

STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ROCKLAND

TOWN OF STONY POINT : PLANNING BOARD

- - - - - X

TOWN BOARD CODE REFERRAL PROPOSED
LOCAL LAW TO AMEND CHAPTER 215 OF
STONY POINT TOWN CODE

- - - - - X

Town of Stony Point
19 Clubhouse Lane
Stony Point, New York
December 11, 2025
7:18 p.m.

BEFORE:

MARK JOHNSON, CHAIRMAN
ROLAND BIEHLE, BOARD MEMBER
MICHAEL FERGUSON, BOARD MEMBER
ERIC JASLOW, BOARD MEMBER
JAMES PURCELL, BOARD MEMBER
JERRY ROGERS, BOARD MEMBER

ROCKLAND & ORANGE REPORTING
2 Congers Road, Suite 2
New City, New York 10956
(845) 634-4200

1 | Proceedings

3 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: The Town Board code
4 referred to the Planning Board. I think that
5 would be you, Max.

6 MR. STACH: Yeah. So I mean basically,
7 what happened is the Town was concerned about
8 out of character, very large homes being
9 proposed in established neighborhoods. We're
10 talking about neighborhoods that have 6,000
11 square foot homes, and people were proposing
12 double digits, 12,000 square foot on similar
13 lot sizes. And they raised some questions,
14 why was this even permissible under the code.
15 The code allows FARs of .4, which means
16 you're going to have on one acre lot, 16,000
17 square foot home which, it's just not what we
18 see in Stony Point, right.

19 So the first sort of flush thought of it
20 was, well, let's fix the FARs. Let's make
21 them more reasonable for the areas. My firm
22 ran a GIS analysis using the County GIS
23 system to see what are the actual FARs,
24 because we can get the square footages from
25 the tax records, and we can get the lot area

1 | Proceedings

2 from the County GIS.

3 And they're all over the place. That's,
4 this is part of the problem because there's
5 areas -- Stony Point doesn't have a lot of
6 zoning districts. It's mostly R1 and RR.

7 And you know, there's couple of other ones,
8 but.

9 And there are areas of R1 that are very
10 different from other areas of R1. So there
11 might be areas in the Town where an FAR of .3
12 might be appropriate. Of an RR district in
13 the Town where a .3 might be appropriate.
14 And there are areas of the Town in the R1
15 where might be .1 would be appropriate. So
16 it's kind of difficult to come up with a fit
17 all FAR.

18 So the idea, the strategy that we came
19 up with is if you meet, if you exceed certain
20 FAR standards or certain total home size
21 standards, to come to this Board for a
22 special use permit -- I'm sorry, conditional
23 use permit. It would be as a Planning Board,
24 you're allowed to exercise your discretion to
25 make judgments on whether something's

1 | Proceedings

2 compatible.

3 So that's sort of where we ended up. We
4 proposed it to the full Town Board. A public
5 hearing came up. Bill Sheehan spoke. He had
6 some concerns about the cost of these
7 applications because some of these could be
8 very simple applications, but now they're
9 being subjected to Planning Board review.
10 Generally, single-family homes and additions
11 and things like that are not subject to
12 Planning Board review because you don't want
13 to necessarily run up big costs for those
14 reviews.

15 So he had suggested we take a look at, I
16 think the FAR again. I think the Town Board
17 was very sympathetic to the idea, that they
18 didn't want these costs built up on these
19 projects. So we kind of were going to maybe
20 take another look at it. And I think at that
21 point, John took it over and has been trying
22 his hand at fixing it up a little bit.

23 So what you have before you is no
24 longer, I think, under consideration by the
25 Town Board. There will be some changes. I

1 | Proceedings

2 think the idea behind making it a conditional
3 use was sort of a stop gap so that we could
4 get rid of this moratorium that we have. But
5 I think after considering it further, the
6 Town Board felt maybe it makes sense to
7 extend the moratorium and to come up with a
8 more permanent fix now rather than waiting
9 and doing a sort of stop gap.

10 So I think that's what we are. I
11 believe the Town Board is considering a
12 moratorium extension of four months while
13 this gets figured out. I think John is
14 really taking the lead now at fixing up the
15 zoning. And maybe he could fill you in a
16 little bit more.

17 MR. HAGER: Yes. Max's summary is
18 pretty good, pretty thorough. I spent some
19 time with it. It will be -- Max will get a
20 look at it again before it gets presented
21 again to the Town Board.

22 We're kind of back to looking at floor
23 area ratios. That requires the revised
24 version of this to be re-noticed at the Town
25 Board level because now it's not going to be

11 At first, it seemed like we would scrap
12 the idea of having a strict requirement to
13 refer to the Planning Board for conditional
14 use, and rely strictly on floor area ratios
15 and use of the Zoning Board of Appeals as an
16 avenue for the public to get informed of
17 public hearings. But as I looked at it, I
18 recognized that a lot of what was already put
19 into this code can still be used as
20 irrelevant. So far, the folks that have been
21 involved all seem to be in agreement that at
22 some point, a certain size home should get
23 referred to this Board.

24 So trying to balance the ability for
25 somebody to come in with kind of more as

12 But what became apparent was that many
13 existing homes also are considered, they're
14 not conforming lots. They preexist. And it
15 was never the intention to have every
16 addition that somebody wants to do end up at
17 the Planning Board for a conditional use
18 permit.

19 So that's what we had to look at. We're
20 trying to figure out how we can exempt a lot
21 of that stuff, but not exempt really large
22 homes that really need this kind of
23 oversight.

24 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Good luck.

25 MR. HAGER: So that's where we're at.

1 | Proceedings

2 We're kind of -- within the next week or two,
3 I'm hoping to get this far enough along to
4 get it to Max. And then I know we're getting
5 into the holiday season. So the goal is to
6 hopefully introduce the new version at the
7 first Board meeting in January. And the
8 second Board meeting in January.

9 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Will that be when
10 they extend the moratorium?

11 MR. HAGER: That will be at the second
12 meeting in January. The moratorium is set to
13 expire by the end of January unless they
14 extend it. So they'll extend it at one of
15 those two meetings in January.

16 So in the meantime, I have some
17 information I can hand out here that might be
18 helpful to you guys in the meantime. So I'll
19 hand that stuff out right now.

20 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you very much.

21 MR. HAGER: So the table that I handed
22 out, I took a similar approach from a
23 different Max. Max had looked at mappings.
24 I simply did some math and saying, you know,
25 reach of use groups. The first column is

1 | Proceedings

2 showing a use group. Second column showing
3 the minimum lot areas associated with those
4 use groups. And then I just did the
5 calculation per .4 floor area ratio to .2,
6 .15, and .10. And I mentioned over on the
7 right side kind of which zone they would be
8 associated with.

9 So it became apparent that a 15 percent,
10 .15 floor area ratio is not unreasonable in
11 most instances if that were to be to the
12 standard. And anything that exceeds that
13 would end up referred for a zoning variance.
14 So that was one way of handling this.

15 And then the other graphic I gave you is
16 just something I downloaded easily from
17 Google or whatever, and it just gives an idea
18 that, you know, the size of housing has
19 increased steadily but seems to have leveled
20 off recently. So it seems to indicate that
21 there shouldn't really be an expectation that
22 people are going to continue to want to see
23 bigger and bigger homes.

24 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Well, except
25 certain people moving into the neighbourhood

1 Proceedings

2 that want bigger homes.

3 MR. HAGER: Well, let's say average
4 people are not seeking bigger and bigger
5 homes. It kind of seems like it peaked
6 around 2005, leveled off. And maybe Max has
7 more information than I do on that, or what
8 the demographics, whether there's an
9 expectation to see house sizes continue to
10 stay, you know, flat like that, or if there's
11 an expectation that they would go up or down.

12 So, but again, going through this, it
13 seems like still even with these floor area
14 ratios and the fact that, you know, in
15 certain cases you'd go to the Zoning Board of
16 Appeals, I still think it's valuable to leave
17 in the code that over a certain size still
18 triggers a Planning Board review so that we,
19 you know, in extreme cases, it does come to
20 Planning. So it would probably end up at
21 Zoning and Planning in some cases. So there
22 would proper oversight to make sure that the
23 projects are reviewed. And, you know, the
24 public would have availability to participate
25 in that review.

1 Proceedings

2 So that's where we're at currently. I'm
3 going to try to wrap that up soon. And then
4 Max and I will get together on it and polish
5 it up before it goes to the Town Board.

6 So there's a few things in the code that
7 seem to be obsolete. And I think that it
8 might be a good time to polish some of that
9 up at this time. There's some, you know,
10 there's dual tables that were set up at one
11 time that seemed to have expired. So right
12 now, it's creating confusion. And there's
13 references to 60 year old maps that are more
14 or less obsolete. So that's something that
15 Max is going to look into as well.

16 So I guess the bottom line is that what
17 you're reviewing or have already reviewed is
18 not totally irrelevant. But it's not going
19 to be exactly that. It ends up they'll make
20 written comments, and that probably won't
21 come until probably your January meeting.
22 Maybe later than that. Do you have anything
23 to add, Max?

24 MR. STACH: Not really. I think we
25 talked about it all. You'll see where, you

1 Proceedings

2 know, the next iteration of this. Again, I
3 think it's the biggest issue is these zoning
4 districts that we think of as being similar
5 aren't similar. There's areas of R1 that
6 have 15,000 square foot lots, and there's
7 areas of R1 that are all one acre lots.

8 So how do you prescribe the same
9 standard, you know, when, you know, there are
10 15,000 square foot lots with 1800 square foot
11 homes. And then there's neighborhoods of one
12 acre lots with, you know, 2500 square foot
13 homes. And they're drastically different
14 FARs to control that, right. The one acre
15 home, if you have a 3,000 square foot house,
16 you know, I'll do to the engineer. That's --
17 what is that?

18 MR. HONAN: Quick, what is that?

19 MR. QUEENAN: One acre, 43,000 square
20 feet, roughly.

21 MR. STACH: 3,000 divided by 40,000
22 square feet, right, is your FAR of .075,
23 right. And if you have an 1800 square foot
24 home on a 15,000 square foot lot, you're at a
25 .12, right. So it's significantly higher.

1 Proceedings

2 But they're all R1. So it's very hard
3 to then recommend a standard for the R1
4 district. That's really, I think, what the
5 issue is.

6 And as John showed here, we have
7 different use groups in certain districts
8 according to whether or not they have water
9 and sewer, and what kind of soils they're on.
10 And it gets very complicated. And you know,
11 the real answer to this, the Town is looking
12 to get a comp plan done, is to take a look at
13 what you have and set the bulk requirements
14 around what's already there.

15 BOARD MEMBER PURCELL: Well, I don't
16 know personally why they just don't do that
17 all in one instead of nitpicking and doing
18 this little by little. I've suggested that
19 many, many times to do that. Kick the can
20 down the road. This is the time to stop
21 kicking the can. They actually should do a
22 full one year moratorium and get it all over
23 with. Spend the money, spend the time, bang
24 it out, set a deadline, get it done. Because
25 this will just continue to be chipped at,

1 Proceedings

2 chipped at, and at the end of the day,
3 doesn't get resolved.

4 There's more than just the zoning here.
5 It's quality of life issues that revolve all
6 around these potential growth spurts that we
7 could have as we see in the southern end of
8 the county. Let's not fool ourselves. So
9 that's, to me it's a waste of time and money
10 to do a four month stop gap again and maybe
11 not resolve this one issue. I mean, Max,
12 you're the planner. You know we've done this
13 before. We've worked, and it's a lot of
14 work. But to me, it's just the Town Board
15 spinning its wheels.

16 MR. STACH: I think again, the idea is
17 sort of stick your finger in the dike.

18 BOARD MEMBER PURCELL: I get that.

19 MR. STACH: And then fix the dike.
20 Because it's going to take a year, right.
21 And you don't want the water coming through
22 while it's --

23 BOARD MEMBER PURCELL: But you put the
24 moratorium in for a year now. I mean, I
25 don't know if you can. There's already --

1 Proceedings

2 they're going to go through six months
3 already.

4 MR. STACH: Yeah.

5 BOARD MEMBER PURCELL: I don't know how
6 the County feels on, you know, doing other --
7 you do a year, it will be a year and a half
8 moratorium. But if you get nothing
9 accomplished, people are going to have a fit.

10 MR. STACH: Yeah. Well, I think we made
11 an effort, you know. I think we've been --
12 it's not like we've been sitting here. We've
13 been trying to figure out --

14 BOARD MEMBER PURCELL: No, no. I'm
15 aware of that. But the Board should just put
16 the halt on it right away for a year.

17 MR. STACH: Yeah.

18 BOARD MEMBER PURCELL: Because it's
19 bigger than a dike.

20 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Do we know where -- I
21 mean, the Town Board is changing very soon.
22 Do we know where they stand with the incoming
23 supervisor?

24 MR. STACH: The incoming supervisor
25 wants to do a comp plan.

1 Proceedings

2 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay.

3 MR. STACH: Yeah. No question.

4 BOARD MEMBER PURCELL: She made mention
5 of it, so.

6 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Can we as the
7 Planning Board go to the Town Board and
8 ask -- you know, no disrespect to John, but
9 this is what Max does. I mean, he does it
10 for all the towns, writing codes like this.
11 Why aren't they having Max do it?

12 BOARD MEMBER PURCELL: Well, it's even
13 bigger than that, Eric. It should involve
14 the Zoning Board, Planning Board, engineer,
15 John and Max. All of us sitting down, having
16 discussions and meetings.

17 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: So can we as the
18 Planning Board go to the Town Board and bring
19 this up?

20 MR. STACH: Yes. I think that's the
21 answer.

22 BOARD MEMBER PURCELL: Mark can speak to
23 Amy. And Mark can speak to Amy and say look,
24 we have concerns we'd like to, you know, talk
25 to you guys about.

1 Proceedings

2 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: And have her come
3 to a meeting, and executive session, and do
4 it. Because I mean, it doesn't sound like
5 we're, they're going to do the maximum to get
6 things right.

7 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Right.

8 BOARD MEMBER PURCELL: John is trying
9 his best to put his finger in a dike right
10 now.

11 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: It's a band aid on a
12 bullet hole at this point.

13 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Right.

14 MR. HAGER: The code was written by Max.
15 And they're not asking me to write the code.
16 They're just having me react to some of the
17 public comment that was received.

18 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Right.

19 MR. HAGER: And then I'm taking the stab
20 at this, and then we'll consult with Max once
21 we get it in a format. So this is
22 essentially Max's. He crafted this, the
23 original draft that did go through some
24 revisions. So it will continue to go through
25 some revisions.

1 Proceedings

2 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: I just don't
3 understand why they took it away, that's all.

4 MR. HAGER: Took it away from?

5 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: From Max, the
6 planner, passing it on to you.

7 MR. HAGER: Nothing has been taken away
8 from anybody. Max and I are working as a
9 team on this.

10 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Okay.

11 MR. HAGER: So as far as the commentary,
12 if you guys, you know, feel that you want to
13 reemphasize that the master plan or the
14 comprehensive plan needs to be forefront,
15 then that's probably something you should put
16 in your commentary.

17 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Yeah, definitely.

18 MR. HAGER: Do you agree, Max?

19 MR. STACH: Yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And do you see any
21 issues with that, Steve?

22 MR. HONAN: No. I mean, we've got to
23 figure out what the -- it's up to the Town
24 Board, what they really want to do. And you
25 know, it's financial as well.

1 Proceedings

2 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Right.

3 MR. HONAN: So the question is if
4 they're ready to pull the trigger, I think
5 they're going to ask the Planning Board for
6 all its thoughts or have joint meetings.

7 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: That's good.

8 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: All right. Maybe
9 I'll reach out to -- well, I have to wait
10 until she's in. But I'll reach out to Amy.

11 MR. HONAN: Right.

12 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: It's only a couple
13 weeks.

14 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: What's that?

15 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: In a couple weeks.

16 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yeah. All right.

17 BOARD MEMBER PURCELL: Going to be
18 quick.

19 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Do you have any other
20 commentary on this, John?

21 MR. QUEENAN: Not my --

22 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: That's not your job.
23 All right, cool.

24 BOARD MEMBER PURCELL: Not at this
25 point.

1 | Proceedings

2 MR. QUEENAN: Not for the record.

3 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you very much,
4 guys. Appreciate it.

5 MR. HAGER: H1 is a single-family home.

6 H2 is a two-family home, I want to say in the
7 R1 district. Over in that right side column,
8 they mention R1 district. RR is one-family.
9 I think two is -- I don't think they allow a
10 two-family in RR. But one is with water and
11 sewer, one is without. The larger lot sizes
12 don't have water and sewer. And if you have
13 one or the other, you get a discount on the
14 smaller lot size. So those are --

15 MR. STACH: E4 I think is if you have
16 water and sewer, and you're on certain soils,
17 but you have to get a conditional use permit.
18 Right, that one.

19 MR. HAGER: I have a use table that
20 this --

21 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: All right. I was
22 just curious.

23 MR. HAGER: Yeah. So that's what those
24 are associated with. Generally, the R1 does
25 allow a two-family house, but you need a

1 Proceedings

2 larger lot size to do it. So there's not too
3 many lots that meet that. So most people
4 that wanted a two-family use in the R1
5 district would have to get a variance for the
6 two-family use. Not a use variance, but an
7 area answerer for the lot size. Plus, they'd
8 have to come to this Board for a conditional
9 use permit. Two-family is a conditional use
10 permit in the R1.

11 The RR district, which is the, you know,
12 the north stuff up on the hills and the
13 larger lots, where there's less sewer and
14 water available, they don't even recognize
15 two-family use in that district. So there
16 would have to be a use variance if they
17 wanted that. And most use variances are not
18 easy to obtain.

19 So that's something that will probably
20 be talked about when the comprehensive plan
21 is considered is whether this Town wants to
22 recognize any two-family use in that zone, or
23 any kind of accessory apartments that many
24 towns have. The standards don't currently
25 recognize that, either.

1 | Proceedings

2 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: So what would
3 trigger someone having to come before the
4 Planning Board?

5 MR. HAGER: Currently, for a one-family
6 house, I don't think any of them trigger,
7 other than that map I mentioned that's
8 obsolete.

9 | BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Right.

10 MR. HAGER: That map came out in the
11 original master plan, which was published in
12 1973, '72, something like that. The map was
13 probably even older than that.

14 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And that's the last
15 master plan?

16 MR. STACH: No, the last one was '94.

17 MR. HAGER: The map was revised. That
18 map appeared again in '95.

19 | CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay.

20 MR. HAGER: So it mentions development
21 difficulties, is it, or development
22 limitations. So it was based on soil types,
23 topography, availability of water and sewer,
24 a bunch of characteristics that made some
25 difference in how they classified what size

1 | Proceedings

2 lots would be allowed and what kind of things
3 would be allowed. That map is still
4 referenced in our code, but it's pretty much
5 obsolete. There's been so many changes over
6 the last 55, 60 years that it's not really
7 relevant anymore. So that's another area we
8 want to look at, is whether we should even
9 reference that map any more.

10 There's other criteria to point to in
11 referencing that map. So there is one
12 criteria there that does kick a one-family
13 into conditional use, and that happened to be
14 in play on the one project that did, got
15 referred to you guys. I don't think you ever
16 did see it because the applicant chose to
17 appeal that decision.

18 So my review, with help from the Town's
19 engineer, was that we couldn't go straight
20 for a building permit on it because it fell
21 into that geographic area from that 1972 map.
22 And a letter went out saying we can't issue a
23 building permit until you go through Planning
24 Board, site plan, conditional use permit.
25 That particular applicant, instead of coming

1 | Proceedings

2 to this Board directly, decided they would
3 appeal that to the Zoning Board of Appeals to
4 see if they agreed with the Building
5 Department's interpretation.

6 They went through that process. The
7 Zoning Board of Appeals came to the same
8 conclusion that I did, that it does require
9 in that circumstance to come to the Planning
10 Board. They still haven't made that
11 application to you guys.

12 So in the meantime, even if they came to
13 you, since they're over that size threshold
14 the moratorium established, you guys wouldn't
15 be able to process their application. So
16 right now, that's one of two projects that in
17 this Town that are being impacted by
18 moratorium, and will continue to be impacted
19 if they extend the moratorium.

20 So the moratorium, a lot of people might
21 think that it's like a, it's impacting all
22 the building permits, but it's not. It's a
23 very narrow area, right, of building permits
24 if they come in and they exceed these
25 thresholds, or they come into the

1 Proceedings
2 definitions, which the proposed code will
3 have, will define definitions. But it has
4 some size thresholds. That's what the
5 moratorium is preventing, processing of
6 applications.

7 The other one is the, they're not so
8 much large size houses, but they're maybe
9 average size houses, but they're on undersize
10 lots. So it's similar scenarios. So those
11 two items are trying to be addressed in the
12 code so that there's more oversight in both
13 scenarios.

14 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And there are the two
15 items that are listed for this code change,
16 right?

17 MR. STACH: Yeah.

18 MR. HAGER: Correct.

19 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: So it's oversize.

20 MR. HAGER: Well, one is listed, right.
21 Until now, now we're again looking at, well,
22 maybe it's just better to globally, over the
23 whole zoning code, change these floor area
24 ratios from 40 percent. .40 floor area ratio
25 was a pretty easy code to achieve, right.

1 | Proceedings

2 Almost, you almost don't even have to do the
3 calculations, given it's going to meet that
4 floor area ratio.

5 MR. STACH: Might as well not have one
6 if you're going to have .4.

7 MR. HAGER: So by this proposed dropping
8 it down 15 percent, well, now maybe it's a
9 little on the low side, right. Maybe the
10 number ends up being, would be somewhere
11 between 15 and 40. This is a starting point
12 of having discussion, right.

13 But at 15 percent, many will still be
14 able to be permitted without being referred
15 to the Zoning Board of Appeals. But more
16 than a few would have to get referred for a
17 variance. Is that necessarily a bad thing,
18 if you're going to go with that size house
19 that's a little bit bigger than average?
20 Maybe it's not terrible if they go to the
21 Zoning Board of Appeals.

22 So that's where it should be back and
23 forth with the public hearing process to get
24 a consensus. Is 15 percent too strict? Or,
25 you know, and Max's input is important

1 Proceedings

2 because he put more into it than I did,
3 right, where he can start to say, well, you
4 know, we've got these variations all over the
5 place, so.

6 But the Zoning Board of Appeals is
7 prepared to deal with that, right. If
8 somebody comes in that has a legitimate need
9 to go slightly larger than what that code is,
10 it's not that big of a burden for somebody
11 to, you know, seek a variance. And then the
12 public does have a chance to make commentary
13 or, you know, be involved in the process.

14 I think that that would be a plus to the
15 community, that people would get to hear
16 about these projects. The problem that I see
17 is someone comes to me for a building permit,
18 if it doesn't get referred to the Planning
19 Board or to the Zoning Board, the neighbors
20 don't know about the project until the
21 bulldozer shows up and starts clearing the
22 lot.

23 Well, by then, the permit has been
24 issued. The contracts have been signed,
25 right. It's a big deal if somebody all of a

1 Proceedings

2 sudden says let's put the brakes on this
3 project, right. It's too late, really.

4 So nobody wants to see anybody put the
5 brakes on a project at the planning stages
6 either, when you're before a Board, but it's
7 a heck of a lot better to do it on paper than
8 it is when you've got the guy dropping off
9 the equipment, cutting trees. So I don't
10 think it's a bad thing to see some of these
11 get referred to one Board or the other, or in
12 some cases, both.

13 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Can -- for like
14 the small projects, just like what you're
15 saying, it's the worst thing when you wake up
16 and the next thing you know, they're digging
17 a big hole next to your house. Like, I don't
18 know what it costs for someone to come before
19 the Planning Board, but can there be a
20 different fee schedule for someone to come in
21 for a minor project that's going to have a
22 significant impact to the neighborhood, that
23 it wouldn't cost as much in coming before
24 just so everybody can do it?

25 MR. STACH: I think so.

1 | Proceedings

2 MR. HAGER: Anything could be considered
3 from a fee perspective. However, in my
4 opinion, the fees that this Board charges in
5 direct fees aren't terrible. I don't think
6 that it's the fees.

7 The bigger burden for an applicant is
8 the fact that there's reimbursable consultant
9 charges here, right, that you don't get on
10 the building permit, right. Here, if you're
11 going to present something, they're going to
12 get billed for the advice you're getting from
13 your consultants to this Board, right. So
14 that's the bigger area. So I think maybe
15 rather than looking at fees, if that's
16 important to this Board --

17 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Well, what's
18 important to the Town Board.

19 MR. HAGER: Right. Well, it is
20 important to the Town Board.

21 MR. HONAN: I think Eric hit it on head
22 here. This is something that we're spitting
23 out, we're just talking about this. This is
24 for something that should be brought to the
25 attention of the Town Board. And they're the

1 | Proceedings

2 ones who are going to be making these
3 decisions and all these criteria stuff that
4 they're going to have to weigh.

16 It's kind of a problem -- what's the
17 word. It's a solution without a problem.
18 Right. But that said, I don't think the Town
19 necessarily wants to incur those fees,
20 either. So I think the Town is trying to
21 figure it out. And I think they will.

22 MR. HAGER: The other way to look at it
23 is more in the Planning Board's purview is
24 rather than reducing the fees, if you came up
25 with a simplified application process, maybe

1 | Proceedings

2 the site plan for residential doesn't need
3 quite as much detail as a commercial site
4 plan. Right now, if you open the code book
5 and look at site plan, the requirements are
6 all structured for commercial and large
7 multifamily apartment style, you know, sites.
8 So it may be a way to reduce some costs if
9 the costs end up at the applicants, we charge
10 the applicant. Maybe a simplified process
11 for a residential site plan versus a standard
12 site plan is something to consider.

13 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: You have to ask
14 the contractor.

15 MR. HONAN: I think that we could
16 discuss this probably for the next few hours.
17 I don't see the point in doing it in an open
18 meeting of the Planning Board. I would
19 suggest that we close the meeting and --

20 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay.

21 BOARD MEMBER PURCELL: Approve the
22 Planning Board minutes.

23 (Time noted: 7:50 p.m.)

24

800

