

**TOWN OF CHESTER
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 4, 2020**

ZOOM Meeting called to order: 7:02 pm

Members present: Chairman Serotta, Larry Dysinger, Jackie Elfers, Mark Roberson, Dot Wierzbicki and Carl D'Antonio

Also present: Dave Donovan-Attorney, Julie Tiller- Secretary, Alexa Burchianti-Building Inspector, Al Fusco-Engineer, and Bob Courtenay

Absent: Bob Conklin

Meeting minutes from August 5, 2020 were adopted

Chairman Serotta: Tonight we have (2) public hearings scheduled if you want to speak please use the chat feature but we can't allow comments until the public hearing is officially open. Another quick update, on 210 Black Meadow Rd at the town board meeting the Village water representative spoke and we were requested to send all information received for that project to engineer Mark Edsall at McGoey Hauser. Now Mark Edsall is retiring so Michael Weeks will be taking over and he has agreed any reports he receives from the Village will come to our board. We were declaring the lead agency and Kirk Rother was working with Dave Donovan to get notices and plans sent to all lead agencies.

Larry Dysinger: I did say at that town meeting that all appropriate agencies will be notified

Chairman Serotta: Correct and the Planning Board has already agreed it was very important to monitor because of the well over there. Okay so moving on, first thing on the agenda tonight is **RIDGE ROAD EQUITIES** being represented by Kirk Rother so Kirk I'll turn it over to you

Kirk Rother: Good Evening everyone, the application before the planning board is a 4 lot single family residential subdivision which is approximately 22 acres in size that lies on the south side of Ridge Rd and the west side of Kings Hwy at the intersection. As indicated this was a proposed 10 lot subdivision and as you can see Lot #1 is the large lot which is proposed to be owned by Mr. O'Reilly who owns all the property and wants to build his personal residence there. The 10 lot plan which the board is in possession of had one additional lot to the left of Lot 1 and additional lots were in between Lots 1 and Lot 2 with one lot also on Kings Hwy. Unfortunately the property is in the ridge line overlay district and we did a visual analysis from Kings Hwy and also Laroe Rd and this has been to OC Dept. of Planning has reviewed and the OCDPW has been notified and reviewed the one driveway that would've been off of Kings Hwy if the 10 lot plan were being perfected. It's in the SR1 zoning district with a minimum lot size of 1 acre with 150 foot lot widths and you can see we've met all those requirements. We've met on site with Highway Superintendent to review Ridge Rd driveway locations and sight distance, Anthony is in agreement with the locations as shown and also asked we propose

TOWN OF CHESTER
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 4, 2020

improvement to the swale along the south side of Ridge Rd which we have agreed to do. The applicant in realizing that he wants to keep 3 lots for his children and 1 big lot for himself has decided rather than pursue the 10 lot subdivision he would like to pursue the 4 lots as a minor subdivision and if and when the time comes he will develop the other 6 lots. Our environmental assessment forms the 10 lot subdivision and based on the mapper says there is potential wetlands to the east of Kings Hwy and indicates potential for bat habitat. The site is primarily fields there's a few trees on the crest of the hill on Ridge Rd and a cluster of trees in the area of Lots 2 and 3 so we have limited months of November through March to clear them. Traffic is another issue, the 10 lot plan would generate 8 vehicles during peak hours and the 4 lot plan is roughly 3.5 per hour so it's very minimal.

Chairman Serotta: We have some comments from Fusco Engineering we can review and John can go over them with us

John- Fusco Eng: We received the sheet showing the elimination of the 1 lot along the county highway and the new lot along Ridge Rd but we didn't get the revised plans showing comments. We do need the SWPPP and we need the witnessed soil testing done as well and a few small ticket items like having stamped plans. So Kirk was there another submission that was made or are you planning on closing the public hearing and making another submission to the board

Kirk Rother: We did another submittal 2 weeks ago with a response letter that addressed all the comments on this letter. The only thing that was not addressed was the witnessed soil testing due to scheduling and the weather

Chairman Serotta: We still have a ways to go so we still need to hear from the public hearing and have the public make their comments, we already have Tracy waiting speak and if anyone else wants to just hit your chat button. Any questions from the board?

Dot Wierzbicki: I'm good now that he changed the lots

Jackie Elfers: On the visuals that were taken from Laroe Rd, what were the impacts?

Kirk Rother: We submitted the visuals in July 2020 and that was with the 10 lots so the impact with the 4 lot plan will be substantially less because they are not even visible from the road and will keep buildings below the 25 foot for the ridge overlay.

Jackie Elfers: Okay then I'm good

Mark Roberson: I'm good

Carl D'Antonio: The comments about the ridge overlay and neutral colors answered my questions

Larry Dysinger: I'm good

Chairman Serotta: Okay so let's open the public hearing, let the record reflect all proper mailings have been sent and proper newspaper publications have been made in the Times Herald Record. Public comments can be submitted for 10 days after tonight and public hearing is now officially open; Tracy the floor is yours.

TOWN OF CHESTER
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 4, 2020

Tracy Schuh: I first just wanted to ask some procedural questions, I didn't know if there are standard reports and documents you have before a public hearing. I heard about the storm water pollution plan and I don't know that you got everything back from county planning. I didn't know if there will be a chance to see the comments before the 10 days to be able to submit public comment. I'm very pleased that the owner is not building a really tall house on the ridge line but I'm not clear about where on the ridge line they lie and I do want to ask about the landscaping plan because I do recall that was going to happen. I thought perhaps your landscape consultant might get them sent to her since it is in the overlay and the rain gardens; I don't know if that's in her area of expertise. I know you spoke about well tests at the last meeting about how it works when it goes from a major to a minor subdivision and in a perfect world there's enough water and the water is good but I learned through this process there's a basic sampling that happens versus the OC Dept. of Health standard and was hoping residents that live nearby would be able to give you some insight into the well water there. The other thing was Lot 4 so the 2018 sketch plan saved that sloped vegetation area and when you're coming down Ridge Road it's the only area where there are trees on the site and it looks like they are not going to remain there. I don't know if anyone looked at that any closer because I always want the trees and if there was any way to blend them to what's already there rather than clear them. So in summary, I always advocate for trees and I'm glad the houses are not going to be too high and that's all I have for now, thank you.

Chairman Serotta: Okay, thank you Tracy. I don't see anyone else here to speak I'll take a motion to close the public hearing

Dot Wierzbicki: I'll make a motion to close the public hearing

Larry Dysinger: I'll 2nd

All in favor to close: Yes

Chairman Serotta: Kirk do you want to come back at our December meeting and you have a copy of Tracy's letter and we'll address these things at our next meeting.

Kirk Rother: Is there anything that you and the board are expecting from me as far as the public comments?

Chairman Serotta: Well Tracy brought up a few points and I think we have to address them; the board just got them tonight as well so I think they have to digest them and we'll go over them at the next meeting

Kirk Rother: Okay got it and just so everyone is aware this was sent to OC planning and we got their comments back in December 2019 and it was also sent to OCDPW we got their comments back and responded and are still awaiting their follow up response

Chairman Serotta: Anthony at the highway department prefers you put the swales back a little bit further and I believe he talked to you about his right?

Kirk Rother: Yes, Anthony would like to mimic what we did at Chesterdale which was wide shallow swales and in order to get strength in the pipe by using steel pipes will only

**TOWN OF CHESTER
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 4, 2020**

need about 6” and that was something Anthony and Al Fusco came up with but if plastic is preferred we can use either or.

Chairman Serotta: He also requested to move the swales back and make a shoulder

Kirk Rother: I believe we have already done that, I’ll get this revised plan to Anthony to make sure he sees it and is comfortable with it. As far as the soil test witness should I just contact Fusco office?

John- Fusco Eng: Yes just call the office and talk to Carol or Jim and we’ll coordinate with one of our inspectors to meet you out there.

Kirk Rother: Okay and in regards to the SWPPP for this scenario the SWPPP would only need erosion sediment control plan

John- Fusco Eng: But included in that SWPPP you should also do a notice of intent preferably signed and ready to go so once it’s approved it can be signed and sent to the DEC. You can include the erosion sediment control plan, the SWPPP plan as an attachment, your construction entrances and silt fences and we’d like to see the executed notice of intent included with that.

Chairman Serotta: Okay next on the agenda tonight is the **SAPANARO 1351 KINGS HWY 2** family dwelling and Kirk this one is you again

Kirk Rother: Application is in the LBSL zone approximately .5 acre parcel of land on the west side of Kings Hwy. We had earlier submittals approved for commercial on the first floor and residential on the second but the applicant decided to pursue a 2 family instead given the current economic conditions. We went before the ZBA for the area variance and were granted and we are here tonight for a public hearing. This is a proposed 2 family dwelling with two entrances and each dwelling will be approximately 1500 SF. We have also submitted some renderings showing the materials proposed to be used; the entrances are on a county highway and have been submitted to the OCDPW and Anthony Trochiano has acknowledged receiving but stated he’s very busy. I did speak with him again today and said he still hasn’t had a chance to look at it yet but if the board was so inclined it could be a conditional approval as long as we satisfied his conditions before documents were signed.

Chairman Serotta: We have your renderings so I’ll bring them up now and you and tell us about it

Kirk Rother: The general style is the same, the color changes to burgundy with black roof and we think this color will fit in with the existing buildings in Sugar Loaf; Hardi board and trim with white vinyl windows

Chairman Serotta: Is this the house you’re going to build? You can’t switch anything if this is what we’re approving for architectural review. If you decide to change anything you will have to come before the board again, otherwise I don’t have any other questions and I did get the variance from ZBA. I’ll go the board now for any questions or comments

Jackie Elfers: I’m good with it

**TOWN OF CHESTER
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 4, 2020**

Larry Dysinger: I'm good, I like the colors

Mark Roberson: I'm good

Carl D'Antonio: Looks like a very nice house to me

Dot Wierzbicki: I think it's very nice; will there be a driveway on each side?

Kirk Rother: No will be just one driveway on the left side

Alexa- Bldg Inspector: Does that run on a well because I see the septic tank is in the front

Kirk Rother: There's a septic for solids and it goes into a pump and goes into a force main, I assume there is a well across the street because I don't think there's public water in Sugar Loaf

Chairman Serotta: Does it make a difference with the well across the street with putting in a septic system?

Kirk Rother: I'm pretty comfortable we have the 50 foot clearance

Chairman Serotta: Okay good, John do you want to review your comments now?

John- Fusco Eng: The variance was granted and what was the final answer about the DPW and your approval for the entrances?

Kirk Rother: They are still reviewing but we have no answer as of today

John- Fusco Eng: I have no problem with that; it's a very nice looking home. Al's comment was that you do need approval from the sewer department for the connection that will involve details for the pump station

Chairman Serotta: This also got submitted to OC planning with a local determination but there was one comment about storm water management. What are you doing about that comment Kirk?

Kirk Rother: The run off from the parking area will go to the back lawn and this plan for residential is far less impervious coverage than the approved commercial plan

John- Fusco Eng: That's a federal wetland behind you? That's not a DEC wetland right? So I agree, it's less than .2 acre of disturbance so you're way under the 1 acre threshold, my suggestion would be to keep as much of a grass area between the proposed construction and where it actually hits the wetland so that there's some sort of vegetative treatment going in to the wetland

Chairman Serotta: Another question would be, what about landscaping? I think it would be nice if there were some nice bushes in front

Jackie Elfers: I would say to stay small like Alberta Spruces to dress up the front but not block the line of sight and you should stay close to the house and not along the driveway and with the driveway you could use an impervious payment if you're concerned about the drainage instead of a black top. And you always have to careful with the septic tank there because you don't want to encroach on that

Kirk Rother: Okay, the county won't allow us to put anything with a drip edge in their right of way line

TOWN OF CHESTER
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 4, 2020

Jackie Elfers: I would just stick with Boxwood in the front, it's going to be evergreen and it will stay small

Alexa- Bldg Inspector: I have a question, so to the left of the driveway when looking at the plan, that's the Lycian Theatre's property and they have outdoor seating so is there going to be any plantings to buffer in between the Lycian property and the driveway?

Chairman Serotta: I think it would be more the Lycian responsibility to buffer for the house to not disturb. Let me just cover one thing, this is a simple project but first we have to hear public comments and I'm a little leery to give approval until we get the OCDPW report, I know you contacted them to try and get an answer but that doesn't solve this. Let's move forward to the public hearing, so let the record reflect the mailings were sent out and proper newspaper publishing were ran in the Times Herald Record; so the public hearing is officially open and Tracy you have the floor.

Tracy Schuh: I agree the building is very nice which I think is very important because it's prominent as you enter Sugar Loaf from both directions but I don't know if there's any guidelines the board follows for the historical look of the hamlet. The house needs to be looked at for the historical district and I know the house next door came up on SHPO radar. If you pull up a street scape, to build this house you have to take down a very large tree that's there so I agree with everyone that spoke earlier about landscaping and I thought a tree would be nice somewhere past the driveway in the back. The Lycian center stage was used by the town this summer so I would think a row of trees in that corner would help with the noise barrier. I also don't know if there's any kind of flooding or drainage that's going on in that corner but I want to make sure no pollutants get into the water if there's a waterway to Creamery Pond. I missed the last ZBA meeting but I wanted to bring your attention to the town code for federal wetlands and I don't know if it applies to the Sugar Loaf historic district at all but Chester requires a 25 foot buffer to federal wetlands and calls for no disturbance, I bring this up because not only for this project but you have Oak Woods with a yield plan showing it going through federal wetlands so I just wanted to bring that up; so that's all my comments for now and thank you.

Chairman Serotta: Thank you Tracy, anyone else here to speak? Doesn't look like anyone else is here so I'll take a motion to close the public hearing.

Larry Dysinger: I'll make a motion to close

Dot Wierzbicki: I'll 2nd

All in Favor: Yes

Chairman Serotta: Okay so public hearing is now closed, we could have a quick discussion but I'm still a little uncomfortable to vote for a conditional approval tonight because I would like to see the DPW approval and Tracy raised a few good questions. I'll poll the board and see what they have to say

TOWN OF CHESTER
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 4, 2020

Larry Dysinger: It would have to be conditional pending the DPW and a few other things that were mentioned

Jackie Elfers: I don't want to hold up the project but I think there are a few unanswered things to be addressed

Mark Roberson: Still have a couple loose ends

Carl D'Antonio: I agree the conditions need to be met before any approval

Dot Wierzbicki: I think we should wait for the DPW

Chairman Serotta: Tracy is right about the 25 feet and I'm big on not bringing grass right to the wetland or stream and then dumping Scotts turf builder on it to go right into the water. I think there should definitely be a buffer and 25 feet is not a lot so I think we need to take a look at that, I don't think it will stop Mr. Sapanaro from building but it should be looked at. Also there are no rules for architectural design in the Town of Chester or Sugar Loaf; we really don't have architectural guidelines in Sugar Loaf because it was just never implemented. I don't think we have to hold this to any SHPO guidelines but Kirk I think you need to come back on this for the next meeting in December.

Kirk Rother: Okay thank you all

Chairman Serotta: Next we have **POMEGRANATE SOLUTIONS** on Davidson Drive, it's a proposed 120,000 SF warehouse that would be combining 6 lots into one big parcel and build a warehouse

Chris- Lanc&Tully: Good evening everyone, so you can see the site plan and we've made some big strides in our design. We've revised the lay outs to achieve a more balanced cut through and we raised the parking lot and moved the south entrance to build up the grade which helped with the cut fill. We also added lighting, landscaping, a road profile and some drainage design and we have some preliminary sizing on the frontage of the property. The SWPPP has not been completed yet but we are working on the full SWPPP per Fusco Engineering comments. I also spoke with the highway superintendent; Anthony Laspina and he do not have any problems since it's a private road and my client has accepted to remain private. Anthony did suggest we send it to county so we will be getting that submitted. The endangered species report came back pretty good; the only habitat that could possibly be on the property is the Indiana bat. We are hoping to get soil testing done next week and are working on the septic design as well as the SWPPP

Chairman Serotta: As far as the county, it appears that your property line is only about 1200 feet off Bellvale Rd so this would also trigger the 239 county referral. I have a question about DPW, Davidson Drive I'm assuming was once an approved driveway going out onto county road so you want to make note of that. I'll have to talk to Anthony Trociano about that because you may still need a driveway permit to get in.

**TOWN OF CHESTER
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 4, 2020**

Larry Dysinger: That's an actively used road so I'm not sure it would require anything other than if it's making additional traffic they may want something else

Chairman Serotta: Who owns that road Chris?

Chris-Lanc&Tully: That would be my client

Alexa- Bldg Inspector: Aren't there empty lots across from this?

Chairman Serotta: No these are all DEC swamps, where there are lots are over here by Lake Station Rd. One other question I had from the last meeting was what about the fire access?

Alexa- Bldg Inspector: As long as the building is fully sprinklered then he is okay

Chairman Serotta: Okay so we got the environmental reports they were required to do. Did we do a SHPO to make sure they are no archaeological findings?

Chris-Lan&Tully: I believe in the long EAF it was not flagged as a sensitive area

Dave Donovan: When this parcel was created was Davidson Drive proposed to be a town road?

Chris-Lanc&Tully: Yes I believe it was constructed to town spec

Dave Donovan: So now that it's going to be a private road, Alexa does this satisfy frontage requirements and lot widths?

Alexa- Bldg Inspector: Are they combining all 4 lots and creating one lot

Chairman Serotta: Yes

Dave Donovan: That would be a condition of approval and would actually be done on a county level before Don would sign the map for site plan approval. The other thing is this is a Type I action under SEQRA so we should declare our intent to be lead agency. Chris, please provide with the names and addresses of all involved agencies and a copy of the EAF and a copy of the plans and I'll do the circulation.

Chairman Serotta: Alright so let's review Fusco's comments; John can you take us through it?

John- Fusco Eng: #1 the signed and sealed plan, #2 SWPPP is needed and is there underground storage? That will need to be detailed on the SWPPP. #3 Septic details, #4 Endangered species report, #5 fire lane; so if the building will have a sprinkler system that's great but in a building this size I believe there needs to be a fire lane for a truck.

Alexa- Bldg Inspector: I believe the cut off was under 130,000 SF as long as it was sprinklered then it was okay but I will double check

John- Fusco Eng: #6 the highway superintendents comments; I know it will be a private road but does zoning allow a commercial building this size on a private road? #7 signage details, #8 is the landscape plan acceptable or does it need to be beefed up? #9 we will need an architect rendering on what the building will look like

Chairman Serotta: I don't think the highway superintendent wants anything to do with this. So is this really a road or just a driveway?

Dave Donovan: It looks like the original subdivision map it was intended to be a public road but in this case it's almost like a commercial lot

TOWN OF CHESTER
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 4, 2020

Chairman Serotta: The board does have the capability to set the setbacks and we've done this before so we can work with you. So we'll take a look at that and at what the width is by Davidson Drive by radar. I think we need a nice rendering and get a neutral color in there that will blend in. Any questions or comments from the board?

Jackie Elfers: I agree that the landscape does need to be beefed up and we need a better plan with renderings of the building

Larry Dysinger: I drove down Davidson Drive and the road is very over grown with weeds and there are catch basins missing and only a base course on the road. The owner would have to clean that all up

Chris-Lanc&Tully: Yes, my client has agreed to do a top course on the road and clear all the vegetation

Larry Dysinger: Okay and we will also need the details on lighting

Mark Roberson: Biggest concern would be what the relationship is between Raynor Garage and Pomegranate and who is going to take responsibility for that road

John-Fusco Eng: I'd like to add in that we are going to have to meet with the engineer because he's going to have to do some raised work and paving but as a minimum we are going to require it be bonded so we can ensure this road is safe

Larry Dysinger: We need to make sure it's all documented and agreed it's a private road so they don't come back and ask for maintenance down the road

Carl D'Antonio: I have no comments

Dot Wierzbicki: Raynor has been there for years so I assume he owns part of that road, I'm curious about that and also the rendering

Chairman Serotta: Okay so Chris you have some homework to do and when you're ready to come back just call Julie to get on the agenda. I need a motion for us to declare our intent to be lead agency

Jackie Elfers: I'll make a motion

Larry Dysinger: I'll 2nd

All in Favor: Yes

Chairman Serotta: Chris, get all your paperwork to Dave Donovan for all the agencies and let us know when you're ready to come back.

Last thing on our agenda is **OAK WOODS Subdivision** this is 26 acres on which they want to do a cluster, town code 98:25 talks about in order to do a cluster they first need to do a yield plan to identify what they could possibly build on that property and they need to give us a number.

James- Pietrzak&Pfau: Our design is off Camp Monroe Rd on the border or Monroe & Chester; we are proposing 7 lots but in the cluster will actually be 6 lots. We had been requested to do joint soils with Fusco Engineering and we did that and are now here seeking approval to move forward on the cluster design

**TOWN OF CHESTER
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 4, 2020**

Chairman Serotta: Fusco Engineering witnessed the soil test, so these are federal wetlands and John, the amount of disturbance is minimal on the proposed road from I what I understand so can you chime in here

John-Fusco Eng: The current regulations allow up to one tenth of an acre without having to apply for permit. Anything over one tenth of an acre you are required to submit a formal application before any disturbance occurs. So looks to me like it's less than one tenth of an acre, the road is 24 feet wide so he's clearly under but there is something in Chester's code that prohibits disturbance of wetlands so I guess Dave will have to look into that

Chairman Serotta: Yes that's a big question that needs to be answered; any comments or questions from the board

Dot Wierzbicki: No comments right now

Carl D'Antonio: None for me

Mark Roberson: Not right now

Larry Dysinger: Just be clear what's depicted here is how many lots it will support this is not the cluster plan and that would be something that's forth coming, correct?

James-Pietrzak&Pfau: Yes that is correct

Jackie Elfers: Had the same question as Larry so I'm good

Chairman Serotta: Alright so you need to get some more information and get back to us. The next thing you need when you come back with your cluster plan we need to know where the open space will be but who will own that open space or will it be available to the town and that's the whole reason behind clusters for open space- and open space is always good

James- Pietrzak&Pfau: So are we good to move ahead with the cluster design?

John-Fusco Eng: We are not sure, you've proven you can support the 7 lots but we need the wetlands question before we can move forward

Chairman Serotta: I agree 100 % we need the federal wetlands question to be answered because that could be the hinge here that needs to be resolved

James- Pietrzak&Pfau: Okay I understand what you mean

Chairman Serotta: And the septic's need to be 100 feet from the wetlands I believe

John- Fusco Eng: Yes code says 100 feet from standing water wetlands, if it's just a federal wetland you do not have to be 100 feet from it

Chairman Serotta: I think you need to do your homework and come back for another meeting and we all need to review the code, so get with Julie and let her know if you want to come back on December 2nd.

Lastly for tonight, we have Larry who has been working with the town board on developing a lighting ordinance, so I'll bring that up and we can review it

Larry Dysinger: The proposed lighting ordinances that were submitted in February is a sample of the lighting ordinances that are in place across the United States. We have a growing problem in the town with light pollution and the worst offenders are in

TOWN OF CHESTER
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 4, 2020

industrial park. They have recently been doing more construction which makes more lighting and some are now using LED lights. I think the town needs to have guidelines on what is acceptable for everyone to follow. What's not included in this copy are examples of good and bad lighting but the samples that are attached from a few towns in Long Island do have those examples. I ask that everyone review this and comment, I welcome any comments so hopefully we can pass this and would be beneficial to the town.

Chairman Serotta: I fully support what you want to do and I've said it all along that we need guidelines to follow, so let's take a look at this and review. I'll give you a couple of my comments, page 1 no comments, page 2 on item #A3 lights on poles shall not be taller than the building or 15 feet; I'm not sure if that will always work might be too short.

Larry Dysinger: The intent of that is to keep the light as low as possible to decrease the area you're illuminating

Chairman Serotta: Next question I had is #B1, any light fixture to be placed in such a manner that no light emitting surface is visible from any residential area public, private roadway/walkway or trail at ground level. So first thing that comes to mind is The Rock where that would be a problem and we need to take that into consideration.

Alexa- Bldg Inspector: I get this complaint all the time about flood lights on neighbors housing that the light is trespassing but just because you can see the light doesn't mean its trespassing so it has to be defined better

Chairman Serotta: Page 3 I have no comments, page 4 the temporary outdoor lighting I think about the community concerts and they do lighting and he runs six or seven concerts and not with 180 days apart so I think that needs to be better worded. Down under control of glare #2B we talk about 25 feet any luminary shall be mounted at a maximum height of 25 feet and that caught my eye because first we were talking about 15 feet and this one says 25

Larry Dysinger: It really depends on the area of the town, if you're in the village where things are very close together it's a real issue; if you go into other areas that may have 3 to 5 acre lots then it's less of an issue so it certainly needs clarification.

Alexa- Bldg Inspector: Maybe we should identify it by zone

Chairman Serotta: Yes and I'm just pointing things out that I noticed, it's the 25 feet that I thought could be a problem and needs to be looked at. Also the billboards need clarification on where it says prohibited and hours of operation. And lastly it states in article 5 the code enforcement officer shall distribute a copy of the lighting ordinance to all local electricians; I don't know how we would do this so I question this too. The town code says the planning board needs to make a formal review but it needs to come us in a local law format.

Larry Dysinger: I ask that all suggestion get emailed to me to get back to the town board

**TOWN OF CHESTER
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 4, 2020**

Chairman Serotta: Okay so Larry I hope we helped you and any comments should be sent to Larry; so we'll close for tonight and thank you to everyone

Meeting adjourned 9:38 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Julie Tiller
Planning Board Secretary