Chairperson Don Danzeisen opened the Village of Harriman Planning Board Regular Meeting of February 24, 2015 at 7:30pm.

ROLL CALL:

Present:

Board Members: Chairperson, Don Danzeisen; Irma Escallier, Martin Stanise, Frank Borowski, Juan Quinones, Member, Alternate Member—Jennifer Phillips-Carrillo and; John Russo, Engineer, Kevin Dowd, Attorney, Ron Walker, Building Inspector and Jane Leake Recording Secretary

Absent: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion was made by Juan Quinones to approve the December 15, 2014 Regular Minutes. Seconded by Irma Escallier. All in favor.

PL GROUP, LLC
108-1-11
Update on Elevation, Signage & Site Plan

Present: Alan Peck-Applicant, George Stewart and Bill Johnson, Engineer for Sparaco & Youngblood, PLLC

Mr. Peck addressed the Board stating we made the adjustment on the building and everything is at the 50 foot level. The sign is within the 180 feet. So we have a total of 180 feet. The word STORAGE is 135 square feet and the phone number is 45 square feet, all within the 50 foot height. All the adjustments have been made in conformity of what we need.

Mr. Danzeisen asked are there any questions?

Mr. Dowd asked have you seen John’s comment letter?

Mr. Peck replied we are going to get to that. I wanted to cover this first because we were supposed to do this last month.

Ms. Escallier stated neither the legend or the site plan nor the plan show itemization nor detail of the signage and lighting. Are the letters going to be lit?

Mr. Peck replied yes, they are going to be lit.

Ms. Escallier asked is the telephone number going to be lit?

Mr. Peck replied yes.

Ms. Escallier stated if I recall the last time we convened the name of the location was STOR-IT.

Mr. Peck replied correct.

Ms. Escallier stated and now it is STORAGE. So is it going to stay STORAGE?

Mr. Peck replied I think so.
Ms. Escallier responded okay.

Mr. Peck stated the reason being is there is another company by the name of STOR-IT in Pennsylvania and there may be a conflict with the name and that is why we changed it to this.

Ms. Escallier replied okay. I just wanted to know what it is going to end up being. I like the other one because it was catchier.

Mr. Peck responded I liked the other one too and there may be a way of doing the other one and it fits. If we did Harriman STOR-IT, but that is a legal question.

Mr. Dowd replied I am totally staying out of that one that is for your own attorney to counsel you on that one.

Mr. Peck stated we are trying to work that out so that we have a name that we can use and not have a conflict down the road. We will conform to this size.

Ms. Escallier asked the size is within the Code?

Mr. Peck replied yes.

Mr. Russo stated basically all the sign information has to be on the site plan. As far as sign size, coloring, whether it is illuminated. All of that needs to be put on the plans.

Ms. Escallier replied I was looking for it and it wasn’t there and then I looked in the legend and it wasn’t there.

Mr. Russo stated that has been part of my comments in the past letters.

Mr. Peck replied I was just able to pick this up a couple of days ago and that is why it is not in there.

Ms. Escallier stated I just wanted to make sure that it is within Code as well. Especially the height, you know how I feel about the height.

Mr. Peck replied yes, I do.

Ms. Escallier stated the Walmart sign is one thing, but this is even bigger.

Mr. Peck replied actually it is not. The Walmart sign is really defacing in my opinion, but that is subjected. This conforms with all of the requirements. There is nothing out of the ordinary. We have backed it down so the design fits the Code.

Ms. Escallier asked will that be visible from the other side of the road?

Mr. Peck replied I don’t know yet because we wanted to do the balloon test. We don’t know. The weather hasn’t cooperated so as soon as it does we will do the balloon test and then we will know where you can see it from where. We are hoping it has the visibility that we want. This is 50 feet high, pointing to the map. This is lower than that (pointing to the map). It has to be underneath because it curls up and to protect the overhang over the letters. Each letter sets separately. It is going to be pretty.

Ms. Escallier stated I can’t see it because if I look out, me personally, off of my deck I can see that Walmart sign and it is marring the whole Hudson Valley view. It is the one thing that is an obstruction in the view.
Mr. Peck replied I live in the Village of Monroe and I can see it so I understand what you are saying. It is terrible, but this is a pretty building and the sign is not a red sign, as most of the signs are. We are trying to make it visible, but yet conformed and look nice with the coloring of the building. We are trying to take an esthetic look to it.

Ms. Escallier responded I understand that. You are just going to keep doubting the Hudson Valley’s beautiful views with all of these buildings that are lit. I came here for the Hudson Valley.

Mr. Peck stated you are absolutely right. It was a magnificent place and it has become a metropolis. It is not comfortable. It is not what it was. I don’t like it. You don’t like it.

Ms. Escallier replied I know it is going to be a help to the community. I am just not thrilled with the sign.

Mr. Peck replied you are right.

Mr. George Stewart representing the applicant stated ultimately when you get the final plans we will have the exact name and all the details that you are looking for, but the only reason we haven’t given it to you yet is because we are still working out the final plans and so that we don’t have to give that many more copies and have to give you guys any more things to read. I would just like to say I also live in Woodbury and the Walmart sign is large. This sign won’t be as high. It is not the same amount of square footage and it won’t be as bright as the Walmart sign, nor is it right in the middle of Route 32 and the main thoroughfare. So the answer is you question will there be visibility, perhaps, perhaps not but in any event, even worse case scenario it won’t even come close to the Walmart sign. We are all living with that and it is ridiculous.

Ms. Escallier replied I know I don’t understand it, but it was approved. Thank you.

Mr. Russo stated at this point in time they are going to be looking to do mitigation. They are going to be disturbing the wetlands. They have had correspondences with Brian Orzel of Army Corp of Engineers. They are going to be looking at doing a 2:1 mitigation. Given that when the project has been presented in the past they were never touching the wetlands. SEQRA will now have to be updated. Your documentation on SEQRA is now going to have to be updated to reflect the permitting requirements from Army Corp. and the disturbances that are going to be occurring. What is the status of submission to Army Corp at this point?

Mr. Peck replied we are negotiating with them right now. There are a couple of questions. The size of the mitigations is going to be smaller. We are hoping to shrink it to under a tenth of an acre. Right now we are okay because it is supposed to be less than a half an acre and we are less than a half an acre. We will try to make it as small as possible. By doing so we will have much less disturbance and part of the reduction of the disturbance is because we are not filling in that much. Originally we got bad information. We were told that we could bridge the wetlands and that is why we were moving forward that way and that is why we had the wetlands in the building and we were bridging it. The issues that John brought up, you are disturbing quote on quote if you are hiding it from light. We didn’t get that information. So the fact is, John is correct and the experts are wrong. So going forward we got the right information and we are going to mitigate that. The part that is inside the building is 1800 square feet and we are going to take some area away from the building so you would have a little bit of a buffer and all of that becomes less than 4000 square feet, less than a tenth of an acre. So that is the approach we are taking and our FEMA expert Leonard Jackson says that we can use the area in the back as wetlands mitigation, so we are going to take that approach.

Mr. Russo responded okay, because the mitigation I saw you were doing everything on the easterly and northerly side.
Mr. Peck stated this is the F; there is a piece of wetlands over here (pointing to map).

Mr. Russo replied there are a couple of pockets in the back.

Mr. Peck continued and that we are going to abut that to this area here (pointing to map), which is where we are going to be able to go.

Mr. Russo asked the mitigation that was shown on the plans are no longer?

Mr. Peck replied we have two choices. The way we have it on the plan is addressing 8000 feet that we are going to fill. So you have 16,000 feet plus that you are going to quip. Looking at it really thoroughly we can cut that in half because it is really not necessary to disturb that much. What we have to have is this (pointing to map). We have to have the 1800 feet. Then if we cut this down like that (pointing to map) and leave everything else then we have very little disturbance. So we can cut it back to less than a tenth of an acre. The result of that we have a chance of having a Nationwide Permit instead of an individual permit. Going forward with a Nationwide Permit we can get through the process in maybe 45 days instead of six months to a year. A huge difference and we already have their attention and their willingness to go forward on the 2:1 ratio. So that is a blessing in itself. It may take three to six months to get that answer, but we have that now in writing.

Mr. Russo stated basically the mitigation plans that you are going to prepare whatever Army Corp. says is going to have to be part of the site plan as well.

Mr. Peck replied and more importantly it has to be in concert with you. All the I's have to be dotted and all the T's have to be crossed. It has to be perfect because the big issue is we don't want to see an Article 78 later. So we have to do this right. We want it more right than you do. As many as the little details you need we want more.

Mr. Russo responded I am letting Army Corp. take the lead. They're the ones that are going to be issuing the permit on the mitigation so it is really going to be up to what they want.

Mr. Peck replied right, but you have to like it too.

Mr. Russo responded they have to like it more.

Mr. Peck stated there are other issues and the other issues are the financing. They take forever. I went through that in the history of this job. What we would like to have is a Conditional Approval from this Board subject to all of your approvals. Everything that you need and the Army Corp., so we can do the financing at the same time.

Mr. Danzeisen replied until you go through SEQRA and get the Army Corp. on board we can't do any of that Allan. You have to go back to SEQRA with this.

Mr. Dowd asked how can we conclude the SEQRA process when we know there are outstanding wetlands issues?

Mr. Danzeisen replied we can't do it.

Mr. Dowd stated realistically if we clear up everything else, that would be great, but there is a whole mess of issues here that need to be put on the plan also that have not been since October 2014.

Mr. Peck replied much of it has been taken care of that is on the list.
Mr. Russo stated my October letter out of the x number of comments only one was addressed and that is just based upon what you are doing with the wetlands now. All the other comments were still outstanding.

Since that time we have added a few more comments at the back of this letter now. So there are quite a few comments that still need to be addressed.

Mr. Peck responded maybe Bill can answer some of those.

Mr. Johnson of Sparaco & Youngblood stated we designed the plan. A couple of things John, the reason we did not respond with response answers to your letter was you know we were waiting on the wetlands expert to give us an answer. My Client has three wetland experts’ proposals in hand and they are deciding which one to go with at this point. It is not so much money it is deciding who is going to be able to get it done. When they get it done we can revise our plan to determine what it is going to be in the end. So we have not changed the SWPPP or drainage report, even though on our plan we have put in the dry wells as you asked for and we went out in the field with your man and went through doing perk tests and deep holes and I think Eric was satisfied with what we came up with. However, we didn’t revise the drainage report because everything depends on what we do with the wetlands.

Mr. Russo responded and I know the plan is going to be changing further depending on Army Corp.

Mr. Johnson replied a few of the comments have been taken care of, for instance, the fire response, the letter for the sprinkler company, it has all been provided. You had a comment about the fire lane having a loading zone within the fire lane. This loading zone is not within the fire lane. The fire lane is 26 feet wide and has to be 15 feet from the building. So loading zone can be in that area. We have done it before on other projects. So that answers that one. I don’t have the list in front of me, but the main thing is that everything else depended on what we do with wetlands. If the EAF needs to be changed because of wetlands we already said in the original EAF that there are wetlands on the site.

Mr. Russo responded you never said that they were being disturbed.

Mr. Johnson replied we didn’t know that we were going to be disturbing any of them until we got the letter from Brian Orzel’s saying that we could, which now changes the plan. Of course we don’t want these little pockets. We were told initially that we couldn’t touch the wetlands, so that is where we are at right now. All of the other issues I think are solvable and responsible and we can make a response as soon as we know what the mitigation is. I don’t know whether you can help my client out. The issue is that if he can get some sort of an approval that helps him to get the funding to continue this job is what is on the table tonight.

Mr. Dowd responded we can’t give a Conditional Approval because we can’t conclude SEQRA.

Mr. Stewart asked when you did SEQRA was it a negative declaration at the time?

Mr. Johnson asked was it a Type 1 or a Type2?

Mr. Dowd responded this time around we didn’t include SEQRA.

Mr. Russo stated last time I think it was Negative Declaration when it was last approved.

Mr. Dowd responded in 2004.

Mr. Johnson replied so now it is not a Negative Declaration obviously, it is a Positive Declaration. So can SEQRA be modified or do you have to start SEQRA from the beginning?
Mr. Dowd responded we are talking about modifying the EAF that you submitted to show that you are going to be disturbing wetlands.

Mr. Johnson replied right.

Mr. Dowd responded I think that is the extent of it.

Mr. Russo replied as long as they extend that.

Mr. Dowd stated so you might want to change the EAF to reflect that.

Mr. Johnson replied a long form EAF with the changes and you want it to be reflected correctly. If that was submitted could you give a Conditional Final Approval at that point?

Mr. Russo responded not without all of these comments being addressed. I have about four or five pages of comments here.

Mr. Johnson replied gotcha.

Mr. Dowd stated if they can't be addressed because you are waiting for the Army Corp. You are asking for a Conditional Approval of a plan that is in no shape to be Conditionally Approved because it can potential change depending on what the Army Corp. says to you. If you had three Engineering comments of technical changes and a Conditional Approval with the condition being that you are changing the plan to reflect those three conditions, but you have five, six pages of comments. Again, you say yourself that you cannot move on those until the Army Corp. decides which way you are going with the wetlands.

Mr. Stewart responded if we respond to some of the comments and reduce some of the comments.

Mr. Russo stated I think you can be working on this at the same time you are going along with Army Corp. addressing a lot of these comments.

Mr. Johnson replied as long as we have a wetland expert telling us what we can do at this point.

Mr. Russo stated realizing the plan could change based upon what Army Corp. comes back with, their comments on what they want in the mitigation. It all has to be incorporated into the plans. But you do have enough room to do mitigation so you can probably minimize.

Mr. Johnson replied and we have been told now we can also use the flood line area for mitigation.

Mr. Russo asked who told you that?

Mr. Johnson replied Leonard Jackson's Office. As long as we didn't build a berm up that would stop the flood way. We could put a depression there or a slope there that would be conducive to it of course with the wetland expert. So therefore a lot of this may not change. We can put it all in the back at that point.

Mr. Russo stated the other thing we were looking at is you have a twenty foot wide sewer easement crossing in the back that is in favor of Woodbury Centre. You are proposing retaining walls, sheet piling.

Mr. Johnson asked do you have any other information – is there actually a pipe there, because we don't have any information.

Mr. Russo stated that is what I was asking you.
Mr. Peck responded there was supposed to be originally a sewer plant next door on the one closest to Route 32. I guess it would be number 6, Commerce Drive South. It was supposed to be a Sewer Plant, but Sewer District #1 refused to allow it. So when the, I guess it was the C Section where Kohl's is that was supposed to be on the Sewer Plant. Instead it went into Sewer District #1. This line is not used. There is nothing there.

Mr. Russo asked is there a line there?

Mr. Johnson replied there is no pipe.

Mr. Peck responded no, there is nothing in there.

Mr. Russo stated there is an easement.

Mr. Peck replied originally it was someplace else and then they moved it back there.

Mr. Johnson stated we can get a release from the easement.

Mr. Dowd stated if it is not serving any purpose you can try to have the easement terminated and then that would just take it off the plan altogether and then you won't have to worry about it. Obviously, if it exists on record it is going to say you will not be able to build up in the easement area. So you violate an easement by building there.

Mr. Johnson replied you can build a parking lot over an easement.

Discussion broke out.

Mr. Russo stated bring in the easement agreement so we can see what it says. My concern was the structure is being built on the top of the pipe, if it existed. Such as the drainage, the sheet piling going down through that easement, if there was a pipe there and all of a sudden they drive something through it.

Mr. Johnson replied no there is nothing there.

Mr. Russo stated like the attorney said, go back to whomever and get that easement extinguished and that would probably alleviate a couple of the comments.

Mr. Johnson replied okay.

Mr. Peck stated the fact that they removed the use of that Sewer Plant on the #6; they are now looking to do something else with that property.

Mr. Russo responded the easement still exists.

Mr. Peck stated I don't know if the easement is connected to the Sewer Plant.

Mr. Russo replied it doesn't matter what happens left to right.

Discussion broke out.

Mr. Peck stated what the facts are.

Mr. Russo responded if it is not needed get it extinguished. Your lot doesn't need to be encumbering with an easement if it is not necessary.
Mr. Peck replied Thank you.

Mr. Russo stated the rest of the comments had to do with a lot of the construction details, the paved surfaces, storm water pollution prevention plan. Leonard Jackson’s has answered some of the questions with regards to the flood plan development. So some of it is minor in nature, the rest of it is in regards to wetland mitigation, the SWPPP, Storm Water and some details that need to be provided and this easement issue and all the additional information in regards to the sign. Make sure the plans are complete with everything on it.

Mr. Johnson asked to modify SEQRA do you need to have another public hearing or no?

Mr. Dowd replied I don’t think we’ve done a public hearing yet.

Mr. Russo stated no not yet.

Mr. Johnson asked anything else? Okay, thank you very much.

Mr. Danzeisen & Ms. Escallier stated thank you.

GARFIELD PLUMBING & HEATING
36 Route 17M
106-5-15
Site Plan for Interior Renovations

Present: John Loch of AFR Engineering in Monroe along with Abraham Klein, Owner

Mr. Loch stated to the Board application for a site plan approval for improvements. The improvements are interior and outside the building as well. There is an existing building on the lot which is approximately 16,379 square feet and is located in the B-2 General Commercial Zone. The building is 5,765 square foot that is the foot print and it has 16 hundred square feet of office which is right here in the front (pointing to the map). It has 3,283 square feet of storage most of which is right in the back over here (pointing to map). It has a garage 640 square feet over here (pointing to map) and it has an overhang of 240 square feet in the front. It has a paved driveway. Parking spaces allotted for about 8 spaces over here (pointing to map). There is a dumpster located right over here (pointing to map) and there is an access egress easement to the property in the back across this lot. The applicant is proposing to take this building, renovate some parts in the inside, fix the outside and use it for his plumbing business. Basically you are going to have office use that is associated with the business. You are going to have storage in the back associated with the business and he is going to be proposing to do maybe some assembly of plumbing fixtures, so that when they take it out to the job they could be ready for installation. Other than that there are no changes proposed to the site. It is going to stay normally as is. I don’t know if there are any questions the Board has.

Mr. Dowd asked before we get into the nitty gritty here, your client is the proposed tenant?

Mr. Loch replied he has actually purchased the property since we made the application.

Mr. Dowd asked so Sven & Tim Realty are out?

Mr. Loch replied that is correct. He is now the owner of the property. He actually filled out a new application and a new EAF and that will be delivered tomorrow morning to the Planning Board Secretary.
Mr. Dowd commented can you provide the Deed to verify that, please?

Mr. Klein replied it is in my car.

Mr. Dowd stated you don't have to do it now. If the application is going to be in your name we just have to see the Deed to see that the ownership has changed.

Mr. Loch replied Mr. Klein is the applicant, his is the owner.

Mr. Russo stated so the plan then will be updated to reflect the different owner.

Mr. Loch replied yes, exactly.

Mr. Russo asked on the EAF question 20 has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the subject of remediation (ongoing or completed) for hazardous waste?

Mr. Loch replied we are not aware of anything, but you know how when you go on the State website it automatically says yes and you don't have an option to change it. So we haven't been able to find evidence of anything happening there in the past and that could be in quarter of a mile or a half a mile it is going to come up as yes.

Mr. Russo asked have you reached out to DEC?

Mr. Loch replied no we haven't.

Mr. Russo stated okay.

Mr. Loch responded we can certainly do that.

Mr. Russo stated definitely you need something because it is marked yes.

Mr. Loch replied sure, I know.

Mr. Russo responded I understand it doesn't give you options when you have it do it automatically for you. That's a problem. The question that arises in regards to the storage portion of the building as to whether a special permitted use is required by the Planning Board for that.

Mr. Dowd stated in John's letter he points out that storage in the B-2 may require a special permit and if you read the Section in the B-2, a special permit use #5 it says commercial storage buildings for materials and motor vehicles wholly within a completely enclosed structure. Such buildings may serve only as an accessory use to a principal permitted use on the same lot. He is taking the words storage buildings for materials now. We just had a brief conversation before the meeting started and I'm not sure if that is what this means. It is a big difference because in one case a special permit, you have to have a public hearing and this type of site plan and alike.

Mr. Danzeisen responded in Harriman with the Plumbing and Heating business is the use of the acetylene and torches and soldering.

Mr. Russo stated and most plumbers carry stock of materials and supplies.

Mr. Loch replied Mr. Chairman you can ask the applicant if he is proposing to do that on site. I know most of his people go right to the job site.
Mr. Danzeisen asked will he be parking his trucks in the building at night? The equipment is on the trucks. You have oxy and or acetylene bottles.

Mr. Loch asked the applicant are you parking the trucks that you use every day in the building at night?

Mr. Klein replied no.

Mr. Danzeisen asked are you storing bare oxy in the acetylene cylinders or propane cylinders for soldering in the building or are they all going to be on the trucks?

Mr. Klein replied we will have some of the small cans.

Mr. Danzeisen responded there you go.

Mr. Russo asked are you also going to be storing piping, fixtures, etc.?

Mr. Loch replied absolutely.

Mr. Klein replied plumbing supplies. Just for my guys to come in take and move out.

Mr. Danzeisen asked will you be prefabbing any water systems that require soldering inside the building for welding?

Mr. Klein replied on the job site. We don't do soldering in the building.

Mr. Danzeisen replied but there will be gas stored in the building.

Mr. Russo stated and there will be other materials associated with that type of plumbing. The question comes is a special permitted use really required for the storage?

Mr. Danzeisen replied it is not a question I can answer.

Mr. Dowd responded it is not a question I can answer. I don't want to tie into that. When I read John's letter my first impression was a business like plumbing or an electrician for that matter, you are always going to have some sort of supplies on site somewhere.

Mr. Klein replied manufacturing, acetylene tanks and a couple of other...

Mr. Danzeisen asked Mr. Klein do you have any idea the amount of lineal feet of pipe and sizes you are going to be storing?

Mr. Klein replied pipe?

Mr. Danzeisen asked you are going to be working with copper pipe, black pipe?

Mr. Klein replied PVS piping?

Mr. Danzeisen responded yeah. Are you going to keep 300 or 400 feet of different sizes in the place? A couple of links?

Mr. Klein replied a mixture. I'm not a supplier, just what I need to take to the job. With the bigger jobs the pipes go straight to the job. It is just for the minor.
Mr. Danzeisen stated I am not seeing a need for a special permit. We are not talking thousands of feet of pipe. I need to get clarification.

Mr. Dowd commented this Board does not interpret the Zoning Code.

Mr. Danzeisen replied no.

Mr. Dowd stated I hate to do this, but I think go for an interpretation of what this means because I don’t want to proceed as a site plan when you need a special permit. I don’t want to unnecessarily make you go for a special permit if you don’t need it. How much storage is accessory to the everyday workings of a plumbing business as oppose to what you are putting in the building that is extra.

Mr. Loch asked are we talking about actually going to the Zoning Board for a meeting or just writing them a letter for an interpretation?

Mr. Dowd replied no, you would have to go to a Zoning Board meeting for an interpretation for what that means. I wish it was clearer. I can counsel him on it, but I am not comfortable saying it is or isn’t. I attend to think what the Chairman is saying is true. I think that is what the ZBA might tell you that this is not what this Section means by storage buildings for materials.

Mr. Danzeisen stated they are the ones who have to say so.

Mr. Dowd commented I don’t want to put up a road block and I don’t want to kick it through and then say ops we made a mistake and you have to come back again. Unless anybody knows of any other type of business, not necessarily plumbing, but electric or that you had before that you came across this, which I am not aware of.

Mr. Danzeisen responded it is always when you get into Plumbing and Heating and you have the welding and gasses involved that there is always a question.

Discussion broke out.

Mr. Danzeisen stated the problem is the storage of the gas you use.

Mr. Klein replied we are coming to your house with those little tanks which you use when you are servicing your house.

Discussion broke out.

Mr. Russo commented it doesn’t specify gas, it is just materials.

Discussion broke out.

Mr. Dowd stated commercial storage buildings for materials, clearly part of it is a warehouse, it is part of the business you have to have stuff in stock to service customers. The question is that in essence kicking into this Section that requires a special permit. I’m not to sure that it does, but my inclination is no, but I’m not the Zoning Board and there not the Zoning Board.

Mr. Danzeisen responded we would rather be on the side of caution here and send you to the ZBA.

Mr. Loch replied okay. Do we need a letter referring us to the ZBA?

Mr. Dowd responded I can prepare one.
Mr. Danzeisen stated would you please.

Mr. Loch commented that way there is some paper trail.

Mr. Dowd stated one must vote tonight to refer this to the ZBA for interpretation as to whether this qualifies as a Commercial Storage Building that requires a Special Permit. I will prepare that letter for the Chairman's signature.

**Motion** was made by Irma Escallier for a referral to the ZBA on an interpretation if this qualifies as a Commercial Storage Building that requires a Special Permitted Use. Seconded by Juan Quinones. All in favor.

Mr. Russo continued with his comments asking are there any free standing or proposed signs?

Mr. Loch replied no signs are proposed.

Mr. Russo commented the off street parking for Section 140-35 has to be marked out.

Mr. Loch replied okay we will provide a detail on stripping that is not a problem.

Mr. Russo continued 140-34 states that the minimum width of the parking stalls are 10 foot wide.

Mr. Loch replied they are 9x18 right now.

Mr. Russo responded so you are going to have to modify that. Then with regards to the cross easement across this parcel we would like to get a copy of that easement.

Mr. Loch replied it is very vague, but we do have a copy of the deed where it is in there.

Mr. Russo commented if we can see that.

Mr. Loch stated these people right here have an access easement across because there is no other way to get to that lot.

Mr. Russo stated so this is the driveway right here (pointing to the map) to the garage.

Mr. Dowd commented if we can get a copy of that.

Mr. Loch replied okay, no problem. Any other questions?

Mr. Russo responded that is all I have.

Mr. Danzeisen stated thank you gentlemen.

There being no further business, **MOTION** was made by Juan Quinones to adjourn the Regular Planning Board meeting at 8:15pm. Seconded by Martin Stanise. All in favor.

Respectfully Submitted:

[Signature]

Jane Leake, Recording Secretary