

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

OCTOBER 21, 2020

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN, CRAIG PAEPRER, VICE CHAIRMAN, ANTHONY GIANNICO,
KIM KUGLER, RAYMOND COTE, ROBERT FRENKEL, MARK PORCELLI,
VICTORIA CAUSA

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
Carmel Fire Department	44.14-1-24	P/H & Reso	1	Public Hearing Closed & Resolution Adopted.
Carmel Fire Department	44.14-1-24	Public Hearing	1-2	Public Hearing Closed & Planner to Prepare Resolution.
Melchner, Charles & Stephanie	66.-2-37	P/H & Reso	3	Public Hearing Closed & Resolution Adopted.
Mahoven LLC (Kaneti)	75.42-1-13	Special Site Plan	3-5	No Board Action.
14 Nicole Way LLC (Zakon)	65.6-1-22	Site Plan	5-8	Public Hearing Scheduled.
Old Forge Estates	75.15-1-19-40	Cluster Sub.	8-10	Public Hearing Scheduled & Referred to ECB.
Itzla Subdivision	55.14-1-6	Subdivision	11-12	Public Hearing Scheduled.
70 Old Route 6, LLC	55.11-1-15	Extension	12-14	1 Year Extension Granted.
Centennial Golf Club	44.-2-2,3,4	Resolution	14	Resolution Adopted.
Minutes – 08/19/20			14	Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

Chairman Paeprer addressed the audience and stated there is a Comprehensive Plan currently under way with the town. There is a survey on the website and a meeting scheduled for next week. He urged everyone to go to the website and fill out the survey.

CARMEL FIRE DEPARTMENT – 94 GLENEIDA AVE – TM – 44.14-1-24 – LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT – PUBLIC HEARING/RESOLUTION

Mr. Carnazza stated all the necessary variances were granted. The only comment is this has to be approved before the site plan. The lots have to be existing before the site plan.

Mr. Franzetti stated all engineering comments have been addressed.

Mr. Cleary stated this is on for a public hearing and you have a lot line resolution before you to be voted on tonight.

Chairman Paeprer asked if anyone in the audience wished to be heard on this application.

Hearing no comments from the audience, Vice Chairman Giannico moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

Mr. Cote moved to adopt Resolution #20-07, dated October 21, 2020; Tax Map #44.14-1-23, 24 entitled Carmel Fire Department Subdivision Lot Line Approval. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Giannico with all in favor.

CARMEL FIRE DEPARTMENT – 94 GLENEIDA AVE – TM – 44.14-1-24 – AMENDED SITE PLAN – PUBLIC HEARING

The consultants had no comments.

Mr. Michael Liquori, applicant's attorney addressed the board and stated I've been tasked with dealing with TD Bank for purposes of facilitating the lot line adjustment and easement and dealing with the issues of traffic across the driveway. When we presented the project to the board we proposed to keep the traffic two-way and the board raised it as a potential concern with cars interacting with the newly proposed apparatus bay. We have back and forth with TD Bank about what's the best way to handle the particular interaction of our uses. He said before they committed to one-way traffic, they asked us to perform a traffic study so they could fully understand how many cars interacted on the site on any given Friday; since that's when they receive the most amount of traffic. The analysis was prepared and about 20 cars per day use that driveway in multiple directions. While that number isn't significant, ultimately TD Bank came back to us and said they would agree to one-way traffic, and their preference would be one-way for the entire length of the easement for everybody and immediately it was a non-starter for us, because the Volunteer Ambulance is part of it and it would eliminate their two way access. He said they went back to TD Bank and said they can't agree to the one-way and the best way to resolve this is to put policies and procedures in place on behalf of the Fire Department to direct traffic for whenever the Fire Department uses that access way and that proposal is summarized in my cover letter to the board which is basically whenever a fire apparatus would come on to that driveway, we would have our members of the Fire Department exit the apparatus and direct traffic if there is traffic on the driveway. He said the Fire Department is uniquely trained to deal with policies and procedures because they operate strictly in accordance with policies and procedures. So, essentially that's our proposal. We keep the two-way and

put a policy in place for our members to handle traffic the way they're supposed to. The only proposal that we could come up with is the one that we've presented and we think we're uniquely suited to manage this particular use in a way that's safe and in a way that the board could support it.

Mrs. Kathleen Gallagher of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant stated in addition from a site planning perspective we did add a secondary flashing yield sign to the other side of the driveway as people are coming into Vink Drive and we added painted arrows to help direct traffic in that area to make sure the lanes are being properly utilized.

Mr. Cleary asked is the sign flashing activated all the time or only when the doors are up?

Mrs. Gallagher replied only when the doors are up.

Chairman Paeprer asked about how many calls in a year would you say the apparatus is used?

Mr. Michael Hengel of the Fire Department responded we average about 400 to 450 calls a year. At least once a day.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked when you get a call you will come out on Vink Drive?

Mr. Hengel replied yes, that's correct.

Mrs. Gallagher stated the driveway will be used when they return from call, so they will have the time and availability to look at their surroundings to drive in slowly.

Mr. Cleary asked if there will ever be an incident where you will be exiting from the back and crossing the TD Bank abruptly?

Mr. Hengel replied I won't say there will never be an incident, but not for normal emergency calls. Possibly on a Sunday morning for some sort of training exercise or the truck needs to be serviced.

Mr. Franzetti asked do you block or direct traffic on Vink Drive when you come out?

Mr. Hengel replied no, because we exit in the front where there is a traffic light and we have a traffic controller, so we push the button and it gives us a green light.

At which time, Chairman Paeprer asked if anyone in the audience wished to be heard on this application.

Hearing no comments from the audience, Mr. Cote moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

Chairman Paeprer asked the Planner to prepare a resolution.

Mr. Cleary replied yes, but just to be clear the subdivision that we just approved needs to be filed and recorded before the next meeting.

MELCHNER, CHARLES & STEPHANIE – 417 SEMINARY HILL ROAD – TM – 66.2-37 – PUBLIC HEARING/RESOLUTION

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Franzetti had no comments.

Mr. Cleary stated you have a draft resolution before you to be voted on tonight.

Chairman Paeprer asked if anyone in the audience wished to be heard on this application.

Hearing no comments from the audience, Mr. Cote moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Giannico with all in favor.

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to adopt Resolution #20-08, dated October 21, 2020; Tax Map #66.-2-37 entitled Melchner Private Stable Final Site Plan Approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

MAHOVEN LLC (KANETI) – 737 SOUTH LAKE BLVD – TM – 75.42-1-13 – SPECIAL SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant proposes to add a bathhouse with raised deck above, extend dock to 25' long (width-from property line to property line) and pergola to an existing vacant lot on South Lake Blvd. in Mahopac. This is still an intense use for this small lot. To my knowledge, the State DOT has not approved the driveway that was added prior to the owner purchasing this lot. Check the site distance as the walls on the adjacent lots block the view when pulling out onto South Lake Blvd (State Rt. 6N). The lot is 13'6" wide and they are proposing a 8'W x12'D bathhouse w/deck above and 10'6" x 15'6" pergola. The walking access to the property is now 2 ft. on one side and 4 ft. on the other. There are six variances required from the ZBA and this project needs to be referred to the ECB for comments.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated this application encompasses adding to existing dock, adding a pergola and storage building. 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. The applicant provided a Town of Carmel Flood Plain permit application.
 - a. This will need to be signed by the applicant once approved by planning board.
 - b. There is information missing on the application (i.e., FEMA map panel number).
 - c. Approvals from Planning Board and ECB will be needed.
 - d. A report or the drawings need to provide the information required as part of this application (i.e. elevations as related to flood plain)
2. The following referrals would appear to be warranted:
 - The Town of Carmel Environmental Conservation Board
 - New York State Department of Transportation
3. Additional details should be provided regarding:
 - How the proposed features will be installed (construction sequence)
 - The plan must show the location of erosion and sediment control measures being used during construction.

- The project is located on Lake Mahopac, wetlands and associated buffer zone must be delineated and provided on the drawings.
- The plans 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.

Applicant has noted that these details will be provided once the site layout is approved by the Planning Board

4. Various plan information required pursuant to §156-27 ("Site Plans") is currently lacking. These include, but are not limited to:
 - Lakefront is to be 50 feet, however only 15 feet is provided.

Mr. Cleary stated as you heard the building has been reduced in size, so there is clear access along the side of the building, but the pergola remains on the plan. He said the outdoor bar has been eliminated from the plan. The architect has clarified the dock on the plan. The plan has been clarified to depict the extent of the existing dock to be removed, and the new dock to be installed. The 25' length limitation is being met. The applicant has indicated that they have filed the permit with the NYSDOT. A number of variances are still required from the ZBA.

Mr. Frenkel stated he went to the site earlier and one of his concerns is the size of the building looks immense for the size of the property. He stated he's also concerned about the deck on top of the building. It's a bit much for that locale. He said there are no dimensions on the plans for the driveway and rain garden. He stated the driveway that is represented there is greatly enlarged compared to what exists now. Again, he stated the building is too big.

Mr. Cote asked what is the width of the property?

Mr. Greenberg replied the width is 15 feet. He stated one of the concerns of the board was having direct access with no obstructions from South Lake Blvd down to the lake. We now have a 4 foot area (points to map) over here. We have room for a 1 parking space. He said on the angle it's 15 feet, but if you go perpendicular to the property we have a 4 foot, an 8 foot bathhouse and a 2 foot setback here (points to map).

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding the discrepancies of the size of the property and how small the site is.

Mr. Greenberg addressed the board and stated to recap what was discussed at the last meeting, we have reduced the size of the building considerably. We have provided direct access without obstruction from 6N out to the lake. We revised the docks which conform to the code of a maximum of 25 feet. The portion that extends beyond the 25 feet will be removed along with all the supports. The DOT agreed to have a blacktop apron from the white line to beyond the property line. The rain garden can't be designed until the board finalizes the size of the bathhouse.

Mr. Frenkel stated as far as the unobstructed access to the lake that works on the plan, but it doesn't work when a car is parked there.

Mr. Greenberg stated he will take a look at it.

Chairman Paeprer stated you are going to have a driveway, an apron, rain garden, bathhouse, pergola and a port-a-potty, that's a lot on a small piece of property. He asked what is the function of the bathhouse?

Mr. Greenberg stated it will be for storage and if it rains they will have shelter. He said there is no plumbing, just lights. It's only 8 x 12, it's not that large. We could rearrange this and also relocate the rain garden, so the cars could move over.

A which time, a discussion ensued amongst the board members and applicant regarding the deck on top of the bathhouse and its purpose.

Chairman Paeprer stated you have made some improvements, but there are still some open comments. He said see what you could do to scale back the improvements and come back to the board.

14 NICOLE WAY LLC – (ZAKON) – 14 NICOLE WAY – TM – 75.42-1-13 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant amended his proposal again to construct 1 building, parking, and outdoor storage on the corner of Nicole Way and Rt. 6 in Mahopac. The site is now accessed through Route 6. There is no bulk tank proposed on this property. What is the height of the retaining wall? Please put on plan. The elevations are there, however, not right at the retaining wall. Provide floor plans and elevations to confirm compliance with code. Provide the Lot Depth and Lot Width lines on the plat.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated this application encompasses a proposal to develop a 1.41 acre parcel located at 14 Nicole Way at the intersection of Route 6. The project involves the construction of a single building and related infrastructure.

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. Putnam County Department of Health
 - b. Carmel Fire Department
 - c. Town of Carmel Highway
 - d. NYSDOT
 - e. Putnam County Department of Planning (GML 239n)
2. Permits from the following would appear necessary:
 - a. New York State Department of Transportation – depending on improvements to the ingress/egress along Route 6
 - b. Putnam County Department of Health Water and subsurface septic treatment systems
 - c. Town of Carmel Highway Driveway permit.
 - d. NYSDOT – work within right of way.
 - e. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation(NYSDEC) – Coverage under General Permit GP-0-20-001

3. The area of disturbance for the work is 0.96 acres and a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) with post stormwater controls has been provided. The applicant will need to provide the following:
 - a. Per the NYCDEP Watershed Rules and Regulations, permits are required within limiting distance to reservoirs and reservoir stems.

The applicant has previously responded that this permit is not needed. Additional information should be provided to support this determination.
 - b. The threshold criteria of disturbances for the NYSDEC stormwater regulation are between 5,000 square feet and one (1) acre and over one (1) acre. The project will require coverage under the NYSEC SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity (GP-0-20-001) and the development of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that is for erosion and sediment control only.
4. Legends should be provided on drawings.
5. All drawings must be signed/sealed by the respective professionals.
6. Traffic and Vehicle Movement Plans should be provided which provide the following:
 - a. Provide all sight distance calculations.
 - b. Pavement marking should be provided on the drawings
7. 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 provide quantity takes off and costs.

II. Detailed Comments

1. Site Plan Sheet S-1
 - a. 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
2. Details Sheet S-4
 - a. All curbs, sidewalks, and asphalt should meet the specifications provided in the Town of Carmel Town Code.
 - b. A detail for standard duty asphalt in the parking area has been provided. The top layer of pavement should be 2 inches not 1.5 inches and the binder course should be 3 inches not 2 ½ inches
3. Grading Plan Sheet C-1
 - a. All retaining walls great than 6 foot must be certified by a NYS licensed structural engineer.
4. Utility Plan Sheet C-2
 - a. The area for the porous pavement should be shown on this drawing and must be protected during construction.

- b. The SSTS expansion area does not match the limits of disturbance shown on Sheet S-3 Landscaping Plan Details and Notes.
- 5. Vehicle Movement Plan Sheet C-4
 - a. Oil/Propane truck and vehicle movements should be provided on the drawings.
- 6. Erosion and Sediment Control Sheets C-5 and Details Sheet D-4G
 - a. Location of porous pavement should be provided on drawing
 - b. Adequate protection should be provided in the SMP areas to minimize disturbance during construction. Details should be provided to show how the porous pavement system will be protected during construction
 - c. The porous pavement needs to be designed per NYSDEC regulations so as to ensure it will function.
- 7. SWPPP. The review is ongoing, preliminary comments are as follows:
 - a. Pre-Construction sequence should include MS4 acceptance.
 - b. The NOI needs to be signed
 - c. The area for the porous pavement area should be shown on this drawing and must be protected during construction.
 - d. Include porous pavement requirements in SWPPP.

Mr. Cleary stated the applicant appeared before you at the last meeting with a revised concept of what is before you today. It reflects significant changes to the plan, most notably the access. The board acted very favorably to the revised plan. The applicant was directed to prepare the more formal site plan that is before you tonight. With those minor comments that brings that plan to completion and to move forward to a public hearing.

Vice Chairman Giannico stated he is glad to see the progress that was made and appreciated the effort that was put into it.

Chairman Paeprer stated since we also play part of the architectural review can you tell us about the finishes of the building.

Mr. Alfred Cappelli, applicant's architect stated he will have a rendering for the public hearing. He pointed to the map and stated the beige area is vinyl siding and the roof is asphalt shingles and the green area is faux standing seam roof.

Chairman Paeprer stated there are several comments from Mr. Franzetti and Mr. Carnazza.....

Mr. Cleary stated you could advance the application and schedule the public hearing conditioned upon them addressing the minor details.

Chairman Paeprer was in agreement with Mr. Cleary.

Mrs. Causa asked what is the purpose of the building?

Mr. Cappelli stated the applicant owns an oil and propane delivery business. The building will be housing his oil storage vehicles that he currently rents from another person's facility. The trucks being stored will be empty. Basically, it's a building for his oil trucks, office and storage space and no maintenance will be done on the trucks.

Chairman Paeprer stated he is okay with moving the application to a public hearing.

OLD FORGE ESTATES – BALDWIN PLACE ROAD – TM – 75.15-1-19-40 – CLUSTER SUBDIVISION

Mr. Carnazza stated all his comments have been addressed.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated this application encompasses a proposal to amend a conventional 10 lot subdivision on a 45.3 acre parcel to a cluster subdivision of 14 units per §156-45 of the Town of Carmel Town Code. 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:

- a. Mahopac Falls Volunteer Fire Department – The applicant provided a copy of letter dated December 31, 2018 to the Mahopac Falls Volunteer Fire Department (MFVFD).

MFVFD responded to the applicant regarding fire flow and moving flushing hydrant.

Permits from the following would appear necessary:

- b. Town of Carmel Highway

Per the applicant this permit is not required

- c. Town of Carmel Environmental Conservation Board

The applicant has noted this comment and has indicated that the application will be submitted to the ECB upon referral from the Planning Board

- d. Putnam County Highway Department for access onto Baldwin Place Road.

The applicant has noted this comment and provided a copy of the November 16, 2010 signed drawing from the PC Highway Department.

- e. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC):
 - i. State Pollution Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) Groundwater Discharge;
 - ii. General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activities. The project has coverage under the NYSDEC General Stormwater Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activities permit number NYR 10L634. The applicant should determine if the coverage under the original permit is applicable to the updated site plan.

The applicant has noted the need for both permits. The SSTS permit will be applied for and the stormwater permit will be updated.

The applicant has indicated that the project has received coverage under the NYSDEC existing General Permit GP-0-08-001 and will be amended to meet the GP-0-20-001 requirements.

- f. New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NCSDEP):

- i. Intermediate Subsurface Sewage Treatment System permit
- ii. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan Approval. The NYCDEP approved the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for this project. The expiration date is September 2, 2018.

The applicant has noted this comment and will submit an amended SSTS and SWPPP to the NYCDEP.

- g. Putnam County Department of Health
 - i. Common Wastewater Treatment System Permit approval.
 - ii. Carmel Water District #13 Public Water Supply extension.

The applicant has noted the need for both permits and will apply for both.

A SWPPP, as detailed by the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) Pursuant to §18-39 of the NYCDEP Watershed Rules and Regulations is required.

The applicant has noted that in order for the NYCDEP to commence review of the SWPPP, that the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) determination from the Planning Board is required. The Engineering Department has no objection to moving forward with the SEQRA process.

Review of the SWPPP is ongoing. The applicant has noted this comment.

The Board should be aware that the drawing DOES contain information regarding areas proposed to be reserved for open space. A note has been provided on the drawings.

The applicant has noted this comment.

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. Prior to Final Resolution the applicant will be required to submit a quantity take off of all proposed improvements for bonding and inspection fee purposes.

The applicant has noted this comment.

The applicant is advised that a stormwater bond and maintenance guarantee, pursuant to §156.87 of the Town Code, may be required.

The applicant has noted this comment.

Mr. Cleary stated this application was previously approved as a conventional subdivision; the revision that is before you is to cluster the plan that results in substantial preservation of open space on the property. The presumption is it is a benefit, but we should make the referral to the ECB. He said at this point we could advance this application to a public hearing. He said it has been a while since the public commented on that.

Chairman Paeprer asked if we should send it to the ECB and have the public hearing at the same time.

Mr. Cleary said to send it to the ECB right away and get their comments and you could incorporate that into the public hearing commentary.

Chairman Paeprer asked when do you want to start this project?

Mr. Paul Lynch of Putnam Engineering, representing the applicant replied in the spring. He stated the previous approval was for a 10 lot conventional subdivision. He said the 10 lots were covering the entire property. As of result of having that layout, the City of New York decided that we were having two watercourse crossings. They decided that the two wetlands down here (points to map) to be connected. He said you are allowed two, but you could not pave the road over this portion (points to map) of the wetland crossing. So, it got to the point where the town would consider in terms of being able to dedicate the road, so having the HOA maintain these large lots, economically it was feasible for them to condense the project. He said it's very similar to what we did on Kennicut Hill Road – Random Ridge Subdivision. These lots will be a little bigger than those lots. The houses will be about the same size, about 2,000 to 2,200 square foot homes. The lot size will be about .35 to .4 acre lot. Instead of having individual septic systems on every lot, there will be three primary systems, 2 in operation while 1 system rests. As far as stormwater, we are going to have infiltration and a stormwater pond and we will actually have less run-off with the cluster subdivision.

Mr. Franzetti asked do you still need referral to the NYCDEP?

Mr. Lynch replied no. It's already been done.

Mr. Franzetti asked will this be dedicated town roads?

Mr. Lynch stated we are going to offer it for dedication.

Mr. Franzetti stated the town will not take the stormwater controls. It will be up to the homeowners.

Mr. Lynch stated there will be a HOA. He stated that's another reason why we would like to have a public hearing. He said we have to form a transportation corporation. NYSDEC will not review and approve our septic plans without there being a transportation corporation formed.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked will this be on town water or a well for the development.

Mr. Lynch replied it will be town water.

Mrs. Causa asked how many houses will there be?

Mr. Lynch replied 14 homes.

Chairman Paeprer stated to work with Mr. Franzetti regarding his comments and we will refer it to the ECB and schedule a public hearing.

ITZLA SUBDIVISION – 9 MECHANIC ST. – TM – 55.14-1-6 – 2 LOT SUBDIVISION

Mr. Carnazza stated all his comments have been addressed.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the project encompasses subdivision of a 1.5 acre parcel into two nearly equal lots. It is suggested that the applicant provide the Planning Board with a summary of the project as this last appeared before the Board in 2016. The Engineering Department offers the following comments on the preliminary subdivision plan provided:

General Comments

The following referrals would appear to be warranted:

Carmel Fire Department

The applicant has provided a letter from 2014. It is recommended that the applicant resubmit to the Carmel Fire Department for review.

A Town of Carmel Highway permit is needed for the driveway.

The applicant has noted the need for this permit

A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), as detailed by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) General Stormwater Permit for discharges from Construction Activities (GP-0-20-001) is required.

The overall disturbance for the project as proposed is ~42,000 square feet, which therefore exceeds 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 threshold 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 only erosion and sediment control and not permanent stormwater controls.

Applicant should note the updated NYSDEC General Permit (GP-0-20-001).

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. The applicant provided a performance bond and engineering fee estimate in 2016 in the amount of \$26,000.00 and \$1,300.00 respectfully. As it has been four (4) years since the original bond amounts were determined the values should be updated. Based on construction costs, as provided in Engineering News Record construction cost index the performance bond and engineering fee should be adjusted by 13% to \$29,500.00 and \$1,500.00 respectfully.

Mr. Cleary stated this is a simple two lot subdivision and the existing dwelling is to remain and one new home will be constructed. The issues with respect to this relates to the proximity to the RPK townhouse development next door. The applicant has relocated the driveway curb cut to the west on Mechanic Street. They have provided sight distance information. As requested, the applicant has provided a "Composite Grading Plan and Sight Distance Profile" as well as a "Composite Landscaping Plan." These plans document

the improvements proposed on the adjacent RPK Home site. It is recommended that the 3 evergreen plantings indicated at the southeastern corner of the RPK site be relocated to the north. Doing so will afford a more expanded line of sight to the west – toward Seminary Hill Road. It is additionally recommended that a “sight distance easement” be created which would restrict the installation of plantings or any other distance impediments within the triangle of land located at the southeast corner of the RPK site. The Planning Board should determine if a new public hearing is warranted, given the long delay since it was previously held in 2016.

Chairman Paeprer asked what has happened since 2016.

Mr. Paul Lynch of Putnam Engineering, representing the applicant stated Mr. Itzla had personal issues and was put on the back burner.

Chairman Paeprer stated this is in a residential area and I think we should hear from the neighbors.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked was there a public hearing on this initially?

Mr. Lynch replied yes in 2016.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked was RPK built at that point?

Mr. Cleary replied no.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked if everything is in place, what is the plan to build?

Mr. Lynch stated the applicant is planning on giving the property to his daughter, so she could build on the lot.

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

70 OLD ROUTE 6, LLC – 70 OLD ROUTE 6 – TM 55.11-1-15 – EXTENSION OF FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL

Mr. Carnazza had no objection to the extension.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the Engineering Department has no objection to the extension or re-approval of the site plan as there are no changes made to the project. However the Planning Board should be aware of the following:

Federal Emergency Management Agency

- The project was determined not to be in the flood plain if built according to the approved plan.

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Requirements

- The project has coverage under the NYSDEC General Stormwater Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activities (GP-0-10-001), permit number NYR 10Q049.
- A NYSDEC wetlands permit was issued for this project (Permit # 3-3770-00371/0002) and is set to expire on December 4, 2022.

- A NYSDEC solid waste management permit was issued for this project (Permit # 3-3770-00371/0001) and is set to expire on February 7, 2024.

New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) Requirements

- The NYCDEP approved the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for this project. The expiration date is March 29, 2022.

The applicant provided email documentation that the NYCDEP permit is still valid.

Town of Carmel

- The project sought and received a Wetlands Permit (Permit 867) under §89 Freshwater Wetlands of the Town of Carmel Town Code. The permit is set to expire on July 30, 2021.
- The file **does not** contain documentation regarding the following items identified in the May 8, 2013 Planning Board Resolution (#13-10):
 - A posted performance bond and engineering inspection fee (Items 5 and 6);
 - A filed and executed "Stormwater Control Facility Maintenance Agreement" with the Putnam County Clerk as specified in §156-85 (Item 7);
 - Easement information (Items 15 and 16) - **The applicant provided easement language which will need to be reviewed by Planning Board counsel.**

Mr. Cleary had no objection to the extension, but part of your approval involved property maintenance issues. They have done significant work to improve the property. You may visit that issue and perhaps send the Building Inspector out to the site to make sure the site is in compliance.

Chairman Paeprer asked Mr. Carnazza if he has been there lately?

Mr. Carnazza replied no, it's been a while.

Mr. Paul Lynch of Putnam Engineering, representing the applicant stated I haven't been to the site in a while also.

Chairman Paeprer stated to Mr. Lynch to ensure the property is still in compliance and not an eyesore to the neighbors.

Mr. Lynch replied okay.

Mr. Cleary stated as Mr. Franzetti stated the performance bond estimate needs to be updated and asked Mr. Lynch to provide a bond estimate to the Mr. Franzetti.

Mr. Lynch replied okay.

Mr. Cleary stated what we should do in this case, is formalize your extension in a resolution and consider granting that tonight, subject to the Building Inspector doing an inspection.

Chairman Paeprer was in agreement with Mr. Cleary.

Mr. Cote moved to grant a 1 year extension subject to confirmation by the Building Inspector that the site is maintained in accordance with the prior approval and the applicant will address the Town Engineer's entire requirement. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Giannico with all in favor.

CENTENNIAL GOLF CLUB OF NEW YORK, LLC – TM – 44.-2-2,3,4 - RESOLUTION

Mr. Cleary addressed the board and stated this is the resolution that had been reviewed the board members and approved. It's before you to be executed.

Mr. Charbonneau stated the resolution was amended to incorporate Mr. Frenkel's comments and was recirculated at that point. It's not the original resolution that Mr. Cleary drafted, it's the amended resolution.

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to adopt the amended Zoning Referral Resolution to send back to the Town Board. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frenkel with all in favor.

MINUTES – 08/19/20

Mr. Frenkel moved to approve the minutes as corrected. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta