

## **APPROVED**

HAROLD GARY  
*Chairman*  
RAYMOND COTE  
*Vice-Chair*

### **BOARD MEMBERS**

EMMA KOUNINE  
CARL GREENWOOD  
JOHN MOLLOY  
JAMES MEYER  
ANTHONY GIANNICO

## **TOWN OF CARMEL PLANNING BOARD**



60 McAlpin Avenue  
Mahopac, New York 10541  
Tel. (845) 628-1500 – Ext.190  
[www.carmelny.org](http://www.carmelny.org)

MICHAEL CARNAZZA  
*Director of Codes  
Enforcement*

RONALD J. GAINER, P.E.  
*Town Engineer*

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

## **PLANNING BOARD MINUTES** **SEPTEMBER 19, 2012**

**PRESENT:** CHAIRMAN, HAROLD GARY, VICE-CHAIR, RAYMOND COTE, EMMA KOUNINE  
CARL GREENWOOD, JOHN MOLLOY, JAMES MEYER, ANTHONY GIANNICO

<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>
Swan Cove	76.5-1-49	1	Site Plan	No Board Action.
Wholesale Fuel Distributors (Shell Station)	55.11-1-40	1-3	Site Plan	No Board Action.
Bavarian Corp (Ariano's)	75.44-1-70	3-4	Site Plan	Public Hearing Scheduled.
Hillcrest Commons	44.10-2-4.2	4-9	Amended Site Plan	No Board Action.
McDonald's USA, LLC.	55.11-1-41	9-11	Amended Site Plan	No Board Action.
Barile, Mike	75.20-2-3	12	Bond Return	No Board Action.
Woodcrest Gardens, Inc.	76.9-1-19	12	Ext. of Approval	180 Day Extension Granted.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

## **SWAN COVE – 628 ROUTE 6 – TM – 76.5-1-49 – SITE PLAN (OPEN PUBLIC HEARING)**

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the public hearing is still open. The applicant would like to continue their presentation on October 17<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Gainer read his memo dated September 19, 2012.

Mr. Cleary read his memo dated September 19, 2012.

Ms. Nicole Barile-Stern asked if she could pick up the consultant memos the next day, so they could be addressed. And if possible to close the public hearing on October 17<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Gary stated we cannot say when the public hearing will be closed.

Ms. Barile-Stern stated presently we are in front of the ECB and we will be meeting with them again the next day. She said we will start addressing all the comments and come back.

## **WHOLESALE FUEL DISTRIBUTORS (SHELL STATION) – 1923 ROUTE 6 – TM -55.11-1-40 – SITE PLAN (CANOPY)**

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant proposes to add a canopy and change the entrance to the existing gas station on Rt. 6 in Carmel. Variances are required by the ZBA. Provide elevations for the building and the canopy.

Mr. Gainer read his memo which stated no details are provided as to the dumpster enclosure, a note should merely be added to the plans to denote that it shall comply with Town Code requirements. Details of the proposed canopy storm water connection must be shown to the existing drainage facilities which traverse the site. A “dog-house” manhole or catch basin should be provided to facilitate the connection. Concern had been raised previously over the intensity of the site lighting. The design engineer should review the illumination levels and establish what can be done to lower overall lighting intensities as well as at the property boundaries. If not discussed previously, the Planning Board should determine whether the proposed site access and landscaping enhancements are now acceptable.

Mr. Cleary read his memo which stated 7 Honey Locust trees are proposed along the site’s Stoneleigh Avenue frontage. It is recommended that this planting be continued with similar spacing to the southern property line. Given the highly visible location of the site, particularly at the northern tip, the proposed landscaping around the ID sign should be enhanced to create a more significant landscaped feature. An angled one-way ingress driveway is now proposed on the north side of the Route 6 frontage. Has this configuration been reviewed by the NYSDOT? To assure that exit movements do not (either intentionally or unintentionally) occur at this driveway, it is recommended that in addition to the “Do Not Enter” sign and second sign be added indicating “Route 6 North” be added with an arrow directing vehicles to the Stoneleigh Avenue driveway. The previous plan indicated very high illumination levels around the proposed canopy. The applicant should consider reducing the illumination levels, particularly along the property lines.

A zoning compliance table has been added to the site plan, indicating that variances will be required. A denial to the ZBA is required.

Mr. Gary asked Mr. Papasian to explain the flow of traffic.

Mr. Kevin Papasian of FST Engineers, Inc., representing the applicant stated he submitted an illumination plan for the canopy in March. Currently, the lighting at the island is regular lights. The canopy will reduce the amount of overspray to what's there now.

At which time, Mr. Papasian described and showed the board the traffic flow. He said Stoneleigh Avenue and Route 6 are two directional traffic. Currently, all three curb cuts are in and out with no delineation. We are proposing to re-align the curb and put landscape on Stoneleigh Avenue to try and reduce the amount of cut through traffic as was previously recommended by the board. We will go to DOT once we get this board's approval.

Mr. Cote asked if there will be an angle cut on the curb on the one way entrance.

Mr. Papasian replied yes, but it is ultimately up to DOT.

Mr. Meyer asked if Stoneleigh Avenue was 2 ways.

Mr. Papasian said both Stoneleigh Avenue and Route 6 are 2 ways.

Ms. Kounine asked if there is an exit onto Stoneleigh Avenue.

Mr. Papasian stated there is only one curb cut on Stoneleigh Avenue, so yes there is an exit.

Mr. Greenwood asked if the exit on Route 6 a right turn only.

Mr. Papasian stated right now, it is not delineated at all and we are not proposing that. He said DOT will review it. Right now the curb cut is already angled; so it is not easy to do that.

Mr. Molloy stated in his opinion it would be much easier to turn from Stoneleigh Avenue, make a right and go to the light on Route 6, rather than make a left turn out of the gas station onto Route 6.

At which time a discussion ensued regarding the existing angled curb cut on the Route 6 side.

Mr. Cleary addressed Mr. Papasian and stated if you want the existing curb cut to exist on your property let the Board know that. If you want a 90° 2 way curb cut, tell us and we will evaluate that. As it stands today, it is a directed right turn curb cut. He said prior to this approval we would tell you to put stripping and signs because your plan created a right turn only maneuver.

Mr. Papasian stated we could do that, but the end result would be DOT. It is there jurisdiction. He said basically, it will show the west curb cut right in and the east curb cut right out. That's the way it should be for a basic traffic design.

Mr. Cleary said to put the appropriate notes and signs on the drawing to show that.

Mr. Papasian said we will do that. He asked if there were any concerns with the canopy.

Mr. Carnazza stated you will need a variance on the canopy once the board is satisfied with everything else.

**BAVARIAN CORP. (ARIANO'S TRATTORIA) – 18 CLARK PL – TM – 75.44-1-70 – SITE PLAN**

Mr. Carnazza stated he was not part of the discussions regarding the crosswalk.

Mr. Gainer read his memo which stated we had sought to provide a convenient place in the office parking lot for users to exit the lot and enter the Town R.O.W. As a result, painted striping will be placed within one parking space in the northeast corner of the parking lot, and a sign installed specifying *"No Parking after 5 pm or on Weekends"*. Mike Simone did not feel that a sidewalk or crosswalk should be provided along Clark Place. The applicant's consultant felt that the existing exterior lighting in the office parking lot was sufficient, and did not need any additional illumination. This will be separately be confirmed by my office.

Mr. Cleary stated at the last meeting you directed the applicant to meet with staff to come up with a better idea for the pedestrian crossing. He said the Highway Superintendent, Mike Simone is against permanent improvements but he didn't mention temporary improvements. Maybe they could put up temporary signs for the pedestrian crossing to go out at 5:00 pm or some other temporary device to show pedestrian crossing.

Mr. Willie Besharat of Rayex Designs, representing the applicant stated we did speak about temporary measures and we have no objection to it.

Mr. Gary asked where will you place the temporary crosswalk.

Mr. Besharat stated we will place the cone with reflectors and a sign indicating the pedestrian crossing in between the restaurant and parking lot. We will indicate it on the plan if the board agrees to it.

Mr. Molloy commented that whatever you do you will have walking behind parking spaces on a very dark road.

Mr. Besharat stated the area is very well lit. He said in any parking lot you will have people walking behind parking spaces.

Mr. Gary asked Mr. Cleary what the requirements are for off-site parking.

Mr. Cleary stated there is no requirement for off-site parking. You are required to provide your parking on site. That is the problem with Ariano's, he doesn't have enough and is trying to get it across the street.

Mr. Carnazza stated there are circumstances where off-site parking is allowed. The first is the ZBA would have to grant a variance if the land is under the same ownership, which he did get. The second is the entrance must be within 250 feet from the entrance to the use it is serving, which it is. The third is such off-site parking spaces shall be usable without causing hazard to pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

Mr. Cleary stated and that is the section he is seeking relief for. He has to do the best he can with a limited situation to make it work.

Mr. Gary asked Mr. Charbonneau his legal opinion with all the comments he has heard so far including what the Highway Superintendent said regarding permanent improvements.

Mr. Charbonneau addressed the board and stated the applicant has done everything he could possibly do to make it safe.

Ms. Kounine stated when you have the planning board attorney saying the applicant has done his due diligence to make it safe, I agree with him.

Mr. Gary stated we can require the applicant to put more lighting on his property that he will control to make sure the crossing is safe.

Mr. Besharat stated we have no objection to addressing the lighting situation and luminous candle per foot. He said if we increase the lighting above what it is already, (we feel it is adequate) it would create a hardship on the nearby residents.

Mr. Cleary stated there is a way to design it.

Mr. Gary clarified that he was talking about lighting that would pertain to the crossing of the pedestrians.

Mr. Besharat stated we will address the lighting with the Planner.

Mr. Gary stated we will move this along and schedule a public hearing.

#### **HILLCREST COMMONS – ROUTE 52 – TM – 44.10-2-4.2 – AMENDED SITE PLAN**

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant proposes to change from four two-story buildings and a clubhouse to two three-story buildings with no clubhouse. The recreation area must include a community room. According to the Site Plan there is no community room. Variance required. Provide a detail of the recreation area(s).  
Note- C.O.'s will not be issued until the proper amount of Recreation Space (300 s.f.) is provided for each unit. Variance required for three-story building. Code allows max. two-story building.

Mr. Gainer read his memo which stated the overall site-related issues had been resolved through the earlier Planning Board review/approval process for the original development concept. However, the change in building heights and layouts may impact fire protection provided to the overall site from the now-existing water booster station. We therefore propose to meet directly with the design engineer to better understand and address this concern. We also recommend that the modified development concept be referred to the local Fire Department for review and comment, as well.

Mr. Cleary read his memo which stated this application involves amending the previously Amended Final Site Plan approval granted on December 15, 2010 for the 150 unit Hillcrest Commons senior multi-family project located in both the Town of Carmel and Town of Kent.

Construction has begun on the project and of this date the project roadway, off-site traffic improvements within Route 52, emergency access drive, stormwater facilities, sewer/water systems, utilities, landscaping and wetland mitigation measures have all been substantially completed. Additionally, C/O's for two of the three buildings located on Lot E-2.1 have been issued, and it is expected that the third will be complete by the end of October. All 76 units within the 3 buildings on Lot E-2.1 have been rented. The applicant is proposing to amend the site plan by eliminating two of the four multi-family buildings approved on Lot E-2.2. The two remaining buildings would be modified to support a 3<sup>rd</sup> story. Each building would support 37 units, totaling 74 units (the same number as originally approved). The 3<sup>rd</sup> story exceeds the 2 - story maximum height provision, requiring a variance from the ZBA.

**AMENDED SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS:**

- The proposed site plan amendment reduces the building footprint of buildings B & C and reduces length of the roadway. The total amount of impervious surface is reduced from 6.58 acres to 5.80 acres (a reduction of 0.78 acres). This reduction of impervious surfaces is generally beneficial from the perspective of site disturbance and stormwater management.
- The amended site plan indicates the elimination of the clubhouse and pool. Clarify the elimination of this amenity, and the projects compliance with the recreation/open space requirements.
- Buildings B & C will now be taller than those originally approved. Given the location of these buildings at the top of the hill, what is the visual impact of this modification? What impacts will occur, particularly to the residences to the east?
- A height variance is required from the ZBA for the 3 story buildings.
- Explain how the number of required off-street parking spaces (111 spaces) has been maintained, given the reduction in the length of the roadway.
- The original approval provided for garage parking within the buildings. The new buildings *do not* provide garage parking. How many garage parking spaces have been relocated to surface at-grade spaces?
- What modifications are required to the stormwater management plan to accommodate the amended site plan?
- Will the creation of additional surface parking spaces result in surface runoff conditions requiring water quality treatment?
- The Impact Comparison Chart (Table 1) indicates that 2.81 acres of additional upland woodland will be disturbed and 3.31 acres of previously approved landscaping will not be provided. The areas of these losses should be identified. As noted above, the taller buildings may actually result in *greater* visual and aesthetic impacts, which may require additional landscape screening and buffering
- The proposed modification to the project will result in a reduction of \$78,898 in total tax revenues. Document that the remaining tax revenue (\$326,059) is adequate to offset the municipal service costs generated by the project.

Mr. Gary addressed Mr. Contelmo of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant and stated as you remember from the original site plan with regards to the public hearing, there was a big concern with the height of one of the buildings. Now, the building is getting higher instead of lower. Why do we want to go through that again?

Mr. Contelmo stated the building being proposed is no higher than the tallest building on the first building that has been constructed. He said his recollection was not for the height of the building but the proximity to Hill & Dale.

Mr. Gary stated it was about the height.

Mr. Greenwood stated he also recalled the building parallel to the houses and it was a question of the height.

Mr. Carnazza stated the new building is no higher than the previous building. They are the same height.

Mr. John Bainlardi of Wilder Balter Partners, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated the board approved an amended site in December 2010. To date we have constructed on the westerly side, three buildings, constructed all the site improvements including off-site improvements in the Route 52 right of way. We constructed the project road, water system which included the water booster station and water tank. We constructed all of the stormwater facilities, graded and landscaped the property. We had a very successful turn-out with the renting of the first three buildings consisting of 76 units. All the apartments have been rented and we have a hefty waitlist for the 74 units to be constructed. He said what we are proposing to do is eliminate two buildings and the detached clubhouse. With respect to recreation facilities, we will be providing recreation facilities in one or both of the buildings. On the first lot that has been constructed the entire (80%) of the first floor, roughly 8,000 square feet is a full service club facility for the residents, which includes a card room, kitchen, bathrooms, workout facilities, library, TV viewing room and management office. In addition we have provided walking trails and outdoor area for benches and chairs. Our goal is to reduce the remainder of the construction duration and we will have less site disturbance. Total construction disturbance will be reduced by about 2 acres and total wood land disturbance will be reduced by  $2\frac{3}{4}$  acres. And the impervious surfaces will be reduced by  $\frac{3}{4}$  of an acre, so there should be no impact from a stormwater standpoint. He said because your zoning code does not permit three story buildings we need a variance to accomplish this. We feel this has several benefits for the neighbors. We have met in advance with Ann Fannizzi (Putnam County Coalition for Open Space) and Dr. Rose (Croton Watershed Clean Water Coalition). They have both expressed their support primarily because of the significant reduction in impervious surfaces and site disturbance. He said we are proposing to add a 3<sup>rd</sup> story by taking the building type (that has already been constructed on the other lot) and dorming out the attic space to create additional apartments on what would be a 3<sup>rd</sup> floor. We could accomplish this without any increase in the height of the building. He said architecturally the buildings will be finished in the same manner. By doing this we could eliminate two foundations and eliminate the need for excavation and blasting for those buildings.

Mr. Molloy stated the height of the building is measured by the average height of the roof.

Mr. Bainlardi replied that's correct.

Mr. Cote asked why are you taking the pool off the plan?

Mr. Bainlardi stated this is a rental project similar to what we have done on the 1<sup>st</sup> phase, who is involved in a lot of the funding does not particularly like to see pools on these projects and we don't particularly build pools on these types of projects. We typically built recreational facilities that were indicated earlier (workout, crafts, card room, computer lab, etc.).

Mr. Cote stated my question again why are you removing the pool.

Mr. Bainlardi stated because we do not want to build it for cost savings in part and maintenance issues. He said these are affordable rentals a pool becomes an expansive proposition in a rental project.

Mr. Gary stated when the planning board approved this project it was approved because of the way it was presented and what it was going to look like in the town. He said with regards to the pool you said you didn't want to build it, so it is up to the board if they want to accept that.

Mr. Gary asked if there were any comments around board.

Mr. Greenwood stated my issue is senior housing is intended to be two stories. Complying with that you end up with three stories of occupancy and these buildings would be built the same way of what was built already, which is in the slope of the hill. He said on the back side of the building is where the low point of the property is. My issue is the accessibility to the back side of the building for emergency access.

At which time a discussion ensued regarding the town code definition of height versus stories which does not have the same meaning.

Mr. Gary asked Mr. Bainlardi if he would consider keeping the pool.

Mr. Bainlardi stated we will consider it.

Ms. Kounine stated this was an approved site for senior housing and it required certain recreation. This board approved that site with a pool and clubhouse with the anticipation that the residents would have those amenities.

Mr. Bainlardi stated we will provide additional amenities in the proposed buildings (community room, etc.).

Ms. Kounine stated you have already amended the site tremendously. She said the only reason for amending this site plan is for financial gain. There is a gain for the environment, which I appreciate, but this just looks like financial gain for you and less for future residents. I think the original amenities should be there.

Mr. Bainlardi stated it was determined the real need is the rental project at affordable rents. We believe we are providing a very good product in this market. We do not skimp, we build high quality and we are well respected in the community.



Mr. Meyer asked if the State capped the rental amounts.

Mr. Bainlardi stated yes, they do. The rentals are set by the State.

Mr. Gary stated you are decreasing the amount of units, you are decreasing the sizes of the buildings, you are decreasing the impact upon the land which does help the environment, but it does not help the project. I think the project the way it was presented and approved has a lot quality. He said what was proposed, should be built as is, that's my opinion. He said I don't care how you dress up the building, it is still a four story building, and I don't think that it should be.

Mr. Greenwood agreed with the Chairman. He also stated he understood why the State did not want the pool but the clubhouse should not be eliminated.

Ms. Kounine stated both the clubhouse and pool should not be eliminated.

Mr. Cote agreed with Ms. Kounine. He said it is one project, one community. A pool is desirable for people in their senior years for a lot reasons and that should stay as part of the plan.

Mr. Bainlardi stated we will consider all the comments about the pool.

Mr. Molloy stated I haven't heard any compelling reason to making any changes after three public hearings and a great deal of thought. What we approved was a project that we liked.

Mr. Bainlardi reminded the board when the project was originally approved there were nine buildings, one clubhouse and pool. The clubhouse was about 4000 square feet. We since divided the lots, and we were required to provide a recreational facility on both lots. He said although we are asking to take away the 4000 square foot clubhouse, we built a 6000 square foot clubhouse which did not exist on the first approval project. You are getting about 50% more in club space. He said the pool is a different issue and I understand your points and we will consider it, but from a clubhouse facility we have provided more than the board approved. He said each of these lots far exceeds the required recreation space under your code.

Mr. Meyer stated his concern with regards to the pool is it not being financially viable. He said what will happen 3 or 4 years down the road. I think long term it may become abandoned.

Mr. Gary stated to Mr. Bainlardi we could come up with a compromise. He said I don't like the four story building. You had four buildings originally and you now want to build two.

Mr. Bainlardi stated that's correct.

Mr. Gary stated why not have three buildings and include in one of those buildings a clubhouse and make the buildings lower.

Mr. Molloy stated with three buildings, I think it's a great compromise.

Ms. Kounine stated I would like to see the community room and the pool stay in place. She said I am not thrilled with a 3 or 4 story building, but the two buildings could remain.

Mr. Gary addressed Mr. Bainlardi and stated we will not vote on anything tonight. He said I want you to go back and take the suggestions that were made and work with the consultants. We need to see if these suggestions would work. We are trying to get you to decrease the height of the buildings.

Mr. Bainlardi stated he understood.

**MCDONALD'S USA, LLC. – 1931 ROUTE 6, CARMEL – TM – 55.11-1-41 – AMENDED SITE PLAN**

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant proposes to change the traffic pattern, add a split drive through, eliminate a curb cut on Rt. 6, and rebuild the fast food restaurant. The applicant submitted a concept plan showing the requested changes. The plan did not include the zoning information but it did include the change to the entrance from Stoneleigh Ave and Rt. 6 as requested by the board. My previous memo read as follows: Why is the lot width N/A on the Zoning Table? Provide lot width. Variances are required from the ZBA. How will the split drive through lane work? The merge is a concern as the timing could cause an issue for getting back in to the line. Turning in off Stoneleigh Ave conflicts with the drive through.

Mr. Gainer read his memo which stated in our view the largest concern exists over the queuing that will occur at the drive-thru lane, and the potential conflicts that will result from vehicles attempting to leave the parking lot heading back towards NYS Route 6. Vehicles entering the site from Stoneleigh Avenue, to either negotiate the drive-thru or otherwise attempt to park in the lot. The latest concept plan has not eliminated these concerns. Therefore, further consideration should be given to making safe vehicular access through the site. For all movements being proposed, turning radii should be shown, for the Board's review and evaluation. Highway Work permits will be required from both New York State DOT and Putnam County Department of Highways & Facilities. A §239m GML referral to the Putnam County Planning Department is required. Wetlands permits from both New York State DEC and the Town of Carmel ECB is required as Michael's Brook (and associated DEC-designated wetlands LC-55) traverses the easterly portion of the site. A SWPPP is required. At the time the Planning Board considers the project ready for final action, 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 §156-85 to assure long-term maintenance of these treatment devices. Permits will be required from the Town for the new sewer and water connections. The Town of Carmel Engineering Department shall have the right to approve any contractor performing work on the public water or sewer. It is also suggested that a drop connection be utilized for the connection to the existing Sanitary Manhole. Once the Planning Board establishes a preferred site layout for these fairly complex site plan improvements, detailed engineering drawings of all technical issues and details must subsequently be submitted for our review and acceptance. As a result, the applicant may expect further comments as the Site Plans are refined.

Mr. Cleary read his memo which stated in response to the comments of the Planning Board; the applicant has revised the site plan by providing angled parking in the main parking lot, thereby creating a one-way traffic flow through the site. The following comments are offered:

- Does this layout result in a net loss or gain in the number of off-street parking spaces?
- A closer examination of both driveways is necessary. While the basic vehicle flow has been formalized into a one way, counter-clockwise circulation pattern through the site, both driveways will serve two-way, ingress and egress traffic.
- Is it possible to physically separate the ingress and egress movements through the installation of curbed (or painted) island or median in the driveway? Such a physical feature may serve to better formalize the inbound and outbound movements. This is particularly important because this plan would alter movements that operated as two-way movements for many years, which patrons of the restaurant are accustomed to.
- In a similar vein, it may be advisable to fully enclose the inbound traffic movement from Stoneleigh Avenue, and perhaps the exiting movement onto Route 6 within a separately curbed traffic aisle? Particularly at the Stoneleigh Avenue driveway, this would prevent vehicles from traveling in the wrong direction through the parking lot.
- It is recommended that both the County Highway Department and the State DOT comment on this proposed driveway and vehicular circulation pattern.

Mr. Charles Martabano, Attorney representing the applicant stated we took the comments made from board members at the last meeting and what you have in front of you is a concept plan to address those concerns. He said we want to see if this design more adequately addresses your concerns with both on site and off site traffic circulation and flow.

Mr. Brad Bohler of Bohler Engineering, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated the main changes made to the revised plan are we closed the entrance on Stoneleigh Avenue. That will now be a one way exit point only. We will have "do not enter" signs posted and painted on the driveway. The other change to the driveway on Route 6 is, instead of a one way in single lane and a one way out single lane we split it so there will be a left turn and a right turn lane onto Route 6. He said based on these changes we changed the configuration to a more traditional counter clockwise maneuver with the fast food restaurant and go the one way drive aisle along the front of the building. That allowed us to angle some of the parking spaces. We now have a total of 37 spaces on the property. Everything else on the site plan remains the same. He said we added a small bump on the back of the building, which is 8 feet for additional cooler and freezer space.

Mr. Cote asked if they were going to reduce the size of the entrance/exit on Stoneleigh Avenue.

Mr. Bohler answered yes. Traditionally, you have 24 feet for a 2 way. We went with an 18 foot drive aisle. This would allow for the trucks to exit properly.

Mr. Gary asked if it could be controlled from people entering from Stoneleigh Avenue.

Mr. Cleary stated that is a big issue. People have been doing this for 30 years and now you will prevent that from occurring.

Mr. Bohler stated with anything else that is new, eventually they will realize they have to go to Route 6. There will be big signs posted.

Mr. Gary stated no matter what you do, people will still enter on Stoneleigh Avenue. He asked why not re-vamp that entrance so people could enter safely.

Mr. Paul Going of Atlantic Traffic & Design Engineers, representing the applicant stated the amount of volume coming in off of Stoneleigh is actually very low, about 10% of the ingress volume. He said that was one of the deciding factors in closing the entrance on Stoneleigh Avenue.

Mr. Gary stated the proper thing to do is close off the driveway, but you will not close it because it will hurt your business. He said try to figure out a way to make it work. People will use that driveway anyway, so make it work. You will not be able to stop them from using it.

Mr. Going stated we may be able to narrow the driveway further, sign and stripe it appropriately and make it so people can't use it. It would have to be enforced properly.

Mr. Gary stated who is going to enforce it.

Mr. Martabano stated I understand your suggestions, but I think there are too many constraints to make it work.

Mr. Gary stated I agree with you, but I have one last request, take a second look.

Mr. Martabano stated we will take a second look.

Mr. Greenwood also suggested to take another look at widening the left turn exit lane onto Route 6. He said it appears to be very tight.

Mr. Martabano replied we will take another look at that.

At which time, Mr. Ken McKenzie, Architect, representing the applicant displayed architectural renderings of the building. He stated the building is brick mason accented with stone of a lighter color. There are trellis features on the pedestrian side where people walk up. He went on to describe the rest of the building.

The board members all agreed that this building looks much better than what was previously submitted.

Mr. McKenzie displayed samples of the stone.

Ms. Kounine stated she didn't like the darker colored stone. She said the pecan colored stone on the rendering looks nothing like it in person.

Mr. Cleary suggested to bring in photographs of a McDonalds already built to show the colors.

Mr. Martabano replied will do.

**BARILE, MIKE – 407 ROUTE 6 – TM – 75.20-2-3 – BOND RETURN**

Mr. Gainer read his memo which stated at the request of the Board; this Department conducted an inspection of the referenced site to determine if a Bond return is warranted. The Bond amount originally posted for the completion of all site improvements is \$12,625.00. Based upon our inspection, we determined that the following work remains incomplete:

1. Handicap parking designation & sign in parking space adjacent to building
2. Wheel stops in (5) parking stalls lying adjacent to structure to north of property
3. Curbing of parking lot
4. Trench drain along building face
5. A proposed catch basin at the western corner of the building.

In our view, items 1 & 2 must be resolved before the Planning Board makes any recommendation as to release of the bond. However, in our opinion the site grading accomplished as part of the construction of the storage building has made items 3-5 unnecessary. Site drainage still functions as intended by the original design.

Therefore, we would not object to the changed drainage conditions and the elimination of the above noted improvements provided that the Planning Board has no objections to these field changes.

Mr. Gary stated we will do whatever your memo says. The applicant has some work to do.

**WOODCREST GARDENS, INC. – 675 ROUTE 6 – TM 76.9-1-19 – EXTENSION OF APPROVAL**

The consultants had no objection to extension of approval.

Mr. Greenwood moved to grant a 180 day extension of approval. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kounine with all in favor.

Mr. Greenwood moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kounine with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta