

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

APRIL 11, 2018

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

ABSENT: CHAIRMAN, HAROLD GARY

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
Hudson Valley Federal Credit Union	86.11-1-1	1-2	P.H.	Public Hearing Closed & Planner to Prepare Resolution.
New York SMSA Limited Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless	65.9-1-24	2-3	Site Plan	Planner to Prepare Resolution.
Hinckley Holdings LLC.	55.10-1-3, 55.10-1-1, 55.6-1-53	3-6	Lot Line	Declared Lead Agency.
Kirkwood Estates, LLC.	64.7-1-21,31	6	Bond Return	Public Hearing Scheduled.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

**HUDSON VALLEY FEDERAL CREDIT UNION – 150 ROUTE 6 – TM – 86.11-1-1 –
PUBLIC HEARING**

Mr. Carnazza stated all his comments have been addressed.

Mr. Cleary stated all site planning issues have been addressed.

Mr. Franzetti stated all engineering issues have been addressed.

Mr. Franze read his memo which stated the applicant has been responsive to the previous memo and to comments from the PB. The 3/26/18 design review meeting was productive and the proposed design has been revised accordingly. Masonry and stucco materials have been reduced substantially and replaced with clapboard siding, softening the overall appearance. Divided lite glazing has been added, further articulating the building with traditional accents. As requested the submittal provides additional information identifying materials, colors and dimensions. The revised sign submittal now indicates externally illuminated signs as requested. The monument sign still shows a rather inarticulate block base that identifies “split block” while the building identifies “ground face veneer.” If these are to match this should be clarified. This submission did not include revised site/civil drawings but at the 3/26/18 design review meeting drawings were presented showing additional landscaping/plantings between the two retaining walls and also presented was clarification of the type of fence that will top the wall assembly. Both of these were in response to PB requests. Aside from comment #2 above we have no objection to the PB accepting the latest design submitted. No further architectural review required.

Vice Chairman Paepre stated we have made really nice changes there. They softened it up.

Mrs. Kugler stated we added the siding; we did the down lighting and the front signage. The interior lighting was taken away from the road signage which is.....

Mr. Franze said the monument sign is no longer internally illuminated. It’s illuminated externally. On the building much of the masonry and materials have been replaced by clapboard siding and the stucco has been replaced with clapboard. Overall, with the changes to the siding and the illumination of the signage everything has been softened in a very favorable way.

Mrs. Kugler asked about the retaining wall.

Mr. Franze stated the when we met the retaining wall was discussed and it had additional plantings at the retaining wall assembly which is two-tiered. The applicant also clarified what type of fence was going to surmount this retaining wall assembly. He

said they showed it was going to be a decorative or picket type fence and they were adding plantings all along the entire length of the retaining wall which is about 200'.

Mr. Roger Keating of VHB, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated that's correct. In summary, we added the plantings as requested along the retaining wall. We are doing an ornamental fence along the top of the retaining wall. It will be black which will blend into the backdrop.

Mr. Cote asked what is the height of the fence?

Mr. Keating replied it's a 4' high fence along the top.

Mr. Giannico asked about the materials on the illuminated sign matching the building.

Mr. Keating replied that is the intent. The intent would be to match the ground face area at the base of the building.

Vice Chairman Paepre asked if anyone in the audience wished to be heard on this application.

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

Vice Chairman Paepre asked the Planner to prepare a resolution for the next meeting.

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

Mr. Carnazza stated he had several conversations with Mr. Fry from Snyder and Snyder discussing the parking lot layout. A final draft was submitted today to me. It has not been fully reviewed yet, but they do have the 14 parking spots provided on the initial map.

Mr. Cleary stated they have addressed all the site planning issues. We have confirmed that it complies with the applicable radio frequency requirements. He said there was a secondary issue not related to the antennas, which was the parking. As Mr. Carnazza indicated, the applicant has submitted a draft this afternoon and they will submit it to the board now.

Mr. Franzetti stated there are no site improvements being done, and the Engineering Department has no technical concerns on the application, however, the drawings that were provided electronically has something to do with the parking area, the initial drawings, not these new ones that were given, which I haven't seen yet.

Mr. Franze stated some of what I addressed in my memo was discussed at the last meeting. He said the enlargement of the enclosure and its relocation from what was a happy thing in December, is a little less happy now. He said the only thing I can address is that the applicant did provide the cross section detail. It shows the materials and profile and the relationship to the building that the applicant represented. Other than its size and location it looks like they want to very much try to match the architecture of the building with respect to colors, finishes and profiles.

At which time, the board members and Mr. Fry discussed future applications coming before the board regarding telecommunications facilities and the change that was done at Sam's Carpet, whether it was a field change or not.

Mr. Jordan Fry of Snyder and Snyder, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated at the last meeting there were two main issues that needed to be addressed. The first issue was a piece of the sample that was brought to the site visit which he then handed to the board member. The second issue is that Mr. Pellegrino alleges that a small piece of the parking lot encroaches onto his lot. He said based on his survey and to alieve any issues, even though, this isn't a Verizon Wireless issue, we worked through a couple of revisions and Mr. Carnazza reviewed them. I have a final revision based on the latest discussion I had with Mr. Carnazza in the afternoon. He said the spots are clearly shifted away from his property line based on his own survey. At which time, Mr. Fry submitted the plans for the record with the 14 spots.

Vice Chairman Paeprer stated the board and consultants will need time to review the latest submission. It will not be done tonight.

Mr. Fry stated we would like to extend the shock clock and respectfully request if the latest plans are good, we would like a resolution at the next meeting.

Mr. Cleary stated we could do that. If there is a problem with the drawing we will let you know.

At which time, the board agreed to extend the shock clock for the record.

HINCKLEY HOLDINGS LLC – 39-65 SEMINARY HILL ROAD – TM – 55.10-1-3, 55.10-1-1, 55.6-1-53 – LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Carnazza stated he spoke to Ms. Hahn after doing his review. He said this is listed as a lot line adjustment and our code only allows lot line adjustments if it's 20% of the land is being transferred or 20,000 square feet. This plat is doing more than both. This is a minor subdivision and it will go through the normal procedure.

Ms. Terri Hahn of LADA PC, applicant's engineer stated it is a simple change of the name on the plat and couple of places in the application. There are no substantive changes to the drawings or to the information.

Mr. Cleary stated theoretically it is a lot line adjustment, because there are three parcels that they are dealing with and there will be three parcels in the future. However, two of those parcels are non-conforming. They are effectively unbuildable; it is the little strip that connects to Route 6 and a little connection out to Seminary Hill Road. Two very small pieces of land. He said the third parcel is the big parcel that supports the building. They are taking those three lots and re-adjusting three lots. So now they will be relatively similar sized lots. He said from our prospective our biggest issue is why is this being done, is it setting up for future development is the office building still in play. He said because they are creating a least one new lot, perhaps a second to develop a lot, we have to address SEQR.

Mr. Stone stated the two very small lots were non-conforming, he asked does this minor subdivision make three conforming lots.

Mr. Cleary stated yes the three lots will be fully compliant.

Mr. Giannico asked what is this property zoned?

Mr. Carnazza replied commerce business park (CBP). He said one lot has two zones. He said one lot splits the zone.

Mr. Franzetti stated all the Engineering Office does not have any comments regarding a lot line adjustment, but that's being changed to a minor subdivision. When the new plans come in there are a different set of code that I review as part of it. He said there was a lot of confusion with the lines. He said you need to provide what you have now, where are the lines and what are you doing in the future.

Ms. Hahn stated I appreciate the fact that you couldn't understand it and we will solve it in the next submission.

Vice Chairman Paerprer asked what are the plans?

Mr. Will Stevens, applicant's attorney addressed the board and stated currently there is negotiation with a couple of the lots. He said if things come to fruition the old Guidepost building will be developed as a distillery. Other negotiation is the new Guidepost office building that was fully approved a few years ago will be developed as an assistant living facility. Those are the plans right now, but in order to get from here to there we have to create this three lot subdivision. He said they are all large size lots. From our analysis they should be able to support either of those to uses.

Mr. Franzetti stated water and wastewater will be the biggest issues. He said it's town water and sewer.

Mr. Stone stated there will be significant stormwater challenges depending on the amount of cover on those lots.

Mr. Stevens stated we did a full SWPPP on lot 2, when we were proposing to build the new Guidepost headquarters which we never built.

Mr. Howard Lepler, the owner of the property addressed the board and East of Hudson has worked with the town and did the upgrades to all the new requirements of NYCDEP. They installed that about 2 years ago on the property for the existing pervious surface. He stated with regards to the small lot between the residences and the frontage on Seminary Hill Road we have an agreement in writing that there will be no development.

Mr. Stevens stated when Hinckley acquired the property from Guidepost there was a condition in the transaction that we had to conserve a certain amount of property. It could never be developed.

Mr. Stone asked what was done by East of Hudson was to address the existing condition.

Mr. Franzetti replied yes. It is below the lacrosse field.

Mr. Cleary stated when the office building was proposed, this applicant did a good job of submitting an expanded Environmental Assessment Form. It was effectively a fully EIS. They had done a very thorough job, so there is a lot of existing information that exists with respect to the site itself. He recommended to the board to designate lead agency and the applicant could circulate the notice and get the SEQR process started.

Mr. Furfaro asked that lot line is going to go across that parking lot, so will it impact the parking of that building?

Mr. Cleary said it would for Paladin's approved site plan to operate that building under the current approval. He said if that building is going away or being modified for the distillery the Paladin approval could be.....

Mr. Furfaro said so part of this minor subdivision would they show us that?

Mr. Carnazza stated they will have to do an amended site plan for the distillery.

Mr. Cleary said we could approve the subdivision with that encroachment of the parking lot. They could give themselves an easement until they choose to advance the site plans. They control the whole property.

Mr. Cote asked what is the point of ingress and egress from lot 2.

At which time, Ms. Hahn pointed to the drawing to show the ingress and egress and a discussion ensued regarding the different access points.

Mr. Cote stated my only reason for asking is because admittedly we have ideas of what we are going to do, but it's not written in stone, so if you sell the lower lot, at some point

they may develop it and the ability for them to have access from lot 2 might be hampered.

Ms. Hahn said that's why we have all the cross easements showing on the drawing. She said that's what it's for.

Mr. Stevens stated under the current construct of our contracts that are going back and forth, the acquisition company of lot 1 will have an option for a period of time to acquire lot 3.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding the possibilities of what could be developed in the CBP zone.

Mr. Lepler stated our contractual agreement that's fully signed with this company that would like to locate as their United States headquarters as well as the manufacturing, part of our agreement is that additional property below (ballfield) is off the market for any sale, lease or any other activity for a 5 year period, unless they wish to go forward and acquire it as part of an expansion. He said that portion of the property would be maintained the same manner as the rest of their property during that period.

Mr. Furfaro moved to declare as lead agency. The motion was seconded by Mr. Giannico with all in favor.

KIRKWOOD ESTATES LLC – KIRK LAKE DRIVE – TM – 64.7-1-21,31 – BOND RETURN

Mr. Carnazza stated all zoning comments have been addressed.

Mr. Cleary had no comments.

Mr. Franzetti read his 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 in November 2016 to evaluate the current 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 \$607,635.000 was reduced to \$103,495 on August 25, 2001. Based upon our inspection all the site improvements required pursuant to the Board's Site Plan approval have now been completed. On this basis, this Department recommends that the remainder of the bond, \$103,495.00 be released.

Vice Chairman Paepre said to schedule to a public hearing.

Mr. Furfaro moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:45 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta