

PUBLIC HEARING:

JOHN JAMES CONSTRUCTION
Site Plan
Section 1, Block 4, Lot 10-395
13 Upland Lane
Bibbo Associates
Discussion

This application was removed from the agenda.

BAIRD
Lot Line Change
Section 1, Block 11, Lots 11-6 & 11-15
Jason Lepro – Jay Fain & Associates
Discussion
Consideration of site plan approval

Chairman Michelman read the public notice for the record. Ms. Desimone noted that 32 out of 33 cards were returned and that all paperwork was in order. Chairman Michelman asked if there were any neighbors present and there were not. The Board opened the public hearing and then Chairman Michelman suggested it be adjourned in order to have the applicant supply additional information.

Mr. Delano moved to adjourn the public hearing pending receipt of the additional information. The motion was seconded by Mr. Adelman and unanimously approved.

NEIGHBOR NOTIFICATION & PUBLIC HEARING:

823 MOUNT KISCO ROAD
Site Plan
Section 2, Block 2, Lot 7C
Michael Godbee
Discussion
Consideration of site plan resolution

This application was removed from the agenda.

S&S BUILDING
Site Plan
37 Washington Place East
Section 6, Block 3, Lot 6
Bipin Shah
Discussion

Mr. Delano recused himself from this application. Ms. Alexandra Hofgardner was present on behalf of the applicant. The applicants were also present. She explained that she has completed the calculations required by the code. With respect to the FAR they are under the maximum. She stated that with respect to the lot coverage, she was able to get it under the maximum by reducing the parking lot, removing the path, and some of the paved area leading to the back yard.

Chairman Michelman said that it would be difficult for the Board to approve a plan with no path to the front door. She doubted whether a lot of creative thought was put into this plan. The current plan would require people to walk from the parking lot across the lawn to the front door. Ms. Hofgardner said that she would have liked to make the parking lot smaller, but pointed out that it is as small as it can get. She did not see any other way to reduce the paved surfaces. She explained that they could add a small path that would partially cross the lawn, but a path for the whole length would put them 150' above.

Ms. Desimone pointed out that this was a public hearing and neighbor notification, so the Chairman should read the public notice. Chairman Michelman read the public notice for the record. Ms. Desimone noted that 22 out of 35 cards were returned, one envelope was returned, and that all paperwork was in order. Chairman Michelman asked if there were any neighbors present. Mr. Carmine Amato of 47 Washington Avenue was present. He explained that he lived directly across from the applicant's property.

Chairman Michelman asked Ms. Hofgardner to present a plan for the neighbor's benefit. Ms. Hofgardner presented the rendering and explained it to the neighbor. Mr. Amato asked where the parking access would be. Ms. Hofgardner explained that it would come off of Washington Place East and that there would be new trees and lawn in the back.

Mr. Amato pointed out that the smaller part of the property falls off in that area. Ms. Hofgardner explained that that area is not going to change and that the railroad tie wall will remain. Mr. Amato asked if there was going to be parking on Washington Avenue and Ms. Hofgardner said there would not be. Mr. Amato pointed out that cars park there now. Mr. Kaufman explained the town owns that area, and they are currently working on correcting the problem. Mr. Amato was concerned because he feels there is a problem at the corner and the stone wall across the street has been hit twice. He said that over the years, Washington Avenue has widened and when the wall was built, the road has encroached over to his property. He discussed businesses nearby and was worried about increased traffic in the area because of those businesses. Chairman Michelman pointed out that while this is useful information, it has nothing to do with this application. Mr. Amato said that he had no comments about this property.

Mr. Simonetti asked if it would be possible to put in stepping-stones for a path from the parking lot to the front door without counting toward the figures. Mr. Kaufman explained that anything on the ground is counted for gross land coverage, including pervious pavers and gravel.

Ms. Hofgardner stated that the backup area requested was 36' 9." Mr. Schroeder suggested that area be cut to 35' to see how much the applicant would be able to gain for the walkway. Mr. Kaufman said that he would be comfortable with 32.' The Board

agreed that this appeared to be a solution, and the applicant could put the path back in by reducing the backup area.

Mr. Kaufman explained that the only other point was what should be done with the survey, because the Board was only in possession of the 1904 survey. Ms. Hofgardner explained that they have a new embossed survey that she thought was submitted long ago. Mr. Kaufman said that if that were true, that would solve the problem. He stated that he had a survey that was not sealed or stamped, that referenced the 1904 plan, and no one was named on the survey. If the applicant has the new survey, the Board needs it.

There were no other issues from the Board. Mr. Schroeder pointed out that the applicant still needed to address his issues. Ms. Hofgardner explained that she would address his issues once the site plan is more formalized. Chairman Michelman advised the applicant to begin with the Town Engineer's issues because if there were too many conditions, the Board would not approve a resolution.

Mr. Adelman moved to close the public hearing. Mr. Kaufman interrupted the vote to explain to the Board that once the public hearing was closed, the Board only had 62 days to make a decision. He recommended that the Board request the applicant to waive that time period, before the Board closed the public hearing. The applicant waived the time period.

Mr. Simonetti seconded the motion to close the public hearing, and all members of the Board that were present approved it.

CONTINUING BUSINESS:

MARIANI

Site Plan & Wetland Permit

Section 2, Block 16, Lot 3.A – 45 Bedford Road

Section 2, Block 16, Lot 9-2 – 49 Bedford Road

Dan Hollis, Esq.

Consideration of site plan approval

Present for the application was Mr. Hollis. Mr. Rob Aiello, John Meyer Consulting was also present. Mr. Hollis explained that the approval of the resolution had a discrepancy between the existing resolution of approval and the DOT regulations. The DOT requires a post development study of the intersection so that any improvements to timing could be made based upon the actual conditions.

Mr. Hollis explained that Mr. Aiello had a conversation with the DOT engineer that day, and what will happen is the applicant will submit their analysis to DOT, and the DOT makes a determination as to whether or not the timing adjustments are necessary. If they are necessary, the DOT makes the adjustments, not the applicant.

Therefore, the only issue he has with the resolution is the last sentence of the first paragraph of condition one that discusses that the bond shall remain in effect until it is ultimately released by the approving authority. Mr. Hollis explained that this made it sound like the DOT had authority over when to release the bond. Mr. Kaufman explained that this was not the case; the Board is always the approving body and they are the holder of the bond. Mr. Hollis was comfortable with that, but was still concerned that it could be read differently. Mr. Kaufman suggested, and the Board agreed, to change the language from "the approving body" to "the Town of North Castle."

Mr. Kaufman explained that they had received the letter from the DOT after the Board had approved the resolution and so the Board has had to revise their resolution to deal with that.

Mr. Simonetti asked if this meant that no changes would be made to the plan when completed. Mr. Hollis explained that a study would be conducted after the business has reopened. Mr. Simonetti wanted to know when that study would be conducted, because that would make a difference. He wanted to insure that the study would be conducted during a representative week. Mr. Hollis explained that they would begin the study as soon as the business opens, which would hopefully be in the early spring. He added that it would probably be done over a period of a week. Mr. Aiello explained that the best time might be late May or early June. Mr. Baroni recommended that the study be done when the schools are open. The Board agreed with Mr. Baroni. Mr. Hollis said that they would make sure of this. Mr. Kaufman did not want to include this in the resolution. The Board was comfortable with this being entered on the record and not being included in the resolution.

Mr. Adelman moved to approve the amended site plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Simonetti and unanimously approved.

BELLANTONI
Site Plan
Section 6, Block 8, Lot 15B
142 Lafayette Avenue
Michael Bellantoni
Discussion

Present for the application was Mr. Bellantoni. He explained that they have drawn a clearer plan and has met with the Town Planner and made revisions according to his suggestions.

Mr. Bellantoni stated that one of the suggestions Mr. Kaufman made for the plan was to include two storage trailers. He reminded the Board that he only had one trailer on site, but that the Board recommended that he ask for two in case he needed one in the future. He added that the irrigation trailer has been off the site for 3 months. He noted for the Board that the privet hedge has been there since the beginning and he maintains it.

With respect to the planting, Mr. Bellantoni said that he was not going to build any planting boxes. He stated that his intention was to use the slats on the fence and plant

ivy along there. He felt that this would be aesthetically pleasing, and function better as screening than shrubs.

With respect to the parking mentioned by the Board, Mr. Bellantoni explained that it is not designated parking, and people always park there; whether or not he prevents his employees from doing so. He added that he checked with the police department, and there have not been any recent accidents from people backing up in that area. Chairman Michelman explained that the Board was trying to eliminate an illegal situation, and requested the applicant prevent his employees from parking there. Mr. Bellantoni said that he would. Mr. Simonetti noted that it is not only the issue of the illegal parking, but when the cars are parked there, they protrude into the roadway. He asked if there was any way to populate that space with objects that would prevent any parking there, and he suggested planters. Mr. Kaufman noted that they had discussed this with the applicant. Mr. Baroni explained that the Highway Department would not permit any obstructions in that right of way. Mr. Baroni said that the Board could inquire, but it was his experience that anything within the 50' right-of-way is denied by the Highway Department because it is a potential hazard. Mr. Bellantoni stated that he has taken steps to prevent his employees from parking there, including purchasing the space next door for parking. Mr. Simonetti asked if parking was illegal in that area. Mr. Baroni said that he did not know. Mr. Bellantoni explained that there are no parking signs all down the block, but everyone seems to ignore them.

Chairman Michelman asked Mr. Kaufman if the ivy was acceptable. Mr. Kaufman said that it was up to the Board. Mr. Bellantoni reiterated that there would be less maintenance. Mr. Adelman and Mr. Simonetti liked the ivy.

Mr. Simonetti asked which branch of the Town had jurisdiction of the safety aspect of the parking along the street. Mr. Baroni explained that it was a combination of the Highway Department general foreman, the town insurance risk manager and the Town Engineer.

Mr. Simonetti asked if they could somehow include this restriction. Mr. Kaufman stated that they could determine whether parking is allowed there or not. He said that he would send a letter to the Highway Department superintendent and the Police Department. Mr. Delano felt that the only way that it could be prevented without maintenance is to curb it and he doubted that the Highway Department would support that. Chairman Michelman directed Mr. Kaufman to send the letter.

Chairman Michelman asked Mr. Kaufman what the next step was. Mr. Kaufman explained that the paragraph regarding the hedge should be revised to read "existing hedge." Additionally, they had to include the fact that the applicant has agreed to the condition that his employees cannot park in the right-of-way, and the fence could be planted with ivy. He explained that the Board could adopt a resolution, and noted that the applicant would not need to submit a revised plan until after the resolution.

Mr. Simonetti pointed out that the parking spaces along the road in the side of the applicant's property were completely occupied by stock and plants. He recalled the Board talking about there being limited space on the property for parking, and asked if the applicant was going to devote that space to cars or stock. Mr. Bellantoni explained

that they are devoted to cars, but sometimes the stock ends up there in the interim. Mr. Adelman pointed out that the applicant said that he has enough parking. Mr. Simonetti said that it seems the Board is approving spaces that are not going to be used for parking. Mr. Bellantoni said that he asked at one of the earlier meetings if he could keep those spaces even though that he would not need them, and he was told that he could.

Mr. Simonetti asked how much parking was required for the site. It was discovered that the plans show 6 spaces, but that number was inaccurate as only 4 are required. Mr. Simonetti felt that figure should be adjusted on the plans and Mr. Kaufman agreed.

Mr. Schroeder pointed out that two of the spaces are not the best; the backup area is only 20'. He noted that the remaining four spaces are suitable. Mr. Adelman suggested the applicant show the parking from next door that he acquired. Mr. Bellantoni said that the adjacent property is not tied to the building, and therefore he could not do that. Chairman Michelman pointed out that the applicant was showing 6 spaces; only 4 are required and only 4 work. She suggested that they only show the four better spaces, and then the applicant does not have to worry about using the two on the roadside for stock.

Mr. Delano moved to direct Mr. Kaufman to prepare a resolution in accordance with the discussion. The motion was seconded by Mr. Adelman and unanimously approved.

A public hearing was scheduled for March 12th.

NEW BUSINESS:

ENTWISTLE

Site Plan

Section 1, Block 6, Lot 5B

35 Mianus River Road

Teodoro Siguenza, AIA - Chary & Siguenza Architects

Present for the application was Mr. Teodoro Siguenza, architect. Also present was James O'Reilly of Pool-Scapes and the applicant himself.

Mr. Siguenza presented the site plan and explained the location of the road, the driveway location, the proposed addition of the garage with a master suite and a playroom on top. He explained that in the front, there are three sets of porches; two of which will be screened and the one in the middle will be open.

He said that the numbers in the memo from Mr. Kaufman are inflated; the living spaces total 2,100 sq. ft. and there is 1,200 sq. ft. of proposed additional living spaces on the first floor and 600 sq. ft. on the 2nd floor. Therefore, the total new square footage for the living space is 4,000 sq. ft. plus the three porches, which are 1,200 sq. ft.

Mr. Siguenza explained that the turning radius seems to work well and the Town Planner's recommendation regarding the approach has been reflected on the new plan. The proposed expansion is sensible to the site (and the Board stated this at the site walk). Mr. Siguenza added that they have a tree removal plan, which will be presented to

the Board. He noted that the Board seemed to have had some questions regarding the location of the proposed pool. He explained that most of the pool is outside of the steep slope area.

He recognized that the Board wanted the applicant to shift the pool slightly, but the applicant feels strongly about the proposed location. He explained they have revised the plans, which he feels is a compromise between the Town's suggestion and the applicant's desires. He presented the new proposed pool location, and explained it to the Board. Instead of moving it, they rotated it and are now moving away from any activity in the steep slope. However, instead of the pool being in the slope, they are proposing having a water slide coming down from the steep slope. He explained that this would create a very small disturbance to the steep slope and that the pool would not have any impact. The Board asked how large the slide would be, and Mr. Siguenza said that it is 30" wide and 25' long. He said that they would not blast, just move some boulders and some earth. Mr. Kaufman asked if the design had been prepared, and Mr. Siguenza said that they have prepared a conceptual plan. Mr. Schroeder pointed out that there would have to be steps to get to the top of the slide. Mr. Siguenza stated that he would use stones as steps to the top. Mr. Adelman asked about fencing, and Mr. Siguenza said that would be discussed. The Board pointed out that the steps, the slide and the fence would be the chief disturbance to the steep slope area.

The applicant said that the idea is to create a natural water slide for the children. This would be a plastic, natural colored slide that would rest into or right next to the ground, and steps would not be concrete; they would make them as natural as possible. The slope area is not visible from anywhere else and that was why they want to keep the pool in that area; it would prevent the necessity of privacy screening. With respect to the fencing, they would use a post fence and make it as inconspicuous as possible.

Mr. Simonetti asked if there would be water running from the top. The applicant's representative said there would be, but it would come from underneath the slide area.

The Board stated that the plan sounds nice, but they need to see the details in order to make a determination. Mr. Siguenza asked for a general feeling of the Board prior to submitting the details, and the Board said they could not do that.

Mr. Kaufman stated that the Board needed the information for the plan. He said that the applicant could place the pool anywhere they wanted to as long as there was no disturbance to the steep slope. Mr. Kaufman explained that the Board needed to know how the applicant planned to disturb the hillside. The schematic was not enough to determine what the applicant was proposing.

Mr. Kaufman asked the Board if they had any issues with the location of the proposed additions. Chairman Michelman pointed out that the house is very visible from Mianus River Road. It is up on a ledge, and she had concerns about that. She pointed out that the proposal is beautiful, but the length of the home will be more overwhelming once completed. Mr. Siguenza explained that they have been before the ARB, and that Board is in favor of the plan. Chairman Michelman asked if they had received approval from the ARB. Mr. Siguenza said they had, and the Board requested a copy of that approval.

Mr. Siguenza pointed out that one reason the garage was turned on an angle was to reduce the appearance of the length from the road. Now when coming down the road, people will see something of interest rather than a garage structure.

Mr. Kaufman explained that everything else the Board has requested is straightforward. He advised the applicant that the revised plans had to be submitted prior to scheduling neighbor notification.

Mr. Siguenza said that he has researched the records to find the comparisons for the surrounding 5 homes. He believed they would only be 50% over. Mr. Kaufman advised the applicant to submit that information and for the Board to review it.

Peter Limberg, Conservation Board representative, asked how large the trees are that will be removed. Mr. Siguenza presented data from the landscape architect, which he explained to Mr. Lindbergh. Mr. Schroeder stated that once the grading is proposed, some additional trees might have to come out. Mr. Siguenza said that they are anticipating having 5 trees removed, none of which are greater than 22 1/2 inches.

Mr. Delano asked where the applicant's well is located, and the applicant explained that it is on the driveway side of the lot. Mr. Delano asked if the applicant has submitted plans to the Health Department. Mr. Siguenza said that they will; this is currently a four-bedroom residence and it will remain four bedrooms.

There were no other comments.

IRVINGTON BUILDERS

Site Plan

Section 2, Block 3, Lot 2-9

9 Hollow Ridge

Barry Naderman, PE – Naderman Land Planning & Engineering

Present for the application was Mr. Barry Naderman on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Naderman explained that they were before the Board for an amended site plan. He said the Board granted prior site plan approval for a pool sited in the rear yard (Mr. Naderman indicated the prior proposed location). He explained that the applicant was now proposing to shift the pool (as indicated). Additionally, they squared off patio and provided driveway entry piers and stepping-stones.

Mr. Naderman said that at the site walk, the field was staked incorrectly, and was approximately 10' off. He said that he would provide revised site plans to reflect that. He noted that the plan calls for the removal of three additional trees that were identified in the table. There are "spindly" trees and a 24" tree that will probably also have to be removed. They are going to maintain the heavy screening along the side.

Chairman Michelman asked Mr. Baroni if the applicant had to go through the entire neighbor notification and public hearing process because they were dealing with an

amended site plan. Mr. Baroni said that if the Board deemed it as a substantial change, then they would.

Mr. Simonetti asked how far the pool was moving. Mr. Naderman said that it was moving 50 feet. Mr. Simonetti asked if it was moving materially closer to any neighbor or the street and Mr. Naderman said that it was not. Mr. Kaufman said that the current proposal is the better location.

Mr. Kaufman pointed out that whether or not it was deemed a substantial change, a public hearing was needed for the special permit.

Mr. Naderman pointed out that there was no increase in the land coverage from the initial site plan. Mr. Kaufman acknowledged this, but said that due to the new law that regulates land coverage, a permit is required. If we're already having the public hearing for the special permit, the same people have to be noticed for a neighbor notification, so they might as well schedule one at the same time. A public hearing was scheduled for March 12th.

Mr. Simonetti asked if there was any way to get around this useless administrative step. He asked if the Board could simply issue the special use permit without a public hearing. Mr. Kaufman explained that would be illegal. Mr. Naderman reiterated that if there would be any way around it, it would be the fact that there is no change in the coverage from the prior site plan. Mr. Kaufman said that it did not matter.

Mr. Naderman stated that he would address the comments in the memo. He asked if he could have a resolution for the same meeting. The Board agreed.

TOLZ / NAGLE
Lot Line Change
Section 2, Block 5C, Lot 5C (Tolz)
Section 2, Block 5C, Lot 4 (Nagle)
104 & 92 Byram Ridge Road
Discussion

Mr. Tolz was present for the application. He said that the Board already has a copy of the site plan. He presented the original site plan from 1997, and said that he would just go through Mr. Kaufman's comments.

Mr. Kaufman quickly went through the more minor comments. He said that with respect to comment #1, the applicant just needed to correct them and he said that he would. Comment number #2 the applicant needed to compile the information, and the applicant said that he would. Comment #3, the applicant needed to add the existing structures on the Nagle lot to the plan. Comment #5 was just a clarification because the shape of Nagle lot on the applicant's plans does not match the Town's plans. Mr. Tolz said that he would try to resolve that. He asked which plan trumps and Mr. Kaufman said that it should be based upon the applicant's survey.

Mr. Kaufman explained that the real issue was comment #4 concerning the well. Mr. Tolz said that the well and the property he is acquiring are two separate issues. The property he is purchasing does not have the well on it. The well functions, and Mr. Nagle doesn't want to move it. Mr. Tolz did not see the connection. Mr. Kaufman explained that, currently either side of Indian Trail is owned by Mr. Nagle. What is proposed is a transfer of land; the southern side will stay with Mr. Nagle and the northern side would be transferred to Mr. Tolz. However, the line runs parallel to Indian Trail with a notch cut into it for the well. Mr. Kaufman recommends having a straight line and a transfer of the well. Mr. Schroeder agreed.

Mr. Tolz stated that Mr. Nagle's property has a line that comes out of it now. While he would like to do straight lines, he did not believe this was a requirement. Mr. Kaufman corrected him, and pointed out that it is a requirement although one the Board can waive.

Chairman Michelman agreed with the professionals and pointed out that it was a very small notch with no easements attached. She noted that if, at some point, there are problems with the well, it would not be able to be worked on with any equipment due to the way it is set up. This creates a very significant potential problem that could be resolved by not creating the cut out.

Mr. Schroeder suggested pushing the lot line back behind the well. Mr. Tolz said that the only problem with that is that, in the future he plans to construct a garage near there, and if the line is made straight, the garage would be forced closer to the house, creating a larger shadow on the house. He said that he would be happy to put up a fence to delineate exactly where the notch is, if that would satisfy the Board.

Mr. Simonetti asked how large the notch would be and Mr. Tolz said that it is approximately 9x10. He said that, according to the Health Department, the notch was supposed to be a 10' radius, but Mr. Kaufman wanted it square.

Mr. Adelman felt that this issued boiled down to having a straight line or drilling a new well. Mr. Schroeder said there was a third suggestion – asking him to push the line back. Mr. Adelman said that since the applicant is not in favor of that, there are really only two options. He added that, given the cost of a well, he does not think the notch is grievous. Mr. Simonetti agreed.

Chairman Michelman asked how the applicant proposed accessing the well. At this point multiple discussions were had.

Mr. Delano asked how large the notch was. Mr. Tolz said that it was 20' wide and 10' on either side. Mr. Delano pointed out that this is inadequate by Health Department standards because it has to be 10' from any property line. Therefore, if the Board goes with the notch, it would have to be adjusted.

Mr. Simonetti asked how much a new well would be. The applicant said that it could be a lot, depending on how deep they had to go. Mr. Simonetti felt that with the adjustments

for the Health Department, the applicant should be permitted to do the notch. He felt that there would be no harm to the environment and no safety hazards.

Mr. Simonetti asked if Mr. Nagle was "on board with this." Mr. Tolz said he was. Mr. Adelman, Mr. Delano and Mr. Simonetti were in favor of the notch.

Mr. Kaufman said that additional information was needed, and then a public hearing was needed. The applicant asked if a resolution could be prepared at the same time. Mr. Kaufman said that they could not schedule a public hearing and resolution until the Board receives the necessary information. Mr. Tolz said that his agreement with Mr. Nagle is expiring shortly. Mr. Kaufman said that the Board would review it as soon as they could after it received the additional information.

HAMMOND RIDGE LOT #21
Amended Site Plan
Section 2, Block 4, Lot 1-19
61 Sarles Street
Discussion
Frank Arturi – VP Bayswater Dev. LLC
Discussion

Present for the application was Mr. Daniel Donohue, P.E. He explained that they were applying for an amended site plan for lot 21 in the Hammond Ridge subdivision. There are three items we're seeking approval for.

Mr. Donohue explained that the infiltration trench that was shown on the original subdivision extends in one direction toward the property line. The contractor found that there is a ditch in that area, and the trench would run through where the infiltration trench would be, so they relocated it. He pointed out that it is the same area and volume as the original infiltration trench.

The applicant also is seeking approval for a 46x16 deck and to extend the driveway by 150 sq. ft.

He asked if there were questions. Chairman Michelman asked Mr. Schroeder about the infiltration trench. Mr. Schroeder explained that we talked in field about having additional test and perc holes done, and he believed the applicant agreed to that. Mr. Donohue said that the septic system is approximately 60' from the proposed trench. He said that they are fairly close together, and he would like to use the same data. Mr. Schroeder said that he preferred separate tests holes. Mr. Kaufman suggested making it a condition of approval.

Mr. Donohue said that everything else on the site has been constructed. He asked if he needed to address these items before going back to the Building Department. Mr. Kaufman said that it be made a condition of the C.O. Mr. Schroeder asked what would happen if it doesn't work. Mr. Delano pointed out that he could build the trench in the location he has approval for. Mr. Kaufman added that if there is a problem, it could be

addressed at that time. Mr. Schroeder was comfortable with this and he'd work with the applicant right before the C.O.

Mr. Kaufman said that he had no issues with the deck or the driveway; the Board said they did not have any issues either. Chairman Michelman asked if the increase of impervious surface would have any impact on the infiltration. Mr. Schroeder said that it would not have any impact.

Mr. Kaufman said that this application had to be referred to the County because the site is adjacent to the Town of New Castle. He said that they would have to wait at least 30 days for that Town's response, and then we could schedule neighbor notification, unless the Board thinks it is insubstantial, and then they could waive the neighbor notification. The Board felt that this was not substantial, so no neighbor notification was required.

Mr. Kaufman reminded the applicant to submit the worksheets to comply with new Town regulations. He said that if a special permit would be needed, then a public hearing would be necessary. Mr. Donohue said that the erosion controls are basically the same. Nothing has changed.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.
