

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
VILLAGE OF CHESTNUT RIDGE
NOVEMBER 17, 2016**

The Board of Trustees of the Village of Chestnut Ridge convened in regular session on November 17, 2016 at the Village Hall, located at 277 Old Nyack Turnpike, Chestnut Ridge, NY 10977.

PRESENT:

ROSARIO PRESTI, JR.	-	MAYOR
JOAN BROCK	-	DEPUTY MAYOR
HOWARD COHEN	-	TRUSTEE
RICHARD MILLER	-	TRUSTEE
GRANT VALENTINE	-	TRUSTEE
WALTER SEVASTIAN	-	VILLAGE ATTORNEY
FLORENCE A. MANDEL	-	RECORDING SECRETARY

1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Mayor's report.

- Had Sunday with the Mayor on Sunday, November 6, 2016; it was a productive day.
- It's always nice when people come out and chat and voice their concerns.
- I had the honor and the privilege to attend the Faist Ambulance annual gathering, on Sunday, the 13th. Rockland Paramedics, Nyack Hospital, Good Samaritan Hospital; they gave out awards for volunteers going over and beyond.
- Gifts were handed out and it was a nice night and nice to be invited.
- This evening, Tony Sharan, our Superintendent of Roads and Highways with the Town of Ramapo informed me that the Town of Ramapo was applying for a grant for sidewalks for those visually impaired; for drop codes and the pads for those visually impaired in areas of the Village and any place else that has sidewalks that would comply with ADA requirements.
- There is a Grant Writer who is putting this all together.
- If you see work going on throughout the Village you can thank Mr. Sharan for his efforts and we hope everything works out.
- Mayor Presti went over and reviewed all complaints from the last Village Board Meeting of October 15, 2016 and what action was taken.

Issues and Complaints

- 4 Lance Ct., house sold – For sale sign not removed. **-Sign Removed**
- 91 Pinebrook Rd., – property a mess – Complaint and picture given to Everett on 10-28-16. **.-91 Pinebrook is the corner of Rt 45 and Pinebrook. The property is not a mess and has no property maintenance issues. The photo provided is a picture of 85 Pinebrook. The property was a fire incident from 2010. Structure demolished in 2016 and VACANT LAND for sale. Owner was contacted by our Code Enforcement Official notified of complaint. Has verbally agreed to mow the grass before Veteran's day weekend. He started and then apparently had to be told again. The Code Enforcement Officer is following up on 84 Pine brook.**
- 648 Chestnut Ridge Rd., 4 Commercial Vehicles – 3 families living in one family house. **-Address 648 Chestnut Ridge Road does not exist. The structure referred to is 640 Chestnut Ridge Road. Violation for commercial vehicles issued and the nature of who is living there. There are some issues with the C of O for a residential home in a PI zone. The Code Enforcement Official is in the process of reviewing the Village records with regard to the appropriate permits and approvals that were granted to that address. They are in contact with the Attorney who represents 640 Chestnut Ridge Rd. and they are going through the appropriate records of both the Planning Board and the Village with regard to the Planning Board decision permitting the continued use of the property of the residence in the PI zone. Code Enforcement is working on that.**
- 623 S. Pascack – converted garage to 5th bedroom. There is no garage. Understanding is there should be another garage. Check Folder – If converted before law – house would be grandfathered. When was it converted? Did they have permit for fifth bedroom? –

complaint given to Everette on 10-28-16. **Address 623 DOES NOT EXIST. 643 has had repeated complaints since the house has been sold to an LLC, renovated and is for sale now again. The history of the property is as follows... Original CO is from 1968. Multiple COs from 1990 including the conversion of the garage (01-4-97). An additional certificate has been issued for the driveway in 1991. Interior renovations CO issued in 2016. ALL IS LEGAL.**

- **Burned out house: 1 Williams Rd., - Address 1 Williams DOES NOT EXIST. The fire occurred at 28 Williams on March 3rd, 2016. Home has been secured and COs have been basically revoked under violation EB2016-027. Owner has recently been in the BD with construction plans to rebuild/repair but has yet to submit a complete application for review and approval. Code Enforcement is aware.**
- **1 Appledale Lane—any news on any of these houses? Sam requests Building Inspector to speak to owners regarding status. Address 1 Appledale DOES NOT EXIST. 45 Grotke, fire occurred February 2nd 2015. Home has been secured and COs revoked under violation EB2015-006. Permit 15/11221 approved to demolish house. Property transferred while permit open and new owners advised to update all permit information prior to commencing work. Owner is deciding. States she is “debating options” with the house and property.**
- **Brian Terrace at 28 Wilshire – house burned down over a year ago? 2 big dumpsters filled with garbage, health hazard. 28 Wilshire fire occurred on August 22nd 2014. Property posted as unsafe and CO revoked February 20th 2015 under violation EB2015-007. Property made safe in November of 2015 after court appearance. Owner has a complete permit and is in the ARB for approval to rebuild. Dumpsters have been removed from site on unknown date.**
- **4 Weiss Terrace – at least three or four families living there; four commercial vehicles parked overnight. 4 Weiss has never had a complaint like this. Please confirm the address of this complaint. 4 Weiss is an older individual who tends to “collect” things as described in the above complaint; all kinds of debris; water tanks, rusted radiators, old toilets, etc. That’s not the house with three or four families.**
- **Mayor Presti:
Find out what the actual address is and call it into the Village.**
- **2 Sutin Place – zombie house – all overgrown, nobody living there. This is a foreclosure. Owner is unreachable and the lender cannot touch the property until foreclosure is complete as per attorney. Resolution to cut grass would be required.**

Mayor Presti:

- That was the list of items from our last Village Board meeting and that was the result.
- With regard to the parking issues: Spring Hill Tr., Williams Rd., Pascack Rd., Pinebrook Rd., Pine Knoll Ct.;
- I spoke with the Village Engineer and he’s been able to visit three of the four areas.
- He’ll have a report for the Board hopefully by the December workshop.
- I mentioned to him what the concerns were; what kind of signage, fifty feet from a stop sign verses twenty five feet from an intersection, the commuters that were maybe parking

on Pine Knoll Ct., restricting the hours of parking, the various alternatives that may be available from a traffic control perspective.

- He is auditing, he is reviewing, he is assessing and hopefully by December he'll have a report for us and we will know where we go from there.
- As a reminder, November 1st through April 1st there is **No Overnight Parking** in the Village from 12:00 p.m. to 6 a.m.
- I try to remind folks with the newsletter.
- As a courtesy, Ramapo PD unofficially usually doesn't start enforcing that until about now; mid-November before they start really getting vigilant on that.
- Give Ramapo Police a call if you see folks parked.
- If Ramapo PD is not being receptive to your complaint, I will need to know when you called, the time, who you spoke to so that whoever is accountable for the call will be held accountable to the call.

3. Open Floor: public discussion of Agenda Items only.

No one from the public wished to speak.

Motion to Close the Open Floor Public Discussion.

MOTION: Trustee Cohen

SECOND: Deputy Mayor Brock

The Board was polled and voted 5-0 to Close to Open Floor Public Discussion.

1. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting, October 20, 2016.

MOTION: Deputy Mayor Brock

SECOND: Trustee Valentine

The Board was polled and voted 5-0 to Approve the Minutes of October 20, 2016.

2. **Resolution No. 2016-82** to approve agreement with All County Property Management for Landscaping and Snow Removal on municipal property.
Resolution amending 2016-2017 Landscaping and Snowplowing contract with All County Property Management Inc.

WHEREAS, the Village Clerk has sought proposals for professional services regarding landscaping and snowplowing of municipal property, and

WHEREAS, All County Property Management Inc. submitted the lowest responsible proposal.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Mayor is authorized to execute a contract with All County Property Management Inc. (formally Procut Lawns and Landscaping & Contracting, Inc.) for Landscaping and Snowplowing of municipal property at a total cost

of \$10,850.00 (plus snow removal at the Village property will be billable on a per storm basis), subject to the approval of the contract terms by the Village Attorney.

Mayor Presti: No change with regard to last year.

MOTION: Trustee Cohen

SECOND: Trustee Grant

The Board was polled and voted **5-0** to approve **Resolution No. 2016-82.**

3. **Resolution No. 2016-83** to amend the Village of Chestnut Ridge Fee Schedule relative to Fire Inspection fees.

RESOLVED that the following fees are hereby added, pursuant to Article XIV (17) of the Zoning Code, "Escrow Accounts to cover specific and non-general costs and expenses", to the Fee Schedule maintained by the Village of Chestnut Ridge:

Escrow accounts for land use applications:

Planning Board/CDRC \$3,500 to be replenished at the direction of the Planning Board, CDRC, and/or Village Treasurer.

Zoning Board \$1,500 to be replenished at the direction of the Planning Board and/or Village Treasurer.

Village Board \$1,500 to be replenished at the direction of the Village Board and Village Treasurer.

ARB \$500.00 to be replenished at the direction of the ARB and/or Village Treasurer.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the following fees are modified in the Village Fee Schedule:

1. Violation searches - \$250 Residential, \$500 Commercial

2. Certificate of Compliance (issued by Fire Inspector) - \$50

3. Fire Inspection Fees -

a. Places of Assembly:

Up to 50 persons - \$75

51-100 - \$100

101-300 - \$125

b. Non-Residential Facilities (size of total facility):

Up to 5,000 square feet - \$75.00

c. Hotels - Rooms over 10 - \$15 each

All other fees shall remain at current levels.

Mayor Presti: We had an opportunity to speak with the Building Inspector, Code Enforcement to go over what the fees are and the time required so we made a little bit of an adjustment to make sure that the proper fee is being paid.

MOTION: Trustee Cohen

SECOND: Deputy Mayor Brock

The Board was polled and voted **5-0** to adopt **Resolution No. 2016-84**.

4. **Resolution No. 2016-84** - to schedule a Public Hearing to amend Local Law No. 12 of 1987, "Architectural Review Board", as pertains to notice and posting of applications. Local Law # of 2016, a proposal to amend Local Law No. 12 of 1987, "Architectural Review Board", as pertains to notice and posting of applications as follows:

- **Mayor Presti:** Currently there is no requirement to go before the ARB to notify neighbors within 500 feet. This will require you notify neighbors within 500 feet. In addition, the Scope of Review, mainly those items that have to go before the ARB is being revised to the degree that a single family residence is normally exempt from having to go before the ARB. However, they will have to go before the ARB if they are increasing their floor area by forty percent or more.

- **Attorney Sevastian:** The section in front of you doesn't have that in it. Right now, a new single family home has to go; additions to alterations don't have to go. The way it was worded was in accordance with alternations and additions are exempt from the requirements if it affects less than 15% per cent of the front façade. In discussion, I think we were more concerned about situations where the gross per floor area is increased so much that sometimes the additions can dwarf the original homes. So, we settled on if the alterations or addition increases the gross area by forty per cent or more it has to go in front of the ARB.

- **Mayor Presti:** We will amend that Resolution accordingly.

Local Law No. 12 of 1987

...

Section 7

The requirements of Section 6A of this local law shall apply to a building permit for the construction of a new building or structure, or an alteration or addition to any building or other structure affecting the exterior of said building or structure where the cost of such alteration or addition is estimated by the Building Inspector to exceed five thousand

(\$5,000.00) dollars, except that alterations or additions to existing single family detached residences shall be exempt from these requirements if the alteration or addition affects less than 50% of the front façade of the residence.

Section 8

...

C. Notice: For matters heard pursuant to Section 6A of this local law, the applicant shall submit, together with the plans required under Section 8A of this local law, and affidavit setting forth the names and addresses of all owners of property situated within 500 feet of the lot for which the application has been made and declaring that such names and addresses are correct as within the knowledge of the applicant and as shown on the latest tax assessment roll maintained by the Town of Ramapo. The applicant shall also provide the Clerk to the Architectural Review Board with addressed letter sized envelopes to the addresses of the properties within 500 feet, stamped with adequate first class postage to facilitate said Clerk mailing notices, at least 7 days prior to the meeting at which the Architectural Review Board will consider the application. The notices shall indicate the lot, for which the application has been made, and the date, time and location of the meeting.

...

This local law shall be effective immediately upon filing with the Secretary of State.

MOTION: Trustee Cohen

SECOND: Trustee Miller

The Board was polled and voted 5-0 to adopt Resolution No. 2016-84.

5. **Resolution No. 2016-85** - to refer certain proposed amendments to the Zoning Code of the Village of Chestnut Ridge, relative to “Nonconforming Uses, Buildings or Lots”, to the Planning Board and the Rockland County Department of Planning for comment.
 - **Mayor Presti:** What we are doing here is actually removing what would be in summarily fashion a step down provision.
 - **Attorney Sevastian:** When the Zoning Code for Chestnut Ridge was adopted in 1986 some of existing residential lots approved with residential homes or vacant lots were rendered non-compliant as to size or bulk requirements with the existing home. Often times when new codes are adopted, there is a relief put in the code; saying, “o.k. if not complying as to bulk of the lot with the existing home or the lot itself you can still use it as a residential lot”, and it gives you some relief from the bulk requirements; that is you could go closer to side yards than you normally would in the new zoning district if there is a lot pre-existing. I think that’s maybe common in order for municipal codes to sort of get broken in with the new municipalities and the properties to be developed. It’s been thirty years and some of the applications that have been coming in have the ability to use different bulk requirements that exists than the zone where the property is currently located results in homes that are sort of out of whack with the rest of the existing

neighborhood. What this amendment in the law does specifically is it says you can still use it, but you have to comply with the bulk requirements that exist in the zoning district where the property is located which would be the normal situation in any case.

- **Trustee Miller:** If you were in an R-25 zone you were a non-conforming lot able to actually step down to an R-15 prior to those bulk requirements. We had homes that were outside these lots. We felt that after all these years with the Village it was time to retract.
- **Mayor Presti:** That now means if you want to do an addition, if you need to a renovation or something of that nature, you have to comply with that current zone; there is no step down. If you can't comply, you would need a variance and then you would have to go before the Zoning Board. Again, this is another check with regard to make sure the homes in the area are staying size and nature of the home that it will be near; that's type of planning. Sometimes it just a matter of evolution.
- We will amend the Resolution accordingly. It was amended after it was printed.

ARTICLE XIII
Nonconforming Uses, Buildings or Lots

1. Applicability of Article.

This Article applies to lots, buildings, structures and nonbuilding uses in existence on the effective date of this local law. The lawful use of any such premises or uses existing on the effective date of this local law may be continued although neither such use conforms nor the bulk of the same complies with the requirements, except as hereinafter follows.

2. Nonconforming buildings, structures or lots.

A. Residential buildings or structures. Any existing one or two family residential building or structure, or building accessory thereto, made noncomplying as to bulk by this local law or any amendment thereof, shall be considered pre-existing nonconforming as to the bulk requirements set forth in the Zoning Code. Any alterations or additions to such pre-existing nonconforming buildings or structures which increase the degree of nonconformity or create a new nonconformity shall require necessary area variances from

the bulk requirements applicable to the zoning district where the property is located.
Increasing the height of a wall or roof that is nonconforming shall be deemed to be an
increase in the degree of nonconformity. ~~be permitted to comply with the yard and~~
~~setback requirements as specified for the highest residential district having the same or~~
~~less lot width. In no event, however, shall the yard and setback requirements of any lot~~
~~be less than the requirements for the R-15 District. No front setback may in any event be~~
~~closer to the designated street line than the existing established setback. For any existing~~
~~building or structure on a lot having less than a one hundred foot lot width, the minimum~~
~~standards will be the same as those specified in paragraph D of this section.~~

B. Nonresidential buildings or structures. Normal maintenance and repair, structural alteration in, or reconstruction or enlargement of, a building or structure with noncomplying bulk is permitted if the same does not increase the degree of or create any new noncomplying bulk in such building or structure.

C. Two (2) or more adjoining noncomplying subdivision lots, regardless of ownership, in a subdivision approved by the Chestnut Ridge (or previously Town of Ramapo) Planning Board shall have three (3) years from the date of filing with the office of the County Clerk to obtain a building permit. Two (2) or more adjoining noncomplying lots in a subdivision approved by the Planning Board and filed with the office of the County Clerk more than three (3) years prior to the effective date of this local law, or meeting the equivalent requirement of the Town of Ramapo for the three year period prior to the enactment of this local law, and in the same ownership, shall not be eligible to receive a building permit. Said subdivision or part thereof shall be resubmitted to the Village

Planning Board for approval in accordance with the applicable provisions of this local law. Any lot in a subdivision approved by the Village Planning Board after the effective date of this local law, but which is made noncomplying as to bulk by any future amendments of this local law, shall have three (3) years from the date of filing to obtain a building permit.

D. Non complying lots.

(1) A residential lot, separated from any other land in the same ownership and noncomplying as to bulk, whether or not located in and part of a subdivision plat approved by the Planning Board and filed in the office of the County Clerk, ~~and which has a minimum lot width of one hundred (100) feet,~~ may be used for a one family detached residence, provided that such use shall comply with the bulk requirements applicable in the Zoning District where the property is located, or when appropriate variances are obtained from the Zoning Board. ~~as specified in the highest residential district having the same or less lot width. For all residential lots having less than one hundred (100) feet of lot width, the following minimum requirements shall apply:~~

~~(a) — The minimum width of one (1) required side setback shall be twenty (20) feet for lots in the RR 50, R 40 and R 35 Districts; fifteen (15) feet for lots in the R 25 District; and ten (10) feet for lots in the R 15 District.~~

~~(b) — The total width of both required side setbacks may be reduced nine (9) inches for each foot that the lot width is less than that specified in the Bulk Table.~~

~~(c) — The minimum front and rear setbacks shall be thirty (30) feet.~~

~~(d) — The minimum lot width and lot frontage shall be seventy five (75) feet.~~

~~(e) — The maximum building height shall be twenty five (25) feet.~~

~~(2) — For all nonresidential lots having less than one hundred (100) feet of lot width, the following minimum requirements shall apply:~~

~~—— (a) — The minimum width of each required side setback shall be twenty (20) feet in the LO and PI Districts and ten (10) feet in the PO and NS Districts, except that where any setback abuts a residential district, the normal requirements for setbacks, yards and buffers shall apply.~~

~~—— (b) — The total width of both required side setbacks may be reduced nine (9) inches for each foot that the lot width is less than that specified for the Table of Bulk Requirements.~~

~~—— (c) — The minimum front and rear setbacks shall be thirty (30) feet for lots in the PO and NS Districts and fifty (50) feet for lots in LO and PI Districts.~~

~~—— (d) — The minimum lot width and lot frontage shall be seventy five (75) feet.~~

~~—— (e) — The maximum building height shall be thirty five (35) feet.~~

E. A lot shall not be considered noncomplying with respect to the front setback or front yard requirements of this local law if said condition is the result of a street right-of-way widening reservation or dedication, whether in fee or easement, required by the Planning Board at the time of subdivision or site development plan approval.

3. Additional considerations. (Amended August 18, 2011,

Local Law No. 1 of 2011)

A. Repair and alterations. Normal maintenance and repair of a building or structure is permitted if it does not expand or extend the nonconforming bulk or use. No extension,

alteration or enlargement shall be made in a building or structure occupied by a nonconforming use, nor in a nonconforming nonbuilding use except:

- (1) When required pursuant to an order of a court of competent jurisdiction.
- (2) To adapt the building or structure to a conforming use.

B. Change of use. Any nonconforming use may be changed to any conforming use or, on application to and with the approval of the Board of Appeals, to any use which the Board of Appeals deems to be more similar in character with the uses permitted in the district in which said change of use is proposed. Any nonconforming building, structure or nonbuilding use may be changed to a conforming use, regardless of whether the newly created conforming use is noncomplying as to bulk, subject to approval by the Board of Appeals, subject to the same general considerations applicable to the granting of special permits and subject to site development plan approval.

C. Cessation of use. If active and continuous operations are not carried on in a nonconforming use during a continuous period of one (1) year, the building or land where such nonconforming use previously existed shall thereafter be occupied and used only for a conforming use. Intent to resume active operations shall not affect the foregoing. The time period set forth herein shall be tolled for any cessation of use pursuant to a court order.

E. Damage and destruction. A building or structure occupied by a nonconforming use or noncomplying as to bulk, damaged by fire or other causes to the extent of seventy-five percent (75%) of last full value as shown in the records located in the Town Assessor's office, excluding the assessed valuation of the land thereof, shall not be

repaired or rebuilt except in conformity with the requirements of this local law. Any building, structure or any part thereof occupied by a nonconforming use or noncomplying as to bulk, which is damaged to an extent less than seventy-five percent (75%) of last full value as shown in the records located in the Town Assessor's office, excluding the assessed valuation of the land, may be repaired, provided that a building permit is obtained within one (1) year after such damage; otherwise such building, structure or part thereof shall thereafter be occupied only by a conforming use and shall comply with the bulk requirements of this local law.

F. Nonconforming open storage yards, outdoor display. Any nonconforming open storage yard or any outdoor display or storage of merchandise which is nonconforming may be continued for one (1) year after the effective date of this local law.

G. Nonconforming industrial uses. In any residential district, any nonconforming industrial use which is permitted in the PI District may be continued for eight (8) years after the effective date of this provision of the Ramapo Zoning Law (the preceding effective zoning control) or twenty-eight (28) years after the initial establishment of such use or an addition thereto that adds fifty percent (50%) or more to the real value of such use, whichever is the longer period, provided that, after the expiration of that period, such nonconforming use shall then be terminated.

H. Modification by Board of Appeals. If an application is made at least six (6) months before the expiration of the period prescribed for termination of a nonconforming use or noncomplying bulk, and the Board of Appeals shall find that the period prescribed

is unreasonable or inadequate for the amortization of the special value of the property resulting from such nonconforming use or noncomplying bulk, then the Board of Appeals may grant such an extension of the period prescribed as it shall deem to be reasonable and adequate for such amortization, provided that no such period of extension shall exceed one hundred percent (100%) of the period prescribed and that such extension may be granted only once for any use.

I. Continued use after termination date is a violation. The continuation of a nonconforming use or noncomplying bulk after the termination date fixed for the same shall constitute a violation of this local law.

Mayor Presti: With that revision, we will make the motion.

MOTION: Trustee Valentine

SECOND: Trustee Miller

The Board was polled and voted **5-0** to adopt **Resolution No. 2016-85**.

9. Resolution No. 2016- 86 Resolution approving Abstract of Audited Claims. RESOLVED, that General Fund Claims set forth on pages 1 through 4 in the aggregate amount of \$194,370.46 as set forth on Abstract No. 2016-11 dated November 17, 2016, as submitted by the Village Treasurer, are hereby approved.

MOTION: Trustee Cohen

SECOND: Trustee Valentine

The Board was polled and voted **5-0** to **approve** the **Abstract of Audited Claims**.

Open Floor: Public Discussion.

- **Tony Sharan -868 Chestnut Ridge Rd., Chestnut Ridge, NY 10977:**
- Complained carters don't pick up all his leaf bags at once.
- Stated he had twenty or thirty at a time.

Mayor Presti:

- Stated Mr. Sharan called him on this.
- Mayor stated he spoke with the Village Treasurer who spoke with the carter.
- Explained it's a shear matter of numbers; you're putting out your 20 or 30 bags, I'm putting out 20 or 30 bags, Mr. Miller is putting out his 20 or 30 bags; the trucks cannot hold it all.

- They'll try to take as much as they can; my understanding was they were going to return.
- What we would ask you to do is put out half and put out half the following week.
- Just like I tell folks who put out a tree; you can't put out your whole tree and expect it all to be picked up in one shot.
- It is physically impossible of a carter to pick up 100 % of that type of debris for everybody in one shot.
- Perhaps Interstate did it because they had a multitude of trucks; and their trucks were a little bit bigger and they were doing it as a courtesy.
- This particular carter they don't have a bigger truck, they still want to service the Village, they are trying to do what they can do, but as a practical matter you have to portion it out.
- We are not going to not pick it up; it's just that you have to put it out not all at once.

Tony Sharan:

- Complained when it rains the bottoms of the leaf bags open up.
- Maybe they should buy a bigger truck.

Mayor Presti:

- Mr. Sharan, you know as well as I that when you go out for bid, you have to take the lowest responsible bidder.
- That was the lowest, responsible bidder with the equipment.
- We will continue to work on it, I assure you.

Trustee Cohen:

- The bid that we did get was considerably less.

Mayor Presti:

- Stated, "Mr. Sharan, if you saw the difference in the bid that we received from our current carter and the bid from Interstate Waste, you would have said, "you know what, I'll keep my fifteen bags in my garage until the following week".
- The increase in price that they would have charged to this Village was oppressive.
- If you want to see what the bids were, you are welcome to see them.

Trustee Cohen:

- It would have put us over the Cap.

Richard Cunningham – 10 Appledale La., Chestnut Ridge, NY 10977:

- Asked if there was a Village ordinance about leaves?
- For Sale sign still up on 9 Appledalte La.
- 4 Badger St. – seven cars parked on lawn; 2 families living in a one family house.

Mayor Presti:

- Code Enforcement will visit and say we've had complaints.
- Take some pictures; if they say, "that's not me", we can show them the pictures.

- Eight out of ten times they will comply.

Avraham Rosskamm - 18 Samuel Rd., Chestnut Ridge, NY 10977:

- Stated he had no place to keep all the cardboard.
- Requested it be picked up every week.
- In the Villages around us they pick up every week.
- Asked about the road closure by Samuel Rd.

Mayor Presti:

- When we bid out the contract, we bid out various options with regard to recycling pick up.
- Obviously, when you are looking to comingle your recycling there is an additional cost and expense to that, which gets to be very expensive.
- When you are putting recycling in your trash, it costs the Village money.
- We have to remind folks to not put their cardboard boxes out with their trash.
- Don't put your trash in the cardboard box; the garbage company will not pick it up.
- Cardboard is supposed to be put out with paper.
- The Village gets money for all recyclable items.
- It becomes cost prohibitive for the garbage scavenger to now have to pick up everything once a week.
- When we rebid again, which will probably be next year; we will see again what the pricing is.
- We have to ask you to do the best that you can do.

Trustee Cohen:

- This all goes to the County collection center; if they see too much recyclables in the garbage, the Village and the carter can be held responsible with fines; put on notice by the County.
- Our garbage collectors have been told not to take them together.
- We've been kicking this around in our workshop for awhile; we know what needs to be done, but we also have to figure out how to pay for it.
- There are penalties to the tax payers if we exceed the Cap.
- We are trying to be fiscally responsible to the community, but we need to see how the numbers fit.

Mayor Presti:

- You are basically saying, because I'm here asking for it, that means I'm willing to pay for it; that's wonderful for you.
- Once folks find out what the cost to that is, they say, "you know what, let's find an alternative way of what to do with it".
- This is not the first time we've heard it; it's not like we are ignoring it, it just that it really does become a matter of dollars and cents.

- If folks want to get their annual rebate by us staying under the Cap, that's how we have to do it; but at the same time, we are never averse to trying to find a creative way to squeeze a little bit more out of the rock.
- We understand what you are trying to do, but we have to balance it.
- As far as Samuel Rd., the Judge ruled the road stays closed.

Deputy Mayor Brock:

- Take the abstract home and look at the expenses.

Magali Dupuy – 49 Spring Hill Terrace, Chestnut Ridge, NY 10977:

- Had a solution for the cardboard and the leaves.
- Suggested cardboard could be used as compost; leaves could be used as mulch.

Mayor Presti:

- Thanked Dupuy Magali for her green tip of the day.

Steven Slackman-:

- Wanted to know how many leaves could be dumped.
- Asked if he wanted to take his customers leaves in the back of his aunt's property and dump them here; was that allowed?
- Stated someone else does it.

Mayor Presti:

- Stated we don't dump; you have to bag the leaves.
- You can't just dump leaves on your front lawn.
- The garbage carter normally picks up ten bags at a clip.
- You are not supposed to be carting leaves or debris from other properties.
- If you have something to say, you are welcome to call the Building Department tomorrow and lodge your complaint.

Claudia Gollub – 2 Sunny Ridge Ct., Chestnut Ridge, NY 10977:

- Stated she thought the speed limit on Chestnut Ridge Rd. /Rt. 45 was thirty miles per hour.
- Requested the speed limit be lowered on the roads;
- Complained people are flying down Scotland Hill Rd.
- Concerned children would get hurt.

Trustee Cohen:

- Stated the speed limit was thirty miles per hour between the schools.

Mayor Presti:

- Stated Chestnut Ridge Rd., Route 45 speed limit was forty miles per hour.
- My understanding is the State sets the speed limit and that's gospel from Albany.

- We will follow up with the Village Engineer to see if there is any flexibility.

Tony Sharan:

- Stated thirty miles per hour is the speed limit.

Motion to Close the Open Floor Public Discussion.

MOTION: Trustee Miller

SECOND: Deputy Mayor Brock

The Board was polled and voted 5-0 to Close the Open Floor Public Discussion.

10. Motion to Adjourn the Meeting and Go Into Executive Session..

MOTION: Trustee Valentine

SECOND: Trustee Cohen

The Board was polled and voted 5-0 to Adjourn the Meeting.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 8:48 P.M.

EXECUTIVE SESSION ENDED: 9:28 P.M.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED;

Florence A. Mandel

Village Clerk

