

**APPROVED**

**HAROLD GARY**  
*Chairman*  
**EMMA KOUNINE**  
*Vice-Chair*

**TOWN OF CARMEL**  
**PLANNING BOARD**



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

**MICHAEL CARNAZZA**  
*Director of Codes  
Enforcement*

**RONALD J. GAINER, P.E.**  
*Town Engineer*

**PATRICK CLEARY**  
*AICP, CEP, PP, LEED AP  
Town Planner*

**BOARD MEMBERS**  
**CARL GREENWOOD**  
**JOHN MOLLOY**  
**JAMES MEYER**  
**RAYMOND COTE**  
**ANTHONY GIANNICO**

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**  
**FEBRUARY 15, 2012**

**PRESENT:** CHAIRMAN, HAROLD GARY, VICE-CHAIR, EMMA KOUNINE, CARL GREENWOOD, JOHN, MOLLOY, JAMES MEYER, RAYMOND COTE, ANTHONY GIANNICO

<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>
Putnam Comm. Foundation & Putnam Hospital Center	66.-2-57 & 58	1-3	Sub/Merger	Public Hearing Scheduled.
250 Route 6, LLC.	86.7-1-8	3	Bond Return	Public Hearing Closed & Bond Return Recommended To Town Board.
Meadowland GM Showroom	55.11-1-8-10	3-4	Site Plan	Public Hearing Closed. Planner To Prepare Resolution.
Yankee Land Development	76.15-1-12	4	Subdivision	Resolution Accepted.
MK Realty	55.6-1-44, 45	4	Extension	1 Year Extension Granted.
Wixon Pond Estates	53.20-1-19	5	Extension	6 Month Extension Granted.
Doyle Subdivision	64.13-1-1	5	Extension	Two 90 Day Extensions Granted (Retroactive)
Minutes - 1/25/2012		5		Heldover.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

**PUTNAM COMMUNITY FOUNDATION & PUTNAM HOSPITAL CENTER – TM 66.-2-57 & 58 – SUBDIVISION/MERGER**

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant proposes to transfer 18.26 acres from tax parcel 66.-2-58 (Putnam Comm. Foundation) to tax parcel 66.-2-57 (Putnam Hospital). The two properties are in full compliance with zoning.

Mr. Cleary stated the issues we have with transfers of properties are always two fold. The first is if it is compliant with zoning. The second is why the transfer is occurring, what the purpose is and what the intent is. We need to be aware of what the potential future opportunity is as a result of the transfer of land.

Mr. Gary asked if a person owns 300 acres of land and wants to break a piece of it and give it to their daughter to build a house is that a lot line change.

Mr. Carnazza stated it is a subdivision/merger. There is no provision in our code for lot line change.

Mr. Jeff Contelmo of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant stated Putnam Community Foundation owns 35 acres of land south of Putnam Hospital. The board may recall in 2003, the Foundation conveyed 8 acres of land to the hospital at that time through the same process. We are asking the board to deem it a minor subdivision, which will allow us to go to final and then a hearing. He said as you are aware the Foundation recently received approvals to develop property as senior housing. They recognize by way of this transfer, they are walking away from the approvals they received.

Mr. Cleary stated basically, the additional land that is being added back to the hospital is for the potential use for the hospital to expand or do whatever they would do on that property.

Mr. Contelmo answered yes. They are planning for a rainy day. There is no other land around them except for DEP city land.

Mr. Cleary stated the approvals for the senior housing project will become null and void subject to this approval.

Mr. Contelmo stated that's correct. The applicant does realize that.

Mr. Greenwood stated since the applicant does not have access or ownership of the property up to the road (Stoneleigh Ave) they would have to get approvals from DEP to gain access.

Mr. Contelmo replied that particular issue was looked at in depth over a period of 2 years. A definitive answer on that issue was not established.

Mr. Greenwood stated to clarify the City owns the property along Stoneleigh Ave, so basically what we are creating by doing this is a land-locked lot.

Mr. Cleary responded that is not correct. He said this parcel becomes part of the hospital parcel.

Mr. Greenwood asked about the lot to the right.

Mr. Cleary stated that is a separate issue. If they were to come in front of this board in the future with a new or modified site plan you could address that issue then.

Mr. Molloy asked why is it a separate issue. By allowing this we are creating a land-locked lot.

Mr. Greenwood stated right now you have access through the property from an existing road that was built.

Mr. Contelmo disagreed with Mr. Greenwood. He stated the issue you bring up is an issue we studied with the Title people for a very long period of time, which was never 100% resolved. He said an integral part of the transfer of the 8 acres in 2003 was to get an easement across the southerly driveway of the hospital which was constructed and paid for by the Foundation. He said we have access through that easement and we do have frontage on a "road".

Mr. Greenwood asked where is the easement across the property you are conveying to the hospital?

Mr. Contelmo stated the lot and easement has not been created yet. We can develop that easement and put it on the map.

Mr. Cleary stated part of the issue is the frontage for the Foundation's parcel will remain unchanged. Whether that's legal or not, it is a separate issue.

Mr. Gary stated it has nothing to do with what's in front of us now.

Mr. Cleary replied no, but the easement has to be shown on the map through the hospital's property to the Foundation's property.

Mr. Contelmo stated we have no problem doing that.

Mr. Gary stated Mr. Greenwood's concern is that piece of property could become land-locked. Is there any way the easement could be moved?

Mr. Contelmo stated there is a logical place for that easement.

Mr. Cleary stated sometime in the future when the site plan is presented you may find the easement a poor means of accessing the property, but it is not your question today. It is the risk they are taking in this proposal. It is a private issue between two private property owners.

Mr. Gary addressed the board and stated according to the code, it says it **shall** have a public hearing. So we could either have a public hearing or waive the public hearing.

Mr. Greenwood stated based on the history and concerns of the property, I absolutely will not consider waiving the public hearing.

All the board members agreed except for Ms. Kounine.

Ms. Kounine stated we have done quite a few of these minor subdivisions and when it is only a lot line change and no other changes we have waived the public hearing.

Mr. Gary said I think it is a minor change, but I could see the necessity for a public hearing just from the discussion around the board tonight.

Mr. Gary said to schedule a public hearing.

### **250 ROUTE 6, LLC. – 250 ROUTE 6 – TM – 86.7-1-8 – PUBLIC HEARING**

Mr. Carnazza stated he performed an inspection of the above-mentioned property on Monday, January 23, 2012. At that time, the property was in compliance with code.

Mr. Carnazza read Mr. Gainer's memo which stated the original bond amount posted, which is currently being held, is \$107,300.00. Based upon our inspection, all of the site improvements required pursuant to the Board's Site Plan approval have now been completed. On this basis, this Department recommends that the entire bond be released.

Mr. Cleary had no comments.

Hearing no comments from the audience, Ms. Kounine moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Molloy with all in favor.

Mr. Greenwood moved to recommend full return of the bond to the Town Board. The motion was seconded by Mr. Giannico with all in favor.

### **MEADOWLAND GM SHOWROOM – 1952 ROUTE 6 – TM – 55.11-1-8-10 – PUBLIC HEARING**

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Cleary had no comments.

Mr. Gary asked what is at the intersection of Old Route 6 and Route 6.

Mr. John Watson of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant stated there will be a display area for vehicles. Right now there is an existing double billboard which will be taken down.

Mr. Greenwood stated he would like to see that corner utilized for something other than a display area. He said getting rid of the billboards is a good thing. I would prefer to see a landscaped area versus 4 or 5 cars on a display.

Mr. Watson said it will be a small display for a couple of cars. We are putting a low retaining wall and we are also planting across the front.

Mr. Gary asked if anything will be done to the intersection of Old Route 6 & Route 6 being that it is a very dangerous intersection.

Mr. Watson replied we are not required to do anything. Hopefully, there will be better sight distance with the clearing we will be doing in the triangle.

Mr. Cote asked if they will be illuminating that corner at night.

Mr. Watson said there are lights there now, but we will be adding more lights. He said a separate lighting plan was submitted showing all the illumination and at which time he went on to describe it in detail.

Mr. Cleary stated he reviewed the lighting plan and it complies with our standards. It is much better from the existing conditions. They have done a very good job of reducing the potential to having an overly illuminated car lot. He said conditions of approval can be imposed such as the lighting, the for sale signs, open hoods, balloons.....

Mr. Watson said the applicant would not have a problem with the conditions of approval.

Ms. Kounine moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

Mr. Gary asked Mr. Cleary to prepare the resolutions.

**YANKEE LAND DEVELOPMENT – BAYBERRY HILL & OWEN DR. – TM – 76.15-1-12 – PRELIMINARY APPROVAL & NEG DEC**

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Cleary stated you have two resolutions in front of you.

Ms. Kounine moved to accept Resolution #12-03, dated February 15, 2012, Tax Map # 76.15-1-12 entitled Yankee Land Development (SEQR) Negative Declaration. The motion was seconded by Mr. Greenwood with all in favor.

Mr. Molloy moved to accept Resolution #12-04, dated February 15, 2012, Tax Map # 76.15-1-12 entitled Yankee Land Development Preliminary Subdivision Approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Meyer with all in favor.

**MK REALTY – ROUTE 6 & OLD ROUTE 6 – TM – 55.6-1-44,45 – EXTENSION OF APPROVAL**

The consultants had no objection to the extension.

Mr. Greenwood asked why he needs the extension.

The applicant, Mr. Dwyer answered no one has shown an interest because of the economy.

Mr. Greenwood moved to grant 1 year extension of approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Molloy with all in favor.

**WIXON POND ESTATES – WIXON POND ROAD – TM – 53.20-1-19 – EXTENSION OF PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION APPROVAL**

The consultants had no objection to the extension.

Mr. Joel Greenberg, representing the applicant stated we are still waiting for DEP.

Ms. Kounine moved to grant a 6 month extension of preliminary approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Giannico with all in favor.

**DOYLE SUBDIVISION – AUSTIN RD – TM 64.13-1-1 - EXTENSION OF SUBDIVISION APPROVAL**

The consultants had no objection to the extension.

Mr. Cote moved to grant two 90 extensions retroactive to September 9, 2011. The motion was seconded by Mr. Molloy with all in favor.

**MINUTES – 1/25/2012**

Heldover.

Ms. Kounine moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Greenwood with all in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta