

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

MAY 10, 2017

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

ABSENT: ANTHONY GIANNICO

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
Putnam Hospital Center/ Emergency Depart. Addition	66.-2-57	1-7	A. Site Plan	No Board Action.
Jan-El Properties, Inc.	86.7-1-25	7-8	A. Site Plan	Denied to the ZBA.
Lincks, Joseph & Lynda & Colonial Park Assoc.	75.42-1-46 & 47	8	Lot Line	Public Hearing Scheduled and Planner to Prepare Resolution.
Woodcrest Gardens	76.9-1-19	8	Bond Return	Public Hearing Scheduled.
250/254 Route 6	86.7-1-8	8-12	Waiver	No Board Action.
Minutes – 03/29/17 & 04/12/17		12		Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

**PUTNAM HOSPITAL CENTER/EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT ADDITION – 670
STONELEIGH AVE – TM – 66.-2-57 – AMENDED SITE PLAN**

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated this application encompasses a proposal to construct a one (1) story 8,400 sq ft emergency room addition to the existing facility located at 670 Stoneleigh Avenue.

Based upon our review of this submittal, the Engineering Department offers the following **preliminary** comments:

I. General Comments

1. The following referrals would appear to be warranted:
 - a. Carmel Fire Department
2. The following regulatory permits will be required for the application:
 - a. New York State Department of Conservation Stormwater Permit
 - b. New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) Stormwater Permit
3. Following Town guidelines, the Applicant will be required to execute and file with the Putnam County Clerk a “Stormwater Control Facility Maintenance Agreement” as specified in Town Code §156-85 to assure long-term maintenance of all stormwater management practices (SWMP) proposed for the site.

It is unclear if the exiting SWMP are covered under a maintenance agreement with either Town of Carmel or the NYCDEP.

4. Should any public improvements be deemed necessary as part of the development of the tract, a Performance Bond and associated Engineering Fee must eventually be established for the work.

II. Detailed Comments

1. Provide a copy of the amended stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP).
2. All turning radii for the site should be graphically provided. This includes the turning radii into the modified site entrances.
3. Additional details and sizing criteria should be provided for the proposed hydrodynamic separator
4. Sidewalks should meet §128-36 of the Town of Carmel Town code.
5. Catch basins and Manholes should meet §128-42 of the Town of Carmel Town code.
6. All plantings shall be installed per §142 of the Town of Carmel Town Code.

Mr. Cleary read his memo which stated this is an expansion of the emergency room and indicated that as such the applicant should clarify the reason for the emergency room extension. And address questions such as are new emergency room services proposed? If so, would this hospital be accommodating patients that previously did not utilize this facility? Will this expansion significantly expand the capacity of the hospital to accommodate patients? Will the expansion of the emergency room result in the additional employees?

Mr. Cleary also noted that the building addition is proposed within an existing off-street parking area and that the application should therefore consider and address in more detail the following elements. Currently, a total of 1,092 parking spaces exist on the site. The project will eliminate 68 parking spaces. A parking tabulation should be added to the site plan documenting the overall parking requirement for the site, and associated compliance. The new addition is served by a new access driveway for ambulances, along with a secondary by-pass driveway. Ambulance turning movements should be indicated, to assure that adequate maneuvering area is available. The 3 parking spaces on the eastern edge of the ambulance bay area may conflict with ambulance maneuvering. It appears that a net loss of landscaped island area will result from the proposed modifications to the parking lot. Opportunities to reclaim landscaped area within the parking lot should be explored, so that, at a minimum, there is no net loss of landscaped area in the parking lot. Is any new exterior site lighting proposed that would be visible from the property lines? If so, details are required.

Ms. Dawn McKenzie of Insite Engineering, Joseph Sinisi of Health Quest and Carrie May, architect were present before the board.

At which time, Ms. McKenzie displayed the drawings and pointed to the through driveway coming in from the main entrance. She said currently when patients or visitors come to the emergency room they have to circle through the existing parking lot to get around to the emergency room. She said this project proposes, in addition to the expansion of the emergency department is to provide the new driveway connection (points to map) to the emergency room. She said patients as well as ambulances will come in off of Stoneleigh Avenue and follow the designated driveway (patients don't have to pass through the parking lot) to get to the emergency department. There will be a separate bay area for the ambulances.

Mr. Carnazza asked if there will be a canopy there?

Ms. McKenzie replied there is a canopy provided at the drop off and at the ambulance bays. She said in response to some of the comments from the consultants, we already sent the plans to the fire department for their review. She said the project is a re-development; all of our proposed changes are within previously developed areas of the site. What that means is we are not going to have an increase in impervious cover, so it should just be a simple SWPPP amendment. She said as far as the expansion of the hospital is concerned, the hospital is looking to provide better service and better patient experience to the people it already serves. They are not looking to expand geographically. It's more to make it a better

experience. They want to increase the number and type of specialty treatment rooms from 17 to 28 and upgrade them with state of the art equipment. They are going to provide a new nurse station which will better serve staff and patients. They are doing a new waiting room for the patients and providing that separate and distinct ambulance entrance.

Mr. Sinisi addressed the board and stated at this time we currently are not planning any additional staff to service the addition. He said our intent is to increase efficiency and to create better rooms and service for the public.

Chairman Gary asked Ms. McKenzie to point to Stoneleigh Ave on the map.

Ms. McKenzie pointed to Stoneleigh Ave on the map and reiterated the expansion of the emergency department and also pointed to the direction of how the patients and visitors currently arrive at the emergency room.

Chairman Gary said currently the cars go up and makes a circle to the emergency room, what is the proposed change to the area.

Ms. McKenzie said the emergency entrance is still in the same location it is now, it will just be in the new addition as opposed to existing emergency room and it will no longer share space at the drop off with the ambulances.

Chairman Gary asked if they will be doing any improvements from where the driveway comes in up top.

Mr. Furfaro said the addition is in that driveway right now.

Mr. Carnazza replied that's correct, it's one way in to the emergency room right now.

Chairman Gary asked about changing the direction of travel into and leaving the emergency room, maybe circle and go back out on the other side.

Mr. Carnazza said they would need room; they would need a 2 way aisle. He asked how many ambulances can you handle currently?

Ms. McKenzie replied three.

Mr. Carnazza asked how many will it be afterwards.

Ms. McKenzie said it will still be three bays, but there will also be additional parking for other emergency vehicles as well.

Chairman Gary asked what happens if there is some calamity and ten ambulances come in at the same time, where do they go?

Mr. Sinisi said we have enough room right now (points to map) to show the 6 plus additional parking spaces for the ambulances.

Chairman Gary said it's not a matter of parking, but how do you get them out of there.

Mr. Sinisi said they have a two way lane getting out, more than enough room.

Mr. Cleary asked if they could show us the turning maneuvers.

Ms. McKenzie said yes we will do that.

Mrs. Kugler asked for clarification of the parking spaces across from the three ambulance bays, if they were for emergency vehicles.

Ms. McKenzie said that entire area is separated from visitors or patients parking. She said that area is strictly for the emergency vehicles.

Mr. Paepre asked if none emergency vehicle is driving to the emergency area, where would they park?

Ms. McKenzie (points to map) to show the emergency room patient or visitor access and parking area which is separated from the emergency vehicles by a curbed island divider.

Mr. Cote asked if there was a reason why the divider doesn't go all the way up to the end to the ambulances. He said it looks like a private vehicle could still cut across into those 3 emergency vehicle parking spaces.

Ms. McKenzie said we could certainly expand it there if you would prefer that. She said we need to test the maneuvering further. She said we are also providing striping at this location. She said there will be clear signage as well.

Mr. Franzetti said additional signage might be necessary if you are going to keep where the ambulances are and the other 3 emergency vehicle spots at the lower section.

The board members and applicant continued to discuss the additional signage and parking for patients and/or visitors. The applicant agreed to look at this issue further to see if improvements to vehicle control/management provisions could be made.

Mr. Furfaro asked if the architecture will be similar to the relatively new outpatient area.

Ms. May replied yes and we are also connecting to existing emergency department.

Mr. Furfaro said basically you are doubling the size of your emergency room.

Mr. Sinisi replied yes.

Mr. Furfaro said so hopefully with the interior you will work out the logistics, so you don't have to go across the hall to get an x-ray.

Ms. May replied the radiology department is not moving, but they have actually invested in a mobile x-ray machine which takes care of about 85% of their x-rays.

Mr. Furfaro asked if they will stay operational during the process.

Mr. Sinisi replied yes. He said our objective is to not impact our patients. That's always the priority.

Chairman Gary asked if the applicant would consider putting flashing lights on the ambulance road at the entrance, so no one else goes up there.

Ms. McKenzie said the alternative would be we'll have to provide a separate driveway for the patients.

Chairman Gary said it's already there. All they have to do is look at it.

Ms. McKenzie said once again we will have patients driving through the parking lot, when they are coming in with an emergency and going all the way around. That's why we are trying to provide..... She said I understand your point.

Chairman Gary said it doesn't have to be a constant thing. He said to maybe have something there to designate in case the hospital gets a call that there is an emergency where there will be 6 to 7 or more ambulances coming in. Maybe, figure out a way to close that off during such an event.

Ms. McKenzie said this is a situation that only happens on occasion not on a regular basis. She replied okay.

Mr. Stone asked if the lower entrance is sufficient for the new configuration for two vehicles to pass. Is it one lane wide or two lanes wide at that location (points to map)?

Ms. McKenzie said right now it is 15' wide.

Mr. Stone said and the existing access is also only 15' wide. It's all one way.

Ms. McKenzie said I believe it is one way. That's correct.

Mr. Stone said to the Chairman's point maybe you could widen it and make it two separate pieces. He said I'm not sure just having flashing lights saying don't go left go right is

sufficient, there's a bottleneck before that point if something were to happen. He said there is more you could look at here.

Chairman Gary said take a long at it.

Ms. McKenzie replied okay.

Mr. Cote asked if there was a particular reason why when you designed it you made it that bottleneck at the bottom and then opening it up.

Ms. McKenzie said we are limited by space because we are trying to maintain as much parking in this area as possible. She said we are trying to make it a clearer entrance, we could widen it a few more feet and then it would allow double traffic. She said we didn't want to encourage two traffic lanes through there. She said right now if you are going to the emergency department you turn in this driveway (points to map) and that is very clear. You don't have to decide what lane you have to go into. You can't accidentally get in the wrong lane because there is only one lane. And as you get in, there is plenty of signage with pavement markings as well as a divider island to realize and give you time for clarification that you're going to the emergency room. She said we will take another look at that and try to widen it up.

Chairman Gary said that's fine.

Mr. Stone asked if an alternative to this approach was looked at. He said where the ambulances turn left now, if you go up a little further (points to map) there is an island between two parking areas and connect to what you have now.

Ms. McKenzie said there is a 4 foot wall there and in order to make this a gradual enough slope to get all the way up to the emergency department at the elevation it needs to be, we have to keep this low, because there is a basement.....

Mr. Stone said you can't come through this (points to map)?

Mr. Carnazza said there is a 20 foot grade differential there.

Mr. Stone said okay. He said there is a piece of island or something shown at the corner of the new building and asked if there is good visibility coming up the hill to see the ambulances.

Ms. McKenzie replied yes there is good visibility.

Mrs. Kugler stated with regards to the three parking spaces opposite the ambulance bays and you talk about striping versus maybe putting in a curb cut, it may be something to consider when you have family members following the ambulances and not paying attention to the parking spaces because they may be to upset.

Ms. McKenzie said okay and we will also label those ambulance parking. She said we will respond to all the comments and hope to come back to the next meeting.

JAN-EL PROPERTIES, INC – 7 LUPI PLAZA – TM – 86.7-1-25 – AMENDED SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant(s) propose to legalize six storage containers (1/tenant) to the lot to the rear of the existing Lupi Plaza.

- Provide a buffering/landscape plan.
- What is being stored in the units? Code allows for Wholesale storage but not for Retail storage.
- Several variances are required from the ZBA.

-Area	40,000 sf	24,800sf	15,200sf
-Depth	200ft	100ft	100ft.
-Front Yard	40 ft.	10 ft.	30 ft.
-Min Floor Area	5,000 sf	960 sf	4,040

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated this application encompasses a proposal to install a six (6) 8' x 20' x 81/2' storage sheds on the referenced property.

Based upon our review of this submittal, the Engineering Department offers the following comments:

1. The applicant should provide a copy of this information to the Mahopac Fire Department for review and comment.
2. Additional details should be provided regarding the pads which storage sheds will be placed.
3. The drawing provided is cut off at the bottom and some notes have been cut off. A new drawing should be submitted.
4. Copies of any additional regulatory approvals should be provided for the file.
5. The overall disturbance for the **does not** exceed the threshold criteria of disturbance for New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) stormwater regulations. A NYSDEC stormwater permit is **NOT** required.

Mr. Cleary read his memo which stated the units are located behind the existing commercial building, just off the edge of the paved driveway and parking area. This represents the least conspicuous area of the site for the location of the units. An approximately .5 acre wastewater treatment area is present behind the parking lot. The storage containers are located on the eastern edge of this area (and do not encroach into the area). The storage containers comply with the applicable C- Commercial zone side and rear yard setbacks. The existing lot itself does not comply with the lot area and lot depth requirements.

Mr. Joel Greenberg of Architectural Visions, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated it requires one parking space, which will not take away from any of the existing parking spaces. He said with regards to Mr. Carnazza's comment this is for wholesale not retail. The containers will be used by the tenants within the building. We need several variances, so at this point we would like to get referred to the zoning board. He said these

containers are directly behind the building, so they are not visible unless you go to the back parking lot. He said there is an easement for NYSE&G, which also restricts where we could put these containers.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding the storage containers, what they were made of and what they were sitting on.

Mr. Furfaro moved to deny the application to the ZBA. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Paepre with all in favor.

LINCKS, JOSEPH & LYNDY & COLONIAL PARK ASSOC. - 771 & 775 SOUTH LAKE BLVD - TM - 75.42-1-46 & 47 - LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Carnazza stated all the necessary variances were granted by the ZBA and are noted on the plan.

Mr. Franzetti stated the Engineering Department does not have any comments regarding the lot line adjustment being proposed. He stated owners' approval should be signed by both parties.

Mr. Cleary had no comments.

Mr. Joel Greenberg of Architectural Visions, representing the applicant asked the board since this is a very minor project can we have a resolution at the same time.

Chairman Gary said to schedule a public hearing and asked the Planner to prepare a resolution.

WOODCREST GARDENS - 675 ROUTE 6 - TM - 76.9-1-19 - BOND RETURN

Mr. Carnazza said they did not do any construction, so I don't have any objection to the return of the bond.

Mr. Franzetti stated to date no work has been performed at the site. The original bond amount of \$136,056 was originally posted on February 2, 2011 and was renewed on March 18, 2015. Based on the applicants request and the fact no work has been performed on site this Department recommends that the entire bond be released.

Mr. Cleary had no objection to the bond return.

Chairman Gary said to schedule a public hearing.

**250/254 ROUTE 6 – TM – 86.7-1-8 – WAIVER OF SITE PLAN APPLICATION
(RELOCATION OF REFUSE ENCLOSURE)**

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant proposes to move the trash enclosure from the rear of the building to the back behind the parking lot.

- What if the garbage company attempts to pick up the trash and somebody is parked in the two spaces in front of the enclosure?
- Is the NYSDEC shed still on the property? Is it still functional?

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated this is a waiver of site plan application which encompasses a proposal to relocate an existing refuse enclosure on the parcel. This Engineering Department does not object to the relocation of the refuse enclosure location and granting the waiver.

Based upon our review of this submittal, the Engineering Department offers the following preliminary comment:

- The applicant should provide graphic representation of vehicle movements through the site should be provided to illustrate that sufficient space exists to maneuver vehicles around the site (e.g., parking, truck delivery etc.) as intended.

Mr. Cleary read his memo which stated the current dumpster enclosure is located behind the loading space – and is therefore generally accessible. The proposed location is proposed behind two centrally situated required off-street parking spaces – and would therefore often be blocked by parking vehicles. Ideally, a more permanently accessible location is required for a refuse enclosure. It also noted that the area just adjacent to the existing loading space – where two isolated parking spaces are located, appears to be a much more logical location for the refuse enclosure, instead of the center of the parking area. He said other than that, I have no objection to the board considering the site plan waiver; however, the location of the refuse enclosure should not eliminate or encumber existing parking spaces, and should perhaps be sited as noted above.

Mr. Andrew Borek, applicant's architect appeared before the board. He said the DEC shed is actually located off of our property. It's on the Town's property. We don't have a right to it. The remediation was completed several years ago. He said the shed was used as a point of aeration. They piped into the bedrock to try and release toxins from the bedrock to cleanse itself. He said that had stopped by the time we purchased the property and it has been completely abandoned. He said we asked them about at the time and they thought it was more trouble to remove it then to leave it. He said it is not on our property.

Mr. Carnazza said can you please tell your tenant to take the signs off the shed saying propane tanks for sale. If it's in the Town's right of way you should not be storing propane.

Mr. Borek said with regards to the refuse enclosure, the whole purpose to re-locate it is because now all the stores are leased and the parking is in the rear and many people are

accessing the different stores from the rear entrances. He said a lot of the tenants found it unpleasant for the dumpster to be located close to the entrances of the stores. It's more a matter of trying to ensure that the businesses thrive.

Mr. Cleary asked how often does the carting company come to pick up the refuse?

Mr. Borek replied about once a week. He stated the concept was we would mark the two parking spaces reserved and put signage stating parking for gas station employees only. He said they currently do the scheduling with the trucks so they could maneuver and moved their cars.

Mr. Cleary stated you don't think it would be inconvenient for your customers to have prime parking spaces available to them and be restricted to employee parking only. He said you would want to have employee parking in the least attractive spaces in the parking.

Mr. Borek said it is not ideal. We considered locating in this area (points to map), but the concern with that was a truck can maneuver to access and pick up waste in that position, but I think it's just more maneuvering to access it appropriately.

Mr. Stone said those would be the two least used spaces in the lot, so the likelihood of anybody being in the way is minimal especially at the time they typically come, which is probably mornings.

Mr. Borek replied that's correct, they come in the mornings.

Mr. Furfaro asked if the dumpster enclosure was all the way on the left.

Mr. Borek points to map to show the location of the dumpster enclosure.

Mr. Furfaro asked if he will pour a pad.

Mr. Borek replied yes. He said right now it is an item 2 stone swale and I would like to fill it in with more stone to allow passage of any water to continue down underneath the enclosure and do a concrete pad above it.

Mr. Stone said if you are putting it over a storm or drainage area, what will be dripping out of that. He said I guess it's coming out in the parking lot anyway now.

Mr. Borek said yes it's all going into the same place.

Mr. Franzetti said that raises another question if you're filling a storm drain. He said that storm drain was designed for a reason and with purpose. He said unless you're going in and sizing that pipe correctly that information will need to be provided to us.

Mr. Borek stated we are not introducing any new water to the pipe.

Mr. Franzetti said that's designed for something.

Mr. Stone said now your change the swale capacity.....

Mr. Franzetti now you are limiting that capacity.

Mr. Borek said I'm not limiting it, because I'm diverting the same amount of water that it's receiving around the enclosure.

Mr. Stone said there is currently a swale that takes the water east to west, correct?

Mr. Borek replied yes. At which time, Mr. Borek points to the map where the hill comes down towards the property. He said at the bottom of the hill there is a gravel swale and underneath the gravel swale is a perforated pipe to bring water towards the road.

Mr. Stone said so presumably the swale has capacity to handle what the pipe below can't under inundation conditions. He said if that capacity is hindered in any way that could be an issue.

Mr. Franzetti said which is what you are showing here now. You said you were going to fill the swale, correct?

Mr. Borek said I'm going to put more gravel over it to ensure..... He said the pipe remains the same and I would do gravel over it to level the area to ensure that any water flowing through still has the ability to access that pipe.

Mr. Franzetti said so you are putting gravel in the swale.

Mr. Borek said it's already in there.

Mr. Franzetti said to a certain level. Are you making it higher?

Mr. Borek points to map to show the swale and how he will fill it with additional gravel.

Mr. Franzetti said which goes to my point, you are filling in a swale and that's where the concern is.

Mr. Borek said what I am saying is this will be accepting the same volume of water.

Mr. Franzetti said but it's not conveying it the same way now. You've done something different, you altered the way it's conveying. He said this will need to be assessed as part of this, because I don't know how that swale was designed, why it was designed. He said there may not be an issue, but you need to prove that.

Chairman Gary asked do you know what Mr. Franzetti means that you have to prove it?

It means you don't come back here and say a word; you get somebody else to talk for you, that has experience in engineering. He said the Engineer just illustrated to you what needs to be done and you will bring that back to the Engineering Department.

Mr. Borek replied okay.

Mr. Stone said it looks like you are putting in a footing along the slope into the gravel, is that correct?

Mr. Borek replied I understand what you're saying it would be an additional hindrance.

Mr. Stone said that cross section needs to be accurate to depth of pipe versus depth of footing, etc.

Mr. Franzetti stated there are a lot more issues that need to be addressed. He said I thought you were just putting the enclosure in the parking spots not over a swale.

Chairman Gary said you need to answer all the concerns of the board. He said you need to get someone with experience.

Mr. Borek said I'm a licensed architect.

Mr. Franzetti said you will need somebody that does land use work. He suggested meeting with the consultants prior to coming back to the board.

Mr. Furfaro stated you are taking something that is tucked behind the building and you can't see it and now you want to put it out in the open down the access way from the street that will be visible. He said you have a nice piece of property let's think it out.

The board members and Mr. Borek continued to discuss where there may be a better location to put the dumpster enclosure on his property.

Chairman Gary reiterated to meet with the consultants for suggestions.

MINUTES – 03/29/17 & 04/12/17

Mr. Cote moved to accept the March 29, 2017 minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Furfaro with all in favor.

Mr. Cote moved to accept the April 12, 2017 minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Furfaro with all in favor except Mrs. Kugler who abstained.

At which time, Chairman Gary along with the board members acknowledged and offered their condolences on the passing of Mr. Cote's mother.

Vice Chairman Paepfer moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:17 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta