

APPROVED

HAROLD GARY
Chairman

CRAIG PAEPRER
Vice-Chair

BOARD MEMBERS
ANTHONY GIANNICO
DAVE FURFARO
CARL STONE
KIM KUGLER
RAYMOND COTE

TOWN OF CARMEL PLANNING BOARD



60 McAlpin Avenue
Mahopac, New York 10541
Tel. (845) 628-1500 – Ext.190
www.ci.carmelny.ny.us

MICHAEL CARNAZZA
*Director of Code
Enforcement*

RICHARD FRANZETTI, P.E.
Town Engineer

PATRICK CLEARY
AICP, CEP, PP, LEED AP
Town Planner

VINCENT FRANZE
Architectural Consultant

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JANUARY 11, 2017

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN, HAROLD GARY, VICE-CHAIR, CRAIG PAEPRER, ANTHONY GIANNICO,
CARL STONE, RAYMOND COTE, DAVE FURFARO, KIM KUGLER

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
Lakeview Realty 168, LLC	76.22-1-4	1	P.H.	Bond Return Granted.
Harman Holdings	44.14-1-31&32	1	P.H.	Public Hearing Closed & Planner to Prepare Resolution.
Tompkins Recycling	55.11-1-15	1-4	Re-Approval	Re-Approval Granted for 1 Year.
Minutes – 11/09/16		4		Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

LAKEVIEW REALTY 168, LLC – 162 EAST LAKE BLVD – TM – 76.22-1-4 – PUBLIC HEARING

The consultants had no comments.

Hearing no comments from the audience, Mr. Giannico moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

Chairman Gary asked Mr. Cleary if this should be referred to the Town Board.

Mr. Cleary responded yes, to the Town Board.

Mr. Franzetti noted for the Board's edification that he explained to the Applicant earlier that if it goes to the Town Board, it's going to be going to the Engineering Dept. for a work session and then a voting session and then he'll get his bond return.

HARMAN HOLDINGS – 3 GARRETT PLACE – TM – 44.A14-1-31&32 – PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Carnazza stated all comments had been made.

Mr. Franzetti stated that he met with the Applicant on site and spoke about different issues. Everything is good; they addressed them and we're moving forward.

Mr. Cleary stated the applicant has addressed all of the site planning issues; we have no further comments on this minor site build.

Hearing no comments from the audience, Mr. Cote moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Furfaro with all in favor.

Ms. Dawn McKenzie of Insite Engineering, representing the project addressed the Board and stated, we're hoping, if possible, to get a SEQR determination tonight. I know a Type 2 action was discussed with no further environmental review required and also we're hoping that maybe we can get a resolution for the next meeting unless the Board has further questions.

Chairman Gary asked the Planner to prepare resolution.

TOMPKINS RECYCLING – 60 OLD ROUTE 6 - TM – 55.11-1-15 – RE-APPROVAL OF FINAL SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza had no objection to the re-approval.

Mr. Franzetti stated that the Engineering Department has no objection to the re-approval of the site plan as there are no changes made to the project. However the Planning Board

should be aware of the permits, expirations, etc. according to his memo dated January 4, 2017 addressed to the Planning Board.

Mr. Cleary said as everybody said, this is a re-approval; there are no changes to this application. You may remember this has a long history with respect to this application and a lot of involvement with the D.E.C.. As Mr. Franzetti indicated, everything is now controlled under those permits. The issue of the wetland permit needs to be re-issued by the E.C.B. as they are reconstructing the wetland buffer on this particular application. Other than that, all the issues remain unchanged. There are no outstanding issues and the Board can consider re-approval.

Mr. Giannico asked if the reconfiguration of the wetlands was going to affect this.

Mr. Cleary replied it's the same configuration but because of the expiration it has to go back to E.C.B.

Mr. Stone asked if any work has been done on this site at all.

Mr. Paul Lynch of Putnam Engineering and representing the applicant stated they've been working on cleaning up the site. There is a new property owner and that's why the original site plan lapsed. It was just going through that stage of buy or not buy and the original Tompkins approval expired and the purchase on the property took place last May.

Mr. Carnazza indicated that we asked them to clean up some of the piles that were out there but we couldn't let them disturb too much of the ground while doing it.

Chairman Gary stated didn't that site have a lot of things wrong with it?

Mr. Cleary responded it did. That's why the D.E.C. got involved in this. Most of that is regulated by the D.E.C. So the junkyard operation a lot of that stuff you would see driving against the property is the things as Mr. Lynch has indicated that were cleaned up by the new property owner. There were piles of junk, some of it slopping over the property lines so it wasn't really clear. The owner just cleaned it and rather than dealing with issues, took it away. He did the right thing by taking care of most of those offensive issues. The operation of the facility is regulated by and under control of the D.E.C. permits that Mr. Franzetti referenced.

Mr. Paepre asked if the re-approval was for 1 year.

Mr. Cleary responded this approval would be granting a new approval for 1 year.

Mr. Furfaro indicated that he'd like to ask a few questions. This is going to be a transfer station?

Mr. Lynch replied no, it's a construction in the debris processing facility. Basically, you go to a construction site, throw your construction debris in a trailer and that trailer gets dumped off at this facility where the debris gets spread out and put onto what is basically a sorting machine for the various materials.

Mr. Furfaro interjected so you separate out the metal, the wood, the plastics and garbage, etc. Then they move it out.

Mr. Lynch replied yes and everything takes place indoors.

Mr. Furfaro added that he noticed a big retaining wall right on the perimeter on this site.

Mr. Lynch responded it's the retaining wall between our access to our building and what's going to be the future wetland and pond area.

Mr. Furfaro asked, so the retaining wall is to separate the sight from the wetland? The site seems relatively flat – right?

Mr. Lynch responded correct to both.

Mr. Furfaro then stated, it's not retaining earth and that's a big wall – right?

Mr. Furfaro, Mr. Lynch and Mr. Carnazza had an exchange that resulted in the wall being there for environmental reasons.

Mr. Furfaro then asked the precise location and Mr. Lynch confirmed it was between the collision place and the humane society.

Mr. Furfaro asked if the wall was going to be put on the far side, away from the road and how high the wall was.

Mr. Lynch confirmed yes and the wall is 5' high.

Mr. Furfaro then asked if you were going to see the wall from Route 6.

Mr. Lynch and Mr. Carnazza responded no.

Mr. Lynch then stated that the back side of us meets the back side of Putnam Plaza.

Mr. Furfaro was just making sure there was no architectural component and esthetics wouldn't be an issue.

Mr. Charbonneau stated so the Board knows there are two easements that are going to be required. One is a temporary easement to remove some debris. Pertaining to the second drainage easement; the applicant is represented by Attorney Joe Spofford.

Chairman Gary asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Furfaro asked if they were anticipating on building soon.

Mr. Lynch replied I believe so. I think they want to get started yesterday.

Mr. Stone stated the fact that the easement is not yet final doesn't affect our approval.

Mr. Carnazza added that would be the signing of the map.

Mr. Cleary stated it would be a condition of the approval prior to the execution.

Mr. Paepre made a motion for Tompkins Recycling 60 Old Route 6 Carmel TM 55.11-1-15 for the re-approval of final site plan for 1 year. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

MINUTES – 11/9/16

Mr. Furfaro moved to accept the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta