

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 26, 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>
Downtown Mahopac Properties	75.12-2-26	1-6	A. Site Plan	No Board Action.
Viscovich, Mario	75.42-1-69	6-8	Site Plan	No Board Action.
Camp Kiwi	77.13-2-16	9-13	Site Plan	No Board Action.
Lake Plaza Shopping Center	65.10-1-45&46	13-14	Bond Red.	Public Hearing Scheduled.
Minutes – 05/22/19		14		Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

DOWNTOWN MAHOPAC PROPERTIES – 559 ROUTE 6 – AMENDED SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant proposes to construct a 1-1/2 story storage building. Lot depth line must start at the midpoint of the frontage. It appears to me that it is not at the midpoint. Provide setback envelope. The “Frame Shed” to the west needs to be moved and/or removed or a variance is required from the ZBA.

Mr. Joel Greenberg of Architectural Visions, representing the applicant stated the shed will be removed.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the proposal involves the installation of 6,000 square foot storage building. 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 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 as provided in the SEAF is 1.1 acres. This exceeds the threshold criteria of disturbance for New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) stormwater regulations. This project is above the 1 acre threshold and therefore requires 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 the post stormwater controls.

The applicant must provide a Storm Water Prevention Control Plan, which provides all the necessary details for design of the stormwater management system.

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.
5. The applicant will be required to supply a stormwater maintenance agreement and maintenance guarantee per Town Code (§156-85 and §156-87 B respectively) to assure long-term maintenance of all stormwater management practices (SWMP) proposed for the site.
6. The facility is currently served by Carmel Water District # 1 and Carmel Sewer District # 1. A water and wastewater report must be submitted.
7. The following referrals would appear to be warranted:
 - a. Mahopac Fire Department

8. The following regulatory permits will be required for the application:
 - a. New York State Department of Conservation Stormwater Permit
 - b. Town of Carmel Sewer/Water connection

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. Erosion and sediment controls for the site must be provided.
9. Construction Sequence should be provided on the drawing
10. It is unclear if any additional electric utilities are being installed.
11. A lighting spill plan must be provided.
12. Access for Fire Department around the rear of the buildings must be considered
13. All sewers must meet the Town of Carmel Town Code § 120-29.
14. All water service connections must be K-copper.
15. Gate valves shall be AWWA non-rising stem type, as manufactured by Mueller Company, Model A-2360-23, or approved equal, conforming to the latest AWWA Standard for Gate Valves - 3" through 48" - for Water and Other Liquids, AWWA Designation C-509.
16. Sizes up to and including 12" shall be 250 psi working pressure. The valve body and bonnet shall be ductile iron. All interior and exterior metal surfaces shall be coated with a two-part thermosetting epoxy complying with AWWA C550.
17. Valves shall have dual "O" ring seals, inside screw, resilient wedge seats in accordance with AWWA Designation C-550 and shall be constructed so as to provide unobstructed full port clearance when fully open and immediate complete closure when closed. The ends of the valves shall be mechanical joint.
18. All valves shall be arranged to open in counter clockwise direction unless otherwise specifically indicated and operating nuts shall be 2" square.
19. Valves shall be tested to a pressure of not less than two times the working pressure.

20. All hydrants shall be six inches in size with six-inch mechanical joint inlet connection and shall be equal to the Mueller Centurion A-421, with one (1) 4 ½ " pumper nozzle and two (2) 2 ½ " hose nozzles.
21. Water Service Saddles shall be equal to those manufactured by Mueller, Model 7 ½" x 1" SS Series Stainless Steel Saddle, Double Stud.
22. Corporation stops shall be equal to those as manufactured by Mueller Company, Model B-25000 Series, NRS and of the size required. Such corporation stops shall meet the requirements of AWWA Specification No. C800.
23. Curb valves (stops) shall be equal to those as manufactured by Mueller Company, Model H-15214 and shall conform to AWWA Specification No. C800.
24. Curb boxes shall be equal to those as manufactured by Mueller Company and similar to Mueller extension type with arch pattern base model H-10314 all extension rods shall be stainless steel.
25. All fire hydrants shall be the approved AWWA type fire hydrants in conformance with the American Water Works Association Standard for Fire Hydrants for Ordinary Water Works Service, AWWA Designation C502, and shall have a 5-1/4" valve opening, a 6" mechanical joint inlet complete with an auxiliary gate valve (close coupled), a 6" mechanical joint shoe, and all appurtenances.
26. Fire hydrants shall be rated for a working pressure of 250 Psi. Fire hydrants shall be sized for a 4'-6" bury.

Mr. Franzetti read Mr. Cleary's memo which stated this proposal involves the construction of a new 6,000 square foot warehouse building on a parcel containing two existing commercial buildings, located on the east side of Route 6. The new building is proposed in an area of the site that is currently used for parking and vehicle storage, and includes a partially wooded area.

SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS:

§ Clarification is requested regarding the proposed use of the warehouse building. What will be stored in the warehouse? How will the new building effect the use of the site. Is the warehouse related to any of the other businesses currently located on the site?

§ The proposed warehouse building is a permitted use in the C – Commercial zoning district.

§ The proposed one-story, 6,000 square foot warehouse building complies with all applicable C – Commercial zoning district dimensional regulations.

§ The 6,000 square foot warehouse requires the provision of 6 off-street parking spaces. 39 spaces currently exist on the site, and 6 spaces are proposed, for a total of 45 parking spaces.

§ The parking tabulation on the Site Plan (AS-100) should identify each use within the two existing buildings to ensure that the appropriate parking requirement has been applied.

§ Currently, there are no designated, striped parking spaces on the lot. The proposal includes new designated, striped parking spaces. It is noted that the new spaces are show as 9' wide, where pursuant to §156-42 A (1), 10' is required. The spaces should be revised, or a variance would be required.

§ Clarify if the new warehouse will be visible from the Putnam Trailway once the rear of the site is cleared of existing vegetation. If so, a more robust landscape buffer and screening plan is recommended.

§ Currently the area in front of the main building just off Route 6 consists of a small planter adjacent to the building, an approximately 15' wide asphalt strip, a 5' wide concrete sidewalk, and then a curb. The asphalt strip, which is primarily located within the Route 6 right-of-way, is depicted on the site plan as an "asphalt parking lot" although no parking spaces are shown in this area. In order to continue the Board's efforts to improve the Route 6 streetscape, it is recommended that the applicant coordinate with the NYSDOT to replace the barren asphalt strip, with landscaping, or at a minimum a grass strip similar to both adjacent properties.

§ Site lighting details are depicted on the Site Plan, however, illumination levels are not identified.

§ An elevation of the warehouse has been provided. Details of the proposed architecture are requested, including proposed siding and roof materials, colors, overhead door details, etc.

§ Clarify if the existing asphalt in the parking area is being replaced.

§ Clarify how stormwater management is being addressed.

Mr. Greenberg addressed the board and stated the applicant is proposing to build a 6,000 square foot building (points to map). The building will be for the owner's use and will be storing his classic cars in there. There is no business, no employees it's just storage for classic cars. He said with regard to the comment of 1.1 acres, the site is 1.1 acres, but the area of disturbance which is the 6,000 square feet plus the area around it, will be only .4 acres. We don't meet the 1 acre threshold. The drawings have been mailed to the Fire Department and haven't received any comments back from them yet. He said the site is served by a well and it is noted on the application.

Mr. Franzetti said water lines are being shown on the drawing.

Mr. Greenberg said we show the water line going from the well to the building.

Mr. Franzetti stated it needs to be clarified. It's not clear.

Mr. Greenberg continued and stated with regards to the trailway, we do not abut the trailway. The area directly behind the building is owned by company named Dunwest, the trailway is behind that (points to map). He said as far as the design of the building, we will have colors and samples at the next meeting.

Mr. Cote asked Mr. Greenberg if he had better drawings of the proposed structure.

Mr. Greenberg responded we will have samples and colors at the next meeting. It will be a pre-engineered steel building.

Mr. Cote asked we will probably need to have this reviewed by our architect to see if fits in with the theme that we have been trying to accomplish with the town.

Mr. Cote asked if this will be visible from Route 6.

Mr. Greenberg said it is about 200 feet back from Route 6. He said you will see it by the entrance, the curb cut that is existing. You will never see the full building because of all the landscaping along the side and down to Route 6 (points to map).

Mr. Cote asked if the classic cars that will be stored in the building are already on the property.

Mr. Greenberg replied you could get a lot of cars in with 6,000 square feet.

Mr. Cote stated right now you have what appears to be a bulldozer on the property with weeds growing through it and is an eyesore.....

Mr. Greenberg said everything that you see there will be gone and cleaned up and the shed will be removed also.

Mr. Cote asked if the parking lot will be re-surfaced or blacktopped.

Mr. Greenberg said the existing blacktop was put down about 9 years ago. We will probably put one coat topping and around the building itself will be brand new.

Chairman Paepre asked what businesses are on the property.

Mr. Greenberg replied there is a tattoo parlor, a pharmacy, beauty salon and two offices in the front building upstairs. He said on the next submission I will list all of the buildings, square footage, the required parking and the number of employees.

Mr. Cote asked for as built renderings of the building for the next meeting.

Mr. Greenberg replied yes.

Mr. Franzetti stated the stormwater needs to be clear..... He stated you initially stated you would be taking everything up, asphalt wide which indicates 1.1 acres of disturbance and that's taking all the asphalt up and removing it. You need to make that clear, so you don't need the permanent stormwater controls if you're not there.

Mr. Greenberg said we will have the surveyor locate exactly where the blacktop is and we block out the area of disturbance which will be about ½ acre.

Mr. Franzetti stated so part of the approval is going to be re-conditioning and re-striping the front end of the parking area, correct?

Mr. Greenberg replied that's correct.

Mr. Franzetti said they will need to be identified, that's not disturbance, but it's part of the approval that the board needs to look at and review as part of what they have to have.

Mr. Greenberg replied no problem.

Chairman Paepre stated the more specific you are the faster the process will go. Also, this board serves as the Architectural Review Board. We will make a decision at the next meeting when we see what you have and if needs to go to our architectural consultant or not.

Mr. Greenberg replied okay.

Mrs. Kugler asked about the shed in the back.

Mr. Greenberg said it will be removed.

Mr. Franzetti stated if the board recommends that it goes to the architect, there is a permit fee associated with that, they review once and if there are any additional reviews an escrow needs to be posted.

Chairman Paepre said to follow up with the consultants.

VISCOVICH, MARIO – SOUTH LAKE BLVD – TM – 75.42-1-69 – SPECIAL SITE PLAN (DOCK)

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant proposes to legalize a raised platform deck and construct a shed. A stop work order was issued on this property but the tenant continued to construct the "Platform" structure without a permit. The neighbors claim that somebody is living in a tent on the property. Lot depth line and width lines must be provided. Provide the high water mark. It is unclear on the map. The dock can only be 25 ft. from the high water mark. It appears to be further. Variance required. Wetland permit is required from the ECB; the platform is over the lake and sitting in the mud. A use permit is required from the State of New York. There are zero parking spaces on the site. Several variances are required from the ZBA.

Rich's memo said this application encompasses adding to existing deck, dock and adding a shed and a porta-potty. The amenity will require the creation of parking on the site per §156.27 of the Town Code. Based upon our review of this submittal, the Engineering Department (Department) offers the following preliminary comments:

1. A survey of the property should be provided.
2. Based on the drawing provided part of the deck is shown off of the applicant's property. This will need to be clarified prior to moving forward with this application.

3. The drawing should provide a legend which contains all significant features on the drawing.
4. The site plan provided is very confusing and should be updated to provide the existing and proposed site plans.
5. The short environmental assessment form identified the following that the project is located in 100 year flood plain. A Town of Carmel Flood Plain permit is required.
6. The following referrals would appear to be warranted:
 - The Town of Carmel Environmental Conservation Board
 - Putnam County Highway Department
7. Easement information from the NYSDOT.
8. Additional details should be provided regarding:
 - How the proposed features will be installed (construction sequence)
 - If a parking spot will be installed.
 - The plan must show the location of erosion and sediment control measures being used during construction.
9. Various plan information required pursuant to §156-27 ("Site Plans") is currently lacking. These include, but are not limited to:
 - Off street parking
 - Highwater mark.
 - Fencing details.

Mr. Franzetti read Mr. Cleary's memo which stated this proposal involves extensions to an existing deck and dock, the installation of an 8' x 8' shed and a "porta-potty". The site is located in the R - Residential zoning district. The proposed improvements are permitted as a "private water related facility" subject to Special Permit approval as set forth in 156-27. The site is not improved with a residence, has approximately 24.9 feet of frontage on Lake Mahopac, is 16.6 feet in depth and is 417 square feet in lot area. Variances for all three dimensional requirements are necessary. The owner must clarify how the site will be used. The proposed dock extends 20' into Lake Mahopac; however, the plans do not indicate the location of the shoreline. Clarification is required. A bathhouse is not proposed. The 417 square foot parcel requires the provision of 1 off-street parking space. None are provided. A variance is required. Clarification is required if fencing is proposed. Are utilities (water, electric) proposed on the new dock? Is exterior lighting proposed on the new deck or dock? If so, details are required. Details of the "flood lights" around the shed are required. Clarification is required regarding the note that reads "provide access to concrete pipes below." Is a new structure proposed to be constructed? The location of the drain pipe easement is unclear. Clarify the interface of the new wood dock and the shoreline. Is new bulkheading proposed? It is unclear if a NYSDEC permit will be required for this application. The applicant should verify this with the DEC. The site is located within the 100-year floodplain. A Town of Carmel Floodplain Permit is required. ECB approval is required.

Chairman Paerprer said to Mr. Greenberg, the applicant's architect, there are a lot of comments.

Mr. Greenberg said as far as the parking that's correct there is no parking. We are requesting a one car variance, because that's what is required. He said there is an easement that the State has for a drainage pipe that goes under the deck and goes out at the shoreline. I will make that clearer. The easement is from Route 6N out to the shore.

Chairman Paepre asked if the drain was blocked.

Mr. Greenberg replied no. He said we are only requesting electric, no water.

Mr. Carnazza asked if he could buffer the potta-potty area either with a trellis or something to make it not as obvious.

Mr. Greenberg replied that's fine.

Chairman Paepre asked when you talk about electric, I'm assuming it's for lighting?

Mr. Greenberg replied yes that's it.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding the dock and shed that was on his neighbor's property.

Mr. Greenberg stated when the neighbor bought his property he claimed the shed and dock was on his property. Mr. Viscovich got a new survey and it shows the dock and shed is on his property, so the neighbor removed both the dock and shed which will reflect on the next submission because it was recently removed.

Mr. Cote asked where do they park when they use it?

Mr. Greenberg points to the map to show where they park.

Mr. Cote asked what happened when a stop work order was issued, but the work didn't stop. Do we know why that occurred?

Mr. Charbonneau asked if there was a violation pending right now.

Mr. Viscovich replied yes.

Mr. Greenberg stated while Mr. Viscovich was away and someone he was familiar with did some things on the property that shouldn't have been done. But that has since been stopped.

Chairman Paepre stated once we clarify where the high water mark is then we will know what variances are required.

Mr. Greenberg replied that's correct.

CAMP KIWI – 845 UNION VALLEY ROAD – TM – 77.13-2-16 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant proposes to improve a parking area that has been used for several years. They wish to item 4 the parking area to make it more usable. A residential parking area is not a permitted use in the R-Residential Zone. A variance is required from the ZBA. Additional screening should be installed adjacent to the adjacent residence. Why is there a frame shed in the Right of Way? Is the only ingress/egress at Blossom Lane?

Mr. Jack Karell, the applicant's engineer replied Blossom Lane is a dead end.

Mr. Carnazza is that the only ingress/egress to this parking lot?

Mr. Karell replied yes.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the application involves the removal of a grassed parking area and replacement with an item 4 parking area at the referenced site. Based upon our review of this submittal, the Engineering Department offers the following **preliminary** comments:

II. General Comments

Permits from the following would appear necessary:

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation(NYSDEC) –
Coverage under General Permit GP-0-15-002

The area of disturbance for the work as provided in the SEAF is 34,600 sq-ft which is above the threshold criteria of disturbance for New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) stormwater regulations. This project is above the 5,000 sq-ft disturbance and below the 1 acre threshold and therefore requires 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 the erosion and sediment controls. The applicant has provided SWPPP which is currently under review. 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.

The following regulatory permits will be required for the application:

- c. New York State Department of Conservation Stormwater Permit
- d. Town of Carmel Highway permit.

II. Detailed Comments

1. Provide the estimated maximum quantity to be excavated and/or removed and the estimated part thereof that will be used for regrading or filling, computed from cross sections of a proposed excavation or disturbed area. All re-grading required to accomplish the intended development should be provided. It is unclear from the drawings provide the extent of cut and fill proposed for the site.
2. Provide the location of any well and the depth thereof, and the location of natural watercourses, if any, located within 300 feet of the proposed disturbed area.
3. Provide the location of any sewage disposal system, any part of which is within 300 feet of the proposed disturbed area.
4. Provide details of any drainage system proposed to be installed and maintained by the applicant, designed to provide for proper surface drainage of the land, both during the performance of the work applied for and after the completion thereof.
5. Provide a construction entrance
6. Provide a construction schedule on the drawing
7. It is unclear if/how cars are going to access spots from Blossom road as there is a double row of parking in this area.
8. Traffic and Vehicle Movement Plans should be provided which provide the following:
 - a. Graphic representation of vehicle movements through the site should be provided to illustrate that sufficient space exists to maneuver vehicles on the site.
 - b. All turning radii for the site should be graphically provided. This includes the turning radii into the site entrance.
 - c. 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. All calculations should be provided
 - d. Slopes at the entrance way need to be defined. It is suggested that slopes of less than 6% be used for the first 20 feet of entry and that slopes of no greater than 8% be used entering the site.

Pat's memo said this proposal involves the conversion of a grass parcel (partially wooded) to a gravel parking lot for 95 vehicles serving Camp Kiwi.

§ Clarify the purpose of the additional 95 parking spaces. Is the capacity and intensity of the use of Camp Kiwi increasing?

§ The status and ownership of the parcel proposed to support the parking requires clarification. The parcel lies across Blossom Lane from the main Camp Kiwi property. Customarily accessory parking is permitted on the parcel supporting the camp use – however, this site is a separate parcel. A non-residential parking lot is *not* permitted in the R – Residence zoning district. It appears that the proposed parking lot is prohibited on this parcel (see below). §156-42 A. (7) allows for the use of a separate parcel, located within 250' of the uses the parking serves if "practical difficulties" make parking onsite impossible. This permission requires the approval of the ZBA.

§ The proposed gravel parking lot, with tandem configured parking spaces, does not meet Town code. The Board should evaluate the suitability of the proposed parking layout, configuration and improvement. §156-42 A. (6) requires that all parking lots adjacent to residential districts be screened and landscaped. The current plan includes no landscaping.

Chairman Paerprer asked what is reason for another 96 parking spaces?

Mr. Karell said they have used this area for parking for years. The area is grass and they have had issues with people getting stuck. They have parking inside the camp. They are not increasing any facilities, we are not increasing any need for additional parking, but they are moving the parking that has been taking place on the camp property and this property and putting it all in one place.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding the parking arrangements at the camp and the need for a variance for this property.

Mr. Karell said they have used this property forever. He said if we have to go to the zoning board, then we will go. He asked why he needs to locate adjacent wells and septs within 300 feet for a parking lot. He said there is no restrictive distance to a parking lot to either a septic or adjacent well.

Mr. Franzetti said it looks like you are regrading and I treating it like a regrading. The code calls out for those particular aspects.....

Mr. Karell said but some of the things are just not applicable.

Mr. Franzetti said runoff from a site could impact either well or septic area. I don't know that until you show or prove that to me.

Mr. Karell said he will locate the wells adjacent to this property. He said we are not changing any drainage. At which time, Mr. Karell points to the map to show the drainage pattern.

Chairman Paerprer stated it was extremely wet there yesterday; you couldn't park cars in there.

Mr. Karell said that's because they dug it all up and they got a stop work order. It's a mess.

Mrs. Kugler said it is always like that. It's always a wet property.

Mr. Karell said that's why they want to put down item 4 and they were hoping to do it for this season.

Chairman Paepre stated if this is done right, it could be an improvement to the site. But there are a lot of comments, such as the landscape plan and drainage.....

Mr. Carnazza asked if the Highway Superintendent would have an issue with everybody backing onto.....because there is no curb cut. It's going to be a full curb cut for front to back.

Mr. Karell said it is going to be the way it is now.

Chairman Paepre said to have him take a look at it.

Mrs. Kugler stated during camp time the traffic there is horrendous. She said it is chaotic to begin with when the parking lot is full. She said I know the parking lot is being used now, but we really have to look at the traffic flow and everything else. Residents have complained about the traffic situation.

Mr. Karell asked if they needed a referral to the ZBA.

Chairman Paepre replied not yet. There are too many comments.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked what do we need from outside agencies on this?

Mr. Carnazza said the highway department.

Vice Chairman Giannico said I know you are trying to get in for the season and if you already have your application in and as long as you get back to the consultants regarding the comments we will see what we could do to keep this moving along.

Mr. Cote asked is the wetness of the property caused by precipitation or is there another factor.

Mr. Karell stated prior to them disturbing the property, it was just thick grass. He said since they dug it all up, there are wood chips and various piles. But that will be corrected, if they could get approval to use it. He said addressing the comments by the consultants is probably a minor thing; the key is going to be getting a ZBA approval. If they don't give us an approval, we have nothing.

Mr. Carnazza said the ZBA meeting is tomorrow night and you can't get on the agenda. If you could get some of the comments addressed for next meeting, we won't hold you and you could get on their agenda for the July meeting.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding buffer and screening on the property and the possibility of maybe putting up fence as a buffer.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked why should Camp Kiwi have to put a fence or trees up if there never was a fence or trees.

Mr. Carnazza said because they are putting parking where there never was legal parking.

Vice Chairman Giannico said but they have been parking on this piece of property forever.

Mr. Carnazza said not legally. He said all parking areas that are adjacent to residences should have 5 foot buffers as per code. He said the good thing is it is not a night time operation.

Chairman Paeprer stated to Mrs. Kugler's point, the traffic flow is something that really needs to be looked into. He asked who would review the traffic flow?

Mr. Carnazza said the board would do that.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding the traffic flow at the location and the dangerous condition it poses for campers crossing the road.

Mr. Karell stated he will meet with Mr. Carnazza and the Highway Superintendent and we address the comments as best we can.

LAKE PLAZA SHOPPING CENTER, LLC – 983 – 1005 ROUTE 6 – TM – 65.10-1-45 & 46 – BOND REDUCTION

Mr. Carnazza had no comments on the bond reduction.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated in response to a request by the applicant, a representative of the Engineering Department performed a field inspection of the referenced property on June 18, 2019 to evaluate the current status of the site construction, for the purpose of determining whether a bond reduction was warranted. The results of our investigation are presented below.

The original bond amount posted, which is currently being held, is \$1,262,000. Based upon our inspection, the following work is not completed:

1. Paving/stripping on ~ 1/3 of the parking area (front of Kmart)
2. Landscaping in certain areas (Kmart and islands in front of Stop and Shop)

Typically the Town of Carmel does not recommend that a bond be reduced to lower than 20% of the original bond amount. Considering the work that is needed in the parking area, we recommend a total of \$912,000.00 be released and that the bond amount be reduced to \$350,000.00.

Mr. Carnazza stated he received phone calls regarding debris in front of the new Stop & Shop adjacent to the road heading towards Baldwin Lane.

Mr. Adam Wekstein, applicant's attorney replied will do. He asked the board if they could schedule a public hearing. He said we think more has been done, then Mr. Franzetti has commented on, but we are fine with what he has suggested.

Mrs. Kugler asked about the existing signage and lighting that was approved.

Mr. Carnazza said they are all to code.

Mr. Cote moved to schedule a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Giannico with all in favor.

MINUTES - 05/22/19

Mrs. Kugler 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 7:53 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frenkel with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta