

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING - JUNE 15, 2015**  
**CALLED TO ORDER BY: CHAIRWOMAN DENISE MAYRER AT 7:00 p.m.**

**PRESENT**

Denise Mayrer, Chairwoman  
Wayne Johnson  
John LaVoie  
Lawrence D'Angelo  
Andrew Aubin  
James Shaughnessy  
Attorney Robert Linville, Esq.  
Richard Laberge, Planning Board Engineer

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Nadine Fuda, Director  
Paul Puccio

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES — JUNE 1, 2015**

Johnson moved, LaVoie seconded that the minutes be approved as amended.

5 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Aubin, D'Angelo, Johnson, LaVoie, Shaughnessy

Abstain : Mayrer, Puccio

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chairwoman Mayrer asked that all comments for the Project Red application be saved for that section of the meeting. The planning board will review the rest of the items on the agenda and asked if anyone in the public had any comments on these items.

There were no comments for the other items on the agenda.

**PUBLIC COMMENT- for Project Red. on the site plan, water quality, special permit**

Resident stated he did not believe this is a legal public hearing; the planning board did not do a resolution so he wanted this hearing canceled to a later date. He also spoke about a petition that was submitted to the Town of Schodack on changing the zoning at Birchwood Estates.

Planning Board Attorney Robert Linville spoke in response to the statement that tonight's public hearing is illegal and stated. The town law gives you the chairwoman of this board authority to call all meetings at any time; it's the call of the chair. Second the Planning board has the power to make regulations as to how it conducts its meeting, hearings and its public hearings. The board has not made such regulations to require a vote by the board on holding of a public hearing. Third voting is indeed necessary if there are motions or resolutions but that is not the case here, the law is very specific as to the requirements for public hearings there are

requirements about the period within which after application submitted by an applicant a public hearing must be held and that is 62 days, then there are clear requirements as to notice to the applicant and the public and that be a notice placed in the paper 5 days before the hearing is scheduled. And I submit to you the broad power to conduct this public hearing and I believe it should go forward as planned.

Chairwoman Mayrer stated that on May 18, 2015 it was noted that we would be having this public hearing tonight on June 15, 2015. We don't pass a resolution that says we are scheduling a public hearing and have it seconded, that is not part of our practice nor are we required to do that as part of our legal council's advice, so that being said it's the appetite of this board to continue with this public hearing tonight.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

-----  
**Nadine Fuda read the hearing notice(s) as published in the Troy Record:  
Project Red published Month Day, 2015  
Chairman Mayrer directed the affidavit(s) of publication be made part of the hearing  
record(s).**  
-----

Public Hearing Opened at 7:16 p.m.

Public Hearing Closed at 8:30 p.m.

Project Red  
1710 Schodack Valley Road  
**Site Plan / Special Permit 223**

2015-13/PD3/189.-10-40.13

Steve Boisvert, PE and Eric Redding from Bergmann Associates were present for this meeting..

Mr. Boisvert stated he is representing a company looking to build a food service sales distribution center at the corner of Rt. 9&20 and Rt. 150. The plan facility is roughly 176 thousand square feet and there is also a planned expansion on the north and south of the main building for another 115 thousand square feet for a total building size of just over 290 thousand square feet.

1 - To start there will be 160 employees to possibly increase another 75 to a total of 235 employees' at full build out.

2 - It will be a 24-7 operation with 4 shifts per day.

3 - Office staff will work normal business hours Monday through Friday 8am to 5pm.

4 - The facility will house dry goods, frozen goods, and beverage items typically found in the restaurant industry.

5 - Access to the property will be along Rt.150. there are provisions being made to provide for an internal access road that will service the remaining lands and also will service the property to the south owned by 9&20 Associates.

- 6 - 48 foot wide access road -2 lanes in and 1 lane out and there will be a guard shack about 430 feet in from Rt. 150 to allow for truck stacking on site.
- 7 - Parking, initially there will roughly be 119 employee parking spaces, 63 truck spaces, 46 trailer space and 32 loading docks, future expansion will increase the parking as follows 150 employee spaces, 113 truck spots, 80 trailer spots and the same 32 loading docks.
- 8 - Lighting - as shown on the engineering plans, primarily located in the parking lot and along Rt. 150 entrance, there will be glare shields and no light will exceed the property line.
- 9 - Utility service, water and sewer are at the intersection of Rt. 150 and Rt. 9&20.
- 10 - Storm water, handled all on site. It has been designed to DEC regulations.
- 11 - There will be a perimeter fence along the facility for security that will tie into the guard house and all trucks maneuvering along the Rt.150 side of the location.
- 12- A fire lane is the only road and access point to the rear of the lot adjacent to the neighborhood.
- 13 - There is one loading dock that will be used for washing out the inside of the trailers that is an enclosed facility.
- 14 - Total disturbed area is roughly 21.3 acres out of the 32 1/2 , that is about 66% disturbed and leaving 34% undisturbed.
- 15 - The building elevations are as shown on the renderings submitted.

Mr. Laberge stated he did a prelim review of this project and issued an 8 page letter dated June 9, 2015 (See Below) to the applicant and is waiting for feedback. After this public hearing he will work with the applicant to work through those comments and then prepare the best project for the boards review.

June 9, 2015

Re: Preliminary Site Plan & SEQRA  
Information Review  
Project Red  
SPB No. 2015-14  
Town of Schodack Planning Board

We are in receipt of a set of plans last revised May 8, 2015 consisting of 23 sheets, an Environmental Assessment Report and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the above referenced project. We offer the following conceptual comments:

General

1. The project is located in a PD3 zone and is a permitted use as a Sales Distribution Center in that zone. No fueling or maintenance facilities are proposed with the exception of a wash station for the interior of the trailers. The project is looking to subdivide off a 32.5 acre parcel for the facility from a 56 acre parcel. Both parcels will be greater than the minimum lot area of ten acres in the PD3 zone. Subdivision and plan approvals are required.
2. The project is a permitted use under the Town of Schodack's Water Quality Control Act. A special permit is required. Use is subject to the conditions of §223-6C (1) and §223-8.

3. Architectural elevations should be submitted to show building style and color.
4. A park land fee will be due at the time of site plan approval.
5. A NYSDOT work permit will be required; as such coordination regarding the driveway should be initiated. The Traffic Impact Study should be forwarded to them as well.
6. A narrative construction plan for the proposed project should be submitted which incorporates the hours of operation and a schedule of activities by time of day including grading/site construction and building construction. The plan should also incorporate specific actions and graphics to be taken regarding noise, lighting, dust, mud, etc.

#### Preliminary Plans

7. Preliminary engineering should be shown for the future driveway on the recurring lands to show that a connection could be installed in that location.
8. The building is close to the adjacent parcel to the south. Consideration should be given to increasing the distance between the building and the southern property line to allow for landscaping to mature and provide additional screening from future development on the parcel to the south.
9. The location of waste/recycling areas should be shown on the plans with adequate screening for aesthetic purposes as necessary.
10. Breakaway access restriction should be installed on the entrance to the 24' wide gravel fire access road located near the main truck gate.
11. Location of all stop signs and stop bars should be shown on the site plan. In addition, all recommended off site signage should be shown using an insert plan as necessary.
12. Details or submittals for the employee canopy and hand truck canopy should be submitted in order to better understand these structures.
13. The applicant should verify that the trailer wash down area is a fully enclosed, covered extension of the building. Spot elevations should be shown to illustrate the grading of the truck wash area will prevent stormwater from entering the sanitary sewer.
14. The applicant should identify all connection locations to the sanitary sewer, along with any grease traps, if necessary.
15. A 20' wide utility easement(s) to the Town should be shown for the water and sewer lines to a point approximately halfway between manholes 6 and 7. From that point a 30' wide vacant utility easement to the Town should be shown extending southerly to the property line. The water and sewer mains in this easement area will be required to be turned over to the Town. Sanitary sewer mains within the easement shall be 8" diameter.
16. The sanitary sewer main along NYS Rte 150 shall be 8" in diameter.
17. Since NYSDOT will not allow open cut of their roadway(s), the plan should indicate that the water and sewer mains will be bored under the highway. Indicate a NYSDOT work permit is needed.
18. A prominent project limit line should be shown on the plans.
19. Appropriately sized guiderail should be added along the driveway where the grade drops away from the driveway.
20. An additional staggered row of evergreens should be added to the proposed evergreens in the rear of the building.
21. The project should be required to provide a five year performance bond for 10% of the landscape contract value to ensure that plantings survive and natural areas are properly maintained.
22. Infiltration is being proposed for stormwater management. As such the design must account for frozen soil conditions. Use of drywells interconnected by perforated pipe, crushed stone is preferred.
23. It appears that the general level of site illumination could be reduced.
  - a) Pole mounted lighting along the gravel fire access road should be eliminated

in favor of limited wall mounted units. Consideration should be given to keeping this lighting off except when needed for maintenance, etc.

- b) The proposed pole mounted lighting is 30' high from the ground elevation. Total height should be reduced, so that it does not exceed 24'.
  - c) The two poles at the western edge of the site should be deleted or delayed their installation until the building is expanded.
- 24. The configuration of the lighting discussed and proposed in the traffic report for the driveway intersection with NYS Rte 150 should be shown on the lighting plan.
  - 25. The location of any signage and associated lighting should be shown.
  - 26. Sanitary sewer manhole details are needed.
  - 27. Details of the water and sewer boring are needed.
  - 28. The required improvements to the existing pump station along US Rts 9/20 should be noted, including installation of pumps, standby generator, and control system.

Environmental Assessment Form & Supplemental Studies

- 29. C.4.a – Requires revision to East Greenbush Central Schools.
- 30. C.4.d – Add Schodack Island State Park.
- 31. D.1.b – Acreage to be distributed is required.
- 32. D.1.d.i – Add “Commercial – Sales” preceding Distribution Center.
- 33. D.1.e.ii – Specify month and year of first phase.
- 34. D.1.h.iv – Replace four instances of “TBD” with estimated information.
- 35. D.2.c.i – Anticipated water demand seems low for domestic truck washing, and cooling towers.
- 36. D.2.c.ii – Revise to indicate “Consolidated Water District 101”.
- 37. D.2.d.i – Volume of wastewater seems low for domestic, truck washing, etc.
- 38. D.2.e.iv – This is checked “yes”. Explain or modify to be “No”.
- 39. D.2.f – This is checked “No” but it appears it should be a “Yes”. Explain or revise including i, ii, and iii.
- 40. D.2.k.i – The estimated annual electricity demand should be given.
- 41. D.2.l.i – Construction hours should be filled in for all categories and take into account Town of Schodack standard restrictions.
- 42. D2.m.ii – This should be marked “Yes” and explain minor tree removal on south side of property to be replaced with evergreens after construction.
- 43. D.2.n.i – Add “All lighting will be full cut off down lighting”.
- 44. D.2.n.ii – Mark as “Yes” and explain minor tree removal on south side to be replaced with evergreens after construction.
- 45. E.1.b – Surface water data seems in error. Please revise or explain and check the other data in table.
- 46. E.1.d – The depth of 6.56 ± feet appears to be in conflict with data at the bottom of page 12, Part III. Review and revise or explain.
- 47. Comments on the EAF above should be reflected in Part III as appropriate.
- 48. Part III, Page 11, paragraph 4, regarding sanitary sewer, should be revised to include installation of necessary pump station components.
- 49. The applicant has provided wetlands and an endangered species report from 2011. The findings of these reports should be confirmed by a qualified biologist(s) to confirm nothing has changed since 2011.
- 50. The applicant should identify whether they intend to have “thruway tandems” entering and exiting the site or if they have any intent in the future to do so.
- 51. The posted speed limit discussion in both the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and Appendix B should utilize the current post speed limit, not 55 mph. In addition, the speed study in the TIS should clarify whether it was performed before or after the change in the posted

speed limit. Lastly, the TIS should be reviewed and revised for consistency with these now existing conditions.

52. All of the TIS recommendations need to be depicted on the site plans. However, instead of a guide sign, a route sign assembly should be installed.
53. The TIS suggests that a heavy duty shoulder be installed between the site driveway and US Routes 9/20. While we agree with reinforcing the shoulder in this vicinity, the applicant should show turning radii and clarify whether there is any intent for trucks entering or exiting the site to utilize the shoulder in this vicinity to do so. If so, the driveway should be redesigned to limit the need to do so.
54. The applicant should analyze and discuss the need for a queuing lane for left turns into the site to avoid impacting the US Route 9 & 20/NYS Route 150 intersection if traffic must wait to turn into the site.
55. The applicant should identify what type of back up alarms on vehicles will be used and whether any refrigerated trailers will be operational while on site

#### Stormwater Report

56. The following are comments on the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan dated May 22, 2015 referred to by the section of that report.

#### Appendix 1

##### Section I.

- E. Make the preconstruction meeting mandatory and list the required attendees that shall include the Town of Schodack's MS4 Stormwater Management Officer and Town Designated Engineer for the MS4 Program.
- G. Include the Town of Schodack's MS4 Stormwater Management Officer and Town Designated Engineer for the MS4 Program as an agency with on demand access to documents.
- I. 5. Add Contractor shall be required to inspect daily per GP-0-15-002, Part IV.B.1.
- I.6. 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph change "...Town of Schodack or their representative..." to Town of Schodack's MS4 Stormwater Management Officer and Town Designated Engineer for the MS4 Program.

##### Section VII.

- B. Sequence of Major Activities. The construction of temporary sedimentation/detention basins and final sediment and infiltration basins should be included in the major construction activities and should occur prior to the site clearing, grubbing soil stockpiling activities. Basins must be fully constructed and stabilized prior to advancing site work.  
Break sequence of construction into phases that will be necessary to keep the project within the maximum 5 acres of disturbance required by the General Permit.  
Additional detail should be provided in the sequence of construction.
- C. Paragraph 7 #3. Use of fertilizer shall be limited and shall be phosphorous free.

##### Section VIII.

- A. Delete the word "excess". No tracked material from the site is acceptable. Include the requirement to increase the length and depth of the stabilized construction exits if material is found to be tracked from the site.
- B. Label the stockpile areas on the Sheets C141 and C142. Include requirements for how and when stockpiles will be stabilized from wind and rain erosion. Cite GP-0-15-002 requiring implementation of stabilization, see Part I.B.1.b.
- D. Equipment cleaning and maintenance and repair shall not occur on-site unless and approved impermeable containment area is provided and means for removal of wash water by a licensed hazardous waste hauler is approved.
- F. Discharge of concrete washout shall not be permitted on-site. Provide locations for masonry/concrete washout, indicating on the plans.

##### Section X.

- A. Add the requirement to indicate the acreage of current disturbance and limits.

- C. b) Revise the requirement for storage of materials under a roof from "if possible" to "shall be".

#### Appendix 4

##### Notice of Intent.

#25. The response indicates no, but SWPPP has a sequence of construction.

#27. This section should be reviewed and revised or the stormwater report should include documentation of how the site planning practices were achieved. If an item was never conceived as part of the plan, and then subsequently not proposed, there should be no indicated credit.

#27A. Where do plans indicate the required soil restoration shall be in conformance with the Design Manual?

#29. Confirm total contributing Impervious area as 15.3 ac (see #4 which indicates 15.2 ac)

- May 22, 2015 letter to Town requesting approval to disturb an area greater than 5 acres at one time.

- 1) The letter should state that the sediment basins and infiltration basin shall be constructed, stabilized and accepted as stabilized by the Town prior to the allowance of disturbance greater than 5 acres.
- 2) The project should present a phasing plan that minimizes the areas open at one time and the phase sequence to be followed.
- 3) Temporary sediment basins be sized in each phase to accommodate the sedimentation that may result in that phase.
- 4) The construction inspections shall be in accordance with the General Permit Part II.C.3.a

#### Appendix 19

##### Stormwater Management Report.

1. Existing Conditions DR-A, composite CN should be recalculated. The use of a CN=96 for a gravel surface is too high. Use of CN=76 is more consistent with the observed ponds of water and reduced permeability within excavated and exposed gravel areas. Recalculate.
2. It is not clear on the existing conditions map how DR-A fully drains to the Analysis Point #1. Explain or revise.
3. Where does Analysis point #1 flow to?
4. Provide Geotechnical data in the SWMR to support the design. Show percolation and deep hole test locations on the plans and results.
5. Analysis Point 2, flow length from the most remote point to the analysis point is not accounted for in the Tc analysis. Review and revise.
6. Proposed Conditions DR-1, indicates woods area at 5.13 ac which would be high given the existing use is a gravel borrow. Revise land use and CN calculations.
7. The NOI indicates area runoff reduction but none is indicated in Total Water Quality Volume Calculations. Review and revise.
8. Designs should be presented for the Rip Rap outlets protection/stilling basins, size, configuration.

We request that the applicant include a cover letter explaining how the above comments are satisfied with their next submittal.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT CONTINUES:**

Resident stated he has concerns on traffic; he lives by Pilot and the Hannaford warehouse and is concerned about overloading at the Pilot gas station.

Resident asked when they were going to announce the name of the applicant; he asked if they will have their own fueling services.

Chairwoman Mayrer stated it is up to the applicant to announce who they are; this and all applications are based on the use not the user. And they will not have fuel on site.

Resident spoke in favor of this project; she had spent time at the town hall looking over the plans and is impressed with the detail that the developer went into. She is not as concerned as to who is going in this site if you're a business you do not want to show your hand, she questioned the Moordenerkill Mall that was mentioned in the paperwork and would like more information it.

Chairwoman Mayrer stated the Moordenerkill Mall is not part of this project.

Resident questioned the amount of trucks vs. the number of truck parking spaces, she stated a resident had looked at the environmental report and stated it was done very well. It looks like Project Red is better than the Dollar Tree Warehouse; she listed the items under the PD3 umbrella and discussed the mixed use type of zoning. If you rezone it would open this up to the possibility of more houses and apartments.

Resident is concerned about the name of the applicant and why they can't know who it is. and is concerned about the truck traffic.

Resident asked if they distribute to a chain of restaurants or all restaurants, asked if there were any tax abatements, it looks like a warehouse to him will there be a retail operation on this site, warehouse are not permitted in this zone so how is this going to work.

Resident spoke about the petition to change the zoning for Ridgewood Drive. That was submitted two years ago and hasn't heard anything.

Resident spoke about the petition for re-zoning Ridgewood Drive. Heavy traffic, Ridgewood is opposed to development like this and Dollar Tree due to the aquifer, they are not opposed to all development just the wrong development.

Resident stated she is very anxious over the mystery of the applicant and if is going to be a good, fit for their neighborhood.

Resident stated not knowing who the applicant is, about Hannaford and Pilot and promise's not kept, truck parking, constant traffic at the truck stop, trucks being worked on right on Kingman Road in the way of other vehicles, Lights, flapping banners. Will there be more trucks going to pilot?

Resident spoke about traffic safety, sight distance, particulate runoff to the Moordenerkill,



Resident stated she support the towns pursuit of development for the town but is concerned about not knowing who the applicant really is, looking for a response to the petition mailed 2 years ago.

Resident spoke about the town board meeting and the discussion on Project Red, if one gets built more will come, update zoning.

Resident stated he is concerned about air and noise pollution; there are regulations on truck idling how will they be enforced, cancer causing particulate matter.

Resident spoke about not knowing who the applicant is, the difference between a warehouse and a distribution center, and why would this be in the town center, the zoning code and a lack of discussion with the public. If there is a fire where would the water run off go? Feel sorry for Ridgewood Drive.

Resident asked if the zone prohibits warehouses, in his opinion there is no distinction between a sales distribution center and a warehouse, the town is opening itself up to issues should this be approved, He spoke on the following to reduce the hours of operation, no idling of trucks, lighting needs to be downcast, this project is a bad idea in retrospect.

Resident spoke about project Red and handed the board pictures of the new Dollar Tree in Connecticut showing the board how close the neighbors are to the business and they are co-existing, he remembers the biggest concern by the neighbors was the million + sq. ft. building that Dollar Tree was going to be, it was stated by the neighbors that if it was smaller they might be more open to this concept on this particular site. What they are proposing today is two hundred thousand sq. ft. which is less than 20% of the original Dollar Tree Building. He agrees the residents should be concerned about business moving in this is area but this application fits nicely.

Resident spoke about the truck traffic and why it needs to be a 24 hour operation, and questioned the zoning of the residents.

Resident stated he owns several commercial properties in town and spoke about the town center committee that he is involved with and is looking forward to continuing the process and changing of the zoning process.

Puccio moved, LaVoie seconded the board close tonight's public hearing and will leave the written comment period open for 10 days.

7 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Aubin, D'Angelo, Johnson, LaVoie, Mayrer, Puccio, Shaughnessy

Oppose: None

## **PUBLIC HEARING - SUBDIVISION**

---

**Nadine Fuda read the hearing notice(s) as published in the Troy Record:  
Project Red published Month Day, 2015  
Chairman Mayrer directed the affidavit(s) of publication be made part of the hearing  
record(s).**

---

Project Red  
1710 Schodack Valley Road  
Proposed - 2 lot subdivision

2015-14/PD3/189.-10-40.13

Public Hearing Opened at 8:47 p.m.

Public Hearing Closed at 9:08 p.m.

Steve Boisvert, PE and Eric Redding from Bergmann Associates were present for this meeting..

Mr. Boisvert stated they are subdividing 32.5 acres off a 56.4 acre parcel, creating 2 lots

Chairwoman Mayrer stated its one lot with remaining lands.

Mr. Boisvert stated correct,

Chairwoman Mayrer asked if both lots were being purchased by the applicant.

Mr. Boisvert stated no, remaining lands will be retained by the current owner.

Chairwoman Mayrer opened the public hearing on the two lot subdivision only.

Resident asked the applicant to show on the map what is being sold and retained by the current owner.

Mr. Boisvert stated there is a detailed drawing that has been submitted on file and showed the public the map.

Resident asked about the screening.

Resident asked if there was a minimum green area for this project.

Mr. Puccio stated the applicant said after construction it will be 53 % covered and 46 % uncovered.

Resident would like no subdivision and the applicant keep the rest green space and have the adjacent lot be housing.

Public Hearing was closed 9:08

#### **RECOMMENDATION TO ZBA**

Matthew Banks

Z736-15/RA/179.-2-10

185Sagendorf Rd.

Proposed - Area Front Yard Setback

Matthew Banks, applicant was present for this meeting.

Mr. Banks stated he is building a garage at his home and need a variance for a front yard setback.

Mr. Johnson asked about the setback of the house.

Mr. Banks stated the house is 17 feet off the road and the home is almost 300 years old.

There were no more questions

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ZBA**

Puccio moved, LaVoie seconded a **"FAVORABLE"** recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

7 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Aubin, D'Angelo, Johnson, LaVoie, Mayrer, Puccio, Shaughnessy

Oppose: None

#### **RECOMMENDATION TO ZBA**

Norman Emrick

Z737-15/R20/177.-9-47

2624 Brookview Road

Proposed - Area front yard setbacks

Norman Emrick, applicant was present for this meeting.

Mr. Emrick stated he would like to put a 4 foot porch on the front of his house.

Chairwoman Mayrer asked about the front yard setback of the house.

Mr. Emrick stated the front yard is a 44 foot setback and the porch will bring it to 40 feet.

There were no more questions for the applicant.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ZBA**

Shaughnessy moved, Puccio seconded a **"FAVORABLE"** recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

7 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Aubin, D'Angelo, Johnson, LaVoie, Mayrer, Puccio, Shaughnessy

Oppose: none

### **RECOMMENDATION TO ZBA**

Michael Miller Z738-15/RA/209.-11-12

1287 Van Hoesen Road

Proposed - Area front yard setback

Michael Miller, applicant was present for this meeting.

Mr. Miller stated he would like to put a porch on the front of his house; the decking is already there they just want to add the roof.

Chairwoman Mayrer asked about the front setback

There were no questions for the applicant.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ZBA**

Johnson moved, D'Angelo seconded a **"FAVORABLE"** recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

7 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Aubin, D'Angelo, Johnson, LaVoie, Mayrer, Puccio, Shaughnessy

Oppose: None

### **RECOMMENDATION TO ZBA**

Matt Pupello

Z740-15/R40/190.-2-1.115

15 Hy Drive

Proposed - Area front yard setback

Matthew Pupello, applicant was present for this meeting.

Mr. Pupello stated the house had burned down and the foundation was damaged so it had to be removed and because the house is so close to the road they need a 35 foot front yard variance to finish the home.

Mr. Johnson asked if this is a new or the original foundation.

Mr. Pupello stated a new foundation in the old location.

Mr. Johnson asked if the decision to keep the house in this location is because of the well and septic.

Mr. Pupello stated yes and the lot lay out.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ZBA**

Puccio moved, D'Angelo seconded a **"FAVORABLE"** recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

7 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Aubin, D'Angelo, Johnson, LaVoie, Mayrer, Puccio, Shaughnessy

Oppose: None

### **RECOMMENDATION TO ZBA**

Mae Frazee

Z739-15/PD3/200.-9-1.12

Champagne Dr.

2015-23/PD3/200.-9-1.12

Proposed - Use Variance for Subdivision in PD3 zone

Steve Hart, Hart Engineering was present for this meeting.

Mr. Hart gave the board more maps showing the property and the subdivision.

Mr. Hart stated He is representing Mae Frazee for her proposed subdivision on Champagne Drive, she is looking to create 3 lots with 2 residential lots fronting on Champagne Drive and the remaining lands to be lot line adjusted to a parcel south of that lot.

Mr. Johnson asked if the variance is granted are you then going to come back for a lot line adjustment.

Mr. Hart stated that is correct.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ZBA**

D'Angelo moved, Puccio seconded a **"FAVORABLE"** recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

7 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Aubin, D'Angelo, Johnson, LaVoie, Mayrer, Puccio, Shaughnessy

Oppose: None

## **SUBDIVISION / LOT LINE**

Albert Van Nederynen  
919 Maple Hill Rd  
Proposed - Lot Line

2015-22/r40/194.-7-5

Ray Smith, Surveysmith was present for this meeting.

Mr. Smith handed out maps to the board and stated the current lot is 125 x 150 which is substandard they are looking to do a lot line adjustment to increase their lot size.

Mr. Johnson asked if there were any structures on the existing land.

Mr. Smith stated there are no structures within 200 feet from the boundary lines.

Mr. Shaughnessy asked if all 4 boundary lines will be adjusted

Mr. Smith stated only 3 of the 4.

## **LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT**

Puccio moved, Shaughnessy seconded that the lot-line adjustment be accepted and approved. A public hearing is not required. The property will be conveyed to the adjacent landowner and become part of that existing parcel.

7 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Aubin, D'Angelo, Johnson, LaVoie, Mayrer, Puccio, Shaughnessy

Oppose: None

## **Site Plan**

Mark Teliska  
1572 Columbia Turnpike  
Proposed - Change in Tenancy

2015-19/HC/178.911913

Mark Teliska, applicant was present for this meeting.

Mr. Teliska stated he would to add a used car dealer license to his current repair shop and would like to have up to 5 cars displayed for sale at this site, he is primarily doing internet sales.

Mr. Johnson asked 5 cars total, registered, un-registered, trucks, trailers, equipment, and how far back on the paved parking area are you planning to display the items for sale.

Mr. Teliska stated yes a total of 5 at any given time, and back behind the curb line not near the street.

Mr. Johnson asked for a minimum of 20 feet distance from the road.

Mr. Teliska stated that is fine with him.

#### **CHANGE IN TENANCY**

Puccio moved, LaVoie seconded APPROVAL of a change in tenancy at "1572 Columbia Turnpike"

**With a condition of:** up to but not to exceed 5 car for display and a minimum distance of 25 feet from the curb.

7 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Aubin, D'Angelo, Johnson, LaVoie, Mayrer, Puccio, Shaughnessy

Oppose: None

#### **ADJOURN**

Johnson moved, Shaughnessy seconded that the Planning Board meeting be adjourned.

There being no objections, Chairwoman Mayrer adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nadine Fuda

Director of Planning & Zoning