Chairwoman Escallier opened the Village of Harriman Regular Meeting of September 19, 2016 at 7:30pm.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairwoman Escallier asks for everyone to remain standing for a moment of silence with respect and admiration and gratitude for our former friend, former neighbor, former colleague, Donald Danzeisen. Thank you.

ROLL CALL:

Present:
Board Members: Chairwoman Irma Escallier, Members Ron Klare, Martin Stanise, Juan Quinones, Michael Zwarycz, Kevin Dowd, Attorney, John Russo, Engineer, John Hager, Building Inspector and Barbara Singer, Recording Secretary.

MOTION was made by Member Klare to approve July 18, 2016 Regular Minutes
SECOND was made by Member Stanise.

AYE: Member Irma Escallier
    Member Zwarycz
    Member Klare
    Member Stanise
    Member Quinones

NAY: -0-

Superior Pack Group
102-2-5.11
Revised Site Plan

Present: John Loch, engineer, AFR Engineering and Land Surveying.

Mr. Loch begins we have been here a number of times before, we had some relatively minor cleanup work to do in respect to clarifying certain things on the plan set with the exception of one note that has been pointed out that has to be reworded slightly. I believe that we have met all of the requirements.

Chairwoman Escallier replies the last time that you were here, Mr. Furst was here, and there was mention of finally getting to the Storm Water management. Please tell me that that is done and over.

Mr. Loch replies I believe it is done. I have not fully inspected the facility. I did actually stop over there just before the meeting, I see that the main facility seems to be in place but I have not stuck my head in to check all of the piping and things on it. I believe that it’s well on its way here.

Mr. Russo states I know that it is under construction and I know that one of the things that Mr. Loch is going bring up is the protection around that unit tonight.

Mr. Loch replies one of the things that did come up after construction was started was a concern that vehicles being able to pull over to where the unit is. Towards that end there was a site meeting and we have added a detail to plan for a 15” high curb that will be structurally reinforced just so that a vehicle can’t roll over it and get over to where that chamber is.

Member Zwarycz replies I appreciate that because I saw that the lot filled up very quickly, with the trailer, it’s tight already.
Chairwoman Escallier also on July 18 there was discussion about the architect inquiring about the sprinklers, if they were necessary, and there was going to be a review so they could submit that to the Building Inspector.

Mr. Hager replies I have not received any submittal.

Mr. Loch replies I am not aware what the architect has done on that, I know that that is a permitted issue in respect with the Building Permit being issued on it but I don't know if that is necessarily going to need site plan approval.

Chairwoman Escallier adds also on that day, Mr. Russo stated that he needed a letter to the effect that the truck traffic would remain more or less the same and you're adding three loading docks.

Mr. Loch replies we don't anticipate that the traffic is going to go up at all. Essentially, I believe that that was addressed in the narrative but we have it that they are going to need more time to load things. What they're finding is that the market has shifted a little bit. They package things and load them at the same time, and what they're finding is a little more diversity of product that they need to park a truck in a a loading bay for a longer amount of time, they don't anticipate increasing the traffic through the site.

Mr. Russo adds I think that now it's on record and they have it on record the last time, that's sufficient. All we need is the one minor change and I haven't seen the most recent plans with the curb detail. I know that the Building Inspector had discussed it with me previously with concerns of loading on that structure so this is a compromise.

Chairwoman Escallier replies I am very glad.

Member Zwarycz adds I like the fence that went well beyond where it was supposed to go. I appreciate that.

Mr. Loch replies actually I went and took a look at that. That was the same length that was called for on the plan. The only thing that they did add was a piece that turns at right angles and comes up to the street.

Chairwoman Escallier asks was that the fence that was built without a permit and we are going to approve when we do the final?

Mr. Russo replies no this is a chain link fence. They had requested to put something else in but that didn't comply with the code.

Member Zwarycz adds according to the plan that I had the fence didn't run to the back of the property. Now it goes pretty far back up, well in to Monroe. It goes well past Harriman. I'm very happy with it.

Mr. Loch replies it's pretty close to the Municipal boundary.

Mr. Dowd states once you've made that final detail on the curb, Mr. Russo will give you a letter signing off on the project so you can sign the site plans.

Chairwoman Escallier states the plans have to read that they are amended site plans.

Mr. Dowd replies they will be revised site plans. We don't need a vote because it was voted on in July as a conditional site plan approval and they have satisfied all of the conditions.
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PL GROUP
108-1-11
Revised Site Plan

Present: Allan Peck, owner; George Sewitt, consultant.

Mr. Peck states the reason we need to make some changes is because of the extraordinary cost of the plan that we had approved. In addition to the fact that when the architect started to design it was determined that the ground floor was not handicap accessible. The office was 525.5 and the loading area was 527.5, so we had to lower the loading area to be equal with the office area so it would be handicap accessible. Which triggered the requirement of reducing the elevation of the rear parking lot. So we had to drop that down and we are also interested in having a lesser impact on the environment. All of which was accomplished. At the same time the walls which were sheet piled, which was approved, we changed that to a more beautiful exposure of a rock type system, I gave you copies, this is what was approved and this is what we want to do. (Mr. Peck showing the photos that had been distributed to the Board members). This is more aesthetically pleasing as opposed to the other wall, which was very functional but believe it or not this is less costly. This is a stone composite which is manufactured in NY State by a company Unilock. And each one of these blocks weight 700 lbs., and they are 39” x 14” deep and 7.25” high. They are absolutely gorgeous. It’s a major improvement to what we had. By reducing the parking lot in the back, we still have the 4’ differential, so if we have 525.5, the ground would be 521.5 so the trucks can come in and load like they were doing before. So in effect we have lowered everything 2’. It works perfectly; we saved some money so it makes it more affordable, and as a result more financeable. Which we couldn’t do before. In order to get the average of 35’ height, the average of all of the corners, we had to remove one floor above the office. And we made that more aesthetically pleasing because now it has a rounded roof. So with all of the input of our architect, who is in the process of designing the finished building, he has improved it dramatically. So everything that we are looking for is an improvement.

Mr. Dowd states it’s up to the Board if they want to waive the Public Hearing. You’ve already had a Public Hearing on this and we had extensive comments on the plans and changes are actually reducing the impact of the project. So I would suggest that you waive any additional Public Hearings on this matter.

MOTION was made by Member Klare to waive the Public Hearing for the amended site plan
SECOND was made by Member Stanise.

AYE: Member Irma Escallier
Member Zwarycz
Member Klare
Member Stanise
Member Quinones

NAY: -0-

Mr. Russo states the comments that I had, based on what was presented, was since the site plan was already approved it should read amended site plan. As noted the wall was changing, reducing the wall heights and in certain areas, they were able to eliminate the wall as required on the site plan. That’s a benefit, improves the visual impacts on the site. They’ve also submitted all of the calculations and the engineering drawings for the wall, which I did review and I had no problems with those. I know that you’ll be getting a copy of those also. I don’t know if you did or didn’t John?

Mr. Hager replies yes, I received them.
Mr. Russo continues if you want I can give you a letter specific to that. On the wall details and designs that were prepared by another engineer I have asked that some of those details be added to the site plan itself. On the west side of the parcel where there was a drainage swale, they are now going to extend the drainage pipe that runs out of that storm water pond. It’s a 30” pipe and they are going to extend it along the property so that they can fill that area in and improve the grading, reduce the walls, because they no longer have the overhang on the building. That whole side is flush now so things kind of shift out.

Member Klare asks about the pipe.

Mr. Russo answers that pipe is going to tie back into the drainage swale that is already there. They are just piping the swale. They are going to extend the existing pipe through the drainage swale so they can fill that area in and it will still outfall to the rest of the swale in the back of the site.

Member Escallier asks is there anything else necessary in order to be completed.

Mr. Sewitt asks now that we’ve revised it and it’s more than just a field change, which is why we’ve come to you, and there’s less impact, you’ve already waived the Public Hearing, we have to do one more revision on the plans to satisfy all of the comments from your letter and I was wondering when that’s done would you be able to move it in the direction of signing it without us having to come back.

Mr. Russo asks what you would like is a conditional approval tonight.

Mr. Sewitt replies that would be great! And much appreciated!

Mr. Dowd responds we have review this project for a long time and these changes are relatively minor and for the benefit of the owner and the public, if you want to approve a conditional amended site plan.

**MOTION** was made by Member Zwarycz to grant conditional site plan approval.

**SECOND** was made by Member Klare.

**AYE:** Member Irma Escallier
Member Zwarycz
Member Klare
Member Stanise
Member Quinones

**NAY:** -0-

**VILLAGE VIEW**

101-1-1.3

Revised Site Plan

Chairwoman Escallier states there isn’t anyone here from Village View but I have the letter here from NYS DOT.

Mr. Dowd replies the only development that we’ve had in the matter is we received a letter from NYS DOT which is requesting quite a bit of information from them with regards to the storm water, the SEQRA documentation.

Chairwoman Escallier the project has to follow all of the requirements so you are all welcome to come and listen in.
The audience asks was everything approved from Monroe already.

Chairwoman Escallier replies Monroe did that a long time ago. That went to court saying the Town has to issue a permit.

Mr. Russo states I have not seen a permit come from the Town of Monroe yet.

Ms. Wykretowicz asks how can a judge sign off on that when he didn’t make the site requirements. They didn’t follow the rules; you need a site requirement of 150’ of where the road is going. They don’t have 150’. I just couldn’t understand how a judge could make the decision.

Chairwoman Escallier responds we can’t make a comment on it; this is not a Public Hearing.

Mr. Dowd explains the matter was fully litigated in the courts as to the actions of the previous Highway Superintendent and then the new Superintendent was elected and the case was started again. They are far from getting approval from this Board. They have a lot of work to do.

Member Stanise responds I thought there was a certain amount of feet that was needed for fire engines to make a turn into that development. Does the Fire Department have to go up there and have a look at that?

Mr. Russo responds depending on the vehicles that your Fire Department has and the vehicles that will be responding. Every one of them has a different turning radius or turning path. We should provide them with a set of the plans to see what comments they will have in regard with this.

Discussion broke out.

MONROE JOINT FIRE DISTRICT
102-4-3.2
Discussion

Chairwoman Escallier asks Mr. Russo if his comment letter was sent to the Fire District.

Mr. Russo responds I thought that they were going to be present this evening and I would give it to them. I will e-mail it to them tomorrow. To Dave Zigler, it’s his company that’s working on it.

Mr. Dowd asks Barbara, I thought that they were going to have somebody here, an architect or somebody here tonight.

Ms. Singer responds I thought that they would provide somebody to come and answer questions if we requested it, but I never heard anyone requesting their presence.

Mr. Hager responds it was my understanding that everything was submitted other than the storm water, the MS4, which must be reviewed by Mr. Russo’s office, the rest of the information that was provided to the Planning Board was for a cursory review. I think that their intention was that you would get the chance to look the plans over and if you had any concerns that you would turn those around to them but if you’re comfortable with what’s been presented that they’re satisfied.
Mr. Russo states I can send out the information to them because I did have a number of comments because the plans that they provided didn’t show any sewer service to the site. As far as the storm water goes, that’s in compliance with the DEC; the site is basically impervious now so they are reducing the amount of impervious that’s going to be on the site. In accordance with the DEC’s design manual, they are under an acre in size and given the type of project all they have to do is perform erosion control sediment control. They also had a flag pole right on top of the water line servicing a hydrant. I was wondering where they stand with DOT.

Chairwoman Escallier states they gave us the courtesy of submitting the plans to us when they really didn’t have to we should have the same courtesy and respond to them with what we’re looking at. Regardless of whether they’re here or not, we are working together.

Mr. Hager responds they have indicated to me that they have started the process with DOT.

Mr. Russo continues something else that was a concern to me was the neighboring parcel, lands of Route 17 Reality. The rear corner of this property I was concerned with the grading and how the grading was done. It appears that they may need to do some additional grading in that area, it wasn’t very clear. They have a generator on the side of Short Street; I wanted to know if there was noise suppression for that generator, silencer on the muffler. That does exercise once during the week, hopefully they’ll set it for during the day. During emergency situations, power outages it will run a lot longer and they are probably an emergency shelter.

Member Stanise asks do they create a lot of noise.

Mr. Russo replies they can, depending on the size they can create a lot of noise but there are ways of reducing that noise impact. You can have a cabinet around the system; residential muffler type system reduces the noise that’s being generated. You’re never going to have all of the noise reduced. The end of the proposed side walk at the intersection of Short Street and Route 17M should indicate a handicap ramp. And on the catch basin casting I wanted to make sure that they are heavy duty. The curb inlets are showing heavy duty but the field inlets grates which are just the flat grates, they’re not calling them out, and I want to make sure that they’re heavy duty. At least label them on the plan that they’re heavy duty. There will be passing trucks and cars over them.

Mr. Hager asks before the meeting is adjourned, I would like to ask a question regarding the Hotel/Motel proposed on North Main Street a few years back. I have some inquiries about that property being available and I was wondering if that got any kind of approval, it didn’t stall because of anything at the Village level.

Chairwoman Escallier replies, yes it was the Kabinoff project and it was a beautiful motel. But there wasn’t any approval given.

Mr. Russo states that was handled by George Lithco. And I believe that the father had passed.

Mr. Hager asks could the project be revived.

Chairwoman Escallier I don’t believe so, not in that form.

Mr. Russo adds he was here about two months ago, but FEMA mapping had changed since that was originally presented so they would have to go back and take a look at that.
Mr. Hager asks they would have to submit a new application; you're not going to continue the original application?

Chairwoman Escallier no, we would need a new application.

Mr. Russo states they could probably use an amended site plan, because it was approved.

Mr. Dowd replies it can't be built because there is now a change in regulation.

Mr. Russo states there was also a change as far as the parking requirements.

Chairwoman Escallier and there was no place to put the snow, it just didn't work.

Mr. Hager states the parking, I believe, the Village Board has addressed. They may not have adopted it yet but I think they did hold a Public Hearing on it.

Discussion broke out.

**MOTION** was made by Member Klare to close the meeting at 8:10pm.

**SECOND** was made by Member Stanise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYE:</th>
<th>Member Escallier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member Quinones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member Klare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member Stanise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member Zwarycz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Respectfully Submitted:  
Barbara Singer, Recording Secretary