

# **APPROVED**

**CRAIG PAEPRER**  
*Chairman*

**ANTHONY GIANNICO**  
*Vice Chairman*

**BOARD MEMBERS**

**KIM KUGLER**  
**RAYMOND COTE**  
**ROBERT FRENKEL**  
**MARK PORCELLI**  
**VICTORIA CAUSA**

## **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*

### **PLANNING BOARD MINUTES** **MAY 13, 2021**

**PRESENT:** CHAIRMAN, CRAIG PAEPRER, VICE CHAIRMAN, ANTHONY GIANNICO,  
KIM KUGLER, RAYMOND COTE, ROBERT FRENKEL, MARK PORCELLI,

**ABSENT:** VICTORIA CAUSA

\*\*\*\*\*

<b><u>APPLICANT</u></b>	<b><u>TAX MAP #</u></b>	<b><u>TYPE</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>	<b><u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u></b>
Carmel Fire Department	44.14-1-2	A. Site Plan	1-2	Public Hearing Waived & Planner To Prepare a Resolution.
Hirsch, Stacy	66.13-1-7	Site Plan	2-4	No Board Action.
Old Forge Estates	75.15-1-19	Extension	4	180 Day Extension Granted.
Minutes – 04/28/21			4	Held over.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

**CARMEL FIRE DEPARTMENT – 94 GLENEIDA AVE – TM – 44.14-1-24 – AMENDED  
SITE PLAN**

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicants propose to amend their previous approval from earlier in the year to include a small connector with stairs to the rear of the building (between the existing bays and the addition) and minor changes to the generator/transformer/trash enclosure area. I have no objection to the minor amendments; however, I thought the board should see what was being changed and be able to comment on them. The approved plans should match the plans I review and approve for a building permit.

Mr. Franzetti stated the proposed site work does not impact the previously approved site plans. All engineering comments have been addressed. There are some minor comments regarding permits and referrals, but the applicant is aware of them.

Mr. Cleary stated there is a building modification that is proposed, it's not technically a field change, so this should have come to you. There are no issues or concerns and I recommend you move forward with this.

Chairman Paeprer asked if the building is just an overhang to keep people safe during inclement weather. He asked what is the building change?

Ms. Kathleen Gallagher of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated the building footprint that is being increased is 50 square feet (points to map) and then there is an overhang that goes over the concrete pad that was previously there before.

Mr. Carnazza said it's a connector between the two buildings.

Ms. Gallagher stated that's correct. There is an existing door on the addition that goes out. That door is being relocated to the west side.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked about the utility pole.

Ms. Gallagher replied that's correct. She said NYSE&G would not finalize the design their portion of the generator and transformer relocation until the Carmel Fire Department owned that portion of the property. That occurred earlier this year and we have been able to work with them to finalize their design. There is an existing utility pole on the TD Bank parcel and originally the drawings had shown that pole connecting directly into the transformer because it's located right on the property line. NYSE&G is requesting an intermediate pole to be placed in between these two locations (points to map) to make that connection.

Chairman Paeprer stated so it's an additional pole, not a replacement pole?

Ms. Gallagher stated there was a pole existing on site on the Carmel Fire Department parcel that was shown to be removed, so in theory it is kind of a relocation of that pole, but we didn't anticipate having to relocate it since this pole was right on the property line.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked will the services be overhead or underground?

Ms. Gallagher replied it will be overhead from pole to pole and then everything will be underground.

Chairman Paeprer asked when you're all done they will blacktop and re-stripe the parking lot?

Ms. Gallagher replied that's correct. The item that was not originally shown on the map related to the parking lot was the existing parking spaces within the front and we were proposing additional parking spaces within the center. For esthetic reasons we will seal the entire parking lot, put back the existing spaces in kind. The total number of spaces do not change, it's more for esthetics.

Chairman Paeprer stated I think in this case we could waive the public hearing. We had a public hearing previously and no one showed up.

Mr. Cote moved to waive the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Giannico with all in favor.

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

### **HIRSCH, STACY – 311 DREWVILLE ROAD – TM – 66.13-1-7 – SITE PLAN**

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant propose to move the existing reception area/office for the kennel into the house, add an indoor dog run, and convert the outdoor dog run to an indoor dog run. A use variance was granted for this property to allow the dog kennel to operate in the R-Residential zoning district. How many kennels will this facility have? I'm concerned about the amount of noise this use can generate in the residential zone. Provide lot depth and lot width lines on the plat. Variances are required for two-way aisle width, lot area, and lot width. Once you draw the lot width on the plat, I will confirm if that variance is required. How is the dog waste handled? If somebody has horses, the town requires a plan for waste removal. We should probably do the same for a kennel of this size. When the kennel(s) are cleaned and/or disinfected, where does the waste water go? Provide floor plans and elevations of all structures.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the project encompasses construction of an 11 ft x 57 ft indoor dog run, enclosing tow (2) existing outdoor dog runs, and the addition of 15 ft x 30 ft office space. The overall disturbance for the project as submitted is 1,400 sq-ft which is under the threshold criteria of disturbance for New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) stormwater regulations. However, the applicant should provide details and location of erosion and sediment controls for the proposed work.

This Department reviewed the documentation provided and offers the following comments:

#### **I. General Comments**

1. The following referrals would appear to be warranted:
  - a. Carmel Fire Department
2. Provide an electronic version of the SEAF.
3. The location of the water supply should be provided.

4. There are wetlands proximate to the site. The wetland limits should be provided so as to determine if a State or Town wetland permit is needed.
5. The amount of fill, if any, being brought to the site should be provided.
6. All fill brought to the site must be certified per NYSDEC regulations and manifests/certification of the fill material being delivered should be provided.
7. Show safety fencing at limit of disturbance.

Mr. Cleary stated we do not have an off-street parking requirement for a kennel. An interpretation from the Building Inspector, or determination by the ZBA is necessary to establish the applicable parking requirement. The 4 visitor parking spaces are indicated as 9' wide, where §156-42 requires 10' wide spaces. The applicant should document if these are legally pre-existing. If not, the spaces should be enlarged to a conforming size, or a variance would be required. Visitor parking space #1 extends nearly 10' into the travel aisle, and creates a point of conflict, which should be addressed. Are the proposed additions required because the intensity of the use of the site is being increased? To clarify this, how many dogs does the facility currently accommodate, and how many employees work at the site? Will these number increase as a result of the proposal? The proposed 57' long indoor dog run appears to penetrate an existing wall to the south. Is this a retaining wall? Does modifying this wall result in any new site engineering concerns? Clarify how refuse and dog waste is disposed of. Does a refuse enclosure exist, or is one proposed? Clarify the purpose and need for the new utility pole. Are existing utility services being increased? Clarify the chain link fence that appears to be part of this facility, which extends onto the adjacent property to the west (by a maximum of 45.2').

Mr. Paul Lynch of Putnam Engineering, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated the main addition is 11 foot-wide which will be the indoor dog run. We are taking the two outdoor dog areas and making it indoor space. As far as having additional kennels, it's not going to change that much. It was just to have the additional dog run to keep dogs inside instead of outside during certain times of the year.

Chairman Paeprer asked how many dogs are there now?

Mr. Lynch replied he didn't know.

Chairman Paeprer stated he was at the site today and met the owner who said there will be acoustical additions to it.

Mr. Lynch said he wasn't aware of that.

Chairman Paeprer stated it might be beneficial to have the applicant here at the next meeting. There are a lot of comments that need to be addressed.

Mr. Lynch was fine with that.

Mr. Cleary stated the acoustical issues is standard operating procedure for kennels. I'm sure she knows what she wants to do.

Mr. Cote asked what is the square footage of the existing outdoor runs versus what is going to be replaced and the capacity. Is she planning on boarding more dogs?

Mr. Lynch replied we will have that answer for you.

Mr. Frenkel stated there are outdoor runs now, if this is approved there won't be any outdoor runs?

At which time, Mr. Lynch points to the two outdoor runs on the map. He said the two outdoor runs will be enclosed, but you do have this outdoor area (points to map) which will remain.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked the two areas that you pointed to that are going to be enclosed, are they kennel areas?

Mr. Lynch replied no. Right now, they are just outdoor spaces.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked is the intent for more kennels?

Mr. Lynch replied no. It would be for dogs to exercise.

Vice Chairman Giannico stated I'm hearing additional kennels, but I think the board is concerned with that.

Mr. Lynch said he will get an answer for that.

Chairman Paepre stated you have a lot of comments to work on.

#### **OLD FORGE ESTATES – BALDWIN PLACE ROAD – TM – 75.15-1-19 – EXTENSION OF PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION APPROVAL**

The consultants had no objection to the extension of preliminary approval.

Mr. Paul Lynch of Putnam Engineering, representing the applicant addressed the board stated he had a question regarding the preliminary subdivision approval resolution. The resolution stated that the road was not going to be offered for dedication and our plan is to offer the road for dedication. That has caused the attorneys who are preparing the HOA documentation to incorporate into their plans that it's going to be a private road when that is not our intent. We would like to have that language changed.

Mr. Cote asked wasn't there an issue with road?

Mr. Lynch stated the original 10 lot subdivision had a 300-foot section of road that couldn't be paved and that's what caused us to go back and re-look at doing a clustered subdivision because we could have a fully paved road and we could offer that for dedication.

Mr. Carnazza stated you would have to amend the resolution to say, town road as opposed to a private road.

Mr. Cleary stated the resolution would say a permanent offer of dedication.

Mr. Cote moved to grant 180 days (6 months) extension of preliminary approval. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Giannico with all in favor.

Chairman Paepre asked the Planner to amend the resolution.

**MINUTES – 04/28/21**

Held over.

Mr. Cote moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:23 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frenkel with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta