

CITY OF AUBURN PLANNING BOARD
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2013 6:30 PM, MEMORIAL CITY HALL

Present: Sam Giangreco, Anne McCarthy, Tim Baroody, Crystal Cosentino, Sheli Graney, Frank Reginelli

Staff: Jennifer Haines, Director, OPED; Andrew Fusco, Corporation Counsel; Greg Gilfus, APD Traffic Coordinator; Brian Hicks, Code Enforcement Officer; Jeff Dygert, Fire Chief

Agenda Items: PUBLIC HEARINGS for minor subdivision at 292 North St., PUBLIC HEARING for minor subdivision at 38 Allen St., Minor Subdivision application review for 292 North Street, Minor Subdivision application review for 38 Allen Street, Major Site Plan Review for 38 Allen Street, Major Site Plan Review 1-7 State Street, Major Site Plan Review 318 Genesee Street.

Chair calls the meeting to order. The Pledge of Allegiance is recited. Roll is called.

Agenda Item 1: Approval of October 1, 2013 Meeting Minutes.

Chair asks for a motion to approve the minutes of the October 1, 2013 meeting. So moved by Anne McCarthy, seconded by Tim Baroody. All members vote approval. No members opposed. Motion carried.

Agenda Item 2: Application for Minor Subdivision of 292 North Street. Applicant: Blair Construction

Chair invites applicant to present the application.

Robert Barry, Attorney representing potential purchaser of the subdivision, Blair Longo- Mr. Longo owns the property that is on the proposed subdivision map in the lower left corner of the subdivision. He proposes to purchase the land to the east and north along North street that surrounds the property. What is unusual about our request is that we have not provided any remaining access on North Street. This parcel we are asking to purchase a part of, runs far to the east. I see that you have an ariel map. The reason we do not propose additional frontage is because it would not serve a purpose. If you look at your map, you would see that any property to the east is blocked by a large quarry, which many of you may be familiar with. Parts of the quarry has water in them but even the remaining land north of the water is a very large hole in the ground that is about 30-50 feet deep and does not provide any reasonable means of access to the property to the east, that the seller would be retaining. That property is accessed by a deeded right of way on the premises to the North, the former NFR processing plant, and there is a roadway there which is a 24 foot right of way that was retained when that property was spilt. That provides access across that property back to the other properties that are owned by the seller in this transaction. We are asking for a favor to that provision.

Chair opens Public Hearing.

Peter Corning, Representing Schooley Enterprises, owner of the property-The concern of the Planning Board, as I understand it, was that the revised plan did not include any access from North Street to the property. Mr. Longo is buying everything from where he owns on North Street, Northerly to the City line, which is to the property line. Refers to map. If you are looking at the property to the North of Mr. Longo's property the topography does not allow for that or make any sense. There is a right of way northerly of the property which is the road that went from NFR. Mr Schooley owns the parcel that is labeled 38 on my map but is located on the far right and at the top. The southerly boundary is basically the railroad. There is a 20-24 foot right of way between Longo and Wayco. Refers to the map. The water in the quarry goes from boundary to boundary so there is not a way to get to the eastern parcel of land

without using a boat. It can be done by using the NFR or Auburn metals road. Distributes pictures of property (looking from quarry to North Street). From the quarry looking westerly, what you see is about a 50 foot cliff. The first picture is looking southerly, on the right is North Street. The second was taken from the quarry and looks directly at North Street.

Anne McCarthy- the gravel road in the picture, is that the right of way?

Peter Corning- No it is not. That is just a road for the quarry. It is the bottom of the quarry. Basically everything to the right of those photographs is North Street. If you have a right of way or an easement of 60 feet it would, after about 30 feet, go off into a 100 foot quarry. Water prohibits access to the rear of the property.

Chair closes Public Hearing.

Chair asks staff for comments.

Jennifer Haines- Reviews Part II of SEQRA document. This is a single action agency as Corporation Counsel noted and recommend that the answer be no for coordinated review.

Andrew Fusco- Mr. Chairman we are seeking a motion of a Negative Declaration

Sam Giangreco- asks Board members for questions or comments

Frank Reginelli- What parties will be involved or be able to use the right of way?

Jennifer Haines- That will be a right of way for Mr. Schooley to access the back parcel.

Chair asks for a motion to approve the SEQRA Negative Declaration Resolution. Motioned by Crystal Cosentino, seconded by Anne McCarthy. All members vote approval. No members opposed. Motion carried.

Chair asks for a motion to approve the Minor Subdivision Resolution. Motioned by Tim Baroody, seconded by Crystal Cosentino. All members vote approval. No members opposed. Motion carried.

Agenda Item 3: Application for Minor Subdivision of 38 Allen Street. Applicant: Auburn Industrial Development Authority

Chair invites applicant to present the application.

Jim Dacey, Chair of Auburn Industrial Development Authority (AIDA) - The site in question is a 20.99 acre parcel on Allen Street and the request is to subdivide 6.44 acres.

Jennifer Haines- This subdivision is also related to the site plan that is following. This would be to sell to Mack Studios from AIDA.

Chair opens Public Hearing

None

Chair closes the Public Hearing

Chair asks staff for comment

Jennifer Haines- Tonight we are asking the Planning Board to declare its intent to be lead agency for SEQRA. This application requires coordinated review. The SEQRA will be voted on at the next Planning Board meeting and the SEQRA will be coordinated with the Site Plan Review application that will be presented following.

Andy Fusco- Who is the applicant? The IDA?

Jennifer Haines- Yes, for the subdivision

Chair asks Planning Board members for comments or questions

None

Agenda Item 4: Application for Major Site Plan Review for the construction of a 50,000 square foot pre-engineered one story metal building at 38 Allen Street. Applicant: Mack Studios, Inc.

Bill Murphy, Space Architectural Studios- A lot has transpired since we were last in front of your board. Currently Mack studios is in negotiation to reach an agreement to gain a portion of the AIDA land, which is to the South of the current Mack Studios. Previously we were in front of this board to expand Mack Studios to the North and the wetlands that were on the site encumbered that proposal. We have provided a preliminary site plan to the Board for review. We have been working with our civil engineer, Rudy Zona, developing a SWPP plan. I turned those plans to Jenny tonight for staff to further review.

The proposal to the south of the current Mack Studios site would be across Allen Street (displays large site plan map) We are proposing a driveway in and a fire access road down one side of the building along with a drive in overhead door and two loading bay doors reached via a separate drive. There is a small break room and rest room in the front of the building and the rest would be used for open pallet storage and staging of trucks to be shipped from Mack Studios. Also included is the grading plan. We have cleaned out the corner of the site (points to map) for a storm retention area to catch our runoff from the building.

Andy Fusco- The environmental issues that arose across the street, on the site that you were first considering, is that relevant here? Such as the habitat of bats?

Bill Murphy- The bats are associated with the wetlands. I cannot speak for the Army Corps or DEC but the wetlands that were on the previous site are not on this site.

Andy Fusco- So there is not a wetland on this site

Bill Murphy- There are no wetlands on the current site

Andy Fusco- Mr. Dacey, one of the things your agency will need to do is a new SEQRA form since the State recently released the new forms. One of the questions that are on the new forms is the potential for flooding. Is that something that someone has thought about?

Bill Murphy- Being that there is a ridge on the site, the water flows from top down, and I do not foresee flooding to be an issue on this site. We have created a very large storm retention area here that is designed by our civil engineer by today's standards for the amount of the roof on the building as well as the parking area. So I do not feel flooding will be a concern at all because of the grade and the new retention area.

Andy Fusco- Very good. We will need that new Part I of the EAF to send to the other involved agencies. Mr. Dacey if you could please send that to us ASAP that would be appreciated.

Tim Baroody- I am sure that if Mr. Zona is preparing a SWPP before it gets a letter or notice of intent from the DEC that will have to be developed for a 100 yr. flood.

Chair opens Public to be Heard.

None

Chair closes Public to be Heard.

Chair asks staff for comments.

Jennifer Haines- Tonight we are asking the Board to declare its intent to be lead agency for SEQRA. We will work with the applicants to make sure the new SEQRA forms are being used.

Andy Fusco- The only reason I ask that is because it is going to be a different form circulated for coordination. The questions on the new form are similar to the old form but specifically the flooding question was not on previously. I feel comfortable circulating the form consistent with what is here before us and what Mr. Murphy has said on the record.

Chair asks Board members for questions.

Chair asks for a motion to adopt the SEQRA Lead Agency Resolution. Motion made by Sheli Graney second by Crystal Cosentino. All members vote approval. No members opposed. Motion carried.

Agenda Item 5: Application for Major Site Plan Review for the construction of a 12,500 square foot theater building at 1-7 State Street. Applicant: Cayuga Community College.

Chair invites applicant to introduce the project

Wendy Marsh, Hancock and Estabrook LLC, Syracuse, representing Cayuga Community College- Since we were here last month the public comment period ended for the conditioned negative declaration that was issued by City Council for the project. City Council reviewed the comments that were received and made no changes to the conditioned negative declaration. That officially completed the SEQRA process for the project. I forwarded copies of the negative declaration to each of the members of the board. At this point the board is in the position to make a decision on the pending application.

Karin Green, JMZ Architects and Planners, Glens Falls- Displays the site plan and 1st floor plan. In October we talked about the size of the building, frontage on State Street and the egress alley that allows patrons to exit to State Street. Shows first floor plan and points to the emergency exit that goes into the egress court. The egress court is about 30 feet long and there was a concern that one end did not lead to an opening and could we ensure that occupants make the right choice in terms of the direction to exit to State Street. We briefly talked about the possibility of a fence with a gate and we had subsequent discussions with code enforcement about that idea and there was some concern that a gate or fence might hinder emergency personnel. We will be able to direct patrons with additional lighting and directional signage. We are proposing to have exit directional signage with additional illumination inside the theater space.

Tim Baroody- Codes did not want a gate on State Street because of emergency personnel getting through?

Brian Hicks- The gate was to the rear of the alley, not to the State Street side

Crystal Cosentino- That door (the emergency exit door from the theater) is only for emergencies, right? It is not going to be open during intermission.

Karin Green- The intent is for emergency egress only. Yes.

Frank Reginelli- Is that walk way going to be concrete?

Karin Green- It is going to be asphalt paving.

Frank Reginelli- Is there a possibility to add arrows on the walkway?

Karin Green- Yes, that would be possible.

Karin Green- There is a gate at State Street and it is wide enough for emergency personnel to get through.

Jennifer Haines- So there is a gate on State Street but no gate to the right of the emergency door going towards the back.

Karin Green- There is a gate at State Street but we are not proposing a gate near the egress of the theater.

Sam Giangreco-The public meeting was left open from the October meeting. Are there any members of the public wishing to be heard?

Justin Hoffman, Camardo Law Firm, 127 Genesee Street- Distributes documents to Board members. Last time we outlined a number of our concerns in a document. Both myself and traffic engineer Jim Neapolitan spoke on our various concerns regarding the project. I would like to go over a few others right now. As you will see in the first document I gave you this evening, marked in green is our building and at the rear of our building, shown in blue, is the beginning of what is an alley way. The blue portion is our property which leads to the portion marked in red, which is a right of way for the occupants of the neighboring buildings. This right of way also serves as a fire connection and in the red portion there is a blue circle. If you flip onto the next page you will see what looks like a loading dock that the college is proposing to install at the rear of the theater that will extend approximately about 9 ½ feet onto the alley way. When it is deployed it will substantially block our ability to exit the rear of our building. So in the event of a fire or other emergency situation and we cannot exit out the front of our building, it could lead to a very dangerous situation. On the 3rd page, circled in red, at the front of the theater on State Street, the area circled in red is the boundary line for the College's property and circled in blue is a portion of the second and third floors of the theater which extends out over State Street onto City property. It is unclear on how the college has the authority to build over the City property. Now, back to the first page, on the right hand side there is a large red circle where the college's boundary line is and then on State Street, you will see a significant amount of work being done. The College has attempted to avoid certain requirements for the width of State Street. A building that is 30 feet tall is required under the fire code requires 26 feet of unobstructed access. As you will see in the hand drawn picture (4th page) the street is at its widest point only 31 foot 8 inches wide. Now including parking on both sides there would only be 11 foot 8 inches in access. Now with parking on one side of the street, there is only 21 foot 8 inches in access. So in order to have this theater, there cannot be parking on both sides of the street. It is my understanding that there has been an attempt to get an exception to the fire code under 503 which I have provided to you. You will see exception two which is the exception that the college has attempted to fit this project under is explaining that fire apparatus access roads cannot be installed because the location on property, topography, waterways, non-negotiable grades or other similar conditions is equipped with sprinkler systems in accordance to 903311 and approved alternative means of fire protection is provided. It is my understanding that they are attempting to say that because the College does not own State Street, they have no authority to make changes to its condition. Now as I showed before on the first page you will see a significant amount of work done on State Street. In addition the City Council was the Lead Agency under SEQRA and did in fact have authority to authorize changes to State Street. It is our understanding that in order to have this exception applied; the college needs to go to the State, which it is

our understanding that it has not been done. On the last page of the packet I gave you, it states: No town, village, city or county nor State agency can be in charge of the administration of this code, waive, modify or otherwise alter any provision of this code unless approved by the State Fire Prevention and Building Code Council in accordance with section 379 article 18.

Kevin Cox, Camardo Law Firm, and 127 Genesee Street- Distributes pages from AECC Soil Vapor and Intrusion Sampling Report, the Memorandum and Order of the Supreme Court of the State of New York Appellate Division, Fourth Judicial Court and Judge Polito's Decision to Board members. Our concerns are with the soil and water. In the first excerpt I have provided is an excerpt from the soil and water intrusion report done by AECC in February 2011. As you can see at the top it recognizes the fact that there is possible historic leaching of cleaning solutions that were spilled at the time the Kalet building was there when they use to store, clean, and repair furs. So, the City was aware of that and as you can see on the second page when the SEQRA was put together back in February of 2011, it says that the City is part of the site planning and building permit review process, which we are in right now, will ensure that any state or locally required monitoring or mitigation measures are included as part of the redevelopment of the subject site. Now as the Planning Board may be aware, this case has a long history and ended up in court and eventually made its way into Rochester to the Appellate Division and I have included that decision. Now the Appellate Division addressed this issue of the soil and water contamination. At the bottom of the first page they recognized "Respondent recognized that additional environmental monitoring to the property after demolition was recommended because of the possibility of contaminants on the property." The Appellate Division then went on to say when face with a potential future impact, respondent should have issued a conditioned negative declaration. That's where we are at right now, which is appropriate for this unlisted action. It goes onto say that the conditioned negative declaration is going to modify the proposed action so that no significant adverse environmental impacts will result. The case made its way back to Judge Polito and in Judge Polito's decision he said until acted upon by the City, its coordinated review and plan adopted on February 18, 2011, is still intact. I believe that date is incorrect. I think it is referring to February 24, 2011. However, the City cannot proceed as adopted unless it acts in accordance with Appellate Division's decision as a coordinated negative declaration with the appropriate notices and opportunity for public comment no EIS is required and it goes on to say that the plan also requires site approval by the City Planning Board. So what Judge Polito recognized and what I am saying to you is that the Appellate Division pointed out the fact that this initial plan that recognizes contaminants in the soil and water and what is going to address these concerns is still intact. It is something that has to be addressed as part of this process. On the last page there is an excerpt from the EAF form which recognizes that you have 1,400 tons of soil being taken from this site. 1,400 tons of potentially contaminated soil and potentially contaminated ground water under that soil and nothing to date has been done to address that problem and I would submit to you the Appellate and Judge's intention of the ruling is that it is supposed to be addressed during the site review process. If it's not this review I would assume it would be incomplete and improper.

Jennifer Haines- I have a letter to read into the record.

Jay and Kim Pearson, 12 State Street- I had anticipated attending the meeting of the Planning Board this evening, but my schedule has changed and I will not be able to attend. I am hoping this e-mail will be presented to the Planning Board for consideration during your discussions.

First 1-7 State Street: As a representative of downtown Auburn business and property owners, we strongly urge the Planning Board to approve development of 1-7 State Street. The positive economic and social aspects of this project cannot be ignored. We have not seen such vibrancy in downtown Auburn for at least 20 years. People are living, attending performances at Auburn Public Theater and frequenting the various businesses and restaurants. We have lived and owned a business in downtown for 40 years and this revitalization has been long needed.

We also have complete confidence that the Fire Department has made the right decision regarding the ability to answer any emergency calls to State Street. The structure and fire safety aspects of the building seem to go far beyond what is necessary to keep the neighborhood safe. This project is a Win, Win situation for Auburn, New York.

In a separate e-mail I have forwarded you a copy of a petition of over 1100 signatures (along with comments) urging the City Council and Planning Board to approve construction of the home of the Schwartz Family Performing Arts Center.

Mack Studios: We support the expansion of Mack Studios in Technology Park. This industrial expansion must be viewed as a positive development in the City by increasing employment and adding to the City's tax base. We strongly encourage the City Planning Board to support these projects.

The petition with comments was distributed to Board members.

Bill Murphy- Is there a roof planned above the alley way or will that be open to the elements.

Karin Green- the egress court is open.

Chair closes Public to be Heard.

Sam Giangreco- Counsel has asked to be excused for a few minutes.

Chair requests a five minute recess.

Five minute recess ends and Chair asks for comments.

Tim Baroody- I am familiar with AECC. Did they give you an analytical report on what they tested? Their report states that the indoor samples were below OSHA standards and because they found some carbon tetrachloride, TC III, they suggested further testing. There is nothing here to alarm anyone and nothing to throw a flag up. If you have the analytical report for me to review, I work with these every day and I would be happy to review it, but right now it is saying that it is not that bad, unless you have something else to show me.

Kevin Cox- I do not have the analytical report with me today, but I would be happy to get that to you. Our interpretation of what the Appellate Division decision was is that the soil and the water has to be looked for any potential contamination. It has not been done to date.

Tim Baroody- AECC is saying that this is within standards now if you an analytical that says different or something should be monitored or a plan from them that says something different, this document from them is telling me it's okay.

Kevin Cox- We can get you the full report if the Board would like to table this until next time

Tim Baroody- I do not think this is a reason top table this if this is their summary

Kevin Cox- This report was issued and the Appellate Division and Judge Polito obviously felt differently

Jennifer Haines- Mr. Fusco, for the items brought up during the public hearing, what items does the Planning Board have to consider as part of the site plan? Was this issue addressed by the Council as part of the environmental review, is this something that needs to be addressed by the Planning Board or as part of the site plan. What items need to be addressed by this Board?

Andrew Fusco- Certainly things along the line of the matters raised by Mr. Hoffman concerning access and the overhang are part of the site plan review. The matters raised by Mr. Cox are somewhat different. The removal of soils do not really go to the review of the site plan but the architect or the developer would be prepared to say that there are certain devices built into the structure which are intended to mitigate and vent what might be the sources of vapors which I interpret as the decision of the fourth department. Those types of things are related to the things that Mr. Cox raised and would go to the issue of some type of site plan or building plan approval.

Tim Baroody- If I can comment on the vapor intrusion. After have gone to the last half a dozen meeting held by the Department of Environmental Conservation and the EPA, vapor intrusion is not a requirement yet, it's being written. However, the suggestions made by AECC make sense and are pretty common construction practices. If they are reusing the existing slab to cover it with a vapor barrier is fine. Or if they remove it, to use a vapor barrier before you pour concrete, which the architect would do anyway. As far as the overhang, I see it falls between the building and the sidewalk. It's not on the street.

Andrew Fusco- The overhanging is what they referred to as a living marque. I think we are all familiar with the uses of a marque off of the front of theater type buildings. The Schine's across the street is the best example.

Tim Baroody- That would be a Codes issue.

Andrew Fusco- Codes is here tonight.

Jennifer Haines- The issue that was raised related to the fire code. We do have the Fire Chief here and it was also discussed at length during the Environmental Review process that was completed by the Council.

Andrew Fusco- Mr. Hoffman did raise the propriety or lack of propriety over the exception which the applicant is reliant. The Fire Chief and Codes is here to answer any questions the board may have.

Sheli Graney- Is there anything in here that has not been discussed before? Is there anything new?

Wendy Marsh- I empathize with the board because you are the last one's hearing these issues and you are hearing a lot of these issues for the second time, since they were raised at the last Planning Board meeting. All of these issues were vetted by City Council numerous times and hours and specific to the soil issues, the City Council took a look at all of the AECC reports and the conditioned negative declaration actually goes through all of the conclusions of those reports and based upon those reports, the College had voluntarily agreed to put in a sub-slab depressurization system and that is what we believed the conditioned meant, that you need a condition declaration to require that sub slab depressurization system. So even though the analytical report that one of the Board members referenced and said that it was not required, we voluntarily put that in and that was the condition that was subject to the public comment. So everything that has been submitted to you has been reviewed by City Council before the issued the conditioned negative declaration. It was provided to them again during the public comment period, they reviewed it again before the agreed to make no changes to the conditioned negative declaration. These issues have also been in front of the Zoning Board of Appeals. These issues have been vetted by other boards and you are not the first ones seeing these issues.

Andrew Fusco- I think I have been to all of the meetings and the one thing I have heard tonight that is new is the raised concern about the living marque. Also, Mr. Hoffman has talked about the different devices in the alleyway and his client's ability to get in and out of there, while that is not a new argument, that has been raised previously but with the red circles and the cross hatches before us tonight is the first time I have seen that. The rest of this is not new to me because I have been to these meetings but that should not control your decision.

Sheli Graney- I agree

Anne McCarthy- The loading dock area that has been checked by the fire department and codes?

Andrew Fusco- The loading area in the back and various doors has been an ongoing concern that was articulated from the very first case that Mr. Camardo brought. So the concern by Mr. Camardo regarding access or blocking access is not new.

Jennifer Haines- Karin can you talk about how the loading dock in the back is going to work?

Tim Baroody- From what I understand the dock is retractable. It is only going to be down when they are loading and unloading.

Karin Green- Yes, that is correct. The area in question, the double doors at the back of the stage is only going to be used occasionally for setting up a show, loading and unloading. It is a very finite time for unloading and then the dock would be retracted. It is not down for continually down for long periods of time. Its intent is periodic access.

Sheli Graney- How long for it to go down and then back up? Should there be an emergency in Mr. Camardo's building would you be able to move it for the fire trucks?

Karin Green- It is a matter of 30 seconds

Andy Fusco- What is the width that remains in the alley way?

Karin Green- in the down position, it appears to be a little over half of the width of the alley.

Andrew Fusco- The reason why I ask this is because that issue, the dock and access, came up during zoning board of appeals and was discussed but it should be explained to this Board as well.

Wendy Marsh- One of the ZBA members works in the area and had knowledge of the amount of deliveries back there. That was one of the discussions they had for the variance on the building. They saw this as similar to the deliveries that were in the back area. The deliveries to Parkers and such are probably much more frequent than the shows change out.

Frank Reginelli- As far as the parties of the adjoining properties, who has the right to utilize that right of way?

Andrew Fusco- The alley way is owned by the City. The title to everything back there was an issue for the first and second of the lawsuits so until you get to the blue hatched mark area on the map that Mr. Hoffman supplied us with, my recollection is that the City owns that and so it is used by all. There is no restriction as to who can use it.

Tim Baroody- So it is City owned but Camardo has a right of way

Andrew Fusco- We have never restricted Mr. Camardo's ability to drive in there or the ability of the beer trucks or the ability of Red Cross.

Frank Reginelli- The alley way there, a good portion of it is owned by the City at the present.

Andrew Fusco- I do not think Mr. Camardo has a right of way. He uses it, we do not stop him from using it. A right of way is a deeded device that is either reserved or given.

Frank Reginelli- Mr. Cox, does Camardo have a right of way?

Kevin Cox- Yes Mr. Camardo owns approximately 15 feet coming out from the end of his building and then has a right of way to the alley way going out.

Chair asks for a motion to adopt the Major Site Plan Resolution. Motion made by Tim Baroody second by Anne McCarthy. All members vote approval with Frank Reginelli abstaining. Motion carried.

Andrew Fusco- Is there a reason for the abstention?

Frank Reginelli- I am not clear on the right of way issue. If a person has a right of way, only those people should use the right of way. There has not been any clarification on whether the theater can use that right of way. Secondly, we are talking about this fire apparatus where the State has an ordinance. Who is really in charge? Does the State supersede local or can the local variance supersede the State? I am not against the theater; I would like to see that theater go up. All obstacles should be cleared and I can't see any reason why the parties involved can't sit down and iron this thing out and get this going. It is causing a lot of controversy, a lot of ill feeling and putting people in the middle that do not deserve to be in the middle of such a confrontation. This should have been settled a long time ago. Those are the reasons why I am abstaining.

Agenda Item 5: Application for Major Site Plan Review for the construction of a 14,000 square foot warehouse building at 318 Genesee Street. Applicant: Mark Peters, Coffee Host.

Chair invites applicant to introduce the project.

Daniel Long, Architect representing Mr. Peters- Coffee Host is looking to construct a new storage building for existing equipment at his site. We have a preliminary site plan and based on the feedback we received from the Director of Planning and Economic Development we have some items that we need to address to move forward and gain approval for this particular site plan review. One of the items was the submission of an updated survey. Mr. Peters has contracted with a surveyor to update his property and as you are aware Rite Aid recently developed the corner and in conjunction with that a property swap happened. Mr. Peters supplied a portion of his property to the Northeast corner to allow ingress and egress in common with Rite Aid and in exchange for that Rite Aid provided his property with additional property to the South which was the pre-existing railroad bed. That has allowed Mr. Peters to look at constructing another storage building. There will not be any electric in it, there will not be a bathroom space. It is just a shell to store most of what he currently has on site. With this facility we are hoping to reduce the amount of man hours that is involved in staging, de staging, and storing from all of the storage containers he has on site. We are trying to consolidate that. To speak specifically about the access, a lot of the trucks that are there now, the ingress and egress are not going to change. Some of the storage containers will be cleaned up where the loading docks are proposed and trucks will be able to access the party equipment from there. We are also proposing on the north east side of the building creating an area on that side to park his vehicles. We are cognizant of the fire separation between the buildings. We are proposing a minimum of 10 feet and Mr. Hicks will be able to speak to that. These are basically pole barns to keep the equipment dry and safe. As far as storm water, some of the area is crusher run stone but we are planning a detention area with an overflow into the existing storm sewer. We would like the runoff from the roof to go into the old railroad area that is and allow to percolate into the soil there. As far as utilities are concerned, there may be minimal exit sign lighting but nothing more than that.

Chair opens public to be heard.

None

Chair closes public to be heard.

Chair ask Staff for comments

Jennifer Haines- Tonight we asked Coffee Host to introduce the project. SEQRA does not require coordination so we will handle that at the next meeting along with the consideration of the final site plan. We are anticipating more detailed information for the next meeting.

Chair asks for board questions.

None.

Other Matters:

The date of the next Planning Board meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 3, 2013 at 6:30p.m.

Motion to adjourn by Crystal Cosentino, seconded by Sheli Graney. All members vote approval. None opposed. Meeting adjourned.

Respectively Submitted by Renee Jensen