

WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES
TOWN OF LLOYD PLANNING BOARD

Thursday, October 21, 2021

CALL TO ORDER TIME: 5:32pm

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

OFFICIALLY OPEN THE MEETING

Via Webex

Attendance: Board members: Scott McCarthy, Larry Hammond, Charly Long, Gerry Marion, Franco Zani, Carl DiLorenzo, Claire Winslow (Town Board, came in at 6:02 pm); Board staff: Dave Barton, Paul Van Cott, Andy Learn and Sarah Van Nostrand.

Absent: Sal Cuciti

Minutes to Approve

September 16, 2021 and September 23, 2021

Old Business:

Peppino's Foods: Amended Site Plan: 304 Station Rd. SBL: 86.4-1-22

Applicant is seeking an amended site plan originally approved on 3/21/02 to delete the 12 parking spaces on the north side of the building and add 18 parking spaces on the east side of the building.

Review Status: Updated Site Plan and response to CPL comments circulated.

Dave said that he sent the applicant a letter, stating that they have to go to the ZBA for relief associated with 100-15 (B)(11), which requires a 50-foot minimum buffer from actively farmed agricultural use, in a certified agricultural zone. The property to the east and south is ag-district number 1 and is also in the Town of Lloyd Ag zone.

Phil (applicant's agent) replied that they are working on making a submission to the ZBA.

New Business

2007 Route 9W LLC: Commercial Site Plan: 10 Lumen Lane, SBL: 88.1-6-1.100

Applicant is proposing an expansion of use at the commercial site at 10 Lumen Lane Highland, NY, SBL 88.1-6-1.100. The proposal includes the addition of a 15,000 sq.ft. warehouse building to the parcel existing office/warehouse use on site. The new building shall be accessed through the existing parking area and be provided with additional parking. The site is serviced by municipal water and on-site subsurface sanitary treatment facilities. An expansion of the existing sanitary facilities is proposed to accommodate the connection of bathroom facilities and additional staffing requirements.

Review Status: Application and site plan circulated to board.

Nadine (applicant's agent) said that the site was developed and has warehouses and offices currently, the applicant would like to add a warehouse which will be accessed through the existing parking area. The applicant is proposing more parking. They plan to expand the septic system for the bathrooms that will be provided, but they have not submitted to the Department of Health yet as they wanted to see what the board thought.

Dave mentioned that the board was going to need elevations for the building and landscaping around the building.

Nadine replied that the landscaping was going to be on the west and south side of the building as only those sides would be visible from 9W.

Dave asked if they had a photometric plan?

Nadine replied not yet, but the applicant is looking to use the same or similar lights that are on the buildings now.

Andy said that he wants to take a closer look at the original site plan to make sure that they are not building over stormwater management. There seems to be a lot of drainage going through this property and wants to make sure that all the culverts are all correctly sized. He thinks there is a 60-inch culvert on NYS lands that leads to the back of the building, so they might want to raise the elevation of the building. Would like to know about tree clearing and how many trees will have to be removed. They will also need to provide truck turning movements to make sure fire trucks will be able to get into the site and up the driveway. It seems that the disturbance will be over 1-acre, so a SWPPP will be required. Health department approval will also be required. Also, there seems to be wetland symbols south of the building on the site plan, so he would like a wetland biologist take a look at it, to make sure there are no federal wetlands. For the lighting, cut sheets will need to be provided and they will have to be fully shielded.

Nadine asked if for the lighting, the board need a full photometric plan or just the cut sheets?

Andy replied a full photometric plan.

Nadine agreed that there is a lot of existing drainage on the site, where the building is being proposed is high and dry. She will get the board more information on the existing drainage.

Scott asked if there was enough parking, handicap parking and access?

Nadine said that they have more parking than the town requires for the square footage and that she will add handicap parking for the new building.

Larry asked if this project was near the battery storage area?

Dave replied yes, just south of it.

Nadine asked if they were going to be on the agenda for next week, and then continue to get the information that the board requested?

Dave replied that correct, as he won't be able to send up to the county until the board has some of the missing information. The county will ask about New York State Flex Energy Code and about anyway to incorporate it into the building. They will also, mention dark-sky standards. The County will also want some indication that the SWPPP is being under way.

Suleiman, Saman: Subdivision: 465 Red Top Rd. SBL: 88.1-2-4.110

Applicant is seeking a subdivision of a 36.6-acre parcel into a 7.02-acre lot and a 29.5-acre lot. Proposed lot 1 will be a 7.02-acre lot with an existing house, well and septic system. Proposed lot 2 will be the remaining lands, a 29.5-acre vacant lot upon which no construction is proposed at this time.

Review Status: Application and maps circulated to board.

Patti (applicant's agent) said that it is a 2-lot subdivision on approximately 36.5-acres on the southernly side of Red Top Rd. There is an existing single-family dwelling on the property where the applicant resides. He is proposing to subdivide that out on a 7-acre lot, she believes that he is conveying lot 2 to his brothers.

Lombardo, David: Special Use Permit: 8 Sheep Ln. SBL: 95.2-3-7.100

Applicant is proposing a small-scale ground mount solar, hidden from the neighborhood on a 7-acre parcel. Array will be 20' x 40'.

Review Status: Application and site plan circulated to board.

Sean (applicant's agent) said that it is going to be a small ground-mount within the setbacks, not visible to anyone driving down Sheep Lane.

Dave said that the array is hidden in the woods. There is nothing in the back of the property, also, Sheep Lane makes a curve here, so the house is in the back. The key for ground-mount solar is visibility to the neighbors.

Gerry asked if there is any battery storage?

Sean replied there is no battery storage.

Dave asked if the max height of the array was about 10 feet?

Sean replied yes.

Public Hearings

Stewart's: Site plan review: 3733 Route 9W: SBL: 96.9-1-33.100 in Highway Business District

Applicant is proposing a new typical Stewart's Shops convenience store (3,850 sq. ft.) with self-service gasoline.

SEQRA Status: Type II

Review Status: Updated site plan and SWPPP response circulated to board.

Dave mentioned that at the Town Board meeting the night before approved CPL to do a map planning report. When the report is done, it will clarify to the Town Board any issues with the water & sewer extension.

Andy asked if the Highway Super, and DOT had anything more to say about the entrances and exits? He also mentioned that the SWPPP was in pretty good shape. The fire truck routing, should be coming into the site from 9W.

Bill mentioned that he was still concerned about the Chapel Hill entrance and if the applicant has looked into it.

Tyler replied that he would have Ken (a part of the applicant's team) on at the next meeting to update the board.

Paul mentioned that the board should be aware that the ZBA has been sued challenging their determination to grant the area variances for the project, but doesn't affect the Planning Board review.

Andy mentioned that the board should make sure they are okay with the landscape plan that is proposed.

Tyler showed the landscaping plan and walked the board through it. Due to a water line running along the south side of the property they had to be careful about how many trees are planted.

There will be an almond color fence, six feet high that will go in front of the trees on the South Chapel Hill side. In the north corner they have some low landscaping beds. The big issue is sight distance, so they made sure the plantings wouldn't affect anyone circulating in and out of the site. On the other corner you have the same thing, there are a couple of larger trees.

Andy said he wants to make sure the board is okay as the code reads there has to be a dense vegetive buffer along all residential areas.

Scott replied that along South Chapel Hill the landscaping is a little bare.

Tyler said they can look into more landscaping, but are somewhat limited as their stormwater stuff is back there.

Carl asked if the gas deliveries would still be in off-peak hours.

Tyler replied absolutely as they are the owner/operator, they build, design and supply their own stations, they have control over when deliveries take place, so they can make sure it won't be during a peak hour.

Carl said that it doesn't seem that the site can be screen all that well from the houses, so he would like to know if they can mix it with stockade fencing and trees?

Tyler replied that they have proposed a six-foot high cream color fence. He can look into additional plantings to make the buffer thicker.

Rozzi, Thomas-Subdivision; Station Rd., SBL #86.4-3-3.1

Applicant is seeking a 3-lot subdivision on existing 26 acres on Station Rd.

SEQRA Status: Unlisted Action.

Potential Action: None, need applicant response to workshop discussion.

Mountainside Woods-Lot Line Revision, 1 & 3 Emerson Terrace, SBL #87.21-1-25 & 87.21-1-26

Applicant is seeking a lot line revision for purpose of meeting set back requirements.

SEQRA Status: Type II Action

Review Status: Application submitted and circulated to Board.

Costantino, Raymond- Subdivision, 136 Bellevue Rd., SBL #88.1-3-24.114

Applicant is seeking a two-lot subdivision if a 7.43-acre vacant lot to create a 2.76 acre, and a 4.67-acre parcel with a proposed house, well and septic system on each lot.

SEQRA Status: Unlisted Action

Review Status: Updated map received and circulated to the Board.

AT&T- Lot Line Revision, Illinois Mountain, SBL #87.4-5-24.100 and 87.4-5-4.112

Applicant AT&T Communications is the owner of a 23.09-acre parcel (SBL 87.4-5-24.100) and a 2.81-acre parcel (SBL 87.4-5-4.112) located on Illinois Mountain. It is proposed that the 23.09-acre parcel will convey 0.5 acres to the 2.81 parcel to create an unencumbered vacant 22.59-acre parcel. The resultant 3.31-acre lot contains communication facilities and no new construction is proposed.

SEQRA Status: Type II Action

Review Status: Updated map received and circulated to the Board.

JTK Management- Site Plan, 86 North Rd., SBL #88.1-4-21

The applicant proposes construction of two two-family dwellings on the property. It is located primarily in the R-1/2 zone, and is located in a mixed-use area of single-family residences, multi-family residences and businesses. Each dwelling will be serviced by Town of Lloyd municipal water and sewer service.

SEQRA Status: Unlisted Action

Review Status: Updated site plan circulated to board.

Other Business

Scott mentioned that Dave had written a letter in response to the parking situation at The Villages, the setback in the parking area. The concern of the board was whether or not the parking met the zoning codes that were set forth in the zoning code.

Dave said his determination focuses on the front yard setback question relating to parking. It was pointed out correctly that the code does read that no parking is allowed in the front yard setback, however in the code the front yard setback can be adjusted to prevailing setbacks in the area. Most of the other properties up and down 9W the parking is all in the front yard setback zone. Also, in the code the parking has to be minimally invasive, which is one of the standards for a special use permit. According to 100-29 (b) suggests that it should have good landscaping, which the board has done. In his determination the board has considered all the impacts and did a full environmental review on it and found no adverse environmental impacts, which is due to the landscaping, fencing a retaining wall to hide some of the parking.

Motion to Adjourn.