Chairwoman Escallier opened the Village of Harriman Regular Meeting of December 17, 2018 at 7:30pm.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL:

Present: Chairwoman Irma Escallier, Board Members Martin Stanise, Ron Klare, 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 accept the minutes of November 19, 2018. SECOND was made by Member Quinones.

AYE Member Escallier
Member Stanise
Member Klare
Member Quinones
Member Zwarycz

NAY: -0-

HARRIMAN PLAZA REALITY
102-4-9.12
AMENDED SITE PLAN

Present: Scott Berliner, applicant; Liam Byrne, LJB Associates.

Mr. Byrne: The building offset was a computer error. We are not disturbing any of the tree line in the back, so the bats shouldn’t be affected. The only space that will be disturbed is the 800 sq ft, just the footprint of the building.

Mr. Russo: What I’m referencing is the SEQRA form, that information has been left blank.

Mr. Byrne: One of the other issues was with the garbage truck and after 15 years of the dumpster being in the exact same location and it has not been hit yet getting it in and out of the building. The dumpster is staying exactly where it is. It is picked up before the business is open. There are no cars in the lot at the time, they are in and out by 4-5am.

Mr. Russo: Now that you have an access door back there, you’re going to have a pad back there. What are the impacts that the truck is going to have on the pad?

Mr. Byrne: It won’t have any impact on the pad because the pad will be 10-12’ away from where the dumpster is currently sitting. The truck will maintain on the driveway. So there really is no impact on where the door or the pad will be. The dumpster currently sits on the blacktop. It’s all blacktopped.

Mr. Russo: Your plans don’t show that as all being blacktopped, that’s why I’m asking. There are a number of comments on SEQRA that need to be addressed. On #20, it’s marked “yes”, you have to provide the information. As far as general comments, it seems that you need three variances, the lot width variance, I don’t think you need because it’s a pre-existing, non-conforming lot. The letter that we received from Harriman Plaza Reality in regard to the uses, it would be nice to know which uses are on which floor. At the last meeting we had discussed showing the septic and the tank on the plans, this still doesn’t show me where it’s located. You have two existing
doors in the rear of the building that appear to swing in three parking stalls, so I don’t know if those stalls are viable. If you have cars parked there, how are you going to open the doors?

Mr. Byrne: The one door that looks like it’s crossing into two parking spaces and the single door, they all have a stop sitting 5’ from the building. That doesn’t affect the door opening or closing.

Mr. Russo: The plans don’t show stops. We need to know that the door can actually open and people have access out. The utility pole is shown in your neighbor’s entrance way. I know it’s not there, the plans need to be modified to show the correct location. Any free-standing signs in the grass area also have to be shown. I believe there are two drainage structures on the west side of the parking lot, that information should be provided on the plan. The plan should note where the topography came from, who you’re representing on the plans. It appears that there are several items that are missing or shown in the wrong location, we would recommend an updated survey of the site. You’re referring to a plan that was done in 1983. On sheet 2, the bulk table, lot coverage, existing coverage, that should be listed. The structure should be realigned. The plans should be updated to reflect that there’s paving in the rear. Handicap parking stalls, they should be located close as possible to the front door. You’re showing one in the back of the building, it’s not near any entrance nor does it comply with current regulations, there’s no access aisle present for it. You may want to consider having both in front and sharing the access aisle. Make sure that you have the appropriate signage and “No Parking” for the access aisle. There doesn’t appear to be sufficient room for a vehicle backing out of the last parking stall in the northeast corner. The parallel parking stalls are showing about 20’. For parallel spaces, especially the center spaces you would need at least 24’ for a vehicle to maneuver in and out from between the parked vehicles. Any proposed site lighting should be shown on the plans are where it’s going to be located. Even if it’s lighting on the building, you should show where it’s going to be present. And also show the isometrics of those lights. On sheet 3, it says “proposed site plans”, you may want to say “proposed construction details”. You will need to be referred to the ZBA for three variances. I think you have to correct the plan (1) shift the building so we can see what the side variance that you’re going to need. I would like to see that the parking is still viable, those two stalls, so we can say how many parking space variances are needed.

Mr. Dowd: The question now before you refer them is how much of a variance is needed on the parking spaces. That doesn’t appear to be clear right now.

There was discussion regarding the deadlines to appear before the Boards.

Mr. Dowd: We want to make sure that when we send you to the Zoning Board, you’re going with the proper information to get the variances that you need.

Mr. Byrne: What if we decided to not put the addition where it is but to go up where the single floor is. Since the existing building is already there, we wouldn’t need a variance for a side set back and we could utilize that 800 square feet in the back for more parking. If we were to do that, it would eliminate our parking requirement.

Mr. Dowd: No, it wouldn’t, it would cut down the number of parking space variance that you would need though. You wouldn’t need the side set back variance since it’s pre-existing. It’s the extension of the building that’s causing the need for the variance.

Mr. Hager: You’re not changing the building’s footprint, but you are increasing the building’s square footage on the second floor so you’re increasing the building’s non-conformity. That would be the strictest interpretation.
Mr. Russo: You were also talking about operations; will this work for you?

Mr. Berliner: I’m not sure about going up. It’s not about workflow, it’s about FDA, pharmaceutical regulations, the way the chemicals move, how I protect the environment, how I protect the public. So having it on one level, without stairs, an elevator, so we’re going to have to think about this.

MOTION was made by Member Quinones to conditionally refer Harriman Plaza Reality to the Zoning Board of Appeals pending the receipt by the engineer of the revised plans by Friday December 21, 2018 so the Planning Board can calculate the number of parking space variance that is needed.
SECOND was made by Member Stanise.
AYE Member Escallier
Member Stanise
Member Klare
Member Quinones
Member Zwarycz

NAY: -0-

Chairwoman Escallier: What is the size of the existing shed?

Mr. Byrne: 20 x 30’. The distance between the shed and the building is the 10’ that is the addition. Where that shed is the exact outline of the addition.

DISCUSSION – COMMERCIAL STORAGE

Discussion broke out regarding definitions and concerns regarding the Village of Harriman Code.

MOTION was made by Member Klare to refer the Planning Board’s recommendation for code changes to the Village Board for consideration to adopt in a Local Law.
SECOND was made by Member Stanise.
AYE Member Escallier
Member Stanise
Member Klare
Member Quinones
Member Zwarycz

NAY: -0-

MOTION was made by Member Klare to close the Planning Board meeting of December 17, 2018 at 8:50pm.
SECOND was made by Member Stanise.
AYE Member Escallier
Member Stanise
Member Klare
Member Quinones
Member Zwarycz

NAY: -0-

Respectfully Submitted: ________________________________
Barbara Singer, Recording Secretary