

APPROVED

CRAIG PAEPRER
Chairman

ANTHONY GIANNICO
Vice Chairman

BOARD MEMBERS

KIM KUGLER
RAYMOND COTE
ROBERT FRENKEL
MARK PORCELLI
VICTORIA CAUSA

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 **JULY 28, 2021**

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN, CRAIG PAEPRER, VICE CHAIRMAN, ANTHONY GIANNICO,
RAYMOND COTE, ROBERT FRENKEL, VICTORIA CAUSA

ABSENT: KIM KUGLER, MARK PORCELLI

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
House of Prayer & Worship	64.6-1-14	Site Plan	1	Public Hearing Scheduled.
Binns Family Trust	75.20-2-2	Site Plan	1-4	No Board Action.
Hamlet at Carmel	66.-2-58	A. Site Plan	4-9	No Board Action.
Western Bluff Subdivision	66.14-1-20	Subdivision	9-10	No Board Action.
Fante Subdivision	87.7-1-22	Sketch Plan	10-12	No Board Action.
NY Fuel Distributors LLC (Coco Farms)	55.11-1-40	Bond Return	12	Public Hearing Scheduled.
Minutes – 07/15/21			12	Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

HOUSE OF PRAYER & WORSHIP – 365 HILL STREET – TM – 64.6-1-14 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza stated all necessary variances were granted by the ZBA and are noted on the plat. All zoning comments have been addressed.

Mr. Franzetti stated he had two comments:

- The applicant should note that a Performance Bond and associated Engineering fee is minimally required for the stormwater management practices, erosion and sediment control drainage features, landscaping etc. installed on the site. Please see §156-61 J and K of the Town Code for additional information.
- Applicant has removed the porta-potty and replaced with bathrooms and a holding tank. How will the unit be maintained and how will the water connect into the unit and how the unit will control overflows.

Mr. Cleary stated he had no further comments and is ready for a public hearing.

Mr. Joel Greenberg of Architectural Visions, representing the applicant stated as far as the bond is concerned he will go over it with the Mr. Franzetti. As far as the holding tank, there is an agreement with one of the companies that does the clean out of the holding tank and the health department required us to put alarms on it should the system fail.

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

Mr. Greenberg asked the Chairman if a draft resolution could also be ready at the next meeting.

Chairman Paeprer replied we could do that as long as there is no outcry from the public.

BINNS FAMILY TRUST – 5 VESCHI LANE SOUTH – TM – 75.20-2-2 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant proposes to add a large building at the existing mixed-use property on Veschi Lane South. What are the uses of the existing buildings? Provide a parking calculation. Provide aisle widths (both one way and two). The dumpster enclosure appears to be partially on the traveled way. What is the 2-way aisle width at the dumpster enclosure. Provide lot coverage. 30% is the max permitted by code. Provide a list of all previous variances granted and/or denied by the ZBA. A variance will be required for the building for property line setback, however, there may be more variances needed once I get the list of all the previous variances. Provide the height of the building on the drawing. What is the proposed use of the building? Will the spaces be rented or leased? Will additional signage be installed? Can the 25 ft Right of Way or the 15 ft. New York Telephone Easement be blocked by cars and/or parking spaces? Town Council should look into this.

Mr. Joel Greenberg of Architectural Visions, representing the applicant stated the easement goes through the property.

Mr. Charbonneau asked what is the easement used for?

Mr. Binns stated the easement was granted back in the 1970's for New York Telephone at the time. It was to get service from their building on Buckshollow Road to Rolling Greens by the High School. They got an easement to run underground wires. We have been there since 1972 and I have never seen the manhole opened once.

Mr. Carnazza asked what about the right of way part of it. It says New York Telephone has a 15 foot, but it says 25 foot right of way. What is the difference.

Mr. Greenberg stated that was probably an old situation before they took it over.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated this application encompasses a proposal to install a 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 should be provided to determine if the disturbance exceeds the threshold criteria of disturbance for New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) stormwater regulations. The applicant must, at a minimum, provide
 - a. erosion and sediment control measures for the proposed work.
 - b. Details on the control of stormwater on the site.
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 not served by either water or septic. Details for these services must be provided.
7. Driveway easements to access the property from Route 6 must be provided.

II. Detailed Comments

1. A survey of the property should be provided.
2. The drawing should provide a legend which contains all significant features on the drawing.
3. The site plan provided is very confusing and should be updated to provide the existing and proposed site plans.
4. Applicant to provide contours at 2' intervals.
5. 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.
6. All turning radii for the site should be graphically provided.

7. 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.
8. Sidewalks, manholes and guiderails should be installed per §128 of the Town of Carmel Town Code.
9. A landscaping plan should be provided to show the location and extent of all plantings.
10. All plantings shall be installed per §142 of the Town of Carmel Town Code.
11. Erosion and sediment controls for the site must be provided.
12. Construction Sequence should be provided on the drawing
13. It is unclear if any additional electric utilities are being installed.
14. A lighting spill plan must be provided.
15. Access for Fire Department around the rear of the buildings must be considered.

Mr. Cleary stated his comments are mostly repeating Mr. Carnazza and Mr. Franzetti's comments on this. There's a lot of clarification that needs to be provided. The primary issue is Mr. Greenberg is describing the building as several buildings. It appears to be a single building with attachments to it. It is essentially a single building. How will the building operate? Clarifications need to be provided on how it will be constructed on the site. Clarify if the space in the warehouse will be heated and air conditioned. Clarify the easements depicted on the site plan, and if any restrictions exist that would impact the proposed use of the site. Clarify if grading is required to accommodate the new warehouse. How will runoff from the roof areas of the warehouse building be addressed?

Mr. Greenberg addressed the board and stated this is at the end of Veschi Lane South. The building being proposed is to store the applicant's business (pest control). It's to keep his vehicles and equipment inside instead of outside. As far as the easement is concerned, this right of way (points to map) goes all the way up across Route 6, up the hill. Mr. Greenberg proceeded to discuss where the proposed building will be on the site. He stated the area is fairly well landscaped and I will be more specific about it. There will not be air conditioning or heating in the building.

Chairman Paerprer asked if there will be an impact to traffic.

Mr. Greenberg replied the impact is zero, because the same trucks being used now are parked on the site and we're proposing them to be inside the storage building.

Mr. Cleary asked is this being done because the business is expanding?

Mr. Greenberg replied no. There will be five vehicles stored in the building.

Mr. Cleary asked are there any unusual storage requirements for pesticides or chemicals that might be associated with the business.

Mr. Binns replied it's already established based on DEC regulations. They are in a contained unit. We don't stock large quantities.

Mr. Carnazza asked what is in the existing buildings?

Mr. Binns stated the front building is still a house. The second building has a tenant upstairs and commercial office downstairs.

Mrs. Causa asked will there be any ventilation in the building.

Mr. Greenberg replied there will be ventilation. We haven't designed the building yet, we need site plan approval first. It would all be taken into consideration when we apply for the building permit.

Mr. Cleary stated this board also serves as the architectural board. If there will be any unusual vents or circulation fans that are necessary for some reason, the board would want to know that.

Mr. Greenberg said we will go a little further and the elevations will show anything that penetrates the roof or the walls.

Chairman Paepre stated to provide the architectural design also and you also have quite a bit of comments that need to be addressed.

HAMLET AT CARMEL – STONELEIGH AVE – TM – 66.-2-58 – AMENDED SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicants propose to develop a 150 unit multi-family development with the necessary parking and recreation spaces on 35.28 acre parcel. This project is for all ages, not a multi-family dwelling for the elderly. The ZBA interpreted that Multi-Family Dwellings are permitted in the R-Residential zoning district in May of 2021 and that 5 units/acre are permitted in July of 2021. Variance required for section 156-28A- These apartments are not Garden Apartments. By definition, they may not exceed 2 stories in height. (I BELIEVE JEFF IS GETTING CONFUSED WITH THE SENIOR MULTI-FAMILY LAW 156-39B(8) WHICH READS- "NO BUILDING SHALL EXCEED 40 FEET IN HEIGHT, AND ALL BUILDINGS SHALL NOT EXCEED TWO STORIES ABOVE THE GROUND". I need to meet with the Engineer to discuss this. His buildings are two stories at the front of the building but exposed at the rear of the building. The Engineering Department needs to confirm this project conforms with section 156-28A(13) which reads "adequate water supplies shall be made available the entire year for fire protection purpose...".

Rich's memo said the applicant seeks an amended site plan for the approval of 120 units of multifamily housing in accordance with § 156-28 of the Town Code. The site is 35.3 acres The Planning Board granted Final Site Plan approval for this project involving the development of a 120 unit senior housing development on June 9, 2009.

As previously provided to the Planning Board on November 19, 2020, the applicant requested a re-approval of the previously approved site plan. At that time the Engineering Department did not have any objection to re-approval of the site plan application for this project as there are no changes to the site being made.

The Engineering Department advised the Planning Board we had met with applicant on October 5, 2015. The following should be noted:

- The re-approval request is for the previously Planning Board approved site, any site changes which may be contemplated by the applicant may trigger a new site review process and regulatory review.
- The performance bond and engineering inspection fee will need to be increased to reflect current costs.
- Stormwater maintenance agreement and bond will be required.

- The Out of District (OOD) Water and Sewer agreements will need to be updated to reflect the proposed use. The applicant is in the process of amending the existing OOD water and sewer agreements. The amendment will result in a reduction from the previously approved flow of 72,000 gpd (for water and sewer) to 42,000 gpd of flow (for water and sewer). The Engineering Department performed a flow assessment and the reduction is acceptable.

Based upon our review of this submittal, the Engineering Department offers the following **preliminary** comments

I. General Comments

- The following referrals would appear to be warranted:
 - New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)
 - New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT).
 - New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP).
 - Putnam County Department of Highways and Facilities
 - Putnam County Department of Health (PCDOH).
 - Putnam County Department of Planning (GML 239 M).
 - Town of Carmel Highway Department
 - The Town of Carmel Environmental Conservation Board (ECB).
 - Carmel and Croton Falls Fire Departments
- Permits from the following would appear necessary:
 - NYSDEC - for stormwater.
 - NYSDOT for work permit and traffic study
 - NYCDEP for stormwater.
 - PCDHF work permit
 - Town of Carmel for the OOD connection for water and sewer.
 - ECB for wetlands permit.
- An existing conditions map must be provided.
- A comparison map of what has previously been approved to what is being proposed must be provided.
- A wetlands delineation should be performed.
- The application identifies that the maximum day water and sewer flows are 24,400 gallons per day. The OOD district connection must be amended to reflect these values.
- A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) detailing the sizing of the SMPs is required. The SWPPP should meet the NYSDEC GP-0-20-001 and NYCDEP requirements.
- A traffic study should be conducted and provided for review. The traffic study will need to be review and approved by the NYSDOT and PCDHF.
- The applicant will be required to supply a stormwater maintenance agreement and maintenance guarantee per Town Code (§156-85 and §156-87 B respectively).
- 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 applicant will need to develop a quantity take off for bonding purposes.

Mr. Franzetti stated there are a lot of detailed comments and the applicant has noted all of them and will provide them at a future submittal. This is just the beginning and they will provide all of the information as part of those detailed site comments.

Mr. Cleary stated the plan is now a 150 unit plan instead of the 120 unit plan that was submitted previously. He stated this was originally the Putnam Community Foundation Senior Housing project that was approved 10 years ago. That plan has been abandoned and is now pursuant to the Interpretation by the Zoning Board a non-age restricted housing development with various affordability levels built into it. The applicant will provide more information as to how it's going to work. We went through a full environmental review for the original plan, but time has passed and some things have changed during that time. The applicant has provided a full EAF with supplements. I'm asking for some clarifications to those documents. We simply cannot rely on the original review. It's a different type of project, times have changed and circumstances have changed. We will need to review traffic, sewer and water and so forth. Operational issues are the primary concern. The physical impact on the site is less than the prior project, the coverage and the amount of disturbance to the property. The physical impact on the property itself is probably not our concern. It's how the site operates and how people flush toilets and drive cars are the issues we need to dig into.

Mr. Ken Kearney of Kearney Realty Group, addressed the board and stated when I appeared before you a few months ago, prior to seeking the zoning clarification we talked about a mixed income development of approximately 80 units and market rate of 40 units. We balanced that based on the Interpretation. We lowered the mixed income affordable to 75 and the 75 units of market rate housing. They will be built concurrently. We will probably do some type of land lease for one of the phases. We are not sure which phase we will give a 99 year land lease to the other. With the mixed income affordable, my son and I have developed over 20 of these projects throughout New York State. We use a combination of tax credits and low interest loans from the state. We turn the tax credits into equity through our equity provider Raymond James Partners from Tampa, Florida. He said we are developers, builders, but more importantly we're hands on managers. We own and manage over 1500 units throughout New York State. We have done this model before and I'm here to answer any questions you may have.

Chairman Paeprer asked what impacts will it have on traffic, roads, sewer and so on.

Mr. Jeff Contelmo of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated we have taken a look at comparing impacts from what was originally reviewed and what is being reviewed now. Mr. Cleary has brought up a host of secondary questions that we are prepared to answer. He said what we're using on the site in terms of land and land disturbance is actually less with this proposal. The issues in terms of impacts that need a closer look include traffic, sewer and water and community services. We did provide information on all four of those and the consultants have brought up further questions which we are prepared to dig in a little deeper on and we plan on getting you more information on that.

Chairman Paeprer stated this board will also act as the architectural review board on this application.

Mr. Contelmo stated we are aware of that process and we have provided our schematic elevation and floor plan information. We could further develop that by getting some colors, etc.

Mr. Cote asked what is the breakdown of units?

Mr. Kearney replied 75 mixed income affordable and 75 market rate units. He stated as far as the architecture, from the outside the affordable and market rate will look primarily the same. We do not use vinyl siding, we use Hardie plank siding. The footprints for the market rate units will be larger. The finishes will be better. We built affordable and market rate units in Beacon, New York. It works!

Mrs. Causa asked what is the income level for affordable units?

Mr. Kearney replied depending on the family size and bedroom size. The one bedroom units ranges from \$50,000 up to \$75,000. The majority of the units are at 60%. We do have some units at 80 to 90%, but the bulk of the units are at 60%. The two bedroom units will range \$64,000 to \$96,000. The three bedroom units will range \$71,000 to \$107,000. We haven't finalized our rents on the market rate, but we believe the rents we are charging for the 90% affordable mixed income units are a little bit below what we are going to charge for the market rate units next door.

Mrs. Causa asked is there a separate entrance to this development or will you be going through the hospital entrance?

Mr. Kearney stated there is an access agreement with the hospital that was constructed about 12 years ago.

Mr. Contelmo stated this was originally planned as part of the hospital southernly entrance. The new emergency room addition access is from this driveway.

Mrs. Causa asked and there is no other entrance to the site?

Mr. Contelmo replied that's correct. That is the only way to get in.

Mr. Cleary asked the mix of affordability limits that was just described, is that permanent and fixed forever, can that change over time?

Mr. Kearney stated when we lock into the affordable units, there will be a regulatory agreement for 50 years. So, for 50 years we will have those income limits and a deed restriction is filed. It's a 50 year affordability, however, one of the low income loans we get has a 30 year sunset. At the end of 30 years, we will pay that off with a refinance. It operates a little differently between years 30 and 50. There is a little bit more flexibility, but you still have to stay within those income limits. He said there is no regulatory agreement or any type of restriction on the market rate units.

Mr. Frenkel asked what happens at the end of 50 years?

Mr. Kearney stated at the end of 50 years it could age out or opt out and could go to market rate.

Mr. Frenkel stated with regards to ownership, you have the general partners as yourselves and limited partners. Does the limited partnership own the building?

Mr. Kearney replied yes.

Mr. Frenkel stated so are these being structured as condominiums?

Mr. Kearney replied no they are not condominiums and they can't be individual ownerships under this structure for the tax credits to flow.

Mr. Contelmo stated we did two projects in town under the same program. Hillcrest Commons and Hughson Commons are both projects, they happen to be senior projects, but Mr. Kearney is aware of the programs that they were funded and built under which is the same as this.

Mr. Frenkel stated he is very interested in seeing the fiscal impact study. I would like to understand the market rate side versus the low-income side effect upon our tax revenues.

Mr. Kearney stated we will have that for you. We are looking at some numbers, but between the affordable and the market rate, I think it could be somewhere between \$750,000 to \$800,000 a year. The majority will be on the market rate units.

Mr. Frenkel stated one of his concerns is how this development will look from the road and what we see. Are you locked into a particular architectural plan based on what you have done in Somers?

Mr. Kearney replied no. Somers is a different model.

Mr. Frenkel stated I reviewed the elevations that were submitted and I'm not exactly thrilled with them. I would like to see something with a little bit of New England in it.

Mr. Kearney replied okay. We will work with the board and your consultant to get there.

Mr. Cote asked if a traffic study has been done for this project.

Mr. Contelmo replied a traffic study was done for the original project and what was submitted recently from Tim Miller Associates are some updated numbers in terms of traffic generation and brief analysis of what that means. Mr. Cleary asked us to further expand that study and we will do that.

Mr. Cote stated since the original study was done, there have been a lot of changes, such as the hospital expansion. We should probably get some input from the hospital as well, because you will be sharing a driveway to the emergency room.

Mr. Kearney stated we met with them. A lot of groups have left the premises and the traffic is less there now then it was 10 years ago. He said so far it has been well received, but will continue that dialog.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked how will the occupancy take place?

Mr. Kearney stated there will be an outreach to all perspective applicants. When the applications come in they are processed in a lottery. It's not first come, first serve. It can be first come, first serve on the market rate units, but not on the affordable units.

Chairman Paeprer asked what areas are you outreaching to, besides Putnam County.

Mr. Kearney replied it will be Westchester County, Dutchess County and possibly Connecticut.

Mr. Carnazza asked will New York State residents get preference?

Mr. Kearney replied that hasn't been my experience. He stated we did an artist project in Peekskill and we had an artist from California.

Mrs. Causa asked does the traffic study include future bus stops?

Mr. Contelmo stated our firm didn't do the traffic study, it was done by Tim Miller Associates. I don't believe they addressed both the public transit component or the school bus component. We could get them to expand it to those.

At which time, a discussion ensued with regards to the best location for a bus shelter to be built for school aged children and traffic flow for the school buses.

Chairman Paeprer stated to work with the consultants and we will move forward.

Mr. Kearney stated we will be applying for funding next month. Once we get more information we will come back to the board.

WESTERN BLUFF SUBDIVISION – 350 WEST SHORE DRIVE – TM – 66.14-1-20 – 3 LOT SUBDIVISION

Mr. Carnazza's memo stated the applicant proposes a three lot subdivision off West Shore Drive in Carmel. A Wetland permit is required from the ECB. All zoning comments have been addressed. I have no further comments for preliminary approval.

Mr. Franzetti read his three pages of comments to the board.

Mr. Cleary stated we worked on this subdivision 2 years ago. You spent a great deal of time on this 3 lot subdivision. We got to the point where we were comfortable with the sketch plan and moving him on to preliminary approval. When the NYCDEP is involved, the DEP will not review the SWPPP until we adopt a negative declaration to complete the SEQR review. We completed the SEQR review and adopted a negative declaration two years ago and since that time they have been working with DEP. That's why we haven't seen them. They have completed the process with DEP and they have come back to us. We could schedule the public hearing on this and complete the process that we started awhile ago.

Mr. John Kellard of Kellard Sessions Engineering, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated we have spent the last couple of years working with NYCDEP. We went through a very detailed SWPPP which was approved and received the stormwater permit from DEP. We have also tested the septic areas with the Health Department. The Health Department is about 95% complete on their review. We have submitted a subdivision plat with the application and the septic and well information is on the plat. We have also submitted to NYSDEC for clarification under the general permit and they

responded back they we can have coverage under the general permit which will be provided.

Chairman Paeprer asked there will be one entrance for 3 lots?

Mr. Kellard replied yes, it's a common driveway.

Mr. Carnazza stated each of the lots have frontage, so no open development was required. They are just sharing a driveway.

Mr. Kellard stated we will have an easement over lot 3 for lots 1 and 2. And then, we will have an easement over lot 2 for access to lot 1. Lot 2 will continue up to the site. He continued and stated the plans are quite detailed. All the drainage is showing on the plans. There is a tree removal plan provided. We have gone to the ECB. They suggested to come back after receiving DEP approval.

Mr. Cleary stated there is a lot of material that is required by Mr. Franzetti. If you open the public hearing, we should keep that public hearing open until all the comments have been provided. Procedurally, our subdivision process is sketch plan, preliminary and final approval. For a minor subdivision which is 5 lots or less, you could go right to final approval from sketch. If the board is leaning in that direction, all that material is necessary. Theoretically, we are dealing with final approval.

Chairman Paeprer stated he is reluctant to go any further until we satisfy all the comments from the Engineer.

Mr. Kellard was fine with that. He asked if he should wait to go to the ECB.

Mr. Franzetti said we should clarify our comments, so that the board is satisfied and then go to the ECB.

FANTE SUBDIVISION - 419 UNION VALLEY ROAD - TM - 87.7-1-22 - SKETCH PLAN (2 LOTS)

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant proposes to divide a lot off the existing lot to create one additional building lot. The existing lot (lot 2), with the existing house now needs a 280A variance as the frontage now belongs to lot 1. Provide easements for review by the Planning Board Attorney. The setbacks are 40' front, 25' sides and 40' rear. I'm not sure why the engineer said 30' front, 20' sides and 10' rear. The Zoning Schedule needs to be amended, however, the lots both comply with the code. Lot depth for lot 2 needs to be discussed with the engineer. The midpoint of the front property line in the general direction of the side lines to the rear line gives you the lot depth. Lot width is a perpendicular line at the midpoint of the Lot Depth from property line to property line. Variance required- Lot depth line for lot 1 exits and re-enters the lot.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated this application encompasses a proposal to subdivide a 12 acre parcel at 419 Union Valley Road into 2 lots. Lot 1 will be 4. acres and Lot 2 will be 8.07 acres. There is an existing structure on Lot 2 and Lot 1 is proposed to be developed with a residential dwelling. The development of Lot 1 will need to come back to the Planning Board. The following are preliminary comments:

- The applicant should provide a separate Subdivision Plat
- The configuration of Lot 1 will require a variance as it does not have road frontage.
- A Driveway maintenance agreement between lots 1 and 2 should be provided.
- The steep slope analysis must be provided in color as it is hard to read.
- A note should be added to the plan to specify that all existing stone walls shall not be disturbed, except as specifically necessary to accomplish the site development shown.
- The Board should be aware that the drawing DOES NOT contain information regarding areas proposed to be reserved for open space.
- As the subdivision plans are refined, all missing elements mandated by §131-13 should be incorporated into the project's design plans. Based upon our review of this submittal, the Engineering Department offers the following comments regarding the future development of lot 1.

Otherwise this Department has no objection to subdivision being presented.

Mr. Cleary stated the creation of a landlock parcel needs to be addressed in some manner, 280A is one way of dealing with that. He said on the new lot there are some constrained areas such as steep slopes and a pond. It appears that the house is in the area of the steepest slopes. Are you limited to be there for some reason related to the septic system? The driveway requires easements and there is also a sharing of the driveway with the adjacent as well.

Mr. Carnazza stated the lot in the back is not being created. It's already there. The lot in the front is and it has the frontage, so it's 280A. Open development would be the Town Board one.

Mr. Jack Karell, applicant's engineer points to the map showing the existing driveway, septic system and proposed house.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked if the front of the house faces Union Valley Road.

Mr. Karell replied yes. He asked Mr. Carnazza if the 280A was Zoning Board not Town Board.

Mr. Carnazza replied it's Zoning Board for 280A.

Mr. Karell asked if he could be denied to the ZBA, because if we don't get the variances we have nothing.

Chairman Paerprer said so there will be three houses using that one driveway.

Mr. Karell replied that's correct, but the present access off of Union Valley Road for the Fante house and this house (points to map) is a good location.

Mr. Carnazza replied that's correct.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding the existing driveway width of 15 feet and the width of the driveway of the proposed house showing how oil trucks, delivery trucks, etc. will be able to make turns.

Chairman Paeprer stated I don't think this is ready for the Zoning Board just yet. There are a lot of comments that still need to be addressed.

Mr. Cleary stated they could grant the variance on a project that you don't feel is right.

Vice Chairman Giannico was in agreement with the Chairman.

NY FUEL DISTRIBUTORS LLC – (COCO FARMS) – 1923 ROUTE 6 – TM – 55.11-1-40 – BOND RETURN

Mr. Carnazza stated he inspected the site and it was all good.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated in response to the request by the referenced applicant, a representative of the Engineering Department (Department) performed a field inspection of the referenced property on July 2, 2021 evaluate the current status of the site construction, for the purpose of determining whether a bond return was warranted. The results of the site investigation are presented below. Based upon our inspection all the site improvements required pursuant to the Board's Site Plan approval have now been completed. This included the NYSDOT work. The applicant posted a bond in the amount of \$163,000.00 on May 14, 2018. Based upon our inspection all the site improvements required pursuant to the Board's Site Plan approval have now been completed.

Mr. Cleary had no comments.

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

MINUTES – 07/15/21

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to accept the minutes of July 15, 2021. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

Mr. Cote moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:20 p.m. with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta