

APPROVED

CRAIG PAEPRER
Chairman

ANTHONY GIANNICO
Vice Chairman

BOARD MEMBERS

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 **JANUARY 25, 2023**

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN, CRAIG PAEPRER, RAYMOND COTE, ROBERT FRENKEL,
JOHN NUCULOVIC

ABSENT: VICE CHAIRMAN, ANTHONY GIANNICO, VICTORIA CAUSA

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
Town of Carmel Comprehensive Master Plan & Zoning Code			1	Discussion.
Carmel Centre Senior Housing-Lot 3(Pulte Homes)	55.14-1-11.1	Open P/H	1-5	Public Hearing Closed.
Lubic, Michael	76.9-1-22	Site Plan	6-7	No Board Action.
NYCDEP West Branch Auxiliary Dam	65.-1-5	Site Plan	8	Adjourned.
G & F Subdivision – Lots 5, 6 & 7	55.-2-24, 5 6-1,7-2&8-2	Re-Approval	8	180 Day Extension Granted.
Pulte Homes of New York LLC – Lot 4	55.14-1-11.2	Bond Return	8-9	No Board Action.
Pulte Homes of New York LLC – Lot 5	55.14-1-11.3	Bond Return	9-10	No Board Action.
Town of Carmel Comprehensive Master Plan & Zoning Code			10	Discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

TOWN OF CARMEL COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN AND ZONING CODE DRAFT – DISCUSSION

Mr. Cleary, Mr. Carnazza and the board members reviewed Section 156-36.16 (Home Occupations) to Section 156-36.29 (Veterinary Hospital; Animal Kennels).

CARMEL CENTRE SENIOR HOUSING (PULTE HOMES) – LOT 3 – TM – 55.14-1-11.1 – CONTINUATION OF OPEN PUBLIC HEARING – BOND RETURN

Mr. Carnazza had no comments pertaining to zoning.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated in response to requests from the applicant for a Bond return for the referenced site, the Town of Carmel Engineering Department has performed numerous site visits (April, May, July, December of 2018, August, September and October of 2019 and May, October 2020) to inspect this site. A representative of the Engineering Department performed a field inspection of the referenced property on October 28, 2020 to evaluate the current status of the site construction, for the purpose of determining whether a bond return was warranted. The results of our investigation indicated that the original bond for Lot 3, in the amount of was \$2,579,959.00 could be released. A public hearing was held for the project on February 24, 2021 and during the public hearing, the residents in the retreat requested that the stormwater ponds be assessed. Pulte provided the attached October 14, 2022 report detailing/evaluating the stormwater pond conditions. This Department met with a representative of Pulte on November 9, 2022 to assess the conditions of all the ponds. At that time and based on the report provided by Pulte, the stormwater ponds were found to be sufficient, however as identified in the report and confirmed in the field, three (3) of the basins (3AQ, 3BQ and 3CQ) only initial clean-out was completed. Once these areas are completed it is recommended that the bond be returned. He stated subsequently, I received an email earlier today from the applicant's representative with a report that was dated November 10th, which is the day after stating they did the cleaning of the basins. The report was then dated November 22nd and I have not had a chance to do an inspection. According to the Pulte, the work was done the day after I did my initial site visit and I need to go out and inspect it.

At which time, Chairman Paepre asked if anyone in the public wished to be heard on this application.

Mr. Richard Sherman a resident of the Retreat and a member of the HOA addressed the board and stated Pulte Homes is entitled to a bond return, if and when they have completed their obligation and responsibility. We and the communities involved do not agree that it has been totally completed. He stated if the bond were to be returned it could likely reduce the incentive to complete the job that they are required and obligated to do. I strongly urge that you show the same wisdom that you did in the past, by holding the bond for now. If the job isn't completed, the responsibility will fall on several entities. We believe the job has not been fully done.

Ms. Myrna Thomas, Board Director and manager of Condo #1 addressed the board and stated she has been a member of the Board of Directors since December of 2018 after the withdrawal of Pulte from the HOA Board of Directors. When they withdrew, they wiped their hands of any responsibilities to us, unless prodded by the town. She stated she served on various transition committees for the last 13 years and we are still waiting for copies of plans involving water management systems, operation and maintenance.

Ms. Jen Porti, a resident of Condo lot #3 and a board member addressed the board and stated we have noted the clean-up that was done in the summer by Pulte's contractor to clean out the basins that was mentioned by the Town Engineer. At that time, we asked Pulte and their engineer to be associated with that and to work with our engineer that was doing studies on our behalf, so that we could coordinate the activity, but that did not occur. We made many efforts to get in touch with that engineer, but it didn't happen. A group of landscapers came in and cleaned up, but we had to go out and do our review as to whether or not we felt it was a sufficient enough work effort to satisfy our needs. We have been asking for many years for an operations plan on how to maintain these ponds. We also expected the periodic maintenance reports that were supposed to be filled out every so often.

Chairman Paeprer asked when you were out to inspect it, was the work done to your satisfaction?

Ms. Porti replied no. At which time, she displayed pictures of the ponds that were taken on November 29, 2022 to the board members and went on to describe what was in the ponds, such as construction debris, weeds and rocks. She stated the Terrace Drive manhole is sinking for the last 3 years.

Mr. Franzetti stated Terrace Drive is a different bond that's being held. It is not part of lot #3 and Terrace Drive has its own bond.

A discussion ensued regarding as to where the catch basins are actually located (Terrace Drive).

Chairman Paeprer stated Terrace Drive is on our agenda tonight, but not for a public hearing. The public hearing is only for lot #3.

Ms. Porti stated Pulte has told us that they are not responsible for it and it has been turned back to the town. They have stopped paying for landscaping, snow removal and the lights were turned off on Terrace Drive, because they didn't pay the bill.

Mr. Frenkel asked Mr. Franzetti when did you do your inspection?

Mr. Franzetti replied November 9, 2022.

Mr. Frenkel asked did you find this when you were there?

Mr. Franzetti replied I don't remember seeing the pipes on there. He said the rock is there on purpose. It is part of a filtering mechanism. I will have to double check to make sure that was the way it was designed.

Chairman Paeprer said so the rock and silt fence act as filter.

Mr. Franzetti replied yes.

Ms. Porti continued and stated she sent the Town Engineer, Highway Superintendent and Counsel a copy of all of their reports that was done by Falcon Engineering.

Mr. Cote stated asked regarding lot #3 the only concern I heard only dealt with the ponds and the operations of the ponds.

Ms. Porti replied those are not the only issues. We have significant drainage issues throughout lot #3. We had to spend homeowners money to fix drainage problems in

backyards. We had to put underground pipes across Dickinson Road which is in lot #3 from the retaining wall towards the apartments.

Chairman Paeprer asked are these problems still current today?

Ms. Porti replied we spent homeowners money to fix it.

Mr. Frenkel asked is it fixed now?

Ms. Porti replied not all of the erosion and drainage under the grasses. Piping that needed to be done, we had to do it, because it was a safety issue.

Chairman Paeprer asked Mr. Franzetti is lot #3 on record for these other issues?

Mr. Franzetti stated we have been given reports from Falcon Engineering, we have reviewed and we provided them to Pulte. According to Pulte they have addressed them. Some of those are not part of the bondable issues. He stormwater ponds, roads and water and sewer are bondable. Grading is not typically bondable.

Ms. Porti stated there are no expansion joints where the sidewalks meet the granite belgium block that makes the frame work for the road on lot #4.

Chairman Paeprer asked has it caused any problems?

Ms. Porti replied it has caused tripping hazards. The design plan said the expansion joints which were part of the bond should be done throughout.

At which time, the board and Ms. Porti continued to discuss the expansion joints.

Chairman Paeprer asked have you submitted to the town specifics on the drainage issues?

Ms. Porti replied yes. It was specified in the two Falcon reports.

Mr. Frenkel asked what are the past issues that have been completed versus issues that are bondable that have not been completed?

Mr. Franzetti stated we inspected the site since 2018. When we first inspected it some of these issues may not have been a problem. The last remaining issue based on the public hearing from 2021 were the stormwater basins with overgrowth in them and who was responsible for them. Otherwise, I didn't see there was anything else going on at that time. We provided the applicant with the Falcon reports for them to address. According to the applicant they have addressed them. We have been doing inspections since 2018.

Mr. Frenkel stated I just want to know what's not done that is bondable.

Chairman Paeprer stated this public hearing has been open for a very long time. We would like to get all the feedback from everyone here tonight and adjust the bond accordingly. He said 2.5 million is a little excessive for this. He said I'm not going to return the entire bond to Pulte. We will return what we think is appropriate plus a little buffer.

Ms. Thomas stated it seems you are interested in what is still open so that the bond could be released. The question is will we be compensated for making these repairs that Pulte should have done.

Mr. Charbonneau stated that's not an issue for the Planning Board. That's an issue that you're going to have address with the HOA and Pulte. That is not an issue of the performance bond or an issue that this board should be concerned with. He stated the public hearing was opened on February 24, 2021. At that public hearing, there was a colloquy back and forth between the board, people that live at Pulte and Mr. Lynch. At the time, we had deferred and left the public hearing open to afford a further inspection. Those further inspections had occurred. It's my understanding, those issues were narrowed down to handful of stormwater basins essentially and we waiting for an update with respect to those stormwater basins which we now have, but Mr. Franzetti requires a further inspection. He said the board could vote to return the full bond or reduce and return a portion of the bond. They could leave the public hearing open for a period which would then have to consult with Mr. Franzetti on doing a further inspection, so we could draw this to a close. The bottom line is this has been opened for an inordinate amount of time and action needs to be taken. Litigation occurred with respect to this, between Pulte and the town between February 2021 and today. At some time, we have to draw this to a close.

Chairman Paeprer agreed with Mr. Charbonneau. He stated he would like to close the public hearing. He asked Mr. Franzetti what is a reasonable bond amount to hold on to.

Mr. Franzetti stated the board typically doesn't lower any bond less than 20% percent of the original bond, so we would be looking at \$500,000 to \$600,000. The remaining work for the stormwater ponds is likely less than that.

Chairman Paeprer stated I think we should hold more.

Mr. Alec Gladd of Cuddy Feder Law Firm, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated we would like some more clarification as to why you don't think the bond should be reduced. The public hearing has been open for two years, which is an unprecedented amount of time.

Mr. Charbonneau stated the public hearing was left open because your representative acceded to our wishes to leave it open pending a further inspection.

Chairman Paeprer stated I am recommending that we lower the bond.

Mr. Franzetti reiterated and said it's not less than 20% of the original bond which is about \$500,000 to \$600,000.

Mr. Gladd stated our understanding is all the work that needs to be done has been completed. All you would have to do is check the three quality water basins to confirm the work the has been done and what else is there?

Chairman Paeprer stated we want to confirm that items brought up tonight that are bondable have been addressed.

Mr. Gladd stated just the sidewalk issue.

Mr. Cote stated one of the residents also spoke about an issue with runoff that's effecting a roadway. That would be a bondable issue.

Chairman Paeprer stated I don't think this needs to be a long turn around. We could inspect the property, either it was done or wasn't done. I'm not returning the bond until we go out and inspect the property.

Mr. Michael Caruso of Cuddy and Feder Law Firm, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated our position is that the board has been very understanding, but two years is a long time on a public hearing. At some point it becomes incredibly difficult to pinpoint the source of some of the improvements that may have naturally degraded to a degree over the course of 10 years. An initial performance bond and where we are today it's getting very hard for the board and public to articulate what's the source. We have zeroed in with our consultants what basins and what work was targeted and what was done and we think that was adequate. He said we think we met the standards several times over and we hope that we could tie it up swiftly at this point.

Chairman Paeprer stated Mr. Franzetti inspected it on November 9th and your report said it was addressed. To Mr. Franzetti's credit he has been out there quite a few times.

A resident addressed the board and stated some of the structures that we are talking about are a lot less than 10 years. It's only been a couple of years old. One of the reasons this has dragged on was because of COVID and many times meetings were postponed or cancelled.

Chairman Paeprer stated we met through COVID whether it was Zoom or in person.

Mr. Charbonneau stated I could give a long list of reasons why there was a delay and COVID was not one of them.

Chairman Paeprer stated I think we should keep a \$750,000 bond. I will go and do a site visit with Mr. Franzetti.

Mr. Franzetti stated I should do an inspection and see if that number is realistic and advise the board accordingly. I could meet with Mr. Lynch and go through some of these issues and come back with a number.

Mr. Charbonneau stated you could close the public hearing tonight and put this on the next agenda, so Mr. Franzetti could do an inspection and report back to the board and the board can vote to either return or reduce the bond at the next meeting. Or you could leave the public hearing open for another two weeks and get Mr. Franzetti's report and continue to take feedback from the public at the public hearing. He said when we finished the meeting in February of 2021, there were a few items left to be dealt with. We're getting to the point where there seems to be colloquy about a lot more items than what was on the board's plate in February of 2021 and the board needs to be mindful of that.

Chairman Paeprer stated I also think it's time to close the public hearing. I want to make sure we hold enough money. We could close the public hearing and do a site visit with Mr. Franzetti and Mr. Lynch and come back in two weeks.

Mr. Charbonneau stated you could close the public hearing and have the secretary place it on the agenda in two weeks for a vote on the bond reduction or return.

Ms. Thomas stated I'm in support of reducing the bond because there were a lot of health and safety issues that the residents had to take care of immediately and not wait until Pulte came to fix them in Lot #3. Having said that there would have been a lot more issues open had the residents were not active in taking care of things.

At which time, Mr. Cote moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frenkel with all in favor.

LUBIC, MICHAEL – 310 BUCKSHOLLOW ROAD – TM – 76.9-1-22 – RESIDENTIAL SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant is proposing to legalize two studio apartments on the fourth floor of the existing multi-family dwelling on the corner of Buckshollow Rd. and Kennicut Hill Rd. in Mahopac.

- P.C.D.O.H. approval is necessary for this proposal.
- An Automatic Sprinkler System must be installed if this project is approved. The Architect wrote "The owner is agreeable to providing a sprinkler system for the two illegal apartments". Research needs to be done in the Building Code. I believe a sprinkler system is required throughout the entire building for the addition of the two units on the top floor. Check the Existing Building Code for guidance.
- The parking calculation is incorrect, there are 11 units, therefore, 22 p.s. are required.
- Use Variance is required from the ZBA for the expansion of a non-conforming use in the R-Residential Zoning District.
- The following area variance is required from the ZBA:
Lot area, 120,000 s.f. required, 80,275 s.f. exist, 39,725 s.f. variance needed.

Rich's memo said the application involves legalizing two (2) fourth floor studio apartments at the referenced property. Based upon review of the plans provided the Engineering Department offers the following preliminary comments:

- Updated drawing shows the installation of ~80' of new concrete curb and driveway
 - Details must be provided regarding the curbs.
 - All curbs, sidewalks, and asphalt should meet the specifications provided in the Town of Carmel Town Code. This should be noted on the drawing.
 - Provide all sight distance calculations.
 - Provide a driveway profile
 - 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 Town of Carmel Highway driveway permit may be required. The drawing must be referred to the Town of Carmel Highway Superintendent.
- The project should be referred to the Mahopac Fire Department

Applicant has indicated the project has been referred to the MFD.

- The referenced is not in a Town sewer or water district. It is unclear if the well and septic have sufficient capacity for these additional rooms and if the Putnam County Department has reviewed/approved these rooms.

Applicant has indicated that the PCDOH does not have information for this site. Applicant indicated they will hire a septic contractor to assess the existing system.

Applicant should note that information should be provided regarding the well and if the PCDOH requires sampling for a multi-family home.

Mr. Cleary stated the primary issue is the Use Variance that is required for this. The applicant did meet with the Highway Superintendent. The Kennicut Hill Road side of the property which was one large curb cut has now been modified to show a curb cut 60 feet up, approximately designed and that is a significant benefit to the traffic circulation into the site. He said the parking lot has been cleaned up and the dimensions were added to the

plan. The rear parking lot is proposed to be paved. That detail should be added to the plan. There are no stormwater management facilities on the site now. Is there any need to improve that condition because of the additional pavement in the back. The septic system is a significant issue. The applicant has indicated that they will assess the septic system to determine if there is adequate capacity. He said if the septic system can't accommodate additional units we have a problem on the site. He stated the applicant needs to clarify if there were any prior violations on the property.

Mr. Joel Greenberg of Architectural Visions, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated since the submission a couple of weeks ago, we had a certified septic contractor find out exactly what is on the property. The contractor has submitted a report today stating in his opinion the septic tank and the fields are enough for the 10 apartments. He also sent it to the Health Department. We recently met with the Highway Superintendent to discuss the curb cut and we came up with a better idea. At which, Mr. Greenberg pointed to the map to show the parking location and curb cut to make it a one-way traffic in and out. The pavement is already there and there is a little portion in the back (points to map) that is gravel and that will be paved and striped.

A discussion ensued regarding the proposed curb cut at the intersection which creates an unsafe condition.

Mr. Cleary stated the normal standard is at least 50 feet off the intersection for a driveway.

Mr. Greenberg stated this is what Mr. Simone is suggesting.

Mr. Cleary stated this is something the board will have to consider.

Mr. Franzetti stated you will need to show the garbage trucks will maneuver in there and not be impacted by parking.

Mr. Greenberg replied okay.

Chairman Paeprer asked about the sprinkler system.

Mr. Greenberg stated he will check the code.

Chairman Paeprer stated also please confirm that there are no code violations on the property.

Mr. Greenberg stated the only thing I'm aware of was a fire inspection for two apartments. The fire inspector has since inspected and it was approved.

Mr. Cote stated we have significant issues that need to be addressed. The issues are the sprinkler system, the access to the property and the septic system.

Mr. Franzetti recommended to Mr. Greenberg to meet with the consultants and the Highway Superintendent.

Mr. Carnazza stated to clarify the number of apartments on the drawing.

Chairman Paeprer said to take care of the issues and come back to the board.

NYCDEP WEST BRANCH AUXILIARY DAM – 34 DREWVILLE ROAD – TM – 65.-1-5 – SITE PLAN

Chairman Paeprer stated the applicant asked for adjournment due to potentially bad weather.

G & F SUBDIVISION – LOTS 5, 6 & 7 – 2054 ROUTE 6 - TM – 55.-2-24, 5, 6-1, 7-2 & 8-2 – RE-APPROVAL OF FINAL SUBDIVISION APPROVAL

The consultants had no comments.

Mr. Cote moved to grant re-approval of final subdivision approval for 180 days. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frenkel with all in favor.

PULTE HOMES OF NEW YORK, LLC – LOT 4 – TERRACE DRIVE - TM – 55.14-1-11.2 – BOND RETURN

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which state the applicant, per the attached January 13, 2023 letter has requested that the bond for the referenced project be released. the original bond amount for the project was \$4,196,105.50. The bond was reduced to \$839,220.90 (20% or the original bond amount), by town board resolution dated December 19, 2012. The Town of Carmel Engineering Department has performed numerous site visits with the most recent being January 2023. The Board should note that applicant in their letter indicates that they believe that the punch list items in the Town's letters have been addressed. The Town had provided the attached February 3, 2020 memorandum summarizing site deficiencies and Pulte provided the attached January 4, 2021 response. The work at Lot 4 is not yet complete as identified in the list of deficiencies/concerns. It is suggested that a representative from Pulte meet with this Department to finalize these remaining issues. At this time, we recommend that the bonds amount of \$839,220.90 be retained by the Town until these matters are addressed.

List of Deficiencies Lot 4 Pulte Homes

- **Leader Drains**
 - Regarding surcharge issues, provide plan as-built of corrective issues. Notify town of construction schedule for performing repairs.

The as-builts have not been provided. However, the board should note that there have not been any recent complaints.

- **Sidewalks and Granite Curbs**
 - The open joint between the sidewalk and retaining wall (at clubhouse) needs about 20 feet of caulk.
 - The sidewalk heading down Blair from unit #19 has several gaps that have opened up in three locations. The gaps range from 2 inches to ¾ in. Replace slabs to eliminate gaps.

The applicant has simply installing concrete in the two (2) inch joint and did not replace the slabs as directed.

- **Roads**

- Replace damaged paving stones in cul-de-sac on Langdon Grove.

This area still needs to be repaired. Applicant states it is a maintenance issues, however it is part of the bond that will need to be returned.

Mr. Cleary had no comments.

Mr. Paul Lynch of Putnam Engineering, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated he would like a copy of Mr. Franzetti's memo so we could go back and look at it.

Mr. Franzetti recommended to Mr. Lynch since we are doing an inspection on Lot 3 and we should also do Lot 4 and 5 at the same time.

Mr. Michael Caruso of Cuddy & Feder Law Firm addressed the board and stated the bond reduction was in 2012. Some of these issues are maintenance issues. They weren't initial installment issues. He said we have a HOA that believes its maintenance obligations should always be Pulte's. He said we would like to bring this to closure.

Chairman Paepre stated I don't disagree. We need to bring this to closure, but we will be doing a site visit in the next couple of weeks, so give us a little more time.

Mr. Caruso stated we appreciate the board going out and doing this and the consultants have been talking with us regularly.

PULTE HOMES OF NEW YORK, LLC – LOT 5 – TERRACE DRIVE - TM – 55.14-1-11.3 – BOND RETURN

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the applicant, per the attached January 13, 2023 letter has requested that the bond for the referenced project be released. The board should note that the original bond for lot 5 was \$872,660.75. This bond amount has not been reduced. The Town of Carmel Engineering Department has performed numerous site visits (April, May, July, and December of 2018, August, September 2019, May 2020 and more recently January 2023 to inspect this site. The Board should note that applicant in their letter indicated that the punch list items in the Town's letters have been addressed, however based on our inspections we have determined that the work at Lot 5 is not yet complete as identified in the list of deficiencies/concerns below:

- **Sidewalks, Walking Path and Granite Curbs**

- Repair washed out pathways.
- Finalize paving of walking path

The Board should note that the paving of the pathways has been a matter of discussion starting in **2016**. Pulte has paved a majority of the walking paths with the exception of an area in Lot 5. The Engineering Department in the attached November 30, 2017 letter advised the applicant that the proposed partial pavement will create a maintenance problem and a tripping hazard at the transition between pavement to stone and that Pulte should consider paving the entire length of the paths. Attached is a June 25, 2018 letter from Pulte

indicating that they will pave the pathways will approval of a change to the stormwater pollution prevent in plan (SWPPP) from the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP). Attached is the September 28, 2018 approval letter from the NYCDEP which does not approve gravel paths within 100 feet of any water course. This section of the path may require a waiver from the NYCDEP. The applicant did provide an Engineering report to the NYCDEP. Attached are pictures of the walking path as taken during the recent site visit performed by this Department. The trail has not been maintained and potentially could pose a tripping hazard when in use. It is unclear if this waiver has been applied for by the applicant. The NYCDEP updated the watershed rules and regulations in 2019 and have eliminated the hardship requirement. If not, this Department recommends that such application be made by the applicant.

Mr. Carnazza asked how unmaintained are the walkways/pathways? He said that's an amenity and it needs to be maintained as per site plan approval.

Mr. Caruso said that's going to be a HOA issue. He said with the transition of control with the board which has happened years ago and the completion of all the build outs, the last C'O's and sale of all the units, Pulte is not control of those maintenance items. The HOA has to come forward and account for where their funds are being appropriated.

Mr. Charbonneau asked Mr. Caruso to provide documentation of that to the board.

Mr. Caruso replied yes.

Chairman Paeprer stated we will visit all three lots.

TOWN OF CARMEL COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN AND ZONING CODE DRAFT – DISCUSSION

Mr. Cleary stated I'll give the board the written commentary of what we have been doing that and you could edit that. As soon as we finish it, I'll send it to the Town Board.

Chairman Paeprer said we should read ahead.

Mr. Cleary replied yes. He said a lot of the administrative items are dictated by the state legislation, so we don't have a lot of lead way in certain areas. He said look at Planning Board procedures.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding signs. Mr. Carnazza stated he included good suggestions at signs in windows, etc.

Mr. Nuculovic moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta