

Board of Health (BOH). We had issues in the past with the construction debris not being managed and it is being managed now. The owners are committed to keep the property clean to best of their ability.

Michael Croissant – Where does the 17B tree line stop? Mr. Kohn shows the Board where on the site plan the trees are going to go along 17B. Michael Croissant – What's the tree spacing? Mr. Kohn - About 20 feet this was recommended by Sullivan Renaissance.

Arthur Knapp – You said the best to their ability! One of the challenges has been to keep the property clean, so when you say that, what do you mean? Mr. Kohn - That means they will keep the site clean and will have dumpsters and remove the debris like a construction site. Arthur Knapp – Can we put some kind of language to address this issue, so we are not this few month's down the road again?

Paula Kay – After the Public Hearing and you listen to the Public, there may be a lot of things that the Board wants the applicant to look at. If this goes down the road for approval that could possibly be a contingency. The Building Department might have to keep a tight leash with them. One of the conditions to have this Public Hearing was to get it cleaned up.

Michael Croissant – For public knowledge can you give more details on the septic since there was always an issue? Mr. Kohn - The sand filter was not maintained in the past. The sand needs to be replaced as well as the piping, most of the septic tanks replaced. This is all in front of the Department of Health (DOH). We are just waiting on the DOH for their final review.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Marek Leszczynski – My property on Maplewood Road behind the power line. The application is fine. They can proceed with what ever they want.

Bernard McEneaney – I don't believe with all that work that is going on there you are only going to have 300 campers. And the sewer should have been taken care right away since it's been an issue forever. I live an 1/8 of mile down the road and I can smell the septic all summer long. When will this be taken care of? I also have a joining property and you mention the construction debris. I have been in the construction debris for 35 years and this is not how you handle it. You have been dumping material up in the back of the woods and maybe even burying it. I can see it from the road and my hunting stand, and don't believe you have any interest in removing it. I really believe the septic needs to be addressed first before anyone inhabits any of the buildings. The trees on the side of 17B are not a good idea, it will make it very difficult to make a left hand turn out of the road on to 17B. It will block your site up the road on 17B. Mr. Kohn - The septic is ready to be worked on as soon as the DOH give us the approval. I'll check out the debris of what Mr. McEneaney said. Mr. McEneaney – Also you have been working throughout the COVID-19 and the debris is spread out throughout the property. So as far as being an unsightly site there is nothing OSHA approved going on there. Mr. Kohn – We did get permission from the state to do construction.

Paula Kay – There was a letter submitted from Diane Lasher.

Temp Chair Matthew Sush – The Public Hearing will be left open for 10 days for written comments.

Temp Chair Matthew Sush appoints Kathleen Lara to replace Chairman Kiefer for voting.

A motion to close the video part of the Public Hearing was made by Jim Barnicle and seconded by Michael Croissant
5 in favor; 0 opposed

Chairman Kiefer called the meeting to order at 7:57 p.m.

Minutes are not adopted because we do not have the Tarpon tower transcript yet.

BBIS AUTO AUCTION

Route 17 & Kaufman Road, Monticello, S/B/L: 12.-1-54 & 55
Ross Winglovitz
John Cappello

Mr. Winglovitz – We last met with the board in January, we completed the survey, we had additional information for the Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) and address a lot of the Boards comments. We had a work session on March 3, 2020. Since then we have been working on additional info. Richard McGoey asked for a grading plan. We prepared the grading plan and the draft of the Part 2 of the EAF and an outline of Part 3 of the EAF. Had another work session three days ago. I submitted all that info to the Board. We are looking for any additional comments you would like us to address.

Hellen Budrock – Part two of the EAF starts with the impact of the land and that's a Yes. Meaning there might be an impact. The moderate to large impact are: 2 federal wetland crossing. The proposed action may involve construction on slopes of 15% or greater. The proposed action may involve construction that continues for more than one year or in multiple phases. The proposed action may result in increased erosion from construction activities. Mr. Winglovitz – In our EAF that we submitted. We are plan on addressing the erosion plan and sewer preventing plan. We will summarize the reports. We will make sure there is no impact to the neighborhood.

Hellen Budrock – Impact on Geological Features, there are none.

Hellen Budrock – Impact on Surface Water, Yes. The proposed action may affect one or more wetlands or other surface water bodies. Like I said there are two Federal Protected Wetland crossing on the property. That is moderate to large impact. The proposed action might create turbidity. And that's through the construction activity and the proposal for erosion. The proposed action might affect water down site or erosion. Mr. Winglovitz - Again in the outline it will describe the possible impacts on the service water. The classified stream in the front of the site and state wetlands in the back. The federal wetlands are in the center of the site. We will provide any delineating for any of the water. Any permits

will be identified for wetland disturbance. Again, we will have erosion control so we don't have any sudden impacts. We will address storm water quality. We will address the storm water quality that is required by the DEC. This is a storm water hotspot, there are two types of treatment that need to be provided. There will be a part three narrative for everyone to review.

Hellen Budrock – There will be no impact on groundwater, flooding or Air. The next is the impact on plants or animal? Mr. Winglovitz – No identified endangered species, but we will be disturbing 90 acres of the site. So there is a significant amount of habitat that will be removed, we are hiring a biologist to compare a habitat assessment to discuss what is on site and to insure there is no impact to plants or animals. Hellen Budrock – Almost all the impact on Animals are no or small impact.

Hellen Budrock- Impact on Agricultural Resources, Yes. And that is because the proposed action may impact soil classified in grouped 1 through 4 in the NY state classification. Mr. Winglovitz – The part 2 asked to look at the soil on site to see if they are good for Agricultural. NY State has a system to classify the soils.

Hellen Budrock – We did say there was no impact on flooding but there is a portion of the property that is in the flood plain but there will be no development on that part of the property. Mr. Winglovitz – That is correct. It is along 17B and we are using it as a buffer.

Hellen Budrock – The impact on Aesthetic Resources, we talked a little about it during the work session. Under moderate to large impact, they are: proposed action may be visible from publicly accessible vantage points both seasonally and year-round. Situation or activity in which viewers are engaged while viewing the proposed action for both routine travel by residents and recreational. Mr. Winglovitz – We included a paragraph about the Aesthetic Resources and this was also talked about at the work session. We will do a visual analysis for the user from 17B. You will not be able to see the site from 17B and if anything was to be seen we will hide it.

Hellen Budrock – Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources, none.

Hellen Budrock – Impact on Open Space and Recreation, Yes. That is from an eco-system perspective that you covered previously.

Hellen Budrock – Impact on Critical Environmental Areas, none. Impact on Transportation, Large. Projected traffic increase may exceed capacity of existing road network. The proposed action may result in the construction of paved parking area for 500 or more vehicle. Mr. Winglovitz – We will exceed the threshold of 500 vehicles, originally it was to be around 1,100 stored, but the storage has gotten smaller so it could be less. Car's will be delivered throughout the day, so no significant peak impact. That will help reduce the impact and will do a study to show this. We will study the intersection and the existing and entering on 17. Hellen Budrock – Jim Barnicle does that address some of your issues? Mr. Winglovitz- I did hear Jim Barnicle issues about the additional signage. Hellen Budrock – Jim Barnicle I think they got you covered.

Hellen Budrock – No impact on Energy. No impact on Noise, Odor or Light. There could be an impact on

Human Health because of handling fuels from the cars. Mr. Winglovitz – There are protocols on how to handle the vehicles when they are brought onto site. If something were to happen there is protocols on how to handle that. And we will review with the board.

Hellen Budrock – Consistency with Community Plans and Consistency with Community Character. I believe that was addressed before with the visual impact. Mr. Winglovitz – To the North and to the South of us behind the mobil park is pretty wooded. We will be consistent with the Community Character.

Hellen Budrock – The applicant is going to do their study and then we will continue on with the SEQRA process.

Mr. Cappello – We know the ball is in our court and we will go back and do our work and provide you with what you're looking for so we can then go forward.

Richard McGoey – There was a discrepancy with the acres. Mr. Winglovitz – 157.2 acres is the correct number and we will correct that. Richard McGoey – Besides that they can address the issue as they make their submissions.

A motion to accept the Part 3 outline was made by Michael Croissant and seconded by Matthew Sush 5 in favor; 0 opposed

AERO STAR

Rose Valley Road Monticello, S/B/L: 32.-1-20

Glen Smith, Engineer

Mr. Smith - I got Richard McGoey comments. This is the Mobil station on East Broadway on the corner off Rose Valley Road. They plan on knocking down everything, rebuild and take out the buried fuel tanks. Then reconstruct the whole area. Because the site is undersized, we need area variance, it is about 17,000 square feet and the proposal is for 20,000 square feet. I need a Denial to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Then I will finalize the site plan. We are going to build in curbing and will need a County 239, County DPW and State Permits as well.

Chairman Kiefer - Did you see Richard McGoey comments? Mr. Smith - I did and have no issues with them. But there is no reason to go through them now if we don't get the variances.

Richard McGoey – Are they going to sell Diesel Fuel? Mr. Smith - I don't know, I'll find out.

A motion for a denial and to send to Zoning Board of Appeals was made by Matthew Sush and seconded by Michael Croissant 5 in favor; 0 opposed

HEBREW DAY SCHOOL

4718 State Route 42, Kiamesha Lake, NY S/B/L: 9.-1-21

Michael Zarin, Law Firm of Zarin & Steinmetz

Chris LaPorta, Chazen Companies

Max Mahalek

Mr. Zarin – I believe we responded on all the request and comments. We did the bond as requested.

Paula Kay – I did not see any other comments come in so there were zero comments.

A motion for negative declaration motion under SEQRA was made by Michael Croissant and seconded by Matthew Sush

5 in favor; 0 opposed

A motion to approve the site plan and special permit was made by Michael Hoyt and seconded by Mike Croissant

5 in favor; 0 opposed

PINE OAKS BUNGALOW COLONY

17 Downs Rd, Monticello, NY S/B/L: 23.-2-54.1

Michael Reilly, Engineer

Joel Kohn, Representative

Mr. Kohn – This is an existing bungalow colony that is 19.5 acres in size and in a zoning district that allows bungalows. There are 31 existing units on the property and some are going to be combined. WE are adding 14 units giving us 39 units and that is the maximum number of units allowed. There will be an upgrade to the sewer and water. And will be replacing the community building with a slightly larger community building. The building is currently 2,000 sq. feet and looking to replace it with 3,150 sq. feet We are looking for a Denial for the parking. The women don't drive but we need more parking spaces. The required amount of parking is 78 but we are looking to have 63 so we need a variance for that. There was a question if we need a variance for the community building as well. It's 25 feet from the property and should be 35 feet. I looked under 250.21-b4 where it said that this size of the building can be done but maybe we might need a variance. Hellen Budrock – You're not just enlarging but destroy it and rebuilding? Mr. Kohn – Yes, the code reads, Normal maintenance and repair, alteration, reconstruction or enlargement of a building which does not house a nonconforming use but is nonconforming as to district regulations for lot area, lot width, front, side or rear yards, maximum height and lot coverage or other such regulation is permitted if the same does not increase the degree of, or create any new, nonconformity with such regulations in such building.

Chairman Kiefer - I have a problem with the parking. I know the women don't drive but the weekends get packed. I believe we need to do the required amount of parking. Paula Kay – This is not a decision for the Planning Board it for the ZBA. Hellen Budrock - The interpretation is about the community building being used as new or if it will be considered enlargement. Mr. Kohn - It say enlargement or

reconstruction. Hellen Budrock – Reconstruct could me inside the footprint instead of demolishing and starting new.

Paula Kay – There is no issue with the Denial for the Parking but I’m checking on the Community Building.

Richard McGoey – My comment about the additional dwelling unit, could through you into a variance issue for density. Mr. Kohn - There is no unit, it’s storage, they store extra beds there. Richard McGoey – It’s not storage, there is a bathroom and 2 beds and an air conditioner. That’s not storage. Mr. Kohn - I’ll look into it; I was told it was storage.

Michael Croissant – What about those trailers? Richard McGoey – I think we need to do a file search and leave that up to Jim Carnell. Jim Carnell – Those trailers are older than all of us.

Michael Croissant – Is the intent to leave the trailers? Mr. Kohn - Yes. Michael Croissant – They don’t look very habitual.

Michael Croissant – I think they need a street sweeper there too. Both entrances are very muddy.

A motion for a denial for parking and interpretation and/or a denial if required on the Community Building to send to Zoning Board of Appeals was made by Michael Hoyt and seconded by Michael Croissant
5 in favor; 0 opposed

ROBERT BUCKLES
40 Katrina Falls Rd, Rock Hill, S/B/L:
Robert Buckles, Applicant

Paula Kay- The applicant is not here so we can’t act.

Jim Carnell – I will reach out to Mr. Buckles and see where he is at.

A motion to close the meeting at 8:42 pm was made by Michael Croissant and seconded by Michael Hoyt
5 In favor; 0 opposed

Respectfully submitted,



Debbie Mitchell
Secretary
Town of Thompson Planning Board