

**VILLAGE OF AIRMONT
CDRC MINUTES**

CDRC Meeting Date: November 10, 2015

Project Name: Interstate Toyota – 411 Route 59

Attendance:

Daniel Kraushaar, Deputy Village Attorney
Eve Mancuso, Village Engineer
Kristen O'Donnell, Village Planner
Matt Ryan, Turner Geneslaw
Ian Smith, Building Inspector
Suzanne Carley, Clerk
Mark Kurzmann, Attorney for Applicant
Steve Sparaco, Applicant's Engineer
Bryan Zelnick, Applicant's Architect
Jim McMahan – Toyota Manager

Map Date: Original Site Plan dated 1966;
Additional site plan dated 12/1970;
Two additional plans dated 2005 with bulk tables on the bottom

Remarks:

1. The Old Site plans were submitted chronologically arranged going back to 1966. Dan Kraushaar asked for confirmation that all the detail of the history is on these site plans for the record.
2. Dan Kraushaar asked if the old CS bulk table was applied under grandfathering which was confirmed.
3. Mark Kurzmann indicated that the revised plan prepared yesterday would show those areas that exist under the Villages old zoning vs. proposed and reduced the amount of non-conformance area. Therefore they would not need to go for variances.
4. The lot lines need to be clear and displayed. Dan Kraushaar's concern is if they sell off one of the lots and the ingress and egress was extinguished then the other property owner may not have access.
5. Kristen O'Donnell noted that they need to disclaim the lot line if it has not been done so already.
6. Kristen O'Donnell indicated that the new site plan needs to reflect what is being proposed vs. what has been approved (note difference not existing conditions approve)
7. Eve Mancuso and Dan Kraushaar suggested that this is shown by color, shading or cross hatching

8. Dan Kraushaar suggested that they lay out in narrative what they plan to do and Eve Mancuso suggested that they note it on the plan with the year of the original plan dates, showing what is not approved but is proposed, etc. what has not been sought out in the past. In terms of history what has been legalized and what you are now seeking
9. Eve Mancuso suggested that they use the site plan to show what was previously approved via color presentation, which would be better than lines or crosshatching. This should differentiate what was done not just what is being proposed i.e. previous buffer areas, etc.
10. Eve Mancuso suggested that they do a large color presentation board and 11 x 17 handouts to be clear to the PB and to try and save on the costs of color.
11. Dan Kraushaar noted they also need to show Storm Water Management in 2 ways showing the assumption of existing vs. proposed conditions. Decreased conditions need to be pointed out etc.
12. Kristen O'Donnell noted that they need to show the disturbance area.
13. Eve Mancuso noted that they need to show the additional use variance approval and plan for the use
14. Eve Mancuso noted they need to indicate the change in plans with the car wash and details
15. Steve Sparaco will add to the plan the dimensions of the parking garage.
16. Ian Smith suggested the dwelling show the detail use as the office. It will require a buffer between the use of residential and non-residential (where the old tire place was).
17. Kristen O'Donnell pointed out that documentation for the previous variances, approved plans and information on the additional lot needs to be shown
18. Ian Smith noted they need to understand how they are operating a commercial use without a buffer. Also advised that they look at the Code Section 210-103 to review all the conditions to ensure they not looking for any other additional variances
19. Eve Mancuso advised need to show where the display area will be shown but need to show previous approved area as well.
20. Mark Kurzmann will gather the data from the Village as they need to see the resolutions showing the previous approved vs. signed plans.
21. Eve Mancuso stated that they need to provide the Montif lot documentation. She was specifically asking when it changed from an R-25 to an NS Zone.
22. Kristen O'Donnell noted that there should be a letter in the file that specifically states an accessory use - this use that was to that use that will continue as an accessory to the overall use of the existing automobile facility. The letter in the file that says specifically states an accessory use is still an accessory to the overall use of the existing automobile sight so it can be utilized.
23. Kristen O'Donnell pointed out that before going to PB they need to know if they will need a variance. Section 210-44A was referenced and doesn't require a variance the PB may require additional items for a buffer in their discretion.
24. Kristen O'Donnell pointed out that Village of Airmont would be Lead Agency for SEQR.

25. Ian Smith noted that Section 210-20(F1) contradicts 210-44A. Kristen O'Donnell pointed out that when the code is ambiguous it goes in favor of the applicant. 210-44 would be better as it has the discretion of the PB.
26. Clerk will need to have confirmation on the number of new parking spots.
27. Toyota is to come back to CDRC with new plans colored showing all the research marks, developmental coverage, the proposed changes to the bulk table and the existing vs. proposed and approved items. They need to delineate how it shows 4 different parcels, existing vs. proposed from 6 maps into one map using a color-coded presentation.