

APPROVED

HAROLD GARY
Chairman

CRAIG PAEPRER
Vice-Chair

BOARD MEMBERS
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 **JANUARY 13TH, 2016**

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

ABSENT: ANTHONY GIANNICO

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
PCSB/Mahopac Branch	86.11-1-1	1	Site Plan	Public Hearing Closed & Planner to Prepare Resolution.
Route 6 Retail Lot 2	86.11-1-1	1-2	Site Plan	Public Hearing Closed & Planner to Prepare Resolution.
Lake Plaza Shopping Center LLC (Proposed Stop & Shop)	65.10-1-45&46	2-17	Amended Site Plan	Referred to ZBA & ECB.
New York SMSA Limited Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless	75.19-1-12	17-21	Amended Site Plan	Referred to ECB.
Thomas Fisher, Inc & Joseph Simone	75.15-1-6 & 8	21	Lot Line Adjustment	Public Hearing Scheduled.
Hillcrest Commons Lot E-2.2	44.10-2-4.2	21-23	Extension	1 Year Extension Granted.
Hamlet at Carmel (Formerly Putnam Community Foundation)	66.-2-58	23	Re-Approval	Removed from Agenda.
Minutes- 12/09/15		23		Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

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

Mr. Carnazza said this is on for a public hearing all of my comments have been addressed.

Mr. Franzetti said the applicant is still in front of the DEP and working with them to get the approvals, they have acknowledged all of our referrals and permits needed. I am still reviewing the SWPPP but they have addressed all of the detailed comments I had. The only other comments came from our wetlands inspector which has been forwarded to the applicant so they can update their plans accordingly.

Mr. Cleary said the applicant has made a number of revisions to this plan; they have addressed all of the site plan issues.

Mr. Jeff Contelmo from Insite Engineering and Mr. Ferrier from PCSB were present before the board.

Chairman Gary said this is a public hearing for PCSB Mahopac Branch Lot 1, he then asked if anyone in the audience wished to be heard on this application.

Hearing no comments from the audience, Mr. Stone moved to close the public hearing on PCSB Mahopac Branch Lot 1. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

Mr. Contelmo asked Chairman Gary if a resolution for the SEQR determination can be done for the next meeting.

Chairman Gary said let's wait until we are done with Lot 2.

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

Mr. Carnazza said this is on for a public hearing and all of my comments have been addressed.

Mr. Franzetti said the applicant has acknowledged the referrals and permits that were required; they are in front of the DEP waiting for approvals for their site. They have addressed all of the engineering comments and they have been made aware of the wetland inspector's comments.

Mr. Cleary said the applicant has made significant revisions to the site plan; all of the site plan issues have been addressed.

Chairman Gary said this is an open public hearing on Route 6 Retail Lot 2, he then asked if anyone in the audience wished to be heard on this application.

Hearing no comments from the audience, Mr. Stone moved to close the public hearing on Route 6 Retail Lot 2. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

Mr. Contelmo said he would like to request a resolution for the next meeting relative to the SEQR determination for both the PCSB and Route 6 Retail site plans. Our application before the DEP cannot be deemed complete without that determination.

Chairman Gary asked Mr. Franzetti if it would be proper to do a resolution.

Mr. Franzetti stated that his comments were mostly dealing with the DEP so I don't have a problem with this.

Chairman Gary asked the Planner to prepare a resolution.

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

Mr. Carnazza said variances are required for the existing 8 x 18 parking spaces, variances are required for the existing signs that are larger than 40 square feet that do not have existing variances and variances are required for the Stop & Shop signage as well.

Mr. Franzetti said this application involves renovations and expansions of the Lake Plaza shopping center, the applicant has acknowledged the referrals and permits that are required. They are actively working with the NYCDEP for both storm water and sewer connection, they have provided a copy of the traffic study which I have forwarded to the DOT and the Town of Carmel Highway Department for their review. Wetland mappings still need to be provided but the applicant has indicated that they will be provided shortly and the wetland inspector has been provided a copy of the planting and wetland mappings for his review. Detailed comments are still being worked on, the applicant has done a great job at moving forward with both of them and we will work with them to get the final comments completed.

Mr. Cleary said the applicant has submitted a very thorough and complete package of revised plans and they have made changes in a number of areas. The first thing they clarified is that this is a single phase development there is no phasing that will happen at a single time all of the façade improvements and the construction of the supermarket as well. The parking issue has been revised and clarified. As far as the parking requirements, they need variances for those issues, they clarified signage and the traffic study has been submitted for the project. The initial comment memo that we had regarding their market analysis is being revised by the applicant to provide some additional clarifications based on the code requirements. The applicant has also clarified that the parking area in the rear that we had concerns about will be for employee parking. They clarified the truck access to the loading areas behind the property, our concerns about pedestrian access in the rear has been clarified with a new sidewalk and curb. They added painted crosswalks to the parking area, we have new plans dealing with the architectural façade of the building and they have addressed some of the lighting by eliminating some in the back where they are unnecessary. A fairly significant revision to the landscaping plan has been provided by substantially

supplementing that, the retaining walls in the rear of the property have been reduced by height and number. They have added utility provisions on the plan and they have acknowledged that the area behind the loading area will be cleaned up. The main driveway out to Route 6 where there is just a concrete area in between the boulevard, they will be adding a planting strip in between there which is a significant esthetic improvement to the access to the property.

Ms. Geraldine Tortorella, applicant's attorney addressed the board and stated that they have made a number of revisions and she would like to go through them and respond to any questions. I would like to spend some time on the architectural plan that we have submitted and the elevations so you can understand what our vision is for the balance of our center, it is significantly different from our original submission.

Mr. Mike Junghans, Engineer for VHB stated we addressed some of the concerns of the board. He said most of the biggest changes happened in the front of the lot. He said previously, we had just a couple of landscaped islands to provide some continuity to the front of the center, we have increased those based on the comments we heard regarding people cutting across the parking lot. We now have islands entirely across the frontage opposite the Kmart; these are also landscaped islands so it will be a pretty nice esthetic improvement on top of just the channelization of the traffic. We also looked into the concern about the waviness in the parking lot. He said he took a drive out there and this area (points to map) seemed to be the most prominent, so we will offer to do additional regrading to make it smoother as you enter the parking lot. In the back of the center we reduced the amount of light poles and significantly dropped the light levels in the back of the center. We also changed the parking configuration to give drive isles into the back of the store because there was a concern about truck deliveries being able to circulate in the back of the center. We also added a raised sidewalk along the back of the loading dock to give a safer movement for pedestrians in the back of the center. Also, we shortened this retaining wall and graded it to give it a nicer appearance so it is a much better layout for this center.

Mr. Carnazza asked if that took away from the tree buffer in the back of the center.

Mr. Junghans said no because this is where that area is now with the shrub plantings.

Mr. Stone said since there is employee parking in the rear, will there be an employee entrance in the rear?

Mr. Junghans said most of these stores have entrances in the back of them today so I can't speak for the tenants but there are entrances in the back. There were also concerns about people pulling out on Route 6 through the Dunkin Donuts entrance; we added additional signage to discourage people from doing that. We also added some parking here which adds a more uniform drive which would be good for the traffic flow.

Chairman Gary asked Mr. Junghans if he prefers the board to wait until he is finished to ask questions.

Mr. Junghans said you can ask questions at any time.

Chairman Gary said my idea was to utilize the red light as best as we can.

Mr. Junghans said the traffic expert is coming up so the overall circulation for that kind of question will be better answered by him.

Chairman Gary said is it easier to wait until your presentation is over to ask our questions or just ask as we go.

Mr. Junghans said anything that has to do with the site you can ask at any time, anything that has to do with traffic please wait for our traffic expert.

Mr. Paepre said last time you were here you discussed black topping throughout the entire parking lot. He asked where do we stand with that.

Mr. Junghans said the entire parking lot will be on a minimum milden overlay; it will be a completely new surface for the entire area.

Mr. Stone asked if the shaded area here is showing the grading area.

Mr. Junghans said yes it will all look brand new.

Chairman Gary asked if they are putting those barriers at the curbs to distinguish those islands, he then asked if he could take one of the islands and put a curb all the way through it so no one will run all the way across there.

Mr. Junghans said we actually made this an island; we tend to not like to do it over here because of the shopping carts. We also have an existing island that will be approved with some nice shrubbery.

Mr. Carnazza asked what about the entrance from Baldwin.

Mr. Junghans said that is something that we looked at and if we were to put that island in we would lose about 7 parking spaces but we could put it in to cut off the traffic. One of the things is we met with the DEP about the storm water for this site and we will actually have to do some special treatments to the pavement here and eventually have to put a drainage feature here anyway so we can add that island.

Mrs. Kugler asked if there will be a significant sign to state that the parking in the back is for employee parking only.

Mr. Junghans said I don't think we were going to put a sign there just to indicate that.

Mr. Stone said it's not a desired or accessible parking area for the shoppers.

Mr. Junghans said its remoteness drives its use; it is excellent if you are working in one of these stores for the back entrance but it won't be ideal to the shopper. Also, with all of these changes we have made we are unable to maintain the number of parking spaces so we still have the same ratio that is out there today. It's a good solution adding all of the islands but we are unable to create more parking spaces.

Chairman Gary said most of the shopping centers that I go to, the big stores are distinguished from the rest of the stores, and you are unable to drive across the parking lot to get to the next one.

Mr. Junghans said I think that is what this island will do over here. I don't like to have two sided curbs, but it is something that we can discuss.

Ms. Tortorella said we want to make sure that we aren't going to lose any parking, which is one of the concerns we have; we are trying to balance an adequate number of parking spaces because we don't need the technical requirement of the code right now so we are trying to be careful.

Chairman Gary said all that we are saying is to put a curb that goes down and across, it is something that you should entertain to see what would work best.

Ms. Tortorella said we are down to inches in terms of being in compliance with the parking requirements.

Mr. Carnazza said the ratio that you have now is the ratio that you got a variance for the meeting before.

Ms. Tortorella said we will need to get a new variance for a new ratio, the ratio that is out there now we have met with this plan, the reason I make that comparison is because we can talk about the theoretical requirement but what we really care about is the functional requirement.

Chairman Gary asked what is below the islands.

Mr. Junghans said these are the driving isles and these curbs will all be landscaped it is just to define the limits of the parking lot.

Mr. Cleary asked if there is parking on the bottom side.

Mr. Junghans said yes.

Mr. John Canning from VHB addressed the board and stated that they have heard the Chairman's concerns on this project, after this meeting we will put our heads together to try to come up with suggestions. The second issue that you raised is the access point from Dunkin Donuts.

I was just out there this morning and it is interesting because it is a one way entrance from route 6 to serve Dunkin Donuts and Valvoline. There is currently a sign at this location that faces into our side that says no entrance onto Route 6 and two signs that say do not enter. So these are pretty well marked, we will also add a sign that says no left turn to further discourage people from doing that. From my perspective what is interesting is when you get out onto the street there are two signs that say one way but from the perspective of somebody coming out of the site, you can't see them because they are perpendicular. We are supportive on whatever the Town wants to do with this but we believe it is really an issue for these two properties.

Chairman Gary said when Dunkin Donuts came in with the station (Valvoline) next to it, we tried to make the traffic come in through the light and enter through the back. Dunkin Donuts had a big concern about that because they didn't want to be entering from a parking lot they wanted an entrance from Route 6. We had a public hearing and we found out that the state would not allow them to enter from Route 6 they had to go in through the parking lot because they didn't want people entering the shopping center through the Dunkin Donuts entrance. They believed it to be safer for them to go down to the light and now 60 percent of the people enter the shopping center through that entrance. The purpose of the red light was to make it safe for everyone in the shopping center; all I am trying to do is accomplish something that will make sense. All I am asking you to do is to slow the people down, don't give them the right away, make it an effort for them to get through the shopping center this way.

Mr. Canning said from here out (points to map) is not our property.

Mr. Cleary said it's when you come in from Dunkin Donuts entrance into your property; you keep them in a curbed lane that makes a left or a right.

Mr. Carnazza said the Chairman wants you to make a left only.

Chairman Gary said if you are going to Dunkin Donuts, you go ahead make your left and go back around to the red light, that's simple.

Mr. Canning said I get it but principally you get red lights put in because getting off the highway is nowhere near as difficult as getting back on the highway. So if you didn't have a red light here you would have people backed up.

Chairman Gary said you have no idea how hard it was to get that red light put in; the state didn't want to put it there. You will have people pulling out onto Route 6 through the Dunkin Donuts entrance all the time.

Mr. Canning said perhaps maybe the answer to that issue is to put the do not enter signs out here on the street where they are legally enforceable.

Chairman Gary said sometime we all don't follow signs, what we have to do is to train people to not go out that way. All I'm asking you to do is to calm that traffic that is coming in through there; you can do that any way you want to do that but it needs to be done or at least try.

Mr. Canning said how big of a problem is the traffic today and if it is a safety issue they should be here talking about it. I don't want to come in and put a left turn here and have people making u-turns in the parking lot and then heading down in the other direction. I don't want what we put in to be a mistake so we will take it back, have a look at it and see if we can come up with something that we feel will work without creating additional consequences.

Chairman Gary said I would encourage the Board to have a traffic study done there to see what can be done. I don't want to go that route if we don't have too, I would like for you to take a good look at it. The last applicant is on the west side of the road, the danger is when they are coming down from East Lake Blvd and instead of going across to the red light, they go diagonally across the road. That is the danger, and we could not get the DOT to approve a red light at East Lake Blvd because the lights would be too close together. He said that spot causes many minor car accidents so let's just take a look at it.

Mr. Canning said we basically studied the three access points, Dunkin Donuts, the red light and Baldwin Lane; we also studied the intersection at Baldwin Lane to Route 6. We did the traffic counts for the peak pm highway hour and the peak Saturday mid-day hour, we determined the peak hours and increased the existing volumes by 5 percent to account for any traffic that may come along in the near future. The prevailing growth rate at this point is under a half percent; we generated traffic for the proposed new store considering the fact that it is bigger and a more prominent name. We are projecting that the proposed action will add 150 trips to the surrounding roadways during the peak hours. We took these trips and assigned them to the three intersections and to the surrounding roadways based on the existing traffic patterns because we had counts at the driveway. We also took an intersection analysis software package called synchro which compares the peak hour volumes to the number of lanes and amount of green time you get and calculates the average delay per movement based on peak hour volume. We did that both with and without the proposed improvements to the supermarket and we determined that the increases of delays will be less than 8 seconds on all movements and less than 2 seconds on most movements. Also that all intersections will operate a level of service D or better and there will be no changes to the level of service, the level of service is like a rating for the intersection with A being the best and F the worst. Typically the letter service D is considered tolerable for peak hour conditions, we prefer a C but during peak hours we can live with D. Our analysis indicated that all of the intersections will operate at a level D service, there is no change to the level of service, and there will be a few seconds increase of delay on movements. The one exception is the East Lake Blvd approach to Route 6, which is a letter of service F now and will be a letter service of F in the future with the project. The delays on that approach are primarily attributable to the heavy volume of traffic onto Route 6. So other than finding a new way to discourage people and reduce the amount of traffic coming through here I don't think there will be a way to move that intersection to a level D service.

Chairman Gary said D is not a great thing to have.

Mr. Canning said no it's not but we can try to get it to a D.

Chairman Gary said it's not your fault that it's an F because that's what it is rated as now; it doesn't take much to move it from an F to a D.

Mr. Canning said we will take a look at that and there are other improvements being made to the site. We are getting rid of the waviness, stopping the cutting through the parking lots, we have also eliminated the slip ramp you expressed concerns about and when you review the application in total these are beneficial impacts associated with the proposed action.

Ms. Tortorella said she wanted to clarify the concern with the traffic going through Dunkin Donuts into the site. She asked if it is largely based on the movements from East Lake Blvd.

Chairman Gary said yes and Route 6.

Ms. Tortorella said I am trying to understand, is it a safety issue or has there been accidents because why are we trying to do this is it because it was something that was originally contemplated when the Dunkin Donuts first came in.

Mr. Cleary said it's the issue that it is not serious accidents but it is congestion and smaller accidents that happen frequently.

Chairman Gary said you have to understand that it is this board's obligation to address every F intersection that there is when it comes up. All I am trying to do is try to make it so that we can raise it up a letter grade because it is a safety issue.

Ms. Tortorella said yes it is a safety issue but not because of traffic that travels through Dunkin Donuts into our site but you believe there is an incentive for people to do the cut across Route 6.

Chairman Gary said if you can slow it down and calm the traffic that will slow everything down. I have seen them come up off the top of the hill, come down and instead of going to the red light they will go up to Dunkin Donuts and cut through, which is very dangerous.

Ms. Tortorella said those link lights are very difficult to get.

Chairman Gary said just ask the engineer, don't try to raise it to a C or B because you will never get it there, just get it to a D is all I'm hoping for.

Ms. Tortorella said if you don't have any more traffic related questions or site improvement questions, we would like to turn into the architectural elevations and review those with you.

Mr. Furfaro said I think we are ready.

Ms. Tortorella said we will do that Mr. Michaels will come up and explain to you what we have in mind for the renovations for the smaller stores, the façade renovations and signage. We are trying to take a global view of this and we are really invested in upgrading this shopping center. We did receive a statement of no further review from the office of parks, recreation and historic preservation and we were asked to make a submission to make sure there are no artifacts or historic sites in the area. At the last meeting you did declare your attempt to lead agency and we have completed the circulation process so the 30 day clock has started to run and will expire on February 5th.

Mr. Keith Michaels of Michaels and Waldren addressed the board and stated the portion of the project that I was asked to review is what you call the middle section between the Stop and Shop and the Kmart. All of you are well aware of what the center currently looks like, there is a covered canopy, sloped roof, brick columns that run across the entire frontage and aluminum and glass that provide an opportunity to see into the various store fronts. As it currently exists there is a brick bulkhead at the base, the intention is to really redo the entire skin and too reconfigure the covered walkway in such a manor to upgrade it and provide new materials that are compatible with the neighborhood. We would like to do one additional thing which is to tank the overall façade to break it up and point out the prime features of the property. If you notice in the upper left hand corner there is an aerial view where the space is located, we are looking into several main features of the design. There is a concern that at each end there will be an anchor store, the anchor stores are higher and are likely to be of marginally different character. We wanted to have a way to separate and announce the difference between one location to the other, so at each end of the property there is a different character to the façade. Starting from the left we have four bays that we would essentially make the same character, it is a light siding but we are looking at it being a noncombustible sustainable material that we feel is appropriate for the commercial use. The visual appearance of it is something that we feel would relate really well to the neighborhood and to have a softened approach. At the center of the design, if you look at the aerial view, there is a point in which the building turns, it is not a straight line, and it is somewhat of a knuckle that was a feature that we should distinguish from the rest of the façade. We have set forth a slightly different character to that when one is underneath the canopy there would be a higher ceiling there and has a capacity to have light go through it. When someone is walking underneath there is an opportunity for a different experience so I think it is a feature that would orient a user as well. The whole design includes a new clan of columns, all new store front windows where the glass would go down to the sidewalk level, which we feel is a feature that would upgrade the center and enhances the tenants ability to market their merchandise. As a result it will create a more vibrant center, I haven't really pointed out the peaked roofs at the left, right and middle which are placed to break the line of the façade to make it more interesting from a distance. We have done some preliminary studies as well of the area underneath the canopy and we have shown some representative signage that would go into the center, it is not ready for final review but we in vision signage that would be channel letters on a raceway and have the ability to have multiple colors. We have shown the signage conceptually to have two foot high letters, when the actual tenants signs come in it may vary from that but we put this together to give you a

representation of our thinking. Going forward I do have a handout that was not presented with our initial package that includes our signage that we are considering and the canopy area itself. The signage would be perpendicular to the wall and wouldn't need a variance.

Mr. Carnazza said so you are saying in addition to the wall signage a perpendicular hanging sign so when you are under there you know what the stores are.

Mr. Michaels said yes it is more pedestrian oriented for when you can't see the wall sign.

Mr. Carnazza said they have that at Putnam Plaza.

Mrs. Kugler asked if they realize that sign is not permitted in the zoning ordinance.

Ms. Tortorella said we recognize that the sign isn't contemplated in the zoning ordinance; I am pleased to hear that it is at other locations and you have welcomed it because it adds elegance to the center as well of being functional. We would like some feedback from your Board because we feel it adds to the character of the overall experience and that is what we are trying to receive here.

Mr. Carnazza said the code requires all canopies to be 7 feet tall so I would assume that is for head bumping so I would ask for that to be 7 or more feet high for the underside.

Chairman Gary asked what the measurement on the canopy is now.

Mr. Carnazza said it doesn't have a measurement on it now.

Mr. Michaels said it would be higher than the top of the glass volume, which is at 8 foot 7 now.

Mr. Paepre asked if the sidewalk would remain the way it is today.

Mr. Michaels said it is intended now to remain the way that it is but the rendering shows perhaps a different character to it which is not part of this presentation.

Mr. Stone said you pointed out the gabled components, there are also two other raised areas which appear to have openings for windows or something. I think you described them as higher ceilings below an atrium kind of effect. He then asked if the other two raised sections are similar to that.

Mr. Michaels said he wanted to have a component that broke the line of this entire wall façade and act visually as a book end to that center element. The ceiling can be raised in that area and it just gives more of an opportunity for developing a design for walking under the canopy.

Mr. Stone said I am trying to understand the components there. He said the renderings suggest that it is open and discontinuous under those locations. There is no continuous solid façade at the front face all across.

Mr. Michaels said that is correct that is left open. The signage would be handled in a similar way that there would be cattle letters but it would be some open air behind it.

Mr. Stone said I understand I am less concerned with the sign I am trying to understand what's there. On the main gable it appears there are windows there.

Mr. Michaels said we are developing that design right now it would be screened in some way we don't want birds in there but we want to be sure that the details will be good without wildlife getting into that area. It would be transparent but with at least some sort of a screen preventing the wildlife from entering.

Mr. Stone said the ceiling in that atrium area is that open to the truss structure in the gable, if you are walking under it and you look up, will you see the truss structure.

Mr. Michaels said yes you will.

Chairman Gary asked if they have this design somewhere else where it can be seen completed.

Mr. Michaels said no, I can't think of a center that has exactly that but I could certainly find examples of the component pieces that would provide a good example of what you could expect. Our renderer said we should have developed the one rendering instead of having 5 different views to give it a better explanation.

Chairman Gary asked why you came up with that rendering if you don't have it somewhere else, why do you think that will fit with this site.

Mr. Michaels said we considered the scale of the center and how it will be viewed from the street or parking lot; there are endless examples of shopping centers that are scaled in a similar fashion with similar height. The signage is of a similar scale, the materials that we are using are materials that are in the neighborhood used throughout this area and they are materials that are scaled and comfortable. For example the horizontal lines from the siding will provide a better and more comfortable feel than a different material, the heights of the building and spaces that we see and recognize how they relate to someone in a distance.

Chairman Gary asked if he thinks this design makes it unique enough from anything else, or if he thinks it will blend in.

Mr. Michaels said to some extent the center is set back from the highway so there are some visibility issues to begin with, I think the idea that there are certain features that can make it stand out from the highway that will give you the sense that there is something back there that is worth seeing.

Chairman Gary said from my appearance it looks like there is going to be a modern construction and driving through the town; he then asked if it blends in with the characteristics of what we have in the area.

Mr. Michaels said with the materials, it blends in but it is not identical to everything else in the neighborhood.

Chairman Gary said it's not the materials that are the concern it is the design itself, don't take this as a negative, I am just trying to understand where you are coming from and if it is going to fit in with this community.

Mr. Michaels said I think it will blend in though it is not identical to the other buildings in the neighborhood but I do believe it is compatible.

Mrs. Kugler said I love the peaks to break up the flat line of the roof and I think that is something we are trying to get away from in our community. We are trying to create a traditional feel and a more pleasant main street charm and we want that to show in our shopping centers as well. The signage that you showed underneath the canopies I think are a great idea, it adds more appeal but I think we are looking for something more traditional that will fit with the rest of our town. My question is, looking at the columns, what are we dressing those columns in and is there symmetry all the way through at both ends of the shopping center.

Mr. Michaels said the end caps are marginally higher than the middle section is, the Stop and Shop is not part of our presentation I have seen it and I do feel that what we have done would be compatible with the Stop and Shop and we do not have any opportunity to control what happens over on the Kmart side. What that means to me is it is what it is now and will change at some point in the future.

Mrs. Kugler said that really breaks it up and that looks wonderful but in essence to Stop and Shop I see the continuity of what Stop and Shop has in the front and I don't think we really had summed up with what design we were going with yet. I think you showed us a prototype last time but for the rest of the shopping plaza we are basing this on what we have seen as the prototype and that's not really where we are looking to go. What we need to do is to determine what Stop and Shop will look like first.

Mr. Carnazza said this board discussed this last time that the materials they are concerned about will be okay but different textures and colors.

Mr. Stone said I think what we're dancing around is that while this is very nice, this shopping center is not a large established center. This is a neighborhood shopping center as opposed to Walmart off major roads. My gut is saying that this design is not consistent with what the town is trying to go for in this circumstance; I believe it is too contemporary and is not towards the traditional lines that we are thinking. The entire character is going to stand

out and I think we need to rethink this visual, I know that this is your new Stop and Shop but I think it is a bit off the mark for what the town is anticipating.

Mrs. Kugler said at the last meeting we had the rough rendering you showed us of the Stop and Shop.

Ms. Tortorella said the renderings were for the smaller stores this design for Stop and Shop are prototype for the design this company is now building.

Mr. Carnazza said you did say you could take the Stop and Shop that you have now and darken it or change things slightly.

Chairman Gary said you must have this design somewhere that it has already been built.

Mr. Michaels said he can find some examples of similar product.

Chairman Gary asked if this is the first one that you have done like this.

Mr. Michaels said we have done many shopping centers and they are not cookie cutters, they are all somewhat different so we do not have a duplicate, but we do have examples with the component parts. We looked into a design that would fit in this location for this town and would convey the image of where it is and what the general character of the neighborhood is. I have attempted to do that with my experience and look at the neighborhood, there is a variety of different architecture along Route 6, and it isn't a single character. I tried to incorporate a New England like flavor with the use of the materials but I did not try to duplicate and 1830s colony type building. It is a steel frame shopping center but I tried to show respect for the other buildings in the neighborhood, it is an existing center that has big elements on the left and right.

Chairman Gary said we will discuss that because we need to figure out what Kmart is going to do. This may fit in here, but since you are open to changes we will look at it and we need to see how it would fit into the characteristics of this neighborhood. There is nothing in here that is New England style here, you just have to convince the Board because we want to respect your right to build what Stop and Shop would like to see, but it will need to blend into our neighborhood.

Mr. Michaels said if you are able to give some guidance as to what you think is successful.

Chairman Gary said you have answered the concern for this evening and yes we will give you the guidance that you need.

Ms. Tortorella said that's what we were hoping, I know you are bringing an architectural consultant on board and I think it would be appropriate for us to get together. We are willing to be flexible as long as we can make it work for both Stop and Shop and the center. We don't want to design into a black hole not knowing what kind of target we are going to hit and that's really what we need to be guided on. I heard a couple of things as far as materials

and coloring but I don't know what that means and I believe that a sit down meeting with professionals will be helpful. We do think there are a lot of traditional elements to this but obviously there may not be a consensus of the Board members, so we really would like to meet. She then asked if they know the time frame of retaining the architectural consultant will be.

Mr. Cleary said the decision will be made shortly.

Ms. Tortorella said I don't think it would make sense for us to keep redesigning without any guidance; it is inefficient and probably frustrating for you to keep seeing it. So what I would like to be able to do is obtain referrals out to the Zoning Board for parking and signage variances and also a referral to the ECB Board because we will also require a wetlands permit. After that we would revisit with this Board, have a meeting with the architectural consultant you hire so that we can sit down and try to deal with some of these other issues.

Chairman Gary said I have great confidence in your architect that he is more than capable to do that job; we are not criticizing his work.

Ms. Tortorella asked if anyone has any additional questions or can we move on to the procedural steps that need to be taken.

Mr. Carnazza said there are several variances that are required for signage on the existing buildings as well as on the new buildings, the parking formula they went to a different ratio in the past and they are trying to go to an even different ratio again.

Ms. Tortorella said the code requires 6 per thousand and there is a variance for 4.6 per thousand so we would like a variance for 4.2 per thousand.

Mr. Carnazza said there is another variance that is higher but you are not going to use that one.

Ms. Tortorella said that's correct.

Mr. Carnazza said there are a few variances and parking space size down to 9 x 19 prevailing on the site. There are some instances that they are smaller than that.

Chairman Gary asked if this Stop and Shop is related to the other drawing.

Ms. Tortorella said yes these are the different angles we are showing.

Mr. Cleary said you have a clapboard façade facing on this and you had clapboard on the other one that was bright white and this is a wood tone. If the colors are more coordinated you might get a better reception.

Mr. Paepre said so there is no signage on the end of the building, correct?

Ms. Tortorella said at the end of the building on the left hand side there are four signs that are indicated here.

Mr. Carnazza said they are permitted by right to have a sign facing Baldwin as well as Route 6.

Ms. Tortorella said Fast Care, Pea Pod and Peoples United Bank are services within the Stop and Shop. The wall sign has really been simplified by Stop and Shop to be the sign with the fruit bowl which I think is a very nice clean line. You can see on the far right is the Starbucks sign because currently there will be a Starbucks in this Stop and Shop. This is the prototype we don't know for certain if all of these elements will be in this building but we wanted to give you the whole picture as opposed to something less and then have to add something.

Mr. Paepre asked what happens to the rear of the building.

Ms. Tortorella said the rear elevation of the building is continuous.

Mr. Carnazza asked if the loading dock will be back there.

Ms. Tortorella said yes.

Mr. Michaels said there will be more to develop as we move forward.

Ms. Tortorella said these wall signs will require variances in terms of number and size and as we previously discussed we will need variances on the parking.

Mr. Carnazza asked what the boxes below are.

Ms. Tortorella said those are the Pea Pod lockers.

Mr. Paepre asked if he drives by the Baldwin shopping center will your sign be the same size as that Stop and Shop sign.

Mr. Carnazza said this one will be larger.

Mrs. Kugler asked what exactly are Pea Pod lockers.

Ms. Tortorella asked if she is familiar with the Pea Pod.

Mrs. Kugler said I know its home delivery.

Ms. Tortorella said it is home delivery or pick up, you call in your order ahead of time it is assembled for you and you pick it up.

Mr. Carnazza said so those lockers do not move.

Ms. Tortorella said no they do not.

Mr. Stone said the front of the locker that we see is not flush to the side of the building it sticks out.

Ms. Tortorella said that's correct it is against the building.

Mr. Stone said so they are like containers.

Ms. Tortorella replied yes.

Mr. Stone said he is confused visually on what that is.

Mr. Carnazza asked how does the operation work?

Ms. Debra Far the director for Stop and Shop said the bins are more like sheds it is a manned person who will take the individual grocery bin out of the shed and put it into the customer's car so it isn't a locker per se. The interaction is about 5 minutes.

Mr. Stone asked is there a separate entrance for this?

Mrs. Far said no they use the front door.

Mr. Carnazza said there are 5 bins being shown here and there is nowhere for anyone to park for this. You can't have people parking in the fire zone.

Mrs. Far said it is around the corner I think it is shown that way on the site plan.

Mr. Cleary said you need to modify that. So it will be the normal pattern of parking spaces and that separation doesn't have to change for someone pulling up there. We need to see that with some more clarity because this is the first time we are seeing this.

Ms. Tortorella said the key is that it will always be manned so if someone does pull up in the fire zone they will be directed to a parking spot. As far as the look goes we have them in fun colors to attract your eye so you see it but we have in some cases changed the look of it so the materials blend right into the façade and you barely see it.

Mr. Stone said to me they look like a FedEx drop box right now.

Mr. Carnazza said we will have to add that signage to the signage calculation also.

Mr. Furfaro asked if there is a location we could stop at to see these pods.

Ms. Tortorella said they do this at a number of locations around here, we will send a list to the secretary so you can see them at your convenience.

Mr. Cleary said the sign issues you heard tonight and the parking issues are pretty straight forward and I don't think any of that relates to anything that we are talking about so if you are willing to consider it I don't see why you can't. The ECB referral is appropriate right now, I don't see a problem with the Zoning Board referral either, none of this would change any of the site plan issues that we have been talking about.

Mr. Stone asked if they would have to come back for the center signage.

Mr. Cleary said it is either going to be what it is or what it's not, you're not going to have any say on that signage. It seems there are some open issues for that but if you have the measurements it's either a yes or no from the Zoning Board.

Ms. Tortorella asked if he meant existing signs.

Mr. Cleary said yes for the new center signs, if you are considering making adjustments to those based on the comments from the façade you may have to return to the Zoning Board if you are going to change the sign.

Ms. Tortorella said we understand that.

Mr. Carnazza said the only other thing that can change that is if you change the parking layout by making a left to go towards the exit.

Ms. Tortorella said yes we prefer not to be held up because we are unsure what we are going to do with the calming devices that you have asked us to think about.

Chairman Gary said we don't want to hold you up so therefore we need to go back and look closely into turning left.

Mr. Furfaro moved to refer the application to the ECB and ZBA. The motion was seconded by Mr. Stone with all favor.

NEW YORK SMSA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS – 361 ROUTE 6 – TM – 75.19-1-12 – AMENDED SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza said the applicant proposes to add an antenna to the roof of the existing Sam's building in Mahopac, variances are required for two addition parking spots and you didn't give us a calculation on the map for parking. The project needs to be referred to the Fire Department and the ECB for comments.

Mr. Franzetti said there are no new site improvements or plans regarding this application so the engineering department has no technical concerns on this. The application should be referred to the Town Of Carmel ECB Board, Mahopac Fire Department and the Putnam County Department of Health for review and recommendation per section 156-37E of the Town Code.

Mr. Cleary said this is a wireless communication facility; it is an allowable conditional use in this zoning district and the applicant is indicating that it is a collocation on the building. Just from driving by I didn't notice any other facilities on this building so is this a proposed collocation and this is the first antenna or am I missing the other antennas on the building.

Mr. Edward Teyber of Snyder & Snyder, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated this is a collocation.

Mr. Cleary so there is no other facility on the building yet.

Mr. Teyber replied that's correct.

Mr. Cleary said in terms of our understanding of a collocation, this is the first antenna; there are no other facilities on this building yet. The public utility standards that we apply for this, they have submitted the FCC Radio Frequency report which indicates that they are significantly compliant; this does comply with the height requirements in the zone. This does not require screening it is a roof mounted facility, Mr. Carnazza indicated the parking issue, there is a lot of parking around but that issue does need to be clarified. The issue that we deal with on these is visual impact, we need to have an understanding on what they are going to look like, they gave us photo simulations, and one of them coming from the south is pretty far away from the building. The most important thing with respect to visual impact on this is the Putnam Trailway, which is right behind the building and is a significant public asset to the County; we will need to see a rendering from the Trailway closer to the building.

Mr. Teyber said we have submitted our application to the Department of Health and Fire Department; I have the receipts from certified mailing. We would like to be referred to the ECB Board required by your zoning code. As for parking, my understanding is there is ample parking on the property and I would hope we wouldn't have to go to the zoning board but if we have to I will come back and ask for a referral. We will have the plans updated to reflect the parking, I know that your zoning code requires two parking spaces for all public utilities but this is an unmanned public utility so any additional parking would be limited to one maintenance visit once a month. We submitted the visual analysis and we will supplement those two views and add that with addition to the one from the Trailway. The compliance report was signed and sealed so that should address some of the questions that came up before. If the Board doesn't have any other questions we would like to be referred to the ECB maybe schedule a public hearing.

Mr. Furfaro asked to see the elevation. He then asked if there will be any wiring that will come down the face of the building.

Mr. Teyber said no all of the equipment will be behind it.

Mr. Furfaro said so were not going to see any wires or conduits coming down the side of that building.

Mr. Teyber said they will be down the back side but there will be no cable chase on the outside of the front part of the building.

Mr. Cleary asked what is on the top of that cupola, is it empty attic space.

Mr. Teyber said I don't think it is anything.

Mr. Carnazza said its open cathedral ceilings.

Mr. Furfaro said to go back to the roof plan.

Mr. Teyber said as you can see the cables are wrapping along the roof and then come down.

Mr. Furfaro said wouldn't it make more sense if you move that in towards the center of the building more. He then asked if that would give it less of a visual impact for the structural issue

Mr. Teyber said my understanding is that the idea was to try to hide it behind the building.

Mr. Furfaro said I just thought if you brought it in more you wouldn't see it at all.

Mr. Teyber said the problem with that is we have a roof shadow with that which means the antenna would be hitting a wall, we might be able to move it some amount but we won't be able to move it to the middle of the building.

Mr. Cleary said Mr. Carnazza stated that it is open volume to the interior space, just verify that because if it is in fact attic space, putting an antenna within an attic is sometimes an option and is far less visually intrusive. I think Mr. Carnazza is right and it is open but if it is in fact attic space could you take a look at putting it in there.

Mrs. Kugler asked if there is a way to disguise this better.

Mr. Teyber said they are already painted to match; the roof line of this building is slightly pitched and has these dormant windows.

Mr. Cleary said this application is a little bit different than the others you brought to us because the building is so new and has some really nice architectural merit to it.

Mrs. Kugler said I would hate to distract the architect that this building already has with popping antennas all over.

Mr. Teyber said there are only two antennas.

Mr. Carnazza asked if the wires will also be painted to match.

Mr. Teyber said yes.

Mr. Stone said this is also a first of what will be a collocation. So what will this mean as a collocation, he then asked if you can say no to turning it into a collocation.

Mr. Cleary said Federal Legislation dealing with additional antennas in a collocated site and there are now thresholds that if you don't expand it within a certain size, the legislation says you don't have to comply with the Planning Board you can go right to the Building Department. The provisions set standards for a collocated facility that if it is not exceeding these thresholds, they don't even have to come to us anymore, the Building Department is obligated by law to give them building permits. That phrase was said intentionally, there is a purpose for them to have it in the approval that this is a collocated site so there will be more antennas.

Mr. Stone said my basic question is this board does not have the authority to say we will not accept antennas.

Mr. Cleary said the only thing we have discretion over is the visual and esthetic impact and this one is a little different because it is next to a major public resource.

At which time, a discussion ensued about the antennas and what the board is allowed to do.

Mrs. Kugler said so this will be a collocation, she then asked how that will affect this building in the future.

Mr. Carnazza said they won't have to come back to the board.

Mr. Cleary said theoretically they may not have to come back.

Mrs. Kugler said so if they don't have to come back, they can keep adding antennas to this building.

Mr. Carnazza said yes in the location they show you now.

Mr. Stone said even though this atrium may not be attic space, I would like to see its consideration with the owner; I don't believe there are other commercial aspects of that space.

Mr. Cleary said we are usually at a disadvantage with that because they will tell us that they technical can't do that. What we have is our own guy who is an expert in this field that we are able to refer these questions to and they will say yes they can do it or no they can't.

Mr. Stone said given this is a collocation and the architectural aspects that you noted earlier that they did have an effort to make this building appealing. I think given the potential for several additional antennas, I would like to see locating them inside the atrium considered with the owner and your technical people.

Mr. Carnazza said right now you are only proposing two antennas, if he wants to do 4, he would have to come back to the board he just wouldn't have to come back for the second one.

Mr. Stone said the reason for my request is if we put it on the outside, we set a precedent that the outside is okay. If he can get a collocation for the inside of the building the next 5 or 6 companies that come and want to put it on the outside then they can't automatically because that precedence hasn't been set.

Mr. Tyber said they will take a look at that.

Mr. Furfaro moved to refer to the ECB. The motion was seconded by Mr. Stone with all in favor.

THOMAS FISHER, INC 7 JOSEPH SIMONE – 6 & 7 NORTH VESCHI LANE – TM – 75.15-1-6 & 8 – LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Carnazza said all necessary variances were granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Franzetti said all engineering comments have been addressed and we do not have an objection to the lot line adjustment being proposed.

Mr. Cleary said we can move to schedule the public hearing on this.

Chairman Gary said to schedule a public hearing.

HILLCREST COMMONS LOT E-2.2 – ROUTE 52 – TM – 44.10-2-58 – EXTENSION OF FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL

Mr. Carnazza said he has no objection to the extension of site plan approval for one year.

Mr. Franzetti said the engineering department has no objection to the re approval with the amended site plan as long as there are no changes being made to the site. The Board should be aware that the applicant does have coverage under the NYS Stormwater, NYCDEP Stormwater, and Putnam County amended approvals for the plans for sewer collection system. However does not contain documentation regarding the stormwater control maintenance and facility agreements which was part of the Planning Board resolution and the easement information.

Mr. Cleary said in 2015 this Board granted a re-approval for this, which is coming to its expiration date thus the request for the extension of the approval, we have no objections.

Mr. Jeff Contelmo of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant stated one of the comments Mr. Franzetti had was the stormwater agreement, which has been filed and copied on an email for proof that it was done. I believe that everything is in order for the extension nothing has been changed since we were here last time.

Mr. Cleary said there is a letter from the applicant indicating that there is a financing issue which continues to be a problem for the applicant.

Chairman Gary said weren't there some concerns back before this extension was granted.

Mr. Cleary said yes we had to sort out a number of issues prior to the re-approval in 2015. All of that was clarified at the time so all of those conditions are continuing to be carried with the last re-approval.

Mr. Furfaro asked what the expectations are for this being built, is this something we are going to see this season.

Mr. Contelmo said from my perspective what I know is that the financing isn't there right now, but they have applied again for the different forms of financing that is necessary for this type of project and we are waiting to hear on it.

Mr. Furfaro asked if this is a state funding.

Mr. Cleary said there are a number of sources of funding that goes into this project, that is the complication and they had to meet certain requirements for each funding source. It is simply a complicated management effort to put it all together and keep it running simultaneously while they deal with all of the approval conditions.

Mr. Contelmo said it is competitive funding but there is only so much of it that goes around.

Mr. Furfaro asked if we can get a quick description of where we are right now because a phase of this has already been done.

Mr. Contelmo said Hillcrest Commons was approved as 150 units of a senior housing development behind the Shop Rite off Route 52 near the Kent line. Wilder Balter is a very established builder on both market rate and affordable homes throughout the Hudson Valley region. They built the first 75 units which are in place up on the hill behind Shop Rite; there is a new roadway and all of the infra-structure in place for the whole 150 units. As Mr. Cleary pointed out we were re-approved back 9 months ago, one of our conditions allows us to come back for an extension for another year that is what we are seeking. Mr. Boulter has submitted again some more of the competitive funding, which we had just referred too. We would love to start the project assuming that the funding has been put into

place; the first 75 units have been very successfully occupied and embraced by the community.

Chairman Gary asked if all the rest of the conditions have been taken care of.

Mr. Cleary said yes it was, all of that has been sorted out including compliance with the open space requirements and recreational requirements have all been satisfied.

Chairman Gary asked if there was something on egress.

Mr. Cleary said yes the access driveway which comes in from Kent and into the Town of Carmel is already built and approved serving phase 1 and extends into phase 2.

Chairman Gary asked if all of that is outlined so the members of the board can get copies of it.

Mr. Furfaro said we vetted this in the spring of last year so I have a pretty good understanding of this one.

Mrs. Kugler moved to grant a 1 year extension of final site plan approval for Hillcrest Commons. The motion was seconded by Mr. Furfaro with all in favor.

HAMLET AT CARMEL(FORMALLY PUTNAM COMMUNITY FOUNDATION) – STONELEIGH AVE – TM 66.-2-58 – RE-APPROVAL OF FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL

This application was removed from the agenda.

MINUTES – 12/09/2015

Mr. Paepre moved to accept the minutes of 12/09/15. The motion was seconded by Mr. Furfaro with all in favor.

Mr. Furfaro moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:17 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta