

APPROVED

CRAIG PAEPER
Chairman

ANTHONY GIANNICO
Vice Chairman

BOARD MEMBERS

KIM KUGLER
RAYMOND COTE
ROBERT FRENKEL
VICTORIA CAUSA

TOWN OF CARMEL
PLANNING BOARD



60 McAlpin Avenue
Mahopac, New York 10541
Tel. (845) 628-1500 – Ext.190
www.ci.carmel.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
JANUARY 13, 2022

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN, CRAIG PAEPER, VICE CHAIRMAN, ANTHONY GIANNICO,
KIM KUGLER, RAYMOND COTE, ROBERT FRENKEL

ABSENT: VICTORIA CAUSA

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
Hamlet at Carmel	66.-2-58	Public Hearing	1	Public Hearing Closed & Planner To Prepare Resolution.
Mehra, Sanjay	75.16-1-27	Site Plan	1-2	Public Hearing Scheduled & Planner To Prepare Resolution.
Suez Water New York Inc – London Bridge Wells	64.7-1-10	Site Plan	2-6	Denied to the ZBA & ECB.
Suez Water New York Inc – Geymer Wells	75.13-1-6	Site Plan	7-10	Denied to the ZBA & ECB.
Suez Water New York Inc – Chateau Wells	75.20-1-16	Site Plan	10-14	No Board Action.
Suez Water New York Inc – Mahopac Wells	75.20-2-68	Site Plan	14-17	No Board Action.
Suez Water New York Inc – Archer Wells	85.12-1-8	Site Plan	18-21	No Board Action.
Centennial Golf Course	44.-2-2 & 2-4	A. Site Plan	21-23	Motion to Declare Lead Agency.
Centennial Golf Townhomes	44.-2-2 & 2-4	A. Site Plan	24-26	Motion to Declare Lead Agency.
Centennial Golf Course	44.-2-2 & 2-4	Lot Line Adj.	26-27	Motion to Declare Lead Agency.
Minutes – 12/9/21			27	Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

HAMLET AT CARMEL – 650 STONELEIGH AVE – TM – 66.-2-58 – PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Carnazza stated a **Certificate of Occupancy schedule** has been submitted so the developer can get c.o.'s before the project be fully built provided they are in full compliance with code. This includes the 300 s.f. recreation per dwelling unit.

Mr. Franzetti stated I have some minor comments, but the applicant is moving forward. The applicant has provided all of the information we need. They are committed to meeting with the Town Board to lower the previously identified Out of District connection flows and allotments. They have noted all the general comments and permits that are needed. They have submitted the SWPPP to the NYCDEP. The applicant provided traffic information in the Full Environmental Assessment Form and Supplemental Studies for the referenced project. This information should be provided to both the PCDHF and an outside consultant for review and comment. They will provide a stormwater maintenance agreement and maintenance guarantee per Town Code (§156-85 and §156-87 B respectively). The applicant will need to develop a quantity take off for bonding purposes.

Mr. Cleary stated he had no further comments on planning issues.

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

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

Chairman Paerprer asked the Planner to prepare a resolution.

Mr. Ken Kearney, applicant, addressed the board and stated we received the necessary funding for the 75 mixed income units.

MEHRA, SANJAY – 10 VESCHI LANE SOUTH – TM – 75.16-1-27 – SPECIAL SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant proposes to complete the conversion of a one family dwelling into a commercial office building. The previous Architect/Engineer got final approval, however, never completed the process. All necessary variances were granted by the ZBA and are noted on the plat. (Lot area, Depth, Side Yd for existing Garage, 2-way aisle width, and frontage). I have no zoning comments for this submission.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated this application is described as an office and was previously approved by the Planning Board and Resolution 12-16, dated June 13, 2012 is on file. The following are the comments:

- The Planning Board Attorney shall confirm the legality of the right-of-way providing access to this site.
- The drawings need to reference the solar panels located on the site.

Mr. Cleary had no comments.

Chairman Paerprer asked Mr. Charbonneau if he had a chance to look at the legality of the right-of-way.

Mr. Charbonneau replied he's fine. The right-of-way is referenced on the deed to the property.

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

Mr. Greenberg asked if a resolution could be drafted at the same time.

Chairman Paepre stated as long as the issue with the solar panels is resolved.

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

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated a Use Variance is not required for the Private Utility. The ZBA interpreted that Private and 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". This project should be looked at closely. The building is extremely close to the road and Kirk Lake is to the rear of the building. 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. Provide lot depth line - variance may be required. The following variance(s) are required from the ZBA lot area- 120,000 s.f. required, 60,886 provided, 59,114 s.f. variance needed. Front yd- 40 ft. required, 33 ft. provided, 7 ft. variance needed.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the applicant has noted the following referrals and permits:

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)
Putnam County Department of Health (PCDOH)
New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP)
The Town of Carmel Environmental Conservation Board (ECB).
Mahopac Fire Department
NYSDEC - for stormwater and wetlands;
PCDOH for well and treatment system.
ECB for wetlands

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.

All re-grading required to accomplish the intended development should be provided. It is unclear from the drawings, so please provide the extent of cut and fill proposed for the site. The applicant has provided a grading plan. The amount of fill, if any, being brought to the site should be provided. All fill brought to the site must be certified per NYSDEC regulations and manifests/certification of the fill material being delivered should be provided. A note should be added to the drawing. Traffic and Vehicle Movement Plans should be provided which provide the following:

- a. The applicant provided sight distances at the driveway location.

All calculations should be provided

- b. 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.

A driveway profile should be provided

6. 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.

The applicant has noted this requirement. The applicant should note that a Performance Bond and associated Engineering fee is minimally required for the stormwater management practices, erosion and sediment control drainage features, landscaping etc. installed on the site. Please see §156-61 J and K of the Town Code for additional information.

II. **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.

Applicant indicated that Note 8 was added to the drawings. This note is not provided.

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.

Applicant has noted this comment.

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 infiltration area will be protected during construction.

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

Applicant has noted that the electric utilities will be extended underground

5. The drawing identifies retaining walls. Please provide top and bottom elevations. All walls great than 5' in height need to be designed by a structural engineer.

Mr. Franzetti continued and stated the reason why the applicant is here is because they have to upgrade their particular water treatment system to account for PFOA and PFAS. The NYS Department of Health lowered the detection (monitoring) limit to 10 micrograms per liter. The Federal Government has it at 70. Water treatment facilities are required to capture and treat for this. It is typically done by a granulated or powdered activated carbon system. They are upgrading their facilities to include for the treatment of these particular forever chemicals.

Mr. Cleary stated there was some confusion about the site boundary. The site boundary has been clarified, and the site is owned by SUEZ. The Applicant will seek a variance from the

ZBA for the non-compliant minimum lot area. The Applicant will seek NYSDEC and USACOE permits for the wetland buffer encroachment. The Applicant has clarified that the PFAS treatment facility will be a permanent and on-going operation. The Applicant has clarified that they propose to maintain the existing fenced enclosure and access to the spring house and add a second fenced enclosure and access driveway for the PFAS building, and will not combine the driveways. The reason why a single combined driveway cannot be utilized was not provided. The height of the new chain link fence is 6'. The Applicant is unwilling to add privacy slats to the new fence, indicating that new landscaping is being provided, which provides an adequate screen. A new landscaping plan has been provided. Retaining wall details have been provided. Heights vary from 1' to 5'. The Applicant has clarified that the new pumps will be located within the wells and are between 140' and 300' below grade. No noise impacts are expected, and the project will comply with the sound level standards for residential districts established in Chapter 105 of the Town Code. The Applicant has agreed to preserve the 3 large maple trees located on the south side of the driveway. The Applicant has clarified that all chemical storage tanks will have secondary containment structures designed to accommodate the entire volume of chemical storage. Chemical levels are constantly monitored remotely. The Applicant has clarified that site visits will occur once per day. The carbon in the system will need to be replaced every one or two years. A new site lighting plan has been provided. The Applicant has located a vendor that can provide the prefabricated building to meet the project timeframe. The building will be a prefabricated metal building with steel framing, a standing seam roof system and a cast in place concrete foundation. The color of the building will be "hemlock green." The roof trim, gutters and downspouts will be "cool harvest." A 4' split face masonry wall is proposed around the building, to be "Tribeca tan." Revised project renderings have been provided. A color sample of "hemlock green", "cool harvest" and Tribeca tan" should be provided.

Mr. John Kirkpatrick, applicant's attorney and City Planner, Steven Garabed of Suez Water, Ramya Ramanathan of Atzl, Nasher & Zigler, Andrew Balto of Gannett Fleming Engineers and John Atzl of Atzl, Nasher & Zigler appeared before the board.

Mr. Kirkpatrick addressed the board and stated we are under a deadline from the state health department, so we're pushing this as hard as we possibly can. He stated your consultants have indicated that there are technical issues that need to be addressed. What we would like to do tonight is concentrate on those issues in which we really need a little more input from your board. We need to go for variances and wetland permits. We are hoping to leave tonight to make our applications to the Zoning Board and ECB. We are also hoping when we come back before your board that we could have a public hearing at that time. He said tonight we will address landscaping, buffering and appearance.

At which time, Ms. Ramanathan addressed the board and stated from the last meeting we were asked to do an analysis of the existing trees on site. She said there aren't many evergreen trees on site, just two of them and they will be preserved. The majority of the trees on the site are deciduous. We are proposing a different species of evergreens to be planted and most of the plantings are at the entrance to Brook Ave (points to map), so that the building could be shielded as much as possible. At which time, she displayed renderings of what the plants would look like at an 8' height and 20' height. She said we are proposing removing 14 trees due to site development.

Mr. Cleary asked are they being installed at 8 feet height?

Ms. Ramanathan replied they will be from 6 to 8 feet in height.

Mr. Cote asked what is the anticipated growth of each tree?

Ms. Ramanathan replied typically they grow 10" a year.

Mr. Cote stated so you are looking at a decade before they reach 20'. Can you go bigger than 8 feet?

Ms. Ramanathan replied we can try and see what the cost factor would be. We will talk to the applicant and see.

Mr. Carnazza said maybe you could do a couple larger trees and then the other trees would catch up.

Mr. Cote this particular site is right on the road and quite big. Most of the other sites you're developing is set back or not as visible as this one.

Chairman Paeprer asked how tall is the building?

Ms. Ramanathan replied it's 22 feet.

Mr. Frenkel asked how wide is the building?

Ms. Ramanathan replied the dimensions are 33' x 22'.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding how many taller trees to plant and what type of trees.

Mr. Carnazza asked can the building be moved back?

Ms. Ramanathan replied we looked into that, but site constraints are not allowing us to do that, because it drops off quite a bit.

Chairman Paeprer asked will fill be brought to this site?

Mr. Atzl replied yes and we will adhere to the Town Engineer's comments about the notes required for the site and the amount of fill.

Chairman Paeprer stated any fill that is brought on site needs to be clean.

Mr. Atzl said we will do a cut fill analysis for all five sites and it would be noted on the site plan.

Chairman Paeprer asked about parking and lighting.

Mr. Atzl stated there will only be lighting above the doorways to get in and they are not large fixtures. There is one on the south side of the building and another on the west side of the building. They don't come anywhere near the road or any of the neighbors. As far as parking they will enter the site and park here (points to map) and then leave.

Mr. Carnazza asked is this a daily operation?

Mr. Atzl said they will be checking daily during regular business hours.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked whether separate vehicles come into change the filtration media and stuff like that? If so, how often does that happen.

Mr. Steven Garabed of Suez Water addressed the board and stated with regard to carbon change outs we expect it to be every one to two years before we have to change it. He said with regards to the landscaping when you transplant these trees it's a shock to the themselves and the smaller trees tend to grow faster when you first plant them because they can recover quicker than a larger tree. So, it's not always better to plant a larger tree. With regards to the lighting the Department of Health wants us to put perimeter lighting up at all of these sites. They want out sites lit up like Yankee Stadium and we are not proposing that. He said we need the lighting for safety purposes.

Mr. Cleary stated will they mandate that?

Mr. Garabed stated with other sites we have done they do their inspections and tell us we should do more and we generally keep it the way it is, because most of our facilities are in residential areas and it's not appropriate to light it up like Yankee Stadium.

Mr. Cleary replied we agree, but just be aware the site plan will be conditioned on this plan. If you have to amend that in the future, you will have to come back to this board to ask permission.

Chairman Paeprer asked about security measures.

Mr. Garabed stated as part of our SCADA (Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition) system and when we build these new facilities, we will put in new SCADA for the new buildings. They will have intrusion alarms, smoke detectors, etc. The system takes all the readings from the instruments, the pressures, the flows and so forth. It brings it to a terminal and then transmits the information via cell modems back to a central control room. He said if the chlorine level drops down below a certain set level we would get an alarm and send someone out to take care of it.

Mr. Frenkel asked about worst-case scenario.

Mr. Garabed said if there was a power outage at the facility, the well would go off. Everything would shut down. We would get a signal via SCADA of the loss of power and then deploy someone to investigate.

Mr. Franzetti asked if any of sites will have permanent generators.

Mr. Garabed replied not permanent on-site generators.

At which time, Mr. Cote moved to deny the application to the Zoning Board. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Giannico with all in favor.

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to refer the application to the ECB. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

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

Mr. Carnazza read his 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 not required for the Private Utility. The ZBA interpreted that Private and 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. This building is set back quite far from the roadway. A buffer is already in place. In my opinion, no additional trees are needed. Referral to the ECB, Fire Department and Putnam County Dept. of Health are required by code. Lot area variance is required from the ZBA 120,000 s.f. req’d, 26,030 provided, 93,970 s.f. variance.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated this application involves the installation of a 33’x22’ 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

The applicant has noted these referrals.

2. The following permits are required:
 - a. NYSDEC - for stormwater and wetlands;
 - b. PCDOH for well and treatment system
 - c. ECB for wetlands

The applicant has noted these permit requirements.

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.

The applicant has noted the need for this permit.

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.

The applicant has provided a grading plan. The amount of fill, if any, being brought to the site should be provided.

All fill brought to the site must be certified per NYSDEC regulations and manifests/certification of the fill material being delivered should be provided. A note should be added to the drawing.

6. Traffic and Vehicle Movement Plans should be provided which provide the following:
- All turning radii for the site should be graphically provided. This includes the turning radii into the site entrance.
 - The applicant provided sight distances at the driveway location.

All calculations should be provided

- 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.

A driveway profile 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.

The applicant has noted this requirement. The applicant should note that a Performance Bond and associated Engineering fee is minimally required for the stormwater management practices, erosion and sediment control drainage features, landscaping etc. installed on the site. Please see §156-61 J and K of the Town Code for additional information.

II. Detailed Comments:

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

Applicant has indicated that a tree plan has been provided. No tree planting plan was provided, only a tree removal plan.

2. The rain garden locations 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.

Applicant indicated that the calculation will be provide prior to construction. Minimally these calculations will need to be provided/approved as part of the ECB approval and prior to seeking coverage under the NYSDEC general stormwater permit.

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

Applicant has indicated that they are investigating an electrical service upgrade. The installation of the upgraded electrical service should be buried.

Applicant has noted these comments. The only exception is comment 8 where SUEZ standard is to open right.

Mr. Cleary read his memo which stated the applicant has confirmed that the proposed building is located outside the designated floodway, however it is within the 100-year floodplain. The first-floor elevation of the new building will be located 2' above the base flood elevation, which conforms to the floodplain. The Applicant has clarified that that they would be prevented from bringing in fill to elevate the access driveway above the base flood elevation. So, in certain storm events the driveway would flood (as it does today). Maintenance personnel would utilize trucks with high ground clearance to access the building when feasible. If unable to physically access the building, the facility is designed to be monitored remotely. In response to the question of whether landscaped screening is necessary, the Applicant has taken the position that due to the distance from the facility to the nearest neighbor (145') and the presence of intervening existing vegetation, additional landscaping is unnecessary. Photographs have been submitted to support this position. The Applicant has clarified that the new pumps will be located within the wells and are between 168' and 252' below grade. No noise impacts are expected, and the project will comply with the sound level standards for residential districts established in Chapter 105 of the Town Code.

Mr. Franzetti stated the applicant is considering investigating an electrical service upgrade. He said the installation of the upgrade electrical service should be buried. I don't know if they have considered that.

Mr. Kirkpatrick replied we will be responding to that in the next submission.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked will the service upgrade be underground?

Mr. Garabed stated to get the electric utilities to the site, it has to go above ground. Once it gets to the site we will drop it down the utility pole and it will be subsurface.

Mr. Franzetti stated that information should be shown on the drawings.

Mr. Cote asked how is it set up now?

Mr. Garabed replied it's all above ground.

Ms. Ramanathan stated we haven't submitted a formal landscaping plan, because we believe there is currently enough vegetation on the site (points to map). At which time, Ms. Ramanathan presented different renderings of the building views. She stated the fencing and lighting is the same as the other site.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding the size, heights, color and look of the buildings.

Chairman Paepre asked for a motion to deny the application to the Zoning Board.

Vice Chairman Giannico stated that the Town Engineer had a lot of comments, he asked if the applicant is ready to go the Zoning Board at this time.

Mr. Franzetti stated a lot of the comments are relatively straight forward. They need to get their approvals from other agencies ultimately, but they are okay to go to the Zoning Board at this time.

Mr. Carnazza asked if the lighting is the same as the other site.

Ms. Ramanathan replied yes.

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to deny the application to the Zoning Board. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frenkel with all in favor.

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to refer the application to the ECB. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

SUEZ WATER NEW YORK INC – CHATEAU WELLS – 50 MCNAIR DRIVE – TM – 75.20-1-16 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his 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 not required for the Private Utility. The ZBA interpreted that Private and 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”. The submission includes 6-8 ft. trees and 20 ft. trees. The building is somewhat close to the McNair cul-de-sac. It makes it more difficult to screen the building. Is there any issue with security? Screening buildings from the street makes it more difficult to see if somebody is tampering with the building. Is there a happy medium? Referral to the ECB, Fire Department and Putnam County Dept. of Health are required by code. Lot area variance 120,000 s.f. req'd, 47,745 provided, 72,255 s.f, variance needed.

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

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. The Town of Carmel Environmental Conservation Board (ECB).
 - d. Mahopac Fire Department

The applicant has noted these referrals

2. The following permits are required:
 - a. NYSDEC - for stormwater and wetlands;
 - b. PCDOH for well and treatment system
 - c. ECB for wetlands

The applicant has noted these permit requirements.

3. The area of disturbance for the work as provided is ~13,600 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.

The applicant has provided a grading plan. The amount of fill, if any, being brought to the site should be provided.

All fill brought to the site must be certified per NYSDEC regulations and manifests/certification of the fill material being delivered should be provided. A note should be added to the drawing.

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

A driveway profile should be provided.

Town driveway specifications are 8 inches base course, 3 inches binder and 2 inches top course.

6. 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.

The applicant has noted this requirement. The applicant should note that a Performance Bond and associated Engineering fee is minimally required for the stormwater management practices, erosion and sediment control drainage features, landscaping etc. installed on the site. Please see §156-61 J and K of the Town Code for additional information.

II. 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.

Applicant indicated that Note 8 was added to the drawings. This note is not provided.

2. The rain garden locations 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.

Applicant indicated that the calculation will be provide prior to construction. Minimally these calculations will need to be provided/approved as part of the ECB approval and prior to seeking coverage under the NYSDEC general stormwater permit.

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

Applicant has indicated that the electrical service will be upgraded using overhead wires. The installation of the upgraded electrical service should be buried.

Mr. Cleary read his memo which stated the applicant has responded to the initial comments as follows:

The plans have been revised to reflect the boundary of Plumb Brook and the on-site pond. New landscaping is now proposed on the east side of the building (in the area of the deficient side yard setback). The Applicant has clarified that the PFAS treatment facility will be a permanent and on-going operation. The Applicant has clarified that a single building to house the existing pump house and the proposed PFAS building is not feasible, due primarily to the fact that the pump house must remain operational during construction.

Chairman Paeprer asked about architectural design of the building.

Mr. Balto stated this building is now reflective with the right color with the mason base (points to map). The building will be hemlock green and the roof is a medium brown color. On this particular site we added 6 to 8 feet landscaping view (points to drawing).

Chairman Paeprer asked if the building is shielded from the front, and how it is shielded from the side.

Mr. Balto stated the driveway and the property line are very close to one another, so there isn't a lot of room to plant anything. We have planted a row of trees there, but that's it. It's not multi layered like it is along the front and the other side. He said right now, there is no screening to the existing building.

Mr. Cote asked what is the size of the existing building.

Mr. Cleary stated about 4 feet.

Mr. Balto stated the new building is much taller.

Chairman Paeprer stated we are going to come back to this application, so it might behoove you to think about the screening.

Mr. Franzetti stated maybe they could put siding on the existing building to make it match the new building or paint it the same color or something to that effect.

Mr. Kirkpatrick stated we had to make a change to the design of the building. The existing proposal before you is that the lower 4 feet is what's called a split block foundation, however, it does not meet state energy code. Therefore, we are switching to a concrete panel and the lower part of the building is now a concrete panel (points to drawing). I don't think it makes a big difference, but we wanted to make you aware of it.

Chairman Paeprer asked when the new building is up and running, can the existing building be sunset?

Mr. Garabed replied no. All the existing equipment inside the existing building is going to continue to be used. We are providing the treatment on the front end and there are storage tanks that are buried behind that building, so the water will continue to go through those, be chlorinated and the booster pumps will go out to the distribution systems. All of that will remain.

Mr. Kirkpatrick stated we are adding a system to this, but the existing system has to stay.

Mr. Garabed stated we are just adding upstream treatment.

Chairman Paeprer stated basically you are adding a 38' x 24' building for upstream treatment.

Mr. Garabed replied yes.

Mr. Carnazza asked how many houses does this well service?

Ms. Ramanathan replied about 180 customers.

Mr. Frenkel asked how long are the generators on site at all the properties.

Mr. Garabed replied all the time.

Mr. Frenkel asked can the generators be situated at each location, so that it's not visible to the adjoining properties?

Mr. Garabed replied I don't believe so. The generators have batteries, so they have to be connected to electricity. It's needs to be close to utilities to maintain that.

Mr. Cleary stated if the generator is there all the time, it's a permanent feature on the site, so it should be reflected on the site plan and it's not now. This needs to be clarified. He stated if it's there 364 days of the year, we should worry about its color, screening and so forth.

Mr. Garabed replied we will look into that.

Chairman Paeprer stated I think we have to re-visit the colors. I like the color of the new building, but you have a building and generator that's white. I don't think it blends. He said I think the building should be painted. We should have uniformity among the buildings.

Mr. Kirkpatrick stated we could paint to match it.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked does the generator have to be stored at this location? He said you have other locations that are more set back.

Mr. Garabed stated we don't have a formal yard where we could store all the generators.

Vice Chairman Giannico said I wasn't referring to a yard, but maybe another well site where it's further off the road and less visible.

Mr. Garabed replied he will talk to operations and see if there is another location where we could keep it.

Chairman Paeprer stated before we go any further, I would like see a little bit more on this application.

Mr. Atzl asked when we come back to the board, you want to see the colors for the existing and proposed building and if the generator will remain.

Chairman Paeprer replied yes.

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

Mr. Carnazza read his 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 not required for the Private Utility. The ZBA interpreted that Private and 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". **The buffer that is provided in the picture could be re-located closer to the building, therefore, allowing for more coverage of the building.** Referral to the ECB, Fire Department and Putnam County Dept. of Health are required by code.

Mr. Carnazza asked what is the view from the other side (Coventry Circle)? He said we are getting the most calls from that side because of the look and height of the building.

Mr. Atzl stated one of the reasons why we placed the trees at the existing tree line was not to disturb a lot of the woods and there is a difference of grade. We felt the closer the trees are to the homes and higher up they are, the more they'll be screening the facility.

Mr. Frenkel asked will any existing structures remain on the property?

Mr. Garabed stated the trailer on site is a treatment trailer that currently treats one of the wells. He said that trailer continues to operate today and treat the water, but once we have the full scale facility in place, that trailer will be removed. He said the existing well house and generator will remain.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated this application involves the installation of a 45' x 29' building to house a granulated activated carbon treatment 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. The Town of Carmel Environmental Conservation Board (ECB).

- d. The Town of Carmel Highway Department
- e. Mahopac Fire Department

The applicant has noted these referrals

- 2. The following permits are required:
 - a. NYSDEC - for stormwater and wetlands;
 - b. PCDOH for well and treatment system
 - c. Town of Carmel Highway – work permit.
 - d. ECB for wetlands

The applicant has noted these permit requirements

3. The area of disturbance for the work as provided is ~18,644 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. The applicant should note the area of disturbance must include the areas for the proposed underground utility service.

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. This includes the areas for the proposed underground utility service.

The applicant has provided a grading plan. The amount of fill, if any, being brought to the site should be provided.

All fill brought to the site must be certified per NYSDEC regulations and manifests/certification of the fill material being delivered should be provided. A note should be added to the drawing.

- 5. Traffic and Vehicle Movement Plans should be provided which provide the following:
 - a. All turning radii for the site should be graphically provided. This includes the turning radii into the site entrance.

All calculations should be provided

- b. 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.

A driveway profile should be provided

- 6. All easement information regarding the areas for the proposed underground utility service must be provided.

Applicant has provided easement information. This should be reviewed by Planning Counsel

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.

The applicant has noted this requirement. The applicant should note that a Performance Bond and associated Engineering fee is minimally required for the stormwater management practices, erosion and sediment control drainage features, landscaping etc. installed on the site. Please see §156-61 J and K of the Town Code for additional information.

II. 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 and have provided a tree removal plan.

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

Applicant indicated that the calculation will be provide prior to construction. Minimally these calculations will need to be provided/approved as part of the ECB approval and prior to seeking coverage under the NYSDEC general stormwater permit.

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

Applicant indicated that an electrical upgrade is being installed underground. The extent of the underground utilities should be provided.

5. The wastewater report should provide loading values (#/dy) for the proposed system.

The applicant has provided a wastewater report. It needs to provided loadings from the system. The applicant should refer to §120 of the Town Code. The report should provide the parameters in alphabetical order.

6. Details for the proposed connect into the Town of Carmel Sewer System must be provided.

The applicant should note that all sewers must meet the Town of Carmel Town Code §120. The full set of drawings should provide this information.

7. Road cut details must be provided.

The applicant should note that Town road specifications are 12" item 4, 3" base, 2" binder and 1" top course. This should be identified on the drawings.

Mr. Cleary read his memo said the applicant has responded to the initial comments as follows:

- A new landscaping plan has been provided which adds screening plantings new the residences along Coventry Circle.
- The applicant has clarified that the operator will visit the site twice per day as required by the Health Dept. for the operation of the iron/manganese pilot treatment system. Additionally, approximately once every week and a half the backwash water from the pilot treatment system is removed by a waste hauler.

Chairman Paeprer said this is the largest of the buildings (45' x 29'). What makes this the largest building?

Ms. Ramanathan stated this site serves 300 customers.

Chairman Paeprer asked how far is the building from the closest neighbor?

Mr. Garabed stated the proposed building to this distance (points to map) is about 180 to 200 feet from the closest residence.

At which time, Mr. Franzetti discussed stormwater disturbance, wastewater and easements with the applicant.

Chairman Paeprer asked is the easement through the neighbor's yard?

Mr. Franzetti replied yes, that's correct.

Mr. Charbonneau stated the Building Department received complaints with respect to workers walking through their backyard. We will have to pay close attention to the existing utilities and access easements particularly on this site, because some of the neighbors feel Suez is taking liberties with the existing easements or they really don't know where they are and just trudging through their backyards. We need to make sure they are defined on this.

Chairman Paeprer stated we will need details on all easements.

Mr. Atzl replied will do.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding generators on all of the sites and their locations and the possibility of moving them.

Vice Chairman Giannico stated you should note on all of the plans where the portable generators are stored.

Chairman Paeprer asked when the new buildings are up and running, will all of the previous structures stay or will they be removed?

Mr. Carnazza replied the trailer will be removed on this site, but otherwise everything else stays. They are all pump houses.

Chairman Paeprer stated we need more details on the easements, wastewater utilities, generators and buffers.

The board members were in agreement with the Chairman.

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

Mr. Carnazza read his 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”. This project needs to be reviewed very closely. The building is behind houses and therefore, should be buffered to the adjacent property owners. Referral to the ECB, Fire Department and Putnam County Dept. of Health are required by code. Provide lot depth and lot width measurements. Variance may be required. Area Variance needed- 120,000 s.f, required, 19,754 s.f. provided, 100,246 s.f. variance needed.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated this application involves the installation of a 33'x22' building to house a granulated activated carbon treatment 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. The Town of Carmel Environmental Conservation Board (ECB).
 - d. The Town of Carmel Highway Department
 - e. Mahopac Falls Fire Department

The applicant has noted these referrals

2. The following permits are required:
 - a. NYSDEC - for stormwater and wetlands;
 - b. PCDOH for well and treatment system
 - c. Town of Carmel Highway – work permit.
 - d. ECB for wetlands

The applicant has noted these permit requirements

3. The area of disturbance for the work as provided is ~ 0.2 ac (8,712 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, so provide the extent of cut and fill proposed for the site. This includes the areas for the proposed underground utility service.

The applicant has provided a grading plan. The amount of fill, if any, being brought to the site should be provided.

All fill brought to the site must be certified per NYSDEC regulations and manifests/certification of the fill material being delivered should be provided. A note should be added to the drawing.

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.
A driveway profile should be provided

6. All easement information regarding the areas for the proposed underground utility service and driveway access must be provided.

Applicant has provided easement information. This should be reviewed by Planning Board Counsel.

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.

The applicant has noted this requirement. The applicant should note that a Performance Bond and associated Engineering fee is minimally required for the stormwater management practices, erosion and sediment control drainage features, landscaping etc. installed on the site. Please see §156-61 J and K of the Town Code for additional information.

II. Detailed Comments:

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

Applicant has indicated that a tree plan has been provided. No tree planting plan was provided, only a tree removal plan. A waiver has been requested

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

Applicant indicated that the calculation will be provide prior to construction. Minimally these calculations will need to be provided/approved as part of the ECB approval and prior to seeking coverage under the NYSDEC general stormwater permit

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

Applicant indicates that no electrical upgrades are anticipated. However electrical service will be by overhead wires to the proposed building. Consideration should be given to bury all electric service to the site.

4. It is unclear how the property will be accessed and if additional site work for access is needed.

Applicant notes that they are pursuing access using one (1) of either two (2) driveways. This needs to be clarified and the necessary improvements, area of disturbances clearing, grading, landscaping, associated site plan features etc. must be identified.

5. Details for the proposed connection into the existing water system must be provided.

Applicant indicated that the existing connection will be used and no improvements are being made.

6. Road cut details must be provided depending on the access road used.

7. Typical Town Road paving requirements are 12" item 4, 3" based, 2" binder and 1" top.

Applicant has noted this comment.

Pat's memo said the applicant has responded to the initial comments as follows:

- As requested, the applicant assessed the existing vegetation on the north side of the proposed building, which consists of 5 evergreen trees. It is the applicant's position that additional landscape screening is not necessarily due to the distance of 270' to the nearest residence, and the existing intervening vegetation. Photographic support for this position has been submitted.

Mr. Atzl stated as far as the question of lot width and lot depth, this is a very strange lot of property considering it's a circle. He said I'm not sure how we will compute lot width or lot depth.

Mr. Carnazza said to call the office and we will do it together.

Mr. Kirkpatrick stated this particular property was originally intended as the open space for the adjacent residential subdivision. The taxes weren't paid and the County took the property. He said the County owns the property that surrounds the well site and it has access out onto Colton Road. That may be an option. He said Suez and the County are in negotiations now for Suez to purchase the County property. It should move relatively quickly. Suez would like to have that property to increase the buffer area around the site. He said it is geographically challenging and it would be expensive to build the driveway and it would be disturbing to those neighbors. What we would like to do is go back to the original driveway. We believe we have a legal right to it. It was used for years and we think we could argue a prescriptive easement. That is the alternative that we going to pursue. At the same time, we are going to give the complete detailed plans that Mr. Franzetti is requesting for both accesses. We believe we will be able to use the old farm road.

Mr. Cote said so you will go to court to force a neighbor to allow you to use their property. Mr. Kirkpatrick replied we may have to. First, we will have discussions with them. It's an option.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding the two options, the County property to Colton Road and the old driveway that has been closed off by the new buyer.

Chairman Paeprer stated the new homeowner blocked the entrance you were using, how are you accessing it now?

Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that's what the neighbors are not happy about. Right now, we go between the houses. It's not a good situation at all. We cannot do construction that way.

Mr. Franzetti stated they have an easement where their water line runs from the plant to the treatment right now up to Colton Road. That's where they are accessing between two homes.

Chairman Paeprer stated something needs to be shown on the map for us to work with. At this point, there's nothing much this board could do.

Mr. Kirkpatrick said we will have a better answer for you in two weeks. He stated to the board that they will be making separate applications for tree cutting because of the protection of bats. You could only cut trees up to March 31, 2022.

CENTENNIAL GOLF COURSE – 185 JOHN SIMPSON ROAD – TM – 44.-2-2 & 44.-2-4 - AMENDED SITE PLAN

Mr. Richard O'Rourke of Keane and Beane Law Firm, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated as the board is aware the Centennial Golf plans are very comprehensive. There are three separate applications that have been submitted to this board.

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicants propose to change a tee box and move the parking area over to land in Southeast to make room for the Townhouse Development proposed on the corner of Fair St. and Simpson Rd. The already submitted Lot Line Adjustment must be approved and filed before the Amended Site Plan(s) for the multi-family development and golf course can be approved. Why is the narrative for the Townhouses included in the application for the golf course? Very confusing. The lot is labeled 44.2-2.1, that is incorrect, it is 44.-2-2.2. Before considering referrals to ECB or ZBA, all tax I.D. #'s need to be corrected on the plat and verified. The required parking for the golf course is no longer in the Town of Carmel. We, the town, have no control of the parking space size, number, or aisle widths. A variance is required from the ZBA for non-compliance with section 15-42A(7).

(7) Where there are practical difficulties in the location of parking spaces or if the public safety or public convenience, or both, would be better served by the location of such parking spaces other than on the same lot as the use to which it is appurtenant, the Board of Appeals, on specific application, may authorize such alternative location of required parking space as will adequately serve the public interest, subject to the following conditions:

(a) Such off-site spaces shall be located on land in the same ownership or under a legally binding, perpetual arrangement between the premises.

(b) The entrance to such space shall be within a radius of 250 feet from an entrance to the use that such space serves.

(c) Such off-site parking spaces shall be usable without causing hazard to pedestrians, hazard to vehicular traffic, traffic congestion, detriment to the appropriate use of other property in the vicinity or detriment to any residential neighborhood. The parking spaces proposed in the Town

of Southeast do not meet the Town of Carmel requirements. Carmel require 10x20 spaces, the spaces proposed are 9x18.

Mr. Franzetti stated the applications that were submitted, the drawings, comments and cover letters are virtually the same. My suggestion is to make this one specific to the Town of Carmel and what's related to it. For instance, on one of the drawings you talk about wetlands. There are no wetlands on this specific site.

I. General Comments

1. The following referrals are required:
 - a. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)
 - b. Putnam County Department of Highways and Facilities (PCDHF)
 - c. New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP)
 - d. The Town of Carmel Environmental Conservation Board (ECB).
 - e. Carmel Fire Department
2. The following permits are required:
 - a. NYSDEC - for stormwater and wetlands;
 - b. NYCDEP – for stormwater
 - c. ECB for wetlands
 - d. PCDHF – Highway Permits
3. The FEAF
 - a. Page 3 of 13 D.1.d. calls this a lot line adjustment. This should be corrected
 - b. Page 5 of 13 D.2.c – Applicant will need to provide additional assessment regarding water/sewer. This will minimally include a water/wastewater report.
 - c. Page 5 of 13 D.2.d. Liquid wastes should include stormwater. Applicant will need to provide additional assessment regarding water/sewer. This will minimally include a water/wastewater report.
 - d. Page 7 of 13 D.2.j. Applicant has provided traffic generation findings. This should be reviewed by a traffic consultant.
4. The applicant must provide a water/wastewater report. It is suggested that the applicant meet with the Engineering Department to discuss this further.
5. Wetland mapping and delineations provided needs to be verified by the NYSDEC and the Town of Carmel Wetlands Inspector. Note on Site Plan Drawing C130 indicates wetlands on the site. These should be shown on the drawing.
6. The area of disturbance for the work as provided is 19 acres 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 permanent stormwater controls.

In addition, the applicant should note that a SWPPP will be required by the NYCDEP

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

The applicant has provided a grading plan. The amount of fill, if any, being brought to the site should be provided.

All fill brought to the site must be certified per NYSDEC regulations and manifests/certification of the fill material being delivered should be provided. A note should be added to the drawing.

8. 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.
 - d. Roadway and driveway profiles should be provided
 - e. The applicant needs to specify if the roads are intended to be dedicated to the Town of Carmel.
9. The applicant will be required to supply a stormwater maintenance agreement and maintenance guarantee per Town Code (§156-85 and §156-87 B respectively).
10. 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. The applicant should note that a Performance Bond and associated Engineering fee is minimally required for the stormwater management practices, erosion and sediment control drainage features, landscaping etc. installed on the site. Please see §156-61 J and K of the Town Code for additional information.

Mr. Franzetti continued and stated there are a lot of detail comments and these are the same detail comments for the next application (townhomes). There is a lot here that needs to be worked on as we move forward.

Mr. Cleary stated the three applications need to be distinct and separate, however, for the purposes of SEQR it's a single action. The only thing we're doing tonight is starting that process. The objective this evening is to designate your intent to serve as lead agency. He said when the project was originally approved, we paid attention to the configuration of the golf courses. They are changing it now and if it is affecting the playability of the course. So, if the course is being reduced in its quality, we should know that. The parking is being shifted now, it's in Southeast. Is that an issue for us?

Chairman Paeprer stated declaring ourselves as lead agency is a good start. We need to make sure we have enough water to supply your needs. Will you be using more water for this project?

Mr. Franzetti stated that's all part of the SEQR process. It covers the traffic, water, sewer, schools and any of the other environmental potential deficiencies.

Mr. O'Rourke stated the project went through an exhaustive examination 25 years ago. Obviously, things have changed since then and we have to update that, but I also think it's important to realize that this is a cooperative application with the Town of Southeast. He said the real purpose tonight is to get the ball rolling.

CENTENNIAL GOLF TOWNHOMES – 185 JOHN SIMPSON ROAD – TM – 44.-2-2 & 44.-2-4 -AMENDED SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicants propose to construct a 63 Unit Townhome development with clubhouse and pool on the corner of Fair St. and Simpson Rd. The Lot Line Adjustment must be approved and filed before the Amended Site Plan(s) for the multi-family development and golf course can be approved. The lot is labeled 44.2-2.1, that is incorrect, it is 44.-2-2.2. Before considering referrals to ECB or ZBA, all tax I.D. #'s need to be corrected on the plat and verified. Provide floor plans and elevations. How do you calculate Parking? Will there be central garbage? Central Mail? The County Highway Dept. and Carmel Fire Dept. should comment on the new driveways coming out to Fair St. This project needs to be referred to the ECB for comments. What code are you using to do this development? Cluster156-45? Multi-Family 156-28? Provide a recreation calculation table. 300 s.f./dwelling unit are required.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated 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 Highways and Facilities(PCDHF)
 - c. New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP)
 - d. The Town of Carmel Environmental Conservation Board (ECB).
 - e. Carmel Fire Department
2. The following permits are required:
 - a. NYSDEC - for stormwater and wetlands;
 - b. NYCDEP – for stormwater
 - c. ECB for wetlands
 - d. PCDHF – Highway Permits
3. The FEAF
 - a. Page 3 of 13 D.1.d. calls this a lot line adjustment. This should be corrected
 - b. Page 5 of 13 D.2.c – Applicant will need to provide additional assessment regarding water/sewer. This will minimally include a water/wastewater report.
 - c. Page 5 of 13 D.2.d. Liquid wastes should include stormwater. Applicant will need to provide additional assessment regarding water/sewer. This will minimally include a water/wastewater report.
 - d. Page 7 of 13 D.2.j. Applicant has provided traffic generation findings. This should be reviewed by a traffic consultant.
4. The applicant must provide a water/wastewater report. It is suggested that the applicant meet with the Engineering Department to discuss this further.
5. Wetland mapping and delineations provided needs to be verified by the NYSDEC and the Town of Carmel Wetlands Inspector.
6. The area of disturbance for the work as provided is 19 acres 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 permanent stormwater controls.

In addition, the applicant should note that a SWPPP will be required by the NYCDEP

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

The applicant has provided a grading plan. The amount of fill, if any, being brought to the site should be provided.

All fill brought to the site must be certified per NYSDEC regulations and manifests/certification of the fill material being delivered should be provided. A note should be added to the drawing.

8. 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.

d. Roadway and driveway profiles should be provided

e. The applicant needs to specify if the roads are intended to be dedicated to the Town of Carmel.

9. The applicant will be required to supply a stormwater maintenance agreement and maintenance guarantee per Town Code (§156-85 and §156-87 B respectively).

10. 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. The applicant should note that a Performance Bond and associated Engineering fee is minimally required for the stormwater management practices, erosion and sediment control drainage features, landscaping etc. installed on the site. Please see §156-61 J and K of the Town Code for additional information.

Mr. Cleary stated it appears that on-site wetlands (federal, state and locally regulated) are constraining and dictating the proposed configuration of the project. It appears that encroachments into wetland buffer areas are proposed for grading and stormwater measures. Are additional encroachments potentially possible that would improve the layout and configuration of the project – that could be justified through a new wetland restoration and mitigation plan? The question is how important or how ecologically significant is that wetland and is a trade off possible? That would basically rotate the three buildings on a hinge, bring them back down into main section of homes and eliminate the connection to Fair Street. It would require encroachments into the wetland, but that's a trade off if it's a poor functioning wetland. Is that a better trade off then new curb cuts on Fair Street and the second group of buildings. We should look deeper into this wetland. He said the location of the new clubhouse and pool are proposed at the end of a new dead-end roadway, at the edge of the development. These types of amenities are more commonly located in the front of developments such as these (or in a more centralized location). Because a new "emergency access road" extends this dead-end road out to Fair Street, it is conceivable that in the future, the residents of this development may wish to open up this emergency driveway to more conveniently access the clubhouse. Would it be possible to flip the clubhouse to the opposite end of the new roadway, so it is located more in the center of the development, instead of out on the edge?

Chairman Paeprer asked how big is the clubhouse?

Mr. Boudreau replied about 2400 square feet.

Mr. Cleary stated your requirement is 18,000 square feet.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked why is the clubhouse and pool closer to the road and not to the center of the development?

Mr. Christopher LaPorta of Passero Associates, addressed the board and stated we are staying out of the 100-foot buffer. It's within a fairly walkable distance about ¼ mile. Even though, it's not in a central location to the development, it's certainly accessible to the development.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding the health of the wetland that was raised by Mr. Cleary and a mitigation plan if not viable.

Chairman Paeprer asked what kind of townhomes will you be building?

Mr. Jack Landman of Toll Brothers, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated the townhomes on the main portion of property in the vicinity of the clubhouse will be two car garage townhomes with second floor master bedrooms – three bedrooms in total. The townhomes on Fair Street will be 1st floor master bedroom, also three bedrooms and a two car garage as well. They will be about 2,000 to 2,500 square feet.

CENTENNIAL GOLF COURSE – 185 JOHN SIMPSON ROAD – TM – 44.-2-2 & 44.-2-4 – LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicants propose to swap 11.84 acres from 44.-2-4.2 to 44.-2-2.1 and 7.65 acres from 44.-2-2.1 to 44.-4.2 (INCORRECT TM#'s). The Lot Line Adjustment must be approved and filed before the Amended Site Plan(s) for the multi-family development and golf course. The small lot is labelled 44.2-4.2, that is incorrect, it is 44.-2-4.1. The larger lot is labeled 44.2-2.1, that is incorrect, it is 44.-2-2.2. The Lot line adjustment law only allows for the transfer of 20% or 20,000 sq. ft. of lot area. This submission does not comply. Variance required from the ZBA. This type of project is not the intent of the Town Lot Line Adjustment Law. It is to correct any encroachment, and to allow residents to trade properties so they can build an addition, deck, etc., not for a full development. Before anything is referred to the ZBA, all tax I.D. #'s need to be corrected on the plat and verified.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated The Town of Carmel Engineering Department does not have any comments regarding the lot Line adjustment being proposed.

The applicant should note the following, per §156-61 M. of the Town of Carmel Town Code:

- Copies of any restrictions or easements on the land (copy of deed).
- Signature book for Planning Board Chairman to endorse approved plat.
- Key map at a scale of one-inch equals 800 feet, showing the relation of the portion to be subdivided to the entire tract and the relation of the entire tract to its neighborhood for at least 1,000 feet beyond its boundaries
- The location of proposed setback lines (setback envelope).
- Existing or proposed covenants or deed restrictions applying to the site.

- Location, composition, and approximate size of all monuments.
- Label "old" and "new" property lines.

Mr. Cleary read his memo which stated the Lot Line Adjustment Plan is difficult to understand. Instead of the cross-hatching, can colors be used to differentiate the sending and receiving parcels? The reasoning and rationale for the lot line adjustments should be more fully documented. Why are the adjustments proposed as currently configured? §156-61 M. (e.) establishes that a lot line adjustment shall not increase/decrease a lot by more than 20% or 20,000 square feet. Both lot line adjustments exceed this threshold. A variance is required.

Mr. LaPorta stated we worked a long time to put this layout together. He said we will continue the sidewalk in front of the townhomes on the lower road. That was an oversight and we are sensitive to pedestrian connectivity around the development. We will try to meet the recreation, to eliminate that variance.

Mr. Cleary asked why are you doing this.

Mr. Boudreau stated this journey started back in 2018, when we were looking at a long-term solution to sustain the golf. The usage of golf is going down and the cost and maintenance goes up making it difficult to run a successful business. We are very excited to be here in front of you this evening. The consultants have all been very helpful.

At which time, Vice Chairman Giannico moved to declare the planning board as lead agency. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

MINUTES – 12/09/21

Mr. Frenkel moved to accept the minutes as corrected. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:23 p.m. with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta