

APPROVED:
MOTION BY: **SECONDED BY:**
AYES: **NAYS:** **ABSTENTIONS:** **ABSENT:**
DISTRIBUTION: OFFICIAL MINUTES BOOK – TOWN CLERK – BLDG DEPT.

Certification of Receipt	
By: _____	
Rosaria Peplow, Town Clerk	
Date: _____	

WORKSHOP MINUTES
TOWN OF LLOYD PLANNING BOARD

Thursday, March 17, 2016

CALL TO ORDER TIME: 5:30pm

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ATTENDANCE **Present:** Dave Plavchak, Lawrence Hammond, William Ogden, Peter Brooks, Scott McCord, Fred Pizzuto, Carl DiLorenzo, Nicki Anzivina, Dave Barton; Building Department Director, Teresa Bakner; Planning Board Attorney
Absent: Brad Scott

ANNOUNCEMENTS: GENERAL, NO SMOKING, LOCATION OF FIRE EXITS, ROOM CAPACITY IS 49, PURSUANT TO NYS FIRE SAFETY REGULATIONS. PLEASE TURN OFF ALL CELL PHONES.

Old Business

Mt. Triumphant Church; 1377 Route 44-55, Commercial Site Plan SBL#94.4-1-9, in A zone.

The applicant proposes to demolish an existing 1,456 s.f. structure and construct a 40' x60' church assembly hall with associated parking, and septic system. The proposed will include a kitchen, bathrooms, a 50 seat dining area and a small office.

Andrew Willingham of Willingham Engineering, the applicant's representative, was present for the meeting. The Board reviewed revised site plan maps.

In review of Morris Associates comments dated March 15, 2015 (see attached) the following was discussed:

- 1) Andy W. met with Dave Corrigan (with Department of Transportation) who had the same concerns as stated in Morris' comments. The DOT does not require curbing just cut pavement and landscaped area to define the entrance.
- 2) Andy W. is working on Department of Health approvals.
- 3) The site plan has been sent to the Fire Chief in Highland and will be sent to the Fire Chief in Clintondale.
- 4) Andy W. will adjust the pipe slope.
- 5) See number 1) above.
- 6) Light detail has been submitted. There are two flood lights that will need to be replaced with shielded lights.
- 7) Only two regular garbage cans will be used, and the location is shown on the map.
- 8) Lighting is shown on the site plan.

The Board had no additional comments.

At next week's meeting the Board anticipates new map updates and setting of the public hearing for next month.

New Public Hearings

Erichsen's Auto Service; 8 Lumen Ln., Commercial Site Plan SBL#88.1-6-10, in GB zone.

The applicant is requesting site plan approval to put up a fence at their property located on Lumen Lane to use for the increase in business at their shop located at 170 State Route 299.

The Board reviewed maps but would like to have note number 10, about the storage containers, depicted on the map showing more information on the trailers and locations.

The public hearing is set for next week March 24, 2016.

Administrative Business

Conceptual

Highland Auto; 3443 Route 9W, Commercial Site Plan SBL#88.1-4-16.100 in GB zone.

The applicant would like site plan approval to operate at this parcel for the purpose of retail car sales. The intent is to use the site and the building as they exist and to make cosmetic improvements needed.

Signs at the entrance and on the building are also proposed.

Ed Loedy, Architect P.C., was present on behalf of the applicant Highland Auto. The applicant does not have the letter of agent yet from the owner of the property but wanted to show conceptual maps to the Board.

This is the old Getty station on Route 9W.

Ed Loedy: I have been retained to handle this project for Mr. Cespedes. He owns Highland Auto Sales Inc. and advises that he is in contract with Haven Realty who owns this parcel. Mr. Cespedes has had some difficulty getting the letter of agent from the property owner who lives in Manhattan.

The Board reviewed conceptual maps.

Mr. Loedy: This site has had the old tanks removed and I understand that the DEC (Department of Environmental Conservation) has given their approval that this was done properly. My client would like to use the site as it exists with cosmetic improvements. There is a DOT (Department of Transportation) right of way out in front of the building and he will have to deal with them as far as making improvements on the right of way. We showed the delineated spaces mostly for the purpose of showing how many cars we could fit on the lot. I am not sure how he would like to display the cars. Would you insist on the striping of parking spaces?

Dave B: The handicapped spaces would need to have striping.

The Board reviewed the bulk requirement regulations put on the map.

The Board discussed whether the paved surfaces are included in the building coverage requirement.

Peter: I think there is confusion on what coverage means and I think it means building size not paved area size.

Larry: I think year round business need to have paved areas.

Mr. Loedy: If your code requires paving he will have to pave it or decide what he would like to do. I cannot speak for him.

The Board discussed clean up of the site and the paving suggesting that the paved area should be in the center of the lot with the perimeter left unpaved. Packed gravel does count as impervious surface.

Dave B: In the GB there is no maximum building coverage but that would fall under the 40% minus the parking. After you subtract out the parking from the 40% you would get the size of your building. Here is the dilemma with this lot; if this was a new building 40% would be the maximum and I do not think you would allow this use to exist on this site because with the building you would have only 10 cars (approximately).

This site has been the same for 40 years since Getty was there and has not been in use for 15 years. At first I was thinking the requested 68% coverage was a lot but it is not the 79.3% that it was. Because this exists already I think I would be okay letting this go at 68%, but that is up to you guys.

Bill: You may want to show the graveled areas because that is good drainage.

Ed Loedy: That is a good point because drainage is always a super important fact. There is a lot of pervious area on this site because it is not paved otherwise everything would run off and there is only one catch basin. Actually there were two catch basins, I guess if the first one overflows it would run down to the second one. The applicant would like to use the lighting that is there now. There are two pole lights. I know we will need to work on the shielding. The sign is proposed to be in place of where the former sign stood; unless he requests a variance for a bigger sign it will meet regulations. He will be requesting an internally lit sign more details will follow.

The Board would like additional information on the clean up, paving, landscaping, lighting and signage.

Jeff: There would be no need for a dumpster or anything?

Mr. Loedy: I have done dealerships, mostly new car dealerships, this will be a used car dealership and he has told me that there will not be any work done on site. Other than people bringing in their lunch there should not be much garbage.

Ed Loedy: Would you consider a grassed area instead of pavement?

Dave: If he did go with grass and fluids were leaking we would call DEC.

Carl: That is why you should stay with blacktop.

The Board anticipates the letter of agent to continue with this site plan.

Old Business

Walker, Desmond; 3945 Route 9W, Commercial Site Plan SBL#95.4-1-18, in HBD zone.

The applicant would like to move his currently established business, Ultimate Auto Inc., from 512 Route 299 to a new location at 3545 Rt. 9W.

New maps dated March 17, 2016 were reviewed by the Board.

Wesley Walker, applicant, was present for the meeting.

Dave B: In our code you are allowed to replace an old trailer with a new trailer. This is almost like two different sites because of the elevations, from a code perspective; I am comfortable with letting them have a trailer in the back (Perkinsville Rd.) with the business in the front (9W access). The front trailer on 9W (which is pre-existing and overhangs the property boundary) will be removed.

Wesley: There is not enough space on this lot so we are not requesting approval for an impound yard. Cars will still be towed for repairs.

Peter: The DOT is okay with this?

Dave: He already has the cut; nothing is changing so it does not need to go back to the DOT.

Wesley: I would like to put the sign from the Route 299 shop on this property, I met up with the guys from DOT and we walked off the distance so they are okay with the placement they said I need the okay from the Town and then it gets sent back to them. It will go where the existing sign is now.

The Board requested the applicant use shielding for the proposed lighting.

The Board anticipates SEQR and setting of the public hearing next week. The public hearing will be set for April 28, 2016.

New Public Hearings

Purdy, Robert, Lily Lake Rd, Special Use Permit SBL#79.4-1-22.110, in R1 zone.

The applicant is requesting a special use permit for timber harvest 47 acres of his 50.1 acre parcel.

The Board anticipates follow up regarding Indiana Bat Habitats.

The public hearing is set for next week March 24, 2106.

Administrative Business

The Board discussed training classes.

Dave Plavchak has been taking some of the online classes and recommends them.

Dave P. thanked Nicki Anzivina for putting together a checklist of the step by step process for filing maps with the County. Nicki just went through the process with her own lot line revision.

PRD – Planned Residential District discussion.

The Board reviewed a draft of the revised PRD code. This is a compilation of modifications the Board discussed. There are a lot of modifications from the original that was started with. The Planning Board will submit a red lined version to the Town Board for review when they are done.

The Board believes the general regulations are in line with the comprehensive plan and the first paragraph was redone to answer what is trying to be accomplished.

The Board discussion included the following;

PRD's in existing or proposed municipal water and sewer lines only?

Is open space needed to be left undeveloped for community use? If so how much?

The Planning Board requested a timeline showing the progression of a PRD application.

Limiting commercial activities permitted within a PRD.

Prohibited uses and structures: Any use or structure not specifically permitted. (If it is not on the plan it will not be allowed)

Bulk Regulations – Minimum setbacks to the property line; should it be the height of the tallest proposed building or 35 ft. or whichever is greater? If R ¼ has only a 30 ft. setback why would this be greater?

The Board agrees that where the PRD is may make a difference but setting a minimum set back may a good idea. The Board likes flexibility but does not want to step on their own toes in the future. The Board is considering 15 ft. as a minimum setback which can be adjusted by the Planning Board depending on site conditions.

Maximum lot coverage should not be more than 70% of the site acreage.

Maximum building height is 35 ft.

A **Motion** to adjourn was made by Fred Pizzuto, seconded by William Ogden. All ayes. 7:25pm