

# **APPROVED**

**CRAIG PAEPRER**  
*Chairman*

**ANTHONY GIANNICO**  
*Vice Chairman*

**BOARD MEMBERS**  
**KIM KUGLER**  
**RAYMOND COTE**  
**ROBERT FRENKEL**  
**VICTORIA CAUSA**  
**JOHN NUCULOVIC**

## **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** **APRIL 14, 2022**

**PRESENT:** CHAIRMAN, CRAIG PAEPRER, VICE CHAIRMAN, ANTHONY GIANNICO,  
RAYMOND COTE, JOHN NUCULOVIC

**ABSENT:** KIM KUGLER, ROBERT FRENKEL, VICTORIA CAUSA

\*\*\*\*\*

<b><u>APPLICANT</u></b>	<b><u>TAX MAP #</u></b>	<b><u>TYPE</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>	<b><u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u></b>
Shallow Stream Properties	87.8-1-4,5,&6	Public Hearing	1	Public Hearing Closed & Planner To Prepare Resolution.
Dynamite Properties Corp.	44.14-1-39	R. Site Plan	1-2	No Board Action.
Platinum Propane	65.10-2-11	Site Plan	2-4	No Board Action.
Demag & Ademi	75.12-1-1&2	A. Site Plan	4	Off the Agenda.
Centennial Golf Course	44.-2-2&2-4	A. Site Plan	5-9	No Board Action.
Centennial Golf Townhomes	44.-2-2&2-4	A. Site Plan	9-10	No Board Action.
Centennial Golf Course	44.-2-2&2-4	Lot Line Adj.	10	No Board Action.
Union Valley Cemetery	76.16-1-8	Regrading	11	Re-Approval Granted.
Minutes – 02/10/22 & 02/23/22			11	Approved.
Executive Session – Pending Litigation			11	Rescheduled.
The meeting was adjourned at 8:24 p.m.				

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

**SHALLOW STREAM PROPERTIES INC – 145 & 153 SHINDAGEN HILL ROAD – TM – 87.8-1-4, 5 & 6 – PUBLIC HEARING**

The consultants had no further comments.

Chairman Paeprer 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 favor.

Chairman Paeprer asked the Planner to prepare a resolution.

**DYNAMITE PROPERTIES CORP – 70 GLENEIDA AVE – TM – 44.14-1-39 – RESIDENTIAL SITE PLAN**

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant proposes to convert the second floor of a two-story commercial structure into two one-bedroom apartments. Use variance is required from the ZBA for the mixed-use structure. Provide floor plans of each floor in the front building and the “shed”. I only received plans for the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. Without this information, I cannot recommend referral to the ZBA. The variance numbers might change based on the plans that I am requesting. \*\*\*Note to the Board- There is no on-site parking or loading at this property\*\*\*. Does the applicant propose to add sprinklers to the building? It may be required depending on the building type and use of the building. What is the size and use of the shed? Nothing was added to the parking calculation for the shed. What is the 7x11 structure at the rear of the main building? Is there a trash enclosure and dumpster on the site? Several variances are required from the ZBA.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the application involves converting the second floor of an existing commercial property into two (2) single bedroom apartments. Based upon review of the plans provided the Engineering Department offers the following preliminary comments:

- The applicant will need to provide a water and wastewater report for the site.
- Additional information must be provided regarding the parking area/agreement in the rear of the property.
- No site improvements are proposed for this project. This Department does not have any additional comments related to this project as long as there are no changes being made to the site.

Mr. Cleary read his memo which stated said the proposal involves converting the second floor of an existing two-story commercial building to support two 1-bedroom apartments. No physical changes to the exterior of the site are proposed.

- The site is located in the C- Commercial zoning district, which does not permit multi-family dwellings. A **use variance** from the Zoning Board of Appeals is required.
- The Planning Board has now seen a number of similar applications seeking to add residential apartments to pre-existing commercial buildings. While the applicant can pursue a use variance, the Planning Board may wish to convey to the Master Plan consultants the proliferation of these applications, which may more appropriately be addressed through a zoning amendment.
- As documented in the Director of Code Enforcement’s memorandum, none of the pre-existing non-conforming conditions at this site were ever approved, resulting in the necessity to obtain **10 area variances** in addition to the use variance.
- The site provides no off-street parking. Where would the residents of the

new apartments park? Is the use of the large parking lot behind the property available for shared parking use?

Mr. Carnazza stated we will need formal agreement. It's a condition of the approval for off-site parking. They will have to give a legally binding perpetual agreement.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked is this considered existing, non-conforming?

Mr. Cleary stated structurally the building is, but the residential use is not. It's a brand-new use.

Chairman Paeprer stated we are looking at these codes and it will benefit the town to have commercial downstairs and residential upstairs. It will fit very well in this area.

Mr. Paul Lynch of Putnam Engineering, representing the applicant stated he will respond to Mr. Carnazza's comment about the parking agreement.

Mr. Charbonneau stated a legal agreement is required per our code.

Mr. Carnazza stated he's not ready yet to go to the ZBA. He has more comments to respond to, such as the floor plans.

#### **PLATINUM PROPANE – 1035 ROUTE 6 – TM – 65.10-2-11 – SITE PLAN**

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant proposes to convert a dwelling to an office, remove a garage, add 1500 s.f. "lean-to" for Propane tank storage and add a filling station for a property on Rt. 6 in Mahopac.

- Will this be a terminal? Does the NFPA allow burying of 30,000-gallon tanks? Provide details and information on these tanks.
- Why does the parking calculation provide for 1650 s.f. and the zoning table only provide for 1600 s.f. of building area?
- Provide floor plans of each floor in the front building, filling station and the "lean-to".
- Variances are required from the ZBA for the following:  
Front Yd., 40 ft. req'd, 18.9 ft. proposed, 21.1ft. variance needed.  
Min. Floor Area, 5,000 s.f. req'd, 1600 s.f. proposed, 3400 s.f. variance needed.  
Loading, 1 space needed, 0 provided, 1 loading space variance needed. (A LOADING SPACE CAN BE LOCATED ON THE PROPERTY TO COMPLY).

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated this application encompasses a proposal to convert an existing residence into office space for propane business. The project will develop a 1.3 acres of a 12 acres parcel located at 1035 Route 6. The project involves the construction of a 1,500 sq ft three (3) sided structure to store service vehicles. Based upon our review of this submittal, the Engineering Department offers the following **preliminary** comments:

#### **General Comments**

1. The following referrals would appear to be warranted:
  - a. Putnam County Department of Health
  - b. Mahopac Fire Department

- c. Town Environmental Conservation Board (ECB)
  - d. New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT)
2. Permits from the following would appear necessary:
- a. New York State Department of Transportation – depending on improvements to the ingress/egress along Route 6
  - b. Putnam County Department of Health Water and subsurface septic treatment systems
  - c. NYSDOT – work within right of way.
  - d. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) – Coverage under General Permit GP-0-20-001
  - e. New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP)
  - f. ECB – work in buffer
3. The area of disturbance for the work has is 1.3 acres which exceeds the threshold criteria of disturbances for the NYSDEC stormwater regulation of 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 requires permanent stormwater controls. The applicant may need to obtain, per the NYCDEP Watershed Rules and Regulations, a permit for work within limiting distance to reservoirs and reservoir stems.
4. Access for Fire Department around the rear of the building must be considered
5. Traffic and Vehicle Movement Plans should be provided which provide the following:
- a. Provide all sight distance calculations.
  - b. Provide a driveway profile
  - 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. A traffic study for this site must be performed.
6. The applicant may be required to supply a stormwater maintenance agreement and maintenance guarantee per Town Code (§156-85 and §156-87 B respectively).
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.

Mr. Franzetti further stated he has about 16 detailed comments and will provide it to the applicant.

Mr. Cleary stated the fundamental issue is what type facility is this? He stated there is a gas moratorium in Westchester County by Con Edison. That is potentially being lifted soon. Is this a temporary facility to serve our southern neighbors or is this a facility like the one we reviewed on Nicole Way which is more of a permanent long time facility serving our community. Is this a terminal? Or is this where I go to fill up my tank for a barbecue. That will influence a lot of the site planning issues that we talked about. He said that's really the primary issue, I have a lot of minor technical such as landscaping, screening and DOT, etc.

Mr. Zac Pearson of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated they are a propane business. They have the smaller trucks to go and fill the homes. He said there will be a large tanker truck that will come in and fill the two tanks and that "lean to" is actually for them to back the trucks underneath.

Chairman Paeprer asked is it residential propane deliveries?

Mr. Pearson replied yes.

Chairman Paeprer asked will it be retail also?

Mr. Pearson replied yes. It's wholesale and sell as well.

Mr. Carnazza said so it's not retail.

Mr. Pearson replied no.

Mr. Carnazza said so I can't go there with my tank on a Saturday and fill it up for my barbecue.

Mr. Pearson said I will confirm with them. They may offer that.

Mr. Carnazza said we need to know about the parking and who's coming in and out.

Mr. Pearson said "the loop" is for their propane trucks to come in and fill their propane tanks and then go make deliveries.

Chairman Paeprer asked for clarification on whether this site is for anyone to come in to get their propane tank filled for their barbecue.

Mr. Pearson replied no. The drivers will fill their tanks on site and then taking them to gas stations and homes.

Mr. Cote asked how many trucks are we talking about?

Mr. Pearson replied approximately 3 to 4 trucks.

Chairman Paeprer asked about burying propane tanks.

Mr. Pearson said you could bury tanks, but there are prescriptive distances to the property lines and buildings.

Mr. Cleary asked is it a NYSDEC permit that's obtained for burying the tanks?

Mr. Pearson replied yes.

Mr. Cote asked for an explanation of the safety features of the tanks the next time they are before the board.

Chairman Paeprer stated we also want a rendering of the property the next time you come back to us.

A discussion ensued with regards to possibly relocating the "lean to" structure being it's a 12 acre parcel.

Mr. Pearson stated we met with the NYSDOT on site. There is an existing there and their proposal is to widen it to conform with a commercial entrance. Right now, it is a one lane in, so we're going to make it a two lane in.

Chairman Paeprer stated you have a lot of comments to respond to at this time.

Chairman Paeprer stated the applicant asked for a hold over to the next meeting.

**CENTENNIAL GOLF COURSE – 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 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. 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). Such off-site spaces shall be located on land in the same ownership or under a legally binding, perpetual arrangement between the premises. Is there a mechanism for the Town of Carmel Planning Board to now ask that the Golf Course be Deed restricted to only allow it to be “open Space” or a golf course? The developer claimed that they could not make money as a 27-hole golf course so they needed to develop a portion of the property. Now they are keeping the 27-hole golf course and developing a portion of the property. There is nothing to stop the owner from now closing another 9 or 18 holes and developing them.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the Findings Statement from the original Environmental Impact statement regarding the development of the golf course as a golf course was issued in February 1996;

- The updated FEAF is seeking approval for the construction of a 63-unit Town Home (increased from 52 units from original submittal).

The following are the Engineering Departments preliminary comments:

1. SEQRA –

- a. Impacts on Surface Water – applicant indicates that there are new or extensions of an existing wastewater treatment facility. However, the applicant proposes a new pump station for this site. This should be clarified.
- b. Wetlands – the applicant did not address the concerns of the Planning Board regarding the importance or lack of importance of the wetlands.

The Wetlands report should be reviewed by an independent consultant.

- c. Stormwater – the applicant indicates that the NYCDEP will review the stormwater management features. The applicant should note that the NYCDEP will need to approve too. In order to meet the NYSDEC and NYCDEP criteria, extensive green infrastructure and runoff reduction are required. This information will be required as it may impact the size/nature of the proposed project.

2. SEQRA – Water and Sewer.

a. Applicant indicates

- i. New sewer pump station which has not been approved;
- ii. A new 8” water service along Fair Street. This alignment has not been approved. As such the applicant did not address the Town Engineers concerns;
- iii. Current water usage is shown as 132 gallons per day (gpd). The time frame for this is not provided and does not address all time use.
- iv. Proposed water use is 20,790 gpd.
- v. Water/wastewater report has not been provided, reviewed or approved. The report, once provided, should be reviewed by an independent consultant.

3. SEQRA Impacts on Flooding – this comment should be clarified.
4. SEQRA – Plants and Animals –
  - a. Indiana and Northern long ears bats and bog turtles are in the vicinity of the project site. Additional information is required to show that the project does not impact these habitats. The finding report should be reviewed by an independent consultant.
  - b. Tree cutting is proposed in wetland buffer.
5. SEQRA – Open Space and recreation – it is unclear how updating a parking area and installing Town Homes is a benefit to open space and recreation.
6. SEQRA Impacts on Transportation –
  - a. As no drawing are provided, it is unclear if the units along Fair street are still proposed. If so the applicant did not address the Planning Boards concerns.
  - b. This study will need to be reviewed by a Traffic Consultant
7. Consistency with Community Plan.
  - a. Land Use - unclear how updating a parking area and installing Town Homes is a is the desire to balance the protection natural resources. This project increases the impervious area or the site. This percent increase must be provided.
  - b. Environmental Protection - it is unclear how updating a parking area and installing Town Homes preserves natural resources and protects drinking water supplies.
  - c. Infrastructure – The relevance of paying capital costs for 25 years should be elaborated as the project did receive a benefit from these services (i.e used). It is unclear if the applicant has paid capital as if the property were fully developed as 63 Town Homes.
8. Economic generator – The applicant cites that the 27-hole golf course is an economic generator. The applicant has also represented that the 27-hole golf course was losing money and the Town Homes would be needed to offset this loss. As such the course was going to be converted into an 18-hole course with these homes. This should be clarified.

Mr. Cleary stated my comments are lumping the three applications together. What we are dealing with tonight is SEQRA. We are at a fork in the road in making a determination of how we deal with SEQRA. The applicants made their presentation to you a few months ago. You raised a series of comments and concerns. On the plans that have been submitted essentially, they remain unchanged. It's very similar to the previous plan. He stated we asked them to look at the findings that were adopted over 20 years ago and compare and contrast. The response however, was generalized. We expected it to be a little more detailed. We will be happy to sit with the applicants and describe what needs to be fleshed out with respect to those analyses. He stated as lead agency, you could choose to control that process entirely by moving down the route of Environmental Impact Statement. That requires the applicant to do the same thing that was done when Centennial came before you 20 years ago. The full EIS public hearings, etc. It's a vigorous process, but it also requires the applicant to address alternates. Tonight's decision is do we go that route or do we give the opportunity to the applicant to further refine in respond to our comments and work with us to respond to those issues.

Chairman Paepre stated a lot have changed over the last 26 years. Why would use any data that from 26 years ago?

Mr. Richard O'Rourke of Keane and Beane, Applicant's attorney addressed the board and stated when he looked at the backup agenda, certain documents were omitted. He stated we

submitted a comparative analysis of the 1996 environmental review as well as with this particular application. I thought we answered it point by point. Did you receive it?

Mr. Cleary replied yes. We did get it. He said the responses were generalized and we need a little more detail.

Mr. O'Rourke stated where we are proposing this development is already disturbed. It has been a parking lot and there won't be any further blasting.....

Mr. Cleary replied I understand, but you need to show your work. We need to see it.

Mr. Chris LaPorta of Passero Associates, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated we will certainly beef up any areas that you want us to. For example, rock blasting. There will be some earth work on this project, but through our work with the DEP and doing the stormwater testing we know there won't be any rock encountered.

Mr. Cleary said the fact that you know that and have that information which is useful, but we didn't get it.

Mr. Franzetti stated we should have been made aware that those tests were being done, so we could have witnessed them. It's not just the DEP who's the stormwater, we are the MS4 here. We are in charge of that also.

Mr. LaPorta stated we will share our test pit logs and the photographs of the deep tests that we did.

At which time, a discussion ensued with regards to SEQRA review, NYSDEC and NYCDEP.

Mr. LaPorta stated we had a meeting with DEC and DEP and we showed them the alternative that was raised at the last meeting to try and connect the Fair Street townhome units to the rest of the development and they said this will cause direct wetland disturbance and we require alternative analysis. They said the current plan is the preferred plan. They said the alternative plan is a Class II wetland and is rarely permitted.

Mr. Cleary stated that is useful information, but it would have been nice for us to be there as well to hear our side of that conversation.

Mr. LaPorta said we have been requesting a follow-up. We certainly presented both alternatives as equals.

Mr. Cleary stated I'm not suggesting you're not doing anything appropriately at all.

Mr. LaPorta stated we wanted to get an engineering report in front of you for review. He said we are working in a disturbed area, but we're not creating any significant environmental impacts with this project.

Chairman Paepre stated we need to see a water analysis to make sure our water district can handle the townhomes.

Mr. LaPorta stated we submitted an engineering report that has a water cad model.

Mr. Franzetti stated he did not provide comments to it, but I did a peripheral review of the wastewater report. I have comments and issues with it. The capacity of our plant is not 2



million gallons per day. The highest is about 1.5 million gallons a day. It's designed for 1 million gallons per day.

Mr. Cote asked where do they currently get water from?

Mr. Franzetti replied CWD #2, but it's only for the clubhouse. They don't irrigate with it and they are not going to do it in the future.

Chairman Paeprer asked where will the water come from for the townhomes?

Mr. Franzetti replied once approved it will be coming from CWD #2. No irrigation from the public water supply for the golf course and homes.

Mr. Cote asked can CWD #2 support the new townhomes?

Mr. Franzetti stated that's still be investigated. He said we also have to account for any of the underdeveloped properties within the Town of Carmel.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked when you came before this board a couple of years ago, it was presented in a hardship about operating costs with the golf course going from 27 holes down to 18 holes. You're back to 27 holes, correct?

Mr. O'Rourke replied yes.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked can you take us through this again. Also, can we see the lot line adjustment and townhomes on one plan?

Mr. Larry Boudreau addressed the board and stated when we were before you in 2018 the revenue was going down each year and expenses were going up. The one thing COVID was great for was the golf business. As a result of COVID, new golfers have come in, record rounds throughout the country and clubs filling up. Last year, we did 37,000 rounds and pre-COVID we barely did 30,000. We now have the demand to justify the 27 holes. Three years ago, we didn't.

Chairman Paeprer asked what happens five years from now if there is a recession?

Vice Chairman Giannico stated we also talked about a forever green space. That could be a contingency plan. That was very appealing to the board when you offered the green space.

Mr. O'Rourke stated regarding Mr. Carnazza's comment about in perpetuity in keeping it as a golf course. I'm not aware of any property owner that's going to say in perpetuity and guarantee a golf course. I don't think this property owner will do that either. He said we can't project that.

A discussion ensued regarding the future of the golf course and the trends of golf courses regionally and nationwide.

Chairman Paeprer stated you need to provide details on traffic, schools, water, etc. I'm not sure the studies from 26 years ago are relative.

Mr. LaPorta stated we did update it. Our letter showed the approved plan from 1996 and then we showed the projections for our golf course since the design changed. The modern golf course trip projection is more conservative than in 1996. We showed both data points, along with the new traffic generated by the development.

Mr. Franzetti stated a traffic consultant should look at that.

Mr. Cleary stated no one is disputing the methodology or the conclusions. We need to see the work on how you got there. For example, many of your responses in the memo says nothing has changed. We need to know, show us the information that justifies nothing has changed. That's what we're talking about.

Chairman Paepre stated at this point we are going to move on to Centennial Golf Townhomes.

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

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which said 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. 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. Provide a recreation calculation table - 300 s.f./dwelling unit are required. What is the height of the retaining wall.

Ms. Victoria Storrs, President and Founder of Storrs Associates, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated Storrs Associates is an economic development and development finance consulting firm. We were engaged to conduct a fiscal analysis on the Townhome component. The basic question asked is will this new development generate enough real property tax revenue to cover the incremental new costs that residents would add to the town by moving in from outside of the Town of Carmel. That is the basic premise of this report. The conclusion is yes. In fact, with regard to the Carmel School District, the surplus of real property tax revenue is estimated to cover an additional 16 students. It would be paid for by the surplus. We estimated approximately 13 students would be living in the new community and 16 above that would be covered. The basic analysis begins with how many residents are going to move into the Town of Carmel as a result of these units. The analysis begins with the type of units, the estimated sale price, the size and configuration of the units. That narrows it down to most likely to have an income, to afford the price point and that would be approximately \$164,000 of income. This is above the median income for Putnam County and Westchester County. Putnam County is about \$105,000 a year. These are middle to upper income households coming in at this price point. What is also in this analysis is there are fewer homes serving these kinds of households. So, there is actually a demand for housing at this price point in the Town of Carmel.

Ms. Storrs continued and stated the second question asked is what does it cost to provide services to the residents? For this study, I used a pro rata method of assigning cost per household or per resident. For the school district, we looked at the school district budget per student, estimating the costs per student and then assigning that, so 13 new students would cost "x". Based on the demographics, income and household size, 60 of 63 units are anticipated to attract people from outside of the Town of Carmel with an average household size of 2.77 people, that's 167 new residents.

Mr. Franzetti asked does the 167 residents compare to what was put in for water and wastewater flow?

Ms. Stacey Kurian of Passero Associates replied that count is using bedrooms which is based off the DEC standards for wastewater flow.

Mr. Franzetti asked how many bedrooms are proposed?

Ms. Kurian replied 189 bedrooms.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding on how the two numbers compare and studies done on people looking to downsize to the proposed housing units.

Mr. O'Rourke referred the board to the Pattern for Progress (Out of alignment) website. He said it's rather startling in terms of the demographics in this area.

Mr. Cote asked when was that study done?

Mr. O'Rourke replied it was published about 12 – 15 months ago.

Chairman Paeprer asked for a breakdown of how many units and bedrooms.

Mr. Kevin Moses of Toll Brothers addressed the board and stated with regards to that information that is something we are still working through. To date, what was presented to you thus far is accurate.

Chairman Paeprer said they are all three bedrooms?

Mr. Moses replied I believe so, but I will confirm that.

Chairman Paeprer asked what is the square footage of the units.

Mr. Moses replied approximately 2,500 to 3,000 square feet.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding the cost of students in the Carmel Central School District.

Chairman Paeprer stated you have lot to work on still and thanked the applicants for their time.

#### **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. The Lot Line Adjustment must be approved and filed before the Amended Site Plan(s) for the multi-family development and golf course. 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.

No board action.

**UNION VALLEY CEMETERY – 730 UNION VALLEY ROAD – TM – 76.16-1-8 –  
REGRAIDING APPLICATION**

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated this project received final approval September 25, 2019. The approval was good for 1 year. It has now expired and they are here for a re-approval. I have no objection to the re-approval, however, please clean the garbage at the site before the map is signed.

Mr. Franzetti stated the applicant is requesting a reapproval of the previously approved/lapsed regrading plan. All previous Engineering Department comments have been addressed and this Department has no objection to reapproval.

Mr. Cleary had no objections to the re-approval.

**MINUTES – 02/10/22 & 02/23/22**

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

**EXECUTIVE SESSION – PENDING LITIGATION**

Executive Session was rescheduled.

Mr. Cote moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:24 p.m. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Giannico with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta