

APPROVED

HAROLD GARY
Chairman

CRAIG PAEPRER
Vice-Chair

BOARD MEMBERS
CARL GREENWOOD
ANTHONY GIANNICO
DAVE FURFARO
CARL STONE
KIM KUGLER

TOWN OF CARMEL **PLANNING BOARD**



60 McAlpin Avenue
Mahopac, New York 10541
Tel. (845) 628-1500 – Ext.190
www.ci.carmelny.ny.us

MICHAEL CARNAZZA
*Director of Code
Enforcement*

RICHARD FRANZETTI, P.E.
Town Engineer

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

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES **DECEMBER 9, 2015**

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN, HAROLD GARY, VICE-CHAIR, CRAIG PAEPRER, ANTHONY GIANNICO, CARL STONE, KIM KUGLER, CARL GREENWOOD, DAVE FURFARO

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
Hillside Court	55.6-1-51	1	Bond Return	Public Hearing Closed & Bond Return Recommended to Town Board.
PCSB/Mahopac Branch	86.11-1-1	1-4	Site Plan	Public Hearing Scheduled.
Route 6 Retail Lot 2	86.11-1-1	4-5	Site Plan	Public Hearing Scheduled.
Lake Plaza Shopping Center LLC (Proposed Stop & Shop)	65.10-1-45&46	5-19	Amended Site Plan	Lead Agency Declared.
Old Forge Estates	75.15-1-19-40	19-23	Re-Approval	Re-Approval Granted for 6 months.
Minutes- 07/08/15, 07/22/15, 08/05/15, 08/26/15, 09/16/15, 09/30/15 & 10/14/15				Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:08p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

HILLSIDE COURT – 1819 ROUTE 6, CARMEL NY – TM – 55.6-1-51 – PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Franzetti said the engineering department does not have an objection to returning the bond.

Mr. Cleary said he has no issues with the bond return.

Mr. Gary said this is an open public hearing on Hillside Court, does anyone in the audience wish to be heard.

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

Mr. Paepre moved to recommend bond return to the Town Board. The motion was seconded by Mr. Giannico with all in favor.

PCSB/MAHOPAC BRANCH LOT 1 –150 ROUTE 6 – TM –86.11-1-1– SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza said all necessary variances were granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals and are noted on the plat, all my zoning comments have been addressed.

Mr. Franzetti said there are still comments that need to be addressed with this document and submittal, I recommend the applicants representative come in to talk about this. I know that the project is in front of the NYCDEP for storm water approvals so they still have some time before they get their approval.

Mr. Cleary said this was before us in early August and we sent it to the zoning board, they received their variances, and at the end of August it was sent to the ECB. The plan has been modified to eliminate the wetland boundary encroachment that existed previously at the request of the ECB. At the last meeting the applicant addressed a host of issues and the next step is to schedule a public hearing.

Mr. Matt Gironda of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant asked the board if they had any questions.

Mr. Giannico asked to show the changes that were made as a result of the ECB.

Mr. Gironda said all disturbances within the wetland buffer for the DEC wetlands adjacent area has been removed from the plan. There was previously preliminary storm water basins shown within the buffer, all disturbances were removed to propose infiltration systems for each building under the parking. There is an infiltration system proposed under the Route 6 Retail parking area and an infiltration system proposed under both sides of the PCSB

parking lot. This will handle all storm water runoff generated by all of the proposed impervious surfaces and eliminating any disturbances within the buffer.

Mr. Stone asked if there was a shared system between the two.

Mr. Girona said yes there is a shared system, a portion of runoff from the storm water from the building and a portion of the parking lot will be treated on an infiltration system under the parking lot for Route 6. A portion of the parking for Route 6 retail will be conveyed and directed through a storm water treatment system underneath the parking for PCSB, all of the runoff from PCSB will be treated under their parking lot.

Mr. Carnazza said we are going to need cross easements for that.

Mr. Girona said yes.

Mr. Franzetti said one of his major comments is that the applicant keeps submitting their documents referring to another drawing; the comment from the engineering department is I need this to be a stand-alone document for each site.

Mr. Furfaro asked if that was in relation to the storm water.

Mr. Franzetti said yes storm water and sewer.

Mr. Girona said there is a portion of the storm water conveyance system for PCSB, that handles runoff from the adjacent 6 Retail Lot, the storm water generated by Route 6 Retail will be captured and conveyed through the system into the subsurface infiltration system under the PCSB parking lot. The remaining portion of the parking lot will be captured in the catch basins conveyed into the infiltration system on the Route 6 lot. There is a portion of utilities that are relevant for both projects; there is a reference to more details on the information provided on the site plan, there are improvements that are relevant to be shown on both drawings.

Mr. Cleary said as Mr. Franzetti indicated, everything that they are committing to on the adjacent property should be on a separate site plan. All of the documents relating to the adjacent property and storm water improvements need to be separate drawings.

Mr. Girona said the improvements that are relevant to be shown on this site, that capture and convey storm water to PCSB are shown on the plan including all of the details. All this is is a typical catch basin and drainage pipes which are on both sets of drawings.

Mr. Franzetti said there is also the sanitary piece of it, all the drawings that were shown to me say refer to site plan for Route 6 Retail. That should not be there, everything that impacts this site should be shown on each separate drawing, so when someone looks back on this it is in its own file and we don't have to search for the second file adjacent to it. One aspect is the sanitary drawing; he asked if they have the sanitary drawings.

Mr. Gironda said those are going to be submitted to the Putnam County Health department, the details and locations of the tanks will be included on the septic drawings.

Mr. Franzetti said it shows that the force main is on this drawing which will be fed in through the septic for both sites.

Mr. Gironda said that it is actually two separate septic systems for one location.

Mr. Franzetti said I did not get that out of the drawings that were submitted.

Mr. Gironda said we can provide inverts on these structures that capture storm water and convey it to the PCSB site so if someone is looking at this drawing they may understand the elevations relative to the structures that need to be constructed.

Mr. Carnazza said what Mr. Franzetti is saying is to include all the information for both project.

Mr. Gironda said the information is relevant to both sites.

Mr. Greenwood said anything that relates to the site and is done at a different site has to be included in the same site plan.

Mr. Gironda said for clarity what we did was lay back the proposed site plan improvements and being that these are two separate applications.....

Mr. Greenwood said but they are not because they are combined now with the improvements that you are putting there that affect both sites.

Mr. Carnazza said they are separate with zoning but put all the information on each of the site plans for sanitary and drainage runoff just so everything is there.

Mr. Gironda said easily addressed, there will be no layout changes.

Mr. Greenwood said you have already drawn it all you just need to merge them together.

Chairman Gary asked the board if they had any other concerns.

Mr. Cleary said the next step is a public hearing, provided the applicant can do what Mr. Franzetti has required him to do; I don't have a problem scheduling the public hearing, if it's not submitted in time we will have to adjourn the public hearing.

Mr. Franzetti said it is the board's decision but this is still going to need NYCDEP approval process so that may or may not change what is going on with the site, I am okay with it going to a public hearing.

Mr. Charbonneau said the next meeting is going to be in January, which gives them more than enough time to have that done and we can always leave the public hearing open if necessary.

Mr. Franzetti said he doesn't have a problem with a public hearing; ultimately these issues do have to be addressed.

Chairman Gary said okay we will schedule a public hearing for the next meeting but beware of the points that will come up so they can be addressed.

ROUTE 6 RETAIL LOT 2 – 150 ROUTE 6 – TM – 86.11-1-1 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza said all of his zoning comments have been addressed.

Mr. Franzetti said he has the same set of comments that I had on the prior submission, there are references to the other site plan that need to be addressed. The applicant is still in front of the NYCDEP and having there process reviewed, I recommend the applicants representative come in to discuss and clear up the issues.

Mr. Cleary said at the last meeting the applicant addressed most of your initial comments; you raised a few concerns and asked them to do some additional work. First was to demonstrate the grading connection of the driveway that goes around to the Koehler center in the back, which is provided. They have amended there traffic study to include the Koehler center traffic generation, which is included in the packet as well as the rendering of the projects.

Chairman Gary asked if they can point that out on the map.

Mr. Gironda said the applicant is intending to provide an easement to allow the Koehler center the right to construct the driveway connecting the two at the time they feel necessary.

Mr. Gironda said yes, at the time this is constructed proper permitting and storm water design will have to go through the necessary approvals, the intention right now is to provide an easement to provide them the right to construct this access.

Mr. Furfaro said so this is something the Koehler center would do, he then asked if it is part of the project.

Mr. Gironda said no if they wanted to have access in the future, they would be able to do it.

Mr. Franzetti said that will need to be discussed as well when you come in to review everything. It's not a matter of an easement it would be a matter of segmenting according to NYS Law and DEC.

Mr. Cleary said the driveway wasn't part of the plan at the moment, it was a discussion with the Koehler center, that there might be a desire to make this connection in the future because of the proposed signal light. The Koehler center isn't proposing this at the moment it is a potential future improvement.

Chairman Gary asked what will happen once the Koehler center wants to build the driveway.

Mr. Cleary said the easement would have to be a condition of this approval whether they build the driveway or not. They have submitted a grading plan that shows that the driveway can be constructed around the back.

Chairman Gary said that means they are doing it properly.

Mr. Cleary said this is ready for a public hearing.

Mr. Franzetti said he has no problem with scheduling the public hearing as long as they come in to discuss the application.

Chairman Gary said to schedule the public hearing.

**LAKE PLAZA SHOPPING CENTER, LLC (PROPOSED STOP&SHOP) – 983-1005 ROUTE 6–
TM – 65.10-1-45&46 – AMENDED SITE PLAN**

Mr. Carnazza said they are proposing an addition to the existing design shopping center, the name of the town on the parking summary needs to be changed to Carmel, it's Mahopac now. The note with the asterick is incorrect, they have it down as 9 x 18 and the Town of Carmel regulation is 10 x 20 so that has to be changed over because there was a variance that was already granted for that. He said he needs to know what is in the utility building and the total floor area of all the buildings. The restaurant should not be on the parking calculation; you can remove the restaurant and put that as part of the design shopping center. They need to provide a list of all the variances underneath the zoning table that were granted. Also they need details of all the signage for all of the uses on the site and I would like to meet with the engineer to discuss the submission.

Mr. Franzetti said this board should be aware that this application involves the renovation and expansion of the Lake Plaza shopping center, there is 4.8 acres of disturbance in total according to the plans that were provided. The engineering departments comments are as follows referrals are needed from the NYS DEC for storm water and wetlands, NYS DOT, NYC DEP for storm water, Putnam County Department of Health, Town of Carmel ECB Board and Mahopac Fire Department. The applicant acknowledged that they will look for these in the submittal. Permits would be needed from the State for storm water and wetlands, DOT for work permit and traffic study, DEP for storm water and Putnam County for well and sanitation. Wetland mappings and delineations provided need to be verified by the State and the Town of Carmel wetlands inspector. All plantings should be approved by

the wetlands inspector, the storm water pollution prevention plan has been provided but it is recommended that the applicant meets with the NYCDEP with regards to the SWPPP. The applicant will need to provide a water and wastewater report, it is potential that increased waste water flows will need approval from the NYCDEP. All easements, water, sewer and storm water should be provided. The traffic study should be reviewed and approved by the NYSDOT and the Town of Carmel Highway. The applicant will be required to supply a storm water maintenance agreement and guarantee per Town Code. Any public improvements deemed necessary for the development performance and associated engineering fee will be required. I have a host of more detailed comments which I will email to the applicants engineer and I recommend you come in so we can talk.

Mr. Cleary said this is a beneficial application; it is a Stop & Shop application that they are adding to this shopping center. It requires an expansion at the north end of the property; the building will be expanded to the north and rear for the new Stop & Shop. In addition the owners of the shopping center are going to re-façade the entire shopping center and re-do the entire parking lot. It is an improvement to the center and we have an opportunity to make it better so this is overall beneficial to the site. This is considered a design shopping center in our zoning code and there are criteria that apply to these types of applications and the applicant has made an effort to address some of those. Most of my comments are fairly minor and relate to the layout of the parking area, my biggest concern is adding the square footage and trying to address there parking requirement, they have added new parking to the site. Some of which is in the northern end of the parking lot on the driveway that goes out to Baldwin Lane. They have also added designated parking spaces in the rear of the shopping center, by their loading area in the back that exists today; they are going to establish some of their required parking in that area. While they are doing that to achieve the parking compliance number, it is not clear that those spaces are particularly customer friendly, if you park in the back you would have to walk around the entire building to get to the front. They are providing walkways and painted isles to get around the building but it is not particularly a convenient place to park. It would be preferable to put the employee parking in the back because if it is public customer spaces we need to look at the practicality of that. There might be options because they are eliminating the retail space next to the supermarket today, so there may be an opportunity to create a pedestrian connection through the building to get to the rear. The primary concern with respect to the layout of the parking lot is moving the customers around the site. Most of the other issues are minor related site plan issues and clarifications. One point I would like to raise is the Town is in the process of bringing in an architectural consultant to support our board and the work we do. This is precisely the kind of application where we would want such an expert to help us with; they are redesigning the façade for the entire facility. Hopefully the timing of that will work out so that individual can be on board to help us with this application.

Chairman Gary asked if the building is being expanded to the north and west.

Mr. Cleary said it's to the north going up towards Carmel and to the East in the back of the building by the wetland area. There is a slight wetland encroachment required as a result of the stream in the back of the property.

Chairman Gary asked if it will affect the entire parking lot and inside site with the drainage.

Mr. Cleary said yes, they will actually rebuild the northern end and resurfacing the southern end. The entire parking lot is going to be re-done which will effect there drainage, it is an old facility so we don't know what is there today and how effective the drainage is.

Chairman Gary said there is something on that drainage that comes up every couple years.

Mr. Franzetti said yes there is an existing storm water facility in the front that is part of a regulatory program by the DEP.

Mr. Paepre asked Mr. Cleary if Kmart is excluded from the façade.

Mr. Cleary said yes, Kmart has its own deal with respect to what its building will look like, so they will not be renovating the Kmart façade.

Chairman Gary said so Kmart will stay the same.

Mr. Cleary said yes but again the renovation to the rest of the façade to the entire shopping center is a significant opportunity for us.

Mr. Paepre said when you say façade do you mean just the front or does it wrap around to the rear also.

Mr. Cleary said here is another issue, if the rear of the building is a public side to the building now, they will need to deal with that. I made comments about perhaps providing access doors to the rear of the building because if they are we want the tail end of those buildings to be included as well. I don't know what their proposals are but I'm sure they will share them with us this evening.

Mrs. Geraldine Tortorella, applicant's attorney appeared before the board. She said present with her is Mike Junghans and John Canny, engineers with VHB in White Plains and they are providing site civil and traffic transportation engineering for us. Robert Heidenberg and Pablo Derius from Heidenberg Properties group who are also here on behalf of Lake Plaza Associates and Deborah Far who is the director of Real Estate for Stop & Shop's parent company. We brought a group with us this evening because we are very excited for this project and we want to share the work that we have been devoting to it for a very long time. It is very important for us to get going to work with your board and the other boards to move forward in a cooperative manor so that we can reinvent this shopping center. The design of the shopping center has been guided by two principles and two objectives in order to achieve the redevelopment in an environmentally sensitive and respectful way. The first principle we have been guided by as we have been working with it is to contain our new building from which we are doing an expansion involving demolition of the existing building and rebuilding that space. We are looking to contain it all on the north side of the building where a prior iteration of this board has previously granted approvals for expansions in the past on at

least three separate occasions. We are trying to work within areas that the board has already studied and has been familiar and comfortable with allowing development in the past. The second thing we have been looking to do is to employ sustainable practices and green technology in the development. Stop & Shop is on the leading edge of supermarkets and our client, Heidenberg Properties agreed and wants to partner with Stop & Shop in order to bring in that kind of technology and sustainable practices to the redevelopment of this shopping center. Those principle ideas have been guiding the design that you will hear about tonight and we are very open to speaking and working with your architectural consultant in order to arrive at something that will present a very nice appearance for the shopping center. We require site plan approval from your board and approval of the storm water pollution prevention plan as was mentioned. We also require a wetland permit from the ECB Board for a small amount of unavoidable disturbance on the north side wetlands. We have talked to DEC and they have confirmed our delineation and we do not have any disturbance to the DEC regulated wetland buffer area so we do not anticipate needing a DEC wetland permit. We will require variances from the Zoning Board of the Appeals; this site has been before the Zoning Board a number of times in the past for parking space size and number of parking spaces. We have new parking but we are going to keep the same size of the parking spaces that have already been approved at 9 x 19. We will be looking for a variance for the size and a variance for the number of parking spaces. She said we have done a parking analysis study to support our belief that there is plenty of parking on the site. We need DEC approvals with storm water, we need DEP approvals and Putnam County department of health, and we are not going to be making any changes to the driveway entrances so I don't think we will need department of transportation approvals but if there is we would take a look at that.

Mr. Junghans addressed the board and stated he is the civil engineer on this project and he wants to give a quick overview on what we are proposing here and how we are going to do it. As mentioned what is proposed is the addition of a new Stop & Shop on the north end of the center, what is there today is a 24,000 square foot Key Food and 7,800 square foot CVS in this area. We will be taking both of those down and putting up a new 53,000 square foot Stop & Shop. The new tenant space will be 3,785 square feet. The layout of this will keep the same access points that are there today, and we will generally have the same pattern coming into the site. The shaded area here shows the disturbance that we are going to do to the site which is where we would take the pavement out fully to do our utility work. As far as the remainder of the site we are proposing additional improvements which will be the addition of valance, as you probably know it is all asphalt, there is no delineation and there is no good channelization of traffic. We are going to add along the frontage here islands and landscapes to provide a little channelization and green space to give it a much nicer look. We are also, for the balance of the center, proposing new lighting and resurfacing of all of it. Yes, we are going to be pushing the parking to the north to add additional parking to maintain the buffer of Baldwin Lane, we are leaving about 30 feet which is over and above the required setback. As you go back along the Stop & Shop this northerly line is right inside the existing pavement line so we are not increasing the encroachment to the wetlands area here but we are pushing back. We are cutting a wall in here because when you go to the back of the site the grade rises, this will actually be a nice area for loading when we are done. We are also moving the loading docks to the opposite side of the building; these will

be sealed loading docks to keep all of the noise inside. Also, the wall is going to act as an additional buffer that is going to be 7 to 8 feet which will keep it even quieter for the neighbors. The compactor in the back is also a sealed compactor which is loaded by a shoot from inside the loading dock so there is no external garbage that is being thrown in. So from a buffering to the neighbors, this is a much better layout then what you have out there today. It was also mentioned that we are redoing the parking in the back here, people do parking back there today but what we are proposing is to formalize the parking. We want to add in a spin circle for the trucks in the back of the site we are formalizing it so we can make good use out of that space. The space in the back we are primarily making for employee parking which will make sense because you don't want customers walking all the way around the building. For the most part the circulation stays the same on the site; as far as pedestrians go we did provide the pedestrian circulations.

Mr. Paepre asked if there would be any rear entrances for the employees.

Mr. Junghans said there are rear entrances in all of these stores, I can't speak for the tenants but there are access points from the proposed Stop & Shop.

Mr. Paepre said so the rear entrances are just for the employees.

Mrs. Tortorella said yes.

Mr. Junghans said another important point is that we are going to be upgrading handicapped spaces and re-doing the grading as far as the standards are concerned.

Mr. Carnazza asked about curb cuts onto the sidewalks.

Mr. Junghans said yes instead of asphalt lumps. This shows the grading and the drainage for the site as mentioned this site has a lot of drainage on it today because there are several systems out here which were placed to do compensation for pollution removal for other parts of the town. When we designed ours, we look at it independently for the additional impervious were adding and provided our own sets of treatments here. We are going to feed into that system but all of our water will be detained and treated so when we outflow into that existing system, we will have the same characteristics that we have today. The grading is just flattening out the parking lot in front of the Stop & Shop, it is a little steep today and obviously a use with shopping carts needs to be as flat as possible. We will be dropping the slope a couple percent to give you a better front door and cart control.

Mr. Furfaro asked Mr. Carnazza if there are some drainage issues from the neighbors with the front of the shopping center.

Mr. Carnazza said no not from here.

Mr. Giannico said that parking lot is in really bad shape right now.

Mr. Junghans said everything inside this dashed line is all new and everything over the other way we will do repairs. We will do the whole surface coat on at once so it looks completely flat all the way around.

Mr. Giannico asked for him to point out the access road to the parking lot between Valvoline and Dunkin Donuts. That area immediately into the parking lot and going north south is where it gets a lot of retention and water.

Mr. Carnazza said that is where they pile the snow too.

Mr. Junghans said that is something we will have to deal with and obviously we are doing a bit of digging so we will redo that whole area anyway. But again the grading is just limited to the Stop & Shop area but during construction we will have to keep it open and phase it because we have to maintain access to everyone in the back. I actually have the utility plan here; I just wanted to explain a little better onto how the trucks work. We actually kept the trucks in the same alignments as they are in today so they didn't get any closer to Baldwin Lane, we aren't going to have any additional noise issues, they come off Route 6 and enter into the back and turn around to exit the same way. We also show on here the pedestrian movements in the back to offset the parking.

Mr. Furfaro asked if it was painted in the back.

Mr. Junghans said correct, we are not changing it or altering it, we are just going to resurface this and we will add this. The only real changes we are making are consolidating those two compactors into a better location.

Mr. Furfaro said you have a bunch of containers back there too.

Mr. Carnazza said that is for seasonal storage.

Mr. Cleary said just to be clear there are no storage containers shown on the new plan so they are telling us that they will be eliminated.

Mr. Junghans said we have more loading docks here too, we have three loading docks where there are two now. The last thing I wanted to show is the landscape plan to show what we are adding. We are relighting the entire center in LED which will be the lower energy choice and they have very sharp cut offs. We are using the same size poles that are out there today will a 3 foot base, but we will be adding a few more poles to increase the level of safety. We are able to keep a nice distribution of lights throughout the whole center; we relit everything out to the main entrance and also added lighting to the back to have an even distribution pattern instead of one big light.

Mr. Carnazza asked if they exceed the one lumen at the property line.

Mr. Junghans said yes we do right by the entrance but we figured the entrance would need a little extra lighting.

Mr. Cleary said we will take a look at that.

Mr. Furfaro said it is mostly residential behind the shopping center.

Mr. Giannico said yes but there is a barrier of tall trees along the opposite side.

At which time, a discussion ensued about the trees, residents and lighting.

Mr. Junghans said as you can see in the islands we are proposing in front, we are adding two stories of landscaping with ornamentals, shade trees and 2 level shrub plantings at the base of the islands. We are expanding one island and adding landscaping to move the circulation of traffic out. We are also doing infilling adjacent to this, we will propose to do the infilling based on what the final condition is.

Mr. Furfaro asked if he is talking about the big island by the car wash.

Mr. Junghans said yes.

Mr. Furfaro said so you are going to clean up the traffic pattern in there because it is confusing.

Mr. Junghans said yes it will get much cleaner and we will square it all up.

Mr. Cleary said one of those has a concrete medium and if you can consider doing some plantings on that so the boulevard is more attractive on your way in.

Mrs. Tortorella said we are proposing to beautify the sign by adding a nice, attractive, durable veneer so it looks nicer and less of an invitation for people to hang things there.

Chairman Gary said when Key Food was presented to the board we spent a lot of time on trying to get another light in the back behind Key Food and we had a hard time doing that but the reasoning was so the trucks wouldn't go on Baldwin Lane to get to Route 6.

Mr. Junghans said we have actually opened this up and made this a much easier movement.

Chairman Gary said they went ahead and fixed this so trucks could not go through there, about 5 years later we noticed there is an isle that the trucks can swing around and go out through there. Today you have a circle (triangle) in there which allows the trucks to go out to Baldwin Lane; we would like you to not allow the trucks to make that turn, it is a hazard. Also, you said you are putting a curb over by where the bank is there is a slight grade, so how are you going to get the grade out.

Mr. Junghans said that's why we widened this because we will be pulling these grades out to make it flatter and we are doing a grade change in the island so this will have a little slope to it.

Mr. Carnazza asked if it will act as a retaining wall.

Mr. Junghans said yes which will allow us to flatten it out.

Chairman Gary said also, all the way to the south by Kmart looks terrible, since you're putting a lot of financing into this you should really fix everything up to enhance the whole property.

Mr. Junghans said we are proposing to do that.

Mr. Furfaro said the guard rail in there looks terrible so if you do some landscaping in there as well it will soften the edge.

Mr. Greenwood said originally it was a drive in Movie Theater and I believe some of the bumps are still there in the parking lot from that. Everything looks really nice on the north end but for the majority of the Plaza should be fixed also because one end will look nice and the rest will be uneven and bumpy all the way through. He said it's like a wave going from one end to the other.

Mr. Carnazza said the smoother you make it the faster people drive through it.

Mr. Greenwood said but once you fix the north end, the south end will look even worse than it is; the whole parking lot needs to be fixed. The entire plaza should be incorporated with the same details, if you're going through the process of doing 3/4 of the plaza there is no reason the entire thing shouldn't be done.

Mr. Furfaro said you really have to look at that whole side; it definitely needs to be cleaned up.

Chairman Gary said on paper people always say they're going to do something and don't end up doing it so we are going to watch this closely this time. You are not supposed to drive out of the plaza through where Dunkin Donuts is to get out to Route 6, but so many people do it anyway. You need to look at directing this traffic with one lane in, there should be another way to re-route traffic from not getting to Route 6 through there.

At which time, a discussion ensued about the Dunkin Donuts entrance into the plaza and exit onto Route 6.

Mrs. Tortorella said we know that as we do the resurfacing of the southern half of this shopping center there may be areas where we have to work out the grade and when we get there I am fully expecting us to do that. But it is a big under take to completely reconstruct that end of the shopping center; I don't have complete flexibility as a whole over the façade

of Kmart. I understand that it is not efficient to do part of the job but it is not necessarily something that we can control, we will take it back to our client and discuss it. One comment you made was about the condition down in the corner with drainage and there is a drainage easement there for underground facilities so we will not be interfering with it at all.

Mr. Furfaro stated I know there was some drainage issues at the rear of these buildings off Route 6 but has nothing to do with the shopping center.

Mr. Carnazza said there is a stream there that fills and doesn't run off.

Mr. Franzetti said if you were to look at the NYSDEC wetlands map, it shows how the wetland goes all the way across and in front.

Mrs. Tortorella said we might need to provide more documentation to support what we are trying to do.

Mr. Furfaro said he thinks you should introduce some landscape buffer on the other side to make it look a little better with curbs and some simple things.

Mr. Giannico said with the planting islands on the east and west side of the parking lot as it runs north to south, why don't you make your islands run east and west through the whole parking lot.

Mr. Carnazza said then you will be eliminating a lot of parking spaces.

Mr. Giannico said I think it would be feasible and preferable.

Mr. Junghans said the issue with that are the snow plows.

Mr. Giannico said I would like it to be considered, the plow trucks can go east to west instead of plowing north to south.

Mr. Stone asked about the lighting.

Mr. Junghans said they are going to be LED in boxes so the source will be up in the box.

Mr. Stone asked if they were using flat lens, we are trying to eliminate everything from offsite visibility and also the poles are really high, can they be lowered at all?

Mr. Junghans said the problem with that is we would have to increase the amount of poles, 25 poles for a shopping center with a foot base is pretty modest so we are trying to keep a low amount.

Mr. Stone said there is limited light behind the building now and if you are adding significant light there are homes right up the hill that look down at this whole thing.

Mr. Junghans said we could look into switching some lights off after a certain hour.

Mr. Stone asked about the area that goes to Baldwin Lane because he is concerned about traffic coming in off Baldwin Lane and someone stops to make the closer left and someone comes in behind them, is there a way to eliminate that.

Mr. Junghans said we could take a look at that.

Mr. Stone asked if the tree line to the north would be lost.

Mr. Carnazza said no it will be enhanced.

Mr. Stone said it looks like an offset distance to that corner of the parking lot, he then asked if that is a variance he needed.

Mr. Junghans said no that is 30.4 feet that is more than it needs to be.

Mr. Stone asked about the rear of the building. You mentioned there is a buffer between the parking spaces and the rear of the building. There are all those access doors for the smaller stores.

Mr. Junghans said it is just a striped area that allows the doors to swing and doesn't get the cars in the way.

Mr. Stone said they also have things delivered by trucks, should something be provided for their trucks.

Mr. Junghans said most of those are small box trucks and curb side which should be easy to accommodate.

Mr. Stone asked who the compactors in the back of the stores are.

Mr. Junghans said they are going to remain.

Mr. Stone asked if the façade is significantly taller than the existing building.

Mr. Junghans said it is comparable to what is there today.

Mr. Stone said what I see from the renderings is it is contemporary, I'm wondering if that is in keeping with the towns desire to move towards a more traditional look like the Southbury Mall. You also mentioned the storm water is going to the existing structure; but is there a volume issue with the existing system.

Mrs. Tortorella said it is connecting to the existing system but it is being detained first.

Mr. Stone said he will leave it up to the town engineer to get the details.

Mrs. Tortorella said we have two aspects of this, we have the Stop & Shop façade which we will talk about first and then we have the façade for the balance of the building.

Ms. Debra Far with Stop & Shop addressed the board and stated the façade that you see here is actually our brand new prototype façade, and it will be the very first one built company wide. This is a product of the initiative that we started years ago in trying to reduce our carbon footprint and sustainability is very important to us as a company. We see ourselves as supermarkets with the heart of the community; we have a responsibility to that community, not only in the products that we sell but how we operate and build our stores. The store that you see here today is recycled material that will withstand the test of time, it requires very little maintenance and it always looks good which is very important. The steel used is also recycled steel and the design is a very modern and clean look that we have seen in a lot of other retailers. The store itself has gotten to an 18.6% reduction in our carbon footprint and our goal is to be 20% reduced by 2020. The equipment that we use inside of the building is also very energy efficient and we have been able to reduce the amount of energy by almost 43 million kilowatts. The refrigeration system we use is now ecofriendly and the delivery trucks use a natural gas power. We take the responsibility for the environment very seriously; I think the biggest thing for the building in the design is it will be lead certified. The building is being designed by lead architects and it is very important to us to maintain the lead certifications.

Mr. Cleary asked how much flexibility they have being that it is a brand new building design. He said this board is in the process of retaining an architectural consultant to help us deal with these issues, is there an ability to be flexible to address that or will this be the best you will do and you won't make changes?

Ms. Far said it depends on what the changes are, if they want to turn it into a completely different building then I think that is something we need to talk about. Then you would be taking away all of the goals and the incentives with the materials and the designs of the aesthetics.

Mr. Cleary said it may be something different because our Town Board has tried to establish some general goals with respect to the architectural character of the Town and it's not a modern town we are more traditional. There might be a little discussion about this aspect of it and it is useful to know your willingness to engage in that type of conversation.

Ms. Far said I think we would have to see specific comments before I can really answer that.

Mr. Stone said that the Stop & Shop or super Stop & Shop in Poughkeepsie is more of a town square type traditional appearance. I like the proposed design but I don't think it is in keeping with the Town's desire for a more traditional style as was pointed out

Mr. Greenwood said well again you are talking about an entire shopping center; you are not talking about a standalone store, so everything has to flow together. The idea of the entire shopping center having a modern look is not the direction this Town is willing to go.

Ms. Far said I am not going to speak on behalf of the entire center but it is very much a work in progress. The elevations that we have submitted were only submitted because we had to submit an elevation so we chose an elevation of this building that this board has previously approved.

Chairman Gary said you are not looking at the Board that approved this last time, just like the Town is different so is this Board. Their ideas are going to be different and I don't think they are going to be asking you to go out of step, but they want you to step forward on what we want you to do for this Town, We are only looking out for this Town.

Mrs. Far said I understand that and I just want you to know that we don't expect you to think the elevation we submitted is the elevation that you would approve, it is not one that we would want to construct. We had to have an elevation for the rest of this center because it is in our mind to do that, I fully expect that if I came without anything and didn't comment on the rest of the center you would find that completely unacceptable.

Chairman Gary said we don't really know what we want but what we do want is an architect to come and look at this and talk to you about it. You have one idea and he would be the spokesman for all the board members ideas and his own ideas.

Ms. Far said we had to start somewhere, I have seen instances where we have taken a modern and contemporary and traditional and merged it all together. Maybe that is what we would be able to work with; our client within reason has an open mind to what the façade will be with the rest of the center. We want it to work, we want it to be attractive, we want people to come there and we don't want people wondering why we spent all this money and time. She asked if he knows when there will be an architect on the board.

Mr. Cleary said he is not quite sure but we are in the process of doing it.

Chairman Gary said we will have an architect.

Ms. Far said originally when we met with staff our idea was not to come in at all with the façade because we didn't know what it was going to be and we didn't want to have to design it twice.

Chairman Gary said we all have different ideas but we have to put our ideas with somebody who can represent us so he can be our spokesperson so that you don't get 7 different opinions on it.

Ms. Far said I want to point out that the façade of Stop & Shop is they have the other prototype with a lot of signage on it and we don't have the sign plan for Stop & Shop, I am anticipating that we will need a sign variance from the Zoning Board. Many of the signs in that center all have those variances and we have identified that in our submission materials but I can't articulate to you what the deviation is. I do want to point out that it is a much cleaner line in terms of signage as well which will be a big improvement.

Mr. Carnazza asked if they are only going to sign one side of the building.

Ms. Far said yes.

Mr. Carnazza asked what about the side facing Baldwin Lane.

Ms. Far said I don't think you would be able to see it.

Mr. Carnazza said that's a good reason on why you would need to get a bigger sign because you would be entitled to a sign on Baldwin Lane.

Ms. Far said I really don't think you would see it there; Stop & Shop usually has a bank inside and a Starbucks inside also with a peapod operation.

Mr. Cleary asked if they will have that operation from here.

Ms. Far said it doesn't distribute from here, it is a pick up place so there won't be a delivery van. The signs here don't have to do with the other operations that are within the store.

Mr. Stone asked if the bottle recycling is inside the building.

Ms. Far said yes.

Mr. Furfaro asked if we could talk about the types of materials they will be using.

Ms. Far said the gray material that you see is a recycled composite concrete material that can be textured in any way that you would like it. This is a natural wood material to give you more of an ecofriendly feeling, the brown that you see is the same material but it has a different texture. When you are asking if there are elements that we can change, the answer is absolutely for the colors and textures. If you want the coloring to be more colonial grey, it will look like block but it is really the recycled material. Typically when you see all the sides of a big building it's the entire painted block which isn't very attractive and all you can do with it is paint it. This material, you can make it look like whatever you want it to look like and it is indestructible there is no maintenance. You could do a fieldstone look with a colonial grey above it to give you more of a different feel.

Mr. Carnazza said so the most important thing to you is to use the product but not necessarily the look of it.

Ms. Far said yes the look of it can change it's more the product that we want to use.

Mr. Stone said the elevation we are going to really see on this is just the front because most of this is behind the building as it is today.

Ms. Far said that's correct.

Mr. Carnazza said the Baldwin Lane side is very visible, the front and that side are going to be the most important sides.

Mr. Stone asked if along the front you have full size windows.

Ms. Far said yes another component to us is to use a lot of natural light because that will reduce the amount of lighting that you see in the store. That is something else that we can look at to put mullions in there to give it a more colonial feel.

Mr. Furfaro asked if those are full height windows.

Ms. Far said no, they have the louvers that hang down in front of them.

Mr. Stone said the reason that he was asking is less about the colonial appearance but more about the 24/7 operation and amount of lighted windows.

Ms. Far said ideally we would like to do 24 hours since we are in the store 24 hours and we do our stocking overnight but I think what we proposed here is 6 a.m. to midnight for public access only because other stores in Putnam County have that time frame.

Mr. Stone said the reason for that question is light spill from the inside to the outside at night.

Ms. Far said as you can see there is shading on the glass; it is a filter material and the louvers.

Mr. Cleary asked if they will have seating inside for Starbucks.

Ms. Far said it is not confirmed as Starbucks because Starbucks picks and chooses where they go in but this is a prototype and they usually do have some seating.

Mr. Cleary asked if they would expand that seating for your own customers.

Ms. Far said yes we would for people who want to sit and drink there coffee.

Mr. Cleary said what if I wanted to go to your salad bar and eat dinner in your facility.

Ms. Far said yes we will provide seating.

Mr. Carnazza said because it is a design shopping center that is perfectly fine.

Mr. Cleary said that is an operational issue that we will need to know more about so let us know the size and where that will be located because that adds a restaurant component to your supermarket.

Mr. Stone asked if there is any exterior café or outdoor seating available.

Ms. Far said no.

Mr. Heidenberg said he wants to talk about our willingness to work with you on creating a look you're happy with and that we are happy with. It's a collaborative and cooperative effort and we are looking forward to making our shopping center look new, pretty and up to date. The only request that I make is that we would like to move the process along so as soon as you can bring somebody on to work with us would be great. We are anxious to clean up the property and redo the parking lot, we are very excited about the project but we would like to move forward as well.

Chairman Gary said we will have an architect in 2016.

Mr. Heidenberg said we are ready, we appreciate the opportunity and we would like to make it better and move it along.

Chairman Gary said I think it will be much easier for you to work with one person instead of all 7 of us.

Mr. Heidenberg said it will be much easier then working with a committee.

Ms. Far said this is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act –SEQRA. There are many agencies involved so we would like to get that process started. I am assuming your board would want to be the lead agency of that review if you want to do a coordinated environmental review, we have provided you with the paperwork that you need. I am hoping we can make some progress tonight if you want to serve as a lead agency, just let everybody else know so their 30 day clock can be started. I did want to mention that we did send our materials to the fire department and to the fire chief; I hope they got them to start reviewing them.

Mr. Carnazza said you can't go to the ZBA yet, until we get the sign areas.

Chairman Gary said there are some things that you will need to do before you get there.

Mr. Cleary said the first thing is to designate lead agency so we can coordinate the referrals as we move forward.

Chairman Gary said we are going to try every way that we can to help you and move things along for you, we just want everybody to be pleased with what it is going to look like.

Mr. Greenwood moved to declare lead agency on the Lake Plaza Shopping Center. The motion was seconded by Mr. Giannico with all in favor.

Chairman Gary said we will contact you in dealing with our Architectural Review.

Ms. Far said I know there are more materials that we need to submit so we will work on that so we can get to the ECB.

OLD FORGE ESTATES – BALDWIN PLACE ROAD – TM – 75.15-1-19-40 – RE-APPROVAL OF FINAL SUBDIVISION

Mr. Paul Lynch of Putnam Engineering, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated this is a 45 acre lot located on Baldwin Place Road, opposite the high school. There are three wetlands located along Baldwin Place Road, two old crossings that existed to get access to the property; we are using one of those crossings for our main access. As you work your way up the property there is another small stream that wraps around to the large wetland on top of the hill. The road was developed the serpent time to get up the hill to the back of the property. We developed this as a 10 lot subdivision, the smallest lot is 120,000 square feet, and the other lots are larger.

Mr. Furfaro asked where the access road is located.

Mr. Carnazza said to the left of Muscoot Road across from the high school. This was approved as a larger lot subdivision in the past; I think there was a sewer system.

Mr. Lynch said there was going to be a sewage package treatment plan on the property.

Mr. Carnazza said yes and they weren't allowed to do it so they had to realign it and change everything, if you look in the tax maps all of the lots are laid out for what they were approved for but they never actually built the plan.

Mr. Cleary asked what size are the lots now on average.

Mr. Lynch said this is the smallest lot at 120,000 square feet but I would say the average is somewhere around 130,000.

Mr. Carnazza said almost 3 acres.

Mr. Paepre asked if there were going to be 10 lots.

Mr. Carnazza said yes and they are supposed to give an explanation of the property because we have new members and we have been re-granting projects. Technically what he did was made a new submission and went through the process because you are only supposed to be allowed one extension of approval and after that you have to get a re-grant.

Mr. Paepre asked if there is septic up there.

Mr. Lynch said yes they are individual septic.

Mr. Stone said you came before the ECB a couple years back for the septic test process.

Mr. Lynch said no the water main was extended and went through the property. That was done about 5 years ago.

Mr. Stone asked if it is individual wells.

Mr. Lynch said the water system is number 13, there was an extension done that came through and comes down and ties into the residents down into their water system. The water main already exists; they put that in as part of what they are doing.

Mr. Paepre asked if this is a re-approval for a year.

Mr. Carnazza said the first time they came in front of the board was 1987.

Mr. Furfaro asked how long has it been in front of the board in this form.

Mr. Lynch said the process started back in 2005 or 2006.

Chairman Gary said it's been more than 10 years in this form (10 lots), look at the date on the map.

Mr. Lynch said it is 2005.

Mr. Stone asked what the stormwater management controls here are.

Mr. Lynch said we have two ponds and this design was approved with generally permit 6 so they met the 08 requirements.

Mr. Franzetti said they have a permit that has been approved for it already. They don't have to do anything. It's already approved.

Mr. Stone said okay but it is coming back to us for a re-approval.

Mr. Franzetti said they have an approved permit; we are not going to go back and ask them to bring it up, as long as they pay a \$100 fee every year the permit will last forever.

Mr. Stone said but now they are looking for a re-approval, not an extension of this.

Mr. Carnazza said but they already have the permit that is required.

Mr. Furfaro said there are new storm water requirements for 2010. He then asked if storm water regulations have changed significantly.

Mr. Franzetti said yes they have but if you were building and received coverage under those permits as long as you pay your annual fee that design still holds. The administrative actions change but the design and the way that it is built does not change.

Mr. Stone said I am just wondering if he is looking for re-approval and if we know that it doesn't meet correct stormwater standards can we approve it?

Mr. Cleary said he has a legal right to what Mr. Lynch is showing you right now.

Chairman Gary said you can't really comment on it until it has been denied and presented over, he is not going to go back and change it now. The question is, is it suitable for where it is at right now for 2015?

Mr. Stone said that is precisely the question that I am asking in terms of stormwater.

Mr. Cleary said perhaps Mr. Charbonneau can help with this. The question is what if you let it expire and now all of the new regulations would be triggered, so in doing that would you be extending your appropriate authority in reviewing a pending application.

Chairman Gary said if there is something in the area that needs protection then we should look at that. He will be back here next year with this application so we should look at this next time.

Mr. Lynch said in all honesty I will be back here in 6 months and re-assess with the Health Department.

Chairman Gary said and in the meantime, you should look at this project.

Mr. Furfaro said we have obviously changed the Architectural Review Board at this point so does this type of application warrant an architectural review.

Mr. Carnazza said it's a subdivision.

Mr. Furfaro said I am just trying to figure out what has changed over the years since this application was approved.

Mr. Cleary said stormwater and physical changes on the site could be that the wetlands got bigger or smaller.

Mr. Furfaro asked if there were any zoning changes or anything like that.

Mr. Carnazza said no.

Chairman Gary said if you were doing this from scratch and this board was making suggestions to the applicant, they would listen.

Mr. Greenwood asked why the delay, what is the reason we are back for another re-approval.

Mr. Lynch said the Health Department has to re-test percolation and it is mostly because of financial reasons.

Mr. Stone asked when the wetlands were last surveyed.

Mr. Lynch said not recently, probably about 10 years ago.

Mr. Furfaro moved to grant re-approval for 6 months. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paepre.

A roll call vote was taken as follows.

Mr. Furfaro	For the motion
Mr. Stone	Against the motion
Mrs. Kugler	For the motion
Mr. Giannico	For the motion
Mr. Greenwood	For the motion
Mr. Paepre	For the motion
Chairman Gary	For the motion

Motion carries.

MINUTES – 07/08/15, 07/22/15, 08/05/15, 08/26/15, 09/16/15, 09/30/15, 10/14/15 & 11/18/15

Mr. Giannico moved to accept the minutes of 07/08/15, 07/22/15, 08/05/15, 08/26/15, 09/16/15, 09/30/15, 10/14/15, and 11/18/15. The motion was seconded by Mr. Greenwood with all in favor.

Mr. Greenwood moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:08 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Giannico with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta