

# **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](http://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**

**MARCH 14, 2018**

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

<b><u>APPLICANT</u></b>	<b><u>TAX MAP #</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>	<b><u>TYPE</u></b>	<b><u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u></b>
Hudson Valley Federal Credit Union	86.11-1-1	1-5	A. Site Plan	Public Hearing Scheduled.
New York SMSA Limited Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless	65.9-1-24	5-11	A. Site Plan	Public Hearing Scheduled.
Angelo Senno Trust	44.13-2-2	11-12	R. Site Plan	No Board Action.
MK Realty	55.6-1-44&45	13-14	Extension	1 Year Extension Granted.
Conrad Bley	65.12-1-22	14	Bond Return	Bond Returned.
Minutes – 01/10/18, 01/24/18 & 02/14/18		14		Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

**HUDSON VALLEY FEDERAL CREDIT UNION – 150 ROUTE 6 – TM – 86.11-1-1 –  
AMENDED SITE PLAN**

Mr. Franzetti read Mr. Carnazza's memo which stated the applicant proposes a Bank and related parking. The elevation has been submitted and Vincent Franze prepared a memo for the board. Variances were granted for the following and are noted on the plan. All zoning comments have been addressed.

Mr. Franzetti stated there are a lot of detailed comments that I will forward to the applicant. The applicant has acknowledged the need for some of the general comments which were the permits. They acknowledged the following permits were previously obtained as part of the Route 6 Retail project. He said he would like copies of all those permits.

Mr. Cleary stated as Mr. Carnazza indicated the variances were granted by ZBA. At the last meeting the applicant clarified why they couldn't shift the building on the site. The applicant has updated the location of the mechanical equipment. It will be located on both sides of the new building, and landscaped. It is noted on The Landscape & Lighting Plan (C180), only the equipment on the south side of the building is screened. No landscape screening is provided around the equipment on the north side of the building. Details of the generator have been provided (Detail Sheet, C531) including sound attenuation. The applicant has enhanced the landscaping along Route 6 in front of the parking lot. The plan indicates a plant identification "Am" which is not included on the plant list legend. These plantings should be identified.

Mr. Roger Keating of the Chazen Companies, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated we went before the Zoning Board and we received the variances. We made some minor plan changes with respect to adding the generator and some of the additional landscaping that the board talked about at the last meeting.

Mr. Franze addressed the board and stated I will summarize the architecture memo. He stated in summary the building is generally traditional in form with respect to rooflines and incorporated engaged columns and cornices. They have made an effort to use details that are definitely traditional based. The gable and hip roof forms are locally and regionally appropriate. And a lot about the massing and forming and scale and size of the building is consistent with what the planning board has expressed about its vision for Main Street.

At which time, Mr. Keating displayed the architectural drawings.

Mr. Franze continued and stated as far as the materials it appears to be a textured concrete block building.

Mr. Jay Diesing of Mauri Architects, representing the board replied yes, that's correct. He said it's an architectural ground face concrete block, two tones and the stucco band that runs around the roof is EIFS material and evergreen color standing seam over it.

Mr. Franze stated they are on the right track. He said even with that material clearly they have been thoughtful about the way they have been use it and detail it, but I suggested in my memo they should consider presenting alternative materials that would further soften the façade's appearance and moving it in more of a colonial direction consistent with the Town's long term vision for Main Street. I suggested they take another look at it. He said the drawings should identify all exterior components materials and colors and they should include some general dimensions for clarification. He said the board also asked I take a look at the retaining walls. He received literature on the redi-rock cobblestone product that's being proposed for those walls and based on the images it looks like an attractive system designed to simulate the rustic stacked stones. It's unfortunate there has to be so much of it. The two walls together are about 10 feet and 240 feet long. I know there's not much that could be done, but on the landscape plan it didn't appear to be any vegetation indicated in the vicinity of that wall, so I thought the vegetation would help soften the severity of it. As far as the signage, the monument sign is shown on a textured concrete base, presumably to match the building, so I suggested if alternative materials are going to be considered for the building, they might consider the base for the monument sign. Finally, it's an internally illuminated box sign; I recommend an externally illuminated box sign.

Chairman Gary asked if the building is a carbon copy of the one built in Carmel.

Mr. Diesing replied it's a similar design as.....

Chairman Gary asked what is different about it?

Mr. Diesing said there are different finish materials on the outside as your architect pointed out, ground face masonry which I had presented to the board at the last meeting. He said it is a traditional design, but we have used this material to give it a little more of a modern feel to it. At which time, Mr. Diesing displayed photos of another building that was done in Fishkill using the same exact materials. He said we feel it's an attractive looking building between the mix of masonry colors and stucco that's on the cornice and metal roof. He then asked are there design guidelines that are available?

Mr. Franze replied I'm not aware of there being printed design guidelines.....

Chairman Gary asked what guidelines did you receive when you proposed to do the project.

Mr. Diesing replied I had experience with other buildings for our client. We have done a number of them before and they were very pleased with the building that I presented to you tonight.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding the photographs that were handed to the board of the Fishkill building. They compared the lighting, monument sign and the glass that goes all the way down to street level with that building.

Mr. Furfaro said he had no comments on the building itself, but commented they could come back with a much better sign. Maybe, something more Colonial or Victorian not modern.

Mr. Diesing stated we could talk to the credit union about it.

Mr. Cleary stated the next step with this application is a public hearing if you are satisfied or close enough with respect to the architecture.

Mr. Furfaro asked what is the anticipated time to build the building. Are you ready to go?

Mr. Diesing replied we're ready to go. He said we were hoping for a public hearing tonight.

Mrs. Kugler stated in the front they have a stone base and then they start the columns (pilasters), she asked can something like that be incorporated to give it a more traditional feel.

Mr. Diesing said we could certainly take a look at that. He said that's a good point, the columns were a little different on the Fishkill branch, but we will take a look at that.

The board and Mr. Diesing continued to discuss the architectural look of the building.

Mr. Diesing asked how can we move forward and set a public hearing; he asked what would the board be comfortable with as far as the building is concerned.

Chairman Gary said we're getting there. He said I just want to make sure everyone is happy with it. He said one of the things that stood out is the columns.

Mr. Cleary said the columns in Fishkill are more typical of what we would like to see here, not what was presented.

Chairman Gary said is that possible, can we do that?

Mr. Diesing said yes, we could do that at the front entrance, and we could potentially do it with the drive through columns in the back.

Chairman Gary asked Mr. Franze to take a look at the columns and windows when they come back for their public hearing.

Mr. Franze said I would expect the next step is to have a dialog with the architect and be in communication via emails.

Chairman Gary said Mrs. Kugler will verify what we are talking about tonight.

Mr. Furfaro said it would be great if they could soften the columns and do something with the windows and signs then we could move forward.

Mr. Diesing said I think we could work that out.

Mr. Franze said I am using my expertise to translate for the board what's being presented and compare it with what this board and the town board has informed me is there long term vision for Main Street.

Chairman Gary said are they way off?

Mr. Franze said I'm not saying they are way off, actually I have said a many nice things about this design, it's just that material..... He said there are other things that could be done to soften the appearance of this building. He said the applicant has specifically chose things to make it more modern, but the town has expressed to me, more modern is not what they are looking for. He said we should at least consider alternatives.

Mr. Cote asked what is the exterior of the building that is already there.

Mr. Franze said clapboard upper and vinyl siding.

Mr. Cote said this is the gateway to our community and we have two buildings that are going to be very close in proximity, so do they complement each other, would being similar be a benefit.....

Mr. Franze said you want to avoid excessive similarity and excessive dissimilarity. He said many respects they are not miles apart. This is not a modern glass box. It's not far from being a closer cousin to what's there now.

The board continued to discuss alternatives for the building.

Mr. Diesing asked the board if he could work with Mr. Franze over the next couple of weeks and look at alternative materials and potentially have a public hearing scheduled?

Mr. Franzetti stated if the board chooses to have a public hearing for the next meeting, but you can't come to a resolution within that timeframe then that public hearing will be pushed back to the next available meeting.

Mr. Diesing replied understood.

Chairman Gary said we could schedule a public hearing, hoping you have everything correct.

Mr. Stone stated he would like to volunteer in the architectural process with Mrs. Kugler and Mr. Franze.

Mrs. Kugler asked is there a reason why we strayed away from the original design.

Mr. Diesing said the Carmel branch was built in 2012 and we have done a couple since then, and the Credit Union liked the appearance of the Fishkill branch so that's why we presented it here.

Mrs. Kugler asked about landscaping. She asked what is the guide for maintaining and up keeping prosperous vegetation on the roadside so that it continues to beautify.

Mr. Cleary asked if it's all on your property line or in the right of way.

Mr. Keating said everything that is shown on the map is within our property line.

Mr. Cleary said so the answer to that is, it is there obligation to maintain the landscaping, but there are instances where we have landscaping that slops over to the rights of way. It would be the DOT's responsibility with a maintenance agreement. Sometimes it gets lost in the cracks.

Mr. Keating stated the Credit Union does a good job at their facility in Carmel.

Mr. Franze stated the site plan does not indicate what type of fence is topping that wall system.

Mr. Keating said we are looking at an aluminum style rail fence that would go along the top of the wall.

Chairman Gary said to try and do your best and change some things.

Mr. Diesing said we have heard your comments and we will work hard to meet your comments.

Chairman Gary said we are going to schedule that public hearing, but a lot of alternatives will go with it.

**NEW YORK SMSA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP – D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS – 954  
ROUTE 6 – TM – 65.9-1-24 – AMENDED SITE PLAN**

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the applicant proposes to add a rooftop cellular antenna at 954 Route 6. The necessary variances were granted by the ZBA at the February meeting. The ZBA conditioned the approval on moving the antenna to the north side of the building.

Mr. Cleary stated based on Zoning Board's condition, the antenna location has been shifted to the north side of building. They have updated their plans to reflect that and they have updated the photo simulation to show that location. They have updated their

radio frequency report documenting compliance with the FCC standards. He said there was one issued raised by the board at the last meeting which was the consideration or alternative location at shopping center across the street. They have submitted their technical opinion on that.

Mr. Jordan Fry, Esq. of Snyder & Snyder, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated we did receive the necessary variances from the zoning board. He noted that they did meet with the ECB and they had no issues with the site. As was explained, the zoning board conditioned the variance to relocate the facility to the other side of the building in connection with certain public comments. With that, we submitted updated visual simulations with two options based on our site visit in September where the stealth enclosure had two options at the top. In addition, we submitted affidavits from Verizon Wireless's radio frequency engineers regarding the need for the site at this location, also ruling out the existing Kmart shopping center due to existing topography being approximately 500 feet from Route 6 and a line of sight issue which is documented in the maps that were submitted in the engineering report. We also submitted an analysis from Verizon Wireless's real estate consultant explaining why the other buildings in the Route 6 area are not feasible for this site due numerous reasons including line of sight, height and structure, etc. He said we have extended the FCC shot clock twice, so the goal tonight for the applicant would be to schedule a public hearing for the next meeting.

Mr. Franze addressed the board and stated after the site visit I submitted a memo in December that was favorable to latest submission. He said they did a very good job with the screening by making it look integral with the existing building. He said this was a good example for the Town of Carmel of how to integrate the screening for these antennas.

Mr. Stone questioned why the antennas were moved at the request of the Zoning Board.

Mr. Fry stated the neighboring property owners were in opposition to the facility due to the location of the antennas, so the Zoning Board requested as a condition of approval that we relocate the antennas to the other side of the building. It's still in the front of the building.

Mr. Stone said visually it looks odd and not nearly as appealing.

Mrs. Kugler stated the original way had more continuity. It flowed. She said this is similar to what is on the Smith building.

Mr. Fry stated while it is a little bit pushed back, the idea is still the same. He said we did submit two options. At which time, Mr. Fry passed around the two options to the board. He said I think it is still in line with the architectural design of the building.

Mrs. Kugler stated it had a seamless flow where it was initially, then just plopping it on the other corner where it doesn't make sense.

Mr. Fry stated we presented both options to the zoning board and I explained to them this is a design issue and we would like to give the planning board both options. They conditioned their approval on moving the facility to the other side. But I do think that we still did a good job.

Mr. Stone stated I agree that the finishes match, but it looks almost accidental there.

Mr. Giannico stated this was never presented to the board.

Mr. Charbonneau stated the zoning board had extensive discussions regarding this. There were a number of individuals that live in the adjacent building who expressed some concern. The zoning board was extremely concerned about the issue they raised which is why they conditioned their approval on relocating the antenna. He said Mr. Fry is correct, he offered to the zoning board that he would like the opportunity to come back before the planning board with both options, but the zoning board did vet this issue rather extensively and that's why they issued the approval condition upon the relocation. He said that board did consider exactly what you are talking about right now and deemed it significant enough to advance the applicant to move the location.

Mr. Cote asked can you give us a summary of what the objections and concerns were.

Mr. Charbonneau stated there were some site line issues, the fact that there was a bedroom window that was located in close proximity. There were concerns raised about the radio frequency.

Mr. Fry said we offered both options, but it still meets the architectural design and blending it in with the building.

Chairman Gary asked Mr. Charbonneau was that the decision of the zoning board at the public hearing?

Mr. Charbonneau replied yes.

Chairman Gary said then we don't want to overturn it.

Mr. Furfaro stated at the last meeting we asked if antennas will be placed on every building or every other building.....

Mr. Fry stated the applicant did lay out its plans and right now their current plan is only one additional sight further northeast on Route 6, which is 1717 Route 6 within the next two years.

Mr. Furfaro stated he had an issue with Verizon; they do not do what they say they are going do. He said Sam's Carpet now has a screen on it and we never saw that.



Mr. Fry said with respect to this application, we have conducted a site visit with Verizon's contractor, construction manager and engineer. He said I'm not here tonight to discuss the other applications.....

Mr. Furfaro stated from our board's perspective, you need to understand our position.

Mr. Stone stated from my understanding, the shot clock is based on inaction. He asked if we are progressing the proposal and moving in the direction that we wish, the shot clock doesn't apply, does it?

Mr. Cleary replied we still have to render a decision within the period of the shot clock, typically if we are making progress the applicant will extend the extension of the shot clock. He said the shot clock is a preempted law to prevent boards doing what we are talking about doing now.....

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding the process of the shot clock.

Chairman Gary reiterated the ZBA made a decision and we do not want to overturn it.

Mr. Cleary stated if you want to schedule a public hearing, but there are two alternatives with respect to the architecture of the band. He said you should choose which of those two designs you want to see.

At which time, Mr. Fry passed around the two options. He said one is with a flat band and the other matches the existing cornice.

Mr. Giannico stated the radio frequency report is not stamped by a licensed engineer.

Mr. Fry said it was prepared by a radio frequency professional. He said I don't think you are required to have a P.E. on that. He said there is nothing in your code that requires a professional engineer.

Mr. Giannico replied in my opinion this is worthless. He said unless this is done by a third party licensed engineer in the State of New York, I would not feel comfortable believing anything this says.

Mr. Fry said he is a radio frequency engineer.....

Mr. Giannico said for Verizon Wireless, correct?

Mr. Fry said that's correct.

Mr. Giannico asked if he is an employee or under contract to Verizon?

Mr. Fry said he's an employee.....

Mr. Giannico said that means nothing to me. He said has anyone ever asked for independent studies?

Mr. Cleary said from time to time we do that.

Mr. Fry said I think you are looking at a different report, the FCC emissions is prepared by Pinnacle who is an outside consultant.

Mr. Giannico said it's the report prepared by Khondoker Khoder.....

Mr. Fry said that's a different report, that's the person who designs the network for Verizon Wireless. He said the one Mr. Cleary was discussing, is the radio frequency emissions report which was done by Pinnacle Telecom Group which we did submit a revised report to address the new design of the facility to demonstrate compliance with FCC standards.

Mr. Giannico replied I will look for that report.

Chairman Gary asked Mr. Cleary if the applicant wants to come and put the antenna right there, we don't have anything to say about it. He said if they say it goes there, it goes there.

Mr. Cleary replied that's basically right.

Chairman Gary stated is says we can't have too much objection about putting in the box. But we could tell them what kind of box to put there, correct?

Mr. Cleary said aesthetics we have total control over.....

Chairman Gary said and we could put aesthetics around this box, if the box looks better.

Mr. Cleary replied yes we can.

Chairman Gary said what we want to do as long as you are going to put it there, we could make you put things around this box.

Mr. Fry said that was what the intent of this application is. That it blends in with the building.

Mr. Franze stated from what I see it looks like the same enclosure from what I looked at and wrote a report on. The same materials, the same design concept and the same two cornice options.

Mr. Fry said that's correct.

Mr. Franze said so it's the same one, and it is the right choice with respect to all of that. He said they took the top tier of the cake and dragged it all off center. Apparently, we don't have a choice in that matter, so it is less good than it was. It is a little disappointing, in that it is not as integrated with the design.

Mr. Furfaro asked is there a way to integrate it in that spot.

Mr. Franze replied no, not anymore than they have already. Also, he said of the two options it should be the colonial cornice not the square band.

Mrs. Kugler asked is the top band going to mirror the exact band and style and curves of the rest of the building.

Mr. Franze replied yes, but it's smaller.

Mr. Giannico said for the record it is option #1.

Mrs. Kugler stated we have had problems with other sites, understand our frustration, I'm not in objection to the antenna, but it's how it's being done.

Mr. Fry reiterated we have been out to the site, we got the simulations and we understand the board's concerns. We have designed it the best we could. We brought concealment panels out to the site visit that was done in September to show it does match the building. We had two physical samples to show the different colors. He said we have been very careful with this site.

Mr. Stone asked is this the package or are there detailed drawings that have to see if the profiles are going to match and it's on paper somewhere in the file.

Mr. Fry stated the plan calls out the dimensions, but this cornice is subject to what the board chooses. He said we could certainly update this now to show the option that is chosen by the board.....

Mr. Stone said I want to see a section that demonstrates what you are going to build and match it with what's on the building now. He said dimensionally it doesn't match, but the relative profile needs to be the same. He said we need to see what it will look like.

Mr. Fry said I think we could do that. He said we could give you a more detailed plan with respect to the enclosure and the scale. We will submit an updated sheet.

Mr. Franze said to achieve the effect that is being described, would be a partial cross section through the enclosure with its cornice that would continue and represent the roof line and the existing cornice, so you could see both cornices in the cross section. He said that may require a little bit of field documentation.

Mr. Furfaro said I think it's needed because when they build this, we want to be able to say this is what you showed us.

Mr. Cote asked should the materials that are going to be used be listed on the plans as well?

Mr. Fry said I would be happy to bring the materials and samples whatever color is called out to the meeting or make it a condition of approval. He said we could add it.

Mr. Furfaro said we could do a public hearing subject to Mr. Franze getting all this information.

Mr. Giannico said to recap the change in location is a moot point now. The materials that appear to be in the picture using option #1 as the cornice is in line with what we are looking for. He said if we could see that transcend onto a drawing in a sectional detail I think we could probably move forward.

Mr. Fry said that's great, I just ask that we schedule the public hearing and if we get the plans to you within the two weeks, would that be feasible?

Chairman Gary said to make the copies and bring them to the planning office, so we could look at before the meeting.

Chairman Gary said to schedule the public hearing.

**ANGELO SENNO TRUST – 19 FOWLER AVE – TM – 44.13-2-2 – RESIDENTIAL SITE PLAN**

Mr. Franzetti read Mr. Carnazza's memo which stated the applicant proposes to legalize a renovation that happened many years ago. The structure was converted from a two-family dwelling with commercial space below to a four-family dwelling. Once a dwelling is converted to a four-family dwelling (multi-family by definition), site plan approval is required from the Planning Board. The Zoning Data table is incorrect. The property is in the C-Commercial Zoning District. Several variances are required from the ZBA but the table must be corrected prior to referral to the ZBA. A use variance is required from the ZBA. Only "existing apartments in mixed-use structures at the time of passage of this chapter (2002)" are permitted in the C-Commercial Zoning District.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the application involves legalizing existing apartment and converting existing office space into an apartment. The applicant must provide a water/sewer use report for review. No site improvements are proposed for this project. This Department does not have any additional comments related to this project as long as there are no changes being made to the site.

Mr. Cleary read his memo which stated the applicant is seeking the legalization of a 4-unit, multi-family apartment building, in the C- Commercial zoning district, which does not permit multi-family dwellings. A *use variance* from the Zoning Board of Appeals is required. Six (6) area variances are required for dimensional non-conformities. An asphalt driveway runs along the south side of the building, and it appears as though parking occurs within the front yard. However, no formally designated off-street parking areas exist on the site. In accordance with §156-42 B, the off-street parking requirement for an apartment house is 2 spaces/unit. The 4 units would require the provision of 8 off-street parking spaces.

Mr. Willie Besharat of Rayex Design, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated this is a site plan with existing conditions. This has existed for a long, long time. There used to be two stores on the bottom and apartments upstairs. He said we are trying to legalize the use as it was established since 1970.

Mr. Cote said so it was converted in 1970.

Mr. Besharat replied yes 1970, but the building is much older.

Vice Chairman Paepre said so it was multi-family for 4 families since 1970. He asked about parking.

Mr. Besharat said the parking is manageable; there is on-street parking. He said the building has been functioning since 1970 with no issues.

Mr. Franzetti said we need to double check to confirm if it is in the NYCDEP main street area.

Mr. Besharat replied no problem.

Chairman Gary asked Mr. Cleary what does this board have to do?

Mr. Cleary replied there is nothing more for us to do. He said the only thing we could do is send him to the zoning board for all the variances.

Mr. Charbonneau stated one of the concerns that Mr. Carnazza had when he spoke to him earlier, was making sure that these plans were ready to be denied to the ZBA.

Mr. Cleary said it doesn't have all the requirements of Section 156 on the plans.

Mr. Besharat said we will take all the comments and address them and come back to the board.

**MK REALTY – ROUTE 6 & OLD ROUTE 6 – 55.6-1-44 & 45 – EXTENSION OF FINAL SITE PLAN**

Mr. Franzetti said the Engineering Department has no objection to the extension of final site plan. He said all permits are up to date and the bond has been updated.

Mr. Cleary had no comments.

Vice Chairman Paepre asked this has been around since 2006?

Mr. Zac Pearson of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant stated the applicant is keeping all their permits up to date and valid.

Chairman Gary said this is passed 10 years. It's time to look at it.

Mr. Pearson said we submitted for a re-approval the last time and now we are asking for an extension.

Chairman Gary said somewhere along the line we have to stop. He said something that was approved 12 years ago may not meet today's standards.

Vice Chairman Paepre asked for an overview of the project.

Mr. Cleary said it is a two story commercial building.

Mr. Pearson said it is a commercial site plan on the corner of Route 6 and Old Route 6. He said I don't think there was a designation for what the building was going to be used for. He said parking, stormwater, drainage, sewer connection was done. We have DEP approval and current coverage of the state permit for construction activities. We have a valid ECB permit. All approvals have been updated as they come.

Chairman Gary asked Mr. Cleary would that commercial building meet today's standards?

Mr. Cleary said it still applies with the standards. The issue that is relevant with respect to these approvals, you also dealt with SEQR 12 years, have traffic issues changed, have the neighborhood characteristics changed. That is the relevant question you should be asking. He said these approvals and extensions are completely discretionary on this board's part.

Mrs. Kugler asked what are you waiting for?

Mr. Pearson stated they are waiting someone to come in to use the site. There were some potential users over the past 5 years, but they just never materialized. He said they are actively shopping in hopes that they could develop the site.

Mr. Furfaro stated the Chairman makes a fair point, 12 years is a long time, however, from a building perspective it has been very slow.

Chairman Gary reiterated that property does not meet today's standards before the planning board. He said it's up to the board.

At which time, the board had a discussion on giving extensions and re-approvals on projects that have been in front of the board for a long period of time. At what point do we cut them off?

Mr. Furfaro moved to grant 1 year extension of final site plan approval. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

#### **CONRAD BLEY – 50 CRAFTS ROAD – TM – 65.12-1-22 – BOND RETURN**

Mr. Cleary read Mr. Franzetti's memo which stated in response to the attached request by the referenced above applicant, a representative of the Engineering Department performed a field inspection of the referenced property on September 2017 to evaluate the status of the site construction, for the purpose of determining whether a bond return was warranted. The results of our investigation are presented below. The original bond amount of \$3,000.00 was posted in 1993. Based upon our inspection all the site improvements required have been completed. On this basis, this Department recommends that the bond be released.

Vice Chairman Paepre moved to return the bond. The motion was seconded by Mr. Giannico with all in favor.

#### **MINUTES – 01/10/18, 01/24/18 & 02/14/18**

Mr. Giannico moved to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

Mr. Cote moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:42 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta