

**Village of Brewster  
Planning Board Meeting  
May 26, 2015  
APPROVED**

**Board members in attendance:**

David Kulo, Chairman  
Rick Stockburger, Vice Chairman  
Tyler Murello

Also in attendance:

Mr. Todd Atkinson – VOB Engineer  
Mr. James Nixon, Architect  
Father Gill from St. Lawrence O’Toole Church

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

**Public hearing**

St. Lawrence O’Toole Parish – 40 Prospect St – 67.26-2-12: Site plan review.

Mr. Kulo opened the public hearing explaining that this was an opportunity for the public to comment on the project.

Mr. Nixon reported that the certified letters were distributed to the neighbors in the vicinity.

Mr. Nixon presented an overview of the proposed improvements and parking area.

- . Proposal is to modify the single family residence at 40 Prospect St. This is the property to the left of the church (facing the church). The residence will remain with the exception of the removal of approx. 100 square feet at the rear of the house in order to accommodate parking.
- . Parking access will be from 40 Prospect as it is currently, widened to twelve feet, and it will now be a one-way entrance.
- . Egress will be via the lower lot by the school.
- . Current driveway going under the archway will no longer be a driveway because the area behind the arch will now be parking.
- . There will be 10 parking spaces behind the building (two rows of five and five); seven spaces against the church on the diagonal.

Upon completion of overview, Mr. Kulo opened the public hearing to the audience for comments.

. Mr. Joe DiSantis, 44 Prospect St., asked if the development maintained the current footprint without encroaching on anything additional. The response was, Yes. Mr. DiSantis questioned how this parking would benefit the residents, as he didn't believe that this small increase in parking in this project would alleviate parking congestion on the street. He also stated that he felt that the city lost tax revenue on 40 Prospect.

. Mr. Kulo responded that this discussion was addressing the expansion of parking at 40 Prospect St. and not a forum to discuss the ongoing parking issue in the Village.

. Mr. Jay Bryant asked if this was permitted use. The response was, Yes. He commented that he was one hundred percent in favor of this project.

. Mr. McGann, 35 Prospect St., asked if there were any allowances for handicapped parking. The response was, Yes. Mr. McGann then asked about the grading behind the house. Mr. Nixon responded that the grading is going in the direction of the school, a little less steep than it currently is. Mr. Atkinson added that there would be a curb installed along the side towards the neighbor's property.

. Ms. Barbara Branigan, Marvin Mitchell Court, commented that she was in favor of the project because it would increase parking at the church.

. Ms. Judy Callahan commented that she was in favor of the project because it would also alleviate some of the congestion on the streets for residents.

. Ms. Sue McGann asked about the parking behind the house. She asked what was being removed in the house, with the removal of part of the back of the house. Mr. Nixon responded that the back half of the addition which is being removed contained a laundry room, which will be relocated in the house.

She also asked about entering and exiting the parking area. Mr. Nixon responded that no one will be exiting onto Prospect Street, but rather continuing through past the school.

She also asked about the space behind the current archway. Mr. Nixon responded that this space would now have diagonal parking, with the first space designated as handicapped parking.

. Mr. Ed LeStrange stated that he's in favor of the project because he felt that it shows an effort to do something by Father Gill to improve the parking infrastructure to alleviate some of the burden on the neighbors, and to help beautify the area.

Mr. Kulo thanked the audience for their comments and feedback, and made a motion to close the Public Hearing. This was seconded by Mr. Stockburger and passed unanimously.

### **Regular meeting**

Mr. Stockburger made a motion to open the regular meeting. This was seconded by Mr. Murello and passed unanimously.

Attendance was taken.

### Pending business:

St. Lawrence O'Toole Parish, 67.26-2-12: Final site plan review and determination of SEQR.

. Mr. Kulo stated that counsel made a recommendation of a negative declaration.

. However, Mr. Stockburger, in consulting SEQR 617.5 (c7) stated that this should be a Type 2, since it is a construction on an under 4000 square foot residence with no change in zoning or use regulations, consistent with local land use controls and it is not a radio communications or microwave transmission facility.

. Mr. Stockburger made a motion that the Board declare this project a Type 2 action under SEQR. If the Board doesn't declare this Type 2, another public hearing for SEQR with another notice is required and this would take another two months to complete. If Type 2 action is declared no further action is required and the process can proceed.

. This motion was seconded by Mr. Murello. Mr. Kulo stated that he was also in favor of a Type 2 action, stipulating that the Board was making this decision based on the law and not merely to meet a deadline. The motion was carried unanimously.

. Mr. Stockburger continued to explain that in trying to move forward earlier, since this was a single-family residence, it didn't really need a site plan approval. However, the Board voted that even though a site plan was not required, the site plan approval process would be executed. He added that this project didn't pose any adverse impact on the environment and the site plan was done to accommodate the public and the public hearing.

. In summary, this project falls within the classification of Type 2 and no further SEQR action is required.

Mr. Stockburger made a motion to approve the site plan. This was seconded by Mr. Murello.

Discussion ensued.

. Mr. Atkinson stated that based on his review of the latest drawing, and with the agreement of the Planning Board, he is satisfied that comments in the VOB's Engineering March 24, 2015 report have been addressed with the exception of Comment 3 which is being addressed through discussions between Mr. Nixon and the Engineer's office.

. Mr. Stockburger added that Comment 6 is on the property not within the purview of this site plan application.

. The Board agreed to conduct a vote even with the absence of two of the Board members.

. Mr. Stockburger amended his resolution to recommend approving the site plan conditioned on the Applicant providing Notice of Intent for review and approval by the Village Engineer for coverage under NYSDEC SPIDES General Permit #0-15-002 (Comment 3) before final approval is granted. This was seconded by Mr. Kulo and approved unanimously.

#### Accept minutes of April 28, 2015

Mr. Kulo recommended postponing the approval of the minutes from the April 28, 2015 meeting until more of the Board members were present.

#### Adjournment

Mr. Stockburger made a motion to adjourn the meeting. This was seconded by Mr. Kulo and passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:35pm.