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Chairperson Don Danzeisen opened the Village of Harriman Public Hearing of July 20, 2015 at 7:30pm.

ROLL CALL:

Present:
Board Members: Chairperson, Don Danzeisen; Members, Irma Escallier, Ron Klare, Juan Quinones, Marty Stanise and John Russo, Engineer, Kevin Dowd, Attorney, and Barbara Singer Recording Secretary

Absent:
Ron Walker, Building Inspector, Alternate Jennifer Phillips-Carrillo

PUBLIC HEARING

PL GROUP LLC / ADD STORAGE
108-1-11
Site Plan Approval
Present Allan Peck, Owner; George Stewart

Mr. Peck handed in the mailings of the Public Hearing announcement to Kevin Dowd.

Mr. Peck states PL Group / Add Storage LLC are attempting to get approval to construct a self-storage facility at 8 Commerce Drive South. The highlight features of this project is the interior loading to mitigate noise because it's going to be going on all kinds of hours and to eliminate the amount of disturbance that takes place loading and unloading, all of that is going to be done indoors. There will be 54 loading docks indoors, 27 on each side of the pass through. The pass through is 35 feet wide. It's a relatively new concept over the last several years that have been adopted as the leading edge of "technology" in the storage industry. I stumbled on to it with an architect I was talking to who is a leading architect with this type of building, I fell in love with it and here we are.

Chairperson Danzeisen asks if there are any questions from the public. Did we get anything in writing?

There is no comment from the public, and Barbara Singer reports there were no written inquiries.

Mr. Russo comments that the Board hasn't received any responses to the previous comments as of yet. There are no updated plans. Allen did submit a copy of the plans that were previously filed, with the description of the entire site, Commerce Drive, and that area, highlighting certain aspects in regards of the easements. Basically Lot B14 was set aside previously for a sewer treatment plant to service that area and what's now Kohls and the hotel. The plan notes that set forth in drawing CP-2 Lot B14 has been set aside for location of a sewage treatment plant as served in the sub division in the event that an agreement is breached to follow or to allow connections to the existing Orange County Sewage Treatment plant or other municipal facilities. Lot B14 no longer be needed for sewage disposal and would revert back to development parcels. We know that there is no sewage treatment plant over there. The easement that crosses Allen's property is Easement C3; it's a 20' wide sanitary sewer easement in junction with other easements to accommodate the possibility of extending the treated sewage effluent pipe from Site C, which is a Kohls site and the hotel site to the Ramapo River. This would be required to have the sewage treatment constructed on Site C. There is no sewage treatment plant on the Site C that connected to Orange County Sewer District. Given that, regardless, the question is, are these easements filed with somebody. They need to be extinguished, even though the treatment plant is not build here, these easements still exist, and they were more than likely filed with somebody's deed or agreement, so they need to be extinguished.

Chairperson Danzeisen asks if there has been any progress on this.
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Mr. Stewart states, yes, if I can address that. I actually spoke with Sheila Conroy, who was chairman of the Planning Board at that time, whose signature is on that map, and when I read her those conditions, and map notes, she remembered and she said Oh my goodness, we inadvertently didn’t eliminate that easement as well. She said it was a mistake on our part. I put a call in to Rick Golden who is the planning board attorneys, who like a lot of people this time of the year, is on vacation. He should be back either tomorrow or the next day. The easement is in favor of Woodbury, they control it, because it’s in their map. And I’ll find out from him the best way to get it removed. But my question to you is, knowing that it’s a mistake on the part of Woodbury and it can never go back to that, are you still requiring that we get it removed?

Mr. Russo responds, it has to legally be extinguished. The documents need to be submitted to Kevin.

Chairperson Danzeisen states we can continue with a public hearing, that’s not a problem. We can’t go further with a SEQRE determination until this is taken care of.

Mr. Stewart replies, yes, verbally I’m being told that it’s no problem getting it done it’s just that I need to know what the steps are. I also spoke with the current Chairwomen of the Planning Board, Maria Hunter, and she wasn’t 100% sure but she thought I would have to come in front of the Board and request the change and then it’s just a formality, we’ll take care of it.

Mr. Dowd says, now I spoke with Allen last week, I was under the impression that as per our conversation that the way it was written was that if there was a public sewer on the property that the private easement agreement went away.

Mr. Peck replies, yes that is correct. They did that with the sewer plant but they omitted the wording for the lines coming to the plant. So what they have to do is add that wording to follow suit with the eradication of the plant, and that is what they are going to do. What the map note should have said was if B14 is no longer needed for the sewer plant it goes back to being a developable lot. Then the easement on B13 automatically goes away as well. That note just wasn’t put on there because I guess whoever was there at the time didn’t bring it up.

Mr. Russo responds that doesn’t really relate to the sewage treatment plant on B14 because Easement C3 reads 20’ wide sanitary store easement in conjunction with Easement C2 which is another easement that comes across from Site C to accommodate the possibility of extending treated sewage effluent pipe from Site C. Treated, that means that they would have built a plant over at Site C. From the note that I’m reading it wasn’t either/or. They didn’t build one over there so regardless of what happens on B14, it was specific to a sewage treatment plant being built on Site C. So we know that didn’t happen, it wasn’t in error of B14; if nothing ever occurred on Site C then it should have been abolished.

Mr. Peck asks if that’s the case, is this automatically gone.

Mr. Russo answers, no it doesn’t say that here. Doesn’t specifically say that.

Mr. Dowd replies the easement on Number 6, if there was a sewage treatment plant on the property or another municipal facility, Lot B14 would no longer be needed for sewage disposal. It would revert back to a developable parcel. This one doesn’t say that. You have two different things going on here. One said it would disappear, be extinguished, if it’s a public sewer, the other one doesn’t say that.

Mr. Russo explains, the easement that crosses your parcel C3 is specific to a treatment plant being built on Site C, not over on Site B. This is for treated sewage effluent pipe, that’s after it’s left the plant already. So it’s coming from a plant on Site C, crossing through and hitting the outfall.
Mr. Dowd says for the record there were eight mailings. There were a couple of duplicate owners in those eight mailings. There were three green cards received, one that wasn't received was marked PL Group (Mr. Peck sent one to himself). That shows 50% were returned, I don't know what happened to the other ones, but they were certainly mailed in time, almost two weeks ago, which is enough time to respond. (Mr. Peck also had printed out a tracking notice for each of the mailings). So when you get more green cards, including you own, give them to Barbara so we have a complete set.

Chairperson Danzeisen states with the absence of any comment, or any written comment, I'm going to make a motion to close the Public Hearing.

Mr. Russo asks if we can discuss or get an update on the status of Army Corp or Engineering.

Mr. Peck states our engineer met with Brain Orzel from the Army Corp on July 7 at 3pm, it was an excellent visit. They found from their review that on Wetland B there was a finger sticking out, they found it was 5' x 30', we had to survey that. And then Wetland F shrunk to about half, so the 5' by 30' is 150'; the shrinking is about 200' giving us a positive of about 50'. That was the result of that, it doesn't change anything with the positioning of the building or anything like that, it's just to be more exact. Then they wanted the surveying of 37 trees, identifying the species, that's been done. The surveying of those two areas to update the square footage of those sizes of F and D and that's already been done. It is enroute to the Army Corp, I trust. You will have copies of all of these surveys and site plans.

Mr. Russo adds, the site plans and all the plans in the set will have to be updated to reflect that. You should be getting a copy of the permit from Brian Orzel, and as you said they were concerned about the Indiana bats in some trees.

Mr. Pecks says, all of your comments that we have from the previous meetings, we are going to bring that all up to date at the same time so all of the plans that we agreed to at that last meeting will reflect that. We are going forward with all of that. So everything is perfect. Indiana bats were an issue with the trees and there will be a note on the map that any of the trees that are affected by them have to be removed after Nov 1. All of that will also be a note on the map and the extension of the Army Corp jurisdiction. They agreed to an extension versus a new application. So we are in very good shape. And it's going to be a nationwide permit and approved before 45 days.

Mr. Russo says we should get all of that in writing. Including the mitigation.

Mr. Peck states that as soon as I have it, you will get copies of it.

Chairperson Danzeisen states we will postpone SEQRA until we get these things because otherwise time will run out.

Mr. Dowd states so what we can do since there's no public comment, we can close the Public Hearing tonight but we would like Mr. Peck to waive any time frames for us to take action because we have to wait for 62 days. If we do nothing but close the Public Hearing tonight after 62 days we have to take action. We don't know if we're going to get that information from Brian Orzel in time.

Chairperson Danzeisen says have your attorney to draft a letter to Mr. Dowd, Mr. Russo and the Planning Board about waiving the time frame. So we have e written record.

Mr. Dowd states the Mr. Peck can write the letter himself, stating that he is waiving the 62 day rule.

Mr. Peck agrees waiving his 62 day rule and writing a letter stating that as well.

Motion was made by Board member Klare to close the Public Hearing on July 20, 2015. Board member Stanise seconded it. All in favor.
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Chairperson Don Danzeisen opened the Village of Harriman Planning Board Meeting of July 20, 2015.

ROLL CALL:

Present:
Board Members: Chairperson, Don Danzeisen; Members, Irma Escallier, Ron Klare, Juan Quinones, Marty Stanise and John Russo, Engineer, Kevin Dowd, Attorney, and Barbara Singer Recording Secretary
Absent:
Ron Walker, Building Inspector, Alternate Jennifer Phillips-Carrillo

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion was made by Ron Klare to approve the June 15, 2015 Regular Minutes with corrections. Seconded by Member Quinones. All in favor.

PL GROUP LLC / ADD STORAGE
108-1-11
Site Plan Approval

Chairperson Danzeisen states that until the Board receives those letters there’s not much that they can do.

Mr. Dowd explains that SEQRE has to be completed first and then we can take action on the actual application. We took lead agency last month, but we didn’t declare negative declaration because we’re still waiting for the results of the Army Corp of Engineer’s stuff because they have to say that it’s okay. You’ll get a permit but then you can’t build.

Mr. Stewart asks now that Allen’s waived his 62 day and a nationwide permit is coming, could we get a conditional final? Is that at all possible?

Mr. Dowd explains, we can’t take action and make it legal binding upon you and upon us unless we do SEQRA first. We can’t do a SEQRA determination until we get a final that says there will be no mitigation requirements and then you can actually build on the site. You’re not violating Federal pro standards.

Mr. Russo adds there are also some errors within the SEQRA document. They were noted in the minutes last meeting. I gave a copy to Bill Johnson and it was in my comment letter last time. So that still needs to be corrected.

Mr. Peck says, it looks like everything is going to go alright, and we want to start our efforts to get financing. I would like to get some kind of conditional statement that I can take to the bank showing them that I have the real deal.

Mr. Dowd says we would love to oblige you but we can’t. Legally we can’t.

Chairperson Danzeisen adds until we get the Army Corp of Engineers okay we cannot take any action because we can’t start SEQRA.

Mr. Dowd says we can’t give you a letter that says you will get conditionally approved when we haven’t seen the final results of the Army Corp. We would almost be misleading your bank because suppose that condition can’t be met and they’re already to finance this thing for you. We can’t put something out that
time. These conditions may not be seen as misrepresenting what’s going to happen here so you can get financing at this particular happen.

Mr. Stewart asks could you put together a draft resolution? So when we come to the next meeting, assuming everything is ok, or the meeting after that, whenever it is that we come to the meeting, we can act on it a little faster and authorize the chairman to sign it.

Mr. Dowd explains what we normally do, if you’re ready to go forward and you have the SEQRA stuff and the engineer have signed off on all of the SEQRA and engineering then this board can issue a negative declaration. They would take by motion and second the approval and I memorialize it in their resolution. It would not have to go to another meeting. It would be here is the approval, here are the conditions. Once the conditions are met, he is authorized to sign it. You’re not going to lose anything. I could write up a draft and charge you for it, and then amend it if the conditions might change and charge you again. This way we capture it all on the moment we do it and then I memorialize it and write it so we do it just once. Sound good?

Mr. Stewart agrees.

SAND DOLLAR
102-4-8
DISCUSSION

Present Lisa Cobb, Owner

Ms. Cobb says I would like to talk to the Board informally before we submitted anything because at this point we’re not even sure if we’re going to but I wanted your informal reaction to the idea of subdividing this property into two lots. One that would house the residential use and one that would house the commercial use. I put some of the background in to the memo, I’m sure Mr. Danzeisen you’re familiar with the property. In or about the late 1970’s early 1980’s the Village changed the zoning for the bottom portion of the property and it became commercial. The Sand Dollar was built and was operating for 20-25 years. It was my Mom’s property and now it’s in the estate. We’re having difficulty selling it because it seems like people want either the residence or they want the business but we haven’t found a buyer who is interested in both. And we thought it might be better for all of us, the Village included, if we could get at least some part of it sold and back in use. I know from an engineering standpoint one of the things that I heard was 25’ for the driveway, I don’t know if that’s engineering or building.

Mr. Russo responds, no it’s actually driveway access in the subdivision regulations. You have a maximum of 20’ curb cocks. There are a couple of questions that come to play. One where are the utilities that service the house? Where are the utilities that service the shop? Water service and sewer service. Are they shared services?

Ms. Cobb replies, they both run in a trench as far as I recall. That is roughly to the right of the existing driveway. The bottom several feet are shared, I believe. But there are separate pumps, separate meters but I believe they’re in the same line. The shop is separating metered from the house. I believe there are two water pipes. There is definitely two meters.

Mr. Russo explains, there could be two meters but still coming in as a single service and the meter wouldn’t be until further up and it would branch off.

Ms. Cobb states I don’t honestly remember if they split at the curb at the main street line or if they split slightly in.

Mr. Russo explains they would have to split all the way from the main. The main would be in the road
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Mr. Dowd states what you have to have is two water lines, two sewer lines. One going into the shop and one going into the house.

Ms. Cobbs says my suspicion is that the shop water was just taken off that to the house’s line because the hose has existed for 100 years. But I don’t remember. I may have that information, I have a box full of plans from when the store was put in place so I could probably find that out. What other issues do I need to look at?

Mr. Dowd continues by cutting it in half or approximately in half where you’re showing the line you are basically creating a lot that is totally land locked except for a driveway. Depending on whether it’s an easement or actually the lot itself, we have a flag lot or a land locked parcel with an easement running to it for access. In that case you would actually have no road frontage.

Ms. Cobbs replies I was actually contemplating a flag as opposed to an easement.

Mr. Dowd continues, depending on where you put the line separating the two lots, you have a front yard issue with the house, that would need a setback.

Ms. Cobbs asks if there’s a minimum setback for the front yard.

Mr. Russo answers, front yard for R100 is 40’. Front yard could be 1 to 0.

Ms. Cobbs states, so I wouldn’t need a front yard variance. So I understand it so far what I would need is perhaps lot size because for the R100 there’s a minimum of 15000 square feet.

Mr. Russo states, which I think you already have because the lot size is 1.555 acres so that’s 50,000 square feet and then if you split it in half you have 25,000 square feet each. The front yard setback is a required minimum of 40’. The lot width is the distance between the side lot lines that are required minimum front yard.

Mr. Dowd explains if you took the front of your house and drew your line 40’ from there. That’s your front lot line. Your lot width would need to be 100’ and it wouldn’t be because of your flag pole. Your lot is only 106’ across. So you’re not going to have the lot width either.

Mr. Russo explains Lot width is the distance between the two side lot lines at the required minimum front yard. At the property line you would have to measure back 40’ to get your minimum. Right now you’re showing 106.6’ at the road and your lot narrows as it goes back. The other thing is now that you’re separating these lots under Section 140-18 you have buffer strips between commercial and residential lots. Side yard or rear yard in a B1 or B2 district adjacent to a residential district shall have a minimum depth or width of 20’ which shall be landscaped. So the back of the shop parcel you would have to reserve a 20’ strip and landscape it with pines, staggered a minimum required 5’ high.

Mr. Dowd asks if the front of your house and the back of you shop has at least 60’, 40’ for the front yard and 20’ for the buffer.

Mr. Russo adds the code doesn’t really speak of flag lots.

Ms. Cobb says it is my understanding that they aren’t prohibited but they aren’t favored.

Mr. Russo says that you would have to go to the Zoning Board and they will want to see an actual map developed.

Ms. Cobbs agree. I know there would be several variances that would be required before we could move forward but I wasn’t sure if the Board was favorable to one use on one lot or even if we got the variances from Zoning and came back here you would not be in favor of that. So I figured that before I went through all of the trouble I would ask if the Board was favorable to this idea.
Mr. Russo asks about the condition of the buildings.

Ms. Cobbs answers pretty good. The house was built in the late 1800’s. The house was lived in up until two years ago.

Chairperson Danzeisen passes pictures taken by the Building Inspector recently of the house both inside and outside to Mr. Russo.

Ms. Cobb explains that the plans are actually copies made of actual plans and are in scale.

Mr. Russo explains that an updated survey is needed with all of the buildings drawn to scale as well as additions made to the house. All structures have to be shown to the configuration that they actually are. It shows the shop as a box and I can see an ell configuration. So the survey would need to be updated.

Mr. Dowd adds that to create the flag lot you would have to show the proposed lines.

Ms. Cobbs agrees.

Mr. Russo says you want to get the Board’s feelings and temperature and see if it’s worth moving forward.

Ms. Cobb asks if we went forward and came back to you with a full set of plans and everything was up to snuff and we had our variances in place. Is that something that the Board would consider or do you prefer not making two lots out of one?

Chairperson Danzeisen states that I would much rather see both of those premises occupied then sitting there doing nothing. If it takes a flag lot to fit in there and fit in there properly.

Ms. Cobb states part of the issue and from a variance standpoint is that we are not changing the character of the neighborhood because it’s been this way for 30 years. We are changing lines on a piece of paper but substantially we are not looking to do anything new or different. We are looking to separate two current lots.

Mr. Russo says in doing so you’ll have to meet the rest of the code. Buffer strips, that’s even along the side yard.

Mr. Dowd adds if you went to the Zoning Board and you got the variances, this Board couldn’t necessarily say no if it now meets the Code based upon the variances granted. Unless there is some other problem that is outside the area of variances. I can’t think of what it could be. So you would have to get the variances and come back. And unless there’s a strict prohibition against flag lots and you wanted to apply for it, we couldn’t stop you. You go to the Zoning Board and if they wanted to grant it then this Board is confined to the restrictions of the Zoning Board as to what this lot would look like.

Chairperson Danzeisen says first you can get the drawing fixed up.

Ms. Cobbs explains, first the family has to decide if this is something that they want. My first question is actually going to be the water line. That would be the biggest expense. And the sewer, it was many years ago and I don’t remember.
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VILLAGE VIEW

UPDATED STATUS

Mr. Dowd explains the attorney for the Highway Superintendent for the Town of Monroe had agreed to a consent judgement which would bind him to make a decision on the application for the road open permit and he violated it after he consented to it after a certain amount of time. So now there is a formal contempt proceeding begun in Orange County Supreme Court to compel him to comply by the consent judgement to make a decision on the permit. That doesn’t mean he will grant the permit, but he must make a decision on the permits. He has to say yes or no. If he says no then it will go to an Article 78, I’m assuming, but right now it is an actual contempt proceeding because he didn’t even abide by own consent to make a decision by a period of time.

VILLAGE BOARD PROPOSED CODE CHANGES

DISCUSSION

Mr. Dowd begins the discussion explaining the proposed regulations regarding donation bins and dumpster enclosures. If donation bins should be allowed or not, if they should be only for not for profit organizations. Apparently we are finding out that people are putting donation bins around and people are donating clothes thinking that they’re going to Good Will or Salvation Army and actually the clothes are being sold.

Discussion broke out regarding various bins around the Village, where they’re located and whether or not they are not for profit.

Mr. Dowd continues stating the only problem for this Board is that if you have an existing site plan and they’re putting one, two, or three donations bins, they should be restricted in number and size. Also where they’re placed. Should they be set forward in the front yard where they’re visible? Also they shouldn’t be taking up parking spaces, they are really not in compliance with the site plan. It seems to me that you would need the Village Board to issue a permit. We need the property owner to be part of that permit process because it’s going to be on someone else’s property other than the owner of the donation bin.

Mr. Russo states the biggest issue is that the donation bins can’t be taking up parking stalls. We approve site plans and they have to meet certain requirements regarding the number of parking stalls, if you take the number of parking stalls up with these bins, even dumpsters, you now do not comply with the approved site plan.

Mr. Dowd adds I don’t think you want to be taking up your time with approving clothing bins on commercial lots. If they can avoid taking parking spaces, I know they have to be somewhat visible so the public know that they’re there, but from an aesthetics point of view you don’t want them in the front yard.

Member Escallier states I think the issue is more that (1) he’s doing it for himself, for his own profit. Not a nonprofit agency. So according to Mayor Welle’s note, the Village Board wants them to apply with the Building Inspector, Ron Walker, to get a permit for it and they have to designate their name on it and they have to be an entity that is not for profit. That’s the fundamental issue there.

Mr. Dowd replies, some of these regulations that I’ve given you do that. They say it is only for not for profit, they have to be clearly marked. When they come in for their permit thy have to show you that they
are a legitimate not for profit organization, 501C3, and then the Building Inspector can give them a permit for one or two. As far as your involvement is concerned, it seems to be you would only be involved is where they care going to place these things on any given lot. You don’t want them taking up parking spaces where you have a tight site.

Member Escallier says we should address the fact that it should be designated where they can be if they are not for profit. Fundamentally it’s a fraud that is taking place because this guy is doing it for himself.

Mr. Dowd continues there’s a bunch of issues here but as far as your planning process is concerned, it seems logical that you have to regulate them. Including if there are being done for not for profits. And I think you might want to limit how many of any one organization on any one lot can have because technically you could have two for Good Will, two for someone else and so on all line up on one lot. I think the issue is where they put them on the site and how many on one site.

Mr. Russo adds that’s why the property owner needs to be part of the permit application. So the one on the County property, the County would have to be involved. I’m sure the County doesn’t know that it’s there because if they did, the County would have it removed. I don’t think the County would allow that on their property, especially along the road.

Member Escallier says and this should apply to all existing bins. There are a lot of bins all over the place. So are we going to write something that you can take back?

Mr. Dowd continues you were also given another set of omnibus laws and part of that involves Chapter 140 which is zoning regulations and Chapter 146 which is Subdivision. Section 14 they are talking about changes to your zoning which is Chapter 140; they have a couple of new definitions or changed definitions for hotel, light processing, warehouse and manufacturing The only mistake that I saw was a typo in the Hotel definition, next to the last line was “and individuals”. But the definitions that are there are very helpful. I think the differences of light processing and manufacturing are good ones. It’s much clearer what constitutes processing versus manufacturing. I think that’s a good addition

Member Escallier says back to Section 91 where they’re discussing the receptacles and the recyclables. There is nothing to say that they should be contained, it only refers to the Village Law.

Mr. Russo says they don’t get into trash enclosures, for dumpsters. That’s something that we’ve been talking about. We have been pushing it on different applications before, trying to get them to do it for visual impact purposes but really there’s nothing in the Code that says they have to have some kind of enclosure around these dumpsters. A gate, that closes to keep the trash in there, make it a little more appealing instead of seeing some dumpster overflowing with trash.

Mr. Dowd shows with the submittal of clothing bins there is section on the Village of Monroe Code regarding dumpsters and dumpster enclosures. And there is also a variation from the Village of Washingtonville also. You may want to look at those and the Town of Monroe as well. Your regulation on dumpster and dumpster enclosures are loose, certainly the Village of Monroe has much more extensive regulations.

Mr. Russo says we have been asking applicants on their site plans, even subdivisions, to include enclosures of their dumpsters.

Mr. Dowd says whenever you’re talking about enclosures on a nice open lot, all newly developed, it’s easy. But when you have an existing building that’s been there 100 years and there’s no back yard, side yard and it’s a commercial property, where are they supposed to put it? So there’s always issues with dumpsters on commercial properties on older lots. In a corporate park there is never a problem. Do you want to make any comments on dumpsters or on zoning changes?
Mr. Russo says I think comments should be made or presented back to them that we would like to see something in regards to enclosures on dumpsters. Maybe a waiver built in to the if it can’t be met but put the onus on the applicant to show that it can’t be met.

Member Escallier asks what about the bins for the clothing? I agree with that proposal that they have to get a permit, even the existing ones. It’s out of control now. And it has to be an approved entity, and subsequently they could be fined not noncompliance I agree with the whole thing.

Mr. Russo adds make the property owner part of the application, limit the number that can be on a single parcel, designate where it can be or set minimum guidelines. And to make sure that someone is picking up. Especially during the Holidays where everyone is feeling generous.

Member Escallier states first you have to weed out who is legitimate and whose not. I think that’s a good start.

Member Stanise asks if you need a permit, what is going to show that the particular clothing bin has a permit.

Mr. Dowd answers the Building Inspector would have to keep a file, and keep records on whose bins have been given a permit.

Member Escallier says for the clothing bins according to the proposal they are supposed to put their name and contact number on them. And also the dumpster enclosures are necessary.

Mr. Dowd asks how you would like to handle this. I can draft something for the chairman and submit to this Board for you review and approval.

Chairperson Danzeisen says that this is fine. Also have we gotten the money in to the escrow account for Harriman Dental?

Ms. Singer replies, I mailed out a letter but I haven’t heard back from them.

Mr. Dowd asks do you know what’s going on with the Zoning Board with Garfield Plumbing?

Ms. Singer replies Garfield Plumbing is on the Zoning Board agenda for next month.

Discussion broke out.

There being no further business, MOTION was made by Ron Klare to adjourn the Regular Planning Board meeting at 8:30pm. Seconded by Irma Escallier. All in favor.

Respectfully Submitted: Barbara Singer, Recording Secretary