

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 8, 2016**

Present: Chairman Tom LaPerch; Boardmembers Paul Jonke, Michael Hecht, Phil Wissel and Dan Armstrong; Town Planner Ashley Ley;. Absent and Excused: Boardmembers Eric Cyprus and David Rush; Town Attorney Willis Stephens; Secretary Victoria Desidero

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 1. BRAVCOR, 65 Fields Lane** – This was a Public Hearing to review an Application for Site Plan Amendment. Engineer Joe Buschynski of Bibbo Associates appeared before the Board. Chairman LaPerch recused himself due to the involvement of someone in his office with the property and left the dais. The motion to open the Public Hearing was introduced by Acting Chairman Wissel, seconded by Boardmember Jonke and passed all in favor. Mr. Buschynski said the BRAVCOR building is located at 65 Fields Lane, is a 9.5 acre parcel and, for reference, he pointed out and named the neighboring property owners. The building is under construction, he said, and is here for an amendment to the site plan and is primarily for warehouse use, approximately 49,000 sq. ft. of warehouse space and 12,000 sq. ft. of office space. The amendment that we are applying for, he said, is for the loading dock at the rear of the building. He continued: the tenants the owners are currently negotiating with would like truck loading at the rear of the building and we have designed the docks to accommodate the larger WD-50 trucks and tractor trailers. Incidental to that request was to raise the building floor level by two feet, he said. Boardmember Hecht questioned the maneuverability of the trucks in the loading area. Mr. Buschynski said it is negotiable with the docks arranged in an angled fashion to allow a truck to come to the back and maneuver around them. He said there are two warehouse spaces in the building and the west side has a need for two docks and the eastside has one. Boardmember Armstrong asked about the hours of operation and Mr. Buschynski said they are consistent with the Code; there are no special needs. Boardmember Armstrong questioned the lighting around the building and on the walls and how they are dealing with that. Mr. Buschynski said we had both lighting standards and building lights approved. He asked if they will be on all the time or if there is a chance for a motion detector or a timer so they are not on all night. Mr. Buschynski said he will check with the owner but he seems agreeable so... Boardmember Armstrong said so either a motion detector or a timer would be included in the final plans. Mr. Buschynski said he thinks that will be agreeable plus it saves some energy. Boardmember Armstrong asked if there is any outside storage and Mr. Buschynski said no. Town Councilwoman Lynne Eckardt asked if this encroaches into the wetlands and Mr. Buschynski said there is no change from the previously approved project. She asked when deliveries are traditionally made there and whether it is during business hours and he said definitely during business hours. She said because Dan (Armstrong) raised a good point about the lighting because there are residences in that neighborhood. She said if emergency vehicles can get around the loading dock when trucks are parked there and he said yes, there would be aisles. She asked if they are parked there overnight and he said maybe but... She said but you can get around them? He said yes. Boardmember Armstrong asked if all of the parking is being built or is it phased and Mr. Buschynski said no it is all being built. The motion to close the Public Hearing was introduced by Acting Chairman Wissel, seconded by Boardmember Armstrong and passed all in favor. The motion to Adopt a Negative Declaration under SEQRA was introduced by Acting Chairman Wissel, seconded by Boardmember Jonke and passed by a roll call vote

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 8, 2016**

of 4 to 0 with 2 absent and 1 recused. The motion to refer the application to the Zoning Board of Appeals was introduced by Acting Chairman Wissel, seconded by Boardmember Armstrong and passed all in favor. The motion to refer the application to the Architectural Review Board was introduced by Acting Chairman Wissel, seconded by Boardmember Hecht and passed all in favor.

REGULAR SESSION:

- 1. STARR LEA DEVELOPMENT, 44 Starr Lea Road** – This was a review of an Application for a Wetland Permit. Owner Mark Halstead appeared before the Board. He showed the Board the property and explained where it is on Starr Lea Road. He said there is a home up there existing that they are looking to raise the house and build a single family home. Mr. Halstead said they are expanding the footprint and need a Wetland Permit. Chairman LaPerch asked if he saw the Wetland Consultant's memo and he said yes, his engineer, Paul Lynch, is on vacation this week but will address the comments when he is back. Chairman LaPerch asked for questions from the Board and there were none. He asked Ms. Ley what the applicant needs to do and she said the Board has a resolution tonight to classify this as a Type II Action under SEQRA and set a Public Hearing. Chairman LaPerch said he saw something about historic area? She said yes, they are in the Starr Lea Road Historic Route so anything they do in the first 50 feet of the property would need to be reviewed such as changes to the driveway contour but other things such as landscaping would not have to go the Historic Sites Commission but it looks like you are adjusting the driveway. He said we are actually trying to keep the curb cut the same and keep the driveway the same but if there is an adjustment it might be after that 50 feet but I have to take a look. They talked about how this is to be determined and, if this application will need to be referred to the Historic Sites Commission, Ms. Ley said, they can go to the Historic Sites Commissions separately from this review since this is not a site plan review. She said the referral would come from the Building Inspector. Chairman LaPerch said the applicant should pay attention to this and make sure it is handled. Boardmember Armstrong asked if he is relocating the driveway in any way and Mr. Halstead said they are not completely sure if it is in the first 50 feet or not. They talked about what the driveway looks like now and what he is planning to do with it. Ms. Eckardt said she is the liaison to Historic Sites and the applicant should just make sure he goes over this with (Building Inspector) Michael Levine and just nip it in the bud if he can. Chairman LaPerch said that's good advice. The motion to Classify this as a Type II Action was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Armstrong and passed by a roll call vote of 5 to 0 with 2 absent. The motion to set a Public Hearing for September 26, 2016 was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Hecht and passed all in favor.
- 2. Town Board Referral Re Multi Family Workforce Housing District** – This was a discussion of a referral from the Town Board. Chairman LaPerch said this is a final item tonight and Ms. Ley will lead us in this and what we are discussing. Ms. Ley said Victoria (Desidero) sent out a link last week to the newly revised Environmental Assessment Form submitted by Barrett Hill. She said at this point in time, they have... Chairman LaPerch asked for a time out and asked the Board if they are all familiar with Barrett Hill? He said it was re-zoned how many years ago for senior and now they are coming back into the

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 8, 2016**

Town to re-zone it to 'market rate housing,' if that is the proper term for it, with a caveat of a percentage of the units being workforce or veteran or whatever term they are using... Ms. Ley said they are using 'workforce.' Chairman LaPerch continued: the Town Board is referring it out now for opinions and our role now is to discuss what part of this now? Ms. Ley said the action tonight is for this Board to discuss this and then comment on the Zoning Petition because it is a requirement of the Town of Southeast Code that any new Zoning legislation being considered be referred to the Town Planning Board and County Planning for a Report and Recommendation. She said so any suggestion you have on the language of the Zoning Code and we can discuss it tonight and I'll draft something so then at the next meeting the Board can vote on the Report and Recommendation. Chairman LaPerch said I've been involved in this so I will just throw out a few things and Ashley (Ley) and Lynne (Eckardt) can correct me if I am wrong. My understanding is they have a percentage of housing they want to put aside for workforce housing and affordable housing, he said, and the hot button issues I believe are the school district issues which, based on their calculations, would increase it by plus or minus? Ms. Ley said they are looking at approximately 33 school children based on their calculations, which was originally at zero because it was age-restricted. He said the other discussion point I have heard is the issue of who is the arbiter of who is eligible for workforce housing and who comes in and how long you keep them off the market and so forth and their proposal is? Ms. Ley said their proposal for administration is there would be a third-party, not-for-profit. He said and what qualifies for affordable housing? She said a qualifying household would be one that has total income that is equal to or less than 80 percent of Putnam County's households as published by the US Census Bureau. Chairman LaPerch said which is? Ms. Ley said she thinks the median income is about \$90,000.00 right now. He said and that is the qualifying number to be on this list? Ms. Ley said yes, to qualify for affordable housing. Chairman LaPerch asked and what is the rent for something like that? She said they have put a range for the market rate rental units which I think was about \$1400.00 per month but they didn't give a range for the affordable housing... He said that would be the qualifying number for that affordable housing? She said it would be less than the market rate housing. Chairman LaPerch said if this is approved by the Town Board, a third party would be hired and is there a timeframe of how long it takes to fill that up. She said for the first six months of marketing, they are proposing that these certain set-aside units, not all of which are affordable: there are 30 percent that are for 'preferred persons' or people of certain groups like Veterans, people with disabilities and of that group, there is another smaller group that would be of the 30 percent set aside, a minimum of 34 percent would be affordable units. He said in perpetuity? She said they are set aside for the first six months of marketing and, if they are rented within the first six months, then they would be set aside for 99 years. It's not clear what would happen if they are not rented within the first six months, if that would kick back to being market rate, she said. He said so that could be part of the discussion at our Board? She said yes. The Chairman said this would also address other areas with this type of Zoning and there has to be a certain number of acres so this cannot be done in any other area? Ms. Ley said a big thing that has changed since this Board originally looked at their proposal is they are now proposing a 'Floating Zone' option which is a multi-family workforce housing floating zone and if the Town Board approves this legislation then this applicant would apply to have that Zone mapped to their property. In order to have the Zone mapped to your property there are a number of qualifications you would have to

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 8, 2016**

meet one of which is that you are in the OP-2 Zoning District; it is also that you have a minimum acreage of 25 acres; that you are accessible from a state or county highway; and that you have access to existing sewer and water facilities. He said and today, how many exist? She said there are two today that would qualify. He said and they are? She said one is a site in Terravest that was previously approved for senior housing and the site in question, which is in Mt. Ebo. He said so if this is Zoning approved, then there is only one left? She said yes. He said we approved the Terravest one, they were attached? She said they were attached, senior, I believe three-bedroom units and I think there were 66... Ms. Eckardt said they were detached. Chairman LaPerch said so if this is approved, then the other, Terravest, can petition for this type of... Ms. Ley said well they also included in this legislation that you could only have one or two bedroom units so if that other development were to petition the Town for this Zoning, they would have to significantly change their site plans. Chairman LaPerch said I know it is a lot of moving parts here but those are the current issues they are discussing. He said all of the referrals have been sent out, particularly the County, so the Town Board is waiting for recommendations to come back to them. Once again, he said, this is a non-binding recommendation. Boardmember Jonke said how many were there... 168? Boardmember Wissel said you are saying with 168 units there will only be 33 kids in the school district, really? Ms. Ley said it is all one and two bedroom units. Chairman LaPerch said they did their homework and Ashley's (Ley's) group had to verify all of this. Boardmember Jonke said have they gotten feedback from the school districts who are pushing residential development because they want the kids coming in so someone should have a chat with the school districts. Ms. Ley said I know that Councilman Cullen did reach out to the school district but I am not sure if we have gotten any response. Boardmember Hecht said 168 units, is that the total number of units or... Ms. Ley said that is the total number. She said 30 percent of those are designated for the preferred groups and 34 percent of that is designated for affordable housing. Boardmember Hecht said so we have no input as to changing percentages. Ms. Ley said yes you do because the percentages are part of the proposal. Boardmember Hecht said I personally would rather have more percentage for veterans and workforce because I am more concerned about the school taxes because my school taxes right now are absurd. He said I think it is overbearing. I agree the 33 percent doesn't hold water and that concerns me a lot. He said the other thing I would want to know is will they have a legitimate cap on the number of occupants in the affordable housing units? Ms. Ley said there is not one proposed but that is something that is included in some other model ordinances. He said I would say we should definitely have a cap because I've seen... Chairman LaPerch said these are great questions, Mike (Hecht), what's your cap? He said I would say realistically for affordable housing, I would say six. Chairman LaPerch said six for a two bedroom? Boardmember Wissel said that seems high. Boardmember Hecht said I can see people having three or four kids so... Chairman LaPerch said I'm not challenging you. He said I would want a cap period. Ms. Ley said the Westchester County model ordinance has caps in terms of square footage. Boardmember Hecht said we don't control that other percentage either, the 80 percent of the median... Ms. Ley said that's a pretty standard bar because it's something that's objective. Boardmember Hecht said also I think the affordable should be lower because 80 percent of 90,000 is a lot of money, it's a pretty significant... Chairman LaPerch said these are numbers they didn't make up and are kind of pulled from regional statistics but these are great questions. Boardmember Hecht said the last thing for me

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 8, 2016**

would be that those rental units obviously renters aren't contributing to the school taxes but... Ms. Ley said the property owner would be. He said but at a normal rate, at an assessed rate or a partial rate. Chairman LaPerch said I can answer that on a real estate level, Paul (Jonke) you can answer it even better...it's based on the income. Boardmember Jonke said it's based on the income level. Boardmember Armstrong say I may not have a good order or flow to my questions: I just wrote them down. He said first of all, is there anyone here representing the applicant or are we just doing this on our own? He said OK so I wasn't here when Mt. Ebo was originally proposed and I live in Fieldstone now, but it seems to be when the concept was originally proposed, and this is speculation, it probably was viewed as a predominantly commercial development that would not add children to the school district and would provide a strong tax revenue base. That is sheer speculation, he said, and if anyone here knows the original discussion was I would like to know. He continued: I believe that this site and other sites in the development, and this site in particular, this would be the third change to the Zone: it would be the original change from whatever it was, farm or agricultural or whatever, to this mixed use large development and then to the more upscale senior housing and now this. Is that about it, he asked? Ms. Ley said I am not positive. Chairman LaPerch said I am not positive either but about 10 years ago they did petition to take an industrial piece and turn it into senior housing and there was a demand for it but now they are coming back saying there is no demand and we'd like this change made because there is lack of funding and a whole list of reasons they need to change gears: right or wrong that is what they are saying now. Boardmember Armstrong said OK and my responsibility is to what is in the best interests of the Town and the taxpayers; that's my responsibility. So anyway, he said, the other thing, I went to a Town Board meeting and a retired General appeared and he made an eloquent speech about the need for housing for veterans in the Hudson Valley and that struck my ear because, as far as I know, this Town has done a bang up job of providing housing for every type of need. We're not the County of Westchester being pursued by the Federal Government to create a variety of housing, he said, and we have it and this is to the credit of the Town Board over a long period of time. He continued: so I am not sure where these owners or tenants are going to be coming from and I don't think it's fair for this Town to be the housing source for the Hudson Valley, which is what the General said. He asked if anyone else was at that meeting and Ms. Ley said she was. Chairman LaPerch said he was there as well. Boardmember Armstrong said the other thing that has changed over the years and, this again could not have been foreseen, probably, is that a number of commercial sites at Mt. Ebo are now owned by not-for-profit agencies and I don't know, and haven't looked recently, but I don't know what they are contributing to the well-being of the Town and the taxpayers. He said I don't know if the new owners or tenants are contributing, some do it voluntarily it happens, but I don't know what the situation is and with all due respect, we have a post office there and that's not a tax payer, we have a temple there and I don't know what their status is, we have a nursing home and senior housing there so four sites of a total of 11 or 12 are now not taxpayers, or may not be taxpayers, or may not be full taxpayers. So what I am saying is the Town is being asked to take on what is, potentially, an additional cost, notwithstanding the school district, so I am wondering what is the case being made for the benefit to the Town and the taxpayers of the Town, he said, and maybe I am going beyond what my charge is here on the Planning Board but it just seems to me that these are logical questions that someone should answer and maybe these questions have

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 8, 2016**

been asked and answered at the Town Board... Chairman LaPerch said I am a little confused: are you saying this project is not going to generate Town dollars? Boardmember Armstrong said I don't know... Ms. Ley said they do address the tax generation of this project in the EAF (Environmental Assessment Form) on page 3.5-3: they are showing that while there will be a cost to the school district, that the tax revenue generated would exceed the cost. Boardmember Armstrong said so the property tax would exceed the cost to the school district? Chairman LaPerch said it is a taxpayer and Boardmember Armstrong said I didn't say it wasn't. Chairman LaPerch said I thought that was what you were trying to say. Boardmember Armstrong said I was trying to address what it was from the first day and then over a period of time as things are changing. He said so that's it. Boardmember Wissel said as with most of these things, I think the devil is in the details, and I have concerns about when they say they are reserving units for six weeks of marketing. Is marketing defined as putting out six by six inch signs saying 'for rent' in the middle of a blizzard and by the time spring comes around they say 'six months are up and well, we tried.'? Boardmember Armstrong said it's like the marketing of Garden Street School. Boardmember Wissel continued: so I think we need some specific language tightening that up. I refuse to believe that of 168 units they're saying 33 school children so one out of every five units is going to have one kid going to school, he said, anecdotally that is ridiculous. Chairman LaPerch said well, those statistics have been backed up by our consultants. Ms. Ley said I will say those statistics... Boardmember Wissel said just common sense says its wrong. She said I know it seems off but they did use numbers that are industry standard numbers, they did have the report prepared by Pattern for Progress and the reason it is so low is that the majority of the units are one bedroom units. Boardmember Wissel said if that is the case I would assume the applicant would have no issue with restricting one bedroom units to two people because if the reason there are so few school kids is the one bedroom units then why can't we restrict those to two people? Chairman LaPerch said that goes back to what Mike (Hecht) said earlier. Boardmember Hecht said I disagree with it and I don't think that 33 number holds water at all. Boardmember Wissel said my other issue is that even if there is this limit, who is going to be enforcing it: are they going to throw people out if they have extra kids? How is it going to be enforced, he asked? Chairman LaPerch said that's another good question. Chairman LaPerch said I am going to make sure this is a level playing field and I am going to ask both Town Board members to give us their opinion about what they have heard from the Board, whether right or wrong and maybe fill in the blanks. He said Lynne (Eckardt) you wanted to start? She said I don't need to start... Chairman LaPerch said no, please go ahead. Ms. Eckhardt said as for, I happen to agree, although Ashley (Ley) said what she did, but to address the question of school children I have researched Bridleside which is 65 units, and they do have some three bedroom units down in North Salem, they have exceeded the estimates by one-third of schoolchildren in the district. They say it goes up and it goes down, she said. Boardmember Wissel asked did they give you a gross number? She said I do have numbers but I didn't bring them. Boardmember Wissel said so that was roughly a little under 50 percent of the number of units... She said they estimated, I am trying to think, twenty something... I think it was something... I am not sure but I know it is a third more because I have been keeping updated on that and I checked it in May or June of this year before school let out. So, that should answer that, but it's not definitive because you have to go with the Rutgers study. She continued: the taxes, whoever asked that, they

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 8, 2016**

were estimated when it was commercial (inaudible) at about a million dollars. The senior, which was not occupied seniors, it's not rentals, it was about \$800,000 give or take and now it is at \$68,000 or 69,000, she said. It was supposed to be... when it was at \$800,000 that was because there would be no children in the school district but now it breaks even or we would be in the plus column, at the levels they say, I think by (inaudible) at about \$69,000... Ms. Ley said I think that sounds pretty close. Ms. Eckardt said the other... I agree with Phil (Wissel) on the six month marketing: we don't have any more details on that and we need to get them and I think that is a really good question. She said on the question on affordable housing, and this goes to Dan's (Armstrong's) question, on affordable housing, our Comprehensive Plan does get into some detail that that is something we have provided for people. She said because of the great number of condominiums and other smaller houses throughout the area... it is not of Westchester... in fact, part of the (inaudible)... when the applicant used a piece of the Comprehensive Plan in their EAF and we had that removed. She said they didn't give the whole thing that was in the Comprehensive Plan so it was kind of cherry-picked because it is important to note that we are under scrutiny and we do provide affordable housing. The only senior housing that was ever built, she said, was Stonecrest subsidized, (inaudible) subsidized and 50 Main Street also provides housing for seniors that I think are all fully rented and done really well. The groups that will be allowed, or not allowed but get priority are veterans, seniors, school district employees, Town employees, EMS workers and firefighters and the disabled... am I missing any? Male voice: it's pretty big. She said it is pretty big and I'll speak for myself, I have some concerns because seniors, of course, and the disabled are protected groups but, believe it or not, none of the others are not really protected groups so can be taken to (inaudible) but, of course, anything can happen. Ms. Eckardt said the other thing people are watching is that the Campus attorney is attending all our meetings: I don't know if they are interested in doing something similar or are they OP-1? Ms. Ley said they are OP-3 and they are actually already allowed to have market-rate units, residential in that district. Ms. Eckardt said they are looking at this as well and did anyone have any other questions that I didn't address? Ms. Ley said I have the tax generation numbers: so it is in table 3.5-3 and when they calculated the number of school age children, when you use the Rutgers number, you can get the number of school age children that are in public school and the number of school age children that are in the district and they are coming up with a number of public school children as 26 which means that the net tax benefit to the district would be \$236,748.00 and that assumes a per student cost of \$16,185.00. So if you were to add additional students than would eat away by that profit, she said. Ms. Eckardt said and the per student cost is interesting because if you take the school budget and divide by the number of students it actually comes out at about \$26,000 but with Federal aid and things that are figured in, it comes down to about 16... Ms. Ley said they based it on the local taxes paid to the school district and divided that by the number of children in the school district. Ms. Eckardt said and how many kids do they think will be in private schools? Ms. Ley said they have 26 school age children and I think it was 33 school age children total. Ms. Eckardt said I just seems surprising that (inaudible). Chairman LaPerch said I would just ask the following question, since I am on this Board so long, I remember over the past five years there was talk about negative enrollment in our schools: has anyone verified that? Ms. Eckardt said they have plenty... well, one thing I know is they have plenty of room for more students and the school is not worried, and it is what I have heard through

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 8, 2016**

the grapevine, but they can certainly absorb this amount of students without building anything out or any changes at all. Chairman LaPerch said I heard that it was trending that way. Ms. Eckardt said yes, the student body has (inaudible). Chairman LaPerch welcomed Councilman Alvarez to the meeting. Mr. Alvarez said thank you. Mr. Alvarez said actually the 33 or 26 student proposal, wasn't that at its peak and what they anticipate if it is at the highest level, I guess if all the cards are aligned. If not, if they do this in phases or as kids come in and others go out, he said, they may not meet that threshold... Ms. Ley said the 33 school age children and the 26 in the public school, which is of the 33, they are not added together, is at full build out of the project. Mr. Alvarez said so and again it could fluctuate and be plus or minus and I heard the same thing and I know Bob (Cullen) did reach out to the school district but as far as I know it is not a problem: my son graduated as part of the last largest class in the system and the next couple of years it is definitely reduced in size so they can definitely absorb 33 kids into the school system and you have the numbers of what it will cost. Chairman LaPerch said I have a question for you Ed (Alvarez) and then Lynne (Eckardt) can comment as well: to me, right here, the issue is who is monitoring this, how is the Town Board going to monitor this project and keep tabs on what's going on? Mr. Alvarez said like with anything else in talking to the applicant they are very amenable to suggestions and what not and, in the end, I think, ultimately, it's a business model and I am not really here to dictate to them that they have to cap it at eight people or whatever. I see your point though and I don't think it is unreasonable that we can ask, he said, but I don't know that we can literally sit there and I think, to Phil's point, you can have two kids and say I am not having any more and then all of a sudden you end up having two more kids. If they are already, for arguments sake in a one bedroom, what are we going to do: I am sure we are not going to be knocking on the doors... Chairman LaPerch said but are we legally allowed to put a condition into this... Mr. Alvarez said I think we can make suggestions. Ms. Ley said there are safety concerns as well. Ms. Eckardt said there are square footage numbers but it is not based on the number of bedrooms because we have had some overcrowding issues like in Brewster Heights and it is amazing how many, by our Code, you are allowed to fit into... Chairman LaPerch said so that is something that, at the Town Board level, can be addressed? Ms. Eckardt said it is enforcement and as with everything else in Town... it's like kids coming in from out of the district, people will report it and everything else but I don't know if the enforcement is there or whatever. Boardmember Hecht said it is like overcrowding on my street for 10 years and it doesn't get enforced so... Chairman LaPerch said I know what you mean: we can compare notes... Boardmember Hecht said just getting back to the 33 number the problem is the school says it is going to work with that and the problem is the school is not holding taxes flat and most schools are up 1.9 and Brewster is up 3.2 or whatever the number was last year but it was significantly higher than other schools. So, he said, they say they can handle it but they are not refraining from jacking up the school tax on an annual basis. And the other thing that is concerning they are saying 26 of the 33 will be public school children so they are assuming seven children might be in Catholic, parochial or private school, which is typically 10 or 11 thousand dollars a year, which is a lot, so there is a disconnect between your numbers because in affordable housing, they typically cannot afford that. Chairman LaPerch said it is not all affordable... Boardmember Hecht said I know but that number just doesn't hold water and it is still (inaudible). Ms. Ley said one of the reasons they are presenting this to the Town Board as such a low school children number is that there are a lot of one bedroom

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 8, 2016**

units and they are trying to cater toward people with disabilities who may not have children. Boardmember Hecht said sure so I would think that about 50 percent of the 168 units might have a child. Chairman LaPerch said well it uses standard numbers... He said this is what I suggest we do. Ashley (Ley), you have our comments so can you just try to put a quick memo together so we can continue this discussion at the next meeting? He said you can incorporate our suggestions and we can discuss them and if there are more we can add them at the next meeting or if not, we can send it off to the Town Board? He said I thought this was a very good discussion here: where are they in terms of timing? Ms. Ley said there is a Public Hearing on August 18 and after that they will be able to have a vote on the Determination of Significance, so either a Negative Declaration or a Positive Declaration, and then if they go with the Negative Declaration then they would then be able to act on the Zoning. If they approve the Zoning, she continues, then the applicant would be able to file for an amended site plan which would come to this Board. Chairman LaPerch said my understanding is there are no significant footprint changes that they are proposing? Ms. Ley said they are staying within the existing overall impervious surface and development areas but there are some changes to the existing layout: they are changing the number of buildings and re-orientating some of them. Chairman LaPerch said so we will get a look at it then. Boardmember Armstrong said just one more thing: in all of the documentation, which I have not seen, is there any analysis or source of where the demand for this housing is coming from? In other words, are there people saying why don't you build this housing because we need it, he asked? What is the genesis for this whole thing, he said. Chairman LaPerch said I think it is the reverse of that: they are saying there is not a demand for senior housing and the funding is not available for them to proceed with this project as a senior housing project, is that correct Ashley (Ley)? Ms. Ley said that is correct and they also did cite a study from an affordable housing organization that did include a need for more rental housing in Putnam County. Boardmember Armstrong said so it is the lack of senior demand that's causing this? She said I think it is the lack of funding available... He said so it is the lack of funding? She said yes. Ms. Eckardt said I never get to correct Ashley ever but, Ashley, you weren't at that one meeting and the rent increased quite substantially: there is nothing for \$1400 anymore. She said their suggested rental pricing did go up and it didn't raise any eyebrows but it did go up. Ms. Ley said so here it is: rent for an affordable priority one bedroom unit might be \$1444.00 and an affordable priority two bedroom unit might be \$1733.00. At this time it is anticipated that rent for a one bedroom unit would be \$1700.00 and for a two bedroom unit \$2100.00. Ms. Eckardt said I apologize if I misunderstood... Ms. Ley said no, they did go up since the last meeting. Chairman LaPerch said OK then let's move on.

Chairman LaPerch said we can't vote on the Meeting Minutes because they aren't ready and that's fine. I can't tell you what's on the next agenda but it is a couple of items. Ms. Ley said there is vet going into Hardscrabble Road. Chairman LaPerch said that's right and I got a call from (Engineer) John Folchetti and he is getting his application for the gas station down the street together. Ms. Ley said Donuts by DeBonis is on the agenda. Chairman LaPerch said that was an issue where he let his approval lapse and we have somewhat of a leeway when we say no problem but this went further than that and, besides, he just ignored us so we said come on back in. He said it is not a heavy lift so he is coming back in.

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 8, 2016**

The motion to close the meeting was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Wissel and passed all in favor.

August 19, 2016/VAD