

Planning Board Meeting Minutes – May 23, 2022

A meeting of the Town of Yorktown Planning Board was held on **Monday, May 23, 2022 at 7:00 p.m.** in the Town Hall Boardroom.

Chairman Rich Fon called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following Board members present:

- Aaron Bock
- Rob Garrigan
- Bill LaScala

Also present were:

- John Tegeder, Director of Planning
- Robyn Steinberg, Town Planner
- Nancy Calicchia, Secretary
- Dan Ciarcia, Town Engineer
- James Glatthaar, Esq.
- Councilman Sergio Esposito, Town Board Liaison

Correspondence

The Board reviewed all correspondence.

Motion to Approve Meeting Minutes of May 9, 2022

Upon a motion by Aaron Bock and seconded by Bill LaScala and with all those present voting “aye” the Board approved the meeting minutes of May 9, 2022.

Motion to Open Regular Session

Upon a motion by Chairman Fon, and with all those present voting “aye”, the Board opened the Regular Session.

REGULAR SESSION

Shrub Oak International School

Discussion: Public Hearing
Location: 26.05-1-4; 3151 Stony Street
Contact: DTS Provident Design Engineering
Description: Proposed amendments to the approved Phase II site improvements.
Comments:

Upon a motion by Bill LaScala, and seconded by Aaron Bock , and with all those present , the Board opened the Public Hearing.

David Steinmetz, Esq. of Zarin & Steinmetz; Gerard Schwalbe of DTS Provident Design Engineering, LLP; and Brian Koffler of Shrub Oak International School were present. Mr. Steinmetz stated that the Shrub Oak International School site plan was approved by the Planning Board several years ago with several different phases. They returned to the Board with a slightly amended overall master plan modifying some of the sequencing and some specific on-site infrastructure, stormwater basins, parking, etc. They discussed with the Board the request to accommodate some parking for the adjacent Town owned park by possibly integrating this in conjunction with their site and also eliminate the southern driveway. They are suggesting to defer the final determination for this discussion to a later phase since there is no immediate need for any additional on-site access. They feel they have more than adequate on-site circulation and parking. They are pleased with the cooperation from the Town and Planning Board and are also pleased with the success of the school thus far.

Mr. Schwalbe showed an aerial view of the campus from several years ago before the restoration and development of the site. The entrance road is on Stony Street with parking in the front and side of the building. They are proposing to modify the site plan with minor changes, some of which were seen last year that included a new configuration of the driveway to serve the parking lot on the east side of the building. A color-coded phasing plan was provided to the Board

for review. Phase 2 (beige) will allow for the expansion of 233 spaces on top of what they have already. Phase 3 (blue) adds more parking in the rear as well as an emergency access road to the south. Phase 4 (green) allows for other uses such as an animal grazing area, and stormwater management practices. Everything else will stay the same with the exception of a little more landscaping.

Chairman Fon asked the public if there were any comments and there were none. Chairman Fon asked the Board and Counsel if there were any issues and there were none.

Upon a motion by Bill LaScala, and seconded by Aaron Bock , and with all those present , the Board closed the Public Hearing.

Pied Piper Preschool

Discussion: Public Hearing
Location: 37.14-2-8; 2090 Crompond Road
Contact: Site Design Consultants
Description: Proposed modification to a row of parking to accommodate existing play area.
Comments:

Chairman Fon recused himself from this item. Upon a motion by Bill LaScala, and seconded by Rob Garrigan, and with all those present , the Board opened the Public Hearing.

Joseph Riina, P.E. of Site Design Consultants; Kathleen Dineen; and Minnie Dineen-Carey, property owners were present. Mr. Riina stated that the applicant is proposing to modify a row of parking on the approved site plan to maintain the existing outdoor play area. The six original parking spaces will be reduced to 4 angled parking spaces to accommodate backup space for the current configuration. The reduction in spaces will not interfere with the operation of the site. As part of the construction for the parking spaces, a new fence will be installed to match the fence that is being installed around the rest of the site. At the request of the Planning Board, bollards are proposed to be installed in front of the new fence to protect the play area.

Mr. Bock asked the Board and Counsel if there were any comments and there were none.

Upon a motion by Bill LaScala, and seconded by Rob Garrigan, and with all those present, the Board closed the Public Hearing.

Upon a motion by Bill LaScala, and seconded by Rob Garrigan, and with all those present, the Board approved the resolution approving a modified parking layout for the Pied Piper Preschool.

Dorchester Glen Subdivision

Discussion: Public Informational Hearing
Location: 15.20-3-6; 1643 Maxwell Drive
Contact: Site Design Consultants
Description: Proposed 4 lot subdivision on 24.26 acres in the R1-20 zone.
Comments:

Upon a motion by Bill LaScala, and seconded by Aaron Bock, and with all those present, the Board opened the Public Informational Hearing.

Joseph Riina, P.E. of Site Design Consultants was present. Mr. Riina stated that the property is a total of 24.26 acres and zoned R1-20. There are two access points to the property – Maxwell Drive to the north and Dorchester Drive to the west. The property is currently improved with an existing residence that is accessed off of Maxwell Drive. The proposal is to subdivide the property into 5 lots which includes the existing residence. All of the lots will be in excess of the minimum lot area requirement of 20,000-sf. The proposal shown is for a conventional layout and meets all of the bulk standard requirements for the zone. As discussed previously, the Planning Board had no issue with the applicant’s request to utilize the flexibility standards for this project and agreed to submit a memo to the Town Board. This will allow them more ability to locate the houses and driveways in appropriate locations both from an aesthetic and physical point of view to create the least amount of disturbance. The smallest lot is proposed to be to the west and will abutt the current Dorchester Heights subdivision. A private road is proposed that will be owned and maintained by the five property owners. Stormwater management will be provided for the entire project as well as the public sewer and public water connection to service each house. Along the easterly border of the property there is a stone wall that delineates

the back area of the site from the proposal. At this time, they are suggesting that it either be donated to the town or left as open space.

Chairman Fon asked the public if there were any comments. Public comments as follows:

- Susan Siegel, resident – Ms. Siegel questioned if the rear portion that is proposed to be donated to the town connects to any existing open space.

Mr. Riina responded that this property is contiguous in open space to another subdivision to the south and will provide linkage to the back of the Hanover East property. It also abutts the Grange fair grounds so there could be potential for continuation across and into the Heights area. Mr. Tegeder thought this may possible but would have to look into it.

- Paul Raffone, 25 Moseman Road – Mr. Raffone questioned the access. Another concern of his that he thinks may fall under the Town and not this application, is the Moseman waterway. He noted that the brook that goes through the overpass is collapsing. The Highway Department placed barricades there a few years ago. He questioned if anything could be done.

Chairman Fon responded that overpass would not be part of this application, but suggested that he reach out to the Highway Department and Town Board with his concern. Councilan Esposito responded that he will reach out to Mr. Raffone.

Chairman Fon asked the Board and Counsel if there were any comments and there were none.

Upon a motion by Bill LaScala, and seconded by Aaron Bock, and with all those present , the Board closed the Public Informational Hearing.

Motion to Close Regular Session and open Work Session

Upon a motion by Chairman Fon, and with all those present voting “aye”, the Board closed the Regular Session and opened the Work Session.

WORK SESSION

Lakeview Estates - Lot 6

Discussion: Site Plan

Location: 47.11-1-15; 1102 Gambelli Drive

Contact: TJ Engineering, LLC

Description: Proposed residence on the last subdivision lot in the Lakeview Estates subdivision.

Comments:

Greg Chappell was present. Mr. Chappell stated that he is here this evening as a follow-up with respect to developing the last lot in the Lakeview Estates subdivision. He is proposing to construct a single-family residence on the rock over the conservation line. Since the last meeting, they have refined the 100-ft wetland buffer setback. By repositioning the house, they were able to stay outside of the 100-ft wetland buffer. He noted that there is a hardship as the house does not sit within the building envelope without going over the conservation line. He did some research and noted that there have been exemptions made in this subdivision with other developments and the conservation line. Mr. Bock questioned if these exemptions were from the Planning Board. Mr. Chappell responded that he has not gone through the files as yet. Mr. Bock stated that if this is the case and exceptions have been made for other developments within the subdivision then he would feel differently about withholding his consent to this request. However, if they weren't made on the record by this board, then he would maintain his position to oppose the change. Mr. Bock asked about his research. Mr. Chappell stated that he took a 2021 aerial photo of the development with the property lines and overlaid the subdivision. The conservation areas are outlined in green. 1019 Gambelli Drive shows a pool and structure over the conservation line. 1079 Gambelli Drive shows a fountain and feature beyond the driveway over the conservation line. 1140 Gambelli Drive shows a pool and pool house over the conservation line. The aerials were submitted to the Planning Department. Mr. Glatthaar stated that they show existing conditions and questioned if they were approved or just happened over time. Mr. Chappell stated that this would have to be looked into but brought it up for discussion with the Board. The Board requested that the Planning Department research the subdivision for developments that encroach into the conservation easement.

Arrowhead Subdivision - Lot 6.4

Discussion: Site Plan
Location: 48.13-1-6.4; 821 Shiqer Gashi Court
Contact: Taylor Palmer, Esq., Cuddy & Feder
Description: Proposed site plan for lot 6.4 in the Arrowhead Subdivision.
Comments:

Taylor Palmer, Esq., of Cuddy & Feder; and Ralph Peragine, P.E. of DTS Provident Design Engineering, LLP, were present. Mr. Palmer stated that they are before the Board in connection with an application for site plan approval to develop a single-family residence on lot 6.4 of the former Arrowhead Subdivision. They submitted all the associated documents to the Planning Department and Board for review. The property is located off of Underhill Avenue and is zoned in the R1-200 residence zoning district. The property was formally subdivided into 7 total lots, two of which were deeded to the Town. Lot 6.2 (801 Shiqer Gashi Court) is presently improved with a single-family residence. He noted that while typically a site plan would not be required for a single-family residence, Planning Board Resolution #07-23 required site plan approval for the development of each lot within the subdivision. The proposal is for a 3,203-sf single-family residence including a two-car garage.

Mr. Peragine showed the plans to the Board. He noted that Lot 6.2 is the only existing residence within the subdivision currently. They are now proposing to develop Lot 6.4, which is the adjacent parcel. The grading and retaining walls were shown on the plans. The plan has been approved by the Westchester County Department of Health with the septic system in the same location that was approved with the subdivision. The approval was granted and extended through October of this year. Mr. Tegeder asked if there was any change in the grade from the approved plan. Mr. Peragine responded that there is a bit more grading, and the retaining walls are slightly higher by a foot. Mr. Tegeder noted that the approval for the FFE stated that it should be no more than 2-ft and they are now at 3-ft. Mr. Tegeder asked about the retaining walls. Mr. Peragine responded that there are two 10-ft high walls with a landscaped area in between to soften the appearance. Mr. Tegeder noted that this wasn't in the original design. Discussion followed with respect to the grading. Mr. Peragine stated that the original plans were done based on the National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929 and the proposed plans were done based on the North American Vertical Datum and noted that there is a .99-foot difference between the two datums, which is where the 1-ft difference comes in.

Chairman Fon questioned if there were any issues with the viewshed. Mr. Tegeder responded that the change is the 20-ft high combined walls but it would not be visible to the public, however, the Board should be aware of this change to the original approval. Chairman Fon asked the applicant if they met with the ABACA. Mr. Palmer responded that they did not as yet. Mr. Tegeder asked the applicant to prepare an elevation with the retaining walls. A resolution will be prepared for the next Board meeting.

Rob's Poultry Supply Store

Discussion: New Use in Existing Shopping Center
Location: 37.14-1-46; 2023 Crompond Road
Contact: Acme Realty
Description: Proposed poultry supply store in existing store front.
Comments:

Robert Robinson was present. Mr. Tegeder stated that the application is before the Board at the request of the Building Inspector to review the delivery schedule, loading area and hours of operation. Mr. Robinson, store owner, stated that the deliveries arrive on Friday between the hours of 7:00AM and 7:30AM and usually takes about twenty minutes to unload. The store is open all week. Hours of operation are Monday thru Friday from 9:00AM to 8:00PM and Saturday and Sunday from 9:00AM to 6:00PM. The store will sell chicks, fresh eggs and feed. Mr. Tegeder questioned if the deliveries are specific to Friday mornings only. Mr. Robertson responded that the eggs are delivered on Thursday in a small truck. The larger 26-ft box truck with other supplies such as feed arrive on Friday morning. Mr. Robertson added that the live chicks are picked up at the post office by him as they are pre-ordered by the customers. Chairman Fon questioned if the supplies were delivered in bulk and where they would be stored. Mr. Robinson responded that the deliveries are just enough for the week. Discussion followed with respect to the delivery times and loading area. With the description of the retail operation limited to animal feed products, food products and live chicks only, the Board

agreed to set the delivery times between 7:00AM and 9:00AM with no limitation to a particular day of the week. No other livestock is expected to be stored, sold or present at this location.

2040 Greenwood Street

Discussion: Dumpster Enclosure

Location: 37.15-1-38; 2040 Greenwood Street

Contact: Rick Cipriani

Description: Applicant proposes a fence across the driveway to screen the larger dumpster that is in use instead of constructing the dumpster enclosure shown on the approved site plan.

Comments:

No representative was present. Mr. Tegeder informed the Board that the owner is in need of a larger refuse container and is proposing to install a chain link gate with slats for screening. Mr. Bock questioned if there were any town regulations. Mr. Tegeder responded that it is not a hard requirement. It is a site plan amenity to justify keeping the site tidy and neat looking. He noted that this site has a different characteristic than a typical site and had no issue with the proposal. Mr. Bock felt that the applicant will accomplish the overall objective with this plan. The Board had no issues with the proposal. The Planning Department will issue a memo.

Burger King

Discussion: Site Plan

Location: 37.18-2-57; 385 Downing Drive

Contact: Michael Grace, Esq.

Description: Proposed second ordering line for drive-thru and restriping of parking adjacent to the new drive-thru lane.

Comments:

Michael Grace, Esq.; and Peg Canniff, franchisee owner, were present. Mr. Grace stated that the proposal is to renovate the existing Burger King that is located on Downing Drive. The applicant is proposing to install a second lane to the existing drive-thru to better accommodate the drive-thru services. The parking spaces adjacent to the new lane are proposed to be reconfigured and restriped. The applicant is also proposing interior and exterior renovations to the building.

Mr. Bock questioned the traffic movement. Ms. Canniff responded that they have installed second ordering lanes in other restaurants and it works seamlessly as they have a system. She noted that in Yorktown, 75% of their business comes from the drive-thru and at times the lines are backed up to the liquor store. The second lane will help to move the traffic along. Mr. Tegeder noted that the diagonal parking spaces on the plan are new and requested that the applicant submit a narrative and plan of what the difference is from the proposed to existing parking.

Chairman Fon stated that the application should be referred to ABACA for review of the architectural details. Mr. Tegeder requested that a landscape plan also be submitted. Ms. Canniff responded that the the property landlord has specific requirements for landscaping on the property and there is always an issue. She is unsure as to what the landlord maintains and she maintains. Per the Town's requirements, the landlord planted trees many years ago that have grown to be very tall and block the view to her sign. Discussion followed with respect to the visibility to the building. Mr. Tegeder stated that the white pines were planted to provide screening or buffering that can be looked at provided that the landlord (Oster) agrees to the changes. Ms. Canniff stated that the sign will be on front of the building and is proposing to remove the existing sign. The Board agreed to schedule a Public Hearing for the June 13th meeting,

Wendy's at Staples Plaza

Discussion: Site Plan

Location: 27.14-1-45; 3399 Crompond Road

Contact: Urstadt Biddle

Description: Proposed renovation of the Dunkin Donuts building for a Wendy's Restaurant.

Comments:

No representative was present. Mr. Tegeder stated that the applicaton was referred by the Building Department for review. The proposal is for Wendy's to occupy the current Dunkin Donuts/York Pizza space in the BJs/Staples Plaza at 3339 Crompond Road. The use will be the same, but there will be an expansion of the floor area devoted to patron use

as well as a small addition to the drive-up window which will increase the parking demand. The project also proposes site modifications to the existing drive-thru but all the details are not clear as yet. The parking spaces are proposed to be restriped from head on spaces to diagonal spaces. The building design will be different with higher walls, etc. which will need to be referred to the ABACA for review. The signage will need to be reviewed under the master sign plan. A new lighting plan is also proposed. He noted that on the building rooftop there are four rooftop security style fixtures that face out from each side of the buiding at a near 90 degree angle which is contrary to the lighting code. During leaf off conditions the lights likely shine at a few neighboring residential properties. He noted that he submitted a comment memo dated 5/20/22 to the Building Inspector with a copy to the Planning Board for review.

Chairman Fon stated that although the use is the same, the application will need to be reviewed in further detail with respect to the site plan modifications, lighting, parking, etc. Mr. Garrigan stated that the building currently has three food uses that will now become one food use and questioned if the expanded patron area would increase the parking amount significantly. Mr. Tegeder responded that it is increasing over the existing floor plan for Dunkin Donuts and York Pizza. He feels that the difference will be minor, but given the practice of the Board with respect to this type of expansion, and the series of modifications this overall site has experienced in the recent years, and the law, it will need to be reviewed. He informed the Board that the applicant is aware they need to appear before the Planning Board but could not be here this evening on such short notice. A formal application will be submitted to the Planning Department.

Yorktown Rehab & Nursing Center Solar Projects

Discussion: Site Plan & Special Use Permits

Location: 35.12-1-3; 2300 Catherine Street

Contact: Ecology New York

Description: Proposed installation of a 698 kW DC/467 kW AC solar canopy system over existing parking with a 548 kWh Tier 1 Battery Energy Storage System and installation of a 284 kW DC/260 kW AC ground mounted solar array on a 12.84-acre parcel in the RSP-3 zone with existing skilled nursing facility.

Comments:

Fariha Mahjabin of Ecology Energy was present. Ms. Mahjabin stated that that they were last before the Board on 12/6/21. Since that time, they have made some changes to the site plan. They met with the Conservation Board on 2/16/22. During that meeting they informed the Board that the ground-mounted panels covered a sewer line that runs behind the facility so they explored moving them slightly to the east to avoid the line. The Conservation Board expressed some concern about intrusion into the wetland buffer and the removal of additional trees. She noted that they conducted a shading analysis and they they were able to move the array slightly to the east without removing additional trees or intruding into the wetland buffer as shown on the site plan. The landscaping plan has been updated. In the previous plan, they proposed to plant 81 trees and shrubs in total. The updated plan proposes to plant 97 trees and shrubs to provide additional screening along with the watering plan. Given the space constraints and shading issues this is the maximum number of trees that can be planted. They are also proposing to contribute \$13,500 to the Tree Bank fund as the proposal does not meet the mitigation ratio. This money includes the woodland disturbance and tree removal.

Ms. Mahjabin stated that she received the Town's environmental consultant report from Barton & Loguidice dated 5/16/22. The report asked for a detailed site plan that marries the proposed solar array locations and tree removal areas with the locations of the wetland and water resources identified on site and their associated 100-ft buffers. They are currently in the process of creating this plan and noted that each tree proposed to be removed will be geo located. The report recommended that consideration be given to replacing the trees being removed with lower growing native shrubs to improve the buffer function. She stated that they will review this recommendation with their landscape architect to see if this is feasible and noted that not all of the tree stumps will be removed so this may be an issue with the planting space. They are hoping that the stumps will stabilize the soil. The report also mentioned Town Code Chapter 178. They will submit a wetland and tree removal application to the Town for review once the trees are geo located. The report also questioned if the site is under NYSDEC jurisdiction and she confirmed that it was. They will be working with the NYSDEC and DEP to get the appropriate approvals. They are currently working on the SWPPP. Ms. Mahjabin requested to move forward with a Public Hearing.

Chairman Fon noted that there seems to be quite a bit of work left to do before moving forward with a Public Hearing and the Board agreed. He stated that the Board is also concerned with the screening and noted that this has been a

consistent theme with all of the solar applications that have come before their Board. Ms. Mahjabin responded that they will provide a line of sight analysis for the Board's review.

Underhill Farm

Discussion: Wetland & Fiscal Assessments

Location: 48.06-1-30; 370 Underhill Avenue

Contact: Site Design Consultants

Description: Proposed mixed use development of 148 residential units, 11,000 SF retail, and recreational amenities. Original main structure to remain and to be used for a mix of uses. Development is proposed on a 13.78 acre parcel in the R1-40 with Planned Design District Overlay Zone authorization from the Town Board.

Comments:

Joseph Riina, P.E. of Site Design Consultants; Steve Marino, Wetlands Consultant of Tim Miller Associates; Ann Cutignola, Senior Planner of Tim Miller Associates; and Paul Guillaro, property owner, were present. Mr. Marino stated that there are three areas on the property that have been flagged and identified as town regulated wetlands. There are two small wetland pockets of about 2,000 sf each; and a watercourse that enters the site from Glen Rock Street that flows through the property across the access way that was created during the Beaver Ridge development, and into the existing pond on the site. There are records of the pond existing on the property since at least the 1930s. In his opinion, based on the site conditions when the access road to Beaver Ridge was created, the water flow across the property was blocked and created the two smaller wetland pockets which are not historic to the site. The third part of the wetland which is the larger pond feature as well as the watercourse that enters the site from Glen Rock have historically been there. As noted at the last meeting when the culvert was installed under that access way, there was no provision for maintenance which caused it to block up. As a result, a larger saturated area now exists on the west side of the access way which created some expansion of that feature. Rather than being a narrowly channeled stream watercourse, there is a smaller pocket wetland on the west side of the access way. Photos of the existing pond feature and wetlands were shown to the Board. One of the existing stone culverts that is the outlet for the pond was also shown. This culvert has a 12-ft drop and is culverted under Beaver Ridge and eventually to Route 118. Mr. Garrigan asked about the wetland regulations. Mr. Marino responded that the pond and stream coming into the pond would be regulated by the Army Corp of Engineers, but the two smaller pockets to the north would not be. Mr. LaScala asked if the culverts were maintained would the wetlands then not be there. Mr. Marino responded that if it was culverted under the access way the same way the larger stream had been they would not have developed. Mr. Marino continued that the concept is to excavate some of the material from the wetland and create a marshy area that transitions into a wooded wetland area from east to west. There is an existing berm on the west side of the pond which has been maintained with a wooden foot bridge that crosses over. By creating this wetland, they could install a boardwalk through the area. The wetland will be expanded by about a 1/4 of an acre which would offset the wetland fill for the two smaller pocket wetlands. With the current layout they would be diverting the watercourse as it comes from Glen Rock Road a little further to maintain the flow and bring the water down to the pond. Mr. Glatthaar asked if they were proposing to enlarge the pond. Mr. Marino responded that they are proposing to enlarge the wetland as it is associated with the pond. The pond itself would not be bigger.

Mr. Marino stated that they have surveyed and identified a total of 703 trees on the property; 523 of those trees are proposed to be removed for the development. A report, tree inventory and tree removal plan was submitted for review. A tree removal permit is required. They are currently working on the mitigation portion of the project. A landscape plan will be developed to replace a large number of trees with native species. They are scheduled to meet with the Conservation Board on June 1st. Mr. Bock asked if the stream crossing from Glen Rock into the pond was intermittent or if it flowed regularly. Mr. Marino responded that it flowed enough that it probably wouldn't be considered an intermittent stream, it would be a perennial stream. The 1947 aerial was shown and discussion followed.

Ms. Cutignola reviewed the fiscal analysis report with the Board. The 13.8 acre site is located on Underhill Avenue between Glen Rock Street and NYS Route 118. The proposal is for a mixed use development consisting of a condominium building with 84 units, an apartment building with 64 units, 17,580 sf of commercial space, five 6-unit townhouse buildings, and five 4-unit townhouse buildings. Demographic multipliers were used to project the future population based on the units and number of bedrooms. Based on this development, the multipliers used for a four bedroom unit is 3.89 persons; a three bedroom unit is 2.83 persons, a two bedroom unit is 2.31 persons, and a one

bedroom unit is 1.67 persons per unit. All senior units were projected to house 1.88 persons. By comparison, according to the American Community Survey, the data indicates that the average family size is 3.15 persons in the Town of Yorktown. This results in a population increase of 321 people including 23 school aged children. The current assessed value of the property is \$32,850. As the Soundview property, it was tax exempt so there was no payment. The taxes were paid by Underhill Farm for the 2021 tax year. Based upon the income potential for this proposed development, the value of this site is approximately \$42 million and the assessed value will be about \$900,000. Table 2 of the report shows the current and projected taxes generated by the Underhill Farm development. The total projected taxes are \$1,217 million with \$196,000 to the Town of Yorktown and \$123,000 to the County and about \$900,000 to the schools. Those taxes would have to be calculated again to what it will cost to keep the people here and educate the students. Not all costs are affected with a population increase. They calculate the increase in cost to be \$200 per person. The total expense of \$64,000 compared to the Town revenue of \$196,000 will result in a net benefit to the town. School enrollment has been decreasing regionally over all but particularly in Yorktown over the past five years. The current enrollment in the school district is 3,381 students and they are projecting to add 23 students which is an increase of 0.7 percent. Between the additional infrastructure that is available within the district and the minimal amount of students, they don't anticipate any issues. The calculated cost to educate each student is about \$19,000 based on the review of the school budget, etc. This would result in a net benefit to the school district of \$464,000 annually. They anticipate that this project will bring in about 250 construction jobs and somewhere between 50 and 75 long term jobs. This project will put about \$4.5 million into the local economy.

Mr. Riina stated that he submitted a response to the Westchester County Planning Board to the Planning Department in a letter dated 5/24/22. They are scheduled for a Public Informational Hearing on June 13th and will meet with the Conservation Board on June 1st.

Motion to Close Meeting

Upon a motion by Bill LaScala and seconded by Aaron Bock, and with all those present voting "aye", the Board closed the meeting at 8:53 p.m.