

square footage that is the exact same square footage on the Architectural Drawings. Mr. Delaney states the chart has been reviewed and revised. Mr. Delaney refers to the Town Requirements which would be 40 parking spaces plus 2 handicapped spaces and states they are providing 38 parking spaces plus 2 handicapped spaces. Mr. Delaney states they moved the soil stockpiles to other areas in order to get them out of the way. Mr. Delaney states they added the handicapped sign locations. Mr. Delaney states they revised Note 16. Mr. Delaney states if they decide to use the public water supply for drinking water and the well for irrigation they would need an Approval from the County Health Department. Mr. Delaney states the new proposed Site disturbance square footage will change slightly after the green practices are finalized. Mr. Delaney states the Plan is fairly well set. Mr. Delaney refers to the Site disturbance box and states the 31,090 will go up or down a couple hundred square feet. Cynthia asks Mr. Delaney to give the Board a general overview of what is not being disturbed. Mr. Delaney refers to the Plan and states the area that is hashed in blue will not be disturbed, and will simply be repaved. Mr. Delaney refers to the Plan and states the area in green is where the ditching and utilities will be going. Mr. Delaney refers to the Plan and points out the buildings that will be coming down. Mr. Delaney refers to the Plan and states they will be repaving the DOT area in the front of the building, which he will talk about in a second. Mr. Delaney refers to the Plan and states the green and pink areas are disturbance. Mr. Delaney states everything adds up to approximately 31,000 square feet. Mr. Delaney states they will nail down a figure within the next week. Mr. Ryzerski refers to the Plan and points out a shed that will remain. Will asks whether the blue areas will be repaved. Mr. Ryzerski states they will either be completely repaved or patched. Will asks how the blue area is different than the green area. Mr. Delaney states the pavement in the green area will be ripped out. Mr. Delaney states there will be new utility work done in this area, such as new water mains, electrical lines, drainage, water lines going to the back, and a new septic/sewer line. Mr. Delaney refers to the Plan and points out a building that will stay up. Cynthia asks Mr. Delaney what some of the practices are that he is considering. Mr. Delaney refers to the utilization of a separator. Mr. Delaney states all the water that is coming off the lumberyard is flying out to the street. Mr. Delaney states the separator will trap the water for sediment. Mr. Delaney states it will probably be put on the Utility Plan. Will refers to the areas where all of the utilities are and states the pavement will be dug up and a trench will be dug for the utilities. Will refers to the areas that are only being repaved and confirms they will not be touched until the trench work is done. Mr. Delaney states after that they will repave everything. Will asks when the pavement will be pulled up in the repaving areas. Will asks whether this will occur when the trench is dug or after the trench is dug. Will refers to the Plan and shows where the pavement will be ripped up and where the utilities will go back in. Will refers to the areas that will be repaved on the Plan. Mr. Delaney states it will all be done at the same time. Will asks whether it will all be exposed dirt. Charlotte states they are not ripping up the old pavement. Mr. Ryzerski states they will be going over the pavement. Cynthia confirms there will be a topcoat over it. Cynthia refers to the screen and states Frank suggested putting in some kind of stormwater treatments to catch the roof water or maybe something in the front, as well as having a conversation with the DOT about this. Cynthia asks Mr. Delaney whether that conversation has taken place. Mr. Delaney states that a conversation has taken place and there are pluses and minuses with the DOT. Mr. Delaney refers to the Utility Plan Sheet 3 and states they have applied for a Permit to repave and do not seem to feel there will be a problem with that at all. Mr. Delaney states when they went to the DOT to talk to them about putting planters in the right-of way, or any other thing there, they were told to talk to another Division. Mr. Delaney states that means they can't proceed without signing a Lease Agreement in order to rent the area. Mr. Delaney talks about going into a Licensing Agreement with the DOT and states they have chosen not to do that, at least this time. Mr. Delaney refers to the small entranceway in the front and states an area has been freed up for roof drainage that will incorporate green practice planters. Mr. Delaney refers to the Plan and states they are looking at sliding the handicapped spaces over and making the planer a little bit bigger. Mr. Delaney states there will be an elevated filter with plants that will be in peat and sand. Mr. Delaney states the plants will take up some of the water in the transpiration and the rest will filter through a peat and sand mixture, coming out the bottom and be gathered so it goes into the storm sewage system. Mr. Delaney refers to the Plan and shows where all of the filters will discharge. Mr. Delaney refers to the roof

being handled, as well as approximately 274 square feet of filter needed for the parking. Mr. Delaney states they are also looking at a planter filter system behind Building B. Mr. Delaney states he is a little nervous about doing that as this is a tall building and it will get very little sun. Cynthia refers to the roof and states it is pitched forward. Mr. Delaney states he can direct the gutters and down spouts anyway he wants. Mr. Ryzerski states it pitches both ways. Mr. Ryzerski states 70% pitches forward and 30% pitches back in terms of water. Cynthia states she is a little disappointed that there has not been any further movement with the DOT. Cynthia states she is extremely concerned that a truck is going to pull up and park for a moment which they may consider to be temporary. Cynthia states if someone is trying to come out the sight distance will be impeded. Cynthia states she thinks this is a very big issue and can see delivery trucks trying to park there temporarily. Cynthia states this is a sea of macadam and people are going to pull along there and park. Cynthia asks who is going to go out there and do something about it. Cynthia states Mr. Ryzerski is not going to police them. Cynthia states if someone cannot come out and safely make the turn this is an issue. Cynthia asks how people will be kept from parking in this specific area. Cynthia states the Applicant should get permission from the DOT in order to plant there or put planters in. Will asks whether the DOT really requires a Lease so curbing and planting may be done. Will states the majority of driveway cuts and curbs come out to right-of-ways. Will states he could understand if substantial trees were being proposed. Mr. Delaney states that Mr. Ryzerski spoke with DOT directly. Mr. Ryzerski states he was told to occupy any portion of the DOT right-of-way he would need to file for an Occupancy Permit and also have to lease the area from them which would require them to speak to someone in a different Division, other than for the paving procedure. Mr. Ryzerski states it would be more difficult. Cynthia asks why it would be more difficult to talk with another Agency. Cynthia states the Board is going through this with Fuelco and she believes they went through it with the Ambulance Corp. Cynthia states it is pretty common in this Town to cross DOT land and sometimes some of the features end up on DOT property. Mr. Delaney asks how the other Applicants handled it. Mr. Delaney asks if they went to the DOT. Cynthia states Fuelco has a whole planting island going in on DOT land. Will states they went to the DOT to obtain permission. Will states if only a curb and grass were being proposed, that is the same of every driveway, so he doesn't understand why the DOT would require a Lease. Will states if the curb were to be built brand new, it would not be where it is, it would be further into the right-of-way, and the Applicant would be responsible for maintaining the grass. Will refers to planting and states he understands that may change the equation a little bit. Will states he doesn't think this will be difficult for the DOT. Mr. Delaney states they were looking to put fake planters there. Cynthia states that is fine. Will states that planters are structures of sort. Cynthia suggests whatever is the easiest so that it is not a sea of macadam and an invitation for a big truck to just pull right up for deliveries and staying parked there while the driver tries to find out where he is supposed to be. Cynthia states in the meantime vehicles will be trying to pull in and pull out on a busy road. Will asks whether the DOT referred to a Lease in terms of something monetary. Gary asks Mr. Ryzerski if it is possible when he spoke with DOT he portrayed that something permanent would go there, versus planters that could be picked up and moved. Mr. Ryzerski states he specifically told the DOT he is proposing landscaping or planters that would be in the right-of-way. Cynthia states she doesn't mind talking with DOT because she is concerned about a safety issue. Charlotte states that might be better. Mr. Delaney states there is another option which would be striping and a no parking sign. Charlotte states people will ignore that. Cynthia states she has a feeling that striping and no parking signs would be adhered to for the average customer, but not a truck driver who may be nervous about pulling in and being able to pull out. Will points to the screen and refers to this area being built new having one driveway instead of two driveways. Will states if plantings are in there as opposed to grass, that may require an Approval. Will states he never heard of the DOT charging for it because the Applicant would be required to maintain it anyway. Mr. Ryzerski states when he applied for the repaving, which is step one, that is what his conversation led to. Mr. Ryzerski states he reached out to DOT again to see how difficult it would be, but hasn't received any definitive answers. Cynthia states maybe Mr. Ryzerski should ask the DOT about taking up the pavement and putting down grass. Mr. Delaney states there are all new people at the DOT in our Region, and from top to bottom, almost everyone is brand new. Will states that may be true but the rules haven't changed. Mr. Delaney states that the

rules may not change, but the interpretation of them may change. Will states he understands the Divisions are different and the people Mr. Ryzerski talked to have to do with obtaining a Permit at the time the physical work is done, and that is not the same thing as the design. Cynthia asks Mr. Ryzerski to let her know who he spoke with at the DOT and she will make a phone call. Mr. Ryzerski states he spoke with Chris Lee and he specifically referred him to another person. Mr. Ryzerski states he doesn't remember that person's name. Cynthia states she will see if she can get to someone faster and refers to making a change to grass. Mr. Ryzerski asks whether a curb would be involved to, or just a change from asphalt to grass. Mr. Delaney refers to the screen and talks about bringing the aspect further out. Mr. Delaney states that may help them in terms of filtering rainwater. Mr. Delaney states he is going ahead with the assumption that this may not pan out and they will be dealing with planters. Mr. Delaney refers to having a manhole with baffles and states the sediment falls down and the water continues. Mr. Delaney states the issue with DOT will still be left open. Mr. Ryzerski asks Will if he could do an illustration on one of the Plans. Will states we had talked about this a few Meetings ago and one important key is to know what the turning radius will be that is needed. Will talks about utilizing a template. Mr. Delaney suggests the inquiries continue and refers to help from the Chair. Mr. Delaney states they are about to go off their Site. Mr. Rossi states he thinks it is obvious they are trying to cooperate, but the condition is there, and they are basically being asked to do improvements offsite, not within the Site. Mr. Rossi states they proposed striping as an improvement over the current situation. Mr. Rossi states he doesn't know the extent that the Board has the strict authority to have them do offsite work. Cynthia refers to the stormwater issue and states it would be nice if the DOT would help the Applicant deal with it. Cynthia states we are not looking to create more work for Mr. Ryzerski, but are looking to address a potential safety issue. Mr. Rossi states it has been a safety issue forever. Cynthia states we know the fallback position is to stripe the heck out of the area and put up signs. Cynthia talks about having something that is a lot nicer, which will function much better than having to worry about trucks parking there, and people not being able to see when trying to get in and out of the driveway. Mr. Rossi states they understand and he is not saying they are throwing down any gauntlets. Mr. Rossi states the overall situation will be improved by eliminating the parking in the front. Mr. Rossi talks about needing to comply with rules from the DOT that might be more onerous. Mr. Rossi states that Mr. Ryzerski is willing to do whatever has to be done, but they are talking about an offsite improvement for an existing access way. Will refers to telling DOT that the driveway has been used for decades and the Use will be less. Mr. Rossi states he is familiar with the Fuelco Site Plan and the Fields Lane side has a very wide right-of-way. Mr. Rossi asks if that is a State Road. Will states it is a Town Road and the State has an ownership of a piece between the road and the property. Cynthia states the Town Road is like an island over a huge chunk of DOT right-of-way. Mr. Rossi states that area might be very different than this proposal in that there may already be lawn and curb space. Will states no, it is not in the curb, it is between the driveways, and the curb doesn't come out to it, but the landscaping will. Mr. Rossi states the landscaping may have already existed in the right-of-way. Gary states we should see how Cynthia makes out with the DOT. Gary states we are all on the same page in terms of not wanting to have parking there. Gary states the Board understands the Applicant does not want to pay a lot of money to make it happen. Gary states anything that is done will be better than what has been there. Gary states if the DOT is at all reasonable they will see it as an improvement. Mr. Rossi states he is not sure what the expense might be. Mr. Rossi refers to a Project in Putnam County and dealing with the DOT there as opposed to Katonah. Mr. Rossi refers to a Mexican Restaurant up on Route 22 and states their sign required Approval from the DOT because that area has a right-of-way. Mr. Ryzerski refers to the turning radius. Will states he doesn't know what the turning radius is.

Mr. Delaney refers to Detail Sheet 4. Cynthia brings the Drainage Details Sheet up on the screen. Mr. Delaney states it should be called "Details". Mr. Delaney refers to the Plan and states Mr. Jacobsen, wanted a cedar stockade fence which was added. Mr. Delaney states they added crosswalk paver details. Mr. Delaney states this area is behind Building A where the handicapped parking is. Mr. Delaney states they have added a handicapped sign for parking. Mr. Delaney refers to the soil stockpile and states it will be tarped at all times.

Mr. Delaney refers to the Landscape Plan and states they moved some of the trees back. Mr. Delaney refers to a drain and the moving of Boxwoods and states other than that the Landscape Plan is unchanged.

Mr. Delaney states they did relabel the parking spaces.

Cynthia states now we have to deal with the fact that the Plan is two parking spaces short and talk about what the Planning Board can do about that. Cynthia states the Board would like to go over the Referral to the ZBA. Cynthia suggested the Applicant take a look at the Code and states Will brought extra copies of what it allows the Planning Board to do or not to do. Cynthia refers to 250-28 which refers to the minimum amount of off-street parking spaces and states the Board may only do a reduction where there are adequate accessible reserve areas and she doesn't think the Applicant is going to come up with any reserve areas. Cynthia states the Board may do a reduction upon demonstration that the number exceeds the design-hour requirement and a demonstration that such reduction would not induce parking on public ways or result in hazardous conditions. Cynthia refers to the Applicant not demonstrating 250-28(B), and asks Will whether the reduction of parking spaces is subject to an Area Variance, or may they just not do it. Will states anything is subject to a Variance. Will states the only items that may be reduced are 250-28(A) and (B), and 250-30(D). Will states he doesn't know whether the difference in terms of time of usage can really be shown since the Uses are all day. Will states it is not as if a restaurant will be there that primarily has evening hours. Gary states Mr. Ryzerski had indicated workers will be coming in, loading up, and leaving. Mr. Delaney states a Traffic Flow Analysis is on their Utility Plan. Mr. Ryzerski states they will not have a lot of night usage. Mr. Ryzerski states they will have a lot of people coming in the morning and going home at the end of the day. Mr. Ryzerski refers to an acupuncturist who will work later versus earlier and states they usually work Tuesday through Saturday. Mr. Ryzerski states he and the other Contractor come in the morning and then leave. Mr. Ryzerski states he works and drives the same vehicle. Mr. Ryzerski states even though he has parking spaces for all of his vehicles, plus one, three of the spaces will never be occupied at night, or all day. Cynthia refers to the screen and points out the assigned spaces Mr. Ryzerski will have for his vehicles and states the general public is not supposed to go in that area. Cynthia refers to the screen and points out spaces where the Board has the biggest concern. Cynthia refers to the employee as well as the general public parking. Mr. Ryzerski refers to the screen and states some of the spaces are factored into the Tradesman Use part of it. Cynthia states that trucks are not supposed to be parked in this area. Mr. Ryzerski states if a Tradesman doesn't take a truck home and comes to work in his own car he needs to park it somewhere. Cynthia points out the employee parking spaces. Mr. Ryzerski states there will probably be more flexibility because a lot of the cars will be gone all day. Cynthia refers to the screen and points out passenger vehicle parking and confirms there will not be any Tradesman vehicles parked there. Cynthia states everything outside of the fenced area is for passenger vehicles. Mr. Rossi refers to the design-hour and asks whether it is defined in the Code. Will states no, it is a standard industry practice. Will refers to the way the Site will operate and states every Tradesman will not operate the same way. Will states the design-hour is for the business and what the demand of that business will be. Will states the truck Mr. Ryzerski uses may not be parked on the Site during the day, but it is part of the contractor number. Will states Mr. Ryzerski is not parking his car in the lot and getting into a truck, which will free up a space. Mr. Rossi states they are missing a grass area that could possibly be looked at as overflow. Cynthia refers to shared spaces and talks about using the argument that was just demonstrated, such as at least two of the spaces will not be needed because the Tradesman vehicle is going to be the vehicle that is taken home and brought back. Mr. Ryzerski states that is definitely the case for him, as well as two other Contractor's he has spoken with. Mr. Ryzerski states their trucks are brought home and then go straight to the job site. Will states there is no way to police that. Gary states if Mr. Ryzerski needs a 5% Variance, why not just go to the ZBA. Mr. Rossi states they could do that. Mr. Rossi refers to the screen and points out two potential overflow parking spots. Gary states if you could show it that way you are home free. Potential overflow parking areas are discussed. Will refers to the screen and states if the location is acceptable, they could be reserve spaces. Cynthia states we could also make a Finding that some of the Tradesman vehicles will not be there so they will

not be taking up the employee spaces. Will states they will need to be shown as reserved spaces. Cynthia states a Note will need to be added to the Plan. Will states an inset detail should be listed showing the two spaces as reserved. Cynthia refers to the screen and states a Note needs to go on the Plan, which will also be part of the Referral in order to obtain relief from the ZBA, to show the parking areas are clearly marked as spaces for non-tradesman vehicle Use. Mr. Delaney states he could list that with symbols. Cynthia states that there also has to be a Note on the Plat. Cynthia states this will help the residents next door so they know that trucks will not be parked in their direction. Mr. Delaney states he will change the numbering.

Cynthia asks whether the Board should go over any of the Variances. Mr. Rossi states he believes the signs meet the Code. Cynthia refers to the screen and states there had been mention of a metal sign. Mr. Ryzerski states there will be brushed stainless posts and the lettering will be inset brushed stainless with a painted finish. Cynthia asks Mr. Ryzerski if he has the color/details for the building signs. Mr. Ryzerski states they would match, as it is the same font. Cynthia asks what the building color will be. Mr. Ryzerski states a light moss green. Mr. Ryzerski refers to the signs and states they will be a bronze/brown type color as a surface. Cynthia asks whether Mr. Ryzerski meets the Code Requirements and asks how wide the building will be. Cynthia states she believes there is a 15 foot limit. Will states 15 feet is the maximum. Mr. Rossi states the requirement is to be 15 feet in length or 30% of the occupancy. Mr. Rossi states the architect was charged with preparing signs that met the Code. Cynthia refers to the signs being proposed in other places, such as entranceways and asks if that is all working, or are Variances needed. Mr. Rossi states they believe it works. Mr. Rossi refers to the screen and states there are two small Tradesmen signs. Cynthia refers to the back of the building and talks about the signs. Will asks what the size will be. Mr. Delaney states the lighting will be above the doors. Cynthia states they are almost like nameplates and asks whether they meet the size criteria. Mr. Rossi states he thought they were considered directional signs. Cynthia states we have directional signs and nameplate signs. Cynthia states this is a back building and will not be seen from the street. Will asks Mr. Rossi what the size of the signs are. Will states two square feet would be the maximum for directional signs. Cynthia states she believes the nameplates are the same. Cynthia refers to the Code and states nameplates or identification signs for each entrance are not to exceed two square feet. Cynthia states to make sure the nameplates are two feet by one foot, or less. Mr. Rossi states if the Board deems it appropriate to Refer them to the ZBA, can they make a reference that the signs that are shown on the Plans are what Mr. Ryzerski wants. Cynthia states it has been demonstrated that the signs along the front of building meet the Code. Mr. Rossi talks about being referred for a Variance in the event the signs as depicted on the latest elevations require it. Mr. Ryzerski states the nameplates are three feet by eight. Cynthia states she thinks the Applicant is fine. Will states he does not know why the Board would want to support a Variance that exceeds the nameplate limit. Cynthia refers to the Spa sign and states she can't imagine it is over two square feet. Will states he would assume all of the signs would be the same. Mr. Ryzerski states they will make all of them fit the requirement. Cynthia states that is what we want to hear. Will confirms there will be three signs in the front. Mr. Rossi states there will be one Railyard sign and two business signs. Cynthia states there are three businesses. Cynthia states we just wanted clarity that the three signs in the front are for three different entities. Mr. Ryzerski states all of the businesses will be listed again on the Railyard sign so everyone will be included on that sign. Will asks whether the Railyard sign is being considered as a replacement for the existing sign. Cynthia states the new sign will be going in a new location. Cynthia states the existing sign is not legal. Cynthia states Lakeland was supposed to come in and fix it. Will states eight square feet is the maximum. Cynthia asks whether the proposed sign is eight square feet. Mr. Ryzerski states, plus signs for each individual business. Cynthia states the whole overall sign is not supposed to be larger than eight square feet. Mr. Ryzerski states the Railyard portion is eight square feet, plus each individual business. Cynthia refers to the free-standing sign and states it is not supposed to be bigger than eight square feet. Cynthia states she thought this was understood. Mr. Ryzerski states the sign is too big then. Cynthia asks whether the Railyard portion needs to be repeated. Will refers to a free-standing multi-business directory sign and states it may be 10 square feet. Cynthia states she would rather look at whether a Variance is needed rather than sending the Applicant to

the Town Board. Cynthia states the multi-business signs were intended to be out on Town right-of-ways to direct people into business areas. Cynthia refers to the sign on the corner near the previous Fire Department and states it directs people up into the Hamlet and lists all of the businesses that are on Front Street and Cross Street. Will states that is not what the language refers to. Cynthia states that is what the intent was when it was written, but it didn't come out that way. Cynthia refers to the screen and talks about the location of the sign. Cynthia states she doesn't know whether the sign is needed. Mr. Rossi states it not only announces what is there, but it creates a brand so to speak. Charlotte talks about taking off the Railyard reference on the top. Cynthia suggests the word "The" be taken off and just list "Railyard". Cynthia asks what the overall height of the sign is. Mr. Ryzerski states it was supposed to be six feet tall. Mr. Ryzerski refers to 250-40.1 (C) and (D), and states it seems to him that they are talking about several businesses versus one. Mr. Ryzerski states that limit was 10 square feet. Mr. Rossi states it is a free-standing sign that identifies multiple businesses. Cynthia states Mr. Ryzerski would have to go to the Town Board for that Permit. Gary states Mr. Ryzerski should just go for a Variance. Gary states it is a nice looking sign and it is needed. Cynthia states she would like to get the size down a little bit. Mr. Ryzerski talks about making the "The" a lot smaller. Gary states that will only save a couple of inches. Cynthia states that will save a whole foot up there. Gary states a Variance will still be needed. Mr. Ryzerski asks whether obtaining a Variance will be a mountain to climb. Cynthia states she still thinks it is too big and would like to see about getting it down. Cynthia states the sign is 20 square feet right now and it is only supposed to be 8. Mr. Ryzerski asks whether it is supposed to be 8 or 10 square feet. Will states it is 8 square feet in 250-41.1 (B), and 10 in 250-41.1(D), but you would have to go to the Town Board. Mr. Ryzerski states they will make it smaller. Cynthia refers to the lettering of Somers Acupuncture and states why not make all the other signs the same height lettering. Will states he has a feeling it is a visual illusion. Will refers to the size of the panel. Will states it is not necessary to have a gap between the panels. Cynthia asks whether the height of the word "Railyard" is one foot. Mr. Ryzerski states yes. Cynthia states for a free-standing sign, the word "Railyard" doesn't need to be that big. Mr. Ryzerski states he doesn't have a problem with that and they will make it smaller. Cynthia states she doesn't have a problem if Mr. Ryzerski can get the sign down to 10 square feet, as right now he is at 20 square feet. Cynthia confirms the height is fine. Mr. Ryzerski states his graphic designer will look at it and he will e-mail it for review. Cynthia asks Mr. Ryzerski when he has to get his materials in to the ZBA in order to get on their next Agenda. Cynthia asks whether the sign will be up on the ledge. Mr. Ryzerski states it is about halfway up the embankment. Cynthia states it will be about 10 feet above ground level. Cynthia states it will be seen and it doesn't need to be that big. Cynthia suggests Mr. Ryzerski take a look at the sign at the corner near the previous Fire Department. Gary states the sign lists all of the businesses and it is readable. Cynthia talks about making a motion that the Board makes the Recommendation for the list of Variances and when it comes to the sign, she will state it may be no greater than 10 square feet. Cynthia states Mr. Ryzerski should see if his designer can work with that, and if he can't, she will engage the Board to see what may be done about it. Cynthia states she has a feeling the designer will be able to get the sign within 10 square feet. Gary states that would be five feet tall by two feet wide. Mr. Ryzerski states that will not include the designs at the bottom. Cynthia states we are only talking about the sign service area, not the posts. Mr. Ryzerski states realistically they should be able to shrink it a lot, but probably will not get it down to 10 square feet. Mr. Ryzerski states his guess is that the sign will be 14 feet. Mr. Ryzerski states he has to go out to the Site and see, based on the size of the letters, whether the sign may be read. Cynthia refers to the sign at North Salem Center and states they wanted a 4 by 8 feet sign, which was huge. Cynthia states we had a lot of discussions and the size was brought down. Gary suggests Mr. Ryzerski see what he can do. Mr. Rossi states 10 square feet would be tight. Mr. Ryzerski confirms the Board is talking about the entire sign, which would include all of the tenants. Charlotte states the posts would not be counted. Mr. Ryzerski states he will visit the Site and talks about drivers coming under the bridge in terms of being able to see the letters. Charlotte states color-wise you want to make sure the sign doesn't get sucked into whatever the background color is. Cynthia states the most important signs are the ones that will be on the building. Cynthia states anybody coming north on Route 22 will not see this sign. Cynthia states people coming south will see it. Will talks about the minimum lettering

size and states it is 10 inches. Will suggests an eight foot sign that just lists “The Railyard”. Mr. Ryzerski states maybe the solution is to take the two Tradesman Offices off the sign, or the other two occupants. Mr. Ryzerski states that might be the solution. Cynthia states the Board will do the motion for 10 square feet and if it is a problem Mr. Ryzerski will need to come back and talk with us. Cynthia states at least this way the Referral may be done tonight.

Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Make a Recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the Following Variances for the Railyard Project; Area Variance 250-15 and 250-20 for the Reconstruction of the Front Building to Include two (2) Stories with an Increased Height Within the Front and two Side Yard Setbacks, Area Variance 250-15 and 250-20 for Reconstruction of the Rear Building to Include an Enlarged Footprint as well as two (2) Stories with an Increased Height Within the Rear Yard, Area Variance 250-15 and 250-20 for the Enlargement of the Side Shed Structure Within the Side and Rear Yards, Area Variance 250-20 (Column G) to Permit a West Side Yard Setback of 0.8 Feet for off-street Parking, Area Variance 250-20 (Column G) to Permit an East Yard Setback of 1 Foot for off-street Parking (near Maple Avenue), Area Variance 250-20 (Column G) to Permit a Parking Access way Expansion of Less Than 1 Foot From a Residential Property Line, and an Area Variance for the Free-Standing Sign for an Increase from Eight Square Feet to Ten Square Feet, per 250-40.1 (B). Gary Jacobi seconds. All in favor. No opposed.

After the motion Cynthia asks Mr. Ryzerski how the Meeting went last night with the Architectural Review Board (ARB). Mr. Ryzerski states it went fairly well. Mr. Ryzerski states they talked about a couple of different materials in regards to the exterior. Mr. Ryzerski states he is going to provide the ARB with a few samples. Mr. Ryzerski states the ARB did not understand the design for the sign in terms of the metal concept. Mr. Ryzerski states he is glad he didn't order the sign yet, especially after the discussions tonight. Mr. Ryzerski states the ARB liked the roof color, although they are not sold on the roof and windows matching. Mr. Ryzerski states the ARB thought the windows will be too dark against the greenish façade. Mr. Ryzerski states they are entertaining different window colors. Charlotte refers to the trim. Mr. Ryzerski states the trim will match the roof and refers to a dark bronze color. Mr. Ryzerski states it will be a metal roof. Mr. Ryzerski states the ARB doesn't necessarily like the idea that the color of the front buildings will look different than the back buildings. Mr. Ryzerski states it was his concept to have the Tradesmen area look from the retail area. Mr. Rossi states it comes down to the Planning Board. Cynthia states the ARB is a recommending Board. Cynthia asks if Mr. Ryzerski is doing the brick look. Mr. Ryzerski states that the brick will stay. Mr. Ryzerski refers to Building C and states it is broken up by the hedge. Mr. Ryzerski states the brick would stay the same, but the center of Building B may be a different color than the front building. Mr. Ryzerski talks about a color change so the retail part of the building will look different than the back of the building. Mr. Ryzerski refers to having a color break line where it goes from high to low. Mr. Ryzerski states the front of Building C will be the soft moss green color. Will confirms there will be only two different colors. Cynthia refers to the break and the hedge. Cynthia asks Mr. Ryzerski what color he is proposing for the back buildings. Mr. Ryzerski states right now he is proposing a dark stained oak color. Mr. Ryzerski talks about utilizing a synthetic siding product. Will asks whether Mr. Ryzerski explained the division of the building to the ARB and the way the yard works and states that is what convinced him in terms of the building transition. Mr. Ryzerski states he would like to show the ARB materials so as to put them side by side. Will states the colors will not be seen together, as there will be a break. Cynthia states she doesn't have a problem with the proposed concept at all. There is a discussion about there being two totally different Uses. Cynthia states when Mr. Ryzerski goes back to the ARB he should tell them that the Planning Board likes the concept of having two separate colors. Will states the ARB's point of reference is the current condition.

Cynthia asks what the timeframe is for providing the additional materials. Cynthia states she believes a revised EAF has to be done and asks when the Board will see that. Mr. Delaney states there is one number left

blank, which is the area of disturbance. Cynthia states to Will that the Planning Board doesn't like to set Public Hearings until everything is complete. Cynthia states she doesn't like to hold Public Hearings on Work Session nights. Cynthia states if we don't open the Public Hearing on February 3rd we are looking at March 2nd. Cynthia asks Will whether the Board should try to set a Public Hearing this early or try to wait for the next round of review. Will states he doesn't have a problem with the Board setting a Public Hearing. Cynthia states she thinks everybody is on the right page in terms of the landscaping and the fencing, and would like to hear from the public if they choose to come because these issues will directly affect them. Will states the signs, stormwater, and parking are the substantive issues and the rest are just housekeeping. Mr. Rossi states if the Public Hearing is opened on February 3rd, they will obtain comments that could be very relevant to their going before the ZBA. Cynthia asks Will what should be circulated for the February 3rd Public Hearing, and refers to the Plan the Board is seeing tonight. Cynthia asks Mr. Delaney to submit a revised EAF even if there is one item yet to be determined. Cynthia states she will then have that as part of the package to be circulated for the Public Hearing. Cynthia asks Mr. Delaney to put together a cover note that will basically state he has responded to all of the comments, except list the items that remain open. Cynthia states she would like to have this information by Monday. Cynthia states Dawn already researched how soon the Public Hearing Notice would need to go to the neighbors. Dawn states the Public Hearing Notice has to go out at least seven days prior to the Hearing. Mr. Rossi states the labels are all sitting on his Secretary's desk. Dawn states the Journal News would like us to provide them with the Public Hearing Notice by February 26th for publishing. Cynthia states she did do a rough draft of the Public Hearing Notice and states it mentions the Site Development Plan Approval, Stormwater Management Approval, and the Lot Line Merger. Mr. Rossi states that is great. Cynthia states Will has the Public Hearing Notice to review. Cynthia states once Will cleans up the Draft we will send it to Mr. Rossi.

Chairwoman motions that, Based Upon the Plans Received Tonight, and Further Information Coming in on the Responses to the MDRA Memo and Engineer's Memo, Which will Include an Updated EAF, the Planning Board set a Public Hearing for February 3, 2016 for the Site Development Plan Approval, Stormwater Management and Lot Merger Approvals for Rylan West Realty, Inc. Charlotte seconds. All in favor. No opposed.

After the motion Will states the stormwater materials have not been finalized and asks when they would come into play. Cynthia states we would be keeping the Public Hearing open until the materials have been received. Will asks Mr. Delaney whether he will be able to submit the materials prior to opening the Public Hearing. Mr. Delaney states he hopes so and does not see any stumbling blocks between his technical people and the Town Engineer's technical people. Cynthia states if we have it in hand it may still take a week or two for Frank to review it, but at least it would be submitted before the Public Hearing. Mr. Delaney states they are not going to give Frank anything he has not already seen and agreed to. Cynthia states in the meantime she will talk with the DOT to see if they will be a little more receptive to work being done in the front. Cynthia states her primary issue has to do with safety and we will see if that opens up a conversation for something other than striping. Mr. Delaney states maybe the DOT has a suggestion in regards to preventing large trucks from parking in the front of the building. Gary states not only large trucks, but delivery trucks as well. Cynthia asks Mr. Delaney if she should mention the possibility of utilizing the area for stormwater practices. Mr. Delaney states he doesn't see a negative with that. Cynthia states the DOT should be concerned about stormwater handling also. Will states Cynthia should clarify she is talking about non-structural stormwater practices when she talks with the DOT. Cynthia states she will let Mr. Rossi know how she makes out with the DOT.

Mr. Ryzerski states he would like to thank everybody for taking the time out of their schedules in order to make this happen. Gary states it will be nice to see something happen there. Gary states it is an eyesore now and will only look better.

2. Next Meetings:

- Regular Meeting – February 3, 2016
- Work Session – February 17, 2016

3. Resolution:

Chairwoman motions to adjourn the Planning Board Meeting. Charlotte Harris seconds. All in favor. No opposed.