

HAROLD GARY
Chairman
EMMA KOUNINE
Vice-Chair

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

**TOWN OF CARMEL
PLANNING BOARD**



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

APPROVED

MICHAEL CARNAZZA
*Director of Codes
Enforcement*

RONALD J. GAINER, P.E.
Town Engineer

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

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MARCH 7, 2012

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

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
Putnam Comm. Foundation & Putnam Hospital Center	66.-2-57 & 58	1-2	P.H.	Public Hearing Left Opened.
Meadowland GM Showroom	55.11-1-8-10	2	Site Plan	Resolutions Accepted.
Hudson Valley Credit Union	55.11-1-42	2-3	Site Plan	Denied to the ZBA.
NYCDEP Pumping Station	77-2-2 88-1-1.1,1.2	3	Site Plan	Public Hearing Scheduled.
Woodcrest Gardens	76.9-1-19	4	Site Plan	No Board Action.
Parkash Estates	65.13-1-54	5	Ext. of Approval	1 Year Extension of Approval Granted.
303 Mountainwood, Inc.	65.10-1-53	5	Waiver	Waiver of Site Plan Granted.
Minutes - 1/25/2012 & 2/15/2012		5		Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

PUTNAM COMMUNITY FOUNDATION & PUTNAM HOSPITAL CENTER – TM 66.-2-57 & 58 – PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Cleary stated there is one procedural step that needs to be addressed this evening which is the SEQRA requirement to designate lead agency.

Mr. Jeff Contelmo of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant stated as the board is aware we have an application for a lot line adjustment and in accordance with your regulations it is a subdivision. He stated we are taking two lots and transferring land and no new lots will be created. Basically, Putnam Hospital Center approached the Foundation to purchase 18 acres of land. This transfer of land came about as Putnam Community Foundation was considering their approved development of the project which they have now shelved because of this request on behalf of Putnam Hospital to purchase the 18 acres of land. He said the current proposal would be to transfer the 18 acres of land with an easement extending through it to provide access to the balance of the property of the Foundation. The development proposal for the full Foundation property contemplated the use of the driveway and the extension of the driveway through to the developing area. The access easement is across the roadway which has already been designed.

Mr. Gary addressed the audience and stated this is an open public hearing and if anyone wishes to be heard to approach the podium.

Ms. Ann Fannizzi addressed Mr. Contelmo and asked if the hospital designated any use for the 18 acres of land.

Mr. Contelmo answered no.

Ms. Fannizzi asked what the cost of the land was.

Mr. Contelmo answered I do not know and was not privy to it.

Mr. Gary stated there are a couple of issues the board needs to address before we go any further with this and we are going to keep the public hearing open until we get the legal answers.

Mr. Cleary also stated with respect to SEQRA, this is an unlisted action that requires a coordinated review and a 30 day circulation period. From that perspective, I recommend you keep the public hearing open.

Mr. Greenwood moved to designate lead agency. The motion was seconded by Mr. Molloy with all in favor.

Mr. Greenwood went on to say it is hard to assess the property without having topography. He said I don't believe this board waived the topography and honestly without that I do not think we could fully look at it.

Mr. Contelmo stated we have the topography for the property. The board has previously reviewed the topography as part of the site plan.

Mr. Gary stated we are not doing anything with that piece of property so we do not need the topography.

MEADOWLAND GM SHOWROOM – 1952 ROUTE 6 – TM – 55.11-1-8-10 – RESOLUTION

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

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

Ms. Kounine moved to accept Resolution #12-05, dated March 7, 2012, Tax Map # 55.11-1-8-10 entitled Meadowland GM Showroom (SEQR) Negative Declaration. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

Mr. Cote moved to accept Resolution #12-06, dated March 7, 2012, Tax Map # 55.11-1-8-10 entitled Meadowland GM Showroom Final Site Plan Approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Meyer with all in favor.

HUDSON VALLEY CREDIT UNION – TERRACE DR & STONELEIGH AVE – TM – 55.11-1-42 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the necessary variances were granted by the ZBA for lot area, depth, and width, however, a variance is required for front yard. 50 ft. are required, 42.73 ft. provided, 7.27 ft. variance is required.

Mr. Cleary stated this was part of the subdivision of the Carmel Corporate Center project. The parcel was carved out during that time for a use similar to this. This is the first time there is a specific use for this property. As Mr. Carnazza indicated variances are required. They exceed their parking standards to 50 from 22 required by code of this size bank.

Mr. Cleary continued to read his memo dated 3/2/2012.

Mr. Carnazza read Mr. Gainer's memo dated 3/7/2012.

Mr. Jeff Contelmo of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant stated our goal tonight is to get to the Zoning Board for the parking spaces and setbacks as Mr. Carnazza indicated. The parking space request for a variance we are looking for is a 9' x 18' space as opposed to a 10' x 18' or 20' space. The Credit Union standard is the 9 x 18 space, it works for them and as engineers we are asked to always try to reduce impervious, reduce number of parking spaces and reduce parking space size. The Hudson Valley Credit Union is currently in the Old Putnam Credit Union which they have already outgrown. The applicant believes they need the 50 parking spaces. They get a tremendous amount of both pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

Mr. Cleary asked if the applicant could provide some supporting documentation from other branches stating that.

Mr. Contelmo replied will do.

Mr. Gary asked why do you want a 9 ft. space and what purpose does it serve?

Mr. Contelmo stated by having a 9 x 18 space as opposed to a 10 x 18 space we are reducing impervious space of the parking lost by 5 or 10%. Part of the new State Stormwater Management is to reduce impervious surfaces. He said some of the questions with respect to justifying the number of spaces and justifying the width and length will be part of the argument we will be making to the ZBA.

Mr. Cleary addressed the board and stated from a planning prospective they are seeking the relief. There is nothing you would do to the layout other than sending them to the ZBA to get the variance. If he doesn't get the variance he would have to re-work the layout and come back to the planning board.

Ms. Kounine moved to deny to the ZBA. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

NYCDEP CROTON FALLS PUMPING STATION – 77-2-2 & 88-1-1.1,1.2 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Carnazza read Mr. Gainer's memo dated March 6, 2012.

Mr. Cleary stated the applicant was last before the board in June and we had raised a number of concerns which they addressed a lot of those issues. There was a question about the replacement of the force main that was being proposed. There has been a modification to that which will result in a less impact related design of the facilities. A full SWPPP has been submitted. The landscaping is the issue which is what the board should be focusing on tonight.

Mr. Paul Costa of DEP addressed the board and displayed renderings with two types of tree options with winter and summer views and what they would like at six months and 5 years later. The 1st option is to continue to use pine trees but make them taller. The 2nd option is to use pine oaks which tend to grow wider and taller and stay green throughout the year.

Mr. Costa stated for this project we created a new access road off of Croton Falls Road and onto Samantha Lane (about 100 feet in). This road would be dedicated to the site work to keep traffic off Samantha Lane. He said the 150 ft. stretch of Samantha Lane will need improvements made so part of the project is to reconstruct that piece of Samantha Lane that butts up with the access road. There was a request made from the Town Engineer, Ron Gainer to have this project include reconstruction of the entire 1700 ft. length of Samantha Lane that goes to the top of the dam. A letter with this request was received from Mr. Gainer on February 27th by email. At this time, it is being reviewed internally by DEP. I am not suggesting that we can't work with the Town to negotiate some remedy for that road.

At which time a discussion ensued regarding negotiations with DEP to reconstruct the 1700 ft. of Samantha Lane. It was determined that the negotiations should continue and it should not be part of the reconstruction of the pumping station project.

Mr. Gary said to schedule a public hearing.

WOODCREST GARDENS – 675 ROUTE 6 – TM – 76.9-1-19 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Carnazza read Mr. Gainer's memo which stated the Board should be aware that the new location proposed for this basin will involve significant removal of mature trees on the site, in a more steeply sloped area of the site. In contrast, the presently approved site lies within an existing, gently sloping lawn area. The proposed location will result in a reduction of sound and visual buffer between Route Six/Buckshollow Road (commercial site immediately in front of the proposed pond location) and the Woodcrest Gardens Complex. If the pond is relocated to this new area on the site, the pond's emergency overflow will direct run-off onto the County Bikeway, and the commercial site immediately downstream. In the originally approved location, this overflow would generally be directly towards the existing site driveway and towards NYS Route 6. If the Board is disposed to consider processing this Site Plan modification, the Engineer should provide certification of the following:

- Quantity/size of trees which require removal in order to construct the stormwater facilities in this new location.
- The area of disturbance is substantially the same as the previous area.
- The detention pond volume matches that provided for the previous pond layout/configuration.
- All appropriate erosion control measures, their locations and appropriate construction details should be denoted on plan.
- Plantings should be provided on the slope of the detention pond. The applicant may wish to consider a mix of deciduous and evergreen trees.

Mr. Cleary stated this is for re-locating the basin that was originally approved by this board last year. He said we basically need to know why it would be less of a problem then it was from the original approved location.

Mr. Peder Scott of P.W. Scott Engineering, representing the Woodcrest Gardens Association stated the committee had some concerns with the original location of the detention pond. One of the concerns is going from an open pasture to ending up putting a pond there. Their wish is to keep the pastoral looking entranceway and move the basin to an area below where there maintenance yard is located. The function would be identical, but it would nestled along the trees. We would be impacting about 14 trees. To mitigate those impacts we will put in a very dense buffer along the downhill side of the pond and put in additional piping which would take any emergency overflow condition and channel it down to the discharge point of the driveway.

At which time, Mr. Scott displayed pictures to the board of trees that would be impacted and the new location for the detention pond.

Ms. Kounine stated one of her concerns was the removal of the mature trees. She said unless you absolutely needed to, I don't see any reason to remove mature trees. There is no benefit to re-locating the pond.

Mr. Gary stated the board's responsibility is to minimize any impact it would have on other people. As a board we need to look at this very carefully because this will impact other people.

Mr. Scott stated he will take this into advisement and bring it back to the committee.

PARKASH ESTATES – 870 ROUTE 6 – TM – 65.13-1-54 – 1ST EXTENSION OF APPROVAL

The consultants had no objection to the extension.

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

303 MOUNTAINWOOD, INC. – 953 ROUTE 6 – TM – 65.10-1-53 – WAIVER OF SITE PLAN APPLICATION

Mr. Carnazza stated he has no objection to the waiver it is in full compliance with zoning.

Mr. Gainer had no comments.

Mr. Cleary had no objection to the waiver also.

Mr. Willie Besharat of Rayex Designs, representing the applicant stated this project was approved for office or retail space on the main level and the lower level was to be used for warehousing a plumbing business. The space for the plumbing is much larger than they anticipated and they would like to put an ice cream business in the lower level. We have sufficient parking and we are not changing the characteristics to the building.

Ms. Kounine moved to grant waiver of site plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Molloy with all in favor.

MINUTES – 1/25/2012 & 2/15/2012

Mr. Molloy moved to accept minutes of January 25, 2012. The motion was seconded by Mr. Meyer with all in favor.

Mr. Molloy moved to accept minutes of February 15, 2012. The motion was seconded by Mr. Meyer with all in favor.

Mr. Molloy moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta