

APPROVED

CRAIG PAEPER
Chairman

ANTHONY GIANNICO
Vice Chairman

BOARD MEMBERS

KIM KUGLER
RAYMOND COTE
ROBERT FRENKEL
VICTORIA CAUSA
JOHN NUCULOVIC

TOWN OF CARMEL **PLANNING BOARD**



60 McAlpin Avenue
Mahopac, New York 10541
Tel. (845) 628-1500 – Ext.190
www.ci.carmel.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 **SEPTEMBER 8, 2022**

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN CRAIG PAEPER, VICE-CHAIRMAN ANTHONY GIANNICO,
KIM KUGLER, RAYMOND COTE ROBERT FRENKEL, VICTORIA CAUSA,
JOHN NUCULOVIC

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
Suez Water New York Inc – Chateau Wells	75.20-1-16	Resolution	1	Resolution Adopted.
Kiwi Country Day School	77.17-1-31&32	A. Site Plan	1-2	No Board Action.
910 South Lake Blvd LLC	75.44-1-57&64	A. Site Plan	3-5	No Board Action.
Yankee Land Development	76.15-1-12	Extension	5-6	Extension Granted & Public Hearing Scheduled.
Minutes – 07/14/22 & 07/27/22			6	Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

SUEZ WATER NEW YORK INC – CHATEAU WELLS – 59 MCNAIR DRIVE – TM – 75.20-1-16 – RESOLUTION

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Franzetti had no comments.

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

Mr. Nuculovic moved to adopt Resolution #22-17, dated September 8, 2022; Tax Map #75.20-1-16 entitled Suez Water New – Chateau Wells Site Plan Approval. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

KIWI COUNTRY DAY SCHOOL – 825 UNION VALLEY ROAD – TM – 77.17-1-31 & 32 – AMENDED SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which asked at what time frame was the property with the one family dwelling on 77.17-1-31 added to the site plan? What is the use of the existing one family dwelling on 77.17-1-31? What is the use associated with the 4 yurts? The metal apparatus? The frame apparatus? The interior traffic now crosses over onto 77.17-1-31. Is this on or near the septic or well? Permits are required for all the on sheds on 77.17-1-31. The Engineer needs to schedule a meeting to discuss this proposal. It is confusing and I would like to discuss the project.

Mr. Cleary read Mr. Franzetti's memo which stated this application encompasses a proposal for the addition of four (4) yurt structures and some minor proposed improvements to the current site plan. Based upon review of this submittal, the Engineering Department offers the following preliminary comments:

General Comments

1. It is unclear as to what all the changes to the current site plan are being proposed. The applicant should provide an existing site plan and an amended site plan with the proposed changes. Each proposed change must be defined.
2. The following referrals would appear to be warranted:
 - a. Mahopac Fire Department
3. All re-grading required to accomplish the intended redevelopment should be provided. It is unclear if the proposed yurts will require any regrading
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.

Detailed Comments

1. Details should be provided for the yurts
2. Details should be provided for the proposed four (4) ft gate

Mr. Cleary stated over the years they have developed some sort of master plan that they have been continually updating to know what's happening with the site and that has been working well. He said what are the 4 yurts being used for, what kind of structure is it. That needs to be clarified. Also, the applicant indicated that there are also other minor

departures from the original plan without specifying what they are. What has changed since the last time they were before the board.

Mr. Adam Thyberg of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated there are a few reasons for the amended site plan. He said some of the current ground conditions deviate somewhat from the currently approved site plan, including some items that were never enacted or built out and some modifications to some of the apparatus on the site. The new owners of Kiwi are looking to clean up any deviations from what currently exists on the approved site plan. Additionally, the applicant is seeking approval for the 4 proposed yurt structures (points to map).

Chairman Paeprer asked what are the dimensions of the yurts?

Mr. Thyberg replied 30 feet in diameter. A yurt is a temporary tent or tepee like structure. They are using it for their camp programming during the summer, specifically for music and art. He said basically a yurt is a large tent where they will conduct some of their programming. He said the purpose of the previously proposed parking lot was to service a previously proposed pre-school that was going to occupy part of this building (points to map). That pre-school never happened, so they are not looking to build the parking lot that was associated with that potential use. It's currently showing as an existing playground and the plan is to keep it as an existing playground that exists there now. He said a metal gate was installed at the entrance to the 31 Blossom driveway. That's proposed to be replaced with a more decorative wooden gate that will match the white fencing along the Union Valley Road frontage.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked if the yurts are seasonal?

Mr. Thyberg replied yes, essentially the whole camp is seasonal.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding the sheds and permits that may be required.

Mrs. Causa asked where will you store the yurts in the winter?

Mr. Thyberg replied the fabric gets rolled up and put away.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked Mr. Thyberg to provide the board with product data and information on the yurts.

Mrs. Kugler asked if a roller rink will be installed? She also asked if 31 Blossom is part of Kiwi. Are they two different parcels?

Mr. Thyberg said I will follow-up when I return regarding the roller rink. He said there is a playing field use easement that allows for that particular use for 31 Blossom and there is a long term lease that is held by Kiwi.

Chairman Paeprer asked how many acres is Kiwi?

Mr. Thyberg replied 14.7 acres with both lots.

Chairman Paeprer stated to Mr. Thyberg to follow up with Mr. Carnazza to clarify his comments.

910 SOUTH LAKE BLVD LLC – 910 SOUTH LAKE BLVD – TM – 75.44-1-57 & 64 – AMENDED SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo dated September 8, 2022.

Mr. Cleary read Mr. Franzetti's memo dated September 6, 2022.

Mr. Cleary stated since they were last before the board, the board asked for definitive responses to be provided in writing. That has not been done for most of those comments. He said the previously proposed 24-room boutique hotel has been modified to now include 30 rooms. The necessity for the additional 6-rooms should be explained. The building footprint has been enlarged slightly. The front of the building is approximately 2' closer to South Lake Boulevard, and it has been expanded sideways slightly. The building footprint expansion has reduced the width of both the ingress and egress driveways (by several inches). The adequacy of the driveways has always been a concern, so any reduction in their width is problematic. 1 off-street parking space per guest room is required. 28 parking spaces are proposed, so the revised 30-room project now requires an off-street parking variance. The provision of sufficient parking at a hotel is a site planning priority. Efforts should be made to meet the off-street parking requirement for the hotel use (through rearranging the parking layout or reducing the number of guest rooms). As noted in prior reviews, numerous variances are required for this development, some of which will be exacerbated by the proposed modification to the plan. When the hotel use was initially presented to the Planning Board in March, a number of operational issues were raised, which the applicant answered briefly at the meeting, but indicated that they would provide more substantive detailed responses. No such detailed responses have been received. Is the proposed hotel part of a chain that has siting and operational requirements that would govern this facility? Will the lounge and conference room accommodate usage and bookings for the general public, other than hotel guests? Will this facility operate seasonally or year-round? What market is the hotel seeking to engage? Extended stay, business travelers, tourists, etc? Details of the projected market are requested to allow the Planning Board to understand and fully assess the economic impact of the proposed facility. Clarify the number of employees at this facility. As noted during the prior review, the proposed vehicle circulation pattern appears problematic for a hotel use. Ideally, a temporary vehicle standing area is necessary near the lobby entrance to allow for guest checks-ins. In the current plan, if a vehicle were to park adjacent to the rear entry door, the inbound and outbound driveways would be blocked. As noted during the prior review of the application, site grading represents a challenge, resulting in driveway grades close to 9%, and building height issues. The Board's Architectural Consultant should be engaged to review this proposal.

Vice Chairman Giannico stated when you were last before the board the board requested locations of other hotels by this owner, photographs, etc. He asked if they have been submitted.

Mr. Cleary replied no.

Vice Chairman Giannico stated I personally cannot move forward until I see that.

Mr. Frenkel stated we also wanted to see more on the financial plan for this.

Mr. Michael Mastrogiacomo, applicant's engineer representing the applicant stated I thought that was submitted a while ago.

Mr. Cleary stated I don't remember seeing that. He said now it needs to be adjusted because it was originally a 24 room hotel and now it's a 30 room hotel. Does that change the metrics of the marketing?

Mr. Cote stated instead of trying to work with us and try to resolve some of the issues that were brought up, you now come back with a plan that's more aggressive and personally it raises more issues.

Mr. Mastrogiacomo stated the structure did not get bigger. We modified the shape and it is actually a little tighter, so cars and trucks can maneuver a little better.

Mr. Cleary stated that's not what the plan shows.

Chairman Paeprer said but you did go to 30 rooms instead 24 rooms.

Mr. Mastrogiacomo replied that's correct.

Mrs. Causa asked did you make the rooms smaller.

Mr. Mastrogiacomo replied no. We modified the plan to make it lay out nicer. We found models of other hotels and that's how we came up with the room layout.

Mr. Frenkel asked if the height increased.

Mr. Mastrogiacomo replied yes, because we have the stairwell tower and 2 elevators.

Mr. Cote asked how many employees do you anticipate?

Mr. Mastrogiacomo replied about 10 employees.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding proposed parking spaces versus required parking spaces and rooftop bar and seating area.

Chairman Paeprer asked if the rooftop bar will be open to the public.

Mr. Mastrogiacomo replied no. This is only for guests.

Mr. Cleary stated this use has the potential to fit wonderfully here, but is it the right sight to fill all of this on? Also, this "use" will use up the rest of the water for this district.

Chairman Paeprer stated you have a lot of comments that need to be addressed.

Mr. Mastrogiacomo stated in preliminary talks with the DOT, they liked the idea of having an ingress and an egress.

Mr. Frenkel voiced his concern about the size and height of the building. This is a very big structure for the downtown area.

Mr. Mastrogiacomo stated that the biggest thing with this property is a 12 foot elevation from 6N to the back. A two story structure would look odd. We took into account the New England style architecture.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked if a well is an option for this site.

Mr. Mastrogiacomo said we will look into doing a well or partially split it with the fire sprinklers being on town water and the well would be for the hotel use.

Chairman Paeprer stated you have several pages of comments from the consultants and to work with them at this time.

Mr. Lou Cardillo, owner of the property addressed the board and stated as you are aware what's currently on the site right now is an eyesore. I have owned it for a few years, but I bought it for a re-development in mind which was originally apartments. I understand there are challenges with regards to parking, but there will be a lot of parking downtown. My biggest challenge right now is, what do you want to see on this site? With the challenges of this site and the water issue is a concern, what do you want to see on the property?

Mrs. Causa stated I personally think it's a great idea and we need something like this. It's just a matter of the size and if we could make it work on that small piece of property.

Chairman Paeprer stated I'm concerned with the infrastructure and water problems. Of course, we want a successful business there, because it is a key spot for development.

Mr. Cardillo stated the amenities on site, such as the indoor pool and rooftop bar and conference room is to draw people to come to the hotel. Danbury and Peekskill are the two closest hotels and they both have conference centers.

Mr. Carnazza stated can you shrink it down to meet the parking requirements?

Mr. Cardillo replied that's a question for my engineer, but if that is one of the biggest hurdles, what about Swan Cove.

Mr. Carnazza said no one will walk from Swan Cove to the hotel.

Mr. Frenkel said there will not be overnight parking at Swan Cove.

The board members and Mr. Cardillo continued to discuss the parking requirements for the site.

Chairman Paeprer said to work on some of these issues.

YANKEE LAND DEVELOPMENT – BAYBERRY HILL ROAD & OWEN DRIVE – EXTENSION OF PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION APPROVAL

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Cleary read Mr. Franzetti's memo dated September 5, 2022.

Mr. Cleary had no comments.

Mr. Angelo Luppino, owner of the property asked the board if they could continue what we started at the last meeting regarding the 2 lot subdivision.

Mr. Cleary stated as long as they submit the new plan and pay the fee for final approval, there is reason why you couldn't schedule a public hearing for the next meeting and move them to final approval on the two lot subdivision.

Mr. Cote moved to grant an extension of preliminary subdivision approval for 6 months. The motion was seconded by Mr. Nuculovic with all in favor.

Mr. Frenkel moved to schedule a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Causa with all in favor.

MINUTES – 07/14/22 & 07/27/22

Mr. Frenkel moved to accept the minutes as corrected. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:42 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta