

# **APPROVED**

**CRAIG PAEPRER**  
*Chairman*

**ANTHONY GIANNICO**  
*Vice Chairman*

**BOARD MEMBERS**  
**CARL STONE**  
**KIM KUGLER**  
**RAYMOND COTE**  
**ROBERT FRENKEL**  
**MARK PORCELLI**

## **TOWN OF CARMEL PLANNING BOARD**



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

**NOVEMBER 13, 2019**

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

**ABSENT:** CARL STONE, MARK PORCELLI

<b><u>APPLICANT</u></b>	<b><u>TAX MAP #</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>	<b><u>TYPE</u></b>	<b><u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u></b>
Downtown Mahopac Properties	75.12-2-26	1	Resolution	Resolutions Adopted.
Longview School	52.-1-12	1-5	Site Plan	No Board Action.
Affinity One	76.12-1-19	6-10	Site Plan	Denied to the ZBA.
Monteleone, Laurie	87.8-1-12 & 88.5-1-11	10-11	Subdivision	Public Hearing Scheduled.
Perricone, Anthony	74.26-2-22	11-12	Sketch Plan	No Board Action.
The Hamlet at Carmel New York LLC	66.-2-58	13	Re-Approval	Re-Approval Granted.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

**DOWNTOWN MAHOPAC PROPERTIES – 559 ROUTE 6 – TM – 75.12-2-26 - RESOLUTION**

There was no audio for the first 1:44.

It picked up with Mr. Charbonneau stating as set forth in paragraph 9 of the resolution. Anything beyond the words NYSDOT, there should be a period and the balance of the sentence removed. Subject to those revisions, if someone wants to make a motion that would be great.

Chairman Paepre asked Mr. Greenberg what kind of progress has been made.

Mr. Joel Greenberg, representing the applicant stated we made a lot of progress. We have had conversations with Mr. Bentley of the DOT and he seems to be moving in our direction..... (no audio).

Mr. Charbonneau said and those requirements could swing both ways, so if they are more stringent then they will be subject to those more stringent requirements from NYSDOT. If they are less stringent the same applies.

Chairman Paepre stated we like this project and we think it's a good project for downtown; the other half of this project is cleaning up the property.

Mr. Cote moved to adopt Resolution #19-07, dated November 13, 2019; Tax Map #75.12-2-26 entitled Downtown Mahopac Properties SEQR Negative Declaration. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to adopt Resolution #19-08, dated November 13, 2019; Tax Map #75.12-2-26 entitled Downtown Mahopac Properties Amended Final Site Plan Approval subject to the revisions. The applicant will comply with NYSDOT requirements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frenkel with all in favor.

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

Mr. Frenkel recused himself and left the dais.

Rich's memo said the proposal involves two (2) phases. Phase 1 - converting an existing residence to a school, widen the existing access drive, and add a handicap ramp. Phase 2 – add a 40' by 100' structure to house a gym. 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

Applicant has acknowledged this comment and has submitted drawing and letter to the MFVFD.

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

Applicant has acknowledged this comment

3. The area of disturbance for the work IS 1.4 acres. The 1 acre disturbance exceeds the threshold criteria of disturbance for the NYSDEC stormwater regulations. This project 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 permanent stormwater controls.

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

The Notice of Intent must be signed/sealed.

4. 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.

Applicant has acknowledged this comment.

5. 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.

Applicant has acknowledged this comment and will submit estimate once SEQRA review is complete.

#### **I. Detailed Comments**

1. All retaining walls great than 6 foot must be certified by a NYS licensed structural engineer.

Applicant has noted this comment

2. Access for Fire Department around the rear of the buildings must be considered

Applicant has noted this comment and is working with the MFVD.

3. It is unclear if this property is serviced by a private road. The applicant has stated that they have reviewed tax records, however the applicant will need verify and provide a title search regarding ownership of this road.

There are concerns with the following:

- Maintenance for the private road;

- If agreement are in place with shared driveway owners;
- It is unclear if a 271 A variance is in place for these residences; and
- Access driveway/road not being up to Town Code.

The attached is the NYSDOT local road listing summary. Scout Hill road is listed as a dead end and is 0.43 miles (2,270.4 ft) in length. The attached phot (from google earth) provides the approximate end point of this road. The Board should note that as provided in the attached photograph the mailboxes are located in this general vicinity which typically the location where Town and private roads meet.

Mr. Cleary stated to summarize where we were with this, Scout Hill Road, parking on the site and phasing of the gym building. Those were the three big issues.

Mr. Peder Scott of Scott Engineering, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated we pulled the road dedications for the Town of Carmel. In that, it appears they dedicated the entire length of the road which is defined on filed map #531. It was filed in 1949 and in 1982 with the help of Mr. Shilling's office we came up with a road dedication of the entire length of the roadway. We have a letter from the title company and it is their opinion that the property fronts on a town road. We also have a letter from the surveyor for the particular lot. She also drafted an opinion letter as well indicating that this road appears on end of a town road. I have a dedicated Scout Hill Road; I have opinions from a title company and a surveyor of record that indicates that we are fronting on a town road. There is no private road and there never was one.

Chairman Paerprer asked if he was able to share the information with the consultants.

Mr. Scott replied I gave it to Mr. Carnazza only at the last moment.

Mr. Charbonneau spoke to Mr. Carnazza regarding this application and he didn't bring it up, so I haven't looked at anything.

Chairman Paerprer stated he spoke to Mike Simone and his opinion is there is no road frontage on this property. We need to look a little further on this.

Mr. Scott stated we were late tonight because we met with fire department. He said we have a fire tank proposed on the project and they want us to upgrade the fire tank from 12,000 gallons to 20,000 (points to map). There was a question about access to the rear of the gym building, because we have to egress points on both sides and because of the type of building we are proposing, they do not require access to the back of the building. We are proposing fencing going up to the back of the building. The last item we spoke about was access on the property. We are making our road all 26 feet, which they will be reviewing. Overall, they said they would approve the project, but they are going to look at one item. The item is the lack of maintenance of a portion of land which holds Scout Hill Road. The problem we are having is the vegetation on the newer side extends across the pavement. They will look at that. He said we are fully conforming to the interpretation as provide to us. We have 55 spaces which is required. We are trying to go to the zoning board. We have provided

documentation for frontage; we have to go to the ZBA for extension of frontage we do have and we are hoping to be denied to the ZBA this evening.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked have we established where we believe Scout Hill Road ends.....

Mr. Cleary said that's the dispute, that's why they have the surveyor's commentary, documenting that. We have to review that and determine if it's accurate.

Mr. Charbonneau asked do you have the actual dedication documents from the town?

Mr. Scott replied I do.

Mr. Charbonneau said that will help.

Mr. Scott said it took place in 1982. It wasn't easy for them to get it dedicated. It appears in the paperwork that we found, in 1971 it was filed and then 1982 the landowners went to the town and demanded the dedication after a lot of paperwork back and forth. It was fully dedicated in 1982.

Mr. Jacobs stated there was a length issue. The dedication documents are very specific about the length of the road that was dedicated and refers specifically to these maps 531 and 532 which has the foot measures that show that it goes right to the end of the road and not to an earlier point.

Chairman Paepre said let's talk about the phasing.....

Mr. Scott stated we elected to eliminate the phase. He said there are two ways we could go ahead with this. We could be granted site plan approval in one single phase, but our intent is to get a Certificate of Occupancy on the school building because time is of the essence for us to move forward. He said one way you do it is to take a building permit out on the building and you have one year to build and one year to extend it. You could have an open building permit on the building, but you could get a closure on your site planning if the retaining wall and slab component of the building were built and then you have a complete site plan. He said a site plan extends up to the footprint of the building and then the building permit would be outstanding on one portion of the building itself. There is no intent to get phasing per se, it's we are trying to get the C/O on main building. The gym is ancillary and we are committed to build it.

Chairman Paepre stated it still sounds like phasing.

Mr. Cleary said it's a gray area.

Mr. Charbonneau stated Mr. Carnazza's position is very clear, either eliminate it or the C/O conditioned upon building it.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding whether it was phasing or not phasing.

Mr. Cote asked if a C/O could have a condition on it that the gym has to build within a certain period of time.

Mr. Charbonneau stated that was Mr. Carnazza's suggestion.

Mr. Cote asked and what time period would that typically be.

Mr. Cleary said under the code now he has two years free and clear.

Mr. Cote asked after two years after the gym wasn't built what would be the recourse?

Mr. Cleary said that building permit would not have been completed. Theoretically, there would be some action by the building department. Mr. Carnazza would probably return it to the planning board for reevaluation of the site plan.

Chairman Paepre stated there would be bond.....

Mr. Cleary said if the applicant is willing to bond the gym, but not build the gym then we would have some mechanism to re-visit that in the future.

Mr. Charbonneau stated I would like to discuss this more with Mr. Carnazza, because that is not what he envisions.

Chairman Paepre stated there are some issues with Mr. Carnazza..... He stated a lot of your documentation is literally 12<sup>th</sup> hour. There are three items, phasing, fire department and the roads that need to be clarified.

Vice Chairman Giannico stated we need to review the documents that were just produced at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Jacobs stated we are not asking you to not pursue each one of those things, but in the meantime be denied to the zoning board to look at the frontage issue as a separate matter.

Mr. Charbonneau stated I haven't seen any of the documents, so I can't advise them with respect to that. It needs to be taken care of here, before it goes to the zoning board.

The board members were all in agreement with Mr. Charbonneau.

Mr. Frenkel returned to the dais.

**AFFINITY ONE – 345 CROTON FALLS ROAD – TM – 76.12-1-19 – RESIDENTIAL SITE PLAN**

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the applicant proposes to use the existing residence on this site as a sober home. The project will continue to use existing infrastructure (i.e. septic and water) and minimal changes to the existing site.

**General Comments**

The following referrals would appear to be warranted:

- a. Mahopac Fire Department

Permits from the following may be necessary:

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

However additional information regarding the a area of disturbance should be provided to determine if 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) is 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.

**Detailed Comments**

Additional details should be provided regarding the proposed parking area. This includes, but is not limited to, material, area, slopes, drainage etc.

Access for Fire Department around the rear of the buildings must be considered

Additional information regarding the access driveway and easement with NYCDEP should be provided.

Additional information regarding the easements noted on the site plan drawing should be provided.

Additional information regarding lighting on the site should be provided.

Mr. Cleary read his memo which stated this application involves the re-use of an existing residence to support a “sober home.” Residents in this facility would be recovering from substance use disorder. No physical changes to the site are proposed.

§ The proposed “sober house” facility is a prohibited use in the R-Residence zoning district.

A use variance would be required to allow for the operation of the facility as proposed.

§ The nature and operation of the proposed facility should be more fully documented; including:

How many individuals will reside at this facility?

How long will individuals stay at this facility?

Are residents restricted to this site?

Will this facility be limited to individuals, or will family members be allowed to reside at the facility as well?

What type of treatment (if any) will take place at this facility?

What type of security measures are proposed?

Do residents have individual bedrooms, or are dormitory-like facilities proposed?

§ The EAF notes that “minimal changes proposed to existing site features” however, no changes are noted on the Site Plan. Clarification is required.

§ Depending upon the number of individuals residing in the facility, combined with the two – fulltime (live in?) staff, confirmation that utility services are adequate to support the use is required.

Mr. Cote stated according to Mr. Carnazza’s email it stated the project is a “sober house”. The code is silent to the use. They either need an interpretation and/or a use variance. Mr. Jeff Contelmo of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant and Linda Nicoletti from Affinity One were present before the board.

Mr. Contelmo addressed the board and stated this is an existing developed property which has a single family as well as out buildings, pool and normal residential improvements on it. Our proposal is to use the property exactly the way it is. The one thing that we are showing as an improvement is the removal of the center island which is in the parking area. That’s the only site improvement that we are contemplating at this time. The use is knowledge to not be mentioned in the zoning code. As of matter of fact, the applicant’s attorney, Bill schilling has had discussions with Mr. Carnazza and the town regarding the use. We are fully aware of the fact that the use will require some kind of relief from the ZBA. The proposal is as stated as a “sober house”. It’s a seven bedroom house; it has a recently re-done septic system and well. He said Affinity One is planning on investing significant capital, bringing the property back to a much better quality in terms of appearance, etc.

Ms. Lynda Micheletti of Affinity One addressed the board and stated we own and operate 20 treatment facilities of all different levels of care up and down the east coast. We do from inpatient medical detox to sober living houses. Right now, we have an Affinity One location in Toms River, NJ. It’s a 40 bed location and has been up and running for 2 years without incident. The primary goal of Affinity One is to be the last stop for individuals that have received treatment services and are on well on their way in their recovery. In order to qualify to be a resident, you have to have had completed treatment successfully and continued sobriety. We staff the facility 24/7 with individuals that would monitor the behaviors. We have a full time driver. The grounds will be kept very well. Meals will be provided to the patients. It will be on the higher end of sober living homes. She said we have intense.....program called the counseling center in Yorktown Heights and it has been expressed by many of the families with patients that we treat there that this is a big need.

Chairman Paepre asked what is the size of the property?

Mr. Contelmo replied it is a little over 12 acres.

Chairman Paepre asked what kind of traffic do you anticipate?



Ms. Micheletti replied minimal traffic. We are looking to have about 10 to 12 residents. We will have transportation available for them. There could be a time when a resident would earn a car as they are getting back to work and things of that nature. The traffic will be monitored very closely.

Vice Chairman Giannico what is the maximum amount of residents?

Ms. Micheletti replied as a maximum we are anticipating somewhere between 10 and 12 potential residents in addition to our staff. The staff does not live there, but there will a continuous rotation with the staff.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked what is their typical length of stay?

Ms. Micheletti replied their typical length of stay is approximately 60 days. Sometimes it's a little less; sometimes it's a little more.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked will these residents be from the general area?

Ms. Micheletti replied we are hoping to service the general area. We are not looking to bring in people from other areas; we want to serve this community.

Mr. Cote asked will these patients be voluntary?

Ms. Micheletti replied it's voluntary. We are not a receiving facility. Any resident signs in and signs out voluntarily.

Mr. Frenkel asked is the facility licensed from the State?

Ms. Micheletti replied the facility itself is not licensed, but there are various boards and groups we try to join. All of the staff will be CPI trained (crisis prevention and intervention). It is a nationally accredited organization that trains people on how to deescalate crisis situations.

Mrs. Kugler asked about the security.

Ms. Micheletti stated we have two staff members at all times on the property with constant monitoring. We will also have a fancy security system with cameras, etc. We also like to develop strong relationships with the police department. We do not allow cell phones for the residents. She said basically things are earned at this stage of recovery.

Mrs. Kugler asked if the rooms are private to themselves and if they are locked.

Ms. Micheletti replied they will likely have a roommate. The rooms will be semi-private. They will have a lock and our staff will have the key as well.

Chairman Paepre asked if I want to look up more information about the company do I look under Affinity One?

Ms. Micheletti replied you could learn more under the parent company, Praesum Healthcare. You could also look up the counseling centers. The counseling center of Toms River is the intensive outpatient program that is in New Jersey.

Mr. Frenkel asked you mentioned that you have a number of facilities up and down the east coast. How many are actually sober homes?

Ms. Micheletti replied right now we have Affinity One of Toms River and we are about to open Affinity One in Massachusetts. We have eight in patient detox facilities and 11 intensive outpatient programs.

Mr. Frenkel asked will this sober home be run as for profit facility?

Ms. Micheletti replied it will be a for profit. There will be a rent fee; an agreement will be done between the resident and us and it's fairly priced.

Mr. Frenkel asked how do residents interact day to day?

Ms. Micheletti replied we provide meals and snacks. They are allowed to go to a store as long as they are accompanied by a staff member. There is a lot of structure in the beginning and as they go through different phases of the sober home, the idea is to have them fully prepared and acclimated. There is tons of recreation. We would like to incorporate rock climbing in the summer.

**At which time, there was no audio for approximately 2 minutes.**

Mrs. Kugler asked if they are restricted to the property and only allowed to leave with a staff person.

Ms. Micheletti replied it is quite restrictive, but not as restrictive as a typical treatment center. We try to assemble a community amongst the people that are living there, so they do a lot of their activities together accompanied by a staff member. We encourage family involvement. If a resident is doing well and exceling in their recovery, we will grant them a pass to go out with their family for an afternoon. They would get drug tested when they returned. Any property brought back would be searched.

Mrs. Kugler asked how will the medication be dispensed?

Ms. Micheletti replied we will have a pharmacy consultant that will come in and check the medication observation record. We will have a double locked storage area for medications and we keep a very detailed record for each resident. When it's time to received medication, they will go to a locked medication cart with a staff member and they observed taking it by a staff member.

Mrs. Kugler stated so it's not a registered nurse.

Ms. Micheletti replied we will have a registered nurse that works in tandem with our pharmacy consultant to oversee the observation, but you don't have to be a registered nurse or LPN to observe someone taking their medication safely.

Chairman Paepre stated to Mr. Contelmo you have some work to do.

Mr. Contelmo stated from a site planning prospective, this is a straight forward application and we don't have an application unless we go to the zoning board and get a determination on the use. We ask the board for consideration to get denied this evening to the zoning board.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding fire safety and codes.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked what harm is there in referring them to the zoning board.

Mr. Cleary said a lot of the issues are building code issues; you would not involve your site plan approval with them. He said if you have an understanding of the operation of the facility, it's appropriate for you to send them to the zoning board.

Chairman Paepre stated I think they answered the questions very thoroughly.

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

**MONTELEONE, LAURIE – 120 & 124 SHINDAGEN HILL ROAD – TM – 87.8-1-12 & 88.5-1-11 – 2 LOT SUBDIVISION**

Chairman Paepre stated Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Cleary had no new comments.

Mr. Cote stated Mr. Franzetti had no comments also.

Mr. Joel Greenberg of Architectural Visions, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated we received the variance from the zoning board. At this point, we respectfully request a public hearing to be scheduled.

Chairman Paepre asked Mr. Greenberg for a recap of the project.

Mr. Greenberg points to map and stated this is what it looks like now, the smaller lot is about  $\frac{3}{4}$  acre, the big lot is approximately 4 acres. We are adding square footage (acreage) to the existing house and bringing that up to 1.8 acres, keeping the other lot conforming at 3 acres. So now we have one conforming lot, and one more conforming lot.

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

**PERRICONE, ANTHONY – 163 ORCHARD ROAD – 74.26-2-22 – 3 LOT SUBDIVISION (SKETCH PLAN)**

Mr. Cote read Mr. Franzetti's memo which stated this represents the applicant's first appearance before the Planning Board. The proposal involves a three (3) lot subdivision at the referenced location. Based upon our review of this submittal, the Engineering Department offers the following **preliminary** comments:

**General Comments**

The following referrals would appear to be warranted:

- c. Mahopac Falls Fire Department

Permits from the following would appear necessary:

- d. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation(NYSDEC) – Coverage under General Permit GP-0-15-002
- e. NYSDEC wetlands
- f. Town of Carmel Water and Sewer
- g. Town of Carmel Highway (driveway/road cut)
- h. Town of Carmel Wetlands

The area of disturbance for the work will need to be provided to determine if the project 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 permanent stormwater controls.

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.

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.

**Detailed Comments**

There are four (4) drawings entitled AS-10. These should be names differently and cross referenced accordingly.

A miscellaneous untitled/referenced drawing was provided. Additional details should be provided for this drawing.

As this is a subdivision, areas for recreation must be provided.

A water and wastewater plan must be provided.

It is unclear if the applicant is dedicating an open space/recreation area or making a payment in lieu the open space/recreation area. A note should be provided on the drawing. Future submittal will require meeting the preliminary and final subdivision requirements.

The applicant will minimally need to provide the following as part of the Preliminary Plat approval:

1. All re-grading required to accomplish the intended development of each lot must be shown.
2. Driveway profiles for each access drive are required. Further, a driveway cross-section should be added to the plan.
3. All utilities (e.g., electric) serving the lots should be shown.
4. Metes and bounds of the proposed internal lot boundary line should be provided.
5. The plan should specify the total area to be disturbed, as well as the extent of new impervious areas to be created, so that applicable SWPPP requirements can be defined. Further, an intended Construction Sequence should be added. Lastly, all appropriate erosion control measures and construction details should be added to the plans.
6. All required information as specified in Article III of the Town's Land Subdivision (§ 131-13) Regulations.

Mr. Cleary stated these are two pre-existing non-conforming lots. There is a single family home on one of those parcels. There is a proposal to create a 3<sup>rd</sup> lot. The two lots are significantly undersized, so the third would result in three significantly undersized lots. All three lots violate every zoning requirement. Both Lots 1 and 2 are regularly configured. Lot 3 however, has a 20' "tail" that does not represent the most appropriate configuration for this parcel. The Site Data table on drawing AS-101 is incorrect. It refers to the R-120 district, which was replaced by the R district, and includes inaccurate required setback dimensions. All subdivision sketch plans are required to document that the proposed improvements could be constructed as proposed – which requires topographic data and preliminary grading, stormwater management and utility plans. The plans submitted in support of this application do not include this information.

At which time, Mr. Greenberg hands out paperwork to the board members. He said what I have given you is an excerpt from the original subdivision, map 151E. Map 151 was approved in 1935 and 151E was 1938 and it specifically says on the general notes: No building should be erected or used as a plot of less than 2 lots as shown on this map. So basically, the original subdivision for this particular section in Lake Secor was that 2 lots represent what the subdividers and the planning board approved at that time. We have 12 lots. So the configuration would be approximately 4 lots per house. He said right now, we have 2 lots and we are asking for a third lot. He said the closest wetland is Lake Secor which is about 600 to 700 feet from the property. There are no wetlands on the property. He said the most important thing right now is we need numerous variances and we ask to be denied to the zoning board.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding whether or not the application should be denied to the zoning board.

Chairman Paepre stated there are 3 pages of comments and to work with the consultants before going to the zoning board.

**THE HAMLET AT CARMEL – STONELEIGH AVE – TM – 66.-2-58 – RE-APPROVAL OF FINAL SITE PLAN**

Chairman Paepre stated Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Cleary stated they have been obtaining extensions of their approvals. The code limits the amount of extensions you can get, so this is now a re-approval. There are no changes to the plans.

Chairman Paepre asked when did this project start?

Mr. Jeff Contelmo of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated this goes back a long time. Some of the early work that included the water and sewer pre-dated by years the actual site plan approval. This went through a full environmental impact statement and a lengthy review process by the NYCDEP and the Town of Carmel. We are here this evening for re-approvals.

Mr. Cote asked is this the project that is behind ShopRite?

Mr. Contelmo replied this project is just south of the hospital.

Mr. Cote moved to grant re-approval of final site plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frenkel with all in favor.

Mr. Cote moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:08 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta