

Mr. Gordon stated that he has been on site for 6 years and has parked his vans overnight for the past six years and he recently received a summons for parking vehicles overnight. He noted that he told his landlord that he needed overnight parking before moving in and was not aware this approval was necessary.

Mr. Adelman noted that during the original approval of the building, many neighbors came out in protest, especially the next door neighbor.

The board discussed the Town Engineer and Planning Board memos. It was noted that 23 parking spaces were necessary for the site and 23 parking spaces are existing on site. Mr. Baroni and Mr. Kaufman discussed interpretations of the code to see if it were necessary for the applicant to go to the ZBA. It was concluded that the applicant would need to go to the ZBA because they were three spaces deficient as overnight parking was not calculated in the original 23 spaces.

Mr. Delano made a motion to refer this application positively to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). The board also noted that they approved of the proposed location of the overnight parking spaces and wanted that relayed to the ZBA as well. Mr. Carthy second the motion and it was approved with five Ayes.

The Planning Board will prepare a resolution of approval once the applicant has been before the ZBA.

428 – 436 MAIN STREET

428 – 436 Main Street

Section 2, Block 13, Lot 8

Proposal to construct 8 additional off-street parking spaces

Michael Piccirillo, Michael Piccirillo Architecture

Discussion

Present for the application was the professional Michael Piccirillo and a representative for the property owner, Rodney Lais, Lordae Realty.

The application is for an amended site plan application for the establishment of 14 off-street parking spaces.

Mr. Piccirillo stated that he read both memos and noted that he would be able to create a garbage area as noted in Mr. Kaufman's memo. He also noted that lighting on site would not be necessary as the present uses on site (Salon, realtor, Jewelry store and tutor) are open during daylight hours. It was also noted that there were motion sensor flood lights on the rear of the building. The existing retaining wall will remain; the walls that were there were recently replaced.

Mr. Kaufman stated that he had no issues with paving the parking lot but would like the applicant to submit the total amount of legal parking spaces on site. Hopefully when the

parking district is created, this will be a moot point.

The applicant will resubmit plans according to the memos and will update the map with a corrected street location.

A public hearing was scheduled for May 2, 2013 and the board will consider a resolution the same evening.

MCKENNA/REINHARDT

13 Hidden Oak & 280 King Street

Section 2, Block 1J, Lots 1 & 10

Lot Line Change

Michael Campbell, PE Campbell Engineering, LLP

Discussion

Present for the application was Michael Campbell.

The applicant is proposing an even land exchange of property between the two lots noted above. Both lots are located within the R-2A Zoning District. Once this approval is granted, the applicant will move forward with a three lot subdivision. It was noted that the board did not want a segmented review for this applicant.

Discussions were had regarding comments made in the Town Engineers memo and whether it was too soon in the process to discuss the stormwater mitigation and infiltration on site. The board also discussed the stormwater mitigation and infiltration on site at this time. The board concluded that that they would like Mr. Campbell to prepare a conceptual plan along with conceptual stormwater locations.

Mr. Kaufman noted that a public hearing would not be necessary due to a less than 10% exchange of property between the two lots. Once the revised plan is submitted, he will prepare a negative declaration and lot line resolution for the board to consider.

Mr. Delano noted that according to the DEC website these lots were located within the rare plant and animal species area. Mr. Campbell will follow up on this matter.

GJONAJ

7 Pine Ridge Road

Section 1, Block 05, Lot 1.D02

Preliminary Subdivision

Paul Sysak, RLA, ASLA John Meyer Consulting, PC

Discussion

Paul Sysak was present for this application.

Mr. Sysak stated that he has appeared before the Conservation Board and they have asked for a second site walk and requested some specific things to be flagged on the site. Tim Miller flagged the wetlands for his client. He has recalculated the steep slopes and has added some steep slopes to the original calculations that were submitted and now he will not need to go to the ZBA. Lot #2 residence was moved outside the wetland buffer which reduces the wetland buffer impact by 3,000 feet.

Mr. Kaufman stated that the board does need the Conservation Board comments and after looking at the cross sections for the lot on Bedford Banksville Road he would like to see the landscaping proposed for that lot. The structures are out of the wetland buffer and some of the access is still within the buffer.

Discussions were had regarding mitigation to the access points of two driveways located within the wetland buffer and the steepness of the driveways

It was noted that the Conservation Board would like the wetlands verified and once they are verified they will conduct their site walk.

80 LAFAYETTE AVENUE

80 Lafayette Avenue

Section 6, Block 8, Lot 54

Second floor addition to the existing building

Damian Holowinski, Dominick R.Pilla Associates

Discussion

No one was present for this application.

GRGUROVIC

3 Briggs Lane

Section 2, Block 11, Lot 3.G07

Appeal from the decision of the RPRC

Elvis Grgurovic, property owner

Discussion

Present for this application was Elvis Grgurovic.

Because this application was an appeal based on the decision from the RPRC, those people who were present at original RPRC meeting were excused from this discussion which were Adam R. Kaufman, Joe Cermele and John Delano.

Mr. Grgurovic stated that the RPRC was created to streamline the process. He has reviewed the determination letter and can comply with the comments made in that letter. The determination letter did not state why specifically he had to go to the ARB and he would not prefer to go before the ARB for the following reasons: Timing and costs; application is within the zoning; preparation, review and approval from the ARB will takes weeks; excess cost which is disproportionate and may dissuade him from doing the project. The cost to hire a landscape architect is very expensive. His professionals reached out to the Town's professionals and no one knew why this application was sent to the ARB. He would like to eliminate the excess costs of this request as well as avoiding the delay of his project.

Mr. Carthy noted he has spoken to another member of the ARB and he was comfortable with this applicant not going to the ARB. Mr. Adelman and Mr. Sauro also agreed that they did not feel this applicant should go to the ARB.

Mr. Carthy made a motion to reverse the decision of the RPRC that required the applicant to go to the ARB. Mr. Mezzancello second the motion and it was approved with four Ayes.

Meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.