

Village of Bloomfield Planning Board meeting of January 23, 2014

The planning board meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Dan Morley. Present were: Dan Morley, Nancy Witt, Nikki Every, Ken Martin, Gail Harrington, public works supervisor Brian Rayburn, village engineer JP Schepp, and CEO Andy Hall. The meeting was held at Veteran's Park, located at 6910 Rtes. 5&20. A legal notice appeared in the Daily Messenger on January 12.

Minutes: Dan motioned, Nikki seconded and it was unanimously carried to amend the minutes of the January 9 meeting for clarification on several points and review at the next meeting.

Dan motioned, Gail seconded and it was unanimously carried to amend the motion concerning the environmental review such that a coordinated review will be done.

Public meeting for discussion of a preliminary site plan for the property located at 3 Main St.:

Present were: John Sciarabba (Landtech), Rob Clark, Dale Frasca, Nancy Long, Gary Hooper, Bill and Jean Burlingame, Tim Engstrom, Cathy and Greg Templar, David Carmel, Ron and Cathy Wilson, Dave Conklin, John Henry, Robert Day, Joan and Jack Herrington, Marian Metsinger, Robert and Debra Roth, Richard Rayburn, Ron Newell, Jeff Warren, Larry Reynolds, Terry and Estelle Hall, John O'Mara, David Norman, Jay Mitchell, Karl Smith, Bev and Bruce Bailey, Ron Hawkins, Frank Fessner, and Erinn Cain (Daily Messenger).

Preliminary site plan for 3 Main St. presentation: Landtech gave a presentation of the plan which included the following highlights:

1. There will be a new entrance to the site from Elm St.
2. The canopy will be re-located to the east onto Elm St.
3. The access on Main St. closest to the intersection will be removed.
4. The addition to the existing building proposes a Dunkin' Donuts with a drive-thru.
5. The Elm St. entryway is directly across from the post office access.
6. 24 parking spots are proposed – as is required in the zoning
7. The fence along the western border will be constructed to prevent light spillage onto adjacent properties from car headlights traveling through the drive-thru.
8. Signage has not been decided yet but will be presented prior to seeking final site plan approval.
9. A gate will be installed in the fence (to be located along the western border) for emergency access
10. The dumpster is located close to the building in an area that will be well screened from customers. It will not be re-located but the hauler will be directed to schedule pick-ups during non-peak times.
11. The handicapped parking spot is located in an area close to the door with appropriate grading for easy access and will not be re-located.
12. The water service does not need to be relocated and the owner will work cooperatively with the village DPW if and when repairs are needed in the future
13. Traffic flow is expected to be slow and fairly low volume – arrows have been added to direct traffic flow on the site.

Public comment:

Dan welcomed all in attendance and opened the floor for questions and comments. The legal notice for the public hearing which appeared in the Daily Messenger was read. Some of the questions/comments discussed were:

1. Residents would like to see all of the property owned by Mr. Bruckel graded and seeded. The board should consider if approval could be conditioned upon grading/seeding the entire property.
2. When asked, Mr. Sciarabba stated that there are no plans at this time to develop the third parcel. The developer must meet the challenges of a creek flowing through the middle of the site and the WWTP adjacent to the third parcel.
3. The estimated cost of constructing the sidewalk is \$10,000 so there are no plans to extend the sidewalk beyond the site of the current project as shown on the plans
4. The dumpster will be enclosed in a board-on-board fence similar to the fence to be constructed along the western boundary of the project site.
5. Although it is regrettable that the restaurant to the west will not have access to the rear of their property from the east, there is an existing easement on the west side of the building for access to the rear. Local business owners expressed concern for the potential increase in on-street parking for the adjacent restaurant- especially for delivery vehicles
6. The appearance of the canopy should be disclosed as it affects the aesthetic appearance of the project.
7. Concern was expressed by several residents that the traffic flow may be increased onto Main St. with the drive-thru. Accidents occur at that access due to the compromised line-of-site from the cars parked on Main St. The village may want to consider removing the 2 parking spots between the Main St. access and the corner. Requesting that DOT consider prohibiting right-on-red from Elm St. onto Main St. was also suggested.
8. The access onto Main St. is similar to the access from the bank across the street. It was commented that the advantage of the proposed project is that the building is set back more than the bank and allows for some increased line-of-site visibility.
9. Many residents expressed concern that if too many roadblocks are forced upon the developer, he may walk away from the project. Although some preferred the first concept plan, this proposal is an improvement over the existing facility.
10. It was suggested that the access at Main St. be designated as one-way only to direct more traffic onto Elm St. to exit. CEO Andy Hall commented that this could reduce the distance between vehicles and pedestrians leaving the building.
11. A letter received from Jacky Spindler was read to the public – requesting that the project be located closer to the WWTP leaving the area at the corner open for residential use. Nancy Long also urged the board and community to consider the alternative location for the project as other development on the corner may be more suitable for that area.
12. As the restaurant adjacent to the west is crumbling, it was suggested that the village should consider making it a public parking lot.
13. One resident felt that many of the comments were unfriendly and he was uncomfortable with the meeting.
14. When asked for a show of hands in support of the project, the majority of those in attendance raised their hands in support of the project.

The public comment portion concluded at 8:35 p.m.

SEQR review: the planning board reviewed the draft part 1 of the EAF with the developer and an amended part 1 will be submitted for distribution to interested agencies as part of the coordinated review. The village engineer commented that the existing building and surrounding land have been previously disturbed so it is doubtful that there would be any archaeological significance to disturbing the soils. It is the responsibility of the applicant to contact SHPO, if appropriate.

Escrow – options for recovering the costs of review were discussed. The applicant will remit an application review fee before the next public hearing.

Other items:

1. The planning board received a position letter from Nixon Peabody regarding the preliminary site plan for 3 Main St.
2. The planning board will hold the public hearing in continuance. The next planning board meeting will be Feb. 13 at the village office, located at 12 Main St.

Adjournment: Dan motioned, Nikki seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 10:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Conradt
Clerk