

line because of the setback. He continued: What we have to do is slide everything towards the road to make everything fit. After you have your fifty feet, you can imagine the back line being a little closer to the road. He has a little less area. Unfortunately, when you do that unit number one gets too close to an existing unit that they're keeping. And that's the one that is dashed in over here. That's the one that becomes the closest to the shul. So what we're proposing to do is slide that building up to here (*referring to the rendering*). This is the old unit one that is now moved to here. And we have the same problem on this end with unit 28. So what we're doing is turning that 90 degrees so that it matches all the other buildings by turning it 90 degrees. So we're not proposing any new building. It's just a slight change in their location. Again, caused by the fact that we don't have much room to the rear of the property. And the other thing we had to do was shorten the old parking lot used to come like this. So we lost, I believe it was 8 parking spots. So we're going to prolong this portion of the parking area and make it longer that way to make up for those lost parking spots on that end. So you're ending up with the same amount of parking spots, the same number of units. It's just a slight change. And the other thing is he wants to split, this doesn't have to happen, but being that we're here, he would like to split this one duplex and make it two separate units. Still only two units but only separated.

- Board member: Where were they?
- Anthony Siciliano: They were in the same area but together. They were in between basically in the same spot. We're just splitting them in two. He would prefer that for those two units.
- Kalman Freidus: I just have a question. These were approved as semi-attached, the duplex units. And the interpretation of the new code... not mixed.... (*His comment was not audible*).
- Allen Frishman: It was not approved under the duplex law. This was way before that. So I would say that it's not...
- Discussion.
- Allen Frishman: They're only here because there is a change in the site plan and the configuration up front near the road that's basically what he's asking for.
- Arthur Rosenshein: Okay. So, anybody have any problems.
- Anthony Siciliano: There is also no additional clearing. It's the same amount of clearing involved.
- John Makovic: It will look better, honestly, this way (*referring to the rendering*).
- Anthony Siciliano: Yes, to me it makes sense. We have no choice.
- Discussion – why the one was turned 90; even the owner was questioning that.
- Arthur Rosenshein: Motion to revise the approved site plan for Seven Star Bungalows. There will be three changes. Unit one will be moved to a new location next to unit two. You're going to rotate unit 28 ninety degrees from the original plan. And you're going to take units 14 and 15 and split the duplex into single units.
- Anthony Siciliano: And also the parking area...
- Arthur Rosenshein: And revising the parking area to move eight spots. Anybody care to make a motion?
- Kalman Freidus made the motion. John Makovic seconded it. All in favor.
- Anthony Siciliano: Thank you very much.
 - Motion to revise the approved site plan for Seven Star Bungalows. There will be three changes. Unit one will be moved to a new location next to unit two. You're going to rotate unit 28 ninety degrees from the original plan. And you're going to take units 14 and 15 and split the duplex into single units.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. KDJ REALTY (WHITTAKER ROAD LLC)–SBL# 47-1-5.2/6 & 47A-1-26– Requests site plan approval for 196 condo units. Zone: HR-1. Acres: 153 acres. Location: Whittaker Rd., South Fallsburg
 - Mark Siemers, engineer, Pietrzak & Pfau Engineering & Surveying, LLC, represented the applicant.
 - Arthur Rosenshein: Mr. Geneslaw, I think you are involved.
 - Robert Geneslaw: I am but Mr. Siemers wants to make a little presentation to the board.

- Arthur Rosenshein: Right. I want to make sure you are on board with it.
- Robert Geneslaw: Yes, I am.
- Arthur Rosenshein: We've been through, how many years of this?
- Discussion – Mr. Geneslaw stated that he believed it went back to 2004. But that it probably goes back 20 years or maybe longer. Mr. Rosenshein directed the floor to Mr. Siemers.
- Mark Siemers: I know the entire board wasn't present at the last meeting. I made a presentation on April 21, I believe. So I'll quickly bring the entire board up to date on that presentation. As I outlined in a letter I sent you for the April 14th meeting, this project was in front of the planning board in September, October of 2008 and January of 2009. This project originally was approved as a subdivision. It got preliminary approval in 2005. And it received final **subdivision approval** in 2007. And was extended through August of 2008. At that time it was sold and brought back in front of the board at the meetings I just mentioned to change it from the subdivision to the site plan. ... We had a public hearing, I believe in September 2008, the questions and comments from the public were responded. And the remaining layout and the phasing issues that we were speaking with to the planning board were finalized at the January meeting. At that time, as everyone knows, the economy started to take a little bit of a nose dive and our client asked us to hold the plans back for a little while. We redesigned or regraded the roadway. We narrowed up the roadway that we discussed with the planning board at that time. We regraded the roadway and revised the drainage as necessary to conform to the new roadway widths. Now seeing some positive signs and based on some the expiration dates of the outside agency approvals, my client would like us to come back in, secure the **site plan approval** and move forward with the project. Therefore, we have submitted the plans, came back in front of you. In our opinion, all of the issues as far as the plans go have been addressed sufficiently. And the board authorized Mr. Geneslaw to create a resolution and to prepare the board to reaffirm the **negative declaration** that was originally adopted as a site plan so that we can move forward with the **site plan approval**.
- One thing I do want to address, at the last meeting I did say that our client had architectural drawings that were submitted. And I believe they were submitted in October because I actually saw the architectural drawings. However, in speaking with him since that meeting those architectural drawings were actually never submitted to the board. However, at the last meeting the board did indicate that this project will need to receive approval from the architectural review board. And I would request that would be made a condition of the **site plan approval**.
- Arthur Rosenshein: I think that's putting one cart before one horse.
- Mark Siemers: Why is that?
- Arthur Rosenshein: I think you get the architectural review board approval before you get ours not as a condition. Because typically, we are feeling our way through it, but they may come back with comments that we may want to incorporate into the site plan.
- Mark Siemers: In that regard, I believe some of those comments have been incorporated into the site plan already. We've had quite a bit of discussion... I understand that but... *(In response to an inaudible comment by Kalman Freidus)*.. We have had quite a bit of discussion with you in regard to the walkout basements. And there are notes on the cover sheet, Town of Fallsburg notes and conditions of approval. Note 6 states that the architectural exterior design of the constructed dwelling units must be in compliance with the architectural provided by the client. That will now be reviewed and approved by the architectural review board. And also note 16 under general project notes states that the amount of exposed concrete wall face permitted on the proposed dwelling units shall be limited to four feet maximum. Therefore, any siding will have to be brought down so there are no 10 foot foundation walls sticking out the back of a walkout basement. So I believe there has been quite a bit of discussion on the architectural review. Even though you are not the architectural review board, we have incorporated your comments into the plan.
- Arthur Rosenshein: Right. But one of the problems one has by stringing out a project is that the ground shifts under your feet. And since this has been started and changed and revised and so on, the town has provided for a new board which is the architectural review board. So because you are still in the process,

the way we want it is that it goes to them. They bring a report back to us with any changes or suggestions. And like I said that's what happens when things get strung out you have to go by the new rules. So that comes before **final approval**. So you might want to get it under way. You'll speak to Allen to get it set up.

- Allen Frishman: Before we broach that maybe we should go back a step.
- Arthur Rosenshein: That came up and I just want to make it clear that they now come under that rule. To my knowledge there is no real grandfathering in that.
- Mark Siemers: Right, I'm not asking for grandfathering.
- Arthur Rosenshein: We are where we are. That's now part of reality.
- Mark Siemers: I understand. I just don't think the architectural review board will have any bearing on the design of the site plan. The architectural reviews are going to have to be designed within the building box that is shown on the plan. Each house is either on grade, there's a garage under it or it's a walkout basement. Those units are going to have to be designed based on...
- Arthur Rosenshein: I understand what you're saying. But I think what is happening is the architectural review board's authority pretty well runs through us. So I don't the law provided them with stop/go authority, definitive. So they're basically acting on our behalf and our authority is site plan. So we want to get their report first and then we'll incorporate their report into it. So that's the order it has to go in. I believe that's the way it's working out.
- Kalman Freidus: What stage is the site plan in? Is it fairly set?
- Robert Geneslaw: The site plan is very close to be ready for **final approval** by the board. When we started trying to prepare the resolution, it occurred to me that since we hadn't looked at any of the final documents for several years, we had to go back and I looked at the EAF Part III to make it a declaration, preliminary **subdivision approval**, all of which were prepared in draft form, all of which were reviewed by the Board. We have my notes and we have some meeting minutes. But we haven't found definitive approved copies of any of the three. We can revise of all them to reflect the change from subdivision to site plan. Some of the changes are nominal, dates, ...plan set, changing from subdivision to site plan and related language that goes with it. But there were few conditions that I'm not certain would still apply and I want to be sure of that before the Board re-endorses Part III for example that everything in it is applicable. One of the items is a condition, and I'll read a portion of it: "Construction will continue for more than one year and will involve more than one phase will be mitigated by construction of no more than 49 dwelling units a year thus limiting the amount of land to be disturbed at any one time. And I felt the Board should not be re-endorsing that without the Board and the applicant thinking a little about whether it's still applicable to site plan or if whether they'd be interested in some kind of change. Mark and I spoke about it on the phone this afternoon. His first reaction was that the phases are broken up into approximately that many so offhand didn't see a problem. I don't know if he's had a chance to go back and look at it or not.
- Mark Siemers: The Part III that I have doesn't say a maximum of 49 dwelling units. It says approximately 49 dwelling units. The phasing hasn't changed from the subdivision to the site plan. The way the phases are broken out: phase one is 51 units, phase two is 49, phases three and four are 48, I believe. Also, the plan includes an erosion control construction phasing plan that was reviewed and approved by the New York State DEC that shows construction phases of areas of no more than 5 acres being disturbed at any one time that is within the NYS DEC regulation. So I believe the project absolutely continues to conform to that section.
- Robert Geneslaw: The next item was traffic. The original traffic study was based on a year round development. It is now primarily a seasonal development. So the peak hours are not at the same time nor are they on the same days of the week. The peak hours are now Friday afternoon and Sunday afternoon. So there would be higher peak hours at those two points and lower peak hours on normal, morning and afternoon weekday commuting periods. The traffic study then also took into account the proposed mountain resort and casino in Thompson, Kutscher's. I think at this point would...*(was inaudible due to noise interference)* ...at least for purposes of traffic study. So the question is should the

traffic study be redone to reflect the changes. What I'd like to do is take a little more careful look at it because I think with the reduction of Kutscher's and the general drop in traffic over the past 2 to 3 years because of the recession, I suspect it's not going to be a problem, but I'd like to take a look and confirm that. As a subdivision, all the roads and infrastructure were to be dedicated to the town. As a condominium site plan they're not going to be. That language needs to be clarified, maybe some of the agencies will have different responsibilities. And there was a fiscal analysis which at this point is 6 years old and assumes school children. Now we have a situation where there won't be any school children. It really should be modified to reflect reality. So these things don't have a significant effect on the site plan but I think in terms of the Board's procedure, they ought to be cleaned up. Now, Mark and I have discussed on several occasions a timing problem they may have with one of the permit agencies. He alluded to it but I think he ought to mention it to the Board because it may affect how you want to handle how it proceeds.

- Mark Siemers: That's right. Yes, the Army Corps of Engineers' wetland mitigation approval has an expiration date of July 13 of this year and he needs to get that mitigation underway. That approval has already been extended once. And I know, Jim (Bates) is here, he worked on that and it's his opinion it won't be extended again. Do you have a reason for that?
- Jim Bates: Because all the paperwork was changed and there's another new army corps manual coming out, so...
- Mark Siemers: So while he still has a valid permit, he needs to begin that work that will involve him putting in erosion control, an access drive wide enough for him to get back there and actually construct that mitigation. As long as he begins that mitigation prior to that July 13th deadline, he will have an extra 12 months after that expiration to complete that work.
- Arthur Rosenshein: What will be the date of our July meeting?
- Discussion – response: July 14th.
- Arthur Rosenshein: So you have one month to get through... the architectural review should not be that difficult. I understand they're nice people on there.
- Allen Frishman: You can make the next architectural review board meeting.
- Mark Siemers: I guess the question is he doesn't necessarily need the full **site plan approval** to get the nod to go ahead and begin his wetland mitigation. Do you agree with that?
- Robert Geneslaw: It's the Board's call.
- Mark Siemers: That's what we're asking. Can we begin the wetland mitigation prior to...
- Arthur Rosenshein: How much does that entail? How much disturbance? What do you have to do in order to qualify? Cut an access road. Make a road cut.
- Mark Siemers: Let's read that wording. Jim, do you know how much he actually has to do?
- Jim Bates: I think he needs a signed contract and work has to start.
- Mark Siemers: So basically he needs a signed contract and work has to start putting the erosion control in.
- Arthur Rosenshein: That could be anything then.
- John Makovic: Would you be inspector on that?
- Jim Bates: I don't know. I don't have a contract, so....
- Allen Frishman: In the discussions I have had..., basically they're just talking about putting up the erosion fence around the perimeter. Am I correct? Is that sufficient?
- Mark Siemers: The erosion control where it is shown on the plan.
- Allen Frishman: Right.
- Jim Bates: They'll probably have to cut a few trees, has to have a signed contract...
- Will Illing: I think you should show the Board where this is all going to happen on the project site.
- Arthur Rosenshein: Before we even jump into that, what authority do we have. We have site plan authority. What do we have short of site plan authority?
- Allen Frishman: You mean to start the erosion protection?
- Arthur Rosenshein: Yes.

- Will Illing: They can't do it anyway. They can't do that anyway.
- Arthur Rosenshein: I mean, you can't be half pregnant. I don't know of an authority that we have. We would pass a motion under what to allow it? And I don't know what that would be. From just a technical point of view, I'm not sure what our authority is.
- Jim Bates: Here's one question that I am going to ask the Board. Technically all the Board has to do is allow him to do the filling of the wetlands and start the wetland mitigation. It doesn't have to be in reference to putting in roads, putting in all that stuff.
- Arthur Rosenshein: That's the whole application.
- Discussion.
- Jim Bates: What I'm saying is he doesn't need to put in all the roads and that stuff to start the wetland mitigation.
- Arthur Rosenshein: Right, I don't know how...
- Jim Bates: That technically can be done through the building department.
- Arthur Rosenshein: Right. But I'm not sure, I'm just speaking for the planning board, I'm not sure under what we'd say, "Go ahead and do that part." I don't know if we have an authority. I don't know what the rules are.
- Mark Siemers: I'm not sure he needs an approval from the planning board. He has the approval from the Army Corps. Now correct me if I'm wrong, but we need a cutting permit?
- Discussion.
- Robert Geneslaw: Until site plan is approved by the Board... it's the normal course of the day. Until there is an approved site plan, there shouldn't be done any work on the site until the site plan is approved. And the site plan should be approved through the normal course of events. The changes reflected I'm making on the SEQR documents are primarily based on the change from subdivision to site plan. So they're not really subject to changes affecting the environment...
- Arthur Rosenshein: In your opinion, can it be done by the June meeting, comfortably?
- Robert Geneslaw: I was thinking as we were talking, maybe an alternative will be we'll make a best effort to get all that straightened out before the June meeting. Mark can find out with a little more specificity exactly what work they'd be looking to do to protect the July 13th date. If we don't have the documents done then he can say to the Board, I want to cut road in here, I want to put in wetland protection here and whatever else it might be. And then the Board has something to look at and make a judgment. And maybe even Will (Illing) will take a look at it.
- Arthur Rosenshein: But it's the code enforcement officer who would give that permit, not us.
- Allen Frishman: The permit to start the work. But are you going to give me the authority to give the permit.
- Discussion – for what per the Board. For the wetland mitigation.
- Arthur Rosenshein: I'm just saying, under what authority we issue that.
- Robert Geneslaw: Under the best of circumstances you will be able to grant **site plan approval**...
- Arthur Rosenshein: That's what I would hope to be able to do.
- Discussion.
- Robert Geneslaw: One condition could be for example that they can start the wetland mitigation before the plan is stamped. Because typically it takes a little bit of time after the Board acts on the approval to get the last conditions taken care of, the fees paid, pre-construction meeting to take place...
- Arthur Rosenshein: So you are saying we can do it within the **site plan approval** process. That's what I'm looking for.
- Robert Geneslaw: I think you could but I would feel more comfortable if it were done after the resolution of approval of the site plan and before the stamping.
- Discussion.
- Arthur Rosenshein: Okay, then...
- Robert Geneslaw: Our target will be to have it done by the next meeting. To be able to give the Board a good description of what he thinks he needs to do minimally to protect the deadline.

- Arthur Rosenshein: Yes, and get to it with the architectural review board. I would say just as a general comment, it's not the Board's fault that this has dragged on. We were already to go.
- Mark Siemers: I agree.
- Arthur Rosenshein: So, we're trying but only within what we're allowed to do.
- Mark Siemers: And we appreciate that.
- Arthur Rosenshein: So, Mr. Geneslaw, you will be meeting with them, go through the code enforcement to get your appointment with the architectural review board.
- Allen Frishman: The meeting is June 2nd for the ARB. You have 15 days in advance just like this Board to put it in your application. So you're saying his architectural are done?
- Mark Siemers: That was my understanding, yes.
- Allen Frishman: Let's hope so.
- Robert Geneslaw: Mark, if you have the erosion material done ahead of time, it will be useful for Will to be able to review it, before the June meeting.
- Mark Siemers: Specifically for the wetland mitigation and erosion control?
- Robert Geneslaw: Yes.
- Mark Siemers: Okay. It will basically be what the DEC approved already....
- Ron Hiatt: Do you have all the elements necessary for the ARB application?
- Discussion – Mr. Hiatt suggested he check in with them. Mr. Siemers said he would call the next day.
- Arthur Rosenshein: Because we've looked at it so closely before, it shouldn't be that difficult to do. Basically, you're changing nothing but a few lines and the SEQR and so on. Hopefully you can do it.
- Mark Siemers: Okay.
- Gary Tavormina: I have one question. How many buildings are going to have 8 feet of concrete above the ground?
- Mark Siemers: I don't know that off the top of my head. And they will only have 4 feet of concrete.
- Gary Tavormina: You said something that I didn't like, that's why I'm asking the question. You said you would circumvent that by bringing 4 feet of siding down. I'm not interested in that. I'm interested in how many buildings are going to be 4 feet in the ground. Not eight feet above the ground. Four feet in the ground and 4 feet of concrete above the ground. Not being circumvented by bringing siding down 4 feet.
- Arthur Rosenshein: I think he was just saying that we had asked for so that we wouldn't get that 4 feet of concrete sticking up in the air to bring the siding... that was in that context. It wasn't to circumvent it was simply for cosmetics.
- Mark Siemers: Right, so there is not a concrete wall to look at.
- Gary Tavormina: I agree with that because I don't want a concrete wall to look at because I've seen too many buildings like that around here.
- Arthur Rosenshein: But I don't think the word circumvent fits the situation. It's by our request.
- Discussion.
- Robert Geneslaw: Just for clarification, Gary you asked how many?
- Gary Tavormina: How many and which ones. I want to know exactly. I want to know if it's going to be five, two are going to be above the ground, ten are going to be above the ground, so that when it's presented to this Board and the public is here, they know exactly what's going to be built in their area. What's it going to look like.
- Mark Siemers: We already had a public hearing on this. And I believe this discussion was already held at multiple meetings about the walkout basements....
- Arthur Rosenshein: He's not asking for changes but to simply designate on the map which ones fall into that category.
- Gary Tavormina: So if there is any question by the public even if it's not a public hearing, if the public asks me a question on the sideline, I can say, this, this and this.
- Mark Siemers: Okay.
- Arthur Rosenshein: I don't believe that's a change in what we've asked for, putting it on the map. Anything else on this? You should have an interesting month.

- Discussion.
- Mark Siemers: Thank you.
- Discussion – members in the audience asked if they could comment. Mr. Rosenshein explained the public hearing was already held. The only thing changing is the ownership style. The same buildings, same layout and the same look will now be part of a community or condo association. So there is no physical change. So we don't reopen the public hearing because there is nothing new.
- Woman #1: So if we didn't bring everything up then, everything is set in place now.
- Arthur Rosenshein: It's pretty much far along right now.
- Woman #2: We did have the question of the access road and I notice there is a sign by Mr. Makovic selling that space in between. So I'm afraid that access road will not be an access road and being from Timber Hill, I think that's a danger for us.
- John Makovic: Nothing on the plan is changing.
- Woman #2: Well, you are selling a piece of land that should not be sold because it's an access road.
- John Makovic: Nothing can be changed from the plan.
- Arthur Rosenshein: I remember having it as emergency access.
- John Makovic: Yes. I can't sell the emergency access because I don't own it.
- Woman #2: Then why is your name up there as selling...
- John Makovic: Not on the emergency access. It's not on the emergency access. It's not possible.
- Discussion.
- Allen Frishman: For clarification, was the emergency access road connected to Timber Hill?
- Mark Siemers: No.
- Allen Frishman: Thank you. So there is no connection.
- Mark Siemers: It's just a right of way and there is no connection.
- Allen Frishman: It's an existing right of way and there is no plan to do anything with that to connect it to Timber Hill.
- Mark Siemers: No.
- Discussion.
- Ron Hiatt: Mr. Chairman, while you are allowing public comment, we should get names for the record.
- Arthur Rosenshein: Good point. Please identify yourself because this is something new that I am allowing.
- Kaleka Stern: I am a resident of South Fallsburg, Timber Hill.
- Allen Frishman: The approved plan did not show the access road and that's what I'm verifying with the engineer because I remember there was a lot of discussion about that by the Timber Hill residents. I think we said, "Do not make the connection." So it's not in the plans to make a connection.
- Mark Siemers: That's right.
- Allen Frishman: So for the record it's not a connection.
- Diana Griswald, Timber Hill resident: He mentioned that that one piece of property is a right of way. What is the connection between that and the access road?
- Mark Siemers: It is an existing piece of property that connects the proposed project property to the Timber Hill Road. It's just a piece of property that gives rights if the Town wanted to put a road in there, they could. But they asked us not to put a connecting road for any type of access. So there is none shown.
- Diana Griswald: And that will hold? There never will be a road there? Is that the idea?
- Arthur Rosenshein: Would they have to come back to us for that?
- Robert Geneslaw: It would be an amendment to the plan. Yes.
- Allen Frishman: You could ask for a new public hearing.
- Ron Hiatt: And the Town owns that right of way, no?
- Allen Frishman: No, the Town doesn't own it.
- Ron Hiatt: Who owns the right of way?

- John Makovic: Not me.
 - Discussion – woman said to John Makovic, “Why is your name on the property?”
 - John Makovic: Have you had it surveyed and know what property it is? No. We’re wasting time of people who are here waiting to be heard on something that is irrelevant. The property has nothing to do with this right of way. The property I have for sale has nothing to do with the right of way. What the right of way is set up with this project has nothing to do with those properties. There is a right of way that cuts through Timber Hill into this project...
 - Woman: That is next to that.
 - John Makovic: Correct. And the Town asked that there be no access put through there. And from where we are so far, you are agreeing with that. And your development isn’t looking to put a road through there.
 - Mark Siemers: No.
 - Ron Hiatt: And that was condition of site plan.
 - Arthur Rosenshein: So it’s a dead issue now.
 - Ron Hiatt: So they can’t unless they come back here and the public is notified.
 - John Makovic: And you will all be contacted, everyone from Timber Hill would be contacted if they were looking to put a road in there.
 - Arthur Rosenshein: I can’t imagine them ever allowing it.
 - John Makovic: It probably wouldn’t be allowed.
 - Discussion.
 - Arthur Rosenshein: We have a large agenda.
 - Stacy Rogers: A quick question (Mr. Rosenshein permitted she speak). I’m at Timber Hill as well. What was the final decision as far as this space between the boundaries of Timber Hill and this new development that you are putting up?
 - Mark Siemers: I believe we showed a 25 foot buffer or 40 foot buffer.
 - Discussion – forty foot buffer.
 - Mark Siemers: It’s on the plan.
 - Stacy Rogers: So it’s 40.
 - Arthur Rosenshein: You can go to the code enforcement office and see that plan. It’s all public. There’s nothing private.
 - Mark Siemers: After the public hearing, the September 2008 public hearing, we brought the plans back and we addressed all the public comments.
 - Stacy Rogers: Meaning that you will not touch any trees within the 40 feet of the boundary between both properties?
 - Mark Siemers: With the exception...
 - Ron Hiatt indicated for them to go to the code enforcement office to look at the plans.
 - Arthur Rosenshein: May I suggest that you go to code enforcement, see what we have on the map, the agreement, everything is public and you have every right to see it. And that will settle it out in more detail.
 - Ron Hiatt: So you are going to unofficially close the unofficial public hearing.
 - Arthur Rosenshein: In an unofficial way.
2. CATSKILL COMMUNITY MIKVAH (CHUT HAMESHWLASH) SBL# 39-1-1.2 - Requests site plan/special permit approval for a mikvah. Zone: R-1. Acres: 3. Location: Brickman Rd., Fallsburg.
- Randy Wasson, engineer, represented the applicant: What we are looking for tonight, if the Board is so inclined is conditional **site plan approval** and a **neg dec** on SEQR. The project status as I said earlier one of the items is the project went before the architectural review board. They looked at the building and the plans and everything we provided. I think they summarized their reviews at the end as to what they were looking for. They didn’t give us an approval. They basically wanted us to come back and bring samples of the materials that we propose for the outside of the building. That includes cedar siding, stone veneer,