

**PHILIPSTOWN CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Town Hall, 238 Main Street, Cold Spring, New York 10516**  
**March 11, 2008**

The CAC held its regular meeting on Tuesday, March 11, 2008 at the Town Hall. The meeting was opened at 7:30p.m.

**Present:** David Klotzle, Wetlands Inspector  
Mark Galezo  
Andy Galler  
Lew Kingsley  
M.J. Martin  
Bob Repetto

**Absent:** Eric Lind

**Regular Meeting**

## Table of Contents

1.	Ardenia Corp.	-	Page 3
2.	Louis Lanza	-	Pages 4 to 5
3.	Manitoga Inc.	-	Pages 5 to 6
4.	Vamco	-	Page 6
5.	Flaherty/Percacciolo	-	Pages 6 to 7
6.	Hopkins	-	Pages 7 to 10
7.	Open Discussion	-	Pages 10 to 11

Ms. Martin, the acting chairperson welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**Ardenia Corp./Garrison Highlands Route 9D, Garrison, Tax Map #71.7-14.1  
Paving existing roads, parking areas and associated storm water drainage**

Mr. Watson was present to represent this permit request and explained drawing. Mr. Watson said that the CAC had seen this in a much more elaborate form before. There was a special use permit and wetlands permit issued for the Highlands Country Club. What they wanted to do at this point was to stabilize the driveway, pave the driveway into the property and rebuild the existing parking. Mr. Watson explains the drawing. The parking right now is first come, first serve. The vegetation has been worn away and the club members have complained. The plan is to curb and build a driveway on its present route. The little stub that goes over towards the barn would be left alone. On the edges where the uncontrolled parking is they intend to clean with the grass creek with timber (curbing?) so there would be some chance to build and some chance to be a little bit green. The reason the paving is wanted is because it would help control the erosion in addition to other advantages. This would also be the paving plan.

Mr. Watson said they took the storm water treatment which they are still proposing in the same location which is the south end of the driveway, low area and then go to an existing pipe and then back into the pond. That is what we are seeking to do.

Mr. Galler asked how different a pavement plan this was from the original application.

Mr. Watson said that he thought that the application the CAC had been involved with was the extension of the pavement. We have been very careful not to enlarge the footprint of the disturbed area. We limited the parking spaces to those that are being used now and we have limited the driveway to what is there now.

Mr. Galler asked about the paving.

Mr. Watson said that there was another parking lot that was not paved at all as far as he knew.

Mr. Klotzle asked about the drainage from the asphalt driveway.

Mr. Watson said it drained into the existing pond and that this is essentially the same plan as before. The idea is to make this workable with the least amount of money spent as possible and also don't want to expand the use (inaudible). Mr. Watson said they did put a new roof on it. There will all be landscaped.

Mr. Watson added that the timber would not be treated with poison.

Mr. Kingsley made a motion to grant the permit. Mr. Galezo 2<sup>nd</sup>. All in favor.  
The vote was as follows: 6:0.

**Louis Lanza Nelson Lane, Tax Map #71.2-95.1**  
**Wetland permit application**

Ms. Martin clarified with the CAC that the site was not flagged at the time they had visited.

Mr. Klotzle said that the property was now flagged but that he was given a technical violation because he had done work within 100 feet of the screen. Basically, it is just kind of taking care of business. Mr. Klotzle said that Mr. Watson had it on the map where it begins way up on the hillside.

Mr. Watson said that he thought everyone on this project was of the opinion that this was not within the 100ft buffer. Mr. Lanza bought the Gates house with the intention of reconstructing it and had gone and obtained a permit. He planned to subdivide this into three lots. He had applied to the wetlands for the subdivision and apparently at that time there were no questions raised. It was thought that this was a runoff at first but after another look it was seen that it was a stream. Mr. Watson said that they went out and located the stream, rebuilt the wetland buffer, submitted it with our application package for the subdivision at which point Mr. Klotzle informed Mr. Watson that there was a problem with the wetlands permit that came out before so this application is separate and apart from the subdivision application which has not yet been approved. We are trying to bring this activity into compliance. The activity was the removal of the car port, which was removed, the addition to the house which has been finished, the construction of the garage and the related site work. There was a retaining wall constructed here to channel the water into the culvert. We want to bring this job into compliance to get rid of this ticket.

Mr. Galezo asked if the stream flow would change.

Mr. Watson said the plan was revised to take care of that.

Mr. Klotzle said not the current activity that had been basically finished and said he had no problem with this.

Mr. Kingsley asked when it was last visited.

Mr. Klotzle said that he had visited approximately three weeks ago.

Mr. Kingsley asked if it will stay as a stream.

Mr. Klotzle said yes.

Mr. Watson said they had relocated the driveway and are proposing to put a culvert in on the subdivision just below where it splits.

All refer to plan.

Mr. Galler asked where the third house was.

Mr. Watson showed him on the plan.

Mr. Repetto asked if they were proposed houses.

The CAC said yes.

A CAC member asked where the drive to the third house was.

All refer to the plan for the answer.

Ms. Martin asked if there were any further comments.

Mr. Galezo motioned to approve the permit for existing structure work. Mr. Galler 2<sup>nd</sup>. All in favor. The vote was as follows: 6:0.

### **Manitoga Inc. Route 9D, Garrison Tax Map #82-1-3**

#### **Replace footbridge**

(Not present)

Mr. Klotzle said that he and Mr. Lind had spoken regarding this request. Mr. Klotzle said he thought that all was okay. The question was whether or not this fell under our (CAC) minor activities and after he discussed this with Mr. Lind they felt that it did not because it is a new construction and it is not as if the non profit itself was doing the construction, it's an actual construction company doing this and therefore they felt there needed to be some control over what would be done. The replacement of the old bridge would be locust and white oak, no footings, bridges that would support the waterfall.

Ms. Martin said that it was a footbridge that crossed over (inaudible). It is just a plank bridge and no railings.

Mr. Klotzle said they had spoken of railings and they would not be able to be placed on the footbridge for historical reasons. It has to be the same as what is there. In answer to Mr. Galler's question, Mr. Klotzle said it would be in the exact same spot.

Ms. Martin said the only difference would be the width so that it would be two way instead of just one.

Mr. Klotzle said that prior to any work being done he would be notified. Mr. Klotzle said that all is fine and he did not have any issues with this. Mr. Klotzle did suggest that all bark be stripped from the wood prior to work. Mr. Klotzle said he would call the applicant first and strongly suggest that white oak be used. Mr. Klotzle said that he would include that suggestion in the permit.

Mr. Galezo motioned to approve. Mr. Kingsley 2<sup>nd</sup>. All in favor. The vote was as follows: 6:0.

**Vamco, Route 9, Tax Map #27.16-01-16 - Revised site plan**

Mr. Klotzle said that the CAC had received maps and that he had his and the rest were given to the CAC at the meeting. This is a Planning Board referral and there are more details for the landscaping.

The CAC discussed as they reviewed the plan.

The applicant was asked to maintain the gravel and clean up the wetland if possible but to otherwise leave it alone and it would actually help the brook.

Mr. Klotzle said that they were also removing the macadam.

Ms. Martin said that this did reflect the CAC's comments.

Mr. Klotzle said yes and felt that it looked okay to him.

Ms. Martin said she would look at the new plans for Vamco and incorporate any "buts" into a memo to the Planning Board.

**Application of Flaherty/Percacciolo  
3284 Route 9, Tax Map #27.8-1-4**

Mr. Flaherty said that he had attended January 2008 CAC meeting and had updated the members then. Mr. Klotzle had coached him prior to that on what was needed to be done.

Mr. Klotzle said that Mr. Watson had been in attendance with the applicant the last time and they had spoken about the drainage. Correct?

Mr. Flaherty said yes that Mr. Watson was with him at that meeting.

Mr. Klotzle said that Mr. Watson had had a couple ideas that sounded okay with him.

Mr. Flaherty said that they had discussed the pipe and catch basins. The catch basins could be used as a water runoff and make a retentions pond where the pipe comes out. (refers to plan)

Mr. Klotzle said that that would take care of all the runoff on this piece of property right here. (refers to plan)

Mr. Flaherty said he just needs Mr. Watson to finish what he has to do, right?

Mr. Klotzle said yes and that Mr. Flaherty had been very responsive and had done what was asked of him to do.

A CAC member asked if the drain was working.

Mr. Flaherty said that the two catch basins have metal plates over top of them and are catching the water. Mr. Flaherty said he would follow up with Mr. Watson as to where that stands as far as getting that corrected.

Mr. Klotzle said other than that he was okay with that. He asked the applicant if he was planning to bring the east grade up more or not.

Mr. Flaherty said the plan is to get this section even with the rest of the grade. (refer to plan) That is the plan, to make the whole property level.

The CAC decided that Mr. Flaherty would have to come back to the next meeting to follow up.

Mr. Klotzle added that he would be happy to meet with the engineer at any time if necessary.

**Hopkins 341 Avery Road – Tax Map #49.-1-68  
New permit application for back yard work**

Mr. Hopkins handed out information to the committee. Mr. B is the engineer for Mr. Hopkins.

Mr. B. explains the plans for Mr. Hopkins. One is the DEC work which they had just received the permit renewal from.

There are sketches and maps and plans being discussed.

Mr. B. said that the intent would be to place a curtain drain in to be able to pick up that water and just take it to the stream. The DEC did not want the discharge pipe into the (inaudible) itself but they wanted it five foot off. So, what they had done was rip raff the end of that and discharged the ground water at that point, so basically all the piping would be underground and the lawn would be able to be mowed and taken care of at this point. The curtain drain coming from the back and going to the stream is dry. That is one phase of the application.

Mr. Klotzle said that the property was graded pretty level back there so that would not act as a curtain drain type of thing.

Mr. B. said, “No, that the pipe would.”

Mr. Klotzle said right, but what he meant was that the graveled area could pick up water and travel down here right?

Mr. B. said that that was right but that they probably would not put too much gravel around that. They would basically use the existing soil. The gravel would be around the

curtain drain area. And then the other pipe would just discharge and be a transport pipe at that point.

Ms. Martin asked how long that was.

Mr. B. said approximately 50ft in length maybe.

Mr. Galezo asked if the water is clean that comes out of the well house.

Mr. B. said yes.

Mr. Galezo asked about the erosion control measures and if it was included in the packet.

Mr. Klotzle said yes it is already there and it will be improved before the project is started.

Mr. B. said actually what was being done is that the silt fence is being replaced with wire silt fence and the list of improvements are also in the packet. In the back of the building they plan to put in a patio, one area is 30x18ft and the other is 22x13ft with a little step in between the two. We are adding planting beds in the corner and a walkway over to the back steps from the area that comes from the old house. This house footprint has been developed on the same footprint. It is a very old house.

Mr. Kingsley asked if the patio was part of the old footprint.

The engineer said that there was an existing patio behind the existing house. After further discussion with the applicant it was clarified that the house went on the existing patio. There was a poured foundation. The engineer said that the patio back there would be approximately 900 square feet. There will be a planting bed between the patio and the house and up in the front there will be a planting area also. Just recently the board approved a septic improvement which was up in front of the house on the east side. The left side of the sheet shows a little swale there and what that would do is pick up any water that comes off that patio by that swale and redirected to the backyard so that it doesn't cause any erosion that would go toward Indian Brook.

Mr. Klotzle asked about the drain in the back yard.

The engineer said he had another back area (inaudible). The difference with that is that the surface runoff would dissipate once the rain stops.

Mr. Galezo asked where the roof runoff would go.

The engineer said that some of the roof runoff will go through some of the pipes that are actually there from the old house. On the right side they would like to put in some catch basins and a flex pipe so that the water would go through the bends and then discharge

into that area (refer to plan). That is surface water so an hour or two after it stops raining that water will stop and dry up.

Mr. Klotzle explained that the problem is not so much the drying up of the water as much as it is the initial runoff that really causes problems alongside that stream.

The engineer said that that was why they used rip raff and put a silt material cloth underneath to keep it from eroding and keep it a dry area.

Mr. Galezo asked why they don't use a dry well.

The engineer said they could put a dry well in.

A CAC member said that he felt that all the efforts to try to get a nice lawn may possibly be defeated without a dry well because the runoff may turn the backyard into a swamp.

The engineer said that surface water dries up very quickly.

Mr. Klotzle said that they have high ground water here anyway so the surface water won't dry up as fast. Everything slopes toward the road itself or the front yard.

Mr. Galler and Ms. Martin said they were concerned with fertilizers to keep the lawn healthy naturally.

Mr. Galler said he also would like to see a planting plan and an updated plan on a larger scale so that it would be easier to read so and be more clearly interpreted.

Ms. Martin said she would also like to see (refers to plan) some planting here, a filtration strip.

Mr. Klotzle asked if that would be in mitigation for the problems in front.

Ms. Martin said yes and just to get it back to where there would be a real filtering system for that protection for Indian Brook.

All agreed.

Mr. Repetto asked if drywells work in such a high area.

Mr. Klotzle answered no not really. Mr. Klotzle asked if anyone knew the procedure regarding berming on a town road and if it were possible to berm here. He said he had been there during a heavy rain and knows that there is a certain amount of runoff that is coming right on the road. That would save a lot of water from coming onto the property. It would keep the back yard drier.

Ms. Martin said she was still concerned about the back yard.

Mr. Galler said that he agreed with Ms. Martin and said that there may be a problem with the temptation to fertilize, etc. There really is no way to monitor.

Ms. Martin said she would love to hear if anyone had a solution but is skeptical as of now. Again, I think we really need to see a more detailed set of plans and some ideas of how this would work and a planting plan for a riparian border.

The CAC decided to table this permit application until CAC member Eric Lind can be in attendance for his expertise and feedback because he is very familiar with this area.

All agreed to table this until next month.

**Miscellaneous:**

Mr. Bill Sandler, a member of the community commended the CAC on the work and effort and accomplishments they have achieved. He added that finally things are being watched and overseen now that should have been previously. Mr. Sandler said he just wanted to let them know he was very happy with all their efforts, etc.

Mr. Shea asked about the Hopkins project and the septic repair.

Mr. Klotzle said that they had done the septic repair. Mr. Klotzle said he had been there daily, almost fifteen days when nothing was happening and had said finally to them (the Hopkins) to call him when they wanted to start once they wanted to run out of their escrow money here. They finished it correctly. They filled it in and had rolled the aerobic chambers and they were functioning. It was all functioning. It doesn't look great but they have to let it settle, then they would grade over the top by hand and plant the seed and make it look better. So, that is all taken care of.

Mr. Kingsley asked about the Health Department and if they had visited the site.

Mr. Klotzle said the Health Department had been there once while he was out there.

Mr. Kingsley asked, "Once?"

Mr. Klotzle said that they do not coordinate nor make sure that their site visits are at the same time. He had met the man from Peekskill that was doing the work. He was a very good man and was doing everything very, very carefully, making sure every i was dotted and every t was crossed.

Mr. Shea said that essentially, it is a solid standard tag, it's a pump up system, and it has an aerobic chamber.

Mr. Klotzle said it had four pipes/lines running out and they said the old lines are still connected but Mr. Klotzle said he thought that didn't matter.

A CAC member asked where it would go because the lines didn't work before.

Mr. Klotzle said that it did work but that it just didn't work well.

Mr. Klotzle said that he would keep looking at it.

Ms. Martin said that the aerobic chamber would warn someone first because it has an alarm on it.

That was the end of the discussion.

Mr. Galler made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Kingsley 2<sup>nd</sup>.

The meeting ended at 9:00 p.m. The vote was as follows:

David Klotzle	-	In favor
Andy Galler	-	In favor
Mark Galezo	-	In favor
Lew Kingsley	-	In favor
Eric Lind	-	Absent
M.J. Martin	-	In favor
Bob Repetto	-	In favor

Respectfully yours,

Christine Muscat

Note: These minutes were prepared for the Philipstown Conservation Advisory Committee and are subject to review, comment, emendation and approval thereupon.

Date approved: \_\_\_\_\_