.

Mr. Sinsebox: I think the driveway sight distance is your major issue. I think it is a little risky to submit final plans till you know where that is.

Mr. Carruso: I hear what you are saying we will put that together and see. I would not do that independently; I think it is appropriate that we address it in our application. We will submit it all at once. I would not submit a hodge podge.

Mr. Freel: Will you have gutters?

Mr. Carruso: Proably just stone sides.

Mr. Freel: What is the width of the lanes? 10 foot?

Mr. Carruso: Yes.

Mr. Halaris: Would emergency ever have to access back there?

Mr. Carruso: Yes, there will be 10-foot lanes and then a grass median.

Mr. Sinsebox: It will look nice. Certainly not a dense project and is appropriate for that site.

Mr. Coburn: When you delineate the flood plain please put the elevations on the drawings so that we can see them.

Mr. Freel: One thing you may want to consider is, you are going to own and maintain this thing till the end of time. I would put some road weeps in there. For a small investment it would be worth while in the long run.

Mr. Gizzi: It is very sandy through there.

Mr. Carruso: In the cul-de-sac area it is 8' of sand.

Mr. Sinsebox: Thank you very much.

IV. CONCEPT - None

V. EXPIRATION – None

VI. MAPS FOR SIGNING – *Please see map table in Building Department***

VII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of the Planning Board Meeting minutes of **August 28, 2008** *as presented.*

Introduced by Mr. Coburn
Seconded by Mr. Robinson

MAY IT BE RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Board meeting of **August 28, 2008**, stand approved as presented.

Vote of the Board

Ayes: Coburn, DelRegno, Halaris, Hetzke, Parker, Robinson, Sinnebox
Nays: None

Approval of the Planning Board Meeting minutes of **September 25, 2008** *as presented*.

Introduced by Mr. Robinson
Seconded by Mr. Coburn

MAY IT BE RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Board meeting of **September 25, 2008**, stand approved with a minor correction on page 6 changing the adjournment date of the meeting; to the correct date of September 25th.

Vote of the Board

Ayes: Coburn, DelRegno, Halaris, Hetzke, Parker, Robinson, Sinnebox
Nays: None

VIII. WORK SESSION - None

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Introduced by Mr. Robinson
Seconded by Mrs. Hetzke

MAY IT BE RESOLVED that the Planning Board meeting of August 28, 2008 was adjourned at 7:33 PM.

Ayes: Coburn, DelRegno, Halaris, Hetzke, Parker, Robinson, Sinnebox
Nays: None

Respectfully submitted,

Jack Crooks, Secretary