ĺ		ı	
1		INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAUREL HOLLOW PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING May 29, 2018	
3		7:00 p.m.	
4 5		VILLAGE HALL 1492 Laurel Hollow Road Syosset, New York 11791-9603	
6			
7	PRESENT:	SCOTT ABRAMS, Member	
8		ELIZABETH DiBLASIO, Member	
9		NANCY JONES, Member	
10		JAMES GALTIERI, Member	
11			
12	ALSO PRES	ENT:	
13		HOWARD AVRUTINE, Village Attorney JAMES ANTONELLI, Village Engineer	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18	P2-2018	& T9-2018 - Laurel Hollow Road, LLC, Laurel Hollow	
19		Road SI ope and Trees	
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25		RONALD KOENIG OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER	

	, and the second se
1	MR. AVRUTINE: This is the application of
2	Laurel Hollow, LLC, Slope Application P2 of 2018, Tree
3	Removal Application No. 9 of 2018.
4	This is the public hearing in connection with
5	the application of Laurel Hollow Road, LLC, address is
6	no number Laurel Hollow Road. to remove 118 trees and to

construct a new single-family home, disturbing a steep and very steep slope -- excuse me, disturbing steep and very steep slopes as shown on the site plan prepared by Bladykas & Panetta, L.S. & P.E., P.C., dated 4/23/2018 and last revised 5/1/2018.

The parcel of property under application is known as Section 26, Block C, Lot 2077 on the Land and Tax Map of Nassau County.

The exhibit list in connection with this application is as follows:

First, notification from the Nassau County
Planning Commission dated May 8, 2018 that the matter is
referred to the Village of Laurel Hollow Planning Board
to take action as it deems appropriate.

The next exhibit is public notice dated May 10, 2018.

The next exhibit is an affidavit of posting from Elizabeth Kaye that the legal notice was posted on the front bulletin board in front of the Village Hall on

May 18, 2018.

The next exhibit is an affidavit of publication that the legal notice was published in the Oyster Bay Guardian on May 18, 2018.

The next exhibit is a document that confirms that the legal notice was published to the village website on May 15, 2018 and sent to village website subscribers on May 22, 2018.

And the final exhibit is an affidavit of mailing from the applicant, indicating that the notice of public hearing was mailed on May 15, 2018 to the individuals set forth in the affidavit.

Let the record reflect that Chairman

Hadjandreas has recused himself from consideration in

connection with this application inasmuch as he is a

principal of Laurel Hollow, LLC, the applicant.

Is there a presenter in connection with this hearing?

MR. RANT: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board. Michael Rant, Bladykas & Panetta, here this evening representing the owners of Laurel Hollow Road, LLC, seeking to develop in a vacant parcel on the east side of Laurel Hollow Road approximately 1200 feet north of Moores Hill Road. The property is a vacant parcel and it has a large grade change heading

from west to east. There's approximately a 75-foot grade change throughout the property.

we're trying to find a position of the house that will help again to balance in cut and fill a situation like this. There is a lot of material that's going to be generated from the site, so we're trying to utilize it as best as possible.

we're proposing a new curb cut on the south side of the property working with the grades as much as possible. We have an 8 percent slope pitch coming into the entrance of the property and increases to about 12 and-a-half percent, and the home itself is situated 100 feet from the front yard in the center of the parcel.

In order to contain our grading and minimize the disturbance around the property in the rear and the south, we're utilizing some boulder retaining walls. In the front, we have a 6-foot boulder wall. These walls are meant to look natural. They can be planted and fit in with the character of the property itself.

In the rear of the property, in order to create useable space, a lawn area, which is a necessity in a home of this size, we're utilizing a boulder wall to help limit our grading, maintain the rear of the property as much as possible, and again to create some flat useable space on the property which currently it

does not have.

we're proposing an entirely new drainage system for the site to contain all runoff. Currently, all of the water comes from the upper portions of the property and drains directly onto Laurel Hollow Road. So by implementing this plan, it will be a vast improvement over the existing conditions.

Again, we are seeking the removal of 118 trees ranging in size, some smaller, some in decline, some health problems. We tried to keep our disturbance in the center of the property maintaining a buffer in the rear as much on the south side as possible.

permit, and we did prepare a slope analysis map. Again, it's a vacant wooded site with strips of steep slope running from north to south making it necessary to disturb those areas in order to gain access to the center portion of the property where the home and the proposed future aminities would exist.

The disturbance itself, along Laurel Hollow Road there is a steep slope that we would be cutting into in order to construct the driveway, a further steep slope area up by the proposed driveway courtyard, and then there is a strip of very steep slope that kind of runs directly in the middle of the building envelope.

It would very difficult to find a location on the property, especially when you have the limited building envelope, in order to avoid any disturbance of that very steep slope, but we feel that we've minimized that impact as much as possible.

Again, there is an existing non-sloped area that we're looking to utilize for future aminities, lawn areas, pool, patios in the future, and again, minimizing as much of our grading as possible.

Again, the site itself, a heavily wooded site. There's approximately 250 trees on the property currently. So we feel we are maintaining a substantial amount on the property.

If the Board has any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

MEMBER GALTIERI: The frontage on Laurel Hollow Road, that's going to remain natural?

MR. RANT: From the edge of road, approximately a 40-foot strip along Laurel Hollow Road. The bulk majority is really just to cut in a driveway. We want to find a balance of minimizing disturbance but also having a driveway that's a safe slope, so having an 8 percent pitch coming in and the maximum we would like for a driveway is 12 percent, which is what we're proposing. And then we have a boulder wall which can

1	help preserve as much of the trees in that area as
2	possible leaving it a natural buffer.
3	So we feel that the disturbance itself is the
4	minimum required in order facilitate a safe driveway.
5	MEMBER GALTIERI: How high is the retaining
6	wall in the back?
7	MR. RANT: It's a tapering wall. At its
8	tallest point, it's 8 feet. Now this wall, we would be
9	on the lower side. So the retain side is the neighbor's
10	side, so they wouldn't see a wall. They would see
11	directly over it. So the only person that would
12	visually see the wall itself would be the homeowner
13	standing in their backyard. It would not be visible to
14	the neighbors.
15	MEMBER ABRAMS: How wide is the driveway
16	there?
17	MR. RANT: It's about 12 feet wide.
18	MEMBER JONES: Are there requirements for the
19	driveway size?
20	MR. ANTONELLI: I believe this village has a
21	maximum. It's been a while since that's really come
22	into play.
23	MR. RANT: 12 feet is a standard minimum size
24	you want for a driveway. A vehicle can fit in an

8-foot-wide driveway, but 12 gives you a little room on

25

the sides to maneuver.

•

we didn't want to go too big and have a large amount of asphalt in the front yard. We feel that a 12-foot is acceptable as far as for vehicular traffic and safe navigation to the property.

MR. ANTONELLI: I certainly have no problem with 12. My recollection is that the maximum allowable in this village is 15.

MEMBER GALTIERI: Is there a drain at the base of that driveway?

MR. RANT: We have two strip drains. We have a strip drain at the upper portion of the property which will help contain as much runoff before it enters the steep slope. So we want to minimize as much of the runoff that goes down the steep slope portion, so we have a secondary strip drain at the entrance of the property. So there will be two, one at the bottom and then one up top.

MEMBER DiBLASIO: And you have plans too for this area that we won't have the runoff onto Laurel Hollow Road and clog up the drains that are now existing?

MR. RANT: Yes. The bulk majority of the property that slopes would drain onto the driveway. The area would be landscaped to help absorb as much of that

water as possible. But this whole area between the driveway and the house would run off and be contained on the driveway and then collected into the strip drain. The area to the west of the driveway, that area would be landscaped ground covered to help.

MEMBER DiBLASIO: And during construction, it would be protected?

MR. RANT: We have silt fencing erosion control around the entire property. This property does disturb more than an acre of land so we were required to prepare a storm water pollution prevention plan which add additional erosion control measures, construction entrance and anti-tracking pad, silt fencing. And those measures need to be put into place and maintained throughout the project which is important.

MR. AVRUTINE: Does the Board have any further questions?

Before we go to Jim will be a report prepared by Elizabeth Bibla, Landscape Architect, dated May 23, 2018. I will just read various portions of it.

Due to the slope of the property and the necessary driveway design for slope, there will be extensive clearing of this woodland. There will be a generous area of woods to remain on the east side rear of the property. There would be a varying woodland

buffer on the south property line. The north property
line will have no woodland buffer due to the location of
the driveway behind the proposed garage and the fact
that the neighbor has scant plantings along this border.

I recommend that additional planting be designed because the proposed planting plan does not offer enough visual blockage. I recommend that more natives be used, as the existing proposal uses flowering pear, arborvitae and Norway spruce, to name a few.

In addition, areas not being regraded should have a snow fence border along with erosion measures as required to protect existing vegetation.

At this time, I recommend that Mr. Hadjandreas be given permission to remove the trees as noted on the site plan issued by Bladykas & Panetta. Prior to removal, the area of construction on the site shall be ribboned off so that no more trees than necessary are removed.

I believe that the Board may want to recommend additional planting as noted in my remarks above.

Additional understory trees in particular would help give privacy and dimension to the remaining woodland.

Mr. Antonelli.

MR. ANTONELLI: I reviewed the site engineering which included grading, drainage, sanitary

sewage disposal, erosion control, vehicular circulation, and the full storm water pollution prevention plan.

The plan that you have in your package dated May 1 was acceptable with one exception, and that is that the 1500-gallon sewage septic tank that's shown should be increased to 1750 gallons.

MR. AVRUTINE: Mr. Antonelli, would you wish to address your environmental review, please.

MR. ANTONELLI: Yes.

Although the State Environmental Quality
Review Act considers the construction of a single-family
house as a Type II action, the fact that we have steep
slope disturbance and quite a volume of earthwork
activity, the Village considers this an unlisted action
and, therefore, the Short Environmental Assessment Form
has been submitted. I reviewed it and I completed Part
2 on behalf of the Village.

And based on the information provided, I determined that following this plan and including the storm water pollution prevention plan, there would be no significant adverse environmental impact.

MR. AVRUTINE: Thank you, Mr. Antonelli.

I noticed that there was, had, a landscape plan prepared by Vincent Reilly which appears to have been dated May 6, and then there's the one with that

handwritten change, it says May 29.	IS	that	a	different
drawing, a different construction?				

MR. HADJANDREAS: As per Ms. Bibla's recommendations which we received a week ago, we updated and amended the landscape plan to reflect what she recommended, which was the additional screening that she asked for on both sides of the property. So if you compare the two, the revised to what you had previously, there is additional screening that further screens the neighbors on both sides of the property.

MR. AVRUTINE: Do you want to walk the Board through it a little?

MR. HADJANDREAS: Sure.

Besides the plan that was changed, the other form that is the count of trees was also increased.

So what was changed, without having to open both of them, was we added screening. If you're heading north on Laurel Hollow Road and you pass the property, the house just past us has cleared the entire property up to the property line. And because of grading, we're going to have to -- of the driveway area, the parking area -- we're going to have to remove the couple trees that are here.

So according to Ms. Bibla and what she recommended, we increased the amount of screening. And

that's represented by these number 2s and 3s which are Norway spruce trees, 8 to 10 footers, and green giant arborvitae trees, 8 to 10 footers, that would fill in this area and block the view, if there is one, from the neighbor into the parking area.

And on the south side of the property, the change in this revised plan adds the screening from basically the bottom of the retaining wall to just in line with the frontage of the house, and that's adding approximately six to eight Norway spruce trees.

And for the Board's information, this side is not being disturbed. We're just adding additional screening on this side. The screening goes around the entire property. And the rest of the screening is what was originally submitted.

And in the back above the wall, we're adding a lot of screening of all different type. It's not just going to be one wall of one shrub. There's all different types of trees and deciduous trees. And Vincent Reilly, our landscape designer, can discuss what we are putting around the house to fully landscape this property.

And the last thing I want to mention is, this is an accurate representation of the entire property.

And we are not touching -- besides on the side here and

in the front of the property along Laurel Hollow Road, except where the driveway penetrates to Laurel Hollow Road, and the area where we need to put dry wells, we're not touching along Laurel Hollow Road. And we're not touching anything in this represented area which is a significant portion of the property and significantly shields any of the neighbors that are behind us.

Vincent, do you want to speak?

MR. REILLY: Sure.

Vincent Reilly, 5 Godfrey Lane, Huntington.

what Chris was just talking about in the back here and if you take along the side, it's approximately 35 percent of the property is not even going to be touched. Another about 10 percent, the only thing that's going to be touched on is just to revitalize it and put in more screening on everything.

So it's basically horseshoed all the way around, privacy all the way around. The only opening at all in our big trees is just right where the driveway comes in. It's a total of 51 large evergreen trees, 8 to 10 feet.

The trees that are being taken out are all deciduous. So the evergreens are going to give more privacy to the neighbors and the street than would be given with the deciduous trees.

Down in this area, there was a question asked about doing the screening along Laurel Hollow Road there. And what we're planning on doing is bringing in about eight of -- we're going to plant new Laurels in there. Also, when we're doing the job, they start to dig everything out from here, any Laurels that are in good health, we're going to save. We're going to take those, transplant them all the way, spot them in anywhere that we can. I know that the Board likes their Laurels.

So with the addition of the 30 and the plants that we will save, there'll be a net increase of Laurels on the property. And along the road, we're really going to do it heavily because that's kind of what the road really is right now, it's all Laurels going down there. So that is one thing that I want to touch on.

Also, that the village arborist was -- of the 118 trees that are on the permit, all the trees that are going to be taken out are on the permit, but you can see as she listed, is a large amount of trees that are under the 7-inch requirement and they're in poor health, dead. It's probably approximately half of the trees -- I walked through there -- are in that situation. So you're cutting it down to half of what the application really says just on the trees that are permissible to be

taken down.

Again, we had her there and we, you know, accommodated what she wanted. Her basic thought was to more screening, and we've gone the distance for that certainly.

The landscape, it consists mostly of native plants commonly used throughout everyone's landscape in the village, so it will conform with all other landscapes. It'll just look like another house.

we're heavily planted all along the foundation. It will, you know, give more screening from the neighbors from the road with all the plantings that will go on there.

Along the driveway, we have the -- there's all cherry trees going up, azaleas in between. It will look very nice from the road.

There was a question about the drainage coming off of here. This is all sod right here, sod or grass. It's turf grass. Turf grass really absorbs more water than any other thing that you can really put. So it's going to absorb the water coming down the hill. What's left over will make it to the driveway where there's plenty of drainage to make sure we don't get anything down onto the street.

That's pretty much it. If you have any

1

3

2

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

questions --

MR. AVRUTINE: I just have one clarification. So based upon your letter of May 29, 2018, it says, landscape proposal, it says there's going to be an addition of 55 trees including 39 evergreen trees, 8 to 10 feet tall?

MR. REILLY: That is not in addition to the original plan. That's a total.

MR. AVRUTINE: Thank you. I just wanted to clarify that.

And also for the record, what we are going to do is mark as Applicant's Exhibit 1 a document titled Landscape Proposal, prepared by Vincent M. Reilly, dated 5/29/18, and the accompanying revised landscape plan, Applicant's Exhibit 1.

Any other questions from the Board?

MR. ANTONELLI: I would like to add something to what was said earlier.

I know two of the Board members were concerned and asked questions about runoff and Laurel Hollow Road, and the statement was made about strip drains. I don't like that term.

These are not your little tennis court strip drains. We don't allow those for drainage on driveways in the village. They're actual cast iron trench drains.

1	They're a minimum of 1-foot wide so that they capture
2	water.
3	And the statement was made that there's one at
4	the top and one at the bottom. The one at the top
5	collects the runoff from the parking court. And the one
6	at the bottom collects the runoff from the rest of the
7	driveway.
8	I wanted to clarify that that was something we
9	took a harder look at. The system is designed for
10	runoff from a 4-inch rainfall, which I thought was
11	adequate.
12	MR. AVRUTINE: Anything else from the Board
13	members?
14	Open to the public. Anyone from the public
15	wish to be heard?
16	Let the record reflect that no one wishes to
17	be heard.
18	A motion to close the public hearing?
19	MEMBER ABRAMS: A motion.
20	MR. AVRUTINE: Member Abrams.
21	And a second?
22	Member Galtieri.
23	All in favor?
24	MEMBER ABRAMS: Aye.
25	MEMBER DiBLASIO: Aye.

Proceedings

	rioceeunigs
1	MEMBER JONES: Aye.
2	MEMBER GALTIERI: Aye.
3	MR. AVRUTINE: A motion to declare the Board a
4	lead agency under the New York State Environmental
5	Quality Review Act?
6	Member DiBlasio.
7	May I have a second?
8	Member Abrams.
9	All in favor?
10	MEMBER ABRAMS: Aye.
11	MEMBER DiBLASIO: Aye.
12	MEMBER JONES: Aye.
13	MEMBER GALTIERI: Aye.
14	MR. AVRUTINE: A motion to declare the matter
15	unlisted under the New York State Environmental Quality
16	Review Act?
17	Member Jones. Seconded by Member Abrams.
18	All in favor?
19	MEMBER ABRAMS: Aye.
20	MEMBER DiBLASIO: Aye.
21	MEMBER JONES: Aye.
22	MEMBER GALTIERI: Aye.
23	MR. AVRUTINE: A motion to declare a negative
24	declaration under the New York State Environmental
25	Quality Review Act indicating that the application as

	11 occanings
1	presented will not result in excessive environmental
2	impact?
3	MEMBER ABRAMS: I make that motion.
4	MR. AVRUTINE: Member Abrams.
5	A second?
6	MEMBER GALTIERI: Galtieri.
7	MR. AVRUTINE: Member Galtieri.
8	All in favor?
9	MEMBER ABRAMS: Aye.
10	MEMBER DiBLASIO: Aye.
11	MEMBER JONES: Aye.
12	MEMBER GALTIERI: Aye.
13	MR. AVRUTINE: And a motion on the application
14	for tree removal and slope disturbance?
15	By Member DiBlasio.
16	It's a motion to approve.
17	MEMBER GALTIERI: Galtieri.
18	MR. AVRUTINE: It's a motion to approve by
19	Member DiBlasio, seconded by Member Galtieri.
20	And this is with the conditions of a
21	1750-gallon septic tank and compliance with the amended
22	landscape plan, correct?
23	MEMBER DiBLASIO: Correct.
24	MEMBER ABRAMS: Correct.
25	MR. AVRUTINE: All in favor?

	Proceedings 21
1	MEMBER ABRAMS: Aye.
2	MEMBER DiBLASIO: Aye.
3	MEMBER JONES: Aye.
4	MEMBER GALTIERI: Aye.
5	MR. AVRUTINE: Application approved, with the
6	conditions as noted.
7	*******************************
8	CERTIFIED THAT THE FOREGOING IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE TRANSCRIPT OF THE ORIGINAL STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES
9	IN THIS CASE.
10	
11	RONALD H. KOENIG
12	Senior Court Reporter
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	