

Town of Wallkill  
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

March 20, 2019

Members in Attendance: Gary Lake

Tom Hamilton, Clark Najac, Bill Capozella, Doug Dulgarian

J. Keegan, & A. Guattery,

Also in Attendance: Dick McGoey, MH&E PC, Consulting Engineer

Tad Barone, PB Attorney

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

7:30 PM – MEETING

1. Joshua Auto SP/SUP- 320 Highland Avenue (36-2-41.1) #33-16

J. O'Rourke

D. Higgins: Good evening, I'm David Higgins of Lanc and Tully Engineering and Surveying. I was here at the meeting a few weeks ago, covering for John Queenan on the project. One topic discussed was that there were still some objects out at the site that required some cleaning up. I believe they have been cleaned up. John also resubmitted the plans without revision because you might not have had the map at the last meeting.

D. McGoey: Yes, the easement wasn't straightened out on the map that I had.

D. Higgins: I think it said 10 foot easement on our property, and 10 foot on the other side.

G. Lake: So a few of us have been out there, and yes, some cleaning has been done. I do think a little more still needs to be done. I did meet with the building department today and there is still a slight disagreement with them as their court date was pushed back. They are waiting on us to give a site plan, which at that time will give them everything they need to enforce what they are in court for. With that understanding, I am going to go through the board. Doug?

D. Dulgarian: Well they have made an attempt to clean it up. As you stated, it seems to be a work in progress, but it is leaps and bounds better than it was initially. I have no problem moving forward with this project, I just hope that the property owner holds the applicants to the site plan that is approved. I hope that 6 months from now we won't go back to seeing unknown barrels stored, and outside storage around the building like it was a few weeks back. As long as Dick is happy with the plans I have no problem moving forward.

3/20/19  
PB Minutes

J. Keegan: It does look much better than it did. They're clearly making progress on it so I have no issues moving forward.

B. Capozella: I agree that it's definitely been cleaned up. Whether or not its 100% satisfactory to the building department is a different story, but there has been an improvement. In good faith, I don't have any issues right now.

C. Najac: As Doug stated, it has been cleaned to some degree, but the biggest concern is what will happen a few months down the road. Are we going to end up with the same issues? Overall though, it definitely looks a lot better than it did 2 months ago.

A. Guattery: It looks to me it has made these improvements because they are being forced. The concern to me is that we end up right back where we started. I have no issues.

T. Hamilton: I think if the owners had stopped by every now and then and looked at their properties, we wouldn't have this problem before us today. Also, it's not just that building; the building inspectors found cars with no license plates and so forth on their other buildings. If they make sure that their tenants are keeping it the way that it is approved, none of this would have happened. Now in front of Joshua's you're showing four spots? How to the repair these cars? There is nowhere to bring a car in the building, is nothing repaired inside?

D. Higgins: I think they may be moving them in when they are done, I'm not too sure though.

T. Hamilton: The problem there is that they have too many cars, and can't fix them in time so they are all piled all over the place. Is there an overhead door here?

D. Higgins: Yes there is, there is one.

T. Hamilton: What about the parking lot? Is it going to get paved and marked the way they are shown here? The way the cars were parked, it was unclear if there were even markings at all. That's all.

G. Lake: We've been going around with this for a long time. I'm going to propose that we move on and grant you the site plan, as is. I'm also going to propose that we give them 120 days as a little more grace period to finish doing what you need to do. I've already spoken to the building department and Mr. McGoey was there as well. After that point, you need to tell your client that the building department will have the tools to take them to court if necessary. Motion to approve the part 3 EAF subject to our comments, and the 120 day extension.

D. Dulgarian: Motion.

G. Lake: Andy, second?

A. Guattery: Second.

G. Lake: All in favor?

3/20/19  
PB Minutes

All: Aye.

G. Lake: Opposed, none. Motion for site plan special use permit subject to our comments.

A Guattery: Motion.

G. Lake: Bill, second?

B. Capozella: Second.

G. Lake: All in favor?

All: Aye

G. Lake: Opposed, none. Thank you.

2. Devitt Warehouse SP/SUP –599 East Main St. #90-18

J. Samuelson: Good Evening. My name is Jay Samuelson from Engineering Surveying Properties. As you said, we're here for a sketch plan approval, but I'd like to take a step back just to remind everyone of where we were. What we have here is the original plan that we had created for the entire site. For this proposed section of it, we have revised the full buildout section which is in what was submitted to you for this application. This includes the actual hotel which is currently under construction (the Holiday Inn), two of the pad sites, an additional hundred room hotel, and a 270,000 square foot warehouse. Again, for tonight, we're here solely for sketch plan on the layout of the warehouse on the 20 acre portion of the original site.

G. Lake: Are there any particular comments from Dick that you would want to discuss with the board right now?

J. Samuelson: No.

G. Lake: Okay why don't you tell us a bit about traffic before we go through the board?

J. Samuelson: As you remember, we were here last month regarding a project further up on East Main for the Distelburger Apartments. We did meet with the county after that planning board meeting to discuss the traffic and what the county is doing along East Main Street. The county has hired its own consultant who has put together a study. They have many recommendations for all of the projects, and will be meeting with all of the individual engineers for. Unfortunately no resolution came about because the biggest hold up right now is what is happening with the school. The school has put the plans out for bid but they have not made any decision to go forward in when they are making those improvements. The consultant has looked at other options and is talking to the school about trying to reconfigure some of their improvements to make it a little better than the way it is. They had some other ideas from what was originally approved so they are discussing that with the school. I'm not sure where that's going to

go or how long that is going to take, but we are slowly moving forward through the county process. The county is working on it but at this point in time, nothing has been resolved. That's where we are with the traffic issue. We know that this building will cause additional traffic from what we originally studied so we know we have to update the traffic study for this. From what I understand, the counties consultant has suggested that instead of having the horseshoe that the school has in the front, consolidate that to one entrance and move the horseshoe to the internal. This would create a longer queuing on sight for the busses, but only have them come in and out at the same location instead of one entrance and one exit.

D. Dulgarian: Is that school exit off of Schutt Extension a right exit only?

J. Samuelson: That answer I do not know. The rear exit is supposed to be for the parent pickup only, not for school busses. I don't know however if it is a right entrance or exit.

G. Lake: I realize you cannot speak for the school, but has there been any discussion with the school about traffic behind the school or putting up a light?

J. Samuelson: I can definitely speak with the counties consultant who's speaking with the school and pass the answer along.

G. Lake: Okay, Doug do you have anything to say?

D. Dulgarian: Obviously the traffic is the issue; we're all going to have to wait on this study. Will you be doing your own as well?

J. Samuelson: We'll be providing them with additional information based upon these new uses here.

D. Dulgarian: What are your "new uses?"

J. Samuelson: Right now our new use is this warehouse.

D. Dulgarian: Do you know what your 8,000 your 10,000 and your 3,000 pads are going to be?

J. Samuelson: No.

D. Dulgarian: Because if they are a coffee shop, or something along those lines, the intent of use is going to be greater than if it is a dentist. If it is retail it is not as many trips.

J. Samuelson: We are going to use the same worst case scenario as we did in the original seeker analysis of the entire site. The highest use of those pad sites is what we did the original analysis for.

D. Dulgarian: Is there any other 270,000 square foot warehouses around here that I can look at just to get an idea on the size? Anywhere in Orange County.

J. Samuelson: I will find something comparable and get back to you.

D. Dulgarian: That's all I have.

3/20/19  
PB Minutes

J. Keegan: I have no issue with the actual use; East Main Street is the only worry I have. I'm glad the county is going to look at it because with all this development and add in truck traffic, this could become an issue. That's my only concern going forward. That's all for now.

B. Capozella: I'm okay with the site plan.

C. Najac: The warehouse may help the traffic because you can change the timing of when people and trucks will come, and deter them from traveling here at peak hours.

A. Guattery: Does Mark have a tenant for this yet? Do we know what kind of property it may be?

J. Samuelson: He is in contract to sell it, but we do not know yet.

A. Guattery: I'm okay with it; we're just going to need some more info.

T. Hamilton: I'm okay with sketch, but we have a lot of questions that will have to be answered once this gets further along.

D. McGoey: Before you make a motion Gary, I'd just like to point out that there is going to have to be some pretty heavy landscaping. You're not leaving any buffer between this use and the residential use proposed right behind it on Dunning Road.

G. Lake: Motion for sketch approval.

D. Dulgarian: Motion.

G. Lake: Clark, second?

C. Najac: Second.

G. Lake: All in favor?

All: Aye.

G. Lake: Opposed, none. Thank you.

3. 45 Ridgewood Avenue 2 family SP/SUP – 45 Ridgewood Avenue (75-4-12) #20-19

G. Lake: I understand you guys bought this house thinking it was a two family?

P. Sullivan: Yes, that is correct. We purchased the property in May of 2018 from the financial institution as a two family. Currently the assessor has it listed as a two family, and we are being taxed as two family property. We just want to make sure we have all of the information and paperwork the building department does not have to make sure we are in compliance with town codes.

G. Lake: Let me go through the board and then we're going to set you a public hearing. Doug?

3/20/19

PB Minutes

D. Dulgarian: So how do the two different tenants gain entrance the house?

P. Sullivan: Currently it is only leased to one person. It is not leased to two tenants. There are two entrances though; the main entrance is subdivided into two different entrances. It is split into the upstairs and the downstairs.

D. Dulgarian: So when you come in that one front door on the right, you're saying it goes to two different doors inside?

P. Sullivan: Correct.

D. Dulgarian: My concern is that while a two family would it fit in this neighborhood, if you were to build a two family from scratch it would look nothing like this. There are certain hoops you have to jump through; it has to be accessible, there has to be correct parking. You're really supposed to have two separate entrances. Those are just my concerns as we move forward. I'm thinking it was a single family that someone illegally turned into a two family, and now we're looking to seek relief for something that was illegal. I don't feel great about this one.

J. Keegan: I agree with Doug, not only parking but just the way the house it set up in general is not really your typical two family style. I could see there being issues with the driveway; it's very tight and if you put two families in there, there's just not enough space. I'm concerned with that kind of stuff, but in terms of character of the neighborhood, there are plenty of other two families there.

B. Capozella: The unusual thing is that he is paying taxes on a two family house. Usually when you buy a home, you do a title search and the banks don't let you get away with anything. It is an unusual situation; I have to think about it.

C. Najac: So two families are not uncommon in that neighborhood. Has the building inspector gone into this building and made sure that it is even compliant to be a two family? If the building inspector has no issue, then I have no issue going to a public hearing because there are older homes in that neighborhood that are two families. I understand that every single two family home does not look like the brand new ideal home with two separate front doors. Gary do you know if the building inspector has gone in there?

P. Sullivan: Yes, we had a visit from the building inspector.

C. Najac: Gary, did you get a report on that?

G. Lake: No.

M. Hunt: Did you do a title search? Is that how this all came up?

P. Sullivan: We changed ownership back in November, from my personal name to an LLC. That is when the assessor had gone out and reported back to the building department.

3/20/19

PB Minutes

A. Guattery: I agree with Clark. I don't think this is a matter of bringing it up to current standards; I think this is just a matter of us stating whether or not it really is a two family. I think I would feel a lot better if we got a letter from the building department that says it is acceptable the way it is. At that point I would be okay with sending you out to public. If they say it's okay but there are improvements that need to be done, those need to be taken care of before we go too much further.

P. Sullivan: I'd just like to add that we did have a meeting with the engineer and we have the parking layout here. Frank Leva was involved and we have everything listed here in terms of size of parking spaces and how they should be laid out for a two family residence.

A. Guattery: As long as we check that, I'm okay.

T. Hamilton: I had a similar situation happen to a family member and in that case, there were codes not being met with window size in the bedroom. Small things like that are what you are really going to have to look for, there are many things that are going to go into this; it's not an easy task.

G. Lake: How many square feet is this house?

P. Sullivan: It's close to about 1,700 square feet. It is 1700 to 1800 square feet.

D. Dulgarian: Will you be bringing in a floorplan of what this looks like?

P. Sullivan: Yes, I can present that.

G. Lake: When you bought this house, your title search didn't pick up any of this?

P. Sullivan: I can definitely reach out to my lawyer and get that information.

A. Guattery: Tom brings up a good point. You bought this from a financial institution or bank, correct?

P. Sullivan: Correct.

A. Guattery: If they sold it to you as a two family, they should have also done a title search on this property as well. If they didn't pick it up, then your lawyer should have. You may have some legal standing here.

G. Lake: Motion for a public hearing April 17<sup>th</sup>.

B. Capozella: Motion.

G. Lake: Second?

J. Keegan: Second.

G. Lake: All in favor?

All: Aye.

3/20/19

PB Minutes

G. Lake: Opposed, none. Thank you.

4. 251 Highland Avenue SP/SUP- (39-13-4) #92-18

John: Good evening, my name is John and I will be speaking on behalf of my father. My father would like to make sure that he can open a deli store at 251 Highland Avenue.

G. Lake: You have been to a worksession with our engineer and there were a couple of things that need to be done in order for you to move forward. One of which was a used car lot that was to be removed from the site. To my understanding that has been taken care of, correct?

John: Yes.

G. Lake: Do you understand the comment about the dumpster enclosures? The dumpsters need to be enclosed wherever you place them.

John: Yes that is correct.

D. McGoey: Outside of the Auto shop is a truck. There is also a trailer outside and tires stored outside. It's not too bad, but they need to clean it up. There is also a drainage problem on the right side of the building. It is a muddy mess between you and Cumberland Farms. That needs to be cleaned up and fixed so that it drains on both sides of the building.

John: He acknowledges that, yes.

G. Lake: Let me go through the board. Doug?

D. Dulgarian: Dick isn't there an issue to the left side of the motor vehicle shop? I can't remember if it was drainage or whatnot but I remember a problem there.

A. Guattery: There's a sewer line there that comes from Watts Park. Its storm sewer that comes from the creek. When they put all the fields in and cut all the trees down they buried the streak that ran through there. It comes right through the boarder along the town and the city.

D. Dulgarian: So the motor vehicle is going to stay, just the used cars are going?

John: Yes, that is correct.

D. Dulgarian: Do the parking counts work?

D. McGoey: They are light in parking. After removal of the used cars it will be significantly better than it is now.

D. Dulgarian: I'm okay for right now, Gary can you come back to me?

J. Keegan: Getting rid of those cars will really improve the parking situation, so I have no issues.

3/20/19

PB Minutes

B. Capozella: I don't have any issue with the grocery store. My only concern is that this is partially in the city of Middletown. Can the town of Wallkill really enforce rules and regulations on the piece of the property that isn't out town?

T. Barone: They can still enforce it, because it is a condition of the use of the portion of the lot that is in the town of Wallkill.

B. Capozella: Okay. The attorney answered my question so I am okay.

C. Najac: So we're keeping the Chinese take-out and adding a deli/grocery, correct?

John: That is correct.

C. Najac: Are we adding a grease trap for the deli?

D. McGoey: There is a grease trap there already.

C. Najac: This is a grease trap for the Chinese take-out. Are we attaching the deli to that same grease trap?

John: We will be installing a new grease trap.

C. Najac: Will it have the capacity to handle both places?

D. McGoey: My understanding was that the existing grease trap was going to support both the deli and the take-out.

Owner of Property: We will be adding a new grease trap.

D. McGoey: That is not shown on your site plan and it needs to be. It is exterior to the building so it needs to be shown. We have to resolve that problem.

A. Guattery: What is proposed for behind the deli? You're also showing second floor office above the deli. Is that going to be in what used to be the apartment that is over the restaurant?

Owner of the Property: No.

A. Guattery: That's something new? That is the door and staircase you see in the middle of the deli.

D. McGoey: Is that not the entrance to the offices upstairs?

A. Guattery: If that is going upstairs then we need to look at that because there is no way that is conforming. That has safety issues all over the place. It used to be an apartment.

G. Lake: So is that an apartment now?

Owner of the Property: No.

3/20/19

PB Minutes

A. Guattery: I used to have to help dig up that grease trap constantly because it was always plugging up. If we add something more too it, that is going to be an issue. You're showing here, second floor office. You have that written on your site plan. If that is the same area you are talking about, then that is a no go. Not unless there has been an awful lot of work done.

T. Hamilton: We'll just have the building department go out and look at it. They might go in and say no way.

G. Lake: Dick, make sure on the new plans that it says no residential use, office use only. Doug, you asked to come back to you?

D. Dulgarian: There is nothing that states "no outside storage" on the plans for the automotive. I'd like to see that. I also need a little clarification on the parking counts. It seems to conflict a bit. It says there can be 5 overnight parking spots for vehicles in need of repair. It then states: "businesses total of ten." Are there one or two automotive businesses here?

A. Guattery: There is the garage and the used car lot.

D. Dulgarian: I thought the used car lot went away?

G. Lake: It is.

D. Dulgarian: Well that is not what we are approving. I just think the note has to be fixed to reflect 5 spaces, not 10. Is that correct?

D. McGoey: Yes.

D. Dulgarian: Then I am okay with just adding those two notes; no outside storage, limited to 5 overnight vehicles.

G. Lake: Motion for a part three EAF subject to our comments.

A. Guattery: Motion.

G. Lake: Bill, second?

B. Capozella: Second.

G. Lake: All in favor?

All: Aye.

G. Lake: Opposed, none. All in favor of site plan approval subject to our comments.

A. Guattery: Motion.

G. Lake: Tom?

3/20/19  
PB Minutes

T. Hamilton: second.

G. Lake: All in favor?

All: Aye.

G. Lake: Opposed, none. Call back in and meet with Mr. McGoey. He will go over everything you have to add to the plan. Thank you.

5. Countryside Meadows 2 lot SD Midland Lakes Road (24-1-4.4) \#21-19

J. Dillon: Good evening, I am Jim Dillon, Representing the applicant Countryside Meadows. What we are looking at here is a 13.7 acre parcel on the northwestern side of Midland Lakes Road. We would like to divide it into 2 residential lots. Everything is permitted and we have done the soil testing. We've preliminarily designed the whole job. In terms of the two driveways that we have shown, one is going to be 13% and one is going to be 15%. We could have made them less steep but if we did, more vegetation would be used to create the driveways. These houses are lined up with the neighboring houses to the left.

G. Lake: Was this part of another subdivision?

J. Dillon: I don't have a record of any other subdivisions so I would say no. There have been subdivisions on both sides of this project, but this was independent.

D. McGoey: I noticed there is already a driveway cut into there, correct?

J. Dillon: There is driveway, but that was created to access it. There also looked to me, to have been some preliminary grading years ago before we purchased it.

G. Lake: You're just looking for a sketch right now, correct?

J. Dillon: Correct.

D. McGoey: This stone wall that is along the proposed driveway in lot 2 should be preserved if you can.

J. Dillon: Okay.

G. Lake: Let me go through the board. Doug?

D. Dulgarian: Dick, the grade is okay on these driveways?

D. McGoey: The subdivision regulations allow you to exceed 10%.

D. Dulgarian: What is the site distance out at the road, do you know?

J. Dillon: I am going to be measuring them, but there is no problem there.

3/20/19

PB Minutes

D. Dulgarian: Everything else is fine. You're way above the minimums on everything, so I have no problem with a subdivision.

J. Keegan: It is a relatively minor subdivision. Are you going to be able to stay out of that wet area up front here?

J. Dillon: I have a federal worker with me that may be able to flag some of that property. There may be some of that which will be federal wetlands; I can show that in the future plans.

J. Keegan: I was just worried about the driveway; you'll have plenty of room?

J. Dillon: I don't think there will be any problems.

J. Keegan: Okay, then I am good.

B. Capozella: I'm okay with sketch.

C. Najac: Fine with sketch.

A. Guattery: Fine with sketch.

T. Hamilton: Fine with sketch.

G. Lake: Motion for approval of sketch so they can move on.

D. Dulgarian: Motion.

G. Lake: Jim, second?

J. Keegan: Second.

G. Lake: All in favor?

All: Aye.

G. Lake: Opposed, none. Thank you.

6. Tetz 2 lot SD – Rt. 17K (1-1-45.4 & 45.5) #22-19

Jagger: Good evening, I'm Jagger E. I am representing the applicant. The project is for a proposed lot line change. There are two existing parcels owned by the applicant on route 17 k, just south of the intersection on Stone Schoolhouse road. They are looking to reconfigure the lot lines. He would like to shift the lot line on the parcel with the pond closer to the building which would allow both lots to meet the minimum lot width requirements. He is going to then grant an access easement through the existing driveway, which would then serve both parcels. The parcel with the pond would have actual frontage along 17K.

3/20/19  
PB Minutes

G. Lake: Let me go through the board. Doug?

D. Dulgarian: Just so I'm clear, which property line is being deleted? Are you taking that whole line out?

Jagger: So the existing property line between the properties comes down on this dashed line. That line will go away and the proposed separation will be on his line down the middle. Instead of having one "L" shaped parcel, they will both be rectangular.

D. Dulgarian: All you're looking to do tonight is change that lot lie?

Jagger: That is what we submitted the application for. One other thing that Gary would like to do separately is to put a small addition on this building which we did not include on this application so if the board thinks we should run that separately, we will leave that up to you.

D. Dulgarian: Well as far as what you're looking for tonight, I have no issues at all.

J. Keegan: I think it cleans it up nicely, I have no issues.

B. Capozella: No issues.

C. Najac: No issues.

A. Guattery: No issues.

T. Hamilton: No issues.

G. Lake: Motion for part 3 EAF subject to our comments.

A. Guattery: Motion.

G. Lake: Bill, Second?

B. Capozella: Second.

G. Lake: All in favor?

All: Aye.

G. Lake: Motion for minor subdivision subject to our comments.

D. Dulgarian: Motion.

G. Lake: Andy, second?

A. Guattery: Second.

G. Lake: All in favor?

All: Aye.

G. Lake: Opposed, none. Thank you.

7. Middletown Plaza SP/SUP Modification (78-2-5.21) North Galleria Drive #58-12

D. Higgins: Good Evening, my name is David Higgins from Lanc and Tully Surveying. I do believe all the board members were here back in 2005 when we got the original approval on this project. It is for retail. One was also approved to be a restaurant with a grease trap in the back of the building. We came back in, in 2016 to change a few things around in the site plan. We had an approval in 2017, I believe for an extension which was granted. The owner has been marketing the property and one of the problems that we have faced, is that anyone who comes to look at the property wants better visibility of store fronts right on Galleria Drive. The other request is an entrance to get off of North Galleria drive before passing the building. The last plan stated that the building was one large building, and we had some jogs in the building that followed the building's setback. We received an acceptance from the town to allow us to have a connection off of North Galleria Drive direct. There are existing landscape islands and parking spaces for the shopping center. Basically, instead of having that jog configuration and an entrance in which you'd have to pass the building, we would like to move the entrance further from the traffic light. We would then push the front of the building back, adding more parking in front of the building and a little courtyard here. Doing this, we could have storefronts that face Galleria Drive. In the original plans we had something that could have a drive through. We have partially kept that, but we split the building off and provided drive access and parking spots on the side of the building. We believe this meets all the zoning requirements; it is just a matter of confirming the acceptability of the entrance here and those configurations.

G. Lake: The square footage is the same?

D. Higgins: Less actually. The last plan said 16,389, now it 10,312 square feet. We did lose a few parking spaces with the access lanes but we will provide parking calculations.

G. Lake: I don't think parking will be a problem. Let me go through the board. Doug?

D. Dulgarian: The intensity of the uses is lessened and I actually like the layout better. It does give visibility and people see store fronts as they drive by instead of blank walls. I like the entrance better. Dick the landscaping is okay?

D. McGoey: Yes.

D. Dulgarian: I have no problem with this, I think it's great.

J. Keegan: I like the entrance and the visibility. I'm okay with this plan as well.

B. Capozella: I'm okay with everything.

C. Najac: I like where the entrance has been moved, I think it will help with traffic flow. I am okay with this.

3/20/19  
PB Minutes

A. Guattery: It's definitely better, I have no issues.

T. Hamilton: Great.

G. Lake: Motion for site plan modification.

C. Najac: Motion.

G. Lake: Tom, second?

T. Hamilton: Second.

G. Lake: All in favor?

All: Aye.

G. Lake: Opposed, none. Thank you.

8. 404 East Main St. LLC SP/SUP- 404 East Main St. (75-6-2) #23-19

J. Dillon: Good evening, I'm Jim Dillon representing the applicant. The applicant, Danny Gleeson, is proposing to put a State Farm in this location. I believe this is a former auto sale company and has an existing garage in the back. We would like to just leave that the way it is as a garage and storage. He only wants to build a 1500 square foot building, and he wanted me to make sure that if he ever wanted to, he could make another 1500 square foot in the future. I made a layout, our application is only for the front building and the rest of the space will most likely be lawn or landscaping. All the parking will be in the back off of East Main Street exactly like we have it here. I will bring a rendering of what the building will look like in the future.

G. Lake: Along East Main Street, we've been asking for little stone features. Maybe give some thought to tie that in.

J. Dillon: I will talk to my landscaper about that.

G. Lake: Let me go through the board before I set your public hearing.

D. Dulgarian: I think the office building will be mundane and not add to too much traffic. I like the idea of a stone wall or some kind of stone work, even if it's out towards the corner. The only concern I have is the entrance off of East Main. For the amount of use, I'd like to see just the current Belmont Avenue use. There is not going to be many trips so I don't think a new road needs to be cut. Other than that, as long as the landscaping and existing garage looks okay, I have no problem.

J. Keegan: As an insurance company, there won't be much of a traffic problem. As long as the side of the building facing East Main looks okay, then I am okay with it.

B. Capozella: I'm okay with sketch. I like the usage.

3/20/19

PB Minutes

C. Najac: It would be nice to not have to have a driveway cut off to East Main. Either way that's up to you.

A. Guattery: The traffic on East Main Street is bad and with a left turn in, it will be horrific. I think that is the one thing to reconsider. I think you're going to find that 90% of people are going to use Belmont anyway. Other than that, I'm okay with it.

T. Hamilton: He could handle that more or less with the signage, directing people towards Belmont.

G. Lake: I understand what a problem East Main can be, but with the limited amount of traffic coming in and out, I don't see too much of a problem with having an entrance in East main.

D. Higgins: I'd like to talk to the county about it. I am very familiar with the traffic on East Main Street, but this is only going to have a couple cars.

D. Dulgarian: I think since it is such low intensity, it even behooves you more to use Belmont.

G. Lake: Okay, talk to the county and talk to your client. You've heard the board as a whole.

D. Dulgarian: Does he have an entrance on 211?

A. Guattery: He only has the entrance off of Cherry Street. It is a 211 address and it fronts 211, but the entrance is on Cherry Street. You can't get on to it from 211.

G. Lake: We'll put you on the May 1<sup>st</sup> meeting for a public hearing and if you feel you don't have enough time, we'll reschedule you to the next meeting date. Does that work?

D. Higgins: Yes, that works.

G. Lake: Motion to set a public hearing for May 1<sup>st</sup>.

B. Capozella: Motion.

G. Lake: Andy, second?

A. Guattery: Second.

G. Lake: All in Favor?

All: Aye.

G. Lake: Opposed, none. Thank you.

MEETING ADJOURNED.