

PLEASANT VALLEY PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
July 14, 2015

A regular meeting of the Town of Pleasant Valley Planning Board took place on July 14, 2015 at the Pleasant Valley Town Hall, located at 1554, Main Street, Pleasant Valley, New York 12569.

| | | |
|----------|-----------------------|---|
| Present: | Chairperson: | Rebecca Seaman |
| | Boardmembers Present: | Michael Gordon Norman Mackay Janet Gross Eileen Quinn Robert Fracchia |
| | Staff: | Michael White Sonia James |
| | Consultants: | James Nelson, ESQ PB/ZBA Attorney Peter Setaro, PB Engineer |

Chair, Ms. Rebecca Seaman called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. First item on the agenda was:

Taconic Homes

Mr. Nat Parish represented Taconic Homes. He informed the Board that as per the PB Resolution, Taconic Homes are to present the Board with the Progress Report annually.

Mr. Parish informed that they were working on 2 permits:

1. Wetlands
2. DEC Permit for **Extreme (????) discharge**. DEP has changed the standard of Covets design. This does not in any manner change anything approved earlier by the Planning Board.
3. Economy has not picked up, therefore Taconic Homes are not ready yet to put the bull dozer to the ground.
4. No change in DOT

Chair, wanted to know if DOT is aware of the left turn Dunkin Donuts were planning on.

Mr. Parish, thought that Dunkin Donuts wanted traffic lights to be put up there.

Mr. Parish, also wanted to know the Fire Advisory Boards opinion as to where the Fire Hydrants were to be placed.

Chair, told Mr. Parish that the Board will reach out to the FAB for their input.

Next item on the agenda was:

Gina's Orchard

Mr. Peter Andros represented Gina's Orchard. Chair invited Mr. Pete Setaro to share his opinion.

Mr. Setrao stated that most of things relating to this project were taken care of in July 14, 2015 Planning Board Meeting. Updated plans show sidelines. Plans are reasonable. He informed that he is in touch with the Highway Superintendent, who has already proposed new covert showing drainage, they would be working closely with Mr. Andros on this.

Chair informed Board that a request of Public Hearing, was made the Applicant. SEQRA determination will be made after the public hearing – but not necessarily on the same day. Board will work with the Highway Department. Fire Advisory has already given their approval.

Motion was made by the Chair to hold a Public Hearing in the next Planning Board meeting scheduled to be held on August 11, 2015, motion was seconded by Ms. Quinn and was approved 6-0.

Mr. Pete Andros, inquired if the escrow check was submitted. He was informed that the Planning Board Secretary is still not in receipt of the additional funds from the applicant.

HVFCU

Mr. Ozzie Beichert of Timely Signs represented Hudson Valley Federal Credit Union, for ATM approval.

Chair, Ms. Rebecca Seaman, explained that the application was withdrawn last time when the Logo/sign for HVFCU was approved.

Mr. Ozzie stated that they have modified the Design.

Chair, invited Mr. Jim Nelson to offer his input/opinion.

Mr. Nelson sated that the definition of a sign in the town codes include designs which are expressive It should be defined that:

1. Whether this is an additional sign besides other signs approved.
2. Face of the ATM constitute the sign which include square footage.

As attorney, I see a question that goes beyond the number of signs that are allowed, number of words are in a bulk.

Ms. Sears added that, she would like to go back to the issue of the colors, which are not acceptable. The Board has had an understanding that HVFCU already had three signs. Board allowed this because of the position/placement of the building. ATM does not meet the standard of sign. This violates the vision of the Valley. It is very colorful.

Mr. Michael Gordon, added that, it is not necessary to have the ATM painted. The fact that it is an ATM it should be inconspicuous.

Ms. Janet Gross stated that she agreed with Mr. Gordon.

Chair, reiterated that the present design is considered as an additional sign.

Ms. Eileen Quin was of the opinion that it looked like a billboard; too many colors, this is against all the standards we have had in the Valley.

Mr. Ozzie Beichert, requested that the Board give all this in writing so that he can talk to his client – HVFCU.

Mr. Nelson added that the final decision will be made by the Zoning Administrator.

Chair, further stated that, even if it is not considered a sign, the design and colors were unacceptable by the Board.

Mr. White's input was that, this is classified as a sign. But this has to be toned down. It meets the definition of code as sign, the ATM machine looks like a sign.

Mr. Nelson suggested that the Board should go into an executive session.

Motion was made by the Chair for the Board to go into executive session, it was seconded by Ms. Janet Gross and was approved 6-0.

Motion was made by the Chair, to re-open the meeting after the executive session was seconded by Mr. Gordon and was approved 6-0.

Chair, thanked all for their patience. She said that it is part of the Site Plan, we would want to make adjustments, as the present ATM was too startling and loud as per valley standards. No other business or banks were allowed to do so. The Board is unanimous in their decision that this is not acceptable.

Mr. Nelson suggested that Mr. White should look into that fact, if it is an additional sign or if the square footage is in to the sq. footage allowed by the code.

Ms. Quinn commented that the existing ATM does not muster an issue.

Chair further added that if HVFCU words were put on the TAM, it is acceptable, but Neon colors are unacceptable as it defies the characteristics of Pleasant Valley. We have in past discouraged these type of signs.

Ms. Quinn said that ATM should say "ATM" only, if HVFCU has to be there it should be printed in small letters and color should be avoided.as made by the chair to deny the ATM sign, as Planning Board regards this as an additional sign and does not coordinate with the valley codes.

Mr. Ozzie Beichert, informed the Board that he was not in a position to take any decisions therefore he needs the Boards decision in writing.

Mr. White informed that the ATM is 69 sq. feet. Which is too big for a sign.

Mr. Nelson pointed out that:

1. It has become an additional sign
2. Face of the ATM constitutes as 98-46 section B as 69 sq. feet.

Chair said that it is unacceptable, even if it was not a sign the colors do not meet with the Town esthetics, also the Board will not allow a structure to be painted.

Motion was made by the Chair to deny approval based on that:

1. Under section 98-46 B this is classified as a sign
2. Excessive use of number of words
3. Excessive in size i.e. 69 sq. feet
4. Excessive in number of colors used
5. Also this is regarded as a sign

A roll was called by the secretary:

| | |
|--------------|-----|
| Mr. Fracchia | Yes |
| Ms. Gross | Yes |
| Ms. Seaman | Yes |
| Mr. Gordon | Yes |
| Ms. Quinn | Yes |
| Mr. Mackay | Yes |

The Motion was approved for denial by 6-0.