

**Village of Woodbury  
Planning Board Meeting  
February 16, 2022**

Minutes of the Virtual Planning Board Meeting held on February 16, 2022 at 7:30PM

Board Members Present: Christopher Gerver, Chairman  
Richard Cataggio  
Thomas DeLuca  
Michael Pastel  
Evan Yan

Representing for the Village of Woodbury Planning Board:

Kelly Naughton, Attorney  
Natalie D. Barber, Engineer  
Philip Grealy, Traffic Consultant

Board Member(s) Absent: None

Chairman Gerver opened the meeting with Pledge of Allegiance.

1. **Executive Session:** No Executive Session was necessary.
2. **Public Comment:** No member of the public had comments.

3. **Approval and Acceptance of Previous Minutes:**

A motion was offered by T. DeLuca, seconded by R. Cataggio, to approve and accept the minutes of the meeting held February 2, 2022. Chairman Gerver conducted a roll call of the Board which resulted in the motion being:

**ADOPTED**

AYES 5                      Chairman Gerver, R. Cataggio, T. DeLuca, M. Pastel, E. Yan  
NOES 0

4. **Regular Agenda:**

- A. **Superb Developers/ARB** – Review decision for the ARB application of proposed changes to the exterior façade of a previously approved Office Building. Said property is located at 14 Corporate Drive and is known on the Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 226 Block 1 lot 88.

Confirming the Board’s review on facts and findings Chairman Gerver began to read the Specific Conditions of the draft Resolution of Approval ARB for Superb Developers.

*SPECIFIC CONDITIONS*

1. *All applicable conditions attached to the Site Plan, Special Permit and Architectural Review Board approval from September 3, 2013 for Nicholas J. Cardaropoli, and any subsequent amendments thereto, are hereby incorporated into this Resolution and are to remain in full force and effect, and this approval is subject to, and conditioned upon, satisfaction of those conditions as if they were set forth at length herein.*
2. *Specific Condition No. 6 of the Cardaropoli resolution of 2013 which states “The front doors of the building shall be covered by a dark stain, and all glass in the building shall be non-glare.” is hereby revoked since the current approval is for a dark blue finish on the front doors.*
3. *No building permit shall issue authorizing construction of structures inconsistent with the architectural renderings submitted to, and approved by, the Architectural Review Board as part of this approval, nor shall any Certificate of Occupancy issue for any structures constructed except in conformance with such renderings. Any deviation from such renderings will require further Planning Board review.*
4. *All new windows shall be constructed of or coated with non-reflective material or anti-reflection window*

*film will be applied to any new low-e windows installed.*

5. *Prior to the signing of the plans, the Applicant shall comply with the memorandum of the Village Planner dated December 27, 2021 to the satisfaction of the Village Planner.*

A motion was offered by Chairman Gerver, seconded by R. Cataggio to accept the Resolution of Approval. Chairman Gerver conducted a roll call of the Board which resulted in the motion being:

**ADOPTED**

AYES	5	Chairman Gerver, R. Cataggio, T. DeLuca, M. Pastel, E. Yan
NOES	0	

As per Attorney Thomas Landrigan’s request, he will receive a copy of the draft Resolution of Approval via email from Attorney Kelly Naughton.

- B. Woodbury Fresh – Public Hearing** for proposed Site Plan, Special Permit and ARB of proposed conversion of two existing retail spaces into a specialty supermarket. Said property is located within the Woodbury Centre at 37 Centre Drive in Central Valley and is known on the Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 225 Block 2 Lot 1.12.

Representing the applicant, Architect Jason Anderson, Dennis Lynch, and Joseph Haspel.

Engineer Natalie D. Barber noted that the applicant addressed several comments and requests per their last meeting with the Board and she began listing a few. The striping at the rear of the building was adjusted leading to the removal of ten (10) parking stalls accommodating the two-way traffic in that area. The plans show the location of the delivery van parking, and it was recommended to add a condition per the special permit on delivery vans (*Delivery Vans - are permitted for on-site storage and the location(s) identified on the plan.*). She also referenced the turning plan for the fire truck, noting that having a vehicle parked at the loading dock will limit the rear to one-way traffic. She recommended adding a condition that limits the sprinter van deliveries in that area and that the loading docks be numbered. She continues to say that the applicant provided calculations on water and sewer, and she has no comments. Although she recommends conditions associated with the approvals of the Village of Harriman and Orange County Sewer District. Engineer Barber also commented that the applicant submitted a different kind of materials for rooftop screening and recommended the color rendering on sheet a903 be updated by including the type of screening.

Traffic Consultant Phillip Grealy said Engineer Barber covered items on his list and what was previously requested has been added to the plans. For instance, the crosswalk in front of the store and delivery signs. He recommended an additional idling sign in the rear.

The Board had no additional comments; therefore, Chairman Gerver open the floor to the public for comments regarding Woodbury Fresh.

There were no comments from the public.

A motion was offered by Chairman Gerver, seconded by E. Yan, to close the public hearing for Woodbury Fresh. Chairman Gerver conducted a roll call of the Board which resulted in the motion being:

**ADOPTED**

AYES	5	Chairman Gerver, R. Cataggio, T. DeLuca, M. Pastel, E. Yan
NOES	0	

Chairman Gerver had no objections to the suggestive conditions by the Board’s consultant(s) for the Resolution of Approval and neither did Architect Anderson. Chairman Gerver noted that this application is subject to the moratorium and a notice of hardship waiver has not been received.

A motion was offered by Chairman Gerver, seconded by T. DeLuca, for counsel to draft the Resolution of Approval for Woodbury Fresh once the moratorium is lifted or upon receiving the Moratorium Hardship Waiver with the conditions

that were suggested by the engineering consultants. Chairman Gerver conducted a roll call of the Board which resulted in the motion being:

**ADOPTED**

AYES 5 Chairman Gerver, R. Cataggio, T. DeLuca, M. Pastel, E. Yan  
NOES 0

Mr. Haspel said the Moratorium Hardship Waiver was submitted and asked for some clarification on the procedure. Attorney Naughton acknowledged receiving the documents and will try to provide information the next day.

Architect Anderson spoke of the roof screening, and he noted that pictures were taken from three different locations. There was further discussion on whether the screens can be seen from different angles. As a reminder Chairman Gerver said a completed ARB form is needed on this application before he signs.

- C. **CVPM – Public Hearing** for proposed amendment to the previously approved Site Plan and Special Permit to include personal service. Said property is located at 252-260 Route 32 in Central Valley and is known on the Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 230 Block 7 Lot 17.2.

Representing the applicant, Architect Steve Esposito and Jerry Casesa from HVRS.

Engineer Barber began by saying that current discussions on this application have been associated with parking, traffic, increase water and sewer use. The applicant was asked to provide calculations and she is now asking for some clarification on those assumptions and figures that were generated. She spoke of some of the assumptions related to water and sewer which were indicated in her memo.

*H2M Memo dated February 11, 2022:*

*Water/Sewer – This application is subject to the moratorium. The applicant provided a revised water and sewer demand form that requires clarification as follows:*

*a) Applicant to provide source for estimating demand for existing personal service use. Please indicate whether any data for similar type personal service is available.*

*b) Applicant to discuss assumptions used to derive the allocation of 12 stations and 4 hair care sinks to a salon/barbershop use.*

*c) We note a minor correction to the calculation for restaurant use is needed.*

*d) We note the applicant conservatively calculates demand for retail/office utilizing the building area (7,161 SF) that would otherwise overlap with the proposed personal service use.*

*This form will be reviewed with the Water and Sewer Administrator once clarified.*

Traffic Consultant Grealy referred to his comments that were addressed by DTS Provident regarding traffic and parking.

*Colliers Engineering & Design Memo dated February 11, 2022:*

*Parking Based upon our review of the DTS PDE submission, the responses relative to Items 1, 2, and 3 have been addressed.*

*Relative to Item 4, the submission references the actual observations of parking conditions on the site by DTS PDE in June of 2021 and the relation to actual utilization on the site. Their peak observation is consistent with the parking values utilized in their Shared Parking Analysis and thus, we have no further comments regarding that item. As previously noted, the Shared Parking Analysis indicates that at peak times the parking area will be fully utilized.*

*Traffic:*

*DTS PDE has also provided a summary of the information contained in their traffic study and that the uses considered in their original trip generation estimates would account for the types of current commercial uses being considered. Based on the information presented, we agree that the original study accounts for what would be considered higher generating traffic uses.*

*As discussed at the last meeting, this section of NYS Route 32 is heavily utilized and congested during peak hours. It has been confirmed that a communications modem was installed by the Applicant at the intersection of NYS Route 32 and Estrada Road as part of their New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) permit. Based on follow up discussions with NYSDOT regarding signal timing adjustments, NYSDOT indicated that signal timing adjustments would typically be done after completion and full occupancy of a particular development and reflecting conditions with the traffic generating by the project. Any requests for signal timing adjustments should be made by the Applicant and/or Village once the project is fully occupied. This would provide the most efficient signal timing utilization based on actual traffic volumes.*

Traffic Consultant Grealy pointed out that during peak times all the spaces will be used and that DTS Provident provided information demonstrating they can accommodate the proposed uses. In the previous meeting there was a discussion on the signal located on Estrada Road off Route 32. He confirmed there was a modem installed at the signal and that the Department of Transportation has not made any final signal timing adjustments and that they will make adjustments once the building has full occupancy or upon the requests of the Village or the applicant's consultants.

The Board had no additional comments; therefore, Chairman Gerver opens the floor to the public for comments regarding Central Valley Property Management (CVPM).

Resident Keith Ferrara lives on Estrada Road asked about the traffic light on Estrada. He personally has waited at that traffic light 4-5 minutes, waiting for the light to change to get on Route 32 to then have it change back to red in 30-45 seconds. He has also witnessed other cars driving through the parking area of the shopping plaza due to the long wait. From what he's gathering nothing will be done on the timing of the traffic light until the stores are occupied. It's a such a concern especially with a hotel coming soon. Mrs. Ferrara made an example the water main that broke on Smith Clove Road. School Buses as well as other vehicles rerouted going through Valley Avenue onto Estrada Road to get on Route 32, which living on Estrada took her 20 minutes around the corner to get to Smith Clove Elementary. Anytime something happens on those roads there's major traffic on Estrada.

Traffic Consultant Grealy responded saying the Village can request for the DOT to look at that situation to help alleviate the issue, though the DOT usually waits for the facilities to be occupied to assess the situation. He also added that the modem installed can be adjusted remotely by the DOT.

Chairman Gerber said the Board previously expressed the same concerns with that intersection on Estrada Road. He asked Traffic Consultant Grealy if he can draft a letter to the DOT copying the Village Board, to have them look at the timing on that intersection and if they can look at the loop sensors. Traffic Consultant Grealy will take care of it.

Resident Kristin Behr lives on Valley Avenue, and she asked when the parking lot has reached full capacity, what will happen to the overflow parking. She also pointed out that she as well has seen people speeding through the parking lot as a cut off because they don't want to wait for the traffic light.

Traffic Consultant Grealy said that based on their consultant's projections there is enough to accommodate the uses. The consultants prepared the shared parking analysis and included updates based on what's being utilized. Chairman Gerver added that this application is operating under a special permit that is reviewed every year. The review can be triggered if a situation occurs where local residents file complaints with the Building Department. A review can also be triggered if there are pressing matters at the site, that can lead to the Building Inspector reaching out to Board who can then consider taking actions. As per the cars cutting through the parking lot Chairman Gerver said he will reach out to the Town's liaison for the Police Department and let them know the concerns that were expressed in tonight's meeting on cars cutting through.

A motion was offered by Chairman Gerver, seconded by T. DeLuca, to close the public hearing for Central Valley Property Management. Chairman Gerver conducted a roll call of the Board which resulted in the motion being:

**ADOPTED**

AYES 5 Chairman Gerver, R. Cataggio, T. DeLuca, M. Pastel, E. Yan  
NOES 0

R. Cataggio asked if the proposed amendment consist of having a barbershop or hair salon or is the applicant asking for both. Architect Steve Esposito representing the applicant said both. The amendment to the application is to allow personal services which are permitted uses. Mr. Casesa said they have 3 potential tenants, and they are personal service(s), one is a barbershop, a hair salon, and a restaurant and with that he began to address the water usage. He mentioned Architect Esposito sharing the usage to date on the property for the apartments and the one occupied space. There's a letter from the Water Department indicating the amount of water usage from February 1, 2001 to January 19, 2022 stating 247,224 gallons of water use. In the initial application a consecutive number used was 570,000 gallons to indicate water usage per day per bedroom for the year. Mr. Casesa said 60% of what was estimated was used.

Engineer Barber noted that Architect Esposito and Mr. Casesa addressed the assumptions to obtain for the stations in the beauty salon, but she'd like to know the source that led them to that consecutive number for personal service use. She also asks that the applicant provide a revised demand summary to be reviewed with the Water Superintendent and added that this application is subject to the moratorium.

Chairman Gerver asked about the signage for the building. The current tenant has a blue and white paper sign in the window above the door, no gold sign as per the original ARB approval. Mr. Casesa said their intent is to come back to that Board regarding signage. They'd like to keep signage and personal service use issues separated. They are looking to get personal service use approved for Dry Cleaner that will have no water usage. Mr. Casesa continued to say that the calculation of 780,000 gallons water use in that facility was already approved and he doesn't see having an application or a tenant that would exceed those counts. He doesn't want this application on hold due to the moratorium when they were already approved, and the Water Department's letter indicated that upon approval they will be served.

Attorney Naughton stated that the applicant is subject to the moratorium. She explained that there are exemptions the applicant can apply for before the Village Board of Trustees and continued to say that the Planning Board cannot do anything to get the applicant out of the moratorium. This is an existing approval, and the applicant is requesting a modified special permit which makes it subject to the moratorium. Regarding signage, she will look over the approval to make sure what the applicant is proposing complies with that approval. Mr. Casesa said they will return with an application on signage when the moratorium expires since it's a separate part of the current application. Attorney Naughton noted that any personal service approval will need to comply with the approval as well.

Architect Esposito had some questions for Engineer Barber regarding her comments on Water and Sewer. She briefly told him what was needed and how it should be addressed. Chairman Gerver noted that the Board has 60 days to take action from a closed public hearing, and within those days the consultants are to review information that the applicant agreed to provide.

- D. **Hollender/19 Sunny Lane** - Review documents submitted for ARB and Ridge Preservation for proposed 14 x 44 replacement of rear deck on dwelling located at 19 Sunny Lane in Highland Mills. Said property is known on the Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 217 Block 5 Lot 8.

Representing the applicant Contractor John Yastin.

Mr. Yastin gave a brief description of the application. The applicant wishes to have a new deck. The deck measured 43 ft. in length (the back of the house) and 8 feet in width, making it a narrow deck. Difficult for the applicant to use. Mr. Yastin read a letter written by the applicant dated January 18, 2022.

Letter from the applicant:

To whom it may concern

Please find enclosed my completed application for a new deck at 19 Sunny Lane. The original deck measuring 43 feet by eight feet is in severe disrepair and needs to be replaced. The original deck was a long rectangular space and was barely usable due to its small and odd size. I would like to increase the deck to 14 feet projection which will make the space more usable and functional.

Mr. Yastin said the applicant hired him because the deck was falling. He removed it and re-flashed (an aluminum metal) between the siding above and below the deck. Mr. Yastin provided pictures on screen showing the home with the original deck and another picture with the deck removed. The applicant wishes to go full length of the house as the original deck, extend it from 8 feet to 14 feet, and add a staircase to have access to the backyard.

Engineer Barber referred to her memo dated February 11, 2021.

H2M Memo:

1. Zoning –

a) Use – The property is approved for seasonal use. We recommend you discuss if additional review aside from Ridge Preservation and ARB is required for this application with Counsel. If so, we will have additional comments.

b) Bulk – The property is in the R-2A zone and the lot is non-conforming as described as follows. According to the survey prepared in 2021, the lot is undersized (2-acres required, 0.215-acres provided) for a single-family home in this area. Additionally, the lot does not meet requirements for lot width (175-ft required, 75-ft provided), and the existing home does not appear to meet side yard (30-ft required, approx. 14- and 16-ft provided) or front yard (40-ft required, approx. 30-ft provided) setback requirements. From the survey mark-up provided by the applicant, it appears the new deck will extend the full width of the home and at a minimum will encroach on the required side yard setbacks. It further appears that the addition of the stairs on the deck, could increase the degree of non-conformity with respect to the required side yard. We recommend you review this with Counsel.

2. ARB – In your role as ARB, the Code (§8-4) specifies your review and consideration of structures or alterations to structures and the following:

A. Excessive similarity, dissimilarity or inappropriateness in relation to itself or to any other structure existing or for which a permit has been issued or to any other structure included in the same permit application, facing upon the same street or within the same or surrounding neighborhood, including neighboring developments, in respect to one or more of the following features:

(1) Exterior façade of all building sides, including, but not limited to, building materials, mass, roof line, architectural style and authenticity, colors, size, proportion, roof design and height.

(2) Size and arrangement of doors, windows, porticoes or other openings or breaks in the façade, including reverse arrangement.

(3) Footprint and gross floor area, including all or portions of the structure.

The applicant has provided sketches (sketch on survey, section views, and elevation) for your consideration of the new deck. In accordance with your typical practice, we recommend the applicant provide the following for you to review the objectives of the Code:

a) a completed ARB form identifying colors and materials of the proposed deck;

b) colored rendering(s) of the proposed deck attached to the existing home; and,

c) photographs of adjacent homes.

3. Ridge Preservation – This property ranges greater than 750-ft above mean sea level (AMSL) triggering your review under the Code (§310-13) requirements for Ridge Preservation (threshold 600-ft AMSL). The property

*is between two view corridors (Route 44 to the North and Route 105 to the South). We recommend the applicant provide evidence (per §310-13.(7)) of visibility of the structure from both designated view corridors.*

*Upon determination of visibility: If the structure is not visible, we believe it is within your authority to waive any requirements of Ridge Preservation that you determine appropriate. Alternatively, if no waiver is granted, the applicant should confirm the use of natural building materials, neutral and earth tone colors, and whether any clearing of trees is required for the new deck.*

Chairman Gerver's question regarding non-conforming use. Attorney Naughton said per code seasonal dwelling unit is a pre-existing non-conforming use. The expansion of the non-conforming use can go to the ZBA, and the applicant is allowed to expand up to 10%. She noted that this application had built an addition to the house in 2019 and because of this the applicant is to go to the Building Department for a determination as to whether the applicant already received the 10% expansion. The applicant has a CO for seasonal use and there was a question whether they were looking to convert it to permanent. Mr. Yastin confirmed that applicant uses the home seasonal and would like a safe deck to use.

Chairman Gerver told the Board that he had driven by the home and as per Ridge Preservation he doesn't think it will be an issue. He doesn't think it can be seen from Bakertown. E. Yan had a question as to what would trigger ARB and Attorney Naughton advised that before the Board discusses ARB or Ridge Preservation the applicant needs to return to the Building Department to see if they are allowed to come before the Planning Board for ARB. Mr. Yastin offered to show a picture of the addition on the home, but he was told that the determination of whether that 10% already exceeded must come from the Building Department. Chairman Gerver explained if the event the addition exceeded the 10% the applicant will have to appear before the ZBA for a variance to increase the coverage. Mr. Yastin said he will reach out to the Building Department .

- E. Courtyard/Marriot** – Review and discuss revised documents submitted for proposed site plan, SWPPP, EAF and Traffic Impact Study for proposed 108 room hotel to include guest amenities parking and associated utilities. Said property is located at NYS Route 32 and Turner Road in Central Valley and is known on the Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 226 Block 1 Lots 6.1, 7.and 8.

Representing the applicant Engineer Steve Esposito and Carlito Holt from DTS Provident.

Architect Esposito began by giving a summary on the progress and status on the plan. Mr. Holt introduced an updated plan for the intersection of Turner Road and Route 32. With the original traffic study, the DOT required that Turner Road intersection be reconfigured to have a more controlled point of access entering Route 32 and a southbound left turn lane onto Route 32 from Turner Road. They made additional improvements on Turner Road to remedy some issues. Mr. Holt said they had appeared before the Village Board of Trustees as per the Planning Board recommendations for their opinion and acceptance of improvements and they were not on board, leaving the applicant to do an improvement required by the DOT and staying out of the Village right of way. He said a concept was presented to DOT and they approved the plan bringing them before the Planning Board to get their thoughts on the plan.

Traffic Consultant Grealy referred to his letter dated February 10, 2022 summarizing his comments.

*Colliers Engineering & Design letter:*

*We are in receipt of the January 18, 2022 submission from DTS Provident including updated plans and correspondence relative to the proposed NYS Route 32 improvements associated with the proposed hotel. Based on a review of that information, we note the following:*

*1. The plans have been revised to include roadway improvements to be constructed on lands within the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) right-of-way or on lands controlled by the Applicant, and no longer utilizes any Village property. Based on the correspondence as outlined in the January 12, 2022 email from Jason Brenner, NYSDOT appears to be in conceptual agreement with the plans. The final details will be worked out as part of the Highway Work Permit. Note that the Applicant will have to dedicate some land along their frontage on NYS Route 32 to NYSDOT, which is a lengthy process.*

*2. With respect to the concept plans, the provision of the separate left turn lane on NYS Route 32 and realignment of Turner Road to create a more standard "T" intersection, is a beneficial improvement. The plans*

also calls for an access driveway connection to Turner Road as well as a right-turn-in/right-turn-out driveway connection to NYS Route 32. This portion of the NYS Route 32 plan should include coordination with the proposed Beer World application on the west side of NYS Route 32.

3. The NYS Route 32 right-turn-in/right-turn-out driveway is channelized with striping only. This apparently is to accommodate the larger vehicle movements to and from the site. We would recommend, subject to NYSDOT approval, that consideration of a mountable curb be provided to offer more positive traffic control to reinforce the right-turn-in/right-turn-out movements. The final determination will be from NYSDOT and appropriate "No Left Turn", "One-Way", and other signing will have to be included.

4. The plans appear to indicate a sidewalk along the site frontage on NYS Route 32. This improvement would be subject to NYSDOT approval. Input from the Village Planning Board should be provided to the Applicant relative to that improvement.

5. The section of Turner Road between NYS Route 32 and the access to the hotel should be reviewed in more detail. We believe that some additional widening of Turner Road from NYS Route 32 to the site driveway would be beneficial to ease movements to and from the driveway. This would also ensure more efficient movement for any emergency vehicles along this section of roadway.

6. On the final plans, the position of the existing access from Martial Arts should be shown more clearly and any modifications including new signing should be incorporated into the final plans.

7. The roadway work relative to this intersection should be coordinated with the other applications in the area and the Applicant should update the Board on the status of potential signalization of this intersection or any other improvements, which would be part of the project.

8. Previous plans have been reviewed by the ESO's. If not already received, their input on these revised plans should be obtained.

Traffic Consultant Grealy said what's needed is clarity on DOT's position under this new plan since it's slightly different from what has been presented. E. Yan asked if this was also coordinated with the Dunkin Donuts proposed drive-thru application. Traffic Consultant Grealy said the plan is to coordinate with all the applications, the hotels, Dunkin Donut and Beer World.

Chairman Gerver would like to address DOT, submitting a letter stating the Board agrees with the overall design, but strongly disagrees on not having a signalized intersection due to real-life traffic conditions. Traffic Consultant Grealy agrees and is willing to help submitting this letter from the Board to the DOT. T. DeLuca asked if the Board has the ability in granting approval on this project based on the signalization. Attorney Naughton explained that the Planning Board has some ability in respect to limiting the development of the project based on environmental factors. Mr. Holt said the idea of signalization was brought up to discuss with the DOT at the beginning and they weren't on board with the idea. The layout of Turner Road and how it was to be reconfigured was more appealing than what it currently laid out. He also pointed out that the improvement is a substantial cost to the applicant to widen and facilitate the left turn lane. Chairman Gerver pointed out that it still won't help alleviate traffic. He continued asking the Board to express their opinion(s) on the conceptual plan and they agree with what has been discussed. A letter will be sent to the DOT and the Chairman will talk to Engineer Barber in getting the application to move forward since there are other plans that need to be reviewed.

Engineer Barber briefly went over her comments in her memo dated February 11, 2022 and noted that some are from prior reviews.

*H2M Memo:*

2. *Lot Consolidation / Boundary Modifications – The applicant is proposing development on three (3) tax parcels and previously advised that the lots will be consolidated into one lot. The concept plan provided does not show the deeded property limits extending into the right-of-way like it did previously. It is unclear if the status of this is changed or what limits of any dedications or takings (DOT or other) are required. The plan proposes to reconfigure the property boundaries which the applicant should clarify on future submissions showing deeded limits, State right-of-way, and Turner Road right-of-way (presumptive or other).*

3. *Access/Circulation – Two entrances to the site are proposed. One is off of Route 32, which appears to be a right-in/right-out only configuration like it was previously. The second is off of Turner Road and it is assumed*

*this is proposed for full movement. The applicant's plan also shows a proposed left hand turn lane for Southbound traffic on Route 32 into Turner Road.*

*a. Regarding the access on Route 32, the applicant should clarify the improvements to the triangular medium (striping, curbed, mountable) since turning movements for fire truck and box truck cross this feature and also the exiting right turn lane which appears to cause a conflict with traffic exiting the site.*

*b. The turning movements appear to use a "pumper" truck for demonstrating ESO fire access. The applicant should confirm the dimensions are the same as the ladder truck template the Village Fire Department provided to them previously.*

*c. Understanding this is a conceptual plan, it is difficult at this time to determine how the striping improvements at the Turner Road intersection blend with the current configuration of Turner Road and this should be clarified in a future plan.*

*d. As this application progresses and details on plans provided, these should show fire truck maneuvers into, out of, and through the site (as if the site was at maximum capacity).*

*e. The applicant should advise if there are any current discussions regarding a pedestrian and/or vehicular connection between the proposed hotels. f. The applicant should advise if any sidewalks are proposed along Route 32.*

R. Cataggio asked if a digital simulation model showing traffic with all the applications (hotels, Beer World, CVPM fully leased out and Dunkin Donut drive-thru) built out. Traffic Consultant Grealy said Mr. Holt is a consultant for Beer World as well and has configurations that include the other applicants since they have been working together. Mr. Holt said it can be done since they have the software to make that demonstration. Addressing some of the comments, Mr. Holt clarified that there won't be sidewalks. Architect Esposito added that between the two hotels they will propose a pedestrian connection.

Chairman Gerver assured Architect Esposito and Mr. Holt as soon as they are back on the agenda, they will be able to review information they forward to the consultants.

**Adjournment:**

With no further business to discuss, a motion was offered by Chairman Gerver, seconded by T. DeLuca, to adjourn the meeting at 9:25 PM.

**ADOPTED**

AYES	5	Chairman Gerver, R. Cataggio, T. DeLuca, M. Pastel, E. Yan
NOES	0	

Claudia Valoy-Romanisin, Planning Board Secretary