

APPROVED

HAROLD GARY
Chairman

CRAIG PAEPRER
Vice-Chair

BOARD MEMBERS
ANTHONY GIANNICO
DAVE FURFARO
CARL STONE
KIM KUGLER
RAYMOND COTE

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*

VINCENT FRANZE
Architectural Consultant

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 27, 2017

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN, HAROLD GARY, VICE-CHAIR, CRAIG PAEPRER, ANTHONY GIANNICO,
DAVE FURFARO, KIM KUGLER, RAYMOND COTE

ABSENT: CARL STONE

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
Hilltop Manor Realty	76.22-1-5	1	P.H./Reso	Public Hearing Closed & Resolution Adopted.
NY Fuel Distributors (Coco Farms)	55.11-1-40	1	Public Hearing	Applicant was off the agenda.
Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp	53.17-1-38	1-4	Site Plan	Lead Agency Declared.
Easter Seals New York	55.11-1-23,24 25 & 27	5-9	A. Site Plan	No Board Action.
Wixon Pond Estates	53.20-1-19	10	Extension	Extension Granted for 6 Months.
Smajlaj, Zef	75.42-1-39	10	Extension	1 Year Extension Granted.
PCSB/Mahopac Branch	86.11-1-1	10	Bond Return	Public Hearing Scheduled.
Gateway Summit Senior Housing – Lot 6	55.-2-24.6-1 55.-2-24.6-2	11	Extension	1 Year Extension Granted.
The Fairways Senior Housing – Lot 7	55.-2-24.8-1 55.-2-24.8-2	11	Extension	1 Year Extension Granted.
Town Board Referral – Proposed Ordinance Regarding Wireless Telecommunications		11-13		Positive Recommendation to the Town Board

The meeting was adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

HILLTOP MANOR REALTY – 164 EAST LAKE BLVD – TM – 76.22-1-5 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Franzetti stated there was a question about structural engineering with this and you received a letter earlier through your email with the sign off from the engineer regarding the footings.

Mr. Cleary stated all planning comments have been addressed and you have a resolution for approval of a regrading plan before you tonight.

Chairman Gary addressed the audience and stated this is an open public hearing and asked if anyone wished to be heard on this application.

Mr. Joseph Spallina of 169 East Lake Blvd addressed the board and asked how tall will the structure be.

Mr. Joel Greenberg of Architectural Visions, representing the applicant stated the code allows 10 feet and we are below that.

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

Mr. Cote moved to adopt Resolution #17-15, dated September 27, 2017; Tax Map #76.22-1-5 entitled Hilltop Manor Boathouse Site Plan Approval. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Paepre with all in favor.

NY FUEL DISTRIBUTORS (COCO FARMS) – 1923 ROUTE 6 – TM – 55.11-1-40 – AMENDED SITE PLAN

The applicant requested to be off the agenda.

CENTRAL HUDSON GAS & ELECTRIC CORP – 340 BULLET HOLE ROAD – TM – 53.17-1-38 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the project encompasses the installation of a pressure regulator system at 340 Bullet Hole and a ~3.75 miles of new gas mains. The Engineering Department offers the following preliminary comments:

I. General Comments:

1. Permits from the following would appear necessary:

- a. New York State Department of Transportation
- b. Putnam County Highway (Highway work permit)

Created by Rose Trombetta

Page 1

September 27, 2017

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

- c. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (wetlands and, stormwater)
- d. Town of Carmel Highway (Driveway and work within right of way)
- e. Town of Carmel Environmental Conservation Board (wetlands)

The applicant has acknowledged this list and has indicated that they will apply to these agencies in October of 2017.

Should any public improvements be deemed necessary as part of the development of the tract, a Performance Bond and associated Engineering Fee must eventually be established for the work. This includes erosion and sediment control and permanent stormwater management practices. The applicant has offered a Letter of Undertaking (LOU) in lieu of a performance bond. The LOU will need to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board Attorney.

II. Detailed Comments:

Pressure Regulator System – 340 Bullet Hole Road:

1. The applicant now proposes work in the Town of Carmel Right of Way (R.O.W.) and therefore, approval is required from the Town of Carmel Highway Department.

The applicant has acknowledged that they will apply for the Town road opening permits Gas Line Installation

1. Review of these drawings and the information is ongoing and comments will be provided.

Mr. Cleary stated the applicant has clarified a number of points that were raised at the last meeting. They are in the process of securing all the permits from the work that is being done in the R.O.W. He said the applicant has indicated that they anticipate the work being done by the end of 2017. There is now a revised landscaping plan that has been submitted around the area of the regulating station. The plan includes eastern red cedar, norway spruce and white pine. It is recommended that the white pine be replaced with a species that provides more robust screening lower to the ground. The vinyl slatted fencing has been replaced with a black-coated chain link fence, and the regulator equipment will be painted dark green to help camouflage it and mitigate visual impacts. Razor ribbon barbed wire is no longer proposed. The fencing will be increased from 6 feet to 8 feet to address security concerns. The applicant has clarified that no site lighting is proposed. The applicant has clarified that the regulator station will not produce routine emissions. Some low level noise emissions will occur periodically, and the gas heater will expel exhaust intermittently during the winter months.

Mr. Brian Dimisko of Central Hudson Gas & Electric and Dan Farnan of Maser Consulting were present before the board.

Mr. Dimisko addressed the board and stated we respectfully request that the board process the resolution for lead agency for the SEQR process for this project.

Mr. Cleary said the board can certainly do that tonight. We could produce a resolution and sign it after the fact. The applicant will circulate it to the involved agencies.

Chairman Gary asked the board members if they had any questions.

Mr. Giannico asked Mr. Cleary if the fence is black-coated chain link.

Mr. Cleary replied yes.

Mr. Giannico asked so there is no screening at all.

Mr. Cleary replied no. They have indicated the slats would be a security issue for them. So their alternative is the black fence and to paint all the equipment inside the compound the green color which is a reasonable alternative. It will also be surrounded by landscaping.

Mr. Giannico stated I understand your security reasons, but the site is very visible from the road. He said they do make a screening that goes on chain link fencing that is almost like a forested pattern. He said it's permeable and you can see through it. He asked if they would you consider that?

Mr. Dimisko said that is not our decision to make, we have been working with our security department who is in charge of both our electric and gas structure. He said that is something we would have to discuss with them as well as engineering. He said the station itself is set back off the road and it will be behind landscaping that doesn't exist there now. He said I think we will have a much better appearance aesthetically when the station is in place compared to what is there now. He said we are building this with robust landscaping and setting it back.

Mr. Giannico asked if they had an elevation plans.

Mr. Farnan replied no.

Mr. Cote asked Mr. Cleary if the vegetation that is being proposed will give us year round camouflage.

Mr. Cleary replied yes it is.

Mr. Furfaro asked how close are you to the nearest residence.

Mr. Farnan wasn't sure.

Mr. Furfaro asked if the station will make any noise.

Mr. Dimisko replied virtually no noise. He said in the winter time the loads are at their highest because of the heating demands. He said there may be at times no different than our current regulator station on Stillwater Road. He said you might hear a slight wisp periodically.

Mr. Furfaro said no humming.

Mr. Dimisko said no humming. He said it's very quiet. There's no electric, no lighting.

Mr. Cleary said the nearest residence is about 50 feet from the edge of fenced in portion.

Mr. Franzetti stated to the east of the property there is a large wetland (NYS regulated) area, so there's nobody on one side, no one in the back, it's only on the west side which Mr. Cleary just gave you the dimensions.

Mr. Furfaro asked what is the next step.

Mr. Cleary stated to declare lead agency. He said this is the first administrative step in the SEQR review and it will take them about 30 days.

Mr. Farnan stated we already dealt with all the other agencies.

Mr. Cleary said by designating lead agency it goes back to the agencies to see if they have any conflict with us being lead agency. He said you need our resolution for them to act. So they know what's coming.

Mr. Farnan stated the secretary gave us the forms and we sent them out to all the involved agencies. He said that was a heads up and.....

Mr. Cleary said that's right and now you are going to follow up with an actual resolution tonight if the board chooses to do that.

Mr. Dimisko asked about public comments.

Mr. Cleary said that is two different things. All it's doing is securing this board as the lead agency to make their determination of significance whenever they are ready to do that. He said we still have to have a public hearing on this.

Chairman Gary asked the board if they were set on the fencing.

Mr. Giannico stated he would like to get an answer from the security department.

Chairman Gary asked for a motion for lead agency. He asked Vice Chairman Paepre to meet with the applicant to discuss the fencing.

Vice Chairman Paepre stated he will contact the applicants to set up a meeting during the day.

Mr. Giannico moved to declare lead agency. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

EASTER SEALS NEW YORK – 97 OLD ROUTE 6 – TM- 55.11-1-23, 24, 25 & 27 – AMENDED SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the application involves the construction refitting of an existing retail/office space as a Day Care Center, along with pavement markings and construction of a fenced in play area on the property adjacent to the principal property. Based upon review of these latest plans, we wish to offer the following preliminary comments:

1. The following referrals would appear to be warranted:
 - a. Putnam County Department of Planning (GML 239n referral; proximity to County highway)
 - b. Carmel Fire Department
2. Permits from the following would appear necessary:
 - a. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation – Coverage under General Permit GP-0-15-002.
3. Show details of ADA compliant ramps in the front of the building.
4. The cross section detail for the play area pavement could be reduced to one application of asphalt.
5. The applicant may wish to consider some landscaping or plantings.
6. The overall disturbance for the project as proposed is 4,750 square feet which is below the 5,000 square foot threshold criteria of disturbance for New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) stormwater regulations. However the paved area on the on the property to the north of the principal property was paved without planning Board approval. As this paved area is now being utilized as part of the present application, the applicant must provide details regarding this paving. Inclusion of this overall disturbance may necessitate the need for the preparation of a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). If this project is above the 5,000 sq ft threshold and below the 1 acre threshold coverage under the NYSEC SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity (GP-0-15-002) and the development of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that includes only erosion and sediment control and not permanent stormwater controls will be required.

Mr. Cleary stated this application involves re-using tenant space within an existing building to accommodate an Easter Seals Day Care Center for children with disabilities. The improvement requires by our code as well as state law the construction of an outdoor play area. That outdoor play area is proposed on the upper right hand corner in the aerial photograph that is before you and highlighted. The parking lot in the rear overlaps two different parcels both of which are controlled by the same owner. He said some parking configuration adjustments are necessary. He said there is a new pick up and drop off area that is proposed in the back as well. He said we regulate these as special permit uses not day care centers. There are a series of regulations in the code that set out specific standards for day care centers and they comply with most of them. There are two provisions that they do not comply with. The first one is a 50' setback for outdoor play areas, so they

need a variance. They also need a 15' landscape buffer strip that is required. We need clarification regarding the interior space. No floor plan was submitted. We need the license for the facility from the Department of Social Services. We need documentation that there is adequate infrastructure to support the day care center.

Mr. Christopher Feldman, attorney from Harris Beach PLLC, representing the applicant was present before the board. He addressed the board and stated the applicant is looking to put in a pre-k program in the facility. They will be taking suites 7 and 8 on the property and outfitting the space. As Mr. Cleary stated one of the requirements under the state and town code is to provide a fenced in play area for the children. He said we are putting the play area to the top right of the building. In order to do that, we are putting it on another piece of neighboring property which is also owned by the owner. We are putting in a crosswalk through the parking lot, so the children could get there. We are also doing parking lot striping for a drop off and pick up area at the rear of the building. He said Easter Seals has been providing services for 19 years for people with disabilities. In this case, it will be for pre-k children.

Mr. Stephen Spina, applicant's engineer from JMC, representing the applicant displayed the drawings to the board and pointed to the location of the project and surrounding areas. He pointed to the location of the proposed playground area which is a nice flat area with trees and shading. He said it would be perfect for a playground. He said we put the proposed play area (points to map) where we could fit it. The requirement is 4,000 square feet, because it is 200 square foot per child and they will be 20 children anticipated for the program. The play area is partially asphalt and partially lawn enclosed by a fence. He pointed to the access gate and ADA accessible ramp. He said there is a striped crosswalk from the ramp up to the playground to the back of tenant space #7 and #8. There is also a pick up and drop off striped area for school buses. It will be safe and it is in compliance with the code. He said currently the site does not have enough ADA accessible parking spaces, so we will be adding two more spaces (points to map).

Mr. Cote stated given the public nature of the access to the bikeway, is it really prudent to put gates down at the trail way?

Mr. Spina said we thought it was a good location for maintenance, not really to use it for the children. He said are you thinking that someone could escape or.....

Mr. Cote replied yes. He said anybody could access that.

Mr. Spina stated we could put a lock on them. We didn't specify that, but we could lock them. He said the fence is only 4 feet high. He said it's really not a barrier to keep anybody out, it's more to keep the children in. He said it made sense topographically and logistically, but you make a good point, it is near the trail. He said maybe we could come up with another way to deter anybody from opening the gate.

Mr. Durkin, owner of the property appeared before the board. He stated he was before the board several years ago when the bike path was going on. He said we gave a lot of land to

for the bike path and we didn't want to. He said we own the bike path for almost a ½ mile. He said we went back and forth, the County owned the land behind us, but it was all different grade, so we did end up giving it to the County. He said I have the original map from the County showing all the land that was taken. He said that one of the reasons we are asking for the variances on the land for the bike path, because it was part of the property originally.

Mrs. Kugler stated my only concern is the playground is backing up to the trail way fence line, correct?

Mr. Feldman said there is a little bit of setback.

Mr. Spina stated we are confined to this area. It is a good area to utilize for our playground, but we do understand that is close to that fence and the County trail.

Mrs. Kugler stated you have a lot of people coming and going along the trail. Will there be some kind of screening for the children?

Mr. Feldman said we were actually talking about that earlier this evening. He said we are going to put some trees in the buffer area.

Mr. Spina said we will also put privacy slats in the fence. He said we have about 5 feet between the fence and property line which is the other fence. We could put shrubs that will grow to provide visual blockage and it would look nicer then the privacy slats. He said there are a few things we could do.

Mrs. Kugler asked if that was enough space for the children and how many children will there be?

Mr. Spina replied 20 children.

Mrs. Kugler asked what is the square footage of that area.

Mr. Spina replied 4,000 square feet. The code is 200 square feet per child. He said the town code is a little stricter then the state code.

Mr. Furfaro asked what is the width of the playground?

Mr. Spina replied 25' wide by 160' long.

Mr. Giannico asked if the height of the fence is 4 feet.

Mr. Spina replied yes, 4 foot high vinyl coated black chain-link fence is what's proposed.

Mr. Giannico stated a higher fence could provide a lot more security.

At which time, the board members and applicant continued to discuss the fence by the trail way.

Mr. Furfaro asked if there were parking issues because of the bike path.

Mr. Durkin stated we just sealed the whole parking area to get people not to use it.

Mr. Furfaro it's nearly impossible. He asked are there parking issues on the site when they do this. Will it change the parking calculations?

Mr. Franzetti stated they have ample parking on the site.

Mr. Spina said it definitely meets the town code for parking. We are losing a few spaces because we're adding the handicap striping and crosswalk, but there are dozens of spaces above what is required.

Mr. Furfaro asked what area will you be serving?

Ms. Marianne Gribbin of Easter Seals replied we will be serving all school districts in Putnam County. She said Monday through Friday from 8 am – 4 pm.

Chairman Gary asked Mr. Cleary about their approval from the state.

Mr. Cleary stated this is a licensed facility by the state, Department of Social Services. He said in our code it requires evidence of that license from the NYS Department of Social Services.

Chairman Gary said are we doing this knowing that it's going to happen, or it can happen.

Mr. Cleary said it will be a joint condition of approval. The state will condition their approval on us and we will condition our approval on them.....

Chairman Gary asked who goes first.

Mr. Cleary said I think we could go to an approval with the condition that the state license is delivered and the state is not going to do anything until we grant the approval. So we could go first with a condition that would need to be satisfied.

Chairman Gary said should we have some input or knowledge of what they (state) want.

Mr. Cleary said that it is a great idea. He said speaking from experience, we had one years ago where the applicant went through the process and at the end of the process, the state said they can't meet any of any requirements. It would be a good idea if you could give us a preliminary read from the state as to whether or not this is a suitable site.

Mr. Feldman stated we will reach out to the state to see if they will give us a preliminary look and we will provide it to you.

Mr. Furfaro asked how many children will be in the entire program.

Ms. Griffin replied 20 children.

Mr. Furfaro said so the whole program will use the playground.

Mr. Cleary stated the special permit criteria are related to the number of students. So, if they went up from that number, they would need relief from our zoning board.

Mr. Feldman stated at this point, we are trying to move forward and go to the ZBA for the variances.

Chairman Gary said we could send them to the ZBA with a recommendation, but I don't think at the present time we have any idea what the recommendation is going to be. So, unless we have further information that you could reach out to them and send it back to board, I don't think it will be a problem.

Mr. Feldman and Ms. Griffin both replied we will reach out to the state.

Ms. Griffin stated in preparation of this meeting, I submitted applications on behalf of Easter Seals to the Department of Social Services and they are basically waiting for us to move forward with getting approvals. At this point, I have communicated with Department of Social Services numerous times and I have submitted an application to them and they are working with me hand and hand. She said I could submit the application to you to show you what I have done so far.

Chairman Gary asked Ms. Griffin if a letter from the board would benefit you with making your request to the department.

Ms. Gribbin replied yes. She said in order for me to function in this capacity, I need a day care license first and approval from the Department of Education. So, I need first your approval, then Department of Social Services and then Department of Education. I have submitted all the applications to the state and they are just waiting for us to get the ball rolling.

Mr. Spina stated would it be possible if we could get the information before the October meeting come back to discuss and then maybe get a recommendation to the ZBA for the October ZBA meeting, so we don't lose a whole month.

Chairman Gary said I don't think it would be a problem; the board is more than willing to try help, because it is a great project and it's beneficial to the County.

WIXON POND ESTATES – 243 WIXON POND ROAD – TM – 53.201-19 – EXTENSION OF PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION APPROVAL

The consultants had no objection to the extension of preliminary subdivision approval.

Chairman Gary asked why do you need an extension?

Mr. Joel Greenberg of Architectural Visions, representing the applicant stated this project is under the purview of NYCDEP and we have to go back and get re-approved from the Health Department because it's been over 6 years.

Mr. Cote moved to grant the extension of preliminary subdivision approval for 6 months. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Paepre with all in favor.

SMAJLAJ, ZEF – 803 SOUTH LAKE BLVD – TM – 75.42-1-39 – EXTENSION OF FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL

The consultants had no objection to the extension of final site plan approval.

Chairman Gary asked why can't you build the boathouse.

Mr. Greenberg said it will get built.

Vice Chairman Paepre asked if this was their first extension.

Mr. Greenberg replied yes.

Vice Chairman Paepre moved to grant an extension of final site plan approval for one year. The motion was seconded by Mr. Furfaro with all in favor.

PCSB/MAHOPAC BRANCH – 150 ROUTE 6 – TM – 86.11-1-1 – BOND RETURN

Mr. Cleary read Mr. Franzetti's memo which stated the original bond amount of \$350,000.00 was posted on June 30, 2016. Based upon our inspection all the site improvements required pursuant to the Board's Site Plan approval have now been completed. On this basis, this Department recommends a full release of the bond.

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

GATEWAY SUMMIT SENIOR HOUSING – LOT 6 – GATEWAY DRIVE – TM – 55.-2-24.6-1,6-2 – EXTENSION OF FINAL AMENDED SITE PLAN APPROVAL

The consultants had no objection to the extension.

Vice Chairman Paepre asked why is it taking so long.

Ms. Dawn McKenzie of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant stated as the board is aware we were here for a change in the site plan in early 2016. We were sent to the zoning board for variances and it's still out there. She said until they are ready to come back with that application and those plans are finalized we need to keep our current approvals current.

Vice Chairman Paepre moved to grant an extension for a final amended site plan approval for one year. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

THE FAIRWAYS SENIOR HOUSING – LOT 7 – GATEWAY DRIVE – TM – 55.-2-24.8-1,8-2 – EXTENSION OF FINAL AMENDED SITE PLAN APPROVAL

The consultants had no objection to the extension.

Chairman Gary asked if there was any movement at all on the properties.

Ms. McKenzie said we are dealing with market conditions and financing, and the applicant is working diligently to keep these approved and moving forward with it.

Mr. Giannico stated the Town of Somers is rolling right down the street from us, so I don't know about market conditions. He said we would like to see some movement, considering the time this has been before the board.

Ms. McKenzie stated the applicant feels the same way.

At which time, the board members had a discussion about the senior housing going up in Somers.

Mr. Cote moved to grant extension of final amended site plan approval for one year. The motion was seconded by Mr. Furfaro with all in favor.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE REGARDING WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS – TOWN BOARD REFERRAL - DISCUSSION

Mr. Cleary addressed the board and stated this is the wireless telecommunications ordinance that we discussed at the last meeting. He said this is a model ordinance that has

been used many times. It has been challenged in the courts and it has been upheld. So the framework of the ordinance is very durable. It has been tailored for the Town of Carmel obviously, and again it sets forward a system of a hierarchy. You can't prohibit them town wide, but we can say areas that are preferences for us which are commercial areas as opposed to residential areas. He said the applicants have to prove why they can't be in a preferable area before they could go to the next level. He said that is the basis of the system. Also, in this is the incentive that if you go to the areas that are preferable on existing towers, on existing collocated facilities, there is an expedited review process. That's the incentive to get the carriers to go where we want them to go.

Chairman Gary asked if the Town Board reviewed the ordinance.

Mr. Cleary responded yes, they reviewed and they have set it to the board for your recommendation.

Chairman Gary asked does the Town Board agree with this.

Mr. Cleary responded yes.

Mr. Cote stated he had a couple of comments, but he forgot them at home. He asked if he could send them via email to Mr. Cleary.

Mr. Cleary said we have to vote to send this over to the Town Board, so he asked if he had any substantial comments that will change the intent of the ordinance in any way.

Mr. Cote stated I had raised the issue of Ramiero's and right across the street you have Kmart. It seems to me they seem intent on going on our main thoroughfare to put these units. He said instead of focusing on our main thoroughfare which is the beauty of our town, what about looking outside of that.

Mr. Cleary said that is already built in, the requirement of the carrier is we are asking them to share their secrets with us. He said right now, they say they have to be in certain area because of coverage requirements and they don't have to tell us anything about that now. He said when we adopt this ordinance, they have to share that plan with us and say the coverage is a ½ mile wide.

Mr. Furfaro stated I think it is a good law, but when it's time for the architectural piece of this it kind of falls by the waste side. I'm not sure if this has anything to do with the new code.....

Mr. Cleary responded yes it does. He said that is unique to the Town of Carmel ordinance. He said a lot of the other stuff is kind of boiler plate. All of the aesthetics impact is unique. So, now we have this provision where they have to build a model on the site, so they would have to physically construct a model of what this facility is going to look like. He said that would be a basis for you to make a decision with respect to the aesthetic impact and your approval will be specific to that. He said there can't be a flipping of the switch to turn this

on until all those aesthetic and architectural elements are satisfied to the Building Inspector's requirements and based on your approval.

Chairman Gary stated I think the Town Board had deep concerns of what was happening, and they spent a lot of time on this and they are happy with it; I think we should vote on it.

Mr. Furfaro moved to offer a positive recommendation to the Town Board, subject to the pending comments that were made. The motion was seconded by Mr. Giannico with all in favor.

Vice Chairman Paeprrer moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:13 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta