

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 25, 2019**

Present: Chairman Thomas LaPerch; Boardmembers Dan Armstrong; Eric Cyprus; Michael Hecht; Jim King; Jack Gress; Town Planner Ashley Ley; Town Attorney Willis Stephens; Secretary Victoria Desidero.
Absent & Excused: Vice Chairman David Rush

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 1. BATISTA SOUTHEAST DUNKIN, 1617 Route 22** – This was a continued Public Hearing to review an application for Site Plan Amendment. Kyle Ahearn of The Chazen Companies and Phillip Grealy of Maser Consulting appeared before the Board. The motion to Open the Public Hearing was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Armstrong and passed all in favor. Mr. Ahearn said we are the traffic consultants for the project and we were here last month at which time we updated the Board on some of the changes to the plan that are minor in nature. He said we are back with a couple more revisions based on last month's discussion as well as the comments received from the Town's consultants. There were three main changes, he said, and in the front of the building along the parking some wheel stops were added to protect the storefront from any vehicular incidents and after speaking with the Town's Consultant, we are going to switch those out with bollards, he said. Mr. Ahearn said the sidewalk at the building corner where the Drive-Thru comes out was angled 45 degrees and for the reason of getting any pedestrians, especially coming from the loading area, further away from the building to have a better view around the corner there. He said there will be planting at that corner but they will not be four-season planters so in the winter potentially someone could just go straight and walk out into traffic there so we will be putting something more evergreen and hardier that will survive winter to help. He said last time a little yellow line was added on the pavement to guide people into the site and it will be stopped right before it gets to the parking space. Mr. Ahearn said at the last meeting there was discussion about a possible sidewalk connection to the adjacent property and we will not be doing that at this time for a couple reasons but the main reason is the 49.9% impervious means that essentially any added pavement would put us out of compliance with that Zoning requirement. Additionally, he said, I looked up and down this corridor and there's not really a sidewalk network at this time so we're not anticipating any foot traffic between the two parcels. Mr. Ahearn said the right turn also came up at the last meeting from 312 and what we show is what we discussed with DOT (Department of Transportation) and there are a plethora of reasons it was removed from the project but the main ones would be impervious surface, high pressure gas line that runs along 312 in this area, we only have 19 ft. between the Drive-Thru lane and the bypass lane because we are abutting a residential district, and to add a new entrance would require more room than that. He said it would also encourage thru traffic with people not wanting to wait for the light. Mr. Ahearn said one of the benefits of this amended Site Plan is that we were able to lift the building up because we had encountered some rock on-site higher than what was expected and if we were to add that other entrance it would cause issues on that side with the rock. Chairman LaPerch said my understanding is that there's only going to be one entrance to this property and it's coming from the southbound and that's your business decision, correct? Mr. Ahearn said yes. Chairman LaPerch said do you have your business relationship set with the property across the street to connect to the sewer? Mr. Ahearn said it needs to be re-approved but yes. Chairman LaPerch said re-approved through what agency? Mr. Ahearn said DEP (Department of Environmental Protection). Chairman LaPerch said was that just an administrative approval or is it another filing? Mr. Ahearn said it's an administrative, well it's a re-approval. Chairman LaPerch said besides the DEP, is the business relationship with the owner set? Mr. Ahearn said yes. Chairman LaPerch said you're all set with flows and what it's going to cost? Mr. Ahearn said yes. Chairman LaPerch said did you ever show a rendering of what is being proposed? Mr. Ahearn said no, there will be an architectural review. Chairman LaPerch said that would have been really nice to see here tonight because that's part of our process and it is a public process so next time if you could submit something that you're thinking of putting in. Chairman LaPerch said Ms. Ley (Town Planner Ashley Ley) are there any outstanding issues or comments that should be made before opening to the public. Ms. Ley said we did go through the revised traffic study and the Board members all have a copy of the memo.

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 25, 2019**

She said there were some additional comments that were just responded to in this document that everyone just received so we will have comments for the next meeting on that. She said the one comment that I would draw the Board's attention to is because they are eliminating the right turn lane but they are providing an easement for that, we did notice there should be a discussion about whether the Board would want to set up a Fair Share Mitigation, which is something that the Board has done in the past. Mr. Grealy said in response to that comment there were some changes/mitigation in terms of signal timings that were proposed to mitigate that change from existing. He said the level of service dropped from existing to no build and then the no build to the built was the same but to mitigate that we're doing some signal timing adjustments. On top of that, we have to discuss this with the applicant, but I think we're agreeable to a Fair Share towards the right turn lane, he said. There's been a lot of work done towards that already, he said, and a plan was prepared almost to the point of a permit to construct that right turn lane. He said there's a permitted easement provided because to build that lane, there was land needed to construct the lane. He said those have already been advanced and was actually fairly far along with the DOT; it's an easement as opposed to a dedication because that was DOT's preference but in answer to that comment I think we're agreeable to a Fair Share and I think we should get some credit for the work that's been done: the easements, the plans, etc. Chairman LaPerch said what about our consultant work? Mr. Grealy said yes, absolutely. Mr. Grealy said I think the rest of the comments were pretty straightforward for which we provided a detailed response and I apologize but we just got those comments last week. Chairman LaPerch opened the meeting up for public comment and there was none. The motion to Close the Public Hearing was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Gress and passed all in favor. Ms. Ley said for action items we will review their responses for the next meeting. Ms. Ley said will you be ready to come to the next meeting with the architectural and such? Mr. Ahearn said I will have to check with the applicant on when the architectural will be ready. Chairman LaPerch said I would really like to get the visuals done so everyone can get comfortable. Ms. Ley said the goal would be for the next meeting that you would be at would be to close SEQRA and refer to the ARB (Architectural Review Board).

- 2. NYSEG DINGLE RIDGE SUBSTATION, 17 Branch Road** – This was a Public Hearing to review an application for Site Plan Amendment and Wetland Permit. Mary Steblein of LaBella Associates appeared before the Board. Ms. Steblein said since this is the first Public Hearing for this project I will go through the project. She said we last appeared before the Planning Board in January regarding the Dingle Ridge Substation, which is an existing electrical substation on Branch Road and the lot extends to Route 6 so it's in the Special Route 6 Zoning District. The proposal is to expand the existing substation and we acquired property last year in order to enable that expansion. She said the substation yard will be expanded to the south and to the west and will require a retaining wall to be installed. We propose putting in a new control house, two transformers, and other associated equipment, she said. There will be improvements to the fencing, she said, based on feedback from the Planning Board and we are considering a chain-link fence. She said the landscaping plan provides for screening around the south and east sides of the substation so that the view from Route 6 would be screened with evergreen trees. This substation services the Towns of Southeast and North Salem, she said, and if the transformers at the current substation were to go down that would cause a 10-hour outage for the 709 customers that are served across those Towns. Ms. Steblein said the proposed two transformers would each be larger than the existing transformers so that should prevent any outages potentially. She said the only thing I wanted to confirm was that previously we indicated the schedule would be approximately 18 months of construction and it's actually reduced to something more like eight months of (inaudible) so potentially wrapping up by the summer of 2020. Customers should not be impacted by outages, she said, during the transfer from the existing substation to the new substation components. Chairman LaPerch said I thought one of the main reasons for doing this was to supply power to Metro North? Ms. Ley said that was the other substation. Ms. Steblein said that's Tilley Foster. The Board had no questions. Ms. Ley said there was a memo from the Town Engineer back in January and there

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 25, 2019**

were a couple of minor comments that needed to be carried through on the next set of plans. Ms. Steblein said one of the things that we were able to do with regard to the concern about the discharge at the south end of the site where there are multiple points of discharge, we were able to connect some piping within the substation so that instead of having three points of discharge there will be two; one for the retaining wall and one that would be separated as far as possible across that slope. Chairman LaPerch opened the Public Hearing up to the public for comment and there was no comment. The motion to Declare the Planning Board Lead Agency under SEQRA was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Armstrong and passed by a roll call vote of 6 to 0 with 1 absent. Chairman LaPerch said I apologize that I forgot to open the Public Hearing. The motion to Open the Public Hearing was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Hecht and passed all in favor. Chairman LaPerch asked if there were any questions from the public and there were none. The motion to Close the Public Hearing was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Hecht and passed all in favor. The motion to Adopt a Negative Declaration under SEQRA was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Armstrong and passed by a roll call vote of 6 to 0 with 1 absent. The motion to Refer the Application to the Architectural Review Board was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Gress and passed all in favor. The motion to Refer the application to the Zoning Board of Appeals was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Armstrong and passed all in favor. Ms. Ley said the variances requested are for Lot Coverage and Open Space. Secretary Desidero asked what the height variance required is and Ms. Ley said add fence height to the list of variances. Ms. Steblein said 9 ft. Ms. Ley said so it will be a variance of 6 ft. in the front yard where 9 ft. is requested and 3 ft. is permitted and 6 ft. for the side yard.

REGULAR SESSION:

- 1. DURKIN WATER & DREW REALTY, 120 & 160 Fields Lane** – This was a review of an application for Site Plan Amendment and Wetland Permit. Jamie LoGiudice of Insite Engineering appeared before the Board. Ms. LoGiudice said this is an amended site plan for 120 and 160 Fields Lane in the OP-1 Zone and we have Durkin Water Company and Drew Realty. She said currently there is no access from Fields Lane onto the Drew Realty property and we access through Durkin Water Company. They have existing storage that we are trying to legitimize tonight along with removing existing metal storage containers and putting a new structure which will be included in the next submission, she said. Ms. LoGiudice continued: as part of the Durkin Water Company amended site plan there was (inaudible) for revising some of the wetland mitigation plantings along the wetlands here and then approving a new tenant so we were in receipt of two comment letters from the Town consultants and we will be addressing those comments and providing additional information in the next submission. She said we have reached out to the Wetland Consultant who reviewed and flagged the wetlands located on the Drew Realty property so we can address that issue as well. Chairman LaPerch polled the Board for questions. Boardmember Hecht said on the access, you said currently it is going through the existing area where the water operations are: there will eventually be access? Ms. LoGiudice's response was inaudible. Boardmember Armstrong said what exactly is going to be going on in this part of the building: what is the general... Ms. LoGiudice said in the new building for Drew Realty? He said this says general electrical company... general business use... is it administrative or manufacturing or what is it? She said to the best of my knowledge it is an electrical contractor; they are not manufacturing anything. Chairman LaPerch said he told us at the staff review it was a contractor. Ms. Ley said general business is the permitted use and an electrical contractor would fall within that. Boardmember Armstrong said are they meeting the parking requirement? Ms. LoGiudice said yes. There were no additional questions and Chairman LaPerch asked Ms. Ley if she had any additional comments because they owe us some information? She said this is the first time they are presenting before the

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 25, 2019**

Board so the only action tonight would be to Declare Intent to be Lead Agency and then the other actions would follow when we see revised plans. Chairman LaPerch said for the Board's information, this was a Notice of Violation (NOV) that triggered this review. Ms. LoGiudice said yes, the violation was on the Drew Realty property. The motion to Declare Intent to be Lead Agency and Classify this as a Major Project was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Cyprus and passed by a roll call vote of 6 to 0 with 1 absent.

2. **PALMER SITE PLAN, 2334 Route 22** – This was a continued review of Sketch Plan Application for Site Plan Amendment and Conditional Use Permit. John Folchetti of JR Folchetti & Associates appeared before the Board. Mr. Folchetti said initially this thing started as an effort to get some screening of outdoor storage and just tidy the place up and, in time, for the first review we made last year, the applicant decided they wanted to expand the existing garage to a two-story, 2,000 sq. ft. footprint. Subsequent to that, he said, the application kind of ran into a buzz saw with the City of New York because the adjoining drainage channel comes out of Brewster Heights down the side of the Feehan building and according to the City's revised watershed regulations... inaudible... within 300 ft. of that particular watercourse and, I don't know, for 60 years I have looked at that as a drainage channel not a watercourse but their (inaudible). Mr. Folchetti said that gave us pause and recently we had some meetings with the City and the variance is (inaudible) and the surprising part of it was there is no hardship demonstration (inaudible). He said so I am hoping to have a meeting with the City of New York either at the end of this week or next week and, if in fact that variance is viable and I don't have to demonstrate hardship, we'll probably be back here in 60 days. If, in fact, he said, there is not a viable solution then we will probably be back here in 30 days with a (inaudible)... Chairman LaPerch said more importantly I think there are some visual issues that I had issues with so what are you doing besides that DEP issue to try and clean it up? Mr. Folchetti used the plans to show the Board what is proposed saying the first thing is to try and keep everything that is outside the setbacks inside and get evergreens... Chairman LaPerch said where is Route 6 on that map and Mr. Folchetti pointed it out. He said between the trail and the proposed garage and existing parking area is a 6 ft. high evergreen hedge planting to be coordinated with Ashley's (Ley's) staff and a split rail fence around the perimeter and pulling back the parking that encroaches on the setback areas and, obviously, there are comments from both consultants regarding identification of who is parking where so we will address those. He said again, from my perspective right now, we have to satisfy the City of New York because there may be some other issues. Chairman LaPerch said you won't know what to do until you get direction from them. He polled the Board for questions. Boardmember Gress said I had no questions but I just wanted to make a comment: I believe that this is a good project moving forward because they want to clean the project up and that place has been a mess for several years and I looked at this plan and I am hoping that New York City is going to give you the right to go ahead. He said you have had many meetings with them but I think this would be a good plus moving forward and I would be more in favor of the extension of that building and increasing the size of that: it looks like a good project. Boardmember Cyprus said in the beginning, you were going to come with or without something depending on what New York City says, the building is either totally on the table or totally off the table? Mr. Folchetti said correct. Chairman LaPerch said so you have some work to do so we can't really dive into it until you get a direction. The motion to Declare Lead Agency under SEQRA was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Armstrong and passed by a roll call vote of 6 to 0 with 1 absent.
3. **LAS MANANITAS, 1250 Route 22** – This was a continued review of an Application for Site Plan Amendment. John Folchetti of JR Folchetti & Associates represented his client before the Board. Chairman LaPerch said for the purposes of the Board members, this is the third application tonight that is in response to an NOV. Mr. Folchetti said the more senior members will remember we were

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 25, 2019**

here when there was a violation with some encroachments on the other side of the property line and we were trying to make all the parking work out and we came to the table last year with a proposed agreement with the joint property owner which was insufficient for the Board to legally approve a site plan that extended out to somebody else's land. He said so we had to go back to the drawing board and re-locate a substantial portion of the parking, most of which has been done either along the wall, and between the building and the house, where there is a little dirt track that runs down there. Chairman LaPerch said just two seconds: the reason you were struggling with the parking is because you couldn't come to terms with the adjoining property owner, correct? Mr. Folchetti said correct... well we came in with an agreement but it was insufficient to allow us to move forward so we had to re-do it. He said there was an interim approach where we were trying to put the big tent out in back and put another canopy over one of the outside decks: those have been removed from consideration. Any future requirement or events that require, in the opinion of the owner, needs that tent, the large tent, will be the subject of an individual application, as they have been historically, to the Code Enforcement Officer for that specific event complete with parking plans, emergency plans, fire plans, etc. He said so the total parking that we are providing is 93 spots where we have a requirement for 57 based on the square footage of the building so that is only for the indoor seating but we need 57 for the indoor seating and are providing 90-plus. Mr. Folchetti said there was an outstanding question partly because of the number of tents and the number of events, how do we look in terms of water consumption and waste water generation. Chairman LaPerch said yes, that is a question. Mr. Folchetti said the original application to the Health Department in 2011, we estimated 2,148 gallons a day for an average of 18 gallons per day per seat and that was based on water consumption that the other restaurant had. In response to an inquiry that is very similar to the one posed by this Board, in 2017 the County Health Department requested water consumption records for this facility and, as a result of that increased the approval of seats from 120 to 200: that was in July of 2017 if you want a copy of that. Chairman LaPerch said we would please. Mr. Folchetti said the current seat count including the closed in cupola is 180 and our current water use is 1,209 gallons a day, not 2,148 so our average is 6.7 gallons per day per seat as opposed to the originally approved 17.9 so on that basis... (inaudible). He said we have the comments from both the Planner and the Engineer and we will address them going into the next session. Chairman LaPerch said John (Folchetti), any DOT (Department of Transportation) issues: there was a violation with the wall, can you explain that? Mr. Folchetti said it was some little thing with... there was a low wall out by the driveway that I think was infringing on the DOT right of way: they wanted it taken out but someone did us a favor and wrecked it so all the rocks are gone now. Chairman LaPerch said I think the main concern that everyone has is the parking as always and that is kind of like what do we do here so I think that is utmost in our concerns. He said now, so first of all we do want the letter from the Health Department... that was a big issue, but we just want to make sure we have some kind of verifiable parking plan that we can understand and keep it successful. He said it just seems so hit or miss out there so that is my main concern on this whole project at this point. Mr. Folchetti said well the violation that initiated this thing was a paving violation so historically we never had a striped parking lot. So, it's all paved, he said, so we are going to provide a striped facility that gives you 93 spots where 57 are required. Chairman LaPerch said you also mentioned that if he does have a tented event it would be a permit application to the Town? Mr. Folchetti said historically, going up to the point in time when we presented the thing here to the Board; that's what's happened. It's always been a plan that's been submitted to Mr. Levine (Building Inspector) and it details parking, it details emergency pieces, it details where the portable johns are going to go, all of that kind of stuff, he said. He continued: as a result of one of the work sessions it was well 'what is your dream thing to get all of this stuff on paper' so we put that on there... Chairman LaPerch said we asked for your wish list. He said exactly and I think it just became too heavy of a lift so we decided to back off of that thing and if it becomes necessary, we would do it as a specific application for that specific event... Chairman LaPerch said event by

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 25, 2019**

event? He said yes and then the tent comes down. Chairman LaPerch said fair enough so you still have some work to do. He polled the Board for questions. Boardmember King said I think when you get a concrete parking plan... Mr. Folchetti said well, I mean the proposed parking plan is this one that is in front of you and I don't have any comments right now from either consultant saying do this or do that so I think that by and large we are in good shape. Chairman LaPerch said I guess I am just asking the same thing... identifiable spaces... I don't see a striping plan. Mr. Folchetti said these (pointing to the plan) are going to be striped on the ground everywhere on the site: that's what we are proposing. Boardmember Hecht said are the conversations with the adjacent landowner just dead? Mr. Folchetti said there's not a willingness to part with even a segment of that property and the asking price for the whole property, which is not necessary, is off the chart. Boardmember Hecht said my only concern is once it is all striped out, can you go there on a weekend... sometimes a couple of people will just pull in and park wherever they want and mess things up for everyone: I've seen that happen. I am just wondering if you are going to run into an issue once the stripes are down and people see they have to park in an authorized spot, he said. Mr. Folchetti said nobody has ever had an assigned parking space there but I think the striping will simplify things because it is going to steer people to things, they are accustomed to seeing on the ground. They discussed that it is an enforcement issue but hopefully people will start using the striped spots. Boardmember Armstrong said I've been out there many times: it seems to me that the parking is a little bit left to the discretion of the patrons and there is most of the time somebody there who tries to guide people into parking spaces but overall there is no real... no isles defined as far as I can remember and there are no real parking spaces marked that I can remember. There may be some, he said, and it seems to me that this issue has come up more than once. Mr. Folchetti said agreed. Boardmember Armstrong continued: I am just wondering if we could maybe come to a conclusion on this? Mr. Folchetti said as I said this is the first time, we are presenting a striped parking plan with 24-foot wide aisles so what you see here meets virtually every parking lot criteria that we have ever proposed. There will be stripes on the lot and the aisle width between parking spaces is in fact 24 feet. Chairman LaPerch said to Boardmember Armstrong: I think they are trying now. Boardmember Armstrong said I hear you but it just seems to me that aside from the parking lot itself, we also have an overflow problem and people just park where they find an open space so the parking lot itself is one thing but the overall parking is a bigger issue in my opinion and it just seems to me that maybe the time has come to really put this one to bed and make it work. I don't know what required parking is, he said, it's been there a long time as different restaurants and I'm certainly not trying to say or do anything to impact the business but this seems to me to be... maybe we got lucky that there has never been a fire or anything there where public safety needed to get in or something like that. Boardmember Armstrong continued: it just seems to me that it is time to get a workable plan and that is really going to be enforced. Boardmember Cyprus said I believe I heard there will be no tent and no canopy at all. Chairman LaPerch said if there is going to be an event then they need to ask Michael (Levine)... Boardmember Cyprus said yes but the two... lead agency and the referral need to be changed because they are both referenced in there. Ms. Desidero said they are in there because that was in the current description, was it not? Ms. Ley said it was in the last submission but has been updated. Ms. Desidero said I didn't pick that up. It was agreed the resolution and referral would be changed to reflect the current scope of the project. Chairman LaPerch said good questions from this Board; there is still some work to be done but we have two actions tonight. The motion to Declare Lead Agency under SEQRA was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Armstrong and passed by a roll call vote of 6 to 0 with 1 absent. The motion to Refer the application to County Planning under GML 239-m was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Cyprus and passed all in favor. Chairman LaPerch asked Mr. Folchetti for an update on the Eagle gas station on Route 22 and he said there was a violation by both the Town and the City because they pulled the tanks. The original application never contemplated a tank pull, Mr. Folchetti said, it was a remedial action plan that

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 25, 2019**

was submitted to the DEC that was not approved until spring 2017. He explained what was supposed to be done and said sometime between the approval and the actual clean up, they decided to yank the tanks and that triggers a completely different review with the City of New York so we ended up putting together a complete timeline and they approved the replacement of the tanks in kind but we still need to develop a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and deal with New York City on that issue. Chairman LaPerch said so they are allowing the tanks but you still have the issue of the SWPPP.

4. **NYSEG PARKING AREA, 35 Milan Road** – This was a review of an application for Site Plan Amendment. Jeff Darrow of Delta Engineering appeared before the Board. Mr. Darrow used the plans to show that they are repaving the existing facility with a minor change of removing 31 existing parking spots and I believe that was one of the concerns. He said so basically, we constructed this facility in 1988 and it was designed with 232 initial parking spots and we are recommending that 31 parking spots farthest away from the building that aren't used presently... When this was originally designed NYSEG had over 200 employees so now there are 93 employees at the facility, he said. Mr. Darrow said an additional concern was with the inaccessibility for handicap parking and I spoke with the designer this afternoon and he is amending the drawings now to include that van accessible parking spot. He said I think what we did was actually added a few spots from the original design as well for handicap parking. He said I know there was a request for a thumb drive and I have that Victoria (Desidero). She said thank you. Mr. Darrow said I guess we addressed the concerns with the parking spots and there was also site lighting... there is no proposed change to the site lighting other than one site light being repaired so I think that covers the concerns or comments that were received. Chairman LaPerch polled the Board for questions. Boardmember Cyprus said I realize you don't need the extra spots but why are you removing them, to save money on the construction? Mr. Darrow said there are actually a couple of reasons: there is a stairwell that we would like to eliminate for safety reasons alone and the fact that nobody is actually using these parking spots right now, what we intend to do is just make this a thoroughfare. He said there's a gate here that separates our utility construction area from our customer and employee parking so it would just be a roadway to maintain access. Chairman LaPerch asked Ms. Ley if there are any other issues and she said no. The motion to Classify this as a Type II Action and a Minor Town of Southeast Project was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Cyprus and passed by a roll call vote of 6 to 0 with 1 absent. Chairman LaPerch polled the Board about whether a Public Hearing should be required saying he has no problem with waiving it. No one objected. The motion to Waive the Public Hearing was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Armstrong and passed all in favor. The motion to Refer the application to County Planning under GML 239-m was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Cyprus and passed all in favor. Chairman LaPerch said under a new local law we have the discretion of not referring or of waiving the referral to the ARB. Ms. Ley said it is for any minor project that doesn't involve any structures so it is really limited on when you can waive it and this would be one because it is just a parking lot re-paving. There were no questions from the Board. The motion to Waive the Referral to the ARB was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Hecht and passed all in favor.

The motion to approve the Meeting Minutes of March 11, 2019 as written was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember King and passed all in favor with Boardmember Armstrong abstaining.

Chairman LaPerch asked Ms. Desidero for the next meeting agenda and she said it is on April 8 and the only thing on the agenda is Commercial Campus at Fields Corner previously known as Northeast Interstate Logistics.

**TOWN OF SOUTHEAST
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 25, 2019**

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

April 5, 2019/VAD/CC