

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

JUNE 17, 2020

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

ABSENT: VICTORIA CAUSA

***** ZOOM MEETING *****

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
VIP Wash & Lube	55.12-2-5	P.H.	1	Public Hearing Closed & Full Bond Return Recommended To Town Board.
Barone, Mariano	65.18-1-4	P.H.	1	Planner to Prepare Resolution.
Carmel Fire Department	44.14-1-24	Lot Line Adj.	1-6	No Board Action.
Carmel Fire Department	44.14-1-24	A. Site Plan	7-10	No Board Action.
Melchner, Charles & Stephanie	66.-2-37	Special Site Plan	10-12	No Board Action.
Minutes – 05/20/20			13	Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

VIP WASH & LUBE – 118 OLD ROUTE 6, CARMEL – TM: 55.12-2-5 – PUBLIC HEARING

The consultants had no comments.

Chairman Paepre asked video technician if anyone was waiting to speak for the public hearing.

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

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

MARIANO BARONE – 32 OVERLOOK DRIVE - TM: 65.18-1-4 – PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Paepre stated legal notices were sent regarding the public hearing. He said the consultants had no comments. He then asked the video technician if anyone wished to be heard on this application.

Mr. Zecca replied no one was present.

Hearing no public comment, Mr. Porcelli moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frenkel with all in favor.

Chairman Paepre asked the Planner to prepare the resolution.

CARMEL FIRE DEPARTMENT – 94 GLENEIDA AVENUE – TM: 44.14-1-24 – LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Carnazza stated I have the same comments from the last meeting. He said there is a concurrent site plan application for the Carmel Fire Dept. which explains why the Lot Line Adjustment is being requested. The final subdivision approval must be granted prior to signing the Amended Site Plan. The lot does not exist in the form submitted until approved by Planning Board and filed in the County Clerk's office. A variance is required for the MSB Bank property: Lot area- 40,000 s.f. requires, 24,052 s.f. will exist, 15,948 s.f. variance required.

A variance is also required to allow a Lot Line Adjustment for this application. 156-61M(3)(e) reads:

A lot line adjustment shall not result in additional lots, any lot becoming substandard nor increase/decrease any lot by more than 20% or 20,000 square feet of its original lot area.

The lot line adjustment does not comply with any part of this section. It creates a substandard lot, it is more than 20,000 s.f. , and it is over 20% of the lot area of both lots.

Mr. Franzetti had no comments.

Mr. Cleary addressed the board and stated at the last meeting, the board suggested it would be necessary to see the site plan to understand why the lot line adjustment was being done. So, the applicant submitted the site plan and is on agenda tonight.

Mrs. Kathleen Gallagher of Insite Engineering, Mr. Michael Hengel from the Carmel Fire Department and Mr. Michael Liguori of Hogan & Rossi, applicant's attorney were all present.

Mrs. Gallagher addressed the board and stated we will go over some of the site plan submission.

Chairman Paepre stated I think the site plan will help explain the lot line adjustment.

Mrs. Gallagher stated we were here before for a lot line adjustment and the proposal is to convey .6 acres (points to map) from the bank parcel to the Carmel Fire Department. There is an existing building site (points to map). It was previously a supermarket and was last updated in 1996 and as part of that improvement it created the apparatus bays. Since the 1990's there has been additional requirements for decon. As firefighters come back from their calls, there is an area for them to decon themselves and their equipment. She said there are new regulations as well as new apparatuses, they are wider and bigger and therefore, there are some clearance conflicts with the existing apparatus bays as they currently exist in the front of the building. Based on these two items, the applicant and the design team feel the best and only way to be able to meet the safety and code requirements was to build an addition to east part of the site. The new building in the back is to allow for the new locations of the apparatus space. The space in the front will be converted into meeting space, display space and more office oriented to support both Carmel Fire Department and potentially to move other offices, such as the Board of Commissions for the fire district throughout the town into that area. From a vehicular standpoint, the back of the building was mostly for parking and asphalt. TD Bank had an access easement so they could go through the property of the Fire Department and exit onto Vink Drive and then there was access to the property from Vink Drive into the locations. The proposal of the new addition is to allow TD Bank to still utilize the property of the Fire Department. They will be able to utilize the bank and access the drive that is being proposed on the Ambulance Corp. The two access and exit locations on Vink Drive will remain. From a fire truck perspective they will enter from the ambulance corps where there is a proposed driveway and proposed easement onto the ambulance corps property. This allows them to go into the building and enter the apparatus base. When they have a call they'll exit off of Vink Drive.

Chairman Paepre stated the bank has an exit onto Route 52 also, correct?

Mrs. Gallagher replied that's correct. There are two curb cuts. She continued and stated the parking in the rear on the east side of the property will be relocated both to the north and as well as additional spaces will be provided in the center. From a vehicular perspective we are maintaining the access for the bank parcel and we are adding additional access to the Ambulance Corp property, but of which have started to become vetted and there are conversations with both entities. She said from a stormwater and a sewer perspective, we are conveying the stormwater through a series of catch basins and drain lights on site. This will be conveyed into an existing system to the northeast. Sewer will be utilized and there is a town sewer easement on the east side of the property with a sewer line running through it. We will continue to

connect into both of those locations as previously done in a similar manner. She said that is the basic of the technical portion of the property. She said also there is a cell tower to the east side of the property.

At which time, Chairman Paeprer asked the board members if they had any questions.

Mrs. Kugler asked if they could go over the traffic flow from the bank going in and out.

Vice Chairman Giannico stated the question is, does the bank currently use the easement for the entrance and exit?

Mrs. Gallagher replied I think they do, but as a secondary. I don't want to speak on their behalf, because I haven't done a whole analysis of exactly how they do it. I will the information for you. We will talk to them and see how they truly use it. In my understanding, this is really a secondary access and exit that they utilize when need be. She said for the most part the two curb cuts on Route 52 are the main access and exit points.

Mr. Liguori addressed the board and stated along with Mr. Hengel, we have had primary discussions with TD Bank. He said it was critical for the bank to not give up the access to Vink Drive. They felt if they gave that up, their Route 52 access points would be north only. While some people do exit and turn left onto Route 52 heading south, during periods of high traffic they take advantage of the rear access and come through the fire department parcel. This was a key component in the negotiations with TD Bank.

Mr. Charbonneau asked Mr. Liguori is TD Bank okay with fire trucks coming back up their entrance for easement purposes and entering the building despite the fact that traffic may be coming from the bank to Vink Drive.

Mr. Liguori clarified and stated fire trucks will be coming from the ambulance corps parcel which is Garrett Place.

Mr. Charbonneau asked again TD Bank is onboard with fire trucks returning from Vink Drive across the easement and going into the fire house potentially in the middle of the afternoon when customers coming in and out of the bank?

Mr. Liguori replied yes. They will not give up that access.

Mr. Porcelli asked how wide is that access?

Mrs. Gallagher replied we are proposing a 24 foot wide access road.

Mr. Carnazza said that's what's required.

Mr. Porcelli said so there will be two lanes, one going out and one going in.

Mr. Carnazza replied that's correct.

Mr. Charbonneau stated a fire truck isn't a car; it's a long vehicle that is going to be crossing over and interfering with traffic coming from TD Bank to Vink Drive.

Mr. Hengel stated right now it's the same way, because their easement goes through the back of our property. So, when fire trucks are returning from a call and getting fuel, there are cars going through the lot at the same time. He said all we are doing is moving the access from the rear to down through the ambulance corps. The parcel that is shown there is the part that they are going to donate to the fire department. So that will actually be the fire department's property with the easement for them to exit.

Mr. Charbonneau asked when the fire trucks return, they don't impede that area, correct?

Mr. Hengel stated if we do anything in the back parking lot, we just cone it off.

Mr. Cleary stated there is a point of conflict there. It doesn't exist today. The question becomes would a sign be appropriate or when the garage doors open there is a red light that flashes or something to signal a bank customer that a piece of apparatus is coming up the road. He said it's just about notice and awareness. As Mrs. Gallagher stated earlier, it's rarely used, but it is a point of conflict and it is something we should think about.

Mr. Porcelli asked can they make the access a little wider?

Mr. Cleary said would you pass a fire truck if you were coming out, you would wait for them to pass.

Mr. Porcelli asked how wide is a standard town road?

Mr. Cleary said good point, but clearly this is not a town road, it's a driveway on the fire department's property, so if you're a bank customer, you will stop and wait. He said this is simply a matter of notice and signage, perhaps a signal of some sort.

Vice Chairman Giannico stated at the point of exit on the bank's property prior to hitting that egress there should be some sort of signage to make people aware.

Chairman Paepre agreed with the Vice Chairman.

Mr. Cote asked can't they attach something when the garage doors open a red light would flash telling people to stop.

Vice Chairman Giannico said that could be done.

Mrs. Kugler stated some kind of traffic signal would be best.

Mr. Hengel stated we don't have an issue with that. We will work with the architect to come up with a plan for that.

Mr. Charbonneau asked if the easements have been drafted yet?

Mr. Hengel stated Mr. Liguori is working with TD Bank. He sent drafts to them. There was letter of intent signed, but I don't know the exact status of that. TD Bank wanted to do everything at once. They wanted to make sure the site plan was approved first. Once it's approved, they will sign to convey the land and sign the easements and all the other necessary paperwork.

Mr. Charbonneau addressed the board and stated I will deal with Mr. Liguori on that issue to review the easements.

Mr. Cleary stated typically, we would require easements to be in place prior to us executing the approval resolution.

Mrs. Gallagher stated we will work with the bank.

Chairman Paepre stated the board is consistent with regards to traffic safety. I think some kind of traffic resolution is very important here.

Mr. Cleary stated if that rear parking lot is used periodically for training or equipment maintenance, etc., that may conflict with the bank's customers movements out of there, so if the fire department could explain to us how that occurs, if it occurs.

Chairman Paepre stated it could be fundraisers, barbecues it could be a lot of things and it would probably be in the back of the building. That's more of a reason why the traffic flow is really important.

Mr. Hengel stated right now we use our rear parking lot for different training events, but that's where the new addition is proposed to go, so the training would probably move to the front parking lot to the west. It should not interfere with anything the bank needs to do. He stated the fire department originally owned the parcel where the bank is on back in the 1970's. We subdivided it and sold it to at the time it was First Nationwide Savings. We presently have an easement with the bank to utilize the grassy area in the bank anytime the bank is closed. That was part of the agreement for them to get the original right of way was for us to utilize the rear end of the parcel. The part they are going to donate to us is something we have been using for years.

Mrs. Gallagher stated if there was ever a need to use that northern portion, you would just utilize the same procedures you do now, by coning off the area.

Mr. Hengel said we usually let the bank know ahead of time if we are going to be doing something during regular business hours. We have a very good relationship with them.

Chairman Paepre said to come back to the next meeting with some ideas for traffic flow and traffic safety.

Mrs. Gallagher stated absolutely!

Vice Chairman Giannico asked what will the original structure to the west be used for once the addition is put on?

Mrs. Gallagher stated it will be converted into meeting space, display space and office space.

Mr. Hengel stated presently we do not have a training room, so we are going put a training room. The Board of Fire Commissioners expressed interest in having an office here, so we will make space available to the fire district also.

Vice Chairman Giannico asked are there any renderings or elevations yet?

Mrs. Gallagher stated we are working on those and will have them for the next submission.

Chairman Paeprrer asked what is the square footage of the proposed addition?

Mr. Eric Neiler, the applicant's architect replied it's about 8,000 square feet.

Chairman Paeprrer stated lets close out on the lot line adjustment and we will cover that under the site plan. He said to come back to the next meeting with the traffic safety and traffic adjustments that was brought up.

Mrs. Gallagher asked if the board was comfortable with sending them to the ZBA to get the two variances.

Chairman Paeprrer stated I would like to see the traffic flow before we send them to the Zoning Board.

The board members were in agreement with the Chairman.

Mr. Porcelli asked the traffic from the bank is only one way exiting out onto Vink Drive, correct?

Mr. Carnazza said it's one way out.

Chairman Paeprrer said the fire department is going to be coming in that way, what's to stop the bank traffic from coming in.

Mr. Hengel stated the traffic presently is two ways, but 95 to 98% of the people are exiting the bank. Very rarely do you see a vehicle enter our rear parking lot now and enter the bank that way.

Mr. Carnazza stated you may need a variance for the two way traffic. I thought it was just one way coming from the bank through the fire department.

Vice Chairman Giannico said we could make it one way, because the concern is going out onto Route 52 and not having to make the left. If you do signage and striping showing one way exit only heading east for the bank we have that covered.

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding whether it should be one way or a two way exit from the bank.

Mr. Cleary stated to put a one way only sign inside of your property line, so the bank customers see that as they head east and then it becomes two way through the rear.

Mrs. Gallagher said we will discuss that with the bank.

Chairman Paeprrer reiterated and said everything revolves around traffic flow here, so we will not send this to the Zoning Board yet. Work on the traffic flow and come back to our next meeting.

Mrs. Gallagher replied absolutely!

CARMEL FIRE DEPARTMENT – 94 GLENEIDA AVENUE – TM: 44.14-1-24 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated there is a concurrent Lot Line Adjustment application which must be approved and filed prior to the signing of the Amended Site Plan. Provide elevations. I spoke to the Engineer. The elevations are in the works and will be submitted as soon as they are completed. On the Zoning Schedule, proposed height is “Less Than 35”. If so, the submission complies, however, once the elevations are submitted, I will confirm. Will the building interfere with the cell tower (Monopole) on the site? There are several easements that need to be addressed by legal counsel. The trash enclosure appears to be in a difficult spot unless the driver is coming through the TD Bank entrance. Provide on-site circulation plan for the rear portion of the lot (behind TD Bank). Does the fuel pump need to be in the front of the building? Provide a detail so the board can see what it looks like.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the proposed project includes a building addition which consists of a new apparatus bay space, support spaces for equipment, storage and training as well as the addition of a new driveway, relocation of utilities and site amenities. The existing building will be repurposed to include office, meeting and display spaces. It is anticipated that the Board of Fire Commissioners for the Carmel Fire District will occupy the new office space.

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 – drainage system concerns
 - d. New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) depending on improvements to the ingress/egress along Route 52 and previously approved site circulation approvals for parcels 44.14-1-23 and 44.14-1-24
2. Permits from the following would appear necessary:
 - a. Town of Carmel Highway Driveway permit
 - b. NYSDOT
 - c. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation(NYSDEC) – Coverage under General Permit GP-0-20-001
3. The area of disturbance for the work has been provided as 0.99 acres. 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 erosion and sediment control only.
4. All re-grading required to accomplish the intended development should be provided. It is unclear from the drawings provide the extent of cut and fill proposed for the site.

5. Traffic and Vehicle Movement Plans should be provided which provide the following:
 - a. Graphic representation of vehicle movements through the site should be provided to illustrate that sufficient space exists to maneuver vehicles on the site.
 - b. All turning radii for the site should be graphically provided. This includes the turning radii into the site entrance.
 - c. 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
 - d. Slopes at the entrance way need to be defined. It is suggested that slopes of less than 6% be used for the first 20 feet of entry and that slopes of no greater than 8% be used entering the site. Please refer to AASHTO guidelines for commercial properties.
6. A light spill plan should be provided.
7. All existing and proposed easements on the site must be provided.
8. The applicant may be required to supply a stormwater maintenance agreement and maintenance guarantee per Town Code (§156-85 and §156-87 B respectively).
9. 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.

II. Detailed Comments

1. Layout and Landscape Plan Sheet SP-1
 - a. No landscaping details are provided.
 - b. All planting should be verified by the Town of Carmel Wetlands Inspector. Note should be added to drawing.
 - c. All plantings shall be installed per §142 of the Town of Carmel Town Code. Note should be added to drawing
 - d. Noise/light buffer areas to protect the neighboring properties must be provided
 - e. Zoning/Parking Chart should identify the number of employees.
 - f. Runoff from the proposed driveway will need to be addressed so as to not flood Vink Drive.
2. Grading and Utilities Plan Sheet SP-2
 - a. Details should be provided for the proposed oil water separator.
 - b. Drainage system profiles must be provided.
3. Erosion and Sediment Control Sheet SP-3
 - a. Construction Sequence should be provided
 - b. Stabilized construction entrance must be provided
4. Details Sheets D-1 and D-2
 - a. All sewers must meet the Town of Carmel Town Code § 120-29.

- b. All curbs, sidewalks, and asphalt should meet the specifications provided in the Town of Carmel Town Code.
- c. Sidewalks, manholes and guiderails should be installed per §128 of the Town of Carmel Town Code
- d. Details are provided drop inlet protection however the location of the specific practice is not provided on the drawing.
- e. The top layer of pavement should be 2 inches not 1.5 inches.

Mr. Cleary stated basically there are no major issues of concern. An explanation on how the department would use the exterior space. Ideally, these areas should be identified on the site, and the area may need to be secured, buffered or screened, depending on the types of activities anticipated. It is noted that a painted "H" is delineated in the existing rear parking area, where the new building addition is proposed. Is this a helicopter landing area? Is this being relocated? Clarification is requested. Add parking stall dimensions to the 10 new spaces stripped out in front of the existing building. Is any new exterior site lighting proposed? If so, it should be identified on the site plan, and details provided. A new generator is proposed on the north side of the building. Is this an emergency power generator for the station, or is it used for other purposes as well? Clarify the size of the generator, and sound attenuation measures. A new fuel pump is identified on the south side of the building. Are fuel storage facilities being modified as well? Clarification is requested, and NYSDEC documentation may be required.

Chairman Paepre stated this board also plays the role of the Architectural Review, so for the 8,000 square foot building we will have to see the renderings and be very involved in that. There are a lot of comments, but I don't see a lot as being critical, but there are literally four pages of comments. Since, you have to come back to the next meeting, you might want to work on these comments and come back with the other application.

Mrs. Kugler stated going back to the driveway coming from Vink Drive where the fire trucks are going to be accessing back into the garage, is that a two way?

Mr. Carnazza replied yes it is a two way.

Mrs. Kugler stated but we are not looking to have pedestrian cars coming in that way for the most part. Can we put a sign saying "authorized vehicles"?

Mrs. Gallagher replied yes we can.

Mr. Cleary stated as a protocol if the vehicle is coming down Vink Drive, can you drop off personnel who would walk through the building to the back side where the conflict is and stand there and put up a cone or flag and the vehicle then could come around and move into the parking lot. I think there are a lot of ways to deal with that, from using personnel to signs and signals, etc.

Mrs. Gallagher replied will do.

Mr. Frenkel asked are there plans to change the exterior architecture in terms of the surface level of how it looks to the community.

Mr. Neiler stated we probably will be replacing the siding with brick veneer, so the building is unified. The addition will be either masonry veneer or brick veneer and we are going to do the same thing to existing building on the public sides.

Mrs. Gallagher stated we will review the memos and respond accordingly.

Mr. Hengel stated the only comment I have with regards to the fuel pump is we are fueling fire apparatus. Our ladder truck is 60 feet long, so we need to make so the driver can get near the pump, put fuel in it and get back into the fire house. We had originally proposed to put it over on the parcel that's going to be donated from the bank, but we not sure that the trucks will be able to make the swing on that side of the building. Right now, the trucks come to the rear where the addition is going to go, they get fuel and they drive back around the front. We want to try and keep that same flow.

MELCHNER, CHARLES & STEPHANIE – 417 SEMINARY HILL ROAD – TM – 66.2-37 – SPECIAL SITE PLAN (BARN)

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicants propose to add a "Private Stable" for 2 horses at their existing residence. The following Variances are Required from the ZBA: -Lot Area- 4.5 acres required, 2.578 acres proposed, 2.422 acre variance required. Manure Storage- 200 ft. to P.L., 65 ft. and 40 ft. proposed, 135 ft. and 160 ft. variance required. -156-17A(2) buildings housing animals or runs shall be located a minimum 150 feet from any property lines. The BARN is 80 ft. from the side and 112 ft. from the front (Drewville Rd), 70 ft. and 38 ft. variances are required. The PADDOCK is 0 ft. to the east, 80 ft. to the north, 95 ft. to the south, and 88 ft. to the west. Variances are required of 150 ft. east, 70 ft. north, 55 ft. south, and 62 ft. west. The lot depth and lot width lines are not clear, the site complies on both but the width line drawn on the plan is not a straight line. Locate all wetlands within 100 ft. of the property. Once delineated, this project may require a wetland permit from the ECB. Provide the location of the existing tree buffer. Additional buffer may be needed as this is a residential area.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated The applicant proposes to construct a paddock area and barn to house two (2) horses on a 2.58 acer site. The project will continue to use existing infrastructure (i.e. septic and water).

General Comments

The following referrals would appear to be warranted:

- a. Mahopac Fire Department

Permits from the following may be necessary:

- b. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) – Coverage under General Permit GP-0-15-002

However additional information regarding the a area of disturbance should be provided to determine if 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) is required.

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. Construction Sequence should be provided on the drawing
2. A survey of the property should be provided.
3. The drawing should provide a legend which contains all significant features on the drawing.
4. The site plan provided is very confusing and should be updated to provide the existing and proposed site plans.
5. Per § 156-25 – the lot size should minimally be four (4) acres. A variance is required.
6. Additional details regarding how manure will be handled on site must be provide as identified in § 156-17.
7. The plan must show the location of erosion and sediment control measures being used during construction.

Mr. Cleary stated we haven't seen one of these applications in a while, but we have had number of them in the past. We are aware of the issues associated with these applications. He said this is classified as a private stable use, which is a conditional use in our code. The private stable provision also requires compliance with the farm conditional use standards as well. The primary issue with respect to this is the paddocks which are right up on the northern property line. There really is no setback. We have gotten correspondence from the neighbor saying they have no objection, but ordinarily whether there is a friendly relationship between property owners or not, some sort of a buffer screen should be considered. There is no landscaping proposed. The board should think about if it is warranted or necessary. Permanent erosion and sedimentation measures need to be considered to protect neighboring properties during inclement weather. Also, is lighting proposed? If so, it should be shown on the plans.

Chairman Paepre stated most of the issues so far pertain to the Zoning Board.

Mr. Joel Greenberg of Architectural Visions, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated the comment regarding wetlands, we did walk the property and there are no wetlands on the property. The closest wetland to the property is on the other side of Drewville Road which is approximately 140 to 150 feet away from the paddock. He stated the property line between the neighbor and where the paddock is proposed is very heavily treed, but we are willing to put some evergreens where there are empty spots. He said with regards to tree removal we are not removing any trees, we are not doing any excavation or any regrading. There is absolutely no site work on this property. He said we are under 5,000 square feet of disturbance. There will not be any public improvements so a bond is not required. He said we are going to be putting fencing around the paddock and put down a pre-fabricated building. I agree, there are some things that have to been done, but not to the volume of the comments.

Chairman Paepre addressed the board members and stated you should have received a letter in the earlier in the day in support of the application.

At which time, Mr. Greenberg read the letter from Mr. & Mrs. Fredriksen in support of the Melchner application.

Mr. Franzetti stated you need to provide a lot of the comments on your plan. You need to show erosion sediment control on the drawing. You are making disturbances for the fencing, how are you accessing the area where the barn is being proposed. Are you putting in a road?

Mr. Greenberg replied no problem.

Mr. Frenkel asked how does the manure receptacle work. Is it closed? How long does it take to fill up?

Mr. Greenberg stated it is a closed metal container with a cover. There is a company that provides that container. Depending on how long it takes to fill up, they come and remove the container completely and put a new empty container back in the same place.

Mr. Cleary stated in the past this has been a controversial issue. For the other stables that have been approved the conditions of approval required an established time frame for the removal of the manure.

Mr. Greenberg stated that's not a problem. We could provide that.

Mr. Frenkel stated I realize there is a horse barn directly across the street. Is there an odor issue that needs to be worried about with these manure containers when they are closed?

Mr. Greenberg replied to the best of knowledge no. We will have an answer for that. I will contact the company.

Mr. Cleary stated what we have learned in the past, is that there's seasonal variations, so in the summer time the pickup is more frequent as opposed to the winter time.

Mr. Frenkel asked will the horses be maintained there year round?

Mr. Greenberg replied it's going to be year round. He also stated there is no plan to bring power or any kind of plumbing. This barn is made strictly for the horses.

Chairman Paepreer advised the board members to take a look at the property. He stated there are 2 to 3 pages of comments and come back to the board before we send you to the Zoning Board.

Mr. Melchner addressed the board and stated he would love to have the members walk his property, because that sends a lot of clarity to what's going on. I have two neighbors, one has 7 to 8 horses on their property and the other neighbor is my neighbor for 11 years and 25 years before that he lived across the street from me at my previous house. I have a long term relationship with him. He said we could add more fencing and open it up more, but we don't need it. He stated with regards to the manure, it is generally once a month unless it needs to be sooner. We will get something in writing.

MINUTES – 05/20/20

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to accept the minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frenkel with all in favor.

Mr. Cote moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:06 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta