The Planning Board of the Village of Montebello held a meeting on Tuesday, September 9, 2014 at the Montebello Community Center, 350 Haverstraw Road, Montebello, New York. Chairman Caridi called the meeting to order at 7:17 p.m. and led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT

Anthony Caridi, Member
Jane Burke, Member
Michael Iatropoulos, Member
Thomas Ternquist, Member
Donald Wanamaker, Member
Steven Beldock, Member

OTHERS

Ira Emanuel, Assistant Village Attorney
Martin Spence, Village Engineer
Gloria Scalisi, Planning & Zoning Clerk

ABSENT

Robert Geneslaw, Village Planner

Member Iatropoulos made a motion to approve the minutes of June 10, 2014, seconded by Member Wanamaker. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Storage Post Self Storage—Public Hearing
Site Plan—Second Self Storage Building
55.07-1-13

> Application of Storage Post Self Storage facility located on 2 Dunnigan Drive, Montebello, New York, for Amended Site Plan to allow a second self-storage building with additional parking on the site. The property is located on the north side of Dunnigan Drive, approximately zero feet west of the intersection of North Airmont Road in the Village of Montebello, which is known and designated on the Ramapo Tax Map as Section 55.07, Block 1, Lot 13 in a P-I Zone.

The Applicant's representative Mr. William Marsh; the Applicant's attorney Mr. Steven Honen; the Applicant's architect Mr. Frank Relf along with the Applicant's engineers Mr. Glenn McCreedy and Mr. Danny Russo were all in attendance.

Mr. Frank Relf briefly discussed the proposed site plan for an addition of a second self-storage building.

Mr. Glenn McCreedy explained the site plan, a new 44,250 square foot addition to the campus for storage. The existing facility is entered through Dunnigan Drive and fronted on Dunnigan Drive; 843 feet on Dunnigan Drive, 67 feet on Airmont Road and 970 feet along the Thruway. Dunnigan, Airmont and the Thruway are considered front yard because of the irregular shape of the lot. As of now, the existing facility has one point of access and one point of exit both controlled by a security gate that the new facility will also utilize. Mr. McCreedy stated that they have also provided an emergency access to Dunnigan Drive to facilitate emergency vehicles coming into the facility for emergencies. Currently the emergency gate is provided with a Knox Box. The Applicant stated that they are looking into making the access exit only and are working it out the their Traffic Consultants and will discuss that at a later date with the Planning Board.

Mr. McCreedy stated that the parking configuration is "pretty normal" and usage of the facility is about 7-8 occupants per hour on average. The need for parking is pretty low. Mr. McCreedy informed the Board that it is a very low demanding facility. Mr. McCreedy discussed drainage which will be handled in two fashions. The Applicant will "embrace" the existing drainage system and also bypass with a new infrastructure that will incorporate into the campus which will ultimately discharge at the same location at the northern corner. Mr. McCreedy stated that the Applicant will be requesting two variances, both of which the Applicant feels that they are a result of the odd configuration of the lot. The variances needed are a front yard variance and a floor area variance.

Member Burke questioned the Applicant on the amount of the front yard variance. Mr. McCreedy stated that the existing building received a front yard variance for 40feet and the new addition will need a variance for 34.6feet.

Member Iatropoulos questioned the Applicant on landscaping and will there be a landscaping plan. Mr. McCreedy stated that there has been some species die off in the existing facility that will be supplemented and will be incorporating new landscaping for the new building. The Applicant will have a certified Landscape Architect to attest to the landscaping plan at a later date.

Member Wannamaker questioned the Applicant on whether the look of the building will be the same as the existing building. Mr. McCreedy replied that the look of the new building with match the existing building.

Member Burke stated the she was on the Planning Board when the existing building was approved and when the applicant had come before the Board they had made a proposal similar to what is being reviewed currently. Member Burke stated that at the time, the Board, made concessions such as floor area ratio. Member Burke stated that the Applicant should have known that this application was not approved prior to the Applicant purchasing the building. Member Burke stated her displeasure with having to review the same application that was not approved in 2000-2001.

Member Iatropoulos stated that he is in agreement with Member Burke. Member Iatropoulos informed the Applicant that he was also on the Planning Board when the original existing building was approved.

Mr. McCreedy questioned Member Iatropoulos on what were some of the concerns at the time with the existing building. Member Iatropoulos commented that floor area ratio was a big concern. Member Burke stated that the Board agreed with the colors and with the free standing sign and now the Applicant is proposing to build on the "triangle".

Mr. William Marsh stated that they are new owners of the building and they had no prior knowledge of the history of the existing building. Mr. Marsh stated that it is not the intention of the Applicant to do anything that is counter to some of the agreements that were made in the past. Mr. Marsh stated that the Applicant is trying to present something new to be judged on its own merits. Mr. Marsh informed the Board that several months ago they had presented, informally, the same application for feedback. Mr. Marsh stated that at the time the Board had responded positively to the informal application. Mr. Marsh stated that because of the positive feedback they have gone on to spend considerable money for the application to move along.

Mr. Honen stated that he was present at the informal presentation and the entire Board was positive in their feedback and that is why the Applicant has moved forward with their application. Mr. Honen informed the Board that this is a new application with new owners and with improving the building, sign and etc. it will increase ratables to the Village.

Member Burke stated that she did not remember seeing the plan a few months ago.

Chairman Caridi stated that the Applicant presented a schematic plan of the new building.

Member Iatropoulos questioned the Village Assistant Attorney on why there are no records for a new owner. Mr. Emanuel replied that all the records are public and anyone can come and take a look at them. Mr. Emanuel stated that whether the owners looked at the past records or not they have a right to come in and ask the Planning Board for relief, even if an agreement had been made back in 2001. The Applicant needs to prove their case to the Planning Board and the Planning Board needs to give the Applicant a fair hearing and judge the case on its merits. Mr. Emanuel stated that the application may have "warts" but there are very few applications that do not have "warts".

Chairman Caridi stated that the Planning Board would like to review the previous records as part of the Application review, and the Applicant is correct in stating that the Board informally reviewed the current application a few months ago and gave an acknowledgement that the Applicant would receive a fair review.

Mr. McCreedy questioned Member Burke on how many members was part of the review back in 2000-2001. Member Iatropoulos responded that there were only two member; Member Burke and Member Iatropoulos. Mr. McCreedy questioned the two members on whether there were actual restrictions put on the approval for future development or were there modifications that evolved through the course of the review. Member Burke responded that she does not recall but will review it for the future.

Mr. Frank Relf discussed the application in detail. The building shape was dictated by setbacks and electrical easement. The Dunnigan Drive side will have a solid wall with no entry on that side. The footprint of the building will be 14500. The new building will be a "mirror" to the existing building.

Chairman Caridi questioned the Applicant on whether all current elevations will be held on the new building; all tops of parapets, roof elevations, and tops of towers. Mr. Relf replied that they would all be the same. Mr. Relf stated that there was a height variance for the existing building and they would be requesting the same height variance for the new building.

Mr. Martin Spence, Village Engineer, discussed his memo dated September 8, 2014 (copy in file).

Mr. Emanuel briefly explained the changes to the EAF forms.

Member Iatropoulos questioned the Applicant on whether or not the additions of the new building will double the amount of traffic. Mr. Marsh replied the new building is half the size of the existing building so therefore the traffic will increase by one third.

Member Burke questioned the Applicant on the amount of units in the existing building. Mr. Marsh stated that he did not know the exact amount at this time but will provide the exact number at the next Planning Board meeting.

Member Ternquist questioned the Applicant on the hours of operation. Mr. Marsh responded that the normal hours are 9am-7pm but they have some extended hours till 10pm.

Member Wannamaker stated that as a tenant and user of the Storage Post Self Storage it is very difficult to make a left on Airmont Road in the morning.

Mr. Spence questioned the Applicant on the type of utilities within the units. Mr. Marsh responded that there are no utilities within the units—no power.

Mr. Emanuel questioned the Applicant on whether there is common lighting. Mr. Marsh replied that there is common lighting within the building.

Member Burke questioned the Applicant on whether there will be anyone in the facility for security. Mr. Marsh stated that there will be one to two people in the office during office hours and the facility maintains very sophisticated security systems; digital cameras and digital recorders.

Member Burke questioned the Applicant on whether they have inspections for combustible material in the units. Mr. Marsh replied that once the materials are placed in the units, they do not inspect them. The managers are typically watching when people move their items in.

Mr. Emanuel questioned the Applicant on whether each customer has their own access code to get into the building. Mr. Marsh replied that each customer has their own unique access code.

Chairman Caridi opened the Public Hearing.

Chairman Caridi questioned the Applicant the process of matching the mansard color. Mr. Relf stated that there have been a few variations and he believes they have matched the color with the latest variation and will have the Village Engineer review it for approval.

Chairman Caridi stated his concern with the landscaping around the existing building as well as the new addition and is curious to review the Landscaping Plan when it is submitted.

Chairman Caridi entered into the record a letter from the Rockland County Department of Health, dated August 26, 2014; a letter from the Rockland County Highway Department, dated September 5, 2014; a letter from the New York State Thruway Authority, dated September 9, 2014; a letter from the Village of Montebello Fire Inspector, dated September 8, 2014; a letter from the Tallman Fire Department, dated September 3, 2014 and a letter from the Village of Montebello Building Inspector, dated September 9, 2014.

Member Ternquist made a motion of intent to declare the Planning Board as lead agency, seconded by Chairman Caridi. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Member Iatropoulos made a motion to continue the Public Hearing on the Application of Storage Post Self Storage for Site Plan (second self-storage building), to the October 14, 2014 Planning Board meeting, seconded by Member Ternquist. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Storage Post Self Storage—Public Hearing
Amended Site Plan—addition of Pole Mounted Lighting
55.07-1-13

> Application of Storage Post Self Storage facility located on 2 Dunnigan Drive, Montebello, New York, for Amended Site Plan to add pole-mounted lighting around the existing facility. The property is located on the north side of Dunnigan Drive, approximately zero feet west of the intersection of North Airmont Road in the Village of Montebello, which is known and designated on the Ramapo Tax Map as Section 55.07, Block 1, Lot 13 in a P-I Zone.

The Applicant's representative, Mr. William Marsh and the Applicant's Architect, Mr. Frank Relf are in attendance. Mr. Relf discussed the LED energy efficient pole mounted lighting. The building is currently lit so that the Planning Board will be able to see the actual lighting if they want after the meeting. Mr. Relf stated that the security systems need light to go on.

Mr. Emanuel discussed the impact to the senior citizen complex in Airmont.

Member Burke questioned the lighting on Manhattan Beer and the precedent this application will set on Dunnigan Drive. Mr. Relf stated that Manhattan Beer has very little opening around the perimeter of the building whereas Storage Post has many openings around the perimeter.

Mr. Marsh stated that currently the lighting is very "spotty" and for security purposes it's not very good.

Mr. Emanuel questioned the Village Engineer on the typical parking lot lighting standard. Mr. Spence replied that typically it is 0.5 to 1.0.

Chairman Caridi entered into the record a letter from the Rockland County Department of Planning, dated August 20, 2014; a letter from the Rockland County Highway Department, dated August 11, 2014 and a letter from the New York State Thruway Authority, dated July 21, 2014;

Mr. Emanuel stated that for SEQRA purposes the application is a Type II action.

Member Ternquist made a motion to continue the Public Hearing on the Application of Storage Post Self Storage for amended Site Plan (Pole Mounted Lighting), to the October 14, 2014 Planning Board meeting, seconded by Member Iatropoulos. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

New Business

Mr. Emanuel briefly discussed the proposal of the Wetlands Law to be discussed at the next Planning Board meeting.

Chairman Caridi made a motion to adjourn the meeting to the October 14, 2014 Planning Board meeting, seconded by Member Ternquist. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.