

***Town of Southeast
Architectural Review Board
1 Main Street
Brewster, NY 10509***

Minutes – April 22, 2020

THIS MEETING WAS HELD VIA ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCING

PRESENT: Mary Larkin, Chair
Thomas Frasca
Virginia Stephens
Katherine Weber
Carla Lucchino
Victoria Desidero, Administrative Assistant
Ashley Ley, Town Planner

ABSENT:

CALL TO ORDER: 7 p.m.

AGENDA: Pledge of Allegiance

1. PALMER SITE PLAN, 2334 Route 6, (Tax Map ID 56.-1-10) – Review of an Application for Site Plan Amendment

This was a review of an application for Site Plan Amendment as referred by the Planning Board. The application contained the following documents:

1. ARB Application, prepared by JR Folchetti & Associates, dated 3/6/20
2. Statement of Use, prepared by JR Folchetti & Associates, dated October 2019
3. G, Sheet 4 of 6, Landscaping Plan, prepared by JR Folchetti & Associates, dated October 2019
4. G, Sheet 1 of 2, Existing Conditions & Removals, prepared by JR Folchetti & Associates, dated June 2018
5. G, Sheet 2 of 2, Site Layout, prepared by JR Folchetti & Associates, dated June 2018
6. SD-1, New Garage Construction, prepared by Elevated Design Works, LLC, dated 2/8/20
7. SD-2, New Garage Construction, prepared by Elevated Design Works, LLC, dated 2/8/20

Sean Hamilton of JR Folchetti & Associates represented his client.

Mr. Hamilton: I am here.

Chair Larkin: We can hear you, but we can't see you.

Mr. Hamilton: I saw myself earlier. Not sure what happened. Do you want me to go ahead and present?

Chair Larkin: Can you see the screen?

Mr. Hamilton: Yes, I can see the screen. I can see everybody. It's just a... I even saw myself, but I guess it didn't transfer through. But with your OK, I'll go ahead.

So, I am Sean Hamilton from J. Robert Folchetti & Associates, here on behalf of Mr. Palmer in regards to 2334 Carmel Avenue. So, the gist of the project is that he has a 900 sq. ft. shed on his site. He is looking to replace it with a 2,080 sq. ft. garage. It's within 300 ft. of the Middlebranch Reservoir and because of that we had to incorporate a green roof onto the proposed garage. In July 2019, we submitted plans and calcs to the DEP (NYS Department of Environmental Protection) for a green roof and in October they approved them. In December we went in front of the Planning Board and got approval and got... AKRF recommended a Neg Dec under SEQRA and that refers us to the ARB. So that's how we are here tonight and if you have any questions, I am more than happy to answer them for you.

Chair Larkin: Well, I have a number of questions. I have... a lot of them got straightened out this afternoon. It was a Statement of Use plan that was from October and it wasn't updated so I was reviewing that. That's what was included in the packet and so a lot of my comments have been resolved this afternoon after speaking with (Town Planner) Ashley and (Secretary) Victoria. The first question that I had had to do with the trailers which you've explained and I believe what was sent in the e-mail that we received this evening... and I'm just telling this to the rest of the Board... is that there are two storage trailers that are going to be removed and that there are two job site trailers that will remain. And my understanding is those job site trailers should be registered...

Mr. Hamilton: They are indeed registered and they both have license plates and the owner is not with me tonight, but he would be more than happy to get you that information if that's...

Chair Larkin: Right. So that shouldn't be a Building Department violation, but I'll leave that to the Building Department. So that takes care of the trailers. The fencing was addressed this afternoon. I believe you changed the site plan... landscaping plan. It wasn't updated with a new date but (inaudible) I think a fencing detail that none of the Board has seen.

Mr. Hamilton: Correct. No that was a clerical error on my part and if you go to the October submissions, it was included in the site plan and it was a mistake by my part when we went to resubmit in December, we had put the sheet 4 from months ago back on instead of the updated Sheet 4 with the six-foot stockade fence.

Chair Larkin: Right. So, for the Board to understand, the stockade fence portion of what you just had on there, Ashley, if you go back to the previous screen. Right there. That stockade fence detail was not included in our submission so...

Mr. Hamilton: Correct.

Chair Larkin: So, we are now looking at it and that's what I would want you to have any comments on. It is a six-foot high wood stockade fence and I don't believe it is going to be painted. It doesn't say it is going to be painted. It would just be...

Mr. Hamilton: Yeah, (inaudible) but slightly to the left on that plan, it will delineate where the red line with the x's... will delineate where we are looking to put it. It does not specify whether it is painted or not, but I think...

Chair Larkin: Correct. That delineated line is in our submission so there is going to be both landscape as well as a wood stockade fence.

Mr. Hamilton: Correct.

Chair Larkin: So, I am just going to go through my list and then the rest of the Board members can help with their comments. The lighting... you gave us a spec with a flood light, and I am going to leave that to Ashley to tell us what the Code is, whether it complies with the Code. The roof mechanicals, you can't have roof mechanicals because of your green roof and you are right now deciding whether you are not... you're not going to have any HC in the building at this time?

Mr. Hamilton: It still has not been resolved whether or not the owner will like the

garage to be heated during the winter months. He did express interest in it and I think that is something we should look at down the road but,, at the moment he is still undecided whether he is not... We did throw in your comments earlier today that the Statement of Use and the architectural drawings did not correlate. Where the architectural drawings... the second floor is a storage area and in our Statement of Use from months ago, it was an office. Originally it was supposed to be an office and then plans changed and they are using it as storage for now, so we'll get back to you on... They don't have a need to heat the place really unless they really want to keep everything in there... you know keep anything in there from freezing but you know...

Chair Larkin: Well, this is what made this application very hard to review because I started reviewing it as an office and I started reviewing it with... you know... it was just very confusing today. The thing I am concerned about and, Ashley, you can tell me... when they want to add utilities where do they... where do we find out like the location of the propane tanks, how is it going to be landscaped or site protected. Where does that come into play? Do they have to get a Building Permit?

Town Planner Ashley Ley: Well, they definitely have to get a Building Permit and then the Building Inspector would review whether or not what they are adding would trigger ARB or Planning Board review. If they were going to be adding like a large concrete pad outside the building that a propane tank was going to be on or a generator, that typically triggers minor site plan review and would then get referred to the ARB. If any of the improvements on the outside of the building were valued greater than \$5,000.00 that would also get referred to the ARB.

Chair Larkin: OK. A concern I have is you have loading docks in the rear of the building but there is no... it looks like grass to me... where the loading docks are. So, how does that work if you have to have pervious land, but you have loading docks? Obviously... how does that go together?

Mr. Hamilton: Correct. I think it's um... we have to consult with the architect again. I thought that earlier today. I don't... I believe the only entrances should have been in the front of the proposed garage. The only thing I can think of is if the owner and architect discussed amongst themselves that (Inaudible) to have a two-way in and out garage, not necessarily to unload trucks in there but to... if you are pulling out a water tank... water heater or something out that door but um... It is something I can definitely get back to you on and confirm the...

Chair Larkin: But they wouldn't be loading... the issue I am triggering is the DEP with the sensitivity that pervious versus impervious on the site and having the loading docks there, naturally it's going to become an area of parking things. I believe that rear part is where the bike path is, right Victoria?

Secretary Desidero: Right.

Mr. Hamilton: It is (inaudible) feet away but yeah... um...

Chair Larkin: So, it's naturally... you are not proposing any landscaping there so it is not logical where those loading docks are. Unless you really are going to have loading docks with green lawn, and they are not going to be utilized. So, that's a question that I have. The last question I have is the Western Red Cedars are a good choice, but I think they should be... I think the quantity of 17 and planting them 15 ft. apart is a little too sparse. They only grow at maximum about 5 ft. wide so I think it should be more like a 28 to 30 count in order to (inaudible) the masking that you want there. So those were all my comments. I will go through them again if you wish but I wanted to then let the Board know all of my concerns and then we will go in order of how we sit which will be Katherine, Tom, Ginny and Carla. So, Katherine do you have... what are your concerns?

Boardmember Weber: I am just looking at the last e-mail we got this evening and

they are calling out Arborvitae instead of Cedar so I just... if the engineer can clarify for us what they want to plant?

Chair Larkin: Arborvitae is Thuja and Thuja is also known as Western Red Cedar. It's not a true Cedar.

Boardmember Weber: Oh, got it.

Chair Larkin: The common name is Western Red Cedar. Thuja is an Arborvitae so it's the same thing.

Boardmember Weber: OK. Then I am clear.

Chair Larkin: And it is the most deer-resistant of Arborvitaes.

Boardmember Weber: And I guess my other question was the open side of the roof facing the bike path: is that a necessity for that being a green roof? Is there a drainage function?

Mr. Hamilton: Yeah, exactly. So, there is a drainage... it needs a nominal slope, generally like an eighth of an inch per foot or a quarter inch per foot. So, when the soil is like 75% saturated, then it goes down to this collection system which then takes it off the roof. So, if it is not being used by plants, it is going to lead to the edge of the roof and then it will be brought down to the ground with gutters.

Boardmember Weber: You know I... There is a lot of traffic on the bike path so despite that being the back of the property I think there is probably a lot of visibility there.

Mr. Hamilton: I mean if we are putting 17 trees in the back and the six-foot fence... the bike path being uphill gradient of the garage I don't see it affecting the bike path at all. Um... and we have 17 trees there and that may be going up to 20 to 30 so aesthetically and hydrologically I don't think its affecting the bike path at all.

Boardmember Weber: Right. What's the height differential... like how high... what's the elevation on the bike path relative to the building?

Mr. Hamilton: The bike path is about 134... sorry I don't know off the top of my head the topo there. So, the bike path is about 134 and the building is... the building would be approximately 120 ft. so it is about a 14 ft. elevation.

Boardmember Weber: OK. So, the building... the top of the building will be basically be level or slightly under the bike path.

Mr. Hamilton: Slightly above the bike path... probably about 10 ft. and we've been... an 8 ft. height on the Western Red Cedars so then we spec-ed out 15 ft. on center but it is looking like we are going to change that to 20 or 30 trees so that will be brought in as well.

Boardmember Weber: Yeah, I think increasing the density of that screen would probably be a good thing. Just because you kind of have the least attractive side of that building facing the bike path which does receive a lot of traffic.

Mr. Hamilton: OK.

Chair Larkin: Now that green roof is going to have succulents that should be about Zone 4... Succulents take Zone 4 to about Zone 5 so it will be a true green living roof and I do believe that it's better to have that open drainage system. They have to have that so that it is not (inaudible) or it can cause problems with ice damming if you don't have that open parapet. It is very particularly constructed by a subcontractor who installs it. It is not someone who goes up on the roof and plants succulents. (Laughing) It is done with specific modules and it will be very pretty if it's done correctly. If it is not done correctly, its gonna die and they are going to have to do it correctly so it's not a bad view. I think it is almost a nicer view than the parapet.

Boardmember Weber: OK.

Chair Larkin: If you know what I mean. But I do want to clarify on those loading dock doors because that could be a problem. Tom, do you have questions?

Boardmember Frasca: Yeah, I do, a couple. And I'll echo your concern. You don't

put a loading dock in unless you (inaudible). So, I am assuming that the reason why it is not shown in the drawing, because it is showing grass which will mitigate more stormwater but, again, assuming you are going to use them, have you considered using like a grass block and how would that affect the overall (inaudible)?

Mr. Hamilton: I can go back to the owner. I wish he was here tonight but that was a conversation that was probably made between the architect and himself where... I can go back to him and say, 'Hey, loading docks out in back... no good.' Or we do the pervious pavers or something where it meets DEP standards. We actually exceeded the DEP standards where not only do we have no increase in the runoff on the site, we had a decrease in the runoff from the site as shown on one of the plans that are the green areas that we are replacing that were paved or we are replacing with seed and soil.

Boardmember Frasca: No, I understand why you exceed the standards because you are not really addressing the access to the loading docks.

Mr. Hamilton: Correct. Correct.

Boardmember Frasca: But if you paved that, it wouldn't work and so I could see it using the grass pavers similar to the deli down the road. The other thing is, Mary, what is the survivability of this roof? I mean do you just plant grass? Does it eventually fill with weeds? Does it pick up wildflowers or... I am not really clear on this.

Chair Larkin: It's very specifically done by a subcontractor. It has to be maintained. They do grow weeds so it has to be weeded but you plant in it sedum, which is a low grow ground cover that will... over time and it's meant to be maintained once a year. It has to be maintained.

Boardmember Frasca: How do you stop it... like... how deep is it so that (inaudible) a frost area of 3 ft.?

Chair Larkin: No, no, no. It's a shallow roof, shallow roots in trays. There are trays that are about 4 ft. by 6 ft. and they are placed and the plants grow in the trays with drainage so it is not like you are planting a garden on top of an EPDM flat roof. And they are very expensive so if they don't follow the instructions and have somebody maintain them, they are going to be spending all the money again. So, its not an easy, cheap way of doing things. It's uh... they're committed.

Ms. Ley: They have to do the green roof because of DEP regulations and creating additional impervious surface near the reservoir.

Boardmember Frasca: Right. So, Ashley, then what the DEP looks at this every year? Every six months? I am just curious.

Ms. Ley: I am not sure what the inspection period would be on that.

Boardmember Frasca: Well, those are my concerns. You know maintenance and also the fact that if somebody puts in loading docks, they are going to use them. So, I think we need to see that detail in the drawings and have that (inaudible).

Chair Larkin: I'm sorry, Tom, I'm not hearing what you are saying.

Boardmember Frasca: I'm sorry. Can you hear me now?

Chair Larkin: Yes.

Boardmember Frasca: You know, I think that if you put a loading dock... loading dock garage doors you are going to use it. That's the point. So, if that intent is there, I think they are going to have to show how they are going to access them and what materials would be used: grass, gravel, pavers...

Chair Larkin: Oh, you are there... Well, I am opting to... removing the loading dock doors.

Boardmember Frasca: Well, that's one way of looking at it and the other way is if you are going to access it, can they...

Chair Larkin: Well, if they are going to keep them then they have to do what you

suggest... some way maintaining the perviousness.

Boardmember Frasca: Right. And then I ask Ashley do you have to look at the stormwater again?

Chair Larkin: Again? Right.

Mr. Hamilton: Ashley, if I may, can you keep this screen on the page? You see the trapezoids and rectangles on the bottom right side of your screen? That area is currently impervious surface that we are replacing. So, if we are talking about adding in 20 more feet of impervious surface, extending the outdoor storage area to include those rear loading docks, it should be a quick and relatively easy process to get DEP approval. I don't have the figure on the top of my head, but we are hundreds of square feet over the impervious... under the impervious surface requirement. So, adding on that 20 ft... 30 extra feet to get that loading bays in... Ideally, we didn't put them on the plans, we didn't think they would go on the back but I guess the architect and the owner had a different opinion so, if it is something he really wants to do, I know we have enough impervious surface to add onto that and put some pavers in there but I'm not against saying 'hey, you can only load and unload from the front side of this building,' you know?

Chair Larkin: So, what I am trying to understand is are we reviewing the building as it stands right now and we're asking how is the access... where is the access? There is no access. It's grass.

Mr. Hamilton: I... yeah. The access... so yeah.

Chair Larkin: My other concern is and as we all know this has been quite a spot for unsightly storage the whole... and that's why we are doing all this. So, that back area I'm a little sensitive to and don't want it to become another place to store stuff. So, I'm not really sure how to handle that if we were thinking we were going to approve something tonight, which I am trying to work with this application. We haven't talked too much about the building itself as far as the aesthetics of the building, so I forgot to go into that with my comments. Ginny, I'll touch back on that. Ginny, do you want to give us your comments?

Boardmember Stephens: Um, yeah, I don't want to echo...

Chair Larkin: Tom, are you done?

Boardmember Frasca: Well, so far we haven't addressed the building but my big concern is... as I stated... if you have loading docks to be used then I don't understand how they are going to be accessed and it's not really clear on the site plan.

Chair Larkin: It is not clear. OK, Ginny?

Boardmember Stephens: Well, I don't want to echo what everyone else has said but I will say I think we had an incomplete plan... packet I should say, up until about 6 o'clock and I really find that annoying. That always happens with the ARB that everybody thinks you know, it's gonna be fine. So, um, I am rather resentful that at 6 o'clock we were reviewing everything that was questioned about this plan: the lighting, the loading dock, etc. I would definitely be on the 'what is the deal with this loading dock situation' as well and then I think we should probably go into the structure of the building without further ado. That's my sentiment.

Boardmember Frasca: You know, actually I just got a chance to minimize you guys and read the notes so (inaudible).

Chair Larkin: Carla, do you want to weigh in on your comments?

Boardmember Lucchino: Yes, thanks Mary. I had two questions and they were about the building. First of all, I drove by on the road to take a look and I don't think that garage is visible from Route 6, is that correct, Sean?

Mr. Hamilton: Yeah, its pretty tough... um, it's pretty hard to see if from back there. Yeah, you have to really slow down and take a (inaudible) from the driveway and

there is vegetation between Route 6 and their property line. There is a drainage swale and whatnot between their property and the house and a... You know there is an existing structure on the site already that is already kind of blocking the rear of the site... the proposed garage.

Boardmember Lucchino: OK. And my second question: the colors in the picture that we are looking at on the screen; are those true to what is expected for the finished product?

Mr. Hamilton: Yeah, what the architect had called out was dark gray vinyl and asphalt charcoal or charcoal colored asphalt shingles so that is a pretty good idea of what it is going to look like.

Boardmember Lucchino: And the doors are white?

Mr. Hamilton: It did not specify on the architect's drawings but if I had to take a guess I would say yes, white.

Boardmember Lucchino: OK. That's what it looks like in the pictures so sometimes what we see on the screen it is not always what it is in actuality, so I appreciate the clarification. And I also agree with all the previous concerns. I think the loading dock is a showstopper so um... Mary back over to you.

Chair Larkin: So, I just want to clarify something. On the exterior elevations, its SV-2, it states the colors are dark gray on the vertical and dark gray on the horizontal so that would mean that they are the same color and that is different than the color rendering that you just had (inaudible). So Carla was asking if the colors are true meaning on the colored rendering the vertical siding was much darker, the horizontal was a pale gray giving it a nice deviation so we need to know in order to document this properly what the colors are. I would go according to the elevation plan which is the dark gray on both which is not preferable, in my opinion. So, the comment that I wanted to do was break up those side... I like the way you broke up the front elevation with the vertical and the horizontal. Is there a way we could do that on both side elevations as well? It doesn't necessarily have to be on the back unless we take off the loading... if we take out the loading docks then it should be followed through. But it shouldn't be that much of a cost difference to do the nice deviation between the vertical and the horizontal that you have in the front and carry that around to the sides.

Mr. Hamilton: OK. I see what you are saying. Yes.

Chair Larkin: There is one side that has no windows and that's a little odd. If I was a neighboring property, that's just such a blank slate that we usually try to avoid. So, I didn't know how the Board felt about adding windows in there... that does add cost. If we do the deviation in the siding with the vertical and the horizontal, that adds some interest there.

Mr. Hamilton: OK. It is definitely something I'll run by the owner and the architect.

Chair Larkin: So, it would be preferable to add windows; it would be preferable to do the deviation of siding all the way around and it would be... I think the gist of the Board is the back docks... we are asking for them to be eliminated.

Mr. Hamilton: OK.

Chair Larkin: Um... so...

Ms. Desidero: Madam Chair? This is Victoria. The Chairman of the Planning Board would like to know if he can ask a question?

Chair Larkin: Yes. Tom is he here?

Ms. Desidero: He is and I will unmute him.

Boardmember Frasca: That's a dangerous thing to do.
(Laughter)

Ms. Desidero: Mr. LaPerch, I unmuted you.

Planning Board Chairman Tom LaPerch: OK. Can you hear me?

Chair Larkin: Yes.

Mr. LaPerch: All right. First of all, thank you for allowing me to have a comment here, Mary, very kind of you. First of all, I am very involved in this application because it seems to have been over a year that this has been just lingering and, Virginia, I agree with you 100% that you received this comment letter at 6 o'clock tonight..

Boardmember Stephens: Yes.

Mr. LaPerch: It is disgraceful to me and I don't understand, Sean, why it took... why you delivered it so late after a year and a half you guys working on this application. So, I'm annoyed with that... that this Board doesn't have a longer time period to review it. And, secondly, I don't get this... to me... there's three or four issues that you are avoiding here. This property is packed with cars and trucks for the last 10 years and we've been looking at this application for a year and this is the best you can do? The visual impact on 22 is horrible... it's horrible. And you deliver a package at 6 o'clock to this Board and you expect them to kind of comment on it? I think it is disgraceful. I just don't get that you would... this late in the game that you would present something like this. Ashley, I have two questions: the adjoining property to this he also owns: is this in play?

Ms. Ley: The only application that's before both the Planning Board and the ARB right now is this property right here. This is the property that has the violation on it. And this property is supposed to be moving all of the trailers and storage trucks off the property as part of this application and there is a fence with a gate being proposed right here.

Mr. LaPerch: To do what? What's the gate for?

Ms. Ley: To control the access between the properties.

Mr. LaPerch: Shouldn't that be in play for a visual ARB review? If they are going to access that property, shouldn't that be in play?

Ms. Ley: I mean it is an existing access that they are proposing to partially close off. Both the Planning Board and the ARB could look at more permanently closing this off by asking them to remove the driveway, if that is a concern?

Mr. LaPerch: I am not asking to remove it. I am asking if they plan on using the properties, I would like to think there was some kind of a landscaping plan to be discussed here. Ashley, can you describe what the visual look from Route 22 that they are proposing? I don't see it on the plan here that I can visualize.

Ms. Ley: So, they are not proposing anything at 22 right now. All the improvements are at the rear of the property with some limited changes in this area where they're restoring gravel and paved areas to lawn. All of the improvements are currently shown in the rear of the property where they are adding landscaping between the bike path and the new garage and they are delineating the outside storage area with a series of boulders and a fence that goes here.

Mr. LaPerch: Isn't it more important because this is a gateway zone in our Town that the 22 visual impact... Route 6, I'm sorry... impact should be discussed also?

Ms. Ley: The Board is able to look at the entire property and you certainly could request additional screening on the Route 6 side.

Mr. LaPerch: I think that is the biggest part of this application because it's really... the visual impact that we are seeing with all the trucks and everything else that's parked there so I would think that they would want to have a landscaping plan for the Route 6 corridor.

Ms. Ley: I do recall that was raised at the Planning Board when this was referred to the ARB and the additional plantings were not shown on this plan that arrived at the ARB.

Mr. LaPerch: Yeah, I think we did do that so... Mary, thank you for allowing me to

make a comment on this project.

Chair Larkin: Thank you, Tom.

(Multiple people talking.)

Mr. Hamilton: We went from the Planning Board January 13 and we got comments... the comments that we are discussing today, the loading docks, all of this, we got comments I think 12:30 today so a couple of hours and, as you all know, we all live very busy lives and we have plenty of other jobs going on so um... We had like a four hour lead time to address all of these comments and that may explain the 6 o'clock or 5:30 submittal to you guys... or 5 o'clock submittal to you guys...

Mr. LaPerch: Sean, Sean, excuse me...

(Multiple people talking.)

Mr. Hamilton: ...and I appreciate all your help. You guys have been very cool and thank you very much. It's just you know I had a couple of hours to get this thing together...

Chair Larkin: Sean, I spent a couple of hours reviewing a Statement of Use that was dated from October 2019 that had nothing to do with this application. So, I had all my comments based upon an outdated Statement of Use and when I called Ashley, she said you are looking at the wrong thing; its been updated. So, we've all wasted a lot of time on this and that's why you got last minute comments because the application was defective.

Boardmember Stephens: Yup.

Chair Larkin: So, we're trying our best. Now, what I want to address was that I did not know that the Planning Board had recommended landscaping on the Route 6 corridor there. Ashley, are you familiar with that?

Ms. Ley: It was a comment that was raised at the last Planning Board meeting that they wanted some additional screening for Route 6.

Chair Larkin: Is there any parameters that Sean can be given as far as additional screening?

Ms. Ley: Well, it is within the jurisdiction of the ARB to... Usually, as you know, the applicant would prepare a landscaping plan that the ARB could comment on and offer constructive criticism.

Chair Larkin: I mean other than just a line of Arborvitaes along Route 6... I mean... we need effective screening along Route 6 added to the plan. I don't know anything... because I am looking at this plan, just the four corners of the plan, not knowing the history of some property next door that belongs to them. So, I don't know that looking at the application. So is there a neighboring property on the left that they are going to be... that equally needs to be addressed?

Mr. Hamilton: There is a neighboring property and I don't think there are any trees at the moment between the two properties. I believe they are just (inaudible). I don't think there is any visual barrier other than the proposed six foot (inaudible).

Boardmember Frasca: Can I make a comment?

Chair Larkin: Yes, Tom.

Boardmember Frasca: There are existing violations on this property, correct?

Ms. Ley: Yes, this property has been in court and they are before the Planning Board and ARB to remedy the violations.

Boardmember Frasca: And I think what Mr. LaPerch was directing us to was the adjoining property that is also owned by the applicant. So, that also has violations on it, correct?

Ms. Ley: I am not aware of that. I don't know if that is true or not.

Boardmember Frasca: So, summarily we can't even look at that (inaudible).

Ms. Ley: This is the application that is before the Board right now. This property does have violations that they are seeking to remedy through this application.

Boardmember Frasca: Just a further comment, Mary. As far the use... as far as the loading dock... I mean if they need to have that (inaudible) then they need to address it in some way that will satisfy our Board. I guess that would impact their stormwater and I am still a little wary of the green roof if that's a way that they got approval.

Chair Larkin: There was a letter that was submitted with the application...

Boardmember Frasca: I saw it.

Chair Larkin: ...from the DEP that says they are doing a green roof and a green roof is a very specific definition. It's not just somebody that goes up and plants their roof. So... again, if they screw it up, they've wasted a lot of money. So, its in their best interests to have it maintained properly by the people that they subcontract out to and there are only a few on the northeast coast that have certified green roof installation so I am not that worried about the green roof. I would prefer the loading docks to be eliminated. Can we summarize what it is that we want them to revise and then move on so we can... they'll come to the next meeting and we can button it up. Are there any other comments?

Multiple people talking.

Boardmember Stephens: I have one more comment. I would agree with Mr. LaPerch. Having driven by the property and into the driveway that is off of Route 6 today, I would say more screening and planting than perhaps was or was not discussed at the Planning Board should be a part of the package that is going to come to us at the ARB.

Mr. Hamilton: I'm sorry. What screening along Route 6 here... just to clarify...

Ms. Ley: Yes, more screening along Route 6 to help shield the views of the materials on the property.

Mr. Hamilton: And you guys like what we... the Western Red Cedars as well? Or are you looking for something else?

Chair Larkin: Variety. On our Website there is a list of recommended specimens that are native. So it would be a variety of evergreens.

Ms. Ley: I recall at the Planning Board that it was this area that they thought some additional screening could be added because that would block the views of the trucks and everything in the back.

Mr. Hamilton: Yeah I know that's a pretty steep hill going down from that outdoor storage area to the one story... is that something that we should be worried about or do you want them on the western edge of the property along Route 6?

Boardmember Weber: Can I jump in here because actually from where I am sitting I am looking at this site. I'm actually on the other side of the Middlebranch Reservoir up a hill. And I would say I think I understand where some of the Planning Board's frustration is in that since we are talking about the larger property now, the whole thing looks kind of disheveled. You know that building in the front is not in great repair. We're talking about a massive amount of wood stockade fencing but if that fence is maintained the same way as the existing building, I am not optimistic that it won't look like a wreck in eight years. So, from my vantage point, which is literally looking at it right now, you know I think that although the back of the property is not the most noticeable thing from Route 6, it is very noticeable from the bike path. The overall level of care that is visible now wouldn't give someone a reason to have a lot of confidence in how this would be maintained going forward.

Boardmember Frasca: It is a concern.

Boardmember Stephens: Yup.

Chair Larkin: I am a little at a loss as to how to tell you how to landscape the eyesores.

Boardmember Frasca: Yeah, Mary, I don't think we have enough information with

this scattered and last minute... to make any sort of recommendations.

Chair Larkin: No, we are not making any recommendations tonight. We're gathering all the information they need so they...

Boardmember Frasca: I don't even know what to advise them because I haven't kind of looked at everything.

Chair Larkin: I know. But it is also not up to us to come up with a landscape plan.

Boardmember Stephens: Correct. Correct. It's not our job.

Boardmember Frasca: We can voice our concerns but we (inaudible).

Mr. Hamilton: OK you guys. So, we will address your comments. Thank you, guys, for all your time. We'll get back to you.

Chair Larkin: OK. Thank you, Sean.

Boardmember Stephens: Thank you.

Boardmember Weber: Mary, do we need to memorialize that with 'action reserved'?

Ms. Desidero: No, it will just be continued onto the next agenda. Ashley is there any chance you could give me the screen back. I am trying to find whoever is up next.

Chair Larkin: It's DC Hair

Ms. Desidero: Do we have anybody for DC Hair because I don't see him. I don't see the gentleman I was expecting so you could move on to number three...

Chair Larkin: Bill Henry.

3. BILL HENRY TREE SERVICE, 47 Prospect Hill Road, (Tax Map ID 56.15-1-6) – Review of an Application for a Site Plan Amendment

This was a review of an application for a Site Plan Amendment as referred by the Planning Board. The application contained the following documents:

1. ARB Application, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 4/3/20
2. Memorandum to Chair Larkin from Insite Engineering, dated 4/8/20
3. Proposed Shed Rendering, dated 4/8/20
4. SP-1, Site Plan, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 9/6/16; last revised 4/8/20

Jamie LoGiudice of Insite Engineering and Owner Bill Henry appeared before the Board.

Ms. LoGiudice: Good evening. Jamie LoGiudice from Insite Engineering, Surveying and Landscape Architecture. Can everybody hear me OK?

Chair Larkin: Yes.

Ms. LoGiudice: Also, here is Bill Henry on behalf of his application. So, going through the site plan basically we are here for an amended site plan review of certain items as far as a shed, relocating the wood burning stove, a gate at the front entrance and some retaining walls and also a sign at the front entrance. So, looking at the site plan itself, I just threw some red cloud bubbles just to indicate what had changed since the previous approval back in March 2017. Number one we have the new signage, which we will get into the look of that in a minute, I just wanted to give you the location of it at Prospect Hill Road right there. Number two is a proposed gate; it'll be an aluminum gate, black aluminum gate with stone piers supporting it that detail is just to the bottom right of that page, right there. The stone itself is going to be a bluestone façade with a cap as well. The piers themselves will just be concrete with that façade on them. Then next is number three: we have the retaining walls. Originally, we had proposed some two on one slopes. During construction it was deemed to be a little undesirable and hard to maintain that area. I know Bill wants to be able to mow over there so he has a couple of retaining walls that were

installed. The one retaining wall directly adjacent to the building, right next to where number three is shown, is jersey barriers and then to the front of the building there are boulder walls that help hold back the slope a little bit just to lessen the intensity of that slope. Number four, we have the revision to where the wood burning stove is. That originally was in the front of the building where it says, 'wood pile.' That is now behind the building and is going to be underneath the shed. The shed is 20 by 10, the footprint is 8 by 20, and then extends over the top of the wood burning stove to protect it from winter and other weather problems. We also have the outside storage area is gonna be shifted from the front of the building to the back within that area where the cursor is there. The next slide we go to the shed to look at. So, the shed is a metal structure with this exact same material that the proposed contractor's building is going to be made out of, exact same colors as well. So, it is basically going to be a mini version of the building that is in front of it. So, the doors will be white and then you see how the roofline goes over the top of the wood burning stove just to protect it from the weather. So, it will be an all metal building, gray with the roof evergreen or the top panels and the sides and by the doors will be the buckskin tan color. Moving onto the next slide we get into the sign and this is the sign we have proposed. This is Bill's... this is his company, and this is his logo. He wants it to be right by the road to show his business... what he does. It's a 48-inch by 48-inch sign with four posts and that's basically the sign. The next slide will give you a general idea of what it would look like. This image is a Google image that... there have been site improvements since this had been taken but this is just to give you a general idea of where the sign is. So that is basically what we're doing if anyone has any questions.

Chair Larkin: There is no lighting at the sign, right?

Ms. LoGiudice: Correct.

Chair Larkin: And the sign is made up of what material?

Ms. LoGiudice: It's a... Bill, do you know the material of your sign?

Mr. Henry: I think it is aluminum and they print on it.

Chair Larkin: So, is it power coated?

Mr. Henry: No, I think it is like a big sticker.

Ms. LoGiudice: Like a vinyl wrap?

Mr. Henry: Yeah, a vinyl wrap.

Chair Larkin: I am concerned about maintenance just it won't be painted or..

Mr. Henry: No, it's not going to be painted.

Chair Larkin: OK.

Ms. Ley: The notation on the bottom says 'digitally printed graphic.'

Chair Larkin: Oh, OK. So, I don't have any comments. I don't have any questions, and everything looks fine to me. I just wanted again to go through our list. Katherine, do you have any comments?

Boardmember Weber: No, I think the building and gate are in good, conservative taste and the sign adequately explains what Bill does.

Chair Larkin: Tom?

Boardmember Frasca: No, I thought it was pretty well prepared. The only comment I had is the mass of the sign is it would be nice if the posts, the uprights were a little more... I just think proportionately it would be better but other than that, nothing.

Chair Larkin: I can understand that comment. Is the sign... meets Code as far as the size of it and all of that?

Ms. Desidero: So, Madam Chair I was just going to mention this. Just so the Board is aware... so the Board knows. This is actually two separate applications. One is for the referral for the site plan by the Planning Board; the other was referred by the Building Inspector for the sign so you will need to do separate votes. They actually

paid for two applications and yes, the answer to the question is that sign was referred by the Building Inspector, so it meets Code.

Chair Larkin: Thank you, Victoria. Ginny?

Boardmember Stephens: No, I think... I drove by the property today and it looks fine. I will say on the sign it looks like the address of Prospect Hill Road is just kind of floating there. I am assuming it will either be attached on the side or below the Bill Henry sign. I don't know if it looks like it is floating to anybody else?

Ms. LoGiudice: I believe it will be attached by bolts underneath where it has the Bill Henry Website. It will dangle from there.

Boardmember Stephens: All right. Other than that, I am fine. Thank you.

Chair Larkin: Carla?

Ms. Desidero: Ashley, is that the correct way to display a 911 number or is it just supposed to be a number?

Ms. Ley: It can have the full address.

Ms. Desidero: OK

Chair Larkin: Carla?

Boardmember Lucchino: I don't really have any questions except, Jamie, you said for the sign this is Bill Henry's logo... Or this is his emblem or whatever. Is that correct?

Mr. Henry: Yes.

Boardmember Lucchino: Including the bright red?

Chair Larkin: Yes.

Ms. LoGiudice: It is Bill Henry's... that is his seal.

Chair Larkin: Yes, his trucks are that. That's his logo. The bright red...

Boardmember Lucchino: It kind of... well it certainly stands out. I would say that but I was hoping for something that would be a little more... blend with the environment a little more. The bright red just hits you in the face. I understand if that's a logo, but I am not so sure about that. I don't know that you can change it necessarily if that's the way the company does its business but... boy it looks very commercial in the picture that is very full of trees and... I drove by there, not recently, but a while back and I don't think the sign really blends with the neighborhood because of that bright red.

Boardmember Weber: It's right next to the Southeast Train Station which also has a lot of vibrant signage so I'm going to personally disagree with you there.

Boardmember Lucchino: OK Katherine, that's fine. I didn't feel that so maybe I missed it somehow and I did go by quite a long time ago.

Chair Larkin: OK. Do we have any other questions?

Boardmember Frasca: Well, its two applications...

Chair Larkin: It's two applications so I am going to ask for a motion to positively recommend the... how do I say it, Victoria?

Ms. Desidero: You need to positively recommend the site plan to the Planning Board and the sign is an approval.

Chair Larkin: I am going for one motion now: the positive recommendation of the site plan to the Planning Board.

The ARB voted to **approve** the site plan application to the Planning Board as submitted.

Motion to Approve: Thomas Frasca

Seconded: Katherine Weber

Voice Vote: 5 to 0

Chair Larkin: Can I have a motion to approve the sign?

Boardmember Frasca: I have a discussion item on the posts.

Chair Larkin: Oh, OK. I thought we were done.

Boardmember Frasca: It's just the massing of the uprights and I don't mind Bill Henry's logo. I just think they should increase the mass of the uprights. It just looks a little (inaudible).

Chair Larkin: OK. Do we want to make a motion to approve the sign?

Ms. Desidero: Do you want to add a condition about the uprights or do you want to approve as submitted?

Boardmember Frasca: Let me just make a comment. What is the dimension of the uprights right now?

Ms. Ley: 4 by 4 posts.

Ms. LoGiudice: Right.

Boardmember Frasca: So, maybe if they were 8 by 8 it would be a little more massive. I don't know. That's just my opinion.

Chair Larkin: So, they are 4 by 4 now?

Ms. LoGiudice: Yes.

Chair Larkin: Would it be better if they go 6 by 6? 8 by 8 is pretty big.

Boardmember Stephens: I would agree 8 by 8 is big.

Chair Larkin: 8 by 8 is a little overkill I think.

Boardmember Stephens: Yeah. I agree.

Chair Larkin: Does that mean we have to go back or just make it a conditional motion?

Ms. Desidero: You can just make it a condition of the approval that they be whichever you prefer. Right, Ashley?

Ms. Ley: Yes, that's correct.

Boardmember Frasca: How is that with the applicant?

Ms. LoGiudice: Bill, are you OK with the 6 by 6 posts?

Mr. Henry: That's fine.

Chair Larkin: OK. So, can I have a motion to approve the sign with 6 by 6 posts?

The ARB voted to **approve** the sign with the following condition:

1. The uprights/posts will be 6 by 6.

Motion to Approve: Thomas Frasca

Seconded: Virginia Stephens

Voice Vote: 4 to 1 with Boardmember Lucchino voting no.

2. **DC HAIR STUDIO, 2505 Carmel Avenue, (Tax Map ID 67.6-1-38) – Review of an Application for Two Signs**

This was a review of an application for two signs as referred by the Building Department. The application contained the following documents:

1. ARB Application, prepared by Signs Ink, dated 3/6/20
2. Sign Face Rendering, prepared by Signs Ink, dated 3/3/20
3. Installation Site, prepared by Signs Ink, dated 11/26/18
4. Color Choices, no preparer, undated

5. Photos of Existing Signs, undated

Tim Beachak of Signs Ink represented the applicant.

Chair Larkin: So, how do we handle DC Hair with the multi-tenant sign application?

Ms. Desidero: I think Ashley is going to explain that.

Ms. Ley: OK. Let me just pull it up. Give me a second. So, this plaza was approved a few years ago with a Multi-Tenant Sign Program for both the wall signs within the plaza as well as the monument sign on the street and even though... let me just rotate the view so it is easier to see... even though the sign that is out there today, all of the signs have white backgrounds what was approved at the time was all of the signs would have I believe green backgrounds with white letters. So what is proposed right now with the white background, while it matches what's out there today, is not consistent with what was approved as part of the tenant sign criteria. So, the options for the applicant are to either change this sign and all of the other signs as they get replaced to match the approved criteria or it would be to update the criteria to match what's out there today and have all the signs with white backgrounds.

Chair Larkin: We are actually having trouble getting the Multi-Tenant Sign Program changed, right?

Ms. Ley: They haven't submitted a revised program.

Chair Larkin: They haven't responded to our request.

Ms. Ley: They haven't responded to our request so we... I believe Victoria has relayed the message to them. I've put it in a memo about a month ago and nothing was submitted for this meeting.

Chair Larkin: So we have no response from the landlord so by us approving DC Hair Studio we are going against the landlord's accepted Multi-Tenant Sign Program?

Ms. Ley: That's correct for this monument sign. For the signs within the plaza it is consistent with the criteria.

Mr. Beachak: We just did the bagel store like a month ago and I believe the bagel store was approved the same way. Correct with the white background? Brewster Bagels.

Boardmember Weber: Yes, Brewster Bagels has a white background.

Ms. Ley: And I believe we brought this up at the last meeting and asked the attendee landlord to come in to update the criteria... or to update the Multi-Tenant Sign Program and they have not done so.

Ms. Desidero: They've been asked probably five times over a period of 18 months.

Boardmember Frasca: Well, my comment would be what is the path of least resistance for the applicant? (Inaudible)

Mr. Beachak: Which would be the white since the bagel place was approved with the white.

Chair Larkin: Yes but we can't keep approving what is not correct.

Boardmember Stephens: I have a question. So, I feel a little badly for poor DC Hair Salon or whatever. To no fault of that person, it is the landlord that is screwing up this person either being able to open a business or whatnot. How do we...

Ms. Desidero: Well, I would like to comment on that Ginny, because I have been so actively involved in trying to get this fixed.

Boardmember Stephens: OK. Thanks.

Ms. Desidero: First of all, if we were not experiencing Coronavirus, I might be saying something a little bit differently right now but a hair salon can't open.

Boardmember Stephens: Right.

Ms. Desidero: And I have spoken to the owner of the hair salon and she understood completely what needed to be done and expressed the same frustration with the landlord and not being able to get them to do it. I've also spoken to Steve Chester at Signs Ink who is not on the call but Tim is and they are completely aware that this needs to be fixed and personally, I feel like... just in my position as the Secretary to the ARB, if I have a responsibility to try to get something done and made right, it makes it very hard for me to get that done if we continue to let them just not do what we are asking them to do. That's my two cents. I just had to say it.

Boardmember Stephens: No, no, no. I appreciate that.

Ms. Desidero: It is very frustrating.

Boardmember Stephens: Yeah, it sounds... (inaudible)
(Multiple People Talking)

Boardmember Frasca: But the sign for the façade is OK?

Chair Larkin: Yes.

Ms. Desidero: Yes.

Mr. Beachak: I guess the confusion was because last time Brewster Bagels, we were allowed to do it in white. I guess because of the landlord so I mean... I'll be happy to do the burgundy but I think it might look weird just one...

Ms. Desidero: No, that's not what it is supposed to be now. One of the signs and I think it was Brewster Bagel, it was made a condition of the approval and they still did not submit the Multi-Tenant Sign Program.

Mr. Beachak: Oh, the landlord was supposed to do that?

Ms. Desidero: Yes.

Mr. Beachak: Well, I guess like you said if the landlord is not responding.

Ms. Desidero: But that's not the Town's problem.

Mr. Beachak: No, no. I have no problem with that so don't approve the directory. That's fine and we will just do the main sign and let her hash it out with her landlord. They won't be allowed a sign on the directory.

Chair Larkin: Are we allowed to just address the façade sign, Victoria?

Ms. Ley: You could just approve the one sign that complies.

Ms. Desidero: What is the top thing that you are showing there, Ashley, is that...

Ms. Ley: This is the existing... what's out there today.

Ms. Desidero: Yeah, but what's above it? It says, 'Hair Salon.'

Ms. Ley: I think there is an existing hair salon in that space.

Ms. Desidero: No, there isn't. This is going into that space.

Mr. Beachak: She is taking the space, yeah.

Ms. Desidero: So, you can give her the one over there that she wants then she can just have the one that is out on the thing that says, 'Hair Salon.' Because it is already there.

Mr. Beachak: Does it have a name on it... or no?

Ms. Desidero: No.

Mr. Beachak: Or it was just the hair salon before...
Multiple People Talking

Ms. Desidero: But it is on the other sign as well... if you look at it.

Ms. Ley: Yeah, this is what's out there today... this hair salon.

Boardmember Frasca: Can we see it again... I mean we're talking about the maroon background sign going over the door?

Ms. Ley: Yes, so this is what would be going over the door.

Ms. Desidero: And how is that in keeping with their plan?

Mr. Beachak: That's the updated for the new sign.

Ms. Ley: This is the approved plan for the wall mounted signs.

Ms. Desidero: I'm sorry. I am confused. The one I just saw had a white background.

Ms. Ley: That's the one they want to put in the monument sign.

Ms. Desidero: Oh yeah, I see. OK. I understand.

Ms. Ley: And this is the one they want to put in the wall sign. So that's consistent.

Ms. Desidero: Right. So the wall sign is consistent.

Boardmember Frasca: There would be a black space behind it like that and the actual size of the logo?

Mr. Beachak: Yeah, it's actually (inaudible) bronze. It's aluminum to match the box because I guess the idea here with the new sign plan is to make the signs smaller. So, whoever came up with the original site plan was to add panels on each side to reduce the size of the overall sign face.

Ms. Ley: And that was because the Sign Code changed and the existing wall signs I think in most cases were too big.

Boardmember Frasca: OK. So, the adjacent sign to the left of that, the pharmacy, if that changed its just going to be (inaudible)?

Ms. Ley: Yes.

Mr. Beachak: I don't know if you have been over there. Brewster Hot Bagels already has...

Multiple People Talking.

Ms. Ley: I think there is a photo of Brewster Hot Bagels.

Mr. Beachak: So if a tenant changes out then it will be updated to the new...

Ms. Ley: So here is Brewster Hot Bagels for an example. Tom, can you sit a little closer to your microphone. Its hard to hear you sometimes.

Boardmember Frasca: I'm sorry. I mumble anyway. So, OK, yeah. I'm fine with the building (inaudible).

Chair Larkin: So, are we... is the discussion that we are OK with the façade sign and we are going to leave the monument sign alone until they get their Multi-Tenant Sign Program to us?

Boardmember Frasca: We don't really have a choice.

Ms. Ley: The Board would be able to approve that.

Ms. Desidero: I'm just afraid that that's what they are hoping for because they already have 'Hair Salon' on the monument sign.

Boardmember Frasca: But that's not the applicant's problem... well...

Mr. Beachak: Yeah...

Ms. Desidero: But it is. It is their problem. They've been told.

Boardmember Frasca: Wait. Hold it. Did the applicant send a letter to the landlord requesting approval for this and the landlord is not responding?

Ms. Desidero: Correct.

Boardmember Frasca: I understand it is not a Town problem but being empathetic to business if we don't approve the monument but we approve the façade sign then the applicant probably should probably send a registered... maybe all the applicants or whoever it is should send a letter to their landlord requesting a review of the (inaudible) sign.

Ms. Desidero: I just think that you should keep in mind that they are not going to be able to open this hair salon probably before the next meeting anyway and you know, to be honest, Tom, it's not just the landlord. It is certainly not the applicant's, not the hair salon owner's fault but it is also the sign company in this case. Tim's company is completely aware that they were not going to get an approval tonight if they did not make this change to their Multi-Tenant Sign Program. That's what we stated to them when we sent them the last letter. So, I don't know why we would continue to just let everybody ignore us.

Mr. Beachak: Well, I wasn't involved with the last letter. Maybe Steve Chester was.

Ms. Desidero: He was.

Mr. Beachak: Well then I would have just told it right out of the thing because even though to say she is not opened, she's been renovating the store and she is ready to open if this... if the mayor says they can open May 15, she will be ready to open. I mean she's got a lot of money invested in this store and it's not fair to her that this sign can't be approved. Maybe she will have some leverage with the landlord to say, 'hey I'm not going to pay my rent unless you do something with my directory out there' because even if it says salon hers is hair studio. It's not her sign anyway. You know I just don't think it's fair to her as the person that is spending all this money. As a small business owner trying to start a business in times like this are tough to begin with. She was hoping to have the sign out there to get some type of exposure so people would know, hey, she is somebody new. The timing is bad with everything with this Covid deal. So, I just kind of feel like... it's not her fault. I mean you get it you want to stick it to the landlord because he's not responding but I don't think it's fair that she should take the brunt of it when she is just trying to do the right thing and open up her business.

Multiple People Talking.

Boardmember Frasca: If I could just ask Ashley. Are we opening up a door to a problem if we just approve this and not the monument sign? Are we (inaudible) not create some sort of precedent?

Ms. Ley: You have approved single signs before when another sign that was part of the package was not approvable.

Chair Larkin: I think the thing I am concerned about, Victoria, and I understand your frustration, is that the façade sign does meet the criteria. So, to not allow that approval I don't see how we can defend that but I understand your frustration of not being able to get the landlord to reply.

Ms. Desidero: This is going to be the last thing I say. You can defend it because this is a sign in a Multi-Tenant Sign Program and if what's being proposed for both signs does not meet what their criteria are then they should have to come back with the right...

Mr. Beachak: Well, what happens if she didn't want the sign by the road? She doesn't want to be on it and if we were just to submit not to be on the outside directory, she has nothing to do with the outside directory, how is that fair to say she can't have her main sign? She says I don't want to be on the outside sign.

Ms. Desidero: OK. So make that a condition of the approval: she never gets a sign on the outside directory.

Mr. Beachak: I don't think that's nice... to have her...

Boardmember Frasca: I wouldn't say never...

Boardmember Weber: Mary, would you mind? We haven't really followed our order on this one.

Chair Larkin: Yeah, I'm sorry Katherine, everyone kind of jumped in. You are absolutely right. I wanted to do it in the roll call way. Katherine, what do you have to say?

Boardmember Weber: This conversation feels really vindictive and I know it's frustrating when the landlords don't do the right thing but some poor soul just signed a commercial lease at the absolute worst time of our lives. And to try and punish that person who is already wearing a lease probably like a bad suit for who knows how many months and to say we are going to stick it to the landlord via poor DC Hair Studio when they proposed a sign that complies with what their supposed to do. Like, I mean it just feels like the wrong moment to prove this point.

Ms. Desidero: I would just like to clarify one thing. I have never said 'stick it to the landlord.' I've said the landlord should do what is appropriate so I don't really appreciate that...

Boardmember Weber: Right but so if the landlord is in violation shouldn't they be getting a violation? That's an Ashley question. Like, if their sign is...

Ms. Ley: They could get a violation based on the ARB's approval for Brewster Hot Bagels. Yeah. That's something we can refer to (Building Inspector) Mike Levine.

Boardmember Weber: Yeah, I mean they are in violation so they should get a violation. Like that seems reasonable but this applicant proposed something that does conform and I don't want to be the one to say like you proposed a conforming thing but because we don't like your landlord, we are not going to approve it. Like that feels arbitrary and the least we can do is try to do is be consistent.

Ms. Desidero: But, again, its not that they are... You're saying it wrong. It's not that they are submitting... that is not... it's not arbitrary. It is not approved. It isn't a part of the program that is approved and the ARB... the last time they approved signs in this plaza you specifically made it a condition of the approval that the landlord would come back with a Multi-Tenant Sign Program for the monument sign that was consistent with what they are currently doing, not what they originally had approved. So, I just want to be clear that it's not... I don't really care. I am not going to say any more but you are putting words in my mouth and that's not what I said.

Boardmember Weber: I guess I think because this is being video recorded, I guess it's just important to be sensitive to how things sound because that's in my own words what I am taking away from this conversation. And, I just want to have some sympathy for the applicant even though understanding that it is very important that we preserve the integrity of our architectural review process.

Chair Larkin: Thank you, Katherine. Tom, I think you already said your...

Boardmember Frasca: Well, I just wanted to add a little bit more to that. I think that we should approve the façade sign, which I've already stated, but I think it wouldn't be a bad idea for the ARB to request the Building Inspector to send a violation to the landlord on the monument. That's all my comments.

Chair Larkin: Ginny?

Boardmember Stephens: I would agree with that, Tom. I think the Building Inspector has to step in and this guy needs a violation but I think the façade sign I would go ahead with.

Chair Larkin: Carla?

Boardmember Lucchino: Mary, did you say that the sign on the road was supposed to have had green backgrounds and white letters or did somebody say that?

Ms. Ley: Yes, I said that. I believe that was the original approved monument sign plan, that was approved a few years ago where all of the signs were supposed to be changed to have... I think it was a green background with white letters but that has not been the case as new businesses have gone in.

Boardmember Lucchino: So, Ashley, that's the violation that they don't match that prior approval, correct?

Ms. Ley: Correct. So, when the Board approved Brewster Hot Bagels they did allow them to go in with a green lettering and white background but the condition of approval was that the landlord was going to come in to amend the monument sign criteria to have it all be white background with I can't recall what the colored letters were going to be, green would be one of them, but they never came in and did that so that would be the violation that they never met with that condition of the approval.

Boardmember Lucchino: How long ago was that?

Ms. Ley: Maybe a year. I'm not sure. Whenever Brewster Hot Bagels went in so within the last year or so.

Boardmember Lucchino: So, I agree that its important that if the ARB makes a decision that we make sure that whomever is responsible, in this case the landlord,

follows through so I think that is a separate issue than the sign that we are looking at. The burgundy sign on the front of the building so I would favor separating these two if there is a way to do that and give... I would be willing to certainly approve the sign on the building and then make sure that the landlord fixes the sign along the road. I think that's important. If we don't enforce our decisions then there is really no weight behind the decisions, we make so I think that is very important.

Chair Larkin: Are there any other comments from the Board?

Boardmember Frasca: I would like to make a motion to approve the sign on the side of the building with the stipulation that the Building Department generates a (inaudible) to the tenant... sorry to the landlord that his monument sign is in violation. I don't know if you can construct it that way but Ashley can expand on it.

Ms. Ley: So what the Board can do is you can approve the wall mounted sign, you can specifically say that you are not approving the monument sign until the tenant sign or until the monument sign package is corrected and then we could separately refer this sign to the Building Inspector.

Boardmember Frasca: And request his (inaudible)?

Ms. Ley: Yes.

Boardmember Frasca: All right.

Chair Larkin: So, I move for a motion to approve the façade sign contingent upon notifying the Building Department of the violation of the monument sign.

Ms. Desidero: I am sorry. Who is making the motion?

Ms. Larkin: I am calling for a motion.

Ms. Desidero: Oh. OK.

Chair Larkin: I believe the Chair has to call for a motion. So, Tom, I assume you are making that motion.

Boardmember Frasca: I would be happy to. Yes.

Chair Larkin: Who's going to second?

Boardmember Stephens: I'll second it.

The ARB voted to approve the application with the following condition:

1. The Building Department will be notified of the violation of the monument sign.

Motion to Approve: Thomas Frasca

Seconded: Virginia Stephens

Voice Vote: 5 to 0

4. HIGHLANDS CENTER, Independence Way, (Tax Map ID 56.-1-23.-1) – Review of an Application for a Sign

This was a review of an application for a sign as referred by the Building Department. The application contained the following documents:

1. ARB Application, prepared by ABC Sign Corporation, dated 2/11/20
2. Owner Consent Form, dated 2/11/20
3. Highlands Monument Sign, prepared by ABC Sig Corporation, dated 11/8/19
4. Photo of Existing Sign, undated
5. Preliminary Site Plan, prepared by LADA, PC., date illegible

Lawrence Bourque of ABC Sign Company represented the applicant.

Mr. Bourque: Thank you and good evening. Larry Bourque of ABC Sign Corporation representing the Highlands Center. They have asked us to refurbish a ground sign

on Independent Way. The sign locally is referred to as the Home Depot sign. Either through design or neglect, the sign is in rough shape and as a matter of fact, the Home Depot face and another tenant face are missing at this point. What we are proposing to do is to make some new faces. The size of the sign stays the same but we will put some new faces on there for the Home Depot and six tenants. If you can bring up the rendering... that one... yup. That's what we are proposing that the refurbished sign will look like.

Chair Larkin: Is the size of the sign the same as what was?

Mr. Bourque: Yes. Physically the height and the length of the sign is the same because we are using the existing framework. We are just going to make new signs to attach to it for the tenants.

Chair Larkin: Are you adding any lighting?

Mr. Bourque: We're changing the lighting. The original sign cabinet had a lot of fluorescent lamps in it. The new tenant signs will be with LEDs which is a lot more efficient.

Boardmember Frasca: A lot more consistent lighting too.

Mr. Bourque: Yes, that's right. Very even.

Boardmember Frasca: Yeah, it's nice to see that the proportions of the tenants are...

Chair Larkin: Tom, let me go in a roll call. It's a little easier to manage.

Boardmember Frasca: I keep forgetting what we are doing.

Chair Larkin: I don't have any comments on it. It looks fine to me. Katherine, do you have comments?

Boardmember Weber: It certainly looks better than the large hole that's there now. I will say that the existing sign has kind of a beige buffer at the top that's not featured in the new sign so I am assuming although the whole size of the sign is the same, the printed area is a little bigger. Is that correct?

Mr. Bourque: No, the printed signs is the existing sign cabinet. We are just losing that top piece.

Boardmember Weber: OK. That's fine.

Chair Larkin: Tom?

Boardmember Frasca: Yeah you just got rid of the overwhelming Kohl's sign and put the rest of the tenants in. I think it looks great for...

Mr. Bourque: Thank you.

Boardmember Frasca: Basically it's a mall sign. It just looks good. I like it.

Chair Larkin: Ginny?

Boardmember Stephens: I am happy with it.

Chair Larkin: Carla?

Boardmember Lucchino: Larry, is this sign the one that is... is this visible from Route 84?

Mr. Bourque: Yes, it's the one facing the train station. The photograph was taken from the train station.

Boardmember Lucchino: Got it. Got it. OK. That's all I wanted to know. Thanks.

Chair Larkin: Any other comments? I'll ask for a motion to approve.

The ARB voted to approve the application as submitted.

Motion to Approve: Virginia Stephens

Seconded: Katherine Weber

Voice Vote: 5 to 0

5. STATELINE / RESTAURANT DEPOT, US Route 6/202, (Tax Map ID 68.-2-48.1 & 48.2) – Review of an Application for Site Plan

This was a review of an application for site plan as referred by the Planning Board. The application contained the following documents:

1. ARB Application, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 4/16/20
2. Memorandum to Chair Larkin from Insite Engineering, dated 4/17/20
3. Envisor e² Innovative Equipment Systems Spec Sheet, undated
4. Restaurant Depot Renderings, prepared by ADA Architects, Inc., undated
5. SMP-1, Site Master Plan, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 1/17/20; last revised 4/17/20
6. SP-1.1, Proposed Layout & Landscape Plan, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 12/31/19; last revised 4/17/20
7. SP-1.2, Proposed Layout & Landscape Plan, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 3/21/20; last revised 4/17/20
8. LP-1, Lighting Plan, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 12/31/19; last revised 4/17/20
9. D-1, Details, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 12/23/19; last revised 4/17/20
10. EL-2b, Preliminary Elevations, prepared by ADA Architects, Inc., dated 11/22/19
11. SK-5d, Preliminary Fixture Plan, prepared by ADA Architects, Inc., dated 1/13/20

Jamie LoGiudice of Insite Engineering, Owner Paul Camarda and Architect Heather Mize appeared before the Board.

Chair Larkin: Now, Victoria, we are onto Stateline?

Ms. Desidero: Yes, I am unmuting Jamie and Heather and I believe there is someone else.

Ms. LoGiudice: Yes, I do. I believe Paul Camarda is with us and Heather Mize.

Chair Larkin: OK. So, I sent out an e-mail to everybody asking for an initial review. This wasn't done as a formal memo from Ashley. It's just this is going to be reviewed next month so I wanted the Board to get a peek at everything. We are not going to review any signs right now. We are just getting a look at the proposed layout and the building, landscaping so that we can give any initial input back before the next month's meeting.

Ms. LoGiudice: Great. Thank you very much. Again, Jamie LoGiudice from Insite Engineering, Surveying and Landscape Architecture. As Mary stated we are here for an initial review of the Stateline Retail Center and Restaurant Depot located on Route 6 also adjacent to Interstate 84 to the south of the project. The access is off of Route 6. We do have for the Board's knowledge there is a subdivision application also. It originally was a two-lot subdivision, now going into three. Lot 1 on the western side and Lot 3 on the eastern side are currently vacant but are deemed to be future retail centers later on. But this application is for the Restaurant Depot on Lot 2 in the middle of (inaudible). So, we go to the next page... to take a look at the layout and landscaping. We do have landscaping along the entrance way coming in from Route 6, all native plants coming in, we do have two sign locations at the entrance that we aren't going to talk about (inaudible). But coming into the site, you have wetland mitigation plantings on the western side in between Route 6 and the proposed building area. We do have parking lot landscaping as well around the perimeters and within the parking islands and then also you can see lighting which we will get into a little bit later. There are a couple retaining walls that I wanted to

point out. One in between the access drive and the parking lot toward the middle of the page there... a composite block retaining wall and another one on the south eastern portion of the parking lot and then another on the south western portion of the building out by the loading dock area and compactor. We do have some screening for the compactor in that same location, which we will get into a little bit later in the presentation but it is a fenced type structure and a similar material goes around equipment that is toward the front of the building here as well and is screened with landscaping also.

(Disturbance sound made recording inaudible.)

These plantings, we've been in several conversations with (Wetland Inspector) Steve Coleman about the locations, the intensity of the plantings, the different types of plant materials and the amounts. We've elected to increase the intensity of bringing back a little bit of the removals of the invasive species per Steve's recommendations so we do have again all native species within these areas as well. Next page will give you a general idea of the elevations of the site and those weren't in the packet we submitted to you but just to give you a general idea of heights in relation to the building itself. The building is at elevation 514 coming on from Route 6 you're about 40 ft. below at 474. You climb up the entrance drive up to the parking lot area at 513 so you are going to have very minimal views of the building itself. The building is 270 ft. from the property line along Route 6 and then (inaudible) right of way area. Toward the Interstate 84, just going to go through and give you a general idea of what will be visible from that angle. Eastbound you are going to see most likely nothing of the building just because of the distance from that eastbound lane. Westbound you are going to see... you will see the building. You are at elevation 526, however there is a vegetative berm in between the building and our site improvements and I-84 westbound. This elevation (inaudible) at 514 does come up roughly 20 ft. to I think the maximum approximate height is 534 and then you do go back down to Interstate 84 so there is a good vegetative berm that will block some views of the building. To the next sheet we can get lighting. We are illuminating the parking and access drive areas with pole mounted lights, LEDs, full cut off, dark sky compliant. They are mounted at 20 ft. high and you get an idea of what they look like there. We will be getting additional information to you on building mounted lights within the next submission. We just wanted to give you a general idea of the parking lot areas. Next sheet is just some general details as far as what (inaudible) the walls... planting and guiderail. Then moving into the next set of slides, I am going to hand this over to Mr. Paul Camarda to go over some of the examples of Restaurant Depot.

Mr. Camarda: Hello people. How are you doing?

Chair Larkin: Hi Paul.

Mr. Camarda: I appreciate you continuing to have these meetings this way so we can continue to move things forward. To give you a little history, we came in front of the Planning Board back in 2004 when my children were in elementary school. It's taken us a long time to get to this point. My history here with Restaurant Depot goes back about 10 years. They came to me 10 years ago and talked about this location. They ended up going to Newburgh, came back to me again and decided to go to Waterbury. Can people hear me clearly?

(Several people said yes.)

They then went to Waterbury and spoke to me continually but decided they would not entertain Brewster until they knew how Newburgh and Waterbury would do. What we have done... I have personally been to the Newburgh, Waterbury and their Port Chester locations. Brewster is well situated in that triangle. I stressed to Restaurant Depot all along, going back five, seven, eight years... I saw their prototype. It looked

like... right in front of you is their Newburgh location built maybe a year and a half ago, two years ago. Very simple, vanilla box with a blue stripe on it with a big awning that comes off the front like a brim of a baseball cap like the gentleman is wearing. I initially thought that it created a very dark entrance as you can see. I didn't think this was the right image and I worked with them to try and break this prototype and to do things a little differently and they were receptive to a point but they want to stay with their basic kind of brand; their look. So, if we go onto the next slide, Jamie, if you could bump us along. You can see the building is very vanilla, real simple, a white box with blue stripe and that's what they build (inaudible) only been open for about a year. Again, the big awning in front, kind of dark in front, simple vanilla box, blue stripe. I kind of said to them, 'fellas, we don't want to play the game like let's come in with the ugly duckling and then we'll try to jazz it up because you are gonna basically insult people's intelligence here. We want something nicer and let's come in with our best effort up front.' So, we did our arguing back and forth for quite a long time until we got to something that was a little more palatable, had a little more architecture to it, better colors. The biggest thing is we got rid of the big brim in front of the hat and I convinced them to go with a wrap-around awning that is still covering the same amount of cars that want to pull up and not be affected by the elements, rain and snow, but now the awning wraps around the entire (inaudible) and northern exposure and then added the sort of parapets to sort of break up the box. I think the awning gives it some 3D feeling, trims it out real nice. The parapets break up that flat roof. We went with stone (inaudible) for the columns. If you noticed on the other buildings, they were yellow painted concrete. We did the same thing for the back. We're probably not going to see that back northern... north west corner along 84 but they stayed with the architectural touches. They'll do a couple of things. They'll break the building. We added the stone to trim it nice but you'll also help hide the air conditioners because you may get a view of the air conditioners. Not much, you are not looking down at the building but you may get a look and they'll break up (inaudible)... has come to the Board with what this company considers their "A" game. I mean they're not any different from Home Depot, they've got some flexibility and I think I pushed them to the max. I know I did because they've never done something like this. (Inaudible) give us some input. Let me just bring up some other point here. I don't want to keep going on. We appreciate you looking at this tonight. We really do because look we are in tough times right now. The economy has changed; this virus has made people very apprehensive about things and they are a company that has a black out period just like most very big companies. My mandate is to get them in the ground this summer. If we get close to September, they're gonna punt and if they punt that means they are going to look at this next spring and I don't know what the world is going to bring between August and next March. I have no idea. I have been in situations before when we had Loews and Cosco committed and we were just not able to deliver and they have gone and just flown the coop on people in other locations. So, I think for me, I've got to try and push this... We are working with all the Boards very closely to try to get us in the ground in the middle of this summer so I think it was really great that you entertaining this, at least looking at it tonight so that just maybe at your May meeting if we kind of work with you here we can get done with your Board on that May 27th meeting. So, with that I think I said a lot. We are here to answer questions... what type of materials and any other questions you have, we are here to respond. Thank you very much for listening.

Chair Larkin: Thanks a lot.

Ms. LoGiudice: Mary, can I step in? I'm sorry. Before we go onto the building itself and materials with Heather, I just wanted to go back to the second rendering we had.

I just wanted to point out a couple of things. I think it is slide 12, yup. So, this rendering itself is... it doesn't have the berm between Interstate 84 and the building. It is more for you to see the building itself and the look of it. There is, as I said, a 20 ft. from Restaurant Depot up to the top of the berm and it is vegetated and then it comes down I think 8 or so feet back down to 84 so there is a berm there. This was more a visual for you of the (inaudible).

Mr. Camarda: Bottom line is you are not going to see the building anyway like that. You'll catch eastern elevation and a little touch of that corner of the southern elevation but you're not...

Ms. LoGiudice: Exactly. So, Heather if you want to go through our presentation.

Ms. Mize: Sure and I will just give a little overview in case the Board is not familiar with Restaurant Depot and their operations. Restaurant Depot is a national company; they have offices in New York City, in Chicago and the Anaheim area. They are a cash and carry wholesaler. They serve the restaurant industry, very popular with local Mom and Pop type businesses, fire departments, things like that. They are not open to the public so Restaurant Depot sells a variety of fresh, frozen and non-perishable foods, anything you would need to supply and run your restaurant. They sell equipment, they sell small wares like pans and knives, take out containers. So, restaurant owners have a free membership; they are coming to this location inside the 20,000 sq. ft. of refrigerated space for perishables, there is open space for... similar to what you would have in a Costco or a Sam's Club with a high bay racking for bulk purchases of restaurant equipment. So that is kind of the use of the building. You can see we have a loading dock in the back, we have an entry and exit area where the customers come in and then also, as Paul mentioned, we have this oversized canopy which we've wrapped around this building now. The purpose of that is when you are purchasing hundreds and hundreds of pounds and you need to load it into your van or your SUV, it just gives you some cover there as you are loading your supplies. So, Restaurant Depot has, as I said, I think a little over 130 locations now. I've been involved in maybe 50% of those over the last 11 years. This is bar none the nicest Restaurant Depot we have ever put together. The white box with the blue stripe is kind of their standard. You know they are wholesale and they want to project the image that they are... that you are getting savings when you come to shop there. So, their standard is just kind of a nice, basic, clean, no frills kind of a building. This is certainly a great looking building and we are proud to be involved in it. If you want to flip back to the renderings I can kind of walk through what we've done to dress this up. So, this is the view and it is from a little bit up... as you come in you are going to approach the building from below and this is the corner of the building you would see as you approach it. So the building itself will be a pre-cast concrete wall panel and then that is painted with a neutral tan color plus the blue stripe at the top is also paint. Then added to that we have some stone accents on some vertical pilasters we have on either side of the entrances, right there. To the left hand side you can see the glass and aluminum and exit doors so we have emphasized those again with the stonework and then these pop-up kind of... inverted U-shape pop ups, which have a darker metal panel that we are going to apply to those so they will pop up and kind of emphasize those areas. Also, as Paul mentioned, on the columns we are showing a boxed out stone base on those. The canopy itself, the blue and white of the canopy will be a flush metal panel so it has a... you can see a seam on it there but it will be a flush, you will see a joint but it is not a textured, ribbed panel. I know we are not talking about signage but you can see some general indications of what we are thinking for the signage there. So, there is kind of a radius on the canopy as you turn the corner which I think you can see on some of the end views. And then as you come around here this is the side

that will be facing Route 6 so, again, we don't have an entrance or an exit around here this side of the building will actually, behind this wall, will be our walk-in cooler. But we have carried around these elements because this is the public-facing side so then we have the stone, we have the variation in height, we have the metal panels that come up and over, and then on the right hand side you can see a fenced area with some landscaping in front of it. That will house our refrigeration equipment so the exterior equipment that is going to serve this large walk-in cooler and freezer. So what we proposed there is a composite fence that will block the main view of the equipment and this is actually not it. This is rooftop screening. I don't know that we have a cut sheet on it but it is like a Trex, nice composite wood decking kind of a fence is what we are looking for there along with the landscaping.

Mr. Camarda: I think you should talk about the air conditioners. Although the parapets are going to screen them partially, talk about the actual enclosures around them.

Ms. Mize: OK. Sure. So, up top as Paul mentioned we have the height variation so the difference between the pop up and the roof line is about 4. ft. and, again, our roof surface is below that tan line of the roof edge. So, even just the parapet and the roof edge is going to help screen some of our rooftop air conditioning units and then in addition, anywhere that wouldn't be concealed by those we propose these unit mounted roof top screens, which is this (inaudible) sheet that you are looking at. So essentially this is a system that just attaches to the unit so it is compact and this is kind of a schematic. If you scroll down to the next sheet, we are looking at this vertical system as far as the geometry of the thing and then just a light texture, flushed look from a distance as far as the design of these panels. So we are trying to obviously screen the equipment because people don't want to see that but we are not trying to draw a lot of attention to it with detail or color or building features there.

Mr. Camarda: And you're going to be sitting... some of the units between the parapet and the roof coming up there is about 6 ft. there. Because I believe the units sit about two feet below the top of the wall. Is that correct, Heather?

Ms. Mize: The units are generally five and a half and in some cases six feet high by the time you get on a (inaudible) so, depending on where you are... Certainly if you are standing on Route 6 because of the way that you are looking up, you are not going to see those units at all. Where you may have a little visibility without screening is as you are driving along I-84 but, again, anything that would be visible from that sight line would either be covered by with those varying roof heights or with these screens that we are looking at here.

Mr. Camarda: Let me just add one thing, if I may. In talking to Restaurant Depot and we started talking this last time last February so 14 months ago and they explained to me that if we do all this stuff, this is a slippery slope because the next time we look to do something in the region they're not going to come to us and say, 'can you do Newburgh? Or I like Waterbury.' They're going to come to Restaurant Depot and say, 'give us Brewster.' So they were making decisions knowing this is going to be duplicated again in Connecticut, in New York and around because people are going to want the best-looking building around and this one that we are presenting to you would be the best one they have done yet.

Ms. Mize: If we want to go back to the rendering that kind of looks at the last two sides of the building or the elevations that look at that, I can kind of walk you through them. So this is the side of the building that faces I-84 and we talked about the berm that will conceal it and even though this is not really visible, you are going to catch a glimpse of it possibly, we continued the pop ups with the height variations, the material variations to try to break up the building. So we have incorporated those same high-quality materials on this side as well. And then we don't have a 3D view

that shows the loading dock but there is an elevation view on the next slide. And again we've got a loading area here and we've incorporated the same color palette with paint and you can see a little bit of screening from this side. So, this is again a view I don't think you are going to see from any of the public right of ways but we kept it somewhat compatible and there is still some variation as you see the edges of the building.

Mr. Camarda: That elevation is about the only elevation on this building that has anything in common with their proto-typical because that's a proto-typical elevation. The coloring may be better, the stripes are nicer but we haven't done anything really on this side of the building other than color because you are not going to see this side of the building from 84 or from Route 6. So what you are looking at here... this one is about what they normally do... a little better but not much. We spent our money on the other three sides of the building.

Chair Larkin: OK. Are you guys...

Ms. LoGiudice: I think that does it for us. Thank you.

Chair Larkin: OK. Again we'll go in our polling route for comments. I just will lead off that I love the building. I think it's fabulous. My only concern... I have two concerns. One was the view from 84 but I understand what Jamie's explaining about the berm and I assume that your roof is going to be a black roof, so it is going to be pretty blacked out... I am assuming but you will explain that at the next meeting. The black arches are pretty stark. I didn't know if they could be more of a charcoal but that's kind of my only comment. I think it's a very cool looking building but I tend to really love modern so... And I am only one vote on the Board so with that I will turn to Katherine.

Boardmember Weber: Yeah, well I so appreciate you being sensitive to some of the things that other Restaurant Depots that we might not have been excited about and, admittedly, when I just saw the name come across the desk I was picturing Newburgh and kind of like oh. So this is really... you've added so much to their prototype and for what would be a really great (inaudible). My only thought in looking at the landscape plan is because you do have a pretty nice setback from Route 6... I know you have a lot of stormwater management at the front of the property but maybe if you could add some more substantial trees along that driveway coming in to give it a little bit of a campus feeling to kind of... you know... lend a little more of a natural set off to this nice modern building that you are bringing. I think that would be really quite nice. I really appreciate you screening those HVAC units on the roof. I drive 84 that way a couple of times a day so I think you're doing a really nice job of making sure that 84 viewshed is not disturbed. I am quite excited to see you guys keep working on this.

Chair Larkin: Thanks. I like your idea of the campus look, Katherine, with the trees that you are talking about. Tom?

Boardmember Frasca: Yeah... Hi Jamie. It seems like déjà vu all over again. I remember seeing the original site plan for the shopping center and I think the elevations were well addressed. I think the building will be virtually hard to see from 84 and that's not really my big concern. I like very much Katherine's suggestion. I also endorse Mary's suggestion (inaudible) sub-structures and muting it a little bit. I think the building as far as commercial building (inaudible). Mr. Camarda, I recall you being in front of us years ago with the site plan. My question was: is this going to be like Ace Endico where there's trucks accessing and a parking area as a distribution center?

Ms. Mize: No, so deliveries to the loading area will be done by semi refrigerated and non-refrigerated (inaudible). Most of the customers when they come are coming in, like I said, in a van or SUV. Occasionally you'll get a box truck but these are people

who are coming to buy a day or two's worth of supplies and then take them to their small business.

Boardmember Frasca: Restaurant supply does not have tractor trailers or (inaudible) that they are going to park on this site?

Mr. Camarda: No.

Ms. Mize: No.

Mr. Camarda: That is just not their (inaudible). You go there and you purchase and you take the products with you out the door. It is not a company that delivers to any restaurants or does that type of business.

Boardmember Frasca: OK. I just wanted to clarify on the tractor trailer parking if it was going to be an issue. Other than that, I think as a commercial building... we are sensitive to it as it is in the gateway, I think for, in my opinion, it's a refrigerated building and I think it is a (inaudible) nice.

Mr. Camarda: Well, thank you. I appreciate the Board appreciating what we tried to do. I've been around long enough to know what I think the people of Putnam want and we tried to do things a little nicer. But, getting back to that, their business model is not like Ace Endico or any of these companies that have a fleet of trucks delivering...

Boardmember Frasca: My only concern was a fleet truck parking and I think you've addressed that. That's fine. There are no other issues. We've talked about that already. I think it's very well thought out.

Mr. Camarda: Well, thank you very much.

Chair Larkin: Ginny?

Boardmember Stephens: The only thing I have to say is that I agree with my fellow Board members. I think it is a very cool building and I would back Mary, Katherine and Tom's minor suggestions for improvement and I think it is very well done and very impressive. I am excited to see it go forward.

Chair Larkin: Carla?

Boardmember Lucchino: I just have a couple of questions. I think it looks great overall. But just a few questions. I am the newest member of the Board so can you give me a little of a better sense of where on Route 6 it will be. Is there a landmark, something that it will be close to?

Mr. Camarda: OK. Um... say 500 yards east of that restaurant called Rraci's that serves great food there on Route 6.

Boardmember Lucchino: Got it. That helps a lot.

Mr. Camarda: Or directly across the road from that new building that we never saw until a few trees got taken down. Right across the road from here. They will almost be looking at each other.

Boardmember Lucchino: Got it. That's a big help. And then just a couple of minor questions. In the picture that we are looking at now, the rendering, where those columns are that have the stone on the base. What are the columns made of? It is a little bit hard for me to tell from the picture.

Ms. Mize: Generally, on a basic building those are just like a steel column that is painted out. Here I think the intent is to use steel and paint it white and then dress up at the base of it to kind of transition from that column down to the base.

Boardmember Lucchino: Got it. Got it. And then in addition to all of the information that is included in this plan, do you consider this to include the landscaping plan or will there be something separate that shows the different plantings? I know I saw something but we went through it so fast I didn't have time to study it.

Ms. Ley: This is the proposed landscaping plan that is included as part of the

application.

Boardmember Lucchino: OK. Perfect. Great. I think it looks terrific.

Chair Larkin: OK. So, I think you heard what our comments are. I know Katherine brought up a great suggestion about adding more trees and I love the idea of it looking like a campus entrance. My comment was to tone down the black a little bit, bring it more to a charcoal.

Mr. Camarda: I agree with that.

Ms. Mize: Mary, you also mentioned the roof color and it will be a white TPO membrane roof or you know roof reflectants.

Chair Larkin: So it will be white and then... so I am just picturing the mechanicals then and then... I love your mechanical enclosures. They will be white to match?

Ms. Mize: They're a white or a tan to go with the color of the building façade.

Mr. Camarda: I think they are tan. We're going to go with tan so they blend with the building but what would be your preference?

Chair Larkin: My preference is to not memorialize it and not make it something that you notice. I would blend it with the roof so it disappears.

Mr. Camarda: OK. That's an idea. Right now they are oyster but we can look at possibly try to blend it. Maybe parchment works better with the roof?

Chair Larkin: Yeah so, your eye just glances past it.

Ms. Mize: That makes sense.

Mr. Camarda: Heather, what do you think? Parchment?

Ms. Mize: Yeah, we'll compare it and get something that is a close match.

Chair Larkin: Right. So then we'll be ready to look at this at the May meeting?

Mr. Camarda: Yes. We'll also... You have a sign package but we are not going to discuss that tonight because it didn't get through the building but you can see the signage on the building. But you have that package so...

Chair Larkin: That has to get recommended by the Building Department.

Mr. Camarda: Yes, I understand. That is going to be what you see on the building and some basic monument signs out in front... Stone base type of look. We are trying to keep it all together. And that color... you are thinking about a charcoal gray or a very... how about almost like a bomber jacket brown... a dark, dark brown or you like the gray tone better?

Boardmember Stephens: I like the gray.

Chair Larkin: I like the gray.

Mr. Camarda: Sold!

Boardmember Frasca: I think Katherine's suggestion...

Chair Larkin: It just kind of calms it down a little bit.

Ms. Mize: I was just trying to zoom in on my screen to see if it was meant to be more of a brown or a charcoal but I think with the stone the charcoal would look nice.

Chair Larkin: Or you might want to propose either or. I don't know that I can decide right now but you wanted to get our gist of what our feedback... so we've given you our gist.

Ms. Mize: Thank you.

Ms. Ley: The other thing the Board will need to see at the next meeting is the detail of this enclosure here. As well as what the trash compactor would look like.

Ms. LoGiudice: OK. We can provide those details.

Mr. Camarda: (inaudible) trash compactor on this building? Am I mistaken here?

Ms. Mize: It is an enclosed trash compactor, that's correct. So it is generally and I know we quoted (inaudible) on our team but it is generally a unit that is fully enclosed so you are not taking the trash out, opening the lid and dumping it in. So it is a roll off unit, dark blue, so kind of to match that Restaurant Depot color.

Chair Larkin: OK

Boardmember Frasca: Mary, I had one comment again. I think that the suggestion that was made by Katherine is really important and we'd like to see, Paul, if they can... a tree with a good diameter coming up the driveway that we know is gonna look good and obviously will survive over time.

Chair Larkin: So, you are talking about a five to six inch caliper?

Boardmember Frasca: Well, Mary, I've got to defer to you. I am not sure of calipers but something that (inaudible) hardy, decorative, floral, who knows. I always think of when I go to Washington and I look at the Cherry Blossoms but I don't know if that is even realistic. But other than... it would just tie it all together.

Mr. Camarda: We will put something substantial there. We are not going to put some trees that look like weeds. We'll just (inaudible).

Multiple people talking.

Mr. Camarda: So, its landscaping, you want to see that charcoal gray and maybe we will show you some other colors, you can pick. Jamie, you've taken good notes on this? You know exactly what the Board is looking for?

Ms. LoGiudice: Of course.

Mr. Camarda: Have you taken good notes? We know exactly what the Board is looking for?

Ms. LoGiudice: Yes, I have. We are all set so if the Board has no other comments, we'll submit for you for the next meeting and show you what we've got.

Multiple people talking.

Boardmember Lucchino: Mary, I just have one more question if I can?

Chair Larkin: OK, Carla.

Boardmember Lucchino: The retaining walls, Jamie, that you mentioned. What are those retaining walls made of?

Ms. LoGiudice: I believe they are modular block retaining walls. We can get you the colors and specifics on those once we finalize them.

Boardmember Lucchino: Great. Thank you.

Chair Larkin: They will include that in the next application.

Mr. Camarda: Maybe we can tie the color of those retaining walls into some of the color on the building so it is all gray.

Chair Larkin: You got it. That is what you want to do.

Ms. LoGiudice: Sure can.

Chair Larkin: OK. Thank you. Thank you, Jamie. Thank you, Paul. Thank you, Heather.

Mr. Camarda: Thank you, Ashley. Thank you, Mary.

6. Approve February 26, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Chair Larkin: So now we have to approve the minutes? Victoria?

Ms. Desidero: Yes. Well I realize I only got them out to everybody today so if they feel comfortable otherwise, we can wait until May.

Chair Larkin: Well, I read every word. It was very painful.

(Laughter)

Chair Larkin: It was awful. But the minutes are perfect. Does everybody feel comfortable approving them or do you want to wait until May?

Boardmember Frasca: Well, I had nothing on my dance card today so I read the minutes. They are (inaudible).

Motion to Approve: Thomas Frasca

Seconded: Virginia Stephens

Voice Vote: 5 to 0

7. Close Meeting

Chair Larkin: Anything else before we close the meeting?

Boardmember Frasca: I'd like to make a statement for the record. I think that Victoria did an outstanding job, as well as you, to organize this and it was smooth as silk.

Chair Larkin: Thank you.

Boardmember Stephens: Well done.

Boardmember Frasca: Great for our first go around. (Inaudible) in the future.

Ms. Desidero: Thanks to my partner Ashley.

Chair Larkin: This was a very lengthy meeting and I appreciate all of your time.

Boardmember Frasca: Yes, we always know Ashley is behind the scenes.

Chair Larkin: Yes, and with that I will accept a motion to close the meeting.

Ms. Desidero: We have a question. John are you raising your hand?

Town Councilman John Lord: I just wanted to say thank you. I very much appreciated everyone's work tonight and thanks a lot.

Chair Larkin: Thank you, John.

Motion to Approve: Katherine Weber

Seconded: Carla Lucchino

Voice Vote: 5 to 0

Signed By: _____



Mary Larkin, Chair

Date: 6/29/2020

THE FULL AUDIO RECORDING OF THIS MEETING IS AVAILABLE AT:
<https://www.southeast-ny.gov/337/Planning-Board-Audio-Files>