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The meeting was adjourned at 10:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ashley Smith

**ROONEY, SEAN – 17 MILLER ROAD – TM – 86.11-1-18 – AMENDED SITE PLAN – RESOLUTION**

Mr. Cleary said Mr. Carnazza does not have any issues with this; this is on for a resolution.

Mr. Franzetti said all of my comments have been addressed.

Mr. Cleary said you have two resolutions Mr. Chairman, a negative declaration as well as final site plan approval.

Mr. Giannico offered the resolution of the Planning Board of the Town of Carmel #16-16 July 13, 2016 tax map # 86.11-1-18 Rooney, 17 Miller Road the SEQR Determination of Significance Negative Declaration. The motion was seconded by Mr. Furfaro with all in favor.

Mr. Giannico offered the resolution of the Planning Board of the Town of Carmel #16-17 dated July 13, 2016 tax map # 86.11-1-18 Rooney, Final Site Plan Change of Use. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

**LAKE PLAZA SHOPPING CENTER (PROPOSED STOP & SHOP) – 983-1005 ROUTE 6 – TM – 65.10-1-45 & 46 – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW**

Mr. Franzetti said I have no comments as this is on for an architectural review.

Mr. Cleary stated that Mr. Carnazza doesn’t have anything on this as well because this is on for an architectural review.

Ms. Geraldine Tortorella, attorney for the applicant addressed the board and stated that we have been working on the architectural design for quite some time, we have made a revised submission to your Board with revised design drawings for both Stop and Shop and the central portion of the shopping center in early June. Since that time we have had further meetings and conversations with Mr. Franze to discuss the architectural design. On Monday July 11 we submitted the updated revised design drawings for the central portion of the retail stores as well as the Kmart façade. We are in the position to make some commitments with respects to Kmart. This evening we would like to take this opportunity to update you on the changes and to have a discussion with your Board and see if we are ready to move to the next stage.

Mr. Franze said that the memo to this Board on this application was a conditional no objection, as Ms. Tortorella has expressed. He said since my involvement they have changed the architectural design a couple times, they have met with me twice in my office and we have been communicating back and forth. They have revised the drawings a few times so clearly there has been a focus on part of the applicant regarding the architecture. As I also indicated I think the latest effort is the strongest one yet. The Kmart anchor architecturally is basically not part of the conversation as I have been made to understand it is not part of the application and other then a paint job nothing else is going on there. The other anchor Stop and Shop while being an entirely new building, they view this as a flagship prototype so as much as they have made an effort to move in the direction of more traditional materials, substantially the architecture has not changed a whole lot. That doesn’t mean that it is not good and valuable architecture, it just means that it is not necessarily consistent with what the Town has expressed as a vision for the Town and for Route 6. It was expressed to me rather early on that the signage is not part of the conversation, I have written in a few memos that I think the internally eliminated sign letters is not what I think would be the best choice for this center but it is also off the table because they got approvals from the Zoning Board. I am putting it out there just because it is part of the overall picture but it is one of the three major conditions that are over our no objection to the architecture. The main body of the shopping center, the applicant has spent a lot of time working on and revising things and I think it is substantially consistent with the Town of Carmel’s vision for Main Street and for the public spaces in the Town of Carmel.

Chairman Gary said the fact that Kmart is not part of this application will make a big difference because when the public looks at this center, they will look at it as a whole so is that going to make a difference.

Mr. Franze said whether or not the public looks at this as one center or a complex of buildings I cannot say I can’t speak for the public but the design that is before us clearly suggests essentially three different primary elements, the two anchors and the center section. If anyone is looking for this center to read as one architecturally cohesive building it is not going to be that. That is not necessarily a bad thing but the Kmart anchor is the weakest, it is a big stucco box with no fenestration has a little brick but it is essentially a big massive masonry thing. They are going to give it a paint job that the applicant has volunteered to do because it is not part of their application so they are not obligated to do it. They are going to paint it in a way that will certainly add some variety to that building and some articulation that will make it better then what is there now. But, make no mistake, that anchor is going to look substantially different from the rest of the building. The other anchor Stop and Shop will also be substantially different so the idea that you have a large anchor here that’s one thing, a large anchor here and a main body of the plaza that is on one hand subordinate to both but dimensionally greater than either and also most closely reflects what the Town has expressed that they are looking for. The two anchors are not what the Town has told me it is looking for but that middle part is.

Mr. Cote asked if he is saying that the Stop and Shop is not part of what the Town envisions.

Mr. Franze stated that the Planning Board and the Town Board have expressed to me is the type of colonial village architecture, traditional perhaps Main Street architecture vocabulary. That makes it very clear to me what the Town is looking for. They have also pointed to different communities where they see an architecture that they like. I have with the dialogue from this applicant provided for them a couple of examples. One is a recently remodeled shopping center in Bedford Hills that I believe in many ways is very consistent with the vision that the Town has for their Route 6 corridor. Another one is a shopping center in which happens to be owned by the applicant in Pennsylvania and only by the curiosity I have looked at their website and they are very proud to show the properties that they own. One of which, looks a lot like what the Town of Carmel has described to me as what they would like this center to look like. I provided these images to the applicant and I suppose partially in response to that what has changed for the main tenant section of this center I think to a significant degree reflects those images. That what I was getting at when I said that they have worked very hard to dialogue with me on behalf of the Town to make changes to the architecture and to their team in response to these concerns. It has been explained to me that the anchors and the signage is not part of the dialogue so I can only accept that that is what the case is.

Chairman Gary said so you are saying that the Kmart is going to be vastly different then what the Stop and Shop is going to be like.

Mr. Franze said yes.

Chairman Gray said there is nothing that can be done to change that.

Mr. Franze said I am not suggesting that nothing can be done to improve the architecture.

Chairman Gary asked if there were any suggestions made to do so.

Mr. Franze said no but I can’t speak for the applicant but I also think they won’t disagree when I say that the applicant has expressed to me that it is not an option, they are not offering it. That is not a judgement that is just the facts.

Mr. Carnazza asked why they said that they can’t change the lighted signs.

Mr. Franze said from my understanding it has been considered approved by other authorities having jurisdiction.

Mr. Carnazza said yes for size not for lighting.

Mr. Franze said that in an earlier memo I indicated that there is some language in the ordinates that to me sound like it prohibits internally illuminated signs. It was expressed to me that that has not be historically an interpretation by the Town of Carmel.

Mr. Carnazza said yes that is true.

Mr. Franze said that in my memo I indicated that if it is not a code or non-compliance issue then my opinion is that it is an unfortunate choice.

Mr. Carnazza said ok so it’s not that they can’t it’s that they don’t want to change to an indirectly lite light.

Mr. Franze said the reasons I would like the applicant to explain is because this is starting to get outside of the area of architecture and I can’t speak to economics I don’t know anything about it. I was told that the applicant is not in the position right now to change the architecture for Kmart as much as it could use it. I am also told that they have the right to use the self-illuminated letter signs that are part of the application and that that is not on the table for conversation.

Chairman Gary said if you can’t get a good building then the sign is irrelevant. Is there any way that the applicant or the Town can come up with a solution where someone to take a look at that. Has anyone made any suggestions on what Kmart should look like?

Mr. Franze said I think the Board understands that I need to maintain sensitivity to not presuming to be the designer. That becomes a grey area and I need to do my best to represent the Town and express to the applicant what the Town is looking for and likewise advise the Board with regards to what it is the applicant is presenting. To answer your question directly, I have not said here is what you ought to do with Kmart. I have said what is wrong with it and what the Town doesn’t like about it and I have stated what the Town would like for it to look like.

Chairman Gary asked what type of response he got.

Mr. Franze said it is not on the table; Kmart is not part of the dialogue except for a paint job which is better than nothing.

Ms. Tortorella stated that it might be helpful if we put the drawings up so we can look at something while we have this conversation. I think that is the bottom line of what we said but I don’t think that is all that we have discussed on the parking lot and Kmart as a whole. We have made a lot of concessions to expand the scope of the improvements that were presented to your Board. In terms of Kmart, what we have explained is that we don’t control the façade of that building, we have a tenant there and we don’t know long term what that space will be ultimately. In our view it is a bit premature and not good business judgement to start making changes to a façade that may have a different tenant that needs something very different then what that façade shows. Originally we indicated that we really weren’t going to make any changes, since our initial conversation with you, we did express a willingness to paint it which reflected in the plans and I would like to be able to put the plans up so we can talk about it in reference to the plans. I would respectfully take exception to the statement that there is really very little change to Stop and Shop because there have been significant change to Stop and Shop in terms of materials that were used which will bring us closer to your vision to the Town. There has been a strong effort made in that direction and I think we indicated that there was a lot of flexibility with this prototype because it is the new prototype for Stop and Shop. Stop and Shop has selected Mahopac to avail this new prototype, they are very excited about it in terms of materials and ecological sensibility. There wouldn’t necessarily be a lot of flexibility with design but there would be with materials which we did try to make an effort to do. I would like to put the plans up and talk about Kmart and the central portion first if that is ok with you.

Mr. Franze stated that Ms. Tortorella has been great to work with on this but I just wanted to remind the Board that my memos have indicated that Stop and Shop did in fact move to much more traditional materials applied to their façade. I have recognized those things and I appreciate those things but what I have tried to suggest is in form the building has not changed, it is very much of the same architectural vocabulary with softer materials.

Ms. Tortorella said so what we will do is look at the central retail section which shows the entire elevation so you can see how it relates.

Mr. Michaels said this top elevation here is showing the composite of all of the buildings together with Stop and Shop on the left side, the retail center in the middle and the Kmart on the right side. This is the portion on Kmart that the applicant was going to paint to refresh it and the red accent band about mid building that would be painted as well as the sign band. That is all that would be done to the Kmart at this point. As far as the retail center, the first design that we had was very linear in nature and after meeting with Mr. Franze the owner decided that they would like to make a change in the philosophy of the design. This is the result that we came back with, we did consider some of the locations that were suggested to us, we tried not to copy exactly what they have but we tried incorporating some of the elements that the Town was looking for as far as the downtown feel. What we have done primarily is we added this shingled façade across the retail section that would be clad with an architectural shingle. We also added these gable elements that are spaced between the column bases in the peak of the gable which is built out about 4 or 5 inches with a trim board that creates a shadow underneath that. Those alternate with these flat cornices that run across the face of the building. The main façade itself is clad with copper material which will be the color grey to compliment the Stop and Shop building and behind the sign band there is an accent panel which is a hard panel with cement tissue materials. That color is a beige color to contrast the grey and that will tie into Kmart which is our effort to try to tie the buildings in together. At the bottom and top of the new fascia we have white trim cords as well as trim cords that outline the gable elements in the cornices. We also currently dropped the front of the fascia from 11 feet 1 inches which is fairly tall in order to minimize the amount of height that we are pushing the mansard up we dropped the front of the fascia down to 10 feet which is lower to a human scale in which afforded us a larger sign band in which we could put the tenant signs across here. The material above the store front is similar to what Stop and Shop will be using which is an aluminum material that is covered with a foe wood that Stop and Shop is using on their façade. The existing brick bulkheads on the storefront will be removed and replaced with new floor to open up the retailors with big open windows. The existing columns are currently clad and brick, the bases of these columns are not in great shape so we will create new full brick stone bases 24” x 24”. On top of that we will build a column enclosure out of clap board with brick which is a very close match to the tiers that remain at the storefront building. There is a picture of the brick against the existing brick building, we won’t be able to match it perfectly but we will get pretty close. The brick is a red one so it doesn’t match exactly with the Stop and Shop but again it will tie into the theme of all the buildings even though the architecture is somewhat different.

Mr. Carnazza asked what color is the actual façade?

Mr. Michaels said it will be a red color.

At which time, Mr. Heidenberg passed the brick material around and said this is very close to the existing brick. These are the three colors of the Harding panel one is a warm grey the beige is the accent color that goes behind the sign, and this color is the white trim board around the gable and the top and bottom of the fascia. This material is a same tissue basin material which is very durable and with the manufacture colors it doesn’t have to be field painted so it comes out prefinished and is much more durable. That really covers the details of the retail elevation.

Mr. Stone asked if the sidewalk is going to be resurfaced.

Mr. Heidenberg stated that there has been no discussion of it but if the sidewalk is cracked or crumbling I think they will repair or replace those sections but there has not been a discussion about a full replacement. I would like to add that based on this design that we were presenting tonight, we believe that it is in conformance with the Planning Board’s design review criteria, based on proportions of the building, the relationship and the scale and massing, this portion of the building does not appear monumental in size and does relate well to the human scale. The height of the building is compatible; even though it’s not the same architectural design but it is compatible in height it doesn’t tower over or shy under the adjacent buildings. The shapes of the gables are not monotonous when we use them with the adjacent cornices so it creates a visual interest and details.

Mr. Carnazza asked if you are going to rebuild the entire façade.

Mr. Heidenberg said depending on how it is constructed, they are showing that the existing structure will be below the proposed sign. Sometimes it is just easier to start from scratch but we will see how sturdy it is.

Mr. Carnazza said that they will have to look at the accessibility rules and make sure they are in compliance with that. If you are going to redo the entire structure you will have to make sure that you are in compliance with the accessibility code also.

Ms. Tortorella said you mean at some point it will trigger it.

Mr. Carnazza said yes, so you may have to do some of the sidewalks that you may not necessarily want to do.

Mr. Heidenberg said I would like to add that you can see in this section here that the storm water will be collected with the internal venter which would add to the architecture but in this situation to have the meters coming down so the intent is to conceal it better and allow it to go into the basins.

Mr. Carnazza said they are allowed to put a sign in front of each store perpendicular to the store so when you are walking underneath you will be able to see what you are walking passed.

Mr. Furfaro asked what the signage issue is.

Mr. Heidenberg said what is shown will be internally illuminated with red. In terms of the signs width I think they are allowed almost continuous of sign band of internally illuminated sign.

Ms. Tortorella stated that the signs are shown in red for illustration purposes, we are not selecting a red color for every sign it is going to be tenant dependent. We have one wall sign per tenant space so it is not a continuous band; it depends on how many tenants we have in this space as to how many signs we would have. It is interesting that we are having this conversation because one of the challenges that we had at the time of arriving at this design because once you start having these peaks in the middle of the building you have to match it up with the tenant spaces or else you are impinging on the tenant ability of this space. That is one of the business concerns that we have to balance and take into consideration, we are not proposing one continuous sign band we are proposing one wall sign per occupied tenant space.

Mr. Furfaro said but it depends on the size of the sign.

Mr. Carnazza said no they are only allowed 40 square feet per tenant so depending on the size of the space that they take. It is 2 square feet per foot of linear frontage so if you have a 10 foot wide store you can do 20 square feet but once you hit 20 feet wide you are allowed to do 40 square feet.

Mr. Furfaro said so that is a 4 x 10 sign right.

Mr. Heidenberg said that also has to be proportioned to the size.

At which time, a discussion ensued about the tenant space signs.

Ms. Tortorella said I think we can show you that it can be very tastefully done with internally illuminated signs. But because we have so many vacancies and don’t know which tenants we will have we want this to be a very successful shopping center. So we want to maintain a certain amount of flexibility for the design of the signage and our ability to provide meaningful signage to the retail tenants. We will look into providing you with more information proportionally what the signs will look like so we can demonstrate that it will look tasteful. This is only one part of a very substantial investment that this client is making in a retail venue center.

Mr. Giannico asked if the proposed internal illuminated signs will all be one color or will it be an option for the tenants.

Ms. Tortorella said it’s really hard for us to commit to one color and that is because we will have some larger tenants who do have prototype signage so we will need to have flexibility on that end. I just want to make clear too that the wall signs that are shown here did not need any variances.

Mr. Furfaro asked what the variances were needed for.

Mr. Carnazza said they were for the Stop and Shop signs.

Ms. Tortorella said yes that and to have the perpendicular signs underneath the building. We also made the commitment that any signage that we have on the building will conform in size to your code or we would have to go get a variance. It is not our intent for the signs to change the architect whatsoever this is a significant investment and a significant change in what we were initially looking to do here.

Mr. Furfaro asked if we have the option to be more restrictive then the code.

Mr. Cleary said yes of course.

Mr. Stone asked if these tenant spaces are going to be chopped up differently, there are 10 tenant spaces open now so will there be a different in amount of possibly tenants.

Mr. Carnazza said in turn Planet Fitness could come in and take four store fronts so we never know what is going to happen.

Mr. Franze stated that the applicant has expressed the concern of this very thing and how the flexibility is the most important thing to them in response to the retail spaces.

Mr. Heidenberg said that sometimes shopping center owners make the signage very monotonous without any flexibility, what Ms. Tortorella is trying to explain is that there is a way it can be done where the restrictions aren’t so heavy and the signage can still look good.

Mr. Furfaro asked if Kmart decides to move out of that shopping center and something else goes in there would they have to come back in front of our Board.

Mr. Carnazza said no it is retail to retail and if they cut Kmart in half they still won’t need to come to this Board because there is no change of use.

Mr. Furfaro said so if they were to put a gym there then they would have to come.

Mr. Carnazza said no it is a designed shopping center so it is permitted it is retail sales, services, entertainment, restaurants, drinking and medical.

Mr. Furfaro asked if we can make that a condition that if they change the tenant spaces then they will have to come back.

Mr. Cleary said I don’t think you can do that unless you found some impact that required your review.

Mr. Furfaro said so if they aren’t going to do anything with Kmart because of the lease issues it would be a lot easier to manage this if the new tenant would have to come back to the Board.

Mr. Carnazza said I think that is something that money can fix because they would like to do the whole shopping center but Kmart is using the old leases they can’t afford to do it.

Mr. Furfaro said I get that but if Kmart goes away and another tenant comes in it would be nice to have them come back to us.

Mr. Cleary said I don’t think we can compel them to do that but you can ask Ms. Tortorella if they would be willing to do that in order to create the same architectural binocular on that piece of property.

Chairman Gary asked if they are saying they don’t want anything to do with Kmart.

Mr. Cleary said yes but the owner of the shopping center does. They have a lease with Kmart right now and they are saying that the lease doesn’t allow them to make a change to the building that they own. If Kmart goes away and Walmart comes in and wants to change the building then that is a different story.

Ms. Tortorella said just understand that there are different ways that spaces can change and it would be difficult for us to make a representation that we will come in when that tenant changes and we will reconstruct it. We don’t know what the situation will be at the time but we are investing a lot of money and we do want this to be a successful center and I hope that you will trust that we will do everything that we can in order to make that happen. We have made a significant effort to make substantial improvements throughout the entire shopping center so that it looks like a unified whole. We are also investing a lot into the parking lot improvements as well.

Chairman Gary stated that they have done a lot to make this a much better and safer center since you have first presented it to us. One thing I never fully understood is that one owner owns the whole building is that correct?

Ms. Tortorella said yes.

Chairman Gary said he will own it today and when Stop and Shop moves in so he is remodeling the front of the building to make it fit what he wants to go in there.

Ms. Tortorella said yes that’s true.

Chairman Gary said I understand where you are coming from and this is a conversation that needs to be done at a different time. I would like to sit down and talk to you about your building and what you are going to do to it.

Mr. Heidenberg said absolutely.

Chairman Gary stated that he would like to be in a position where we get together and discuss this whole thing.

Mr. Heidenberg stated that it would be my hope when renovating this shopping center that we could talk about Kmart at this time but unfortunately Kmart has a lease at this time but my guess is Kmart will not be around in the future. We will be here showing you plans when Kmart moves out whether one tenant moves in there or two or three tenants go in there. You don’t have to worry about Kmart not matching because we will be back to fix that.

Chairman Gary said I didn’t know that was the situation and that is a good statement.

Mr. Cleary said technically there is no requirement for them to come back to this Board. In the past we had an Architectural Board and you would have to go in front of them to present the building facades. When that Board disbanded we assumed some of the responsibilities but not in the case of a new tenant occupying this space. Unless the applicant is volunteering to come before this Board they do not have to.

Mr. Furfaro said that would solve a lot of problems if they did so.

Chairman Gary said he owns that whole building all we want is something that the whole Town is going to be proud of. We don’t want to drive them away we just want to help you to make your property something that the whole Town will appreciate.

Mr. Heidenberg stated that we want to be proud of this shopping center and we want this whole Town to be proud of it as well.

Chairman Gary said we can make suggestions to make that happen and that’s what we are trying to do. Mr. Franze will be the one to be of the biggest help on this.

Mr. Stone asked if this is the same color and material that will be used on Stop and Shop.

Ms. Tortorella said yes very similar, would you like us to show you the materials for the Stop and Shop.

Mr. Stone replied yes and asked if the under canopy covered walk is going to stop once you get to Stop and Shop or Kmart.

Ms. Tortorella replied yes.

Mr. Heidenberg said that the covered walk will project it is not going to die into a flat wall when you look down at the end you will see daylight because it will project out in front of the Stop and Shop.

Mr. Stone said okay the ends when you’re coming for Stop and Shop or Kmart will be a flat end on that and it will be a vertical façade.

Mr. Carnazza said it is square.

Mr. Heidenberg said that is open to the daylight.

Mr. Furfaro said he is talking about the top of the canopy.

At which time, a discussion ensued about the under canopy for the middle retail section merging into the end anchor stores and the colors and materials of the Kmart building in relation to Stop and Shop.

Chairman Gary stated that he wants Mr. Franze to get involved with this material at one of the meetings so you can explain it to us and make suggestions in your professional opinion. Then you can schedule a meeting with Ms. Tortorella about giving your opinion on this kind of stuff. We want the 7 opinions here to be on Mr. Franze so we are able to narrow all opinions down to one opinion so you can talk for the Board at the meeting with Ms. Tortorella.

Mr. Franze said ok I will request a meeting with the Planning Board.

Chairman Gary said yes but you must fully understand what Ms. Tortorella is talking about so when you come back to us we will ask you all about it with all opinions included.

Mr. Guzzo stated that since the last meeting we had there have been some substantial changes to the proposed Stop and Shop. We have been going back and forth with Mr. Franze and put a lot of effort into creating several renditions of this with our client and your architect. We feel that although the primary elements of the building are remaining the same, the impact of the type of materials we incorporated were very successful in providing that more traditional look this Town is looking for. We have a couple of prospective up top looking at either direction so it gives you a fairly good feel on what the building is going to look like from either side. All of the elevations have been improved from the last rendition that you saw; previously we were talking about a much wider cement board look which has changed to a sandstone look. Working with both my client and Mr. Franze we tried to keep the integrity of the building because it is a very sustainable building so we will be using similar products that were previously mentioned for the center, they are fiber cement products but the important part of that is that they are going to give us that recycled content. We are trying to go as sustainable as possible with this design, not only through the exterior but also for the interior workings of the building. You will see that the larger windows are our version of bringing a lot of daylight into this space and there are also some skylights incorporated here. The mechanical systems are pretty much state of the art and very efficient so again we are trying to get this concept to something that we can build this as there first and roll that out for future stores. I will walk you through some of the materials and changes to point out specifically what we are proposing. I will start with the front elevation; we have our main entry element which did not change the proportions of that have stayed the same. We have reduced a few things through some design meetings with our client; we had a much larger entry here and incorporated a lot of the wood work product that we were going to use there. We toned that down a lot because we felt it was getting too overwhelming so we tried to incorporate and run the siding through this entire element here. The texture that we chose is a cedar lap siding it is a fiber cement product that has a lot of texture to it and that will come pre-painted which will be a lot less maintenance and more insulation. That is what we are proposing for the upper panels and we have some samples here that we can pass around. We also have some accents along the entire façade; we do keep the wood louvers that we have along the front which will help us control light into the building. They are laminated to look like wood and won’t need to be replaced on a regular base because structurally they are sound, we can control this and put some frame work behind that and project that off the glass. That will allow us to have high glass and a lot of light into the building which will help us direct some light in and it will also serve as an accent over all the window panel which gives the façade a nice touch in feature. We have the design here which is fairly strong but we did change to a little bit more prominent in attempt to hint towards a more traditional type of separation of glass that follow through to either sides of the windows. Our continuous material, which we put a lot of effort to finding the right product, which is a very traditional looking brick that will be highlighted in the left side element. If you remember the previous version that was a very modern looking material so we feel incorporating a much more traditional brick will help and will be the main element to tie everything together. Those are the major upgrades on the front façade that we did but we did not stop there. We also had more of a block looking material on the left façade since it was a concern last time we added metal standing seems panels instead because it is more economical. We eliminated the panels and continued with the same lap siding that will continue throughout the whole side.

Mr. Carnazza asked if that is the dark gray area.

Mr. Guzzo said yes we will stay consistent with the brick material and we are going to stay consistent with the siding.

Mr. Furfaro asked how the panel is installed.

Mr. Guzzo said that is installed with a clip system with a weather proof barrier behind it, it isn’t real brick that we are using it is a simulated brick with dimensions and is consistent with the look of natural brick. We move the exterior wall back and attach the clip system with a drainage system behind that so if water gets behind there it would be able to get out.

A discussion ensued about the clip system, the joints that will connect the panels, the drainage and the lighting.

Mrs. Kugler began talking about how there are so many different colors and she doesn’t believe it will all blend together.

Mr. Guzzo said perhaps you want things to blend but what you really want is a happy co-existence and sometimes the greater difference is better than a slight difference. Because the architectural vocabulary is as different as it is I’m not worried about that I don’t think we are looking to match everything here.

Mrs. Kugler said contrast is good but I think if we could see them all together because to me that is two different color families this is so dark.

Mr. Franze said but look how different the building are and I am not disagreeing with anybody, this gets to be a very suggestive realm. This is good architecture this is thoughtful, balanced, it’s got scale, texture and variety it is not what the Town of Carmel told me what they are looking for. It is a great improvement and it is valuable.

Chairman Gary stated that he agrees with Mrs. Kugler about the colors we should look at it as a whole in order to see the contrast of it all.

Mr. Guzzo said we looked at a bunch of buildings and I haven’t found anything that I can direct you to that is this close to what we are doing everything is so different then the setup we have here. I think this building takes on a much more different appearance now with these materials, the architectural elements are still strong and I will stand behind that. To us we are very happy design wise, I was a little afraid of these materials but they will add this other dimension to the building that we didn’t think about. We were a much more modern approach and these materials will give us a much softer feel then we were expecting.

Mrs. Kugler stated that this is a beautiful concept and I understand that it is prototype but in my opinion this isn’t the prototype for Mahopac.

Chairman Gary asked why they picked Mahopac to try this new prototype out for the first time.

Ms. Tortorella said we have not changed our look or our prototype since 2001 which is a significant amount of time. We have made this commitment to our customers and to the environment to have the sustainability and reduce our carbon footprint to come up with a design which is several years in the making. It is coincidental that this is the first project that will have this new look and all the other Stop and Shop in our sister stores will all be looking like this as well.

Chairman Gary asked if they could put together a sketch to show the Board the colors and see it as a whole.

Ms. Tortorella said yes I think we could put together a materials board where we could get a section of the louvers.

Chairman Gary asked if anyone around the Board has any questions.

Ms. Tortorella said I just want to recap and we can know what the next steps are, we are going to go back and get a material board, we need to set a meeting with the Chairman and if there is anything else you need from us so we can move towards a public hearing.

Chairman Gary said something I would like to see happen is for you to get everything that we talked about before the public hearing so that we can answer questions from the public who I’m sure will have concerns.

**NY FUEL DISTRIBUTORS LLC (COCO FARMS) – 1923 ROUTE 6, CARMEL – TM – 55.11-1-40 – AMENDED SITE PLAN**

Mr. Carnazza stated that there are four variances required from the Zoning Board, front yard on Route 6, front yard on Stoneleigh Ave., Canopy sign and storage tank. They also need to go to the ECB for comments and they need to provide a list of all previously approved variances.

Mr. Franzetti said that the application encompasses the proposal to redevelop on a 0.92 acre parcel on 1923 US Route 6; the project involves the demolition and removal of the existing building and the construction of a new convenience store. They will also provide a new canopy and fuel pumps, they need referrals to ECB, Putnam County Department of Planning, NYS DOT, Carmel Fire Department and the NYCDEP as it is a gas station. Other than that I have a couple of pages worth of comments so I recommend that the applicant come and meet with me being that this is the first time this applicant has come in front of the Board.

Chairman Gary asked if they would want to set up a meeting at Town Hall with Mr. Franzetti our Town Engineer.

Mr. Leo Napior said yes.

Mr. Cleary said you may remember this application first came before us originally in 2014 and it proposed renovating the gas station and proposing a much larger convenience store and car wash. Since then they have taken out the car wash and reduced the size of the convenience store by 2/3 and the gas station proposal is about the same. This is a regulated conditional use, the gas station operation so there are a number of conditional use provisions that the applicant needs to demonstrate compliance with. I have provided the client with a detailed memo in response to those issues. The primary issues expressed last time was traffic circulation around and through the site. This is a site that is often used as a cut through or a bypass in which we expressed a lot of concern about that. The applicant conducted a full traffic impact analysis which was submitted to us. It is very well prepared and very well detailed one of the things is whether or not you want to bring in our own traffic consultant to review that document given the complexity of the material. There is a host of generalized site planning issues, the applicant has addressed some of them but there are opportunities with respects to this property that the applicant could take advantage of a little more significantly with respect to landscaping and beautifying the area.

Chairman Gary asked Mr. Franze if he has any issues with looking at the architecture of this building.

Mr. Franze said absolutely not I would be happy to do so.

Mr. Napior said that the project is to remove all of the existing improvements on the site; it is a rather constrained site being a triangular wedge shape and the intersection of Route 6 and Stoneleigh Ave. We are proposing to keep the existing curb cuts in their current location so that there will be no change to the traffic circulation from the exterior streets. The convenience store is supposed to be 1824 square feet but it is shoved as far back into the building envelope as possible and there isn’t much wiggle room to provide circulation throughout the site. There is also a new canopy proposed and currently there are 3 fuel pumps and we are proposing to have 6 fuel pumps. I understand that there was a concern over traffic cut through and one thing I would like to put in front of the Board that we would hope as the store gets busier any cut through would have to circumvent through the traffic on site and on the street.

Mr. Filichon from Stonefield Engineering stated that they removed approximately 2700 square feet of impervious space as compared to what is existing.

Mr. Napior said that they are proposing to plant and landscape some areas now it is currently hard to do so with such little space. I honestly have not seen the memos with the consultant’s comments yet so I’m not sure what points are raised in there that you would like me to address. The convenience store is basically a traditional convenience store it is not going to be a fast food, sit down franchise it will be a CoCo Farms franchise but just to get your coffee or candy bars. There are 9 parking spaces proposed here as well as 6 in front of the store itself which is zoning compliant. We will update the site plan that was submitted to you based on conversation with staff we will update the parking counts; we were under the impression that we had to count the area under canopy as floor area towards the store which drove our parking count up to 27 spaces. We then in turn, were taking credit for the parking at the pumps, we are still zoning compliant with the parking so we will just need to update that.

Mr. Cleary stated that they are more than zoning compliant which is one of the issues with multiple uses on the site because you have multiple people going just to the convenient store, people getting gas, not getting gas and not going into the store. The way that the site circulates is a significant issue; they provided what is now excessive parking on the left side of the site which might not be necessary. Someone parking over where it is shown is an inconvenience because they have to make their way through the gas isles just to get to the store and then come back again. There may be opportunities to eliminate some of those parking spots and still have a zoning compliant parking layout on the site.

Chairman Gary asked if that cut through is still there.

Mr. Cleary said yes they are still there; they are not changing those curb cuts.

Mr. Filichon said we are proposing a sidewalk along the edge of the paved area for the fuel site so the pedestrians will have a raised and secure walkway to the adjacent parking area.

Mr. Cleary said one other point is the operational conditions of the site that the applicant needs to clarify. He then asked if this is a 24/7 operation.

Mr. Filichon said yes that’s correct. One other change that will show on the next go around of the plans is the existing air and vacuum are currently wedged up against the property line. Staff has indicated that there might be some opportunity to landscape around that and there really isn’t any opportunity to do so in the right of way or in our own property. We are anticipating relocating that equipment somewhere more on the interior of the site adjacent to the parking area. That will give us more of an opportunity to screen that from Route 6.

Chairman Gary asked if they will have to go to any other Board.

Mr. Cleary said yes he will need variances from the Zoning Board.

Mr. Carnazza said and ECB as well.

Mr. Stone asked why there is such a significant increase in pumps, I understand more business but have you studied what the utilization will be. Is it really necessary to add that many pumps because that really constrains the site? If someone is coming in off Stoneleigh and wants to go to the convenience store they have to pull a U-turn somehow or park on the other side and have to walk across. Have you looked into reducing the pump space in order to get that parking closer to the building that circles?

Mr. Napior said the traffic impact study has analyzed what we are proposing here and has determined that there will be no negative impact to the neighboring streets. As far as the double row of pumps, typically on a modern station when you invest all of the money it is the convenience of having people have their gas tanks on either sides of their car so it’s the open opportunity for people to fuel up without making a turn to get access to their gas tank.

Mr. Stone said as far as the impact to the adjacent streets, you are using the same curb cuts and I get that but if someone is coming in there is one egress on Route 6 and if they pull to a pump on this far side and then pull out back onto Route 6 they will be crossing traffic with Stoneleigh. There are a lot of circulation issues with this.

Mr. Filichon said basically we are proposing to keep the curb cuts that are there now the same. The reason for that is because this site is very challenging geometrically you can see that it is triangular with a 40 foot setback on two of the fronting streets as well as a 25 foot setback against the McDonald’s property which is just to the East. We had to put the building where the envelope allows doing so and from there the site kind of takes its course with the canopy being in a logical position. We also don’t want to create a situation where people are fueling at the canopy and there is a big gap between the canopy and the building. There was some thought there but I will add is that the driveway on Stoneleigh will remain with the full access condition but we are bifurcating the access from Route 6. Right now, I have witnessed it myself, people coming in this entrance and going out and the reason why that occurs is because there really isn’t any delineation access, signage or striping. It is sort of a free for all in this area today so we are proposing to make this a right turn in only; we have applied to the DOT already about this. We will be filing with the DOT to add some signage and striping at this driveway to make it an ingress only driveway. So right here there will be two big Do Not Enter signs facing traffic as it comes in from Stoneleigh, if that is not enough we can work with the Board to enhance striping in this area to make it more clear that you cannot use this to go out. That will leave this far Easterly driveway as the only egress going onto Route 6. What we thought about is the activation on the site in this area with multiple fueling positions really becomes an unattractive way to cut through because it is not as direct. We feel that those measures will approve upon the existing condition, there really isn’t a way to prevent cut through without eliminating all access onto Stoneleigh which I don’t think any retail on Route 6 would go for.

Mr. Cote asked if we can angle the ingress onto Route 6 so if you do cut through it you will have an angled entry and have to maneuver around that.

Mr. Filichon said that is certainly something that we can speak to DOT about; we applied to them by leaving everything where it exists and using some softer measures and signage.

Mr. Stone said we need to be a little careful because if that is the only way in from the Route 6 side and you make it difficult for someone to go out that way and go up Route 6 then that will be inconvenient.

Mr. Filichon said we think of this site as really catering to the East bound traffic which is the highest traffic throughout the day but you are right it will certainly give people the opportunity to make a left at the light which we think would be the minority of people. Unfortunately when you have a situation like this and we had to make it an egress only which will make you unable to make the left turn.

Mr. Furfaro said you can’t legally make a left from Route 6 to here.

Mr. Filichon said right you would have to use the traffic light. The vehicle and traffic law in New York State allows you to cross the double yellow for driveway access but not for anything else. That is why we were forced to do it this way.

Mr. Carnazza asked if there will be signs facing Route 6 that will say Do Not Enter.

Mr. Filichon said correct which I think historically is how this site was intended to be all along because of the angle of the driveway.

Mr. Franzetti said I think you need to show that graphically a little better then what you have here now because that will go a long way in showing the Board how this will be done. We need to see it visually because right now we are all talking but it is a lot easier to vision something when it is drawn out already.

Mr. Cleary stated that the biggest challenge with these sites is to make sure that you have free unimpeded circulation while people are doing the stupid things they do at gas stations like parking awkwardly.

Mr. Filichon said we understand that we need to circulate and we are providing a two way drive isle 24 feet in width. We don’t have that luxury all around because we are dealing with a triangular site but we were able to provide a two way circulation right there.

Mr. Furfaro asked if the property line is shown in light green.

Mr. Filichon saiad yes.

Mr. Furfaro asked what the dark green line represents.

Mr. Filichon said that is the DOT’s property so that area will remain landscaped to the extent that they will allow us to do certain things with landscaping. Typically the DOT likes things to be as low maintenance as possible but we have submitted to them and are waiting for a response back.

Mr. Stone said be careful with your landscaping because the site distance is going to be tricky if you have those three large trees there it will block the view for people pulling out of the property.

Mr. Filichon said what we will do is show some site triangles in here because if someone wants to make a left they will need to look to the West.

Mr. Stone said both roads are pretty high speed.

Mr. Cleary said this is a very conspicuous property so the esthetics matter but so does traffic safety so I think we will want to enhance the landscaping somewhat in the context of making sure we are not creating blind spots.

Mr. Furfaro said the elevation of the building would be nice too.

Mr. Franzetti said just to follow up, recently when we did McDonald’s and when we did CVS there is a large development Pulte Homes, people will be walking in this area the bike path is in this area and we asked for amenities from those applicants to accommodate that. We had them add bike racks, picnic tables and areas to sit, you have some extra green area in there and that will go a long way as part of the beautification of this area to help match what we have done with the surrounding properties. In McDonald’s we have that exit at the bottom end of that drawing and it is a Do Not Enter and people don’t turn onto Stoneleigh. One question I have is if there is a way to make it so you don’t make a left onto Stoneleigh. So anyone can go in from Stoneleigh on either side but you can only get out of there by making a left verses having to cross over two lanes of highway to come back the other way. I don’t know if that was looked at in the traffic study or if it is something you are able to do on the site but I think there is a height differential there and I think it will be a concern making that a no left turn for safety.

Mr. Filichon asked if he is talking about the left turn out onto Stoneleigh Ave.

Mr. Franzetti said yes it is a thought I’m not saying you have to do that I’m just saying that you should look into that.

Mr. Filichon said we did the traffic study and we did a count for left turn egress and the performance of the driveway works at times there is a Q that develops here but for the majority of the time throughout the day that turn can be made. We can certainly provide the Board with more information about available gaps and things of that nature. What I would note is that if you aren’t allowed to make this left, then the path to get back here becomes difficult, not to say people won’t obey it, but it would be the type of thing when you encourage another maneuver.

Mr. Franzetti said it was just something that should be thought about.

Chairman Gary said there is one thing that we don’t want to mess with which is the traffic, it is a very valuable business space but it is a mess and nobody on this Board has the ability to recommend what you should do. We need our traffic engineer to come in and check this out for us because this is a very difficult spot in this Town.

Mr. Napior said we are more than happy to work with whoever the Town assigns us too.

Chairman Gary said we will keep you posted with the secretary, Mr. Cleary and Mr. Franzetti.

Mr. Napior said before we depart, we did update the renderings and elevations of the buildings lately in which I know is a big area of concern.

Chairman Gary said that is very valuable but everything that is shown here could potentially change after our traffic engineer reviews this. I think it would be better to wait until you meet with him and then you can come back and present this to us.

**TACO BELL – 1819 ROUTE 6, CARMEL – TM – 55.6-1-51 – SITE PLAN**

Mr. Carnazza stated that the applicant proposes to construct a Taco Bell with a drive thru; variances are required from the Zoning Board for floor area, building sign (twice) and pylon sign three times. The project should be referred to the ECB I was told it may be outside of the wetland buffer but it looks pretty close. The retaining wall that exceeds 6 feet within the setback envelope needs to be shown on the same plan as the setback envelope because once it reaches 6 feet it becomes a structure. I can’t refer them to the Zoning Board until I get that information because that will require a setback as well.

Mr. Franzetti said as Mr. Carnazza said this is a proposed Taco Bell located on a 1.17 acre parcel and is a 2000 square foot building. Referrals to the ECB, Putnam County Department of Planning and the Carmel Fire Department are needed. Permits will be needed from NYS DOT, Town of Carmel water and sewer and the NYS DEC for storm water. I have a bunch of comments and again I recommend we meet with the applicant as this is the first time it is being presented. I calculated wall heights up to 35 feet which are significant walls on this property, I don’t know if that is correct but they are based on the drawings so there are more details that need to be provided with regards to the size of those walls. We will need water and waste water report for the property and the only other thing is the vehicle movement, site distances, turning slopes for the entrance need to be defined and need to be less than 6%. We also need to see details on truck deliveries and the vehicular traffic needs to be provided as well.

Mr. Cleary stated that this is a vacant site, a new restaurant proposed; the building is in the proper location for traditional circulation around the building. There will be variances required for this, this is a conditional use and there are fast food restaurant criteria that must be met. They met most of the criteria besides one that is not met, they do meet the parking requirements and traffic circulation is the issue with this because it has a drive thru and they did not submit a traffic study which the Board should consider them doing. The primary issue with the development of the property is the slope, as you can see it is a fairly deep property and they have elected to grade the front portion and build tall retaining walls. The option to that is to do a more gradual grading plan pushing back to the more underdeveloped part of the property with the tradeoff being more disturbance but lower walls. Mr. Franze should look at the esthetics of this; this is a Taco Bell which means they are fairly limited so while we have our expert here tonight it may be an opportunity to talk with the applicant about whether they can create some of our design vernacular that we are trying to achieve. Simple issues like site lighting, storm water management and landscaping are things that we can discuss as we move through this application, we can give the applicant our comments.

Mr. Franzetti said following what Mr. Cleary was saying, if they push it back there are streams and drainage features which is why the ECB is required for this. There are notes in my memo that talk about the water forces in the back of the property.

Mr. Stone asked where the 30 foot walls would be.

Mr. Cleary said you can see them at the end of the light green area and there are two sets of walls.

Mr. Wazot from Masor Consulting said regarding the review letters we have no problem with setting up a meeting and we did provide a traffic study in which we will submit for review. It is a tough site with the grade differential from Route 6 to the back of the site there is a 70 foot grade difference. From the front to back you are approximately at the elevation of 430 in the front and an elevation of 500 in the back. So obviously that is the reasoning for the walls, we have looked at certain areas in which we will continue to look at as far as tearing the walls and being able to landscape in the front to screen that as much as possible. With the difficulties of the site as it exists today the walls will be required but we will do whatever we can to minimize the visual impacts of that as much as possible. For a wall such as this size, especially with the proximity to the side property lines you are almost looking at a solider piled wall because obviously you will not be able to get away to majora block or even a precast wall. We will look to minimize or try to mitigate the overall appearance of that.

Mr. Cleary said there is also a small wall proposed along the front of the property too so esthetics become a concern when it is up on Route 6.

Mr. Wazot said we are located on East side when you look at the properties North at the top of the page and South down at the bottom, the properties on either side of us are set 6 to 10 feet from the road elevation. I noticed that some of them do have small retaining walls in the front as well similar to what we are providing here as well.

Mr. Furfaro asked if their intention is for the building to sit up above the road.

Mr. Wazot said yes because as I said as you first come into the site the slopes range from 3 to 5 percent but once you start getting towards the river site back in here the slopes begin to drastically go up.

Mr. Stone said at the entrance your pavement is roughly at grade with the road.

Mr. Wazot said yes that is correct and as mentioned earlier we will provide the slopes on the driveway to show that it complies with your requirements.

Mr. Franzetti said there are also the steep slope requirements that you need to be aware of as you do farther cuts into the property.

Mr. Wazot said we did submit a SWPPP with the application from a storm water stand point, we are mitigating the storm water and we do have no net increase in the storm water we actually have slight reductions. We also meet the water quality requirements as well.

Mr. Carnazza asked what the tallest part of the wall is.

Mr. Wazot said the tallest part of the wall is 35 feet at this point.

Mr. Carnazza asked if he can point to where it is.

Mr. Wazot said it is back in this corner here which is in the upper corner of the property.

Mr. Carnazza said that will require another variance.

Mr. Wazot said yes that is correct. The one question I had is about the variance for the conditional use, the proximity is residential.

Mr. Carnazza said yes.

Mr. Wazot said from my understanding that is a residential zone or use.

Mr. Cleary said it is a residential zone.

Mr. Wazot said the closest residential zone to us is further up North which is about 400 feet from the property.

Mr. Cleary asked if it is CPD behind the property or if it is R.

Mr. Wazot said it is CPD behind us.

Mr. Cleary said that may be true then, we will verify that for you.

Mr. Wazot said ok I just wanted to clarify that.

Mr. Franzetti said the resident set to the South of you is actually a residence.

Mr. Wazot said yeah it is a residential use we actually do have a single family residential to the North and a multifamily to the South.

Mr. Carnazza asked if there is any other fast food within 200 feet of the property.

Mr. Wazot said no the closest one would be KFC which is further down South way beyond the Mobile Station.

Mr. Franzetti asked about Dunkin Donuts.

Mr. Wazot said I believe Dunkin Donuts is intertwined with the Mobile Station which is outside of that area. I do have architectural drawings if you would like to see those as well; I believe we did submit colored elevations with the application if you would like to review those.

Mr. Franzetti said what we didn’t mention with the last applicant CoCo Farms but I will mention with you is if the architect is going to look at this, you will need to submit a permit and an application before that. Mr. Carnazza will determine that for you and you get one review based on that but if there are multiple reviews the Board may require you to post an escrow so the architect can be paid.

Mr. Cleary asked if there is any flexibility in Taco Bell’s façade.

Mr. Wazot said it is a brand new prototype within the last few years but I don’t think anything is off the table they have worked with Towns before.

Mr. Carnazza said I think he already paid the fee for the permit.

Mr. Wazot asked if the permit would be a building permit application.

Mr. Carnazza said no give me a call tomorrow and I will give you the information.

Chairman Gary said I don’t think we need any kind of traffic study on that particular spot. It will require some intensive engineering to help the Board understand what exactly is going on and if you need help with that let us know.

Mr. Furfaro said I think the visual impact here is not so much the Taco Bell I think it is the visual impact of the site itself with the walls and the architectural elements of that.

Chairman Gary asked if they have access to an engineer.

Mr. Wazot said yes we are all engineers.

Mr. Cleary said this is one where Mr. Franzetti might need a structural engineer to help him make a design.

Chairman Gary said that’s why I asked if they have someone available in there firm.

Mr. Franze said a landscape architect would play a significant part in this.

Mr. Wazot said yes absolutely.

Chairman Gary asked if they have a landscape architect.

Mr. Wazot said yes we do.

Chairman Gary asked if he can have that done so the Board can understand what it is going to look like.

Mr. Wazot said yes.

Mr. Furfaro said I think the retaining walls are critical here because that will be a bigger visual impact then the building itself.

Mr. Carnazza said the way they landscape in front of it will be important.

Mr. Wazot said so for the next meeting you would like to see a plan view with what the elevation will look like based on how we will screen the landscape and what the wall will look like.

Mr. Franzetti said I think you will need to also show a street level view, like how it will look if I am driving past it.

Mr. Furfaro said you should include what the wall will be made of.

Mr. Franzetti said those details will be needed as well as the esthetics.

Mr. Cote said to bring drawings with the existing structures on either side with elevation views from Route 6.

Mr. Wazot said we can do that and I heard someone say a site section on that as well so you can see how the site continues to rise in elevation.

Chairman Gary said we would appreciate that, when you have that prepared call Mrs. Trombetta and she will put you back on the agenda.

Mr. Cleary asked if he got our memos yet.

Mr. Wazot said no we have not.

Mr. Cleary said our three memos should give you a blueprint on what needs to be done.

Mr. Stone asked what the two curb cuts are for across the street.

Mr. Wazot said those are offices, an accountant firm and another office right next to it.

Mr. Stone said the Chairman mentioned that a traffic study isn’t necessary and I’m not suggesting that it is, but Route 6 backs up all the way down the hill.

Mr. Furfaro said they have a traffic study.

Mr. Wazot said yes we do and we will submit that, we apologize it was not completed at the time we filed our paperwork but we will provide that.

Mr. Furfaro asked about the sedimentations for Pulte Homes.

Mr. Franzetti said this is a lot further away and up a hill. When I asked CoCo Farms about the picnic tables all of those are down by Putnam Plaza which is at the base of Pulte Homes.

Mr. Cleary said this is a little more isolated and further away.

Mr. Franzetti said I think the furthest people might get to is the KFC or Dunkin Donuts.

Mr. Wazot asked if they would like to see the elevations and a truck circulation plan as well.

Mr. Franzetti said I did not see those in the initial application.

Mr. Wazot said essentially this is what the building is looking like right now, the overall height, which is the highest point is the tower at the front of the building in which delineates the entrance. That tower is at 24 feet, the mechanical units will be screened on the roof in which you can see in this area here and all the way in the back. That is extending to a height of 21 feet 6 inches and a good portion of the rest of the building is around 18 feet 10 inches. The allowable height in this zone is 35 so we are below that from a building height standpoint. From a material standpoint it does vary, a good portion of the building is a drive it type material and then this is sort of a louver type architectural feature on the beginning over the canopy.

Mr. Stone asked if that is the main entrance facing the street.

Mr. Wazot said this is the front, this is the back side of the drive thru and this is the main entrance off the front

Mr. Franzetti said you have a walkway going across the drive thru to a parking area; you are really going to have to remove that sidewalk. Making a walkway right where the drive thru is, is going to be a dangerous situation.

Mr. Wazot said I would think for the most part what we would probably use this parking lot for is the employee parking. So you’re not going to get the high turn around as you would in the front spaces, would that be acceptable or you just don’t want the walkway there at all.

Mr. Franzetti said no I think you need to block that walkway off completely, you will need to put plantings there or green area but it is too dangerous for people to be walking on.

Chairman Gary said we need to see the traffic study and then we will go from there.

**DAY ROAD LLC. – 20 DAY ROAD, CARMEL – TM – 55.6-1-41 – AMENDED SITE PLAN**

Mr. Carnazza said provide a loading calculation and one space required by code and this project needs to be referred to the ECB for comments.

Mr. Franzetti said the application involves the construction of a 7200 square foot building on a 4.2 acre parcel with an existing 7500 square foot building on the parcel. The building is planned to be utilized as construction equipment storage facility. I have provided my comments to the applicant and two things that have been added to the comments are that this is in a flood plain so this might require a permit from the Town. You will need to provide a water and waste water study so we know what is going on with that.

Mr. Donahue said there is only going to be able 6 people in the building.

Mr. Franzetti said in the report that you will provide me will have that information in there with the use.

Mr. Cleary said you may remember this site it came to us a couple years ago for the initial construction of the building on the left hand side of the property. It is a very well maintained industrial site, well improved and they are proposing a second building to the right of that. That area now is sort of a rocky area so the primary question is do we know how rocky it is and does rock need to be removed which relates to the construction of that building. They are compliant with zoning and with parking, the site does back up to the trail way so they are clearing a portion of the property. If that is the case is there more visibility, this is the back side of an industrial site so we do want to make sure that buffer remains in place. They might have to do some supplemental plantings if in fact trees will be coming out.

Mr. Franzetti said I did forget to add one thing, this is a project that is located in a NYCDEP designated main street area and as such they will need to develop a SWPPP that is approved by the NYCDEP. The original project went through that process and this project needs to go through it as well.

Mr. Donahue said this project consists of building a similar building to the one that Ed Cooke constructed over here. Mr. Cooke is the owner of the property and he built this building about 10 years ago and now he has found the need to build another building. The property is essentially all rock and when we built this building he was able to scrape out the rock so we really didn’t have to build a retaining wall or anything, the wall stands by itself as a rock wall. Similarly we are going to do the same thing over here with the new building, we submitted plans to NYCDEP for storm water and we submitted plans to the Town for storm water and for the storm water management plan. What we are going to do is build a small pond over here and since the other pond is oversized we can discharge some of the water into that pond as well. St. Michaels Brooke is over here and there is a wetland boundary over here so we will have to go to the ECB to get a wetland permit because we are putting in a sewer line in order to connect to the main sewer and main water.

Mr. Furfaro asked what the building use is.

Mr. Donahue said Mr. Cooke owns a construction company here in Town and he is planning to store his equipment in these buildings rather than leaving them out in the open. Own neighbors are a dance studio and the Town Sewage treatment plan so you couldn’t find a better use for this piece of property. We do have plantings up over here that they asked us to put up when we were building this building and if you want to add more we would gladly do that.

Chairman Gary asked Mr. Franzetti what Mr. Donohue needs to get done.

Mr. Franzetti said I have a memo in which he is already aware of and he will work with me to get it done.

Chairman Gary said so what you need to do is get those things taken care of.

Mr. Donahue asked when he can go to the Environmental Conservation Board.

Mr. Cleary said you can send him to the ECB there is no reason you can’t do that.

Mr. Franzetti said you will probably need to get a flood plain permit.

Chairman Gary said we don’t need to make a motion to refer him to the ECB.

Mr. Donahue said first we have to check to see if it is in the flood plain zone.

Mr. Franzetti said it is in.

Mr. Donahue said ok thank you.

**MEADOWLAND EXTENSION – 1979 US ROUTE 6 – TM – 55.15-1-20 – SITE PLAN**

Mr. Carnazza said this project needs to be referred to the ECB for comments and a variance was granted to allow the parking lot without principle use on the lot.

Mr. Franzetti said the applicant has advised that they have submitted information to the NYCDEP for storm water NYSDEC for fresh water and NYSDOT for the road entrance permit and they have been in front of the ECB I am still reviewing the SWPPP as it is moving forward and it is also being reviewed by the NYCDEP. Just some minor detailed comments, the line of site calculations should be provided and the drawings should be updated to add protection of the infiltration area as part of the construction sequence. There is still a question about that fence on Old Route 6 we need to get something in writing or more official then just a verbal. The application has been submitted to the Putnam County for review.

Mr. Cleary stated that the applicant has addressed all of the planning issues on this, if you remember the building has now been abandoned and there is no customer access to the site. It is purely inventory storage on this side of the property so they have addressed the site planning issues, the screening has been installed per this Board requests.

Chairman Gary asked if this project requires a public hearing.

Mr. Cleary said yes it does and it is ready to go.

Mr. Giannico said there was a question about stacking cars at the entrance to the parking lot, has that been adjusted.

Mr. Cleary said if you remember the distance between the curb cut driveway and the first parking space is 100 feet or more, they do have more than enough space to accommodate the typical operations. Now that there are no customers there it is going to be single attendant at any time so there will never be a stack of vehicles waiting to get out there.

Mr. Cote asked if there is any security or lighting.

Mrs. McKenzie said there is site lighting provided on the plan and we have submitted a photometric plan on one of the other sheets.

Mr. Cleary said they clarified it last time that there will be no gate and no extraordinary security measures.

Mrs. McKenzie said that the applicant has elected to install a gate at the entrance.

Mr. Cleary said that is important to know, is that shown on the plan.

Mrs. McKenzie said yes it is.

Mr. Carnazza asked how far back it is.

Mrs. McKenzie said 60 feet back, we set it back adequate distance in case a large vehicle can get it off the highway if the gate wasn’t open.

Mrs. Kugler asked if there are any other security measures.

Mrs. McKenzie said aside from the gate at the entrance and the site lighting, they have not elected to do anything else.

Mr. Carnazza asked if they are opposed to security if they wanted it.

Mr. Cleary said no.

Mr. Stone asked if there will be delivery trucks or car carriers be pulling into here.

Mrs. McKenzie said actually we do have adequate space in this location for a fire truck or emergency vehicle to come in and turn around at this site.

Mr. Cleary said the main facility across the street provided a specific area for car carriers and drop off on that site so I am not sure how this will operate but the presumption is the main site will be used for this.

Mrs. Mckenzie said there intention is to continue the practice that they have no of unloading vehicles at the dealership and drive them individually to the lot. But we did allow for enough space to do that at the other site in case it does happen.

Mr. Carnazza asked if this was sent to the Fire Department.

Mrs. McKenzie said yes it was.

Mr. Cleary said that this is ready for a public hearing.

Chairman Gary said we will schedule a public hearing for the next meeting.

**LOEWENBERG, RALPH – 260 WEST LAKE BLVD – TM – 64.16-1-30 – SITE PLAN**

Mr. Carnazza stated that he needs to provide a graphic scale on the plan, provide metes and bounds description of the property line along the Lake, these are the same comments from last time. Remove note 3, variance is not required for the parking spaces; this property is improved by a house so you don’t need the parking spaces. The other two necessary variances were granted by the ZBA and noted on the plat.

Mr. Franzetti stated that as the Board may remember this application encompasses a proposal of renovating an existing boathouse and adding a second floor bathhouse using the existing footprint. There are some comments that I had including the drawing should provide a legend which contains all significant features on the drawing. The applicant has presented this application in front of the ECB and they might need to the Putnam County Department of Health.

Mr. Besheret said yes we have been before them as well.

Mr. Franzetti said the applicant and I have been in contact talking about requirements for the Short environmental assessment form and I recommend us talking in the next couple days to discuss the information needed for the backup. Various plan information required pursuant to section 156-27 is currently lacking including the high-water mark which should be provided on the drawing, there is a legend in the middle of the drawing that says high water and low water but there is nothing on the actual site plan where it is shown exactly where that is. Again this is identified as a bathhouse if there is going to be sanitary facilities they must be approved by the County of Putnam. Something that we haven’t discussed in the 100 year flood elevation so we will need to talk about that more and you will need to obtain a permit from the Town to do the work in the 100 year flood plain.

Mr. Cleary said again as Mr. Franzetti said this is a renovation of an existing boathouse with the addition of a bathhouse, they have addressed the site planning comments and as Mr. Carnazza indicated the variances are now in place for this.

Mr. Besheret said as the comments that we have are addressable and they are not major I would like to ask if we can schedule a public hearing for this. I will meet with Mr. Franzetti tomorrow to discuss the other items.

Chairman Gary said we can’t schedule the public hearing until we get some of these comments addressed.

Mr. Besheret said ok as we spoke about it last time, the application is really to construct a bathhouse over an existing boathouse. We are not changing the footprint and we are not introducing any new construction outside of the perimeter of what is existing. The reason why we are here is because the bathhouse is required to do so, the footprint does exist it needed a variance and we obtained the necessary variances and we are also in front of the ECB. The ECB has accepted our application and we expect next Wednesday to have the permit for that. We are currently in front of the Putnam County Health Department and we expect to have an answer from them in the next couple of days. A couple of the comments regarding the archeological areas and endangered species which I will discuss with Mr. Franzetti tomorrow to resolve the issues I don’t believe there will be any major issues that cannot be resolved.

Chairman Gary said I’m the one who made that decision for the public hearing but do you, Mr. Cleary see a reason why we can’t have the public hearing.

Mr. Cleary stated that Mr. Besheret is indicating that he is addressing those issues so if that is in the works then we can schedule a public hearing and we can always keep the public hearing open if the Health Department doesn’t grant the approval he needs.

Chairman Gary said I agree but the applicant has that leverage once you open the public hearing.

Mr. Cleary said that is true but the clock exists when we close the public hearing and we can keep it open for as long as it is necessary.

Chairman Gary said ok does anyone from the Board have anything to add.

Mrs. Kugler said as far as the second level, will there be sanitary facilities.

Mr. Besheret said initially it was not proposed but my client indicated that they would like to have half a bath just a closed wall laboratory because they realized that the Health Department does allow it. We have a verbal ok from them; they don’t see any problem with it because there is no shower just a toilet fixture and a sink.

Mr. Franzetti said just so you know for this approval from Planning I’m going to need to have Putnam County’s DOA approvals ahead of time even if the Board opens the public hearing, it will remain open until those permit are handed in to me.

Mr. Besheret said I really anticipate that we will have everything before the closure of the public hearing.

**NYSMSA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS – 692 ROUTE 6 – TM – 76.30-1-22 – AMENDED SITE PLAN**

Mr. Carnazza said you need to correct the parking calculation; the applicant provides a number but does not include the required spaces as required by code for the antenna. You need to write down that there are two parking spaces required for the antenna and that will be more than enough.

Mr. Franzetti said I have no additional comments as there are no site improvements planned.

Mr. Cleary said they address all of the public use requirements for this, there are no site planning issues and we asked if the Board wanted Mr. Franze to look at the visual impact of the antennas on the building. This is where they are proposing enclosures to screen the antennas so the antennas themselves are not dangling on the side of the building of this particular site.

Mr. Franze said as I tried to indicate with my memo it is a little bit difficult to offer architectural critic. The applicant is proposing couple of mechanical screen walls so we are not really talking about alterations to the building per say. We are talking about a couple of screened walls that are two street front corners of the building. I’m not sure if the walls that are being proposed are worse than the antennas that they are trying to conceal. I mean that literally, living in a community we see things like antennas on rooftops equipment, utility poles and wires of all kind that are in our mists. We live with them and we tend to sort of develop a blind eye to these things because they are unfortunately a fact in our building landscape. I am not sure that these two rather odd looking walls on the corner, the applicant is here because they want to put antennas on the building and I don’t think they would disagree when I say that the purpose is not to create architecture. This is not about architecture, this is about putting up these two curious L shaped walls that are trying to help the building by matching but they will look like walls they are not enclosed.

Mr. Carnazza said it is going to look like a cube on top of the building.

Mr. Franze said yes and they aren’t even cube shaped they are Ls. They are going to be apparent from passing by the building on Route 6; they are going to be apparent as these two L shaped walls at the perimeter of the building because they aren’t even set back. I did make some suggestions in my memo as to what they might consider as alternatives to this but I would start by saying that the walls itself are worse than the antennas, they do more harm than good. They draw more attention to something that we don’t want to have attention drawn too.

Mr. Carnazza said they are more intrusive to not having anything there at all.

Mr. Franze said I’m not suggesting that we should casually embrace more antennas and mechanical equipment but I think they would be less of a problem visually then the mobile effort to seal them. I personally don’t think the effort to conceal them is successful yet.

Chairman Gary asked if anyone from the Board has any other comments.

Mr. Tyber said the purpose of Verizon’s situation is not architectural it is to provide service to the area and the screen walls serve as a secondary function. If another carrier wanted to put antennas on this building, the screen walls would ensure that they would have to conceal the antennas consistent with what Verizon is proposing. By removing those screen walls any other company would be able to come along and provide additional antennas. In this case we only have 4 antennas that we are proposing and that number can grow with new carriers. Also, because the use of this building is a funeral home, the property owner wants the antennas to be screened in order to maintain a more formal and traditional look to the funeral home. The only objection I would have to what you just said is that it draws attention, at the last meeting I showed you the simulations and you couldn’t even see the difference in the building with the antennas. The enclosures will be painted to match the building and if enclosing them on all 4 sides makes a difference they would be happy to do that. In terms of materials, right now we have stealth and the screens are custom designed to match the building’s façade but stealth would be the company they are ordering from so if the Board has any suggestions on a different vendor we would be more than happy to comply. This is all kind of site specific, it is not a one size fits all approach, in this situation Verizon needs the height and there is mechanical equipment on the roof of the building that is visible from the street. To relocate the antennas back to where the HVAC equipment is, Verizon would need to go higher just because of roof shadowing and Verizon is already in the maximum permitted height for the C-Zoning District at 35 feet.

Mr. Carnazza asked if that is a cloth pulled over a frame.

Mr. Tyber said no it is not, I can bring in a sample for you if you would like.

Mr. Cleary asked if it is translucent.

Mr. Tyber said it is R transparent but you can see through it, it is like a fiberglass kind of thing.

Mr. Franze said I appreciate all of that but I suggest that maybe if anyone had difficulty understanding the before and after’s because of the distance from which the images were presented. The Board might consider requesting that the applicant studies some or all of the following alternatives:

* A fully enclosed roof area or pen that will read as a more solid, integral part of the building while also providing screened space for potential future wireless equipment so the rooftop architecture need not be further altered.
* An enclosure that appears as a meaningful roof or crowning element and begins to take the architecture in a better direction.
* An enclosure that is moved away from the roof edge (even if it might have to be taller) and is of a design that diminishes rather than celebrates its visual impact.

Mr. Franze continued by saying I have the luxury of contemplating this from a truly esthetic perspective so that is the only weight that I have which isn’t much. But, in my mind if in fact moving it back to the center of the building caused the enclosure to be taller and less problematic that might be compelling to some of the Board members. He then asked if it is possible to further concentrate the antennas.

Mr. Carnazza said no they need those corner locations to get the most coverage.

Mr. Tyber said if we do move the scepter to the other corner, the other half of the building will be blocking the direction that it needs to be going in.

Mr. Carnazza said that is why they picked the corners in order to get the most coverage.

Mr. Franze said those are just some thoughts I had, right now you have two walls up there that I believe are worse than the actual antennas.

Mr. Tyber said the only thing about the full roof enclosure is that Verizon is just leasing a small portion of the roof and it is a big building. Verizon is only leasing a couple hundred square feet they are not leasing the entire roof of the building and the rest of the roof space is the owners job to lease to other tenants as he sees fit.

Mr. Cleary said that might be a benefit to the owner because as you indicated, another carrier will probably show up on this building so if the screen is there by the owner not by the renter then it will be easier for a different carrier to install there antennas.

Mr. Stone asked how many antennas would be allowed at this installation.

Mr. Cleary said it is limited by their technical requirements and from our perspective they can put 1000 antennas on there because we can’t tell them no.

Chairman Gary said they said that the contractors have a certain amount of square footage.

Mr. Tyber said correct for Verizon.

Chairman Gary said so what you are saying is to conceal that whole area.

Mr. Tyber said yes Verizon is concealing this entire area. My only concern is if the screen gets damaged is it the owner’s responsibility to repair it or is it Verizon’s.

Chairman Gary asked whose responsibility to protect that one sector.

Mr. Tyber said Verizon’s.

Chairman Gary said then it is Verizon’s responsibility to protect their 200 square foot area.

Mr. Tyber said yes but Mr. Franze is saying if we enclosed the entire roof it could look better but Verizon should only be responsibly of maintaining its 100 square feet.

Mr. Franze said from a more basic perspective, if you are going to enclose some roof top equipment then enclose it in something that begins to read like it is part of the building.

Mr. Carnazza said so make a cube instead.

Mr. Franze said yes because right now we have the two L shaped figures.

Mr. Tyber said yes that is something that we can absolutely do.

Chairman Gary asked if that would make it look better.

Mr. Cleary said yes it would and we wouldn’t catch the side view of the antennas.

Chairman Gary asked Mr. Tyber if he can do that.

Mr. Tyber said absolutely that is a pretty easy fix, I would just have to confirm with the engineer but I don’t foresee that being a problem. I appreciate the whole façade idea but when it comes down to it that isn’t possible.

Mr. Cleary said the next step is to have a public hearing on this, so if he can make those revisions before the public hearing then we can go ahead with scheduling the public hearing.

Mr. Tyber said yes we can get the revised plans.

Chairman Gary said ok when you get those send them to Mr. Franze and Mrs. Trombetta so we have them for the record.

Mr. Franze said it might be of interest to you to explore some finishes or colors that may subside.

Mr. Tyber said not naturally.

Mr. Franze said my thought is that it might be better overall.

Mr. Tyber said for the public hearing I can bring simulations with different colors like one matching the building, one matching the trim and one matching the HVAC equipment. That is a very minor detail that I don’t believe the property owner would have any thoughts on that.

Chairman Gary said that would be great we will schedule the public hearing for the next meeting which is July 27.

**ZEF SMAJLAJ – 803 SOUTH LAKE BLVD. – TM – 75.42-1-39 – SITE PLAN**

Mr. Carnazza said variances are required by the Zoning Board for lot area, lot width, lot depth, front yard, side yard, rear yard and parking spaces. This project should be referred to the ECB, a permit license is required to construct this building as it is not fully on the property, and it looks like it is over the property line.

Mr. Greenberg said correct.

Mr. Carnazza said so they will need an approval from Office of General Services (OGS).

Mr. Stone said it is over the property line but whose property is it.

Mr. Carnazza said the States.

Mr. Greenberg said it is an existing lot along South Lake Blvd. and has access to the lake.

Mr. Franzetti said this application encompasses a proposal to install an 8ft x 12ft bathhouse adjacent to Lake Mahopac. The amenity will require the creation of parking on the site per section 156.27 of the Town Code. Based on the survey provided the boat house is shown off the applicant’s property, this will need to be clarified prior to moving forward with the application.

Mr. Greenberg asked what more clarification do you need?

Mr. Franzetti said I need a permit in the file that says you got permission to build on that property.

Mr. Greenberg said okay.

Mr. Franzetti said as the Board can see the drawing is very difficult and confusing and should be updated providing an existing and proposed site plan. It is hard to compare what you have going on there, I understand that it is a very small site but that doesn’t mean we need to have small drawings. This property is in a flood plain so a permit may be needed and the short form EAF needs additional information archeological sensitive area, threatened and endangered species. You will need to go to the ECB and Putnam Highway Department for access on the site.

Mr. Greenberg said that is a State road not a County road.

Mr. Franzetti said ok then you will need to get some kind of permissions from the NYSDOT.

Mr. Greenberg said for what we already have the access road.

Mr. Franzetti said do what you have to do. You also need to provide a construction sequence, what are you doing in the driveway, parking area and you also need a variance for parking so you will need to put new parking on here. All of these things are not really shown on your summary.

Mr. Greenberg said everything that is there already exists except the bathhouse nothing else is being done.

Mr. Franzetti said but you need additional parking for the bathhouse.

Mr. Greenberg said yes that is why Mr. Carnazza said I need a variance because we have no parking on the site.

Mr. Carnazza said the parking calculation for a water related facility is based on the lot area.

Mr. Greenberg said yes I understand that I need a variance.

Mr. Franzetti said driveway grading profile if necessary.

Mr. Greenberg said it is not necessary because it is already there.

Mr. Franzetti said you have a deep leach basin in there, is there enough sizing depth to ground water because that needs to be provided. The plan must show the location of erosion and sediment control measures being used during construction. Details regarding the installation of the electric service for the bathhouse must be provided which includes the area of disturbance and the location of the service line. According to section 156-27 Lakefront is to be 50 feet away, however only 49.5 is provided and you need to show the high-water mark and the fencing details.

Mr. Greenberg said that everything on the site already exists, the only thing that we are doing is putting a bathhouse on there. There is no driveway, the access to the site is already there for a number of years and all we are asking for is the bathhouse so we would like to be referred to the ECB and to the Zoning Board. All of the items that Mr. Franzetti stated can be taken care of if we get the necessary variances needed.

Chairman Gary said we will send you to the ZBA if you answer all of Mr. Franzetti’s comments and give it to him to review.

Mr. Greenberg said no problem.

Chairman Gary said we need the map so we can stamp it and I can sign it.

Mr. Franzetti said my biggest concern is that you are stamping a map that is going to the Zoning Board now that is very confusing.

Chairman Gary said lets go over this again.

Mr. Franzetti said I think the Board should take the other copy of the map and look at it so they can tell me what they think about it.

Chairman Gary asked for him to show the boundary lines on the map.

At which time, Mr. Greenberg proceeded to explain the map, he also said that all of this is existing including the retaining walls; the wall around the lake, the access into the lake is existing as well as the access from Route 6 into the site. The only thing that we are doing is putting an 8 x 12 bathhouse, everything else is all existing.

Mr. Carnazza asked if the parking area is existing because it says new parking area.

Mr. Stone said it suggests that a new parking area is part of the project and I think that is the confusing part.

Mr. Carnazza said yes that is what is confusing about it.

Mr. Franzetti said there is also a dock that is not shown on the drawing. What I am suggesting is an existing conditions project plan be put together and then you show us what you are doing including the entire area of disturbance associated with this project. We ask that for every application and I know this is a small site but it is very confusing.

Chairman Gary said this is not the map; this doesn’t have the 4 corners on there.

Mr. Greenberg said no this is the site right here.

Mr. Franzetti said we shouldn’t have to ask where the site is on the map, which is not how it is supposed to be done. We should be able to tell what is existing and where it is on the site, you never would have known that part of this project is on NYSDEC property that needs to be shown on the map.

Mr. Greenberg said yes it is clear, Mr. Carnazza told me exactly what I need to do and that’s what I am going to do. Everything already exists we are not changing anything.

Chairman Gary asked Mr. Cleary to explain what they are talking about.

Mr. Cleary said that is simply the point, the survey is very hard to read because it is such a small survey.

Mrs. Kugler asked if it can be blown up.

Mr. Greenberg said yes.

Chairman Gary said ok this is going to go to the ZBA but you have to get a map back to us within the next couple days that Mr. Franzetti can sign off on and when you give us that we will go from there.

Mr. Greenberg said Mr. Franzetti gave me his memo last week and I addressed every issue that he requested.

Mr. Franzetti said last week when I reviewed the application I gave you the information that was missing from the application making it an official application. Now I reviewed the application as a whole, this is a different set of review.

Chairman Gary said to address Mr. Franzetti’s comments and bring it back to us.

Mr. Greenberg said yes thank you.

Mr. Franzetti said and you also need to get a flood plain permit.

Mr. Carnazza said it is based on the FEMA maps.

Mr. Greenberg said okay.

**HUDSON VALLEY VET EMS – 559 ROUTE 6N – TM – 76.5-1-67 – SITE PLAN**

Mr. Nicholas Fusco of Architectural Visions, representing the applicant appeared before the board and stated if the Board has any questions or comments I would be more than happy to answer them.

Chairman Gary said we had some things that we asked to be done for this meeting.

Mr. Cleary said yes we asked for the traffic circulation on the left side of the building because it didn’t circulate through but the plans have been revised and modified and you can now see the arrows.

Chairman Gary said let’s go through our initial process first before we get into that.

Mr. Carnazza said variances are required from the Zoning Board for lot area and front yard for what is existing and for the new building.

Mr. Fusco said we no longer need the variance for lot area.

Mr. Carnazza said your right, I’m sorry that comes off. The existing situation was the existing building; the new building almost complies with zoning so I put them on here just so everyone knows what the numbers are. The existing building is 11.5 so a 28.5 foot variance is required and the new building is 38 feet so it is only 2 feet in the buffer. Also, you need to go to the Zoning Board for parking width and driveway with; this project also needs to be referred to ECB because there will be work done in the 100 foot buffer. A curb cut permit will be required from the Town of Carmel Highway Department because you only provide an egress from the Vet EMS rear of the building which is onto Yorke Road (a residential Town road). I recommend this project to be reviewed by the architectural consultant for the new additional building.

Mr. Franzetti said as Mr. Carnazza mentioned ECB and Town of Carmel Highway Department permits are needed for this application. Last time we met, we spoke about the stormwater management plan and the one provided is part of this application was dated October 2013 and reflects the site design proposed at that time. It does meet the criteria for the work done at this site but an updated document will need to be provided and in the future submissions will need to meet the most current NYS DEC storm water standards. There are more detailed comments within the review of the SWPPP; in particular there are internal discrepancies with the CN value so you will have to speak to Hudson Engineering with regards to that. The numbers are off even though they work in your favor; they still need to be fixed. The traffic circulation was one of the questions, it is unclear which type of vehicular traffic which will be entering from Yorke Road and there is no definition regarding deliveries to the site.

Mr. Fusco stated that if there would be any deliveries it would be from UPS.

Mr. Franzetti said ok there is use of hay bales which are discouraged.

Mr. Fusco asked Mr. Franzetti to clarify what he means.

Mr. Franzetti said hay bales are listed on your drawings. We are not going to answer each one of these comments but the big issue is the entrance onto Yorke Road. We spoke about this, the slopes on the ingress and egress need to be refined because it is suggested that slopes of less than 6% be used for the first 20 feet of entry and no greater than 8% be used entering the site. You can refer to the AASHTO guidelines for commercial properties. A detailed profile of where Yorke Road and the ingress/egress meet and transition should be provided with more details. You gave a profile which has some slopes but it says they average to 6% and I spoke to you about the fact that it has to be closer to 7% so you need to refine that grading to bring it where it needs to be to get there. The ingress and egress provided is not sufficient to stop traffic from leaving that site and going onto Yorke Road and no amount of signage will get you there. I think you will need to do something there to make it so people can come up Yorke Road from 6N and make the right into there, nobody can turn from Yorke Road to make a left and no one can come out of there.

Mr. Fusco said I know we spoke about it but I still don’t understand the reasoning for no left turn, I get what you’re saying but I don’t know why you are saying it.

Mr. Franzetti said the traffic is coming from 6N, the idea is not to have traffic going out of that exit and no matter how much signage you have will not stop people from exiting there.

Mr. Carnazza said just like we spoke to Coco Farms about.

Mr. Franzetti said yes, people are going to go out of that exit no matter what; you need to come up with something better because I am concerned about the residence across the street. Your traffic volume will come from 6N not Yorke Road.

Mr. Fusco said what if the driveway profile doesn’t meet that 5% that you are requiring for that driveway because the slope in that area would be greater.

Mr. Franzetti said we are going to have to sit and talk about that and look at it because it is a tough site you are working against slopes in that area. The concern is Yorke Road and people turning in there bottoming out because of the slopes. That’s the kind of thing you need to be concerned about, the initial slopes have to be there and then you would have parking at a weird angle. I think it gets fairly level when you go further to the North top of the site it’s the whole site design that you have to look at in order to figure it out. I have a whole bunch of other comments that I will provide to you but those are the major ones that the Board needs to be aware of.

Chairman Gary asked if they still need a curb cut.

Mr. Franzetti said yes they will need to go to the Town of Carmel Highway Department for that area.

Chairman Gary said you don’t want people coming out of that site and making a left onto Yorke Road is that correct.

Mr. Franzetti said yes that is what we are trying to stop from happening.

Mr. Fusco said they are trying to alleviate that because there are residences across the street and because this particular site would be used during the evening hours we don’t want headlights beaming into residence across the street. That is why we provided ingress only from Yorke Road instead of ingress and egress.

Chairman Gary said you both are engineers and you both are very intelligent I think you can work this out.

Mr. Fusco said well actually this is the first I am hearing about making this a right turn entrance only.

Chairman Gary said there are so many other things that the Board needs to delve on the site but we can’t get there until we get past the entrance to the site. There are so many other issues that the Board has concerns about so we need to get in the site before we can go further.

Mr. Fusco said understood, we just want to make sure that we make this the safest and less intrusive as possible.

Chairman Gary said we are not asking for anything special we just need you to do what it takes to get the correct entrance to this site.

Mr. Stone said by making this less intrusive you are also creating a problem because people will be bringing their animals here throughout the night when they are hurt. So now you will have people rushing and if it is less conspicuous people will drive right past it going into that residential area and having to turn around to get back. We don’t want people going down into the residential area.

Mr. Cleary said right now it is wooded there and in order to create that driveway a lot of that will have to come down. You will see as you come up the road where the driveway is before you make the mistake of passing by it and that is the nature of the improvement they are going to have to do. This is significant and that is why we are sweating the details on how it gets done.

Mr. Carnazza said you may want to get a second sign and go for a variance to have that sign.

Chairman Gary asked if there is any other way to get to that property besides Yorke Road.

Mr. Cleary said they really can’t do it because of the change in grade and the retaining wall on the right side of the building.

Mr. Franzetti said they also don’t own that property so the neighbor won’t give them an easement and there is not enough space on the left side of the property.

Mr. Cote said I think last meeting we talked about using the right side to gain access.

Mr. Greenberg said yes we did try that and it did not work out.

Mr. Furfaro asked how many square feet is the proposed building.

Mr. Fusco said the proposed building is 8000 square feet.

Mr. Furfaro asked how many square feet is the old building.

Mr. Fusco said I am not 100% sure as to what the square footage of the existing building is.

Mr. Furfaro said that little building on the left has the seamstress in there but it is kind of run down and is not much of a building anyway. Wouldn’t it make more sense to knock that building down and incorporate that space into your 8000 square feet in the back and solve this problem?

Mr. Fusco said there are leases there and apartments.

Mr. Furfaro said you are putting 8000 square feet in the back; you can’t incorporate it in somehow. It just seems to make sense but the real issue here is coming from Yorke Road which is creating all of these problems. Two-way traffic in and out just makes sense and that separate building that the seamstress is in is falling apart anyway.

Mr. Greenberg said the answer is very simple, incorrectly this very easily could become a two-way road if we could get the 24 feet that we need. We own all of the property over here but this L shaped piece is owned by the Yorke Road right of way, we need approximately 150 square feet in which we requested an easement from the Town. The Town recused, therefore that is why we are in this situation to begin with. If we got that 150 square feet, the two-way traffic would stay that way and the whole problem we are experiencing with Yorke Road would disappear.

Mr. Fusco said but again I don’t think we are going to be able to take that building down and add the additional square footage to the building at the allowable parking we are going to need along with the two-way driveway.

Mr. Dan Posner the attorney for the owner of the property stated that the owner told him that the building was recently re-sided.

Mr. Furfaro said I live by there and drive past it every day but that little building itself is nothing special it is actually separate from the other structure. Instead of doing all of this site work you should try to manipulate that space into the back building somehow and gain that extra space.

Mr. Posner said your suggestion is to make this a two-way.

Mr. Furfaro said yes and if you get rid of that little building you can incorporate that space into the back building somewhere.

Mr. Carnazza said eliminate the whole need for the access off of Yorke Road and then you won’t need a highway permit or anything.

Mr. Furfaro said it’s not the most elaborate structure.

Mr. Franzetti said maybe you can even put a new structure there.

Mr. Posner said the one consideration is the building is leased.

Mr. Furfaro said that is why you would try to work that space into the back of your building; I am just trying to give some ideas on getting you to the next step.

Chairman Gary stated that the entrance still needs to be clarified before we can even consider anything else about the interior of the property. You need to figure out a way to get in and out of this property that the Board will find acceptable. Whatever you do it has to be legally done and must meet all of the requirements, once it is finalized then we can move forward.

Mr. Fusco said currently the way we have it done is done legally and I do understand the concerns on making a left turn and not disturbing any of the neighbors in the area. But what we have shown here is done according to code.

Chairman Gary said I’m not saying that it is not done to code; I am saying that you need to make the consultants happy in regards to gaining access to this piece of property.

Mr. Posner pointed to the Board and said that this was drawn by Mr. Franzetti, the concept of making this a right turn only. If that is acceptable to the property owner we will deal with the issue of elevations.

Mr. Franzetti said you are going to have to deal with the elevations.

Chairman Gary said but he needs the Town to give him a curb cut.

Mr. Franzetti said yes and he will need that from the highway department. The highway department will look at the slopes and say that they won’t accept this and you will have to come back to the Planning Board anyway to fix it. I am trying to help you get it right before going to the highway department to avoid going back and forth.

Mr. Greenberg states that he understands.

Mr. Carnazza said you have two slopes coming into each other at different angles.

Chairman Gary asked what is existing on this property currently.

Mr. Greenberg said there are three old barns in the back that will be removed.

Chairman Gary asked how big the whole site will be.

Mr. Greenberg said the site now is 4100 square feet.

Chairman Gary asked the size of the structures.

Mr. Greenberg said originally we had almost 9000 square feet but we brought that down to 8000 square feet. We reduced the building by 1000 square feet, eliminated the large rooms on the lower level and eliminated the apartment that was way in the back on the second floor.

Chairman Gary asked Mr. Franze if he has reviewed this information.

Mr. Franze said he has not received any materials on this application at all.

Mr. Carnazza said this is the first time I suggested that he look at this because it is going to be very important to tie the front building into the back building.

Chairman Gary said that Mr. Furfaro has a good point about taking that little building down. You have to work with the Town and the Engineer on this and you really have to answer all the questions the consultants have. The access to this property is what is going to impact the neighborhood the most at this point because there is a lot going on here. The Board needs an overview on what is going in there; this has generated a lot of concern so we need an area map of this so we can see it.

Mr. Greenberg said absolutely.

Chairman Gary said don’t come back to this Board until you have the access to the property.

Mr. Greenberg said I agree and we have taken your suggestions.

Chairman Gary said but you still can’t successfully and safely get into this property.

**MINUTES – 6/08/2016**

Mr. Cote moved to approve the minutes of June 8, 2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Furfaro with all in favor.

Mr. Stone moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ashley Smith