

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

MICHAEL CARNAZZA
*Director of Code
Enforcement*

RICHARD FRANZETTI, P.E.
Town Engineer

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

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES **SEPTEMBER 22, 2021**

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN, CRAIG PAEPRER, VICE CHAIRMAN, ANTHONY GIANNICO,
KIM KUGLER, RAYMOND COTE, ROBERT FRENKEL, VICTORIA CAUSA

ABSENT: MARK PORCELLI

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
Barile Property Management Inc.	75.19-1-12	A. Site Plan	1	Applicant Off the Agenda.
Suez Water New York Inc London Bridge Wells	64.7-1-10	Site Plan	1-7	No Board Action.
Suez Water New York Inc Geymer Wells	75.13-1-6	Site Plan	8-11	No Board Action.
Suez Water New York Inc Chateau Wells	75.20-1-16	Site Plan	11-13	No Board Action.
Suez Water New York Inc Mahopac Wells	75.20-2-68	Site Plan	13-14	No Board Action.
Suez Water New York Inc Archer Wells	85.12-1-8	Site Plan	14-15	No Board Action.
Minutes – 08/12/21			15	Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

The applicant was not able to attend the meeting.

SUEZ WATER NEW YORK INC – LONDON BRIDGE WELLS – 39 BROOK ST – TM – 64.7-1-10 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Franzetti read Mr. Carnazza's memo which stated the applicants propose to add a PFAS Treatment Building to the water treatment facility off Brook Ave. in Mahopac. A Use Variance is required for the Private Utility. Only Public Utilities are permitted in the Town of Carmel. Provide a detail of the buffer. Code §156-37C requires "A landscaped buffer area at least 10 feet in width and six feet in height shall be provided and maintained along all property lines to satisfactorily screen public utility substations and any other buildings from surrounding uses of land. An enhanced buffer should be provided toward Brook Ave. as this building is right off the road (approx. 33 ft.). Referral to the ECB, Fire Department and Putnam County Dept. of Health are required by code.

Mr. Franzetti stated he forwarded his comments to the applicant after the last meeting. They are aware that they have to meet stormwater requirements and will address them as part of the SWPPP. Mr. Franzetti continued and read his memo which stated this application involves the construction upgrades to the existing well site and installing granulated activated carbon treatment building to treat water from this public water supply. Based upon our review of this submittal, the Engineering Department offers the following preliminary comments

I. General Comments:

1. The following referrals are required:
 - a. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)
 - b. Putnam County Department of Health (PCDOH)
 - c. New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP)
 - d. The Town of Carmel Environmental Conservation Board (ECB).
 - e. Mahopac Fire Department
2. The following permits are required:
 - a. NYSDEC - for stormwater and wetlands;
 - b. PCDOH for well and treatment system.
 - c. ECB for wetlands
3. The area of disturbance for the work as provided is 17,186 sf. The threshold criteria of disturbances for the NYSDEC stormwater regulation are between 5,000 square feet and one (1) acre and over one (1) acre. The project will require coverage under the NYSEC SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity (GP-0-20-001) and the development of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that has erosion and sediment controls.

The applicant has provided a SWPPP which is currently under review.

4. All re-grading required to accomplish the intended development should be provided. It is unclear from the drawings provide the extent of cut and fill proposed for the site.
5. Traffic and Vehicle Movement Plans should be provided which provide the following:

- a. Graphic representation of vehicle movements through the site should be provided to illustrate that sufficient space exists to maneuver vehicles on the site.
- b. All turning radii for the site should be graphically provided. This includes the turning radii into the site entrance.
- c. The applicant provided sight distances at the driveway location.

All calculations should be provided.

- d. Slopes at the entrance way need to be defined. It is suggested that slopes of less than 6% be used for the first 20 feet of entry and that slopes of no greater than 8% be used entering the site. Please refer to AASHTO guidelines for commercial properties.

6. A light spill plan should be provided.

7. Should any public improvements be deemed necessary as part of the development of the tract, a Performance Bond and associated Engineering Fee must eventually be established for the work. The applicant will need to develop a quantity take off for bonding purposes. Mr. Franzetti stated there are more detailed comments, but I also provided 18 more comments. Comments 7 through 18 are only necessary if the applicant is going to use them, so the board does not have to be concerned with them. The detailed comments are as follows:

1. A landscaping plan has been provided. The applicant should add a note that all plantings shall be installed per §142 of the Town of Carmel Town Code.
2. The stormwater management practice (i.e. Infiltration) have been provided. The applicant should note that then must meet the criteria as defined by the NYSDEC. This includes providing sufficient depth to groundwater.
3. Adequate protection should be provided in the stormwater management practice (SMP) areas to minimize disturbance during construction. Details should be provided to show how the rain garden will be protected during construction.
4. All water service connections must be K-copper.
5. It is unclear if additional electrical utilities are being installed.
6. The area of disturbance must be shown on the drawing and delineated by orange construction fencing.

Mr. Cleary stated a use variance is required and with this particular application it is unclear of the site boundaries. They need to clarify the boundaries of the site. The facility is proposed within the buffer of a NYSDEC wetland. In accordance with Article 24, a Freshwater Wetland Permit is required from the NYSDEC. Is the PFAS treatment facility a permanent and on-going operation, or is it a temporary measure? It is noted that a new fenced enclosure and gate is proposed for the new treatment building. Clarify if the existing gate to the fenced spring house area will remain. It is recommended that only a single driveway be used for this site. Clarify the height and provide a detail of the proposed chain link fence. It is recommended that the chain link fence include privacy slats – particularly facing the adjacent residence located to the north. Clarify the height and provide a detail of the proposed retaining walls. Provide the noise generation specifications for the new pumps. Noise generation must comply with the sound level standards for residential districts established in Chapter 105 of the Town Code. Can the 3 large maple trees located on the south side of the new driveway be preserved. It does not appear that any improvements or grading is proposed in that area. Clarify if any special

chemical storage provisions are required. How often will the site be accessed by maintenance and or operational personnel? Clarify if any site lighting is proposed. Correspondence included with the site plan application from Creamer indicates that the building was to be a prefabricated metal building with a standing seam roof system. However, due to extensive lead time delays, the applicant is exploring other material options. The architectural treatment of the building must be established at this time, as the Planning Board also serves in the capacity of Architectural Review Board.

Mr. John Kirkpatrick, applicant's attorney and City Planner addressed the board and stated Suez in the Town of Carmel operates five small water systems. They didn't build them. They were originally owned and operated by private company named Forest Park. They came to be issues of maintenance and so a couple of years ago the New York State Health Department required Suez to take over these systems and maintain them. What we are here for tonight is about existing water systems, well sites and treatment systems that go with them. He stated tonight we are only proposing to give you an introduction. We want to speak first about the treatment system which is common to all five of these systems and then we will pivot to the individual site plans and give you a better idea of what each site looks like. He stated as mentioned the Director of Code Enforcement has ruled that these would require use variances. In the table of permitted uses is "public utilities". Suez is a private utility. We don't completely agree, because these are existing uses and if they are not public utilities then they are existing non-conforming uses. He said after we make these presentations, I would like to discuss the best way to handle this, because there are several pieces to this.

Mr. Peter Petriccione, Project Manager, Gannett Fleming Engineers, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated the whole purpose of these projects is PFAS. PFAS stands for Per - and polyfluoroalkyl substances. It's over 5,000 contaminants that are found in common fabrics, such as repellents, Teflon and firefighting foams. The EPA has historically had a limit of 70 parts per trillion in drinking water and Suez's water supply is well below that. He said about one year ago, New York State decided to lower that to 10 parts per trillion. So, there are handful of Suez water supply that fall above 10, but all of are well below the 70. Now, we have the five sites that are in question that we need to add treatment as per New York State Health mandate. He said one common way to remove PFAS from the water is with granular activated carbon GAC. With all these sites, we are basically going to have two carbon vessels that contain carbon installed in a new above grade structure building to house the vessels for all the sites. Ahead of those vessels will be a pre-filter in line to filter any large particles. The well pumps that are existing will not be changed in terms of capacity. We are upgrading the horsepower to overcome additional head loss with the new filter and GAC. In addition, the Mahopac site is a little unique. Currently, Mahopac employs the use of a pilot treatment system for iron and manganese in the water which is specific to that area and as part of the upgrade with the GAC we are going to put a permanent green sand filter on the Mahopac site. The other sites are only getting a GAC system. He said the Chateau site has three wells, a total firm capacity of 150 gallons per minute, that will not change. Geymer has two wells with 100 gallons per minute capacity, that will not change. London Bridge has 60 gallons per minute over two wells and that will not change. Mahopac has 130 gallons per minute and that will not change. Archer has 75 gallons per minute and that will not change.

Chairman Paepre asked how often will the filters be changed.

Mr. Petriccione replied they get backwashed every six to 12 months.

Chairman Paeprer stated so one or two people will go to the pump house and change them?

Mr. Petriccione replied that's correct. They remove and change out the carbon.

Chairman Paeprer asked if the sites have back up generators if the power goes out.

Mr. Petriccione replied yes.

Chairman Paeprer asked do the sites have standby power now?

Mr. Petriccione replied some of them do, not all them. He said there will be provisions for a portable plug-in type generator.

Mr. Frenkel asked what fuels the generators?

Mr. Petriccione replied diesel fuel.

Mr. Frenkel asked how will the fuel be stored?

Mr. Petriccione said it will be brought up with the generator. No fuel will be stored on site.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked what was the standard and why did New York State lower it?

Mr. Petriccione stated they wanted to conserve. He said the federal government hasn't decided on a national standard. The EPA is 70, but a lot of states are questioning that from their own research.

Chairman Paeprer asked how do you know that this filtering will lower from 70 to 10.

Mr. Petriccione said it's not 70 now. It's 10 to 12. He said 70 is the EPA limit.

Mr. Frenkel asked if the well sites are testing above 10 at this point.

Mr. Petriccione replied yes.

Mr. Frenkel asked why do all this investment if it's not needed.

Mr. Petriccione stated it's being mandated by the state health department.

Mr. Frenkel stated so if the standard now has been lowered to 10 for the state and if you're between 10 and 70, you still need to put this equipment in?

Mr. Petriccione replied yes. If you're above 10, that's the triggering point.

Mr. Frenkel asked how many homes are connected to each water system.

Mr. Petriccione replied Chateau well is 180, Geymer is 50, London Bridge is 65, Mahopac is 300 and Archer is 32 customers.

Mrs. Causa asked will these filters have any effect on water pressure?

Mr. Petriccione replied no.

Mr. Frenkel asked if flooding occurs, does that effect the quality of the water in the well?

Mr. Steven Garabed of Suez Water replied not that he is aware of.

Chairman Paeprer asked how big do you anticipate the building to be for the London Bridge well?

Mr. Ryan Nasher of Atzl, Nasher & Zigler PC replied the London Bridge well is 33 feet by 22 feet.

Chairman Paeprer asked what is the size of the current structure?

Mr. Garabed stated most of the structures there are below grade. We have a storage tank, below ground pumps and wells. There aren't any above ground structures.

Chairman Paeprer stated although it's in a wooded area, you will now be able to see it, especially in the winter that you never saw before.

Mr. Cote asked what is the height of the building.

Mr. Nasher replied the height of the building will be 22 feet.

Mr. Cleary stated this is a 770 square foot building with fairly tall expansions. You will see it in the woods.

Mr. Frenkel asked why does it need to be that high?

Mr. Garabed stated it's the height of the vessels. He said you have vessels with piping on top, air release valves and you need clearance to be able to work. It ends up being a large building.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked are these manufactured buildings?

Mr. Garabed replied yes, they are manufactured buildings.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked do you have any samples?

Mr. Cleary stated that was the issue that they indicated, they could not provide that for you at this time.

Mr. Garabed stated we had proposed to go with one building manufacturer. One of the challenges we have is that we have to have everything constructed and operational by August of 2022. The supply chain issues are crazy. The original building manufacturer could not get the buildings until August which was unacceptable. The contractor found a different building manufacturer, now we are able to get the buildings early next year.

Mr. Cote asked do you have a rendering of the building?

At which time, Mr. Garabed displayed drawings of the building.

Mr. Frenkel said the problem with London Bridge is that it's right on the road. The steel utility structure doesn't match the architecture of the neighborhood and it's pretty much in your face.

Mr. Cleary stated is there an alternative vessel, such as a sideways vessel for the London Bridge site that would lower the height of the building.

Mr. Garabed replied no. We already contracted for the vessels.

Mr. Cleary said is there a way to set into the ground a bit.

Mr. Garabed replied the problem with setting it in the ground is if you ever have to take anything out, now you're working in a basement. It makes it a lot more difficult to work with.

Mr. Frenkel asked is there anything that could be done to the exterior of the building to make it look more like a residential building?

Mr. Garabed stated we tried to go with the colors that would blend in well with the surroundings. We believe it works well with many of the sites and the background vegetation.

Chairman Paeprer asked if there will be fencing and security?

Mr. Garabed replied yes.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked will it be a screened fence?

Mr. Garabed stated I think one of the comments said it should be the slats.

Mr. Frenkel stated the building is so close to the road, a 5 to 6 foot fence will not make it look any better.

Mr. Cleary stated going back to the generators, if it's a permanent generator show it on the plans. If it's a portable generator just indicate the location of the portable generator.

Chairman Paeprer how much property do you have there.

Mr. Garabed replied not very much. He said many of these sites have very little property when we took them over.

Chairman Paeprer stated so there aren't a lot of options of where to put the building.

Mr. Garabed replied that's correct.

Mr. Franzetti stated we need to figure out easements and site ownership. I know there were some ownership issues with the property on Eleonor Drive. They need to make sure they have all the proper paperwork.

Mr. Charbonneau stated from an enforcement prospective I have received phone calls from the Building Department relative to where they can and can not access the site going beyond the boundaries of easements, etc. That paperwork needs to be firm and irrefutable.

Chairman Paeprer stated when you come back to the board for all the structures, we will want to see architectural details of the building, the finishes and exterior.

Mr. Cote stated your drawing is showing a distance of 33 feet from the edge of the road to the side of the proposed building, I think we need to think of way to put developed trees there to create a buffer. A chain link fence is not enough.

Mr. Garabed stated we want to be cautious with putting plantings to close to buildings. We don't want to hide things for security reasons. We don't want to create a situation where vandalism could occur.

Mr. Cote stated but we want to be good neighbors and we don't want the people that are already living there to now be faced with a 22-foot monstrosity. There has to be a happy medium.

Mr. Garabed agreed with Mr. Cote.

Vice Chairman Giannico stated looking at a satellite image of the property right now with many trees, why are so many of those trees cleared on your drawing? That's a natural buffer right there. He stated with regards to all the applications, we are going to question the amount of tree clearing and you may want to keep it at a minimum.

Mr. Nasher addressed the board and stated the actual plan will show the number of trees removed and landscaping plan.

Mr. Cleary stated the planning board is also the architectural board. He said with respect to ownership and easements, it's a semi-circular lot, I don't remember ever creating semi-circular sub-divided parcels. Is that a leased hold from the DEP property or is the property boundary. It needs to be clarified.

Chairman Paeprer stated you heard a lot of comments this evening and there are four pages of comments that need to be addressed. He said if the board is okay with it, I think we could move on to the next Suez application. No action will be taken for this application tonight.

Mr. Cote stated the rendering is showing a second gravel drive, what is the purpose of that gravel drive.

Mr. Garabed stated it is to gain access to the wells.

Chairman Paeprer asked how many wells are on this site?

Mr. Garabed replied two wells.

Mr. Franzetti stated it needs to be clarified.

SUEZ WATER NEW YORK INC – GEYMER WELLS – 70 GEYMER DRIVE – TM –
75.13-1-6 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Franzetti read Mr. Carnazza's memo which stated the applicants propose to add a PFAS Treatment Building to the water treatment facility off Geymer Dr. in Mahopac. A Use Variance is required for the Private Utility. Only Public Utilities are permitted in the Town of Carmel. Provide a detail of the buffer. Code §156-37C requires "A landscaped buffer area at least 10 feet in width and six feet in height shall be provided and maintained along all property lines to satisfactorily screen public utility substations and any other buildings from surrounding uses of land. An enhanced buffer should be provided toward Parker Dr. East and the adjacent property on Geymer Dr. Referral to the ECB, Fire Department and Putnam County Dept. of Health are required by code.

Rich's memo said this application involves the installation of a 30'x20' building to house a granulated activated carbon treatment to treat water from this public water supply. Additionally, the applicant proposes to the upgrade wells, access road and water system piping. Based upon our review of this submittal, the Engineering Department offers the following preliminary comments:

General Comments:

1. The following referrals are required:
 - a. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)
 - b. Putnam County Department of Health (PCDOH)
 - c. The Town of Carmel Environmental Conservation Board (ECB).
 - d. Mahopac Falls Fire Department
2. The following permits are required:
 - a. NYSDEC - for stormwater and wetlands;
 - b. PCDOH for well and treatment system
 - c. ECB for wetlands
3. The area of disturbance for the work as provided is 6,672 sf. The threshold criteria of disturbances for the NYSDEC stormwater regulation are between 5,000 square feet and one (1) acre and over one (1) acre. The project will require coverage under the NYSEC SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity (GP-0-20-001) and the development of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that has erosion and sediment controls.

The applicant has provided a SWPPP which is currently under review.

4. The full environmental assessment form identified the following that the project is located in 100-year flood plain. A Town of Carmel Flood Plain permit is required.
5. All re-grading required to accomplish the intended development should be provided. It is unclear from the drawings provide the extent of cut and fill proposed for the site.
6. Traffic and Vehicle Movement Plans should be provided which provide the following:
 - a. Graphic representation of vehicle movements through the site should be provided to illustrate that sufficient space exists to maneuver vehicles on the site.

- b. All turning radii for the site should be graphically provided. This includes the turning radii into the site entrance.
- c. The applicant provided sight distances at the driveway location.

All calculations should be provided.

- d. Slopes at the entrance way need to be defined. It is suggested that slopes of less than 6% be used for the first 20 feet of entry and that slopes of no greater than 8% be used entering the site. Please refer to AASHTO guidelines for commercial properties.
7. A light spill plan should be provided.
8. Should any public improvements be deemed necessary as part of the development of the tract, a Performance Bond and associated Engineering Fee must eventually be established for the work. The applicant will need to develop a quantity take off for bonding purposes.

Detailed Comments:

1. A landscaping plan should be provided to show the location and extent of all plantings.

Applicant has requested a waiver of this requirement.

2. The rain garden calculations have been provided. The applicant should note that then must meet the criteria as defined by the NYSDEC. This includes providing sufficient depth to groundwater.
3. Adequate protection should be provided in the stormwater management practice (SMP) areas to minimize disturbance during construction. Details should be provided to show how the rain garden will be protected during construction.
4. All water service connections must be K-copper.
5. It is unclear if additional electrical utilities are being installed.
6. The area of disturbance must be shown on the drawing and delineated by orange construction fencing.

Mr. Cleary stated the comments are basically the same as the prior application. The uniqueness about this is what Mr. Franzetti touched on. He stated on the east side of this facility there may be need to do some screening and buffering closest to the nearest residence. He said the issue about the floodplain is a significant issue. It's unique to Suez because all of their facilities are in places where the water is, so water impacts them more specifically than many other applications. He said the storm from a couple of weeks ago was a 600-year storm. Our floodplain regulations do not address that. In looking at a public utility facility, we're obligated to look at carefully with respect to this, so elevating a building above the base flood elevation meets the rules, but is it going to properly protect this facility the next time there is a 700-year storm. So, it's a question of proper engineering and mitigating your risk and the impacts associated with what's going on. This particular site is located right on Secor Brook. Should we be doing something more above and beyond instead of three feet above the base flood elevation. Do you elevate the pump equipment? It's not a regulatory issue, but it's prudent planning to think about these things. He said this is one of the five sites that has to be looked at carefully with respect to that.

Chairman Paeprer said to address the FEMA floodplain. We are all concerned about that.

Mr. Nasher stated we know it's in a floodplain and we are going to come up with the 100-year flood elevation to see what number we are looking at. FEMA looks at 100-year floodplain and floodway. We are going to look at the two numbers and we will be in compliance with FEMA regulations. In terms of stormwater management, we are proposing raingardens.

Chairman Paeprer asked what is the anticipated traffic flow for all of these locations?

Mr. Nasher stated he doesn't have the numbers for the traffic schedule.

Chairman Paeprer stated you will need to provide us with that when you come back.

Mr. Garabed stated on a daily basis our operators are at every site, in Mahopac they may be there twice a day.

Chairman Paeprer asked will that be increase of what they do today.

Mr. Garabed replied no. That's what they do today. In the future, I don't expect they will increase the number of times they go to the facilities. He said because we are going to have new facilities, they may not have to go as frequently. There should be no increase in traffic.

At which time, the board members and applicant continued to discuss traffic flow, how it will be built and truck maneuverability.

Mr. Frenkel asked are there new chemicals other than the carbon vessels that will be stored on the site?

Mr. Garabed stated for the five sites the amount of chlorine that exists today should remain the site. The only site where we may have to increase the volume chlorine would be the Mahopac Wells, because it's going to have a green sand filtration system and that requires oxidation and you have to hit it with a little hypo before it goes into the green sand. It would go through the green sand and the GAC and before it goes to the distribution system we would add chlorine again.

Mr. Frenkel asked how is it stored on the property.

Mr. Garabed said it's stored in double wall containers.

Mr. Frenkel stated his concern is leakage into the water system and the havoc it plays with wildlife.

Mr. Cote asked if the building could be moved in the direction of the wells so it's not right on the property line.

Mr. Garabed replied he thinks they were trying to keep it out of the wetlands.

Mr. Nasher stated the wetland boundary is too close, so we're stuck with where it is. We needed room for stormwater mitigation also.

Mr. Cote stated you could keep the gravel driveway where it is, but move the building a little bit further away from the property line. Every bit you could move it away, would be more aesthetically pleasing for the neighbors.

Mr. Nasher said we will look into that.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding the FEMA floodplain regulations.

Chairman Paeprer asked why are you asking for a waiver for landscaping?

Mr. Cleary stated if there is existing vegetation that's substantial, that's reason to ask for the waiver, but the reason was not explained. That needs to be addressed.

Mr. Nasher replied will do.

Ms. Ramya Ramanathan of Atzl, Nasher & Zigler addressed the board and stated we requested a waiver for the Mahopac, Geymer and Archer wells, because of the existing nature of the woods onsite and the also the distance of the nearest home from the proposed structures. She said we will add it to the narrative and submit it.

SUEZ WATER NEW YORK INC – CHATEAU WELLS – 59 MCNAIR DRIVE – TM – 75.201-1-16 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Franzetti read Mr. Carnazza's memo which stated the applicants propose to add a PFAS Treatment Building to the water treatment facility off McNair Dr. in Mahopac. A Use Variance is required for the Private Utility. Only Public Utilities are permitted in the Town of Carmel. Provide a detail of the buffer. Code §156-37C requires "A landscaped buffer area at least 10 feet in width and six feet in height shall be provided and maintained along all property lines to satisfactorily screen public utility substations and any other buildings from surrounding uses of land. Referral to the ECB, Fire Department and Putnam County Dept. of Health are required by code.

Rich's memo said this application involves the installation of a 38'x24' building to house a granulated activated carbon treatment to treat water from this public water supply. Additionally, the applicant proposes to the upgrade wells, access road and water system piping. Based upon our review of this submittal, the Engineering Department offers the following preliminary comments

General Comments:

1. The following referrals are required:
 - a. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)
 - b. Putnam County Department of Health (PCDOH)
 - c. The Town of Carmel Environmental Conservation Board (ECB).
 - d. Mahopac Fire Department
2. The following permits are required:
 - a. NYSDEC - for stormwater and wetlands;
 - b. PCDOH for well and treatment system
 - c. ECB for wetlands

3. The area of disturbance for the work as provided is 13,607 sf. The threshold criteria of disturbances for the NYSDEC stormwater regulation are between 5,000 square feet and one (1) acre and over one (1) acre. The project will require coverage under the NYSEC SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity (GP-0-20-001) and the development of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that has erosion and sediment controls.

The applicant has provided a SWPPP which is currently under review.

4. All re-grading required to accomplish the intended development should be provided. It is unclear from the drawings provide the extent of cut and fill proposed for the site.

5. Traffic and Vehicle Movement Plans should be provided which provide the following:

a. Graphic representation of vehicle movements through the site should be provided to illustrate that sufficient space exists to maneuver vehicles on the site.

b. All turning radii for the site should be graphically provided. This includes the turning radii into the site entrance.

c. Slopes at the entrance way need to be defined. It is suggested that slopes of less than 6% be used for the first 20 feet of entry and that slopes of no greater than 8% be used entering the site. Please refer to AASHTO guidelines for commercial properties.

6. A light spill plan should be provided

7. Should any public improvements be deemed necessary as part of the development of the tract, a Performance Bond and associated Engineering Fee must eventually be established for the work. The applicant will need to develop a quantity take off for bonding purposes.

Detailed Comments:

1. A landscaping plan has been provided. The applicant should add a note that all plantings shall be installed per §142 of the Town of Carmel Town Code.

2. The rain garden calculations have been provided. The applicant should note that then must meet the criteria as defined by the NYSDEC. This includes providing sufficient depth to groundwater.

3. Adequate protection should be provided in the stormwater management practice (SMP) areas to minimize disturbance during construction. Details should be provided to show how the rain garden will be protected during construction.

4. All water service connections must be K-copper.

5. It is unclear if additional electrical utilities are being installed.

6. The area of disturbance must be shown on the drawing and delineated by orange construction fencing.

Mr. Cleary stated they need a side yard variance for this application. With this application they are proposing landscaping, but we may want to extend the landscaping on the side yard that's deficit. The boundary of Plumb Brook and the on-site pond are not clearly defined on the site plan. Clarification is required. Given the adjacency of the existing pump house and the proposed PFAS building, is a single building a viable option on this environmentally constrained parcel? He said all the other issues remain the same.

Mr. Nasher stated what we are proposing is a PFAS 36x24 building. The height is slightly bigger than the other ones. In terms of the stormwater mitigation, we proposed raingardens. He asked Mr. Cleary about his comment regarding having a single building instead of two.

Mr. Cleary replied yes.

Chairman Paepre stated you don't have to answer it tonight. Mr. Cleary brought up a fair point, to have one structure compared to two structures, that would be great.

Mr. Cleary said and if there is a health department regulation that requires a separation, that would be the answer.

Mr. Nasher replied we will check to see if they need to be separated.

Chairman Paepre stated he would like to see the distances of these locations to the closest house. Most of them look to be in a wooded residential area.

Mr. Nasher stated we will try to stay away from residential areas, but we are bound to follow the NYSDEC code. We will try to move the building from the residential side.

Mrs. Kugler stated lighting should be considered for all these locations.

Mr. Nasher replied will do.

SUEZ WATER NEW YORK INC – MAHOPAC WELLS – COVENTRY CIRCLE – TM – 75.20-2-68 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Franzetti read Mr. Carnazza's memo which stated the applicants propose to add a GAC Treatment Facility Building to the water treatment facility off Buckshollow Rd. in Mahopac. A Use Variance is required for the Private Utility. Only Public Utilities are permitted in the Town of Carmel. Provide a detail of the buffer. Code §156-37C requires "A landscaped buffer area at least 10 feet in width and six feet in height shall be provided and maintained along all property lines to satisfactorily screen public utility substations and any other buildings from surrounding uses of land. Provide an enhanced buffer to the houses on Coventry Circle and Nottingham Way. I received a few calls already asking about visibility during the fall/winter months. Referral to the ECB, Fire Department and Putnam County Dept. of Health are required by code.

Mr. Franzetti stated all his comments are the same as the other applications. The only difference is this particular application is that the applicant wants to connect into the town's wastewater treatment facility. They have an iron well and green sand treatment. The wastewater report should provide loading values (#/dy) for the proposed system. Concentration values provided are for the existing treatment system and not the proposed. Details for the proposed connection into the Town of Carmel Sewer system must be provided. Road cut and paving details must be provided.

Mr. Cleary stated this is one facility that operates differently than the others. All the questions related to maintenance, noise and storage may be different on this site. Proposal calls for the removal of 14 trees. Landscape buffer screening may be warranted between the new building and the homes on Coventry Circle. He said there is a note on

the plan that says marsh. Does it relate to a designated wetland? That needs to be clarified and how far away is it. Everything else remains the same.

Mr. Frenkel stated in addition to the pump building, what is the plan for the large storage building presently on site?

Mr. Garabed stated what looks like a storage container, is actually a pilot green sand filtration system. We actually had it at another facility and when we started experiencing high levels of iron and manganese in the well, we worked with the health department and we were able to bring it to the site and only well two is being treated by that.

Mr. Frenkel asked is it a temporary building?

Mr. Garabed replied yes. He said that will go away when we have the permanent facility.

Mr. Frenkel asked it be specified on the next submission.

Chairman Paeprer asked what is the size of the new structure?

Mr. Nasher replied it is 45x29 and the height is at 20 feet. He stated we will look at all the comments that were submitted by the Mr. Franzetti and Mr. Cleary.

Chairman Paeprer stated to review what trees need to be removed. Fourteen trees seem excessive.

**SUEZ WATER NEW YORK INC – ARCHER WELLS – 9 COLTON ROAD – TM – 85.12-1-8
- SITE PLAN**

Mr. Franzetti read Mr. Carnazza's memo which stated the applicants propose to add a GAC Treatment Building to the water treatment facility off Archer Rd. in Mahopac. A Use Variance is required for the Private Utility. Only Public Utilities are permitted in the Town of Carmel. Provide a detail of the buffer. Code §156-37C requires "A landscaped buffer area at least 10 feet in width and six feet in height shall be provided and maintained along all property lines to satisfactorily screen public utility substations and any other buildings from surrounding uses of land. An enhanced buffer should be provided toward Archer Rd. Referral to the ECB, Fire Department and Putnam County Dept. of Health are required by code.

Mr. Franzetti stated his comments are the same as the others. They are running a line and connecting it to the existing water system. They need to provide how they are doing that. Road cut details must be provided. They have an access easement in between two homes, so the easements really have to be reviewed carefully.

Mr. Frenkel stated there is no obvious pathway to the property. How do you access the property?

Mr. Garabed replied we have a utility easement between two homes. Currently, when we need to bring chemicals or tools to the well, we carry it down. We used to access the property from the back side, but when the Archer family sold the property that was cut off. There is a neighbor that claims to have ownership of that. Our legal department is

addressing this and we will take care of it one way or another. We have to get access to the property.

Mr. Frenkel asked do you have an easement to carry materials over land or is just an easement for the pipe?

Mr. Garabed replied it's a utility easement.

Mr. Cote asked does the utility easement match up to where the pipe is?

Mr. Garabed replied yes.

Mr. Cote asked do you know what the width of the easement is?

Mr. Garabed replied it's 20 feet.

Mr. Cleary stated we want to landscaping and screening on the north side of the property. It is noted that several existing utility easements exist on the site. Are any encroachments into the easement areas proposed? He asked will someone have a driveway in their backyard that they didn't anticipate?

Chairman Paepre asked how will you get a crane in there?

Mr. Garabed stated under emergency conditions we have gotten a generator back there.

Mr. Franzetti stated you will have to show it on a drawing. Will there be a permanent improvement?

Mr. Garabed stated the legal team is addressing it.

Mr. Charbonneau stated you have to anticipate that the neighbors are going to come out and have in say in ingress and egress. Some of them have retained counsel. This is an issue that needs to be clarified, so that the public understands where they can and cannot access that.

Mr. Garabed will address all the comments.

Chairman Paepre asked what is the size of the building.

Mr. Nasher stated the size of the building is 33' x 22' and the height is 22'.

MINUTES – 08/12/21

Mr. Frenkel moved to approve the minutes as corrected. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Causa with all in favor.

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:31 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta