

APPROVED

CRAIG PAEPRER
Chairman

ANTHONY GIANNICO
Vice Chairman

BOARD MEMBERS
DAVE FURFARO
CARL STONE
KIM KUGLER
RAYMOND COTE
ROBERT FRENKEL

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

JUNE 12, 2019

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN, CRAIG PAEPRER, VICE CHAIRMAN, ANTHONY GIANNICO,
KIM KUGLER, RAYMOND COTE, ROBERT FRENKEL

ABSENT: DAVE FURFARO, CARL STONE

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
Horowitz/Russell & Brown	64.19-1-84&85	1	P.H.	Public Hearing Closed & Resolution Adopted.
Action Fuel	85.16-1-20	1-2	Site Plan	Denied to the ZBA.
Longview School	52.-1-12	3-9	Site Plan	No Board Action
Top Cat Realty Corp and 1841 Park Ave Realty Corp	86.5-1-25,26 & 9-12 75.17-1-53		T.B. Referral	Planner to Prepare Resolution.
Minutes – 05/08/19		12		Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

There was no audio for the first minute of the meeting.

The Planning Board Members were in Executive Session for a potential litigation from 6:00 pm – 7:00 pm.

Chairman Paepre welcomed Robert Frenkel to the Planning Board.

HOROWITZ/RUSSELL & BROWN – 152 & 156 WEST LAKE BLVD – TM – 64.19-1-84 & 85 – PUBLIC HEARING & RESOLUTION

Mr. Carnazza stated the variances were granted from the zoning board. All zoning comments have been addressed.

Mr. Cleary stated all his comments have been addressed and you have a resolution of approval before you this evening.

Chairman Paepre asked if anyone in the audience wished to be heard on this application.

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

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to adopt Resolution #19-03, dated June 12, 2019; Tax Map #64.19-1-84 & 85, entitled Horowitz/Russell & Brown Subdivision Lot Line Adjustment. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

ACTION FUEL – 16 ROUTE 6N – TM – 85.16-1-20 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant wishes to add a Propane Distribution Facility to the existing yard. This property is in the R-Residential Zoning District, a use variance is required for the additional use.

Mr. Cleary stated Mr. Franzetti's memo points out the various permits and approvals that are required. The area of disturbance for the work has been provided, is 7,200 sq ft. The threshold criteria of disturbances for the NYSDEC stormwater regulation are between 5,000 square feet and one (1) acre and over one (1) acre. The project will require 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 is for erosion and sediment control only. The applicant is aware of this requirement. The applicant may be required to supply a stormwater maintenance agreement and maintenance guarantee per Town Code (§156-85 and §156-87 B respectively). The applicant has acknowledged this comment. However as there are no permanent stormwater management practices being provided for the site, this

requirement is not required. Should any public improvements be deemed necessary as part of the development of the tract, a Performance Bond and associated Engineering Fee must eventually be established for the work.

Mr. Cleary stated the applicant has addressed our initial comments. The issue with respect to this as Mr. Carnazza has indicated is the use variance. They need to be referred to the zoning board for the use variance.

Chairman Paepre addressed the board and stated I looked at the property and there is a lot going on there. He asked about cleaning the site and making it a more attractive site to the neighbors.

Wayne Staten, owner of the property addressed the board and stated when I purchased this property two years ago; I spent a fortune on cleaning the property. It's night and day compared to what it was.

Chairman Paepre said there are firetrucks, a car business, other trucks and debris. He said I could meet with you on the site. He said I'm not sure if any other board member has gone to the site yet.

Mrs. Kugler said she hasn't had a chance to go out there yet.

Mr. Tom Hevner, Engineer with Alliance Environmental Group representing Mr. Staten stated we have a provision to include arborvitaes as a noise barrier for where the tanks were.

Chairman Paepre said I'm okay with sending them to the zoning board. He then asked what is the firetruck doing there?

Mr. Staten said it could have been there for repair, but I'm not exactly sure. He said we could definitely get rid of the firetruck if that is an issue.....

Chairman Paepre said I'm just talking about general housekeeping.

Mr. Carnazza said I have been out there, but not in a while.

Mr. Cleary said if they achieve the hurdle of the use variance, there is screening and landscaping issues we could do to improve the visual appearance of the property, but the primary hurdle they face is the use variance.

Mr. Cote moved to deny the application to the zoning board. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Giannico with all in favor.

Chairman Paepre asked Mr. Cleary what about the ECB.....

Mr. Cleary said it does need to go to the ECB, but let them go to the zoning board first.

LONGVIEW SCHOOL – 110 SCOUT HILL ROAD – TM – 52.-1-12 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant proposes to convert the existing one family dwelling into a private school. Per §156-23(a), provide proof that the school is a nonprofit organization within the meaning of the Education Law of New York State. Provide an age range for the students. You claim that you will have minimal high school age students. The code clearly reads “*schools with pupils of a least high school age shall provide at least 20 parking spaces, plus five per classroom*”. If there children of high school age, 20 parking spaces, plus 5 per classroom are required. Why is phase 1 and phase II on the gym building? Generally, our planning board does not accept phasing.

Mr. Cleary read Mr. Franzetti’s memo which stated based upon our review of this submittal, the Engineering Department offers the following **preliminary** comments:

I. General Comments

1. The following referrals would appear to be warranted:
 - a. Mahopac Falls Fire Department
2. Permits from the following would appear necessary:
 - a. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation(NYSDEC) – Coverage under General Permit GP-0-15-002
3. The area of disturbance for the work has been provided, is 38,300 sq ft. This site is not in the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation(NYSDEC) phosphorus restricted basin. The threshold criteria of disturbances in §156X of the Town Code requires a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that is for erosion and sediment control only.

Review of the SWPPP and associated details is ongoing and comments will be provided to applicant.
4. 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.

I. Detailed Comments

1. Applicant to provide contours at 2’ intervals.
2. Graphic representation of vehicle movements through the site should be provided to illustrate that sufficient space exists to maneuver all types of vehicles anticipated at the site.
3. All turning radii for the site should be graphically provided.
4. Available sight distances at each driveway location should be specified on plan. Any clearing along the edge of the roadway R.O.W. that may be necessary to assure appropriate sight distances are provided, should be identified.

5. Sidewalks, manholes and guiderails should be installed per §128 of the Town of Carmel Town Code
6. A landscaping plan should be provided to show the location and extent of all plantings.
7. All plantings shall be installed per §142 of the Town of Carmel Town Code.
8. Construction Sequence should be provided on the drawing
9. It is unclear as to where the privacy wall is being installed. Please note that All retaining walls greater than 6 feet must be certified by a NYS licensed structural engineer.
10. It is unclear if any additional electric utilities are being installed.
11. Access for Fire Department around the rear of the buildings must be considered.

Mr. Cleary addressed the board and stated this is a conditional use. There are four specific criteria that the applicant must address. The first one is *said school or institution shall be a nonprofit organization within the meaning of the Education Law of New York State*. The applicant has noted that compliance with this provision is “pending.” Approval cannot be granted until the school’s non-profit certification is provided. *Such school shall have, as its prime purpose, the general education of students in the arts and sciences and shall be licensed by the State Department of Education if a license for its operation is required by law*. The applicant must clarify that the school is a general education institution, and provide evidence of a license from the State Education Department. *No school permitted hereunder shall be a trade school, except to the extent that instruction in a particular trade or trades may be a part of the general education curriculum of the school in the arts and sciences. No correctional, health or any other institution not primarily concerned with the general education of students in the arts and sciences shall be permitted*. The applicant states that the school is not a trade school. *The minimum lot area shall be five acres, plus one acre for each 100 pupils*. The site is 15.9 acres. The maximum number of students that would attend this school is 50. The site therefore meets the minimum lot area requirement currently, and at full enrollment. *A minimum of 10 parking spaces, plus three spaces per classroom shall be required for those schools with pupils of elementary and junior high school age. Schools with pupils of at least high school age shall provide at least 20 parking spaces, plus five per classroom*. The Occupancy Layout Plan (L1) depicts 7 labeled classrooms. 2 are labeled as “elementary classrooms” but the other classrooms are not designated. As the parking requirement relates to the grades of the pupils, clarification is required. 29 off-street parking spaces are provided. If only 2 classrooms serve elementary school aged students and the 5 remaining classrooms accommodate high school students, the parking requirement for the site would be as follows:

- Minimum 10 spaces
 - 3/elementary classroom (2 classrooms) = 6 spaces
 - 5/high school classroom (5 classrooms) = 25 spaces
- Total = 41 spaces

The proposed parking would be deficient, and a variance would be required.

A letter from the Carmel Central School District has been provided indicating that they see no issues providing bus service to this site. The existing driveway is being widened to accommodate bus and other traffic. Clarify the grade of the proposed driveway. The applicant has noted that topographic survey data is pending. A more thorough review cannot be completed until topographic data is submitted. The applicant has indicated that a tree plan and landscape plan are not necessary. The Board should review this request, and determine if this waiver is appropriate. Entry landscaping, and potentially screening and buffer landscaping in the vicinity of the new gym building may be warranted. Are any plans for outdoor athletic fields or playgrounds proposed? Does outdoor recess occur? If so, where would this take place? Will a headmaster or any staff reside at the school? The applicant has provided an estimate of vehicle trip generation. During the AM peak hour, 43 trips would be generated. The applicant estimates the existing volume on Scout Hill Road to be 100 trips during the AM peak hour. The Board should determine if this volume of traffic is problematic, or if additional traffic analysis is necessary. Details of the proposed monument sign are requested. A kitchen and food service is proposed. Clarify the operational aspects of the food service operation. Will odors result from venting equipment? How will deliveries be addressed, as well as solid waste disposal and recycling? Are any site security measures proposed, such as gates, fencing or security lighting?

Vice Chairman Giannico asked Mr. Cleary if the kitchen must be a commercial kitchen.

Mr. Cleary replied yes.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked does it have to be certified by the State?

Mr. Carnazza replied no, because it is a private school.

Mr. Peder Scott of PW Scott Engineering and Architect, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated the Longview School is currently located in the Methodist Church in Brewster and they currently have 35 students. He said the anticipated population of the school will start with six administrators, 28 students and four volunteers. A peak buildout would be 8 teachers/administrators, 50 students and six volunteers, a total occupancy between 38 and 64 over time. They looked at many locations and facilities in the area, basically this is permitted in the zone, the property is 15.96 acres and somewhat isolated at the end of the road at Scout Hill Road. It's on a hillside facing west which overlooks the Taconic, powerlines and Fahnestock Park. There are no wetlands on the site. He said we are outside of the NYCDEP watershed. Our disturbance is less than 1 acre and we are exempt from stormwater management per the NYSDEC, but we are providing a stormwater management system. We sent packages to the Fire Department, but they have not responded to us. He said we are in compliance with the fire code for truck access. There is a hammerhead in full compliance on the plan. We are proposing a gym building. The reason why it is being phased is because of the cost factor from converting the house into a school. He said we are willing to submit a footprint of the building itself, but since money is an issue with non-profit school facilities we would like to push off the construction of the building if we could for a

second phase. He said we will commit to putting in a concrete slab and a foundation area initially and that we be serving as an outdoor recreation area. There are no ballfields proposed for this project. It will be mainly a passive educational facility. Trails and garden areas are proposed. He said there will not be any overnight people at all. We will amend the statement to include that. There are high school age students, but based on the small scale of the school, you may have 3 or 4 at most high school students; it is detrimental to provide over 40 parking spaces. He said we are not allowing them to drive their cars there. We could put certain restrictions in to reduce the density of the number of occupants. We could also provide you a green space program where we could allocate spaces for the future in case certain uses arise. It's called land banking and we could provide that.

Mr. Cleary said it's easy to address by clarifying on those classrooms that they are not high school classrooms.

Mr. Scott said that's correct.

Mr. Carnazza stated the code reads if you have children that are in high school, you need 20 parking spots.....

Chairman Paeprer stated once it all gets clarified it may or may not need a variance.

Mr. Scott continued and stated we have the school bus letter saying they will access the site and it's all be fulfilled through a code compliant hammerhead at the back of the property. He said we didn't think a cul-de-sac was apropos for the project due to the limited number of vehicles we have and also some of the topography issues. He said we are on a steep site and we are only working in the areas that have been developed on the site in the past which is level. He said we are using the hammerhead because it works better with grading in the back of the property. He said we have pictures of the building (at which time Mr. Scott displayed the pictures and renderings). He said the existing house has a finished basement and two floors above. We will be adding an elevator for access to the upper floor. The two lower levels are accessible on grade, handicapped accessible ramps will be installed. He said the gym building is one story, low profile and is 40 x 100.

Mr. Carnazza asked what is the height of the building?

Mr. Scott replied 16 feet to the eave. He said we are fully compliant with zoning. He said the only outstanding issue we would have is the interpretation of the number of parking spots required.

At which time, Mr. Mark Jacobs the director and co-founder of Longview School approached the podium. He addressed the board and stated this is our 19th that we have existed. He said for the first half we were in Cortlandt Manor and for the second half we are in the Village of Brewster. He said up until this time we have been renters, and we believe the next phase is to have our own building for many more years to come.

He said the school itself is different in philosophy in a number of ways. First, we are very small and we are dedicated to being small so that we could meet the needs of these individual students, many of them who have a lot of challenges. He said we are not a school for kids that have special needs, but we tend to have about half of our population of kids with special needs. He said one of the things that are distinct about model is the way we integrate kids with special needs and general population who could be average learners to accelerated learners. He said we are able to do that because of some of the very modern educational techniques we are using, such as, project base learning and inquiry based instruction. He said the public schools are doing that, but they struggle to do, because their class sizes are so big. We are able to do that with our students. We also have a big focus on student responsibility and independence. We are a democratic school in the sense that kids are integrally involved in the decision making at the school. That's how we teach them responsibility. Not only are they studying history, but they are participating in the government of the school. They are involved in making decisions, making rules, enforcing the rules, working out conflicts, keeping the school clean and organized. He said we mix that in with traditional academics in all of the main academics areas covering the same curricular areas. He said we have been very successful at it, for nearly 20 years. He said we have had very positive relationships with the towns that we have been in and the school districts that we have been servicing. Although, we are a private school, particularly working with kids with special needs, they need to have a way of interacting with the public schools to make sure that individualized education plans are all being followed. He said I have been there from the very beginning as a co-founder. I intend to be there for a lot of years to come and I brought in a dynamic staff of passionate educators who are reaching these kids and are teaching a wide range of electives, such as sociology, high level film classes, news classes and specific focus areas in history, such as Medieval and Asian history.

Chairman Paerprer asked will you be re-locating the Brewster students to this facility?

Mr. Jacobs replied that's correct. We are not opening a second facility.

Chairman Paerprer asked what are the ages of the students that you foresee here?

Mr. Jacobs replied K-12. He said our goal is not to get very big. He said we proposed bigger than we think we want to get just for safety. We like the 30 to 40 students range is where we feel comfortable to provide what we provide.

Mr. Cote asked if all of their students come to you with IEP (Individualized Education Program).

Mr. Jacobs replied no. About half of the students have special needs and about a quarter of students have IEP's.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked what is the basis for your admission, is it an open application to apply?

Mr. Jacobs replied yes, it is an open application. He said although it is a private school, we never intended to be a school that would price people out. If you compare to private schools in the area our tuition and fees are lower and is about \$20,000.00. He said we having a sliding scale tuition, so we could bring the tuition down to as low as \$3,300 a year and there have been cases where we brought it down even lower.

Mr. Carnazza asked if there is a gym at the existing location.

Mr. Jacobs replied we have a church hall that we use light gym activities and the rest outdoors.

Mr. Frenkel asked about food preparations and service.

Mr. Jacobs stated we do not provide food for the kids; we do not have a cafeteria. We do not have a cafeteria service. The students are bringing in bagged or lunch box lunches.

Chairman Paepre asked if they do the fire drills, safety training, etc.

Mr. Jacobs replied absolutely!! We are regulated and report everything to the State.

Mr. Scott stated in our application submission NYS law requirements require a document to be filed with an approved site plan.

Mr. Cleary said that would be a condition of your approval that they obtain state documents.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked if they had a layout of the interior renovations?

Mr. Scott replied yes and then proceeded to display the drawing. He said both NYCDEP and the Putnam County Health Department reviewed the project and we are being issued a letter accordingly on that.

At which time, Mr. Scott proceeded to describe the interior of the proposed school and all its components within.

Mr. Scott continued and stated they were looking for some latitude on the parking requirements. We could easily show you the allocation of the potential parking spaces if necessary. He said we tried to keep all the parking at the bottom of the hillside.

Mr. Carnazza said the reason for the parking calculation they have is first off you are going to have a theatre, so you will have the grandparents attend possibly mom and dad. It's not just the school day, I hope you understand that.

Mr. Scott replied yes that's correct, I understand that. He stated on the driveway, we are parking on right side of the hillside and we could easily add an overflow of parking because that area is completely open right now.

Mr. Carnazza asked if the septic system is in front of the house.

Mr. Scott replied yes. It is about 40 feet away from the driveway in the lower left hand corner. He said out total disturbance if you take the tree scape that exists now and limited disturbance, we are only disturbing .12 of acre beyond what is disturbed now.

Chairman Paepre stated according to Mr. Franzetti's memo you have about three pages of comments. He recommended that they follow up with Mr. Franzetti. He said there are too many comments right now for the board to make any comments.

**TOP CAT REALTY CORP AND 1841 PARK AVE REALTY CORP – 121-125
STILLWATER ROAD – TM – 86.5-1-25,26 & 75.17-1-53 – TOWN BOARD REFERRAL –
DISCUSSION**

Mr. Carnazza stated this property was formally light industrial. In the 2002 zone change, we changed it because it was vacant property to residential leaving just a single strip of commercial or light industrial and now Commerce Business Park there. He said there proposal is to turn it back into the light industrial/CPB that it was before.

Mr. Cleary stated this was industrially zoned property. The town wide rezoning turned it into residentially zoned property. It has been traditionally used as industrial site (Liffy Van Lines). He said when we did the rezoning the theory behind changing zoning from these categories was that eventually over time the properties that have been rezoned revert to the new zone. In this case, it is a very well maintained building and it's probably not going anywhere, so it exists as a legal non-conforming building which hampers the ability to re-invest in the property and improve the property over time. So it could sit there forever as it is today, or it could continue to be a thriving business and do what it needs to do over the years to improve itself and the only way it could do that is by modifying the zoning on the property. He said the applicant is requesting to revert back to a commercial zone. He said in my memo I have identified with the C-Zone offers in terms of permitted uses and dimensional requirements. I don't think the applicant has any intentions to change the use of operation of the property.

Mr. Charbonneau addressed the board and stated this petition was brought to the Town Board. The Town Board is considering it and they have made a referral to the Planning Board. So any comments that you may have has a board, Mr. Cleary will send a memo back to the Town Board and they will that information in making an ultimate determination on whether to change the zoning.

Mr. Cleary stated you don't have to send a recommendation back, but they had to send a referral to you. You could do nothing, you could simply say you agree, disagree or you could offer a series of comments as you choose to offer to the Town Board.

Mr. Carnazza said the second lot behind the house was Lifetime Tennis; it was a tennis bubble which was pressurized and that's how they kept the dome. It was a commercial use before and they have been gone for a while.

Chairman Paepre said I would like to hear a summary of what you plan on doing. I'm not necessarily opposed to it, I think it is a commercial use today and I don't see it reverting back to residential.

Mr. William Shilling, the petitioner's attorney addressed the board and stated they consist of two entities, Top Cat Realty & 1841 Park Ave Realty. Those corporations are owned by Dan Moloney a Mahopac resident. He said there are three parcels that are looking for a zone change. They all join the warehouse complex. The complex is 121-125 Stillwater Road. He said the three properties in question, were all zoned a light industrial prior to 2002. Mr. Moloney bought the properties in 2001 with every expectation of expanding his commercial use legally under light industrial zone to warehouse purposes. He said the 1st parcel as Mr. Carnazza indicated was the bubble, the tennis court. It was zoned light industrial in 2001, Mr. Moloney bought in it 2001 and then the zoning changed to residential in 2002. It's fair to say that he would not have purchased the residential site; he bought because it was commercial/light industrial with every intention of expanding. The 2nd parcel has the same history. The 3rd parcel is the scenario; he went into contract in 2002 before the zone change to residential. As Mr. Charbonneau suggested, this is a petition to change the zone from residential to commercial and this is pursuant to your town code 156-76 into town law 273. He said the procedure is to go to the Town Board first and then get a referral to the planning board. You then make any recommendations/reports or as Mr. Cleary said you could choose not to do anything. Ultimately, it comes back to the Town Board for a formal change of zoning as per our petition request.

Mr. Cleary said the Town Board then has a public hearing. They will deal with SEQR with regards to this.

Mr. Shilling continued and stated Mr. Moloney has 16 businesses on the properties. They have 64 employees and their property taxes are \$135,000.00, so it is a substantial commercial site in this site. The change in zoning did two things, it rendered a commercial site an island and it made a residential district completely obsolete. There really is no residential component or use for that piece. He said I believe the zoning was ill advised at the time. It didn't really consider the historical background and didn't consider the surrounding area. It created an island. I submitted a memo of law together with the petition which says if the zoning effect has the result of creating an island it's almost spot zoning per se. He said the island that Mr. Contelmo will show you, makes the commercial expansion impossible and residential development improbable.

At which time, Mr. Jeff Contelmo of Insite Engineering, representing Mr. Moloney addressed the board stated to clarify the existing warehouse parcel is currently zoned commercial. It's the adjacent portions of the Moloney Holdings that are zoned residential that are three separate lots (points to map showing the parcels). He said we are seeking

to expand that commercial zone or move that commercial zone line to the west and grab the three adjacent lots which historically have been used for non-residential purposes. We also submitted to the Town Board and Planning Board the old pre 2002 zoning which showed that this portion of the properties (points to map) was zoned Industrial Light. He said with regards to what surrounds the property, the existing commercially zoned property borders Williamsburg Ridge which is a multi-family district. He said to the west of us is conservation land, wetlands and NYCDEP owned property. There are a couple homes across the street. He said what we think this request does, it solves a problem that was created by a single parcel zoned commercial.

Mr. Cleary asked to clarify if the three parcels are used in conjunction with the warehouse building.

Mr. Contelmo replied yes. He said the warehouse building encumbers almost all of its parcels. It has been the subject of multiple site plan enlargement over the years. The storage and parking associated with that building has migrated onto those adjacent properties. There has been other improvements made that will need to be brought back to this board for site plan approval should the zoning go forward.

Chairman Paepre stated he likes the idea of going back to commercial; maybe the owner would make some investments to the site. The way it is now, I do see why he would. He said there is a lot of activity on that site; I have been a few times. He said there is stone, dirt, rock piles and abandoned vehicles that need to be cleaned up and removed.

Mr. Contelmo stated if we're successful with the rezoning, there are improvements already on the property that need to be validated through a site plan process and this board will have a say about the improvements and that would be your opportunity to work with us to bring into conformance.

Mr. Cote asked 18 years later, what brings you here to ask for this change.

Mr. Shilling said as Mr. Contelmo stated as the warehouse site kept on spilling over to the adjacent properties, I think Mr. Moloney's plan was always to expand that site.

Mr. Cote asked is the owner contemplating anything else down the road?

Mr. Contelmo replied since Mr. Moloney is getting up there in age, and he is really trying to get the "house" in order. I'm not sure of the detail of his knowledge of how planning, zoning and how it all works. He said there have been things done without the proper permits and part of this is to clean that up. The first step is to get the zoning in place if we can.

Mrs. Kugler stated she agreed with the Chairman. There is a lot going on there, there are a lot of different businesses and so on. She asked how is the relationship with the neighbors in Williamsburg Ridge.

Mr. Contelmo stated I'm not privy to what those relationships are. I'm not aware of where the neighbors stand.

Mrs. Kugler said we want to try and clean up this property and we want to make sure that we are good neighbors.

Mr. Contelmo stated I was involved with this project 30 years ago when it was just the warehouse and there was some controversy with the Stillwater application. That is not part of the rezoning or site plan.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding the cleaning and buffering of the property for the neighbors.

Chairman Paepre said to Mr. Cleary to draft a letter for a positive resolution to the Town Board.

All the board members were in agreement.

Mr. Cleary said will do.

MINUTES – 05/08/19

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

Mrs. Kugler moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:58 p.m. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Giannico with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta