

The Planning Board of the Village of Montebello held a meeting on Tuesday, December 11, 2012 at the Montebello Community Center, 350 Haverstraw Road, Montebello, New York. Chairman Rubin called the meeting to order at 7:22 p.m. and led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT

Al Rubin, Chairman  
Michael Iatropoulos, Member  
Jane Burke, Member  
Anthony Caridi, Member  
Thomas Ternquist, Member  
Donald Wanamaker, Member

OTHERS

Ira Emanuel, Assistant Village Attorney  
Robert Geneslaw, Village Planner  
Martin Spence, Village Engineer  
Gloria Scalisi, Planning & Zoning Clerk

Member Iatropoulos made a motion to approve the minutes of November 13, 2012, seconded by Member Ternquist. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

**Ramapo Valley Sports Park  
55.08-1-5 &6**

Assist the Village Board with the “Ramapo Valley Sports Park” Village Board Application for a Zone Change or Change of Use. The Applicant proposes to build a multi-sports park consisting of three outdoor fields and one indoor domed field. The total acreage for the parcels (lot 5 & 6) is 19.34 acres. The property is located on the north side of Rella Boulevard, zero feet east of the intersection of Airmont Road in the Village of Montebello, which is known and designated on the Ramapo Tax Map as Section 55.08, Block 1, Lots 5 & 6 in an LO-C Zone.

In attendance were the Applicant, Mr. John Martin; the Applicant’s attorney, Mr. Michael Klein and the applicant’s Engineers, Mr. Jay Greenwell and Mr. Paul Petretti.

Mr. Klein gave a brief overview of the project whereas the Applicant would like to develop a commercial recreation facility on 19 acres of property in the Village of Montebello. The facility would have three artificial turf fields suitable for soccer and other use sports and an indoor air structure that would accommodate one artificial turf field for year round use. The property in question is located in the LOC district. Mr. Klein explained that at the last Planning Board meeting, in April 2012, the Board had wanted a myriad of points clarified. In the interim the Applicant has retained a number of experts, such as Don Rhuda, Musco Lighting and Paul Petretti for stormwater management, to help with the clarification. Mr. Klein stated that the Applicant has prepared a number of renderings to depict the sports park at various vantage points within the Village.

Mr. Greenwell stated that within the last five months the Applicant has ordered an aerial flight, completed the full boundary survey and then adapted the conceptual plan to a more detailed site plan. Mr. Greenwell explained that the site plan before the Planning Board is not for construction purposes. The purpose was to put enough detailed information on the Site Plan so that the Planning Board would be able to evaluate the merits of the project. The current application consists of two lots of the old Ramapo Corporate Center. Since the time of the “Old Ramapo Corporate Center” the site has undergone various applications to the Planning Board which have

not come to fruition. Mr. Greenwell stated that the Applicant, Mr. Martin, is intent on following the application through to fruition.

Mr. Greenwell stated that the infrastructure and the drainage were sized in accordance with the design parameters affective at the time to accommodate a full build-out of all four sites including the one that was built (Provident Bank). Mr. Greenwell informed the Board that the current layout will provide a much greener footprint than constructing office buildings with parking lots around them. Mr. Greenwell discussed a previous map note in which access was provided to the office building to allow left turns onto a signalized intersection and the Applicant has no objection if the Board would like to add that map note.

Mr. Greenwell discussed access to the Bubble-Building. Around the perimeter of the Bubble-Building the access would be gravel. The existing elevation is at 515' and the elevation of the fields will be at 495' and the back (north-northeast) corner of the Bubble-Building (closest to the nearest resident) will be cut into the ground with a retaining wall and which will therefore diminish the impact of the height of the building. The elevation of Rella Boulevard at the center line of the cul-de-sac is 485'. The elevation at the roadway of Montebello Commons is 514'. The elevation of Polo Court is 532'. The elevation of Airmont Road is 481' at the front of Village Hall (Montebello). Mr. Greenwell stated that the Applicant is proposing a 50 foot landscaped buffer adjacent to the residential component on the north-northeast side of the property.

Chairman Rubin questioned the Applicant on whether the buffer is fenced.

Mr. Greenwell replied that the retaining wall will have a fence but if the Board would like the landscaped buffer to be fenced the Applicant will not object.

Mr. Greenwell explained some of the concrete pavilions shown on the site plan which are for outdoor viewing and picnicking, with benches provided.

Chairman Rubin questioned the applicant on whether the fields will have restrooms.

Mr. Greenwell responded that the restrooms will only be in the main building (bubble-building). Mr. Greenwell discussed the parking on the site. The Applicant distributed the parking facing the more industrial/office component of the site and away from the residential component. The parking is evenly distributed so that all the fields and the bubble-building will have access to parking.

Mr. Greenwell explained that the site will have a large swath that will not only insulate the buffer area as well as the area adjacent to the roadway but will remain untouched.

Mr. John Martin provided the Board with an aerial photo of the site right before the leaves opened in April. The photo shows the existing trees and their density, paying close attention to the north-northeast corner of the site.

Mr. Martin explained the two-page flow chart that was submitted at the April Planning Board meeting. Mr. Martin stated that the hours of operation, type of use and parking were of paramount concern. In terms of use, the site is primarily built around a use field sport (soccer, lacrosse, field hockey, football, rugby, baseball, softball, fitness training, golf range, various camps, community events and corporate events).

Member Iatropoulos questioned the Applicant on the "idea" on the volume of vehicular and pedestrian traffic at high volume-peak hours. Mr. Martin responded that on page 2 of the flow chart has that information.

Mr. Klein stated that the Applicant has retained a traffic consultant and does anticipate preparing, at the right moment, a full traffic study but Mr. Klein indicated that advice, from the Village Board, was to prove that the Applicant usage was less than the usage of the office building that were already approved.

Mr. Martin discussed the hours of use and how (on the flow chart) it is divided into four seasons.

Member Ternquist questioned the Applicant on why season 2 and 4 they close at 11pm and season 3 they close at 10pm. Mr. Martin replied that it is the nature of demand.

Chairman Rubin questioned the Applicant on the amount of players, coaches, referees for the various sports. Chairman Rubin also questioned the busing of players and parking for buses, feeding and serving of camp children and the amount of employees working. Chairman Rubin questioned the Applicant on the amount of viewing stands for guests. Chairman Rubin would like to know what provisions are to be made for the transitions/overlap of groups coming and groups leaving the complex. Chairman Rubin stated that the counts of players/coaches, facility staff and parking seem low.

Mr. Martin replied that each field has two sets of viewing stands (5 row bleachers). Mr. Martin stated that the staff would consist of 8 people only due to the nature of the field being self-maintaining. Mr. Martin stated that the flow chart data is meant for the largest number in a typical use.

Member Iatropoulos questioned the Applicant on the facility staff number and how it seems too small of a number.

Mr. Martin stated that at present they (heavily) use Suffern Middle Schools fields (2 fields) from 6pm to 10pm and they use one person to staff the fields. The coaches are in a supervisory position so that the facility does not have to provide additional staff. Mr. Martin thoroughly explained page 2 of the flow chart with emphasis on "All Full-Fields Scenario". Mr. Martin stated that players 10years and under had more parental and guests (grandparents, friends, etc.) viewers than players over 10years old. Mr. Martin stated that for players above 10 years old the viewers and guest drop off dramatically. Mr. Martin stated that in the previous fall season they counted spectators and there were less than a one to one ratio of players to spectators.

Chairman Rubin questioned the Applicant on the food services to be provided for the complex.

Mr. Martin stated that the concession stand and bathroom facilities will be in the bubble building only. The staff would consist of the indoor staff of four people. Mr. Martin stated that they have contacted the Mack Cali Building and have been in discussion over off-site parking. The Mack Cali Building provides 500 parking spaces for its office building.

Chairman Rubin questioned the Applicant on site security.

Mr. Martin stated that generally security is provided by the Ramapo Police Department. Mr. Martin stated at events in the past the Ramapo Police Department did not want them to get "other" security. In terms of site security there is a "Site Supervisor" on staff at any given moment and "he" will take care of any emergency that may come up. Ambulances will be able to drive directly onto the fields without damage.

Member Iatropoulos questioned the Applicant on first aid. Mr. Martin replied that they would have, on hand, first aid for your basic bumps and bruises. The complex would not have an EMT on staff, for more complex injuries 911 would be called. Mr. Martin stated that in his experience, where they run a 3 field complex (not together), the accident rate is negligible. The fields today are engineered to mitigate injuries. Mr. Martin stated that the accident rate is about one per week per three fields. Mr. Martin stated that if the Bubble Field is factored in it would be 2 per week.

Mr. Martin presented the Planning Board with conceptual visuals of the property.

Mr. Martin stated that "whatever vegetation along Airmont Road that the Planning Board would like kept would not be a problem".

Member Burke stated that when the original-previous site plan was approved there were supposed to be "street trees" along Airmont Road, which were never done.

Mr. Martin discussed the visual looking through Polo Court. Mr. Martin stated that the Bubble can be made of material that will turn totally black at night and not be seen.

Mr. Martin discussed the visual looking from Montebello Commons (Building). The tops of the lights will be screened and not seen. Through the trees you will only see white from the bubble.

Member Burke stated that the trees will lose their leaves and the entire field will be lit up and the senior citizens will have a lot of light until eleven pm. Mr. Martin disagrees because the dome will be blocking the fields and the light poles will sit below the dome.

Chairman Rubin stated that the bubble is not translucent; it is opaque and can be manufactured to look black at night. Chairman Rubin questioned the Applicant on whistle-blowing and noise if that is also dispelled from the Bubble. Mr. Martin stated that it will be and that the actual noises from the mechanicals of the Bubble are close to not being able to be heard outside.

Chairman Rubin questioned the Applicant on whether the dome blocks the height of the light stanchions from the fields. The mean average height of the dome is about below 65 feet.

Chairman Rubin questioned the Applicant on whether the dome will have speaker systems. Mr. Martin replied that there will be base audio provided but it will not be like a concert system.

Chairman Rubin stated that under no circumstances would he ever be involved with allowing a musical event to take place under the dome, a party that would require music and or food services to allow weddings. Chairman Rubin stated that if the project passes through the Village Board he hopes the Village Trustees will put a limit on what can be done in the dome.

Member Ternquist questioned the Applicant on the color of the material of the dome. Mr. Martin stated that the fabric is white with multiple layers such that in the evening the outside is dark.

Member Ternquist questioned the Applicant on dome and weather resistant factors such as collapsing. Mr. Martin stated that flooding in the mechanicals is what collapsed the dome at the Saints Center, not wind or rain.

Brief discussion on different colors such as green or blue domes.

Member Iatropoulos would like the Applicant to provide the Board with a digital presentation to show the points being made on dome colors and visual aspects of the dome.

Mr. Klein stated that the Applicant would be happy to do that but when is the appropriate-right time.

Member Wanamaker questioned the Applicant on whether the mechanicals run 24 hours 7days a week. The Applicant replied that the mechanicals run 24-7.

Mr. Greenwell stated that there will be a retaining wall behind the mechanicals.

Member Burke stated that most of the Village of Montebello will be below and downhill this complex and the noise will be heard especially since there are less trees and sound carries. The people on Polo Court will be facing the complex directly.

Mr. Martin described the depth of the lights of the fields.

Member Iatropoulos questioned the Applicant on the acoustical noise of a referee's whistles. Mr. Martin stated that he will have that information at the next meeting.

Mr. Martin stated that there are mitigating factors that will offset the noise; the site is set down and perimeter trees will be maintained to offset noise (more in the summer than in winter).

Mr. Don Rhuda, Musco Lighting, stated that Musco Lighting is an American privately owned manufacturer for over 35 years. Mr. Rhuda explained what 0.5 foot candles means and at 0.5 foot candles it is dark, any lower you would need a flashlight. Musco Lighting is keeping the foot candles at a low number through design. Mr. Rhuda explained in detail the renderings provided, dated December 7, 2012 (copies in File). Mr. Rhuda stated that if the property owners are higher than where you are lighting you will get less light.

Member Wanamaker questioned the Applicant on whether the lights are LED lights. Mr. Rhuda stated that they used metal hail lights for the field and LED lights for the parking which are very energy efficient and easy to control. Mr. Rhuda stated that the lights are guaranteed on and off the field. As far as visibility of the poles, they are limited by the screening surrounding Polo Court. Mr. Rhuda stated that 8 of the poles are 70 feet tall on the field and the 16 poles in the parking lot are 30 feet. A total of 24 poles are on the entire site. The poles in the Torne Valley complex are much higher.

Member Burke questioned Mr. Rhuda on whether his company installed the lights in the Torne Valley Complex. Mr. Rhuda stated that his company installed the lights in the Torne Valley Complex. Mr. Rhuda stated that for a point of reference the Suffern Middle School lights are 100 feet tall.

Member Iatropoulos would like the Applicant to demonstrate digitally the reflection of the light poles at different heights.

Mr. Martin stated that the lights will be shining away from Airmont Road and onto the field.

Chairman Rubin stated his concern for the neighbors on Polo Court because they would look down onto a lit field. Also, the fields' proximity to the neighbors (Polo Court) in terms of the noise issues (whistles). Chairman Rubin stated that he still has an issue with the staff numbers.

Paul Petretti, Civil Engineer, discussed drainage on the 40 acre site. Mr. Petretti discussed runoff reduction of the site.

Mr. Martin Spence, Village Engineer, read his memo dated November 27, 2012 (copy in File).

Mr. Robert Geneslaw, Village Planner, read the minutes of the November 27, 2012 CDRC meeting (copy in file).

Member Wanamaker stated that domes can be made to be aesthetic and questioned the Applicant on the emergency egress from the dome; are there any garage doors on the dome so that a vehicle can drive right into the dome. Member Wanamaker stated his concern for uses of the dome and if there are any Village Ordinances regarding the uses. Member Wanamaker stated that the storm-water retention looks well planned out.

Mr. Martin stated that there are a series of emergency exits that are pre-supposed by the size of the structure.

Member Burke stated that the Applicant did not mention taxes and ratables.

Mr. Klein stated that it was discussed early on with the Village Board and the Applicant is a for-profit corporation that will own the complex and they will pay their fair share of taxes.

Member Burke stated her concern with the project being approved and then turning back into a non-for-profit entity and or an eyesore if left abandoned.

Mr. Martin stated that all the projects pertaining to youth sports that he has been affiliated with are for profit. Mr. Martin stated that the Superdome Sports in Waldwick New Jersey; Hudson Valley in Milton New York; Diamond Nation in Flemington New Jersey and Sportarama in Monsey New York are all for profit. Mr. Martin stated that the area of youth sports is "skyrocketing" in demand.

Member Burke stated her concern for the actual need of the use.

Mr. Klein stated that the proposed sports complex is entirely consistent with the quality of life and the values of Montebello, Ramapo Central and Western Ramapo.

Member Iatropoulos stated his thankfulness for the variety of input of the Applicants professionals but has one question on the origin (where they come from) of the volume of the sports in a rustic village.

Mr. Martin stated that the Ramapo Valley Soccer Club has 2 thousand children from kindergarten through college. The majority of the children come from the Ramapo Valley Central School District.

Member Caridi congratulated the Applicant on tonight's very professional presentation. Member Caridi stated that the Applicant has tackled the issues of noise and lighting as evidence by the presentation of their lighting professional. Member Caridi stated his concern with the proximity of the complex near living quarters. Member Caridi informed the Applicant that they need to use utmost skills to make sure that the surrounding neighbors are screened from the lights and noise of the complex and all the overcut trees will be restored. Member Caridi expressed his appreciation that an Applicant is bringing the Village a step into the Modern Age. Member Caridi would like the Applicant to keep in mind that they are doing something very unique in a very concentrated area. Member Caridi stated his belief that Applicant has presented enough information that the Village Board can make a viable judgment on the proposal. There are still technical issues to be addressed as part of the Planning Board review.

Member Ternquist complemented the Applicant on their presentation but is still concerned with the big picture on whether it is the most appropriate use for that site in terms of creating jobs and also traffic.

Member Burke questioned the Village Planner on the other lots on the site. Mr. Geneslaw replied that there is one other lot remaining if the proposal goes through and would have to research to see if an office building would be less likely to move near a sports complex.

Member Caridi stated that all of the other complexes that Mr. Martin mentioned all sit smack in the middle of commercial areas.

Chairman Rubin stated that the Applicants presentation helped illuminate the concept. Still many open questions ahead such as traffic, appropriate uses of the dome, neighbors on Polo Court, noise, food services for events-camps, bathrooms, security, comparative ratables for the Village and how the Applicant will mitigate sound.

**Congregation Shaarey Israel  
Preliminary and Final Subdivision— 2—90 days Extensions**

Application for Preliminary and Final Subdivision to remove Lot Lines and Subdivision Plat entitled "Congregation Shaarey Israel" dated July 7, 2009, latest revision date of August 31, 2010, which was submitted to the Village of Montebello Planning Board for owner Congregation Shaarey Israel, 16 Montebello Road, Montebello, New York. Total acreage is 5.53 +/-, Section 55.07, Block 1, Lot 1 and Section 48.19, Block 1, Lots 48 and 49 in a RR-50 Zone.

The Applicant has submitted a request for two ninety day extensions. Mr. Emanuel stated the completion of the elimination of the lot lines, which was the final aspect of their subdivision, has not been completed due to many factors one of which was obtaining signatures from the county. The time had run out and therefore now they are requesting two ninety day extensions.

Member Ternquist made a motion to grant two ninety day extensions for the Congregation Shaarey Israel Subdivision, seconded by Member Iatropoulos. The extensions began September 10, 2012 and are set to expire March 10, 2013. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

**Town of Ramapo—Public Hearing  
Coe Farm Road Sewer Extension  
Wetlands Permit**

Application of the Town of Ramapo, 237 Route 59, Suffern, New York 10901, for Approval of a Stream and Wetlands Permit entitled "Coe Farm Road Sewer Extension" to allow disturbance and construction within 75 feet of a freshwater wetland. The proposed construction is for the extension of sanitary sewer service from Coe Farm Road to provide gravity sewer service to an existing dwelling at 585 Haverstraw Road, which will cross 75 feet of wetland. The subject property is located on the west side of Coe Farm Road in the Village of Montebello, which is known and designated on the Ramapo Tax Map as Sections 40.20, Block 1, Lots 21 and 52 in a RR-50 Zone.

The Applicant has submitted a request for an adjournment until the January 8, 2013 Planning Board meeting. Member Caridi made a motion to adjourn the Public Hearing on the Application of the Town of Ramapo for approval of a Wetlands Permit for the Coe Farm Road Sewer Extension, as per the Applicant's request, until the January 8, 2013 Planning Board meeting, seconded by Member Ternquist. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

**New Business**

Member Iatropoulos made a motion to adjourn the meeting to the January 8, 2013 Planning Board meeting, seconded by Member Ternquist. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 10:25 p.m.