

Joanne Rashell – I live at 55 Medallion Road, Kiamesha Lake, NY, in Patio Homes and I was curious why the garages were not built originally?

It was explained that the question wouldn't generally be answered tonight, the applicant would submit an answer to the Board via writing and that would be posted to the website. However, due to the history of the Motor Club, the applicant can answer the question tonight.

Hayden Carell – The track opened in 2008 with a master plan with facilities that would be built in the immediate future. They built some of the proposed garages, in other locations, and have now grown enough to build more of them. The addition of the loft space came from requests from the members. Most of the recent and the future projects are to accommodate members requests.

No further questions or comments from the public.

A motion to close the public hearing, leaving the written comment period open for 2 weeks, was made by Michael Croissant and second by Kathleen Lara.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

JUMPCHA

410 Route 17B, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Chairman Sush read the legal notice out loud.

Proof of mailings were received.

Joel Kohn presented the most recent plans, with very minor changes, and Helen Budrock shared the site plan on the Google Drive for everyone to see.

Joel Kohn – This project is located at 410 Route 17B. It is a 5-acre parcel mostly in the CI zoning district with a small portion, in the back of the property, in the RR-1 zoning district. It is a proposed commercial recreational facility with 2 existing driveways off of 17B, one as an entrance and one as an exit, a parking area and a storage shed. Per the request from DOT, we will be re-doing the driveway to have only 1 driveway, in and out. The proposed project is inflatable and mechanical equipment with 10 rides, a storage shed and a parking lot. If needed I can mention what the rides will be, but they are mainly for children. There will be a 6-foot-wide paved walkway through the site, all the way to the back, and it will have a 12-foot-wide base, for truck access when needed. The facility will be open during the summer season. It will be open to the public on Sunday's and Friday's and open by appointment only during the week days. There will be approximately 12 employees. We have provided 34 parking spaces for cars and 5 for buses.

Paula Kay – Hours of operation? Joel Kohn – I don't remember, but I think last time we said 12 to 6. Jim Carnell – It looks like it is on the site plans. Helen Budrock – The site plans say 9 to 8. Paula Kay – So into the evening.

Kathleen Lara – Is the plan still groups of 250 people 5 times a day? Joel Kohn – Yes.

Chairman Sush – How is the site contained? Is there a fence and how far back are you going? Because the equipment stops up here, but the property goes back further. I was wondering if that back area is going to be usable space, like for a picnic area or something. Joel Kohn – The back of the property is all wooded, so it is not usable space. What is not wooded, more or less, is grass area. The fence is only along the property line on the auto garage side, there is no fence on the other side of the property. Chairman Sush – Does it need one? To keep the people within their play area and to keep non-paying guests out. Kathleen Lara – I don't think it's a bad idea because of the location. Joel Kohn – There is a fence in the front of the property as well, but I will discuss it with the owner. I don't see any issue with that.

Chairman Sush – My only other thought is, you have a jog in the sidewalk that doubles as access for trucks and you may want to potentially straightening that a little or adding more edge so you don't end up stuck or making a mud hole. Joel Kohn – Okay.

Chairman Sush – Also, it would be nice to see what the equipment looks like. I know you have them labeled on the site plan, but maybe you can supply pictures of them. Even if it's not the exact model being used, just so we have an idea. Joel Kohn – We will email in the pictures.

No further questions or comment from the Board.

Meeting was opened to the public.

No public comment.

A motion to close the public hearing, leaving the written comment period open for 2 weeks, was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

KRASNA

203 Anawana Lake Road, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Chairman Sush read the legal notice out loud.

Proof of mailings were received.

Joel Kohn presented the most recent plans and Helen Budrock shared the site plan, that still included the parking area, for everyone to see.

Joel Kohn – Krasna is a school that continued their year-round education from the city to up here during the summer. It is located on Anawana Lake Road, which is a county road, and has a total of 35 acres on

the west side of Anawana Lake Road. It is located in the SR zoning district, which permits this use, subject to site plan approval. The site plan shows a proposed classroom building, up in the back of the property, some relocated study buildings and a 70 x 140 pavilion with a bathroom. The project is being served by private water and Town sewer.

Chairman Sush – Joel, the site plan Helen is showing has the pedestrian bridge on it, but that is not part of this approval, right? Joel Kohn – Correct. The master plan is to also have the bridge, the parking area and replace the dining room building, but we are just asking for these few items at the moment. The site plan I have only includes the items we are asking for. Chairman Sush – Any feed back from the County yet? Paula Kay – The County is waiting for updated plans. Helen Budrock – Yeah, County Planning is going to do an updated 239 review now that some of the elements were taken out. The County DPW did receive the pedestrian safety study and other documentation that they needed for the bridge, but it is going to take a while for them to review that and didn't want to hold up these 2 buildings in the meantime.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

Meeting was opened to the public.

Roy Scandurra – I am the neighbor to the left of the property and my question is, if someone builds a building on someone else's right-of-way, shouldn't they be notified? Paula Kay – You can not build a building on a right-of-way so if you have a survey or something that shows that a proposed building is being built on a right-of-way, you should submit that to the Building Dept. Roy Scandurra – It was already built and I was never notified. Chairman Sush – I believe this was addressed at a previous Planning Board meeting. Paula Kay – I thought so too and believe the applicant supplied a survey. Kathleen Lara – I think you are right. Chairman Sush – I don't remember the end result, but now that you are asking, I remember this coming up before. Roy Scandurra – I personally didn't know until I saw the blueprints the other day and I had no idea they were building there. Paula Kay – We don't know whether it is really on your right-of-way because I believe that there were surveys done, quite a bit ago, but if you have proof that something is over your right-of-way, you can, again, submit it to the Town's Building Dept. and we can take a look. Roy Scandurra – You guys are the ones who signed the right-of-way. Paula Kay – Sir, if you have some information that this Board does not, please submit it because this is exactly what the public hearing is for. Roy Scandurra – I don't live around here. Paula Kay – You can just have your surveyor submit the information to the Building Dept. and then they will send it around to the Board and myself to take a look at. Roy Scandurra – Then they will have to take it down? Paula Kay – Well, if things are as you say they are, we will have to take a deeper look at it. However, if the building is already built, that is a right of action you would have with the applicant. So, why don't you start with submitting what you have. Roy Scandurra – I have a old survey, that my neighbor had done, but I do not have a surveyor now. Paula Kay – That may be the issue and you may have to engage someone or provide whatever proof you feel you do have and the Board will take a look at it. Chairman Sush – The contact information for the Town and the Building Dept. is on this evening's agenda, it has both an email address and contact numbers.

Joanne Rashell - I live at 55 Medallion Road, Kiamesha Lake, NY, in Patio Homes and I am unfamiliar with how all of this works. Can you just explain to me what they are looking to build. Chairman Sush – Like Joel’s presentation shows, they are looking to add some new buildings to an existing facility and part of the process is showing the public what they are planning on doing. The information is also on the Town’s website and it shows exactly what it is they are building. Joanne Rashell – What kind of building are they and what will they be used for? Chairman Sush – That is what he just described. Joanne Rashell – Like I said, I am very new to this. Helen Budrock – It is a pavilion and a classroom. Joel Kohn – It’s a classroom building that will have 12 classrooms and an open pavilion building with a small bathroom and storage closet that they will use for recreation. Joanne Rashell – Is it all one story? Joel Kohn – Yes. Joanne Rashell – Thank you.

No further questions or comments from the public.

A motion to close the public hearing, leaving the written comment period open for 2 weeks, was made by Michael Croissant and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

THOMAS CARUSO

Big Woods Road, Harris, NY
Thomas Caruso, Property owner

Thomas Caruso – I am looking to combined two 5+ acre lots located on Big Woods Road, lots 84.3 and 84.4, to get a 10+ acre lot.

Kathleen Lara – These lots ae part of a previous subdivision, right? Thomas Caruso – Correct.

Kathleen Lara – Any improvements on the lot now? Thomas Caruso – Yes, I put a small hunting cabin. There was one preexisting when I bought it, but it was all dilapidated and petty beat up, so I built a new one. Unbeknownst to me, it was in violation. So, I went for a building permit and tried for a variance from the Zoning Board, who told me that I could combined the 2 lots to get the 10-acre requirement, in lieu of the variance, to keep the hunting cabin.

Kathleen Lara – Matt Sickler, do you have any comments? Matt Sickler – No, provided there was an existing structure there and it sounds like he is in the process of getting the building permit for it.

Chairman Sush – Any other questions or concerns. Kathleen Lara – No. It sounds pretty straight forward and he is on as an action item as well tonight. Paula Kay – You can make a motion to take the agenda out of order if you want to act on this now. Michael Croissant – That make sense so he doesn’t have to wait around.

A motion to take the agenda out of order was made by Michael Croissant and second by Kathleen Lara. All in favor, 0 opposed.

NAFTALI & NECHAMA FOGIEL

16 Demarest Drive, Kiamesha Lake, NY
Mark Weinberger, Project architect
Ibukunoluwa Atolagbe, Associate of Mark Weinberger

Mark Weinberger – My client bought this property with 3 existing structures on it. They had started to do some work without a permit and got a violation for that, so they retained me to help them out. We brought in an engineer to take a look and if you take a look at the plans, you will see the 3 structures (Helen Budrock pulled up sheet SK-102 to reference). There is a structure close to the street, one close behind that structure and then the third structure is far back on the other side of the property. The engineer determined that the first structure, closest to the street and the main structure, is not in good condition, so we were thinking about eliminating that structure and proposing a new one. We were told that because this is a multi-unit property, it has to go through Planning Board review and that's what we are here for.

Paula Kay – What kind of work was being done that resulted in your client's receiving the violation?

Mark Weinberger – They were doing some work in the second structure. I wasn't involved so I'm not exactly sure of the extent of work that was done, but they renovated it. They were in the middle of working on it when they received the violation, which prompted them to bring in a proper team, and once we took a look at the whole situation, we realized the first structure is unsound. This is why they are looking to build a whole new structure. Paula Kay – Okay.

Helen Budrock – Is the plan for the new and existing structure, shown on sheet SK-103, to have 2 families or will it be all one family? Mark Weinberger – Well, they are 1 family, but because there were already 3 structures existing on the property, we weren't going to down grade. They are not sure yet is the answer. If it's going to make a big difference, we can work either way. Their main objective is to at least have one main, good structure, but were hoping to not lose the current status. It is negotiable.

Helen Budrock - I guess my concern is, and Paula can weigh in from a legal perspective, if this is pre-existing, non-conforming and you are removing the 1 structure, I'm not sure I know you have the ruins to remain. What I'm wondering is, if they lose their non-conforming status because they are moving the 1 building entirely and then you have to limit it to say 2 family is allowed, but you wouldn't be able to build that 3rd ruin in the future. Does that sound right, Paula? Paula Kay – Yes. Helen Budrock – Or, if the Board decides to approve it, it could be a condition that the third building cannot be rebuilt. Kathleen Lara – I would always prefer to just have 1 building on a lot because it sets sort of sets a bad rolling rock for future projects. Mark Weinberger – Let me make sure I understand this, what I'm hearing is the third family building in the back is what creates the challenge and if we work to eliminate or combined the second structure together with the new structure, making just 2 families, that is more comfortable.

Right? Paula Kay – Correct because the 2 families are permitted and 3 are not under the zoning code.

Jim Carnell – I believe there is a provision that would allow for it. The only question I have is, will the existing building be attached to the proposed new building, making it a 3 family? Mark Weinberger – We had a lot of decisions about these things prior to the meeting, but if I understand correctly, everyone's hook up is about that second structure, so I can come back with a better picture of exactly what we want to do and then we can address it better. (Mark Weinberger joined the meeting via Zoom and his connection started to cut in and out) Chairman Sush – You are starting to cut in and out, but certainly,

presenting what you would like us to look at would be helpful. (Mark Weinberger attempted to say something but still could not be heard due to the bad connection) Paula Kay – We can't hear you. Maybe you can come in person to the next meeting. Chairman Sush – Or maybe a work session? Paula Kay – That would work. Maybe you can come to a work session. Either way we would need more definitive plans. It sounds like the Board would prefer a 2 family, but we would like to see the configuration. Jim Carnell – Well again, I think in our zoning code there is a provision that would allow the 3-family use because they're decreasing the non-conformity and they're moving it further away from the road, they are increasing the setbacks, and I believe they're under the overall percentage of lot coverage. So, I believe there is a way for them to do this. However, making it a 3 family, it becomes a multi-family in 1 building and would require a sprinkler system. I believe this property is serviced by central water and sewer currently, Allan Schachnovsky's water and Town's sewer, so as far as on-site water, I don't think it's an issue. You're going to get different percentage of coverage and different setbacks with those features, so I would like to get that clarified. Paula Kay – Even if they can legally do a 3-family home, it sounds like some of the Board members would prefer to see a 2-family on a lot like this. Helen Budrock – From a use perspective a 2-family is allowed and a 3-family is not, so my interpretation is that if they want to keep that third unit, which it doesn't look like they have plans now to do, they would need a use variance. Jim Carnell – If you go to district regulations, you can do it. Helen Budrock – They can do what? Jim Carnell – Pre-existing, non-conforming can be replaced. It's not increasing the degree of non-conformity and there's a whole bunch of different things in there. Zoning wise, I believe they would be allowed to replace 3 units on this parcel. Helen Budrock – Okay. Jim Carnell – Again, my only concern would be if it's going to be a 3-family building, they would need sprinklers. Paula Kay – Yes, if it's all under one roof, absolutely. Jim Carnell – Then potentially they are changing the non-conformity because maybe it's a more intense use as a 3-family. If they had 3 separate buildings, like they currently have, they certainly would be able to replace them, in-kind, with just a building permit. Helen Budrock – Right. But there not replacing them in-kind, right? They are demolishing 1 and only replacing the main building. Jim Carnell – Yes, but they are not increasing the non-conformity and that's one of the provisions that they can do it. Helen Budrock – On a different site within the lot? Jim Carnell – Absolutely. That's the only reason they are here. If they just want to tear them down and rebuild them, it would be just a straight building permit. Helen Budrock – Okay and that was my question, whether or not by demolishing 1 structure, moving it to a different location and replacing it with a bigger structure, does that somehow increase the degree on non-conformity. Jim Carnell – That does not increase the degree of non-conformity, but putting a 3-family in 1 building may increase it and maybe all they need to do is keep 10 or 15 feet between those 2 buildings because there's plenty of space. All they would need to do is shift it down towards the setback property line there and they would have adequate space between the new and existing buildings.

Paula Kay – I'm wondering if we are having this discussion amongst ourselves because Mr. Weinberger dropped off. Michael Croissant – I think we are. Helen Budrock – There was someone with their hand raised on Zoom, but I don't know that it is the applicant. It could be someone from the public, but this is not a public hearing, so we wouldn't entertain any questions. Jim Carnell – I will unmute them and see. Ibukunoluwa Atolagbe – Hi my name is Ibukunoluwa Atolagbe and I work with Mark. He got cut off so I joined to take his place and to understand what it is you guys want us to do. Helen Budrock – Thank you. Can you clarify some of the points we discussed? Ibukunoluwa Atolagbe – I will try my best. From what I heard, if we want to keep the 3 families, we can do that, it would just have to be sprinklered, and you guys are worried about the non-compliance of increasing the size of the building we want to demolish and replace, correct? Paula Kay – The issue is, if you put it all under 1 roof as a 3-family, the state would require it to be sprinklered, so is that something you want to do and something your client anticipated? Ibukunoluwa Atolagbe – My client did not anticipate that, but we do want to know what our options are

so they can move forward with the design. At the moment they don't have a very solid idea of what they want to do with the property, but they do want to keep the 2 structures separate. Helen Budrock – So, Jim, you were saying that if the 2 structures are separate, there would have to be a separation distance between them, then that's okay? Jim Carnell – Correct. Helen Budrock – Then it's not considered a 3-family, it would be considered 2 1-family buildings. Jim Carnell – Correct. Helen Budrock – So, your suggestion is to take the proposed new building and shift it further down on the lot, that way they can add on to that existing building, making it larger, and then construct the new one, as long as they keep the two buildings separate? Jim Carnell – Yes. Ibukunoluwa Atolagbe – I just want to make sure I am understanding what you are saying, we can have 3 structures on the property as long as there is the appropriate separation between the existing building and the new building? Jim Carnell – Correct. Ibukunoluwa Atolagbe – If we do want to combined them, what is the implication? Paula Kay – Then you would have to have them sprinklered. Ibukunoluwa Atolagbe – If we keep the space between the 2 structures, there is a possibility to extend the new structure. Jim Carnell – Yes as long as you keep the minimum distance between the buildings, which I believe is 15 feet in this zone, but it might be 20 feet and stay in the permitted lot coverage. Again, the water and sewer aspect of this could possibly change the required distance of separation and lot coverage. If there is serviced water and sewer the distance required would be less then if an on-site water and sewer disposal system is required. Chairman Sush – I think it sounds like a work session would be helpful or getting a better idea of what the applicant wants. Paula Kay – I agree. The first step is figuring out what the applicant wants and then after that if you want to schedule a work session, I think that would be fine or you may just want to come back to the Board without one. Ibukunoluwa Atolagbe – Okay. How do we go about scheduling a work session? Paula Kay – Once you have more definitive plans, you can call Laura in the Building Dept. and she'll set something up for you, but it sounds like the first step is to really determine what you want to do. Ibukunoluwa Atolagbe – What do you mean by what we want to do? Chairman Sush – What you would like the Board to potentially approve. Make your decisions about where you want the building footprints to be on the plan and have your team come up with a set of plans to present to the Planning Board, or directly to the Building Dept., depending on what you decide to do and if it even needs Planning Board approval. Paula Kay – Right, a code compliant plan. Chairman Sush – Or possibly just a call or meeting with the Town's Building Dept., to just clarify what the Town's rules are on what you can build for your client. Ibukunoluwa Atolagbe – Okay. Is there a possibility for approval how it is? Chairman Sush – Not this evening. Paula Kay – You are only on the agenda for discussion. Chairman Sush – Plus there are too many questions that you cannot answer for us, to even consider an approval at this point. We don't even know what you really want to do. Ibukunoluwa Atolagbe – Okay and once we have concrete plans, we can then present them? Paula Kay – Yes, because this Board can not design the plan for you, or really give recommendations, that's between you and your client. We can only tell you whether or not it meets code and what potential issues are. When you came back, it would be helpful to see the location of the structures and what the occupancy of each structure will be. Okay? Ibukunoluwa Atolagbe – Yes, I understand and thank you every much.

FAMILY FUN PARK

65 Friedman Road, Monticello, NY
Joseph Churgin, Project attorney

Helen Budrock – Shared amended site plan for everyone to see.

Joseph Churgin – We are here tonight for an amended site plan. We are trying to combined the 2 lots that are next to each other and add some reasonably small features. We want to add a carousel, a bike path and 3 sheds basically for storage. The light blue on the map are the proposed features. The circle on the right is the carousel, right above that is one of the sheds and then there is the bike path that goes all around with 2 more sheds along that path. One of those sheds are located at the beginning of the path, kind of by the parking area, and the other one is located by the loop there on the western section of the map. That second shed it there in case there is a problem with one of the bikes on the path and needs to be fixed. That's pretty much it.

Paula Kay – What's the terrane like where the bike path is going to be. Joseph Churgin – It will be cleared. Paula Kay – Right, but is it going to be black top? Joseph Churgin – Looking at the Topo on the map, it looks to me like the path is not very steep, for the most part. There is a section you go through, from the beginning until you get to the bike path, that looks to be a little steep, but I'm not the engineer.

Paula Kay – What kind of bikes will they be? Will they be electric? Joseph Churgin – I think they are planning on having just pedal bikes. I am not sure, but I can definitely find that out for you. Paula Kay – And it's only bicycles, right? Joseph Churgin – Correct.

Helen Budrock – It looks like you might need some kind of wetland crossing permit. Is that correct? Joseph Churgin – Because of the bridge over the wetlands? Helen Budrock – Yes. Is Matt Sickler still on Zoom. Matt Sickler – Yes, I am. It's not clear from this map whether they are trying to span that without disturbing anything, because it appears to be about a 50-foot crossing. We would need some clarification on that and also the location of your 10x10 shed. If you look between that shed and the bike path, the line type used is to delineate the wetland, so it's not clear if the shed is in the wetland area. You may want to relocate the shed closer to the bike path. Helen Budrock – Maybe on the inside of the loop, opposed to the outside of it. Matt Sickler – Yes, or clarify if that line type is an error. Joseph Churgin – Okay and going back to the previous comment about the bridge going over the wetland, if the bridge is not disturbing anything, then we don't need a wetland permit, right? Michael Croissant – You are going to be disturbing it, as you are going through it. Chairman Sush – Correct, you are going to have to cross the wetlands to get to the path. Joseph Churgin – I guess you are right. Matt Sickler – Based on the size of it, it may just be coverage under the nationwide, but you should check with whoever you have delineate the wetland as to the status of that and what your requirements are. Joseph Churgin – Good enough. Michael Croissant – Before you begin to build. Joseph Churgin – Of course.

Kathleen Lara – This project is a special use permit that stated off quite small and every time he comes back, it gets a little bigger. Although a bike path isn't necessarily the same as putting up a carousel and all these other things, it is quite impactful and now you are affecting neighbors further down. As a Board member people stop me all the time to ask about or comment on a project and I have heard from neighbors, on both sides, complaining about the noise and stating that equipment is being run even now. I feel this is doubling the size of the originally approved site plan, as the new lot is like 19-acres, and now there is going to be a bike path on it, I personally think we should have another public hearing. Michael Croissant – I don't disagree with you. Paula Kay – Does he have a proposed number of bikes that will be rented? Because that may help in terms of impact. Joseph Churgin – I can get that number for you. Chairman Sush – And does this increase the amount of people that can be there at any one time because I think that was limited at one point in time with this project? Joseph Churgin – If there is a special use permit that limits the number of people, then that is the number of people that will be allowed. Chairman Sush – Also, what kind of carousel? Is there a specific item or catalog cut you can

show us? I'm sure there will be sound projected from this as well, and maybe some mirrors and lights. Helen Budrock – Right and it could get pretty loud. Also, I think this is a permitted use? Aren't commercial, recreational facilities allowed in RR-1? Kathleen Lara – I thought his fun farm is a special use permit. Paula Kay – It is a special use permit. Helen Budrock – Okay

Jim Carnell – As far as the lot combination, was this parcel acquired separately, or were they purchased at the same time? Joseph Churgin – I believe they were purchased separately, but I am not positive. Jim Carnell – I don't think it was submitted as part of the application, so I'm trying to verify if the ownership name is the same for the 2 lots being combined. Joseph Churgin – That is what has to happen. Jim Carnell – Okay, because we had a couple projects in the past that went to file at the County's Real Property and had an issue with the name not being exactly the same. Kathleen Lara – They are owned by the same person. Joseph Churgin – If not, one would have to sell to the other. Jim Carnell – I just wanted to make sure all documentation was correct before the Board takes any action. Joseph Churgin – Sure.

Helen Budrock – Matt, I think you were still waiting for an updated SWPP from the prior modification, right? Is that something that would have to be submitted to you with these current changes as well? Matt Sickler – Correct. I believe we are waiting for the modification from the addition of the slide, so along with this they should show new limits of disturbance and limits of clearing. I assume that is all wooded, so I think the limits of clearing would be beneficial as well. Chairman Sush – Also regarding the prior approval, can you designate the type of go-carts that will be at the track, electric versus gas powered carts? I think this is part of the noise related issue as well, so that should probably be clarified. If you do decide you want electric, I would like that to be revisited. Joseph Churgin – Okay. Matt Sickler – Like Kathleen said, this project has come back many times, so it may be helpful to note on the plan all the previous approvals with the date of approval and any conditions. Kathleen Lara – I agree with Matt because they are currently not listed. Chairman Sush – And the Overview form only goes back to April 2022, so it doesn't go back to the inception of the project. Helen Budrock – Yeah, that would be helpful because I believe last time some sort of resolution was pulled out and it listed conditions. Chairman Sush – I think we were talking about animals at that point. Helen Budrock – Right. Joseph Churgin – Yes, and you were very specific about that. Chairman Sush – I'm sure there will be a question about the number of animals at the public hearing. Kathleen Lara – Also, can you as Mr. Oster to come with a plan for noise, mostly on the Hidden Ridge side? Obviously, there is going to be noise and you control every kid every minute of the day, but that will definitely come up at the public hearing. Joseph Churgin – I'm not in disagreement, but the plan does show tress on that side. Kathleen Lara – Right, and again, that's not something he can necessarily something that he can always control, but perhaps he can come up with something to help the neighbors feel better about the fact that this is expanding. Joseph Churgin – Okay. Helen Budrock – So, you want them to come back with some additional information and when they come back, they can be scheduled as an action item to schedule the public hearing? Chairman Sush – Yes and I think clarification on the wetland would be super helpful. Joseph Churgin – Do I get that information and then contact you, or do you just set something up now? I know the next meeting is in 2 weeks and that may not be enough time. Paula Kay – That's up to you and your engineer, but I think the Board wants you to come back to straighten out somethings, especially the wetlands, and then the Board will set a public hearing date. Joseph Churgin – Okay. I can probably get the answers about the wetlands by the next meeting. When exactly is that? Helen Budrock – The next meeting is November 9th, so if you can get whatever updated information you have in by November 2nd, a week from today, you can be on the next agenda. Joseph Churgin – Sounds good and if I can't submit the information in time for the 9th meeting, I will let you know.

RHAPSODY HOLDINGS, LLC

9 Anawana Lake Road, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – We had a work session after the last Planning Board meeting with the Town’s consultants to figure out exactly what use we will be able to assign this project that will be permitted in the zoning district. We came up with a dual use. 3 of the developed units are exclusively used for family and will be under a cluster development use. The other 2 buildings are for the kids they are bringing up from their respite program in the city and those will be a hotel/motel use since they are being rented out. Also, the Board wanted the fines or the building without permit fees paid prior to approval. The Building Dept. came up with an amount due of \$14,000.00 and that was paid to the Town. So, we are now ready to be back in front of the Planning Board. To refresh your memory, all of the buildings were originally the same size and these 2 buildings were extended to add a kitchen and some porches and decks. So, we need Planning Board approval for those additions, the change in use and then they also want to demolish and replace the main house because it is in a dilapidated shape. The new house will pretty much be in the same location, just a little bit bigger and squared off.

Kathleen Lara – What about service because I know that was a big issue? Paula Kay – We didn’t need to serve anymore because the applicant worked with us and took care of the building without permit fees without having to go to court. It saved time and money on both sides.

Helen Budrock – Are the uses noted on the plan to show which units will be under each use? I think I’m looking at the most recent plans and I don’t see it. Joel Kohn – Not yet. I will have the engineer update the plans to show the dual use and which units are under which use. Chairman Sush – Does this open any cans of worms for other projects that have more than 1 use? Paula Kay – No. Helen Budrock – I believe we have had a couple of those and it is discretionary approval, right? Paula Kay – Yes.

Jim Carnell – I don’t recall seeing all the bulk table stuff, but it could be on page 2. Joel Kohn – It is on page 2. Jim Carnell – Okay and does that information reflect with the new footprint of the proposed replacement building. Joel Kohn – Yes. Jim Carnell – Because on there it just shows the existing. Joel Kohn – This is kind of an existing map, but the bulk table was updated to include the new building. It shows potential lot coverage, existing and proposed. There not a lot being changed. Jim Carnell – I know its not changing much, but I just wanted to verify that this was the most updated, accurate information. Joel Kohn – I will take a look at it again, because the bulk tables will have to be updated again for the 2 uses, so I will just verify that.

Paula Kay – We worked pretty hard with Joel to come up with uses that would fit into our code. Joel Kohn – Thank you. Paula Kay – I also feel based on the work session that the applicant, and hopefully his consultants, now understands what happened and that permits are required. Arthur Knapp – What about as builts? Joel Kohn – They hired an architect or an engineer to get as builts for all the buildings, which we will need to submit to the Building Dept. once we have approvals from the Planning Board, as well as sign offs from the engineer. Helen Budrock – I know this is not on for a discussion item tonight, but since a motion was made to take the agenda out of order, does the Board want to pick a date for the public hearing tonight to keep this moving along? Paula Kay – It actually is on as a discussion item tonight and that is one of the topics to be discussed. Helen Budrock – Okay. Perfect. Jim Carnell – Also, would it be an appropriate time for a 239 as this is on a county road? Paula Kay – Yes. Joel Kohn – I should have updated plans to submit before we send it out for 239 review to reflect the changes. Helen

Budrock – Yes. Joel Kohn – Tim Gottlieb is out for some time so updated plans may take some time. Jim Carnell – Well, you can make a motion pending the receipt of the updated plans and once we get them, we can send the 239 out to the County. Paula Kay – Right. Chairman Sush – Great. Now we just need to pick a date. Paula Kay – How is the first meeting in December? Joel Kohn – That’s fine. Helen Budrock – That should allow for plenty of time for Joel to submit updated plans so the 239 can re sent out and returned. Joel Kohn – We probably won’t get the 239 review back by December 14th. Obviously, the Board is not going to act on the 14th, but we can have a public hearing and we definitely won’t know by the time we have to send out the mailings. Paula Kay – As long as we have updated plans and they are sent to the County so the 239 can commence, you are okay.

A motion to schedule a public hearing on December 14, 2022, subject to updated plans being submitted and the 239 review sent to the County, was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Arthur Knapp. All in favor, 0 opposed.

SULLIVAN REGENCY

6 Dunbar Road, Monticello, NY

Chairman Sush – We are being asked to look at this project because it is in the Village. Is there anything specific they asked of us? Pala Kay – No, it’s just a 239 referral. They are adding some units. Kathleen Lara – Which are desperately needed. Chairman Sush - What is the side road that runs down the side with their main entrance? Jim Carnell – Varnell Road. Chairman Sush – My only comment is, that portion of the road, right there at the end, is really bad and it Ts right into the bottom of West Broadway. I don’t know if that has anything to do with this project, but it’s rough right there for anybody coming and leaving. Jim Carnell – It is a Village Road. Michael Croissant – Is there ingress and regress? Chairman Sush – No, it’s off that road into their facility. Michael Croissant – Off of Dunbar? Chairman Sush – I think they have a gate on both sides. Helen Budrock – But there is no direct access to West Broadway if that is what you were getting at Michael. Chairman Broadway – I am talking about the condition of Varnell Road. Arthur Knapp – No, Dunbar Road is the road that Ts into West Broadway. Jim Carnell – They both do. If you are looking at Dunbar Towers, Dunbar Road is on the left and Varnell Road is on the right. I do not believe there is public access from Dunbar, only the garbage men and maintenance have access to that side. Artur Knapp – I think that is correct. Chairman Sush – I was traveling down Varnell and there was a car leaving the facility so they definitely have access from that side. Jim Carnell – Yes. Varnell is the road with the public access. Chairman Sush – And that road, from the corner of West Broadway to their entrance, is rough.

Jim Carnell – So, your recommendation to the Village Board is to have the developer make improvements to that section of Varnell Road? Chairman Sush – Correct. Do we need to vote or make a motion? Paula Kay – Make a motion.

A motion to recommend Varnell Road be repaired by the developer was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Croissant. All in favor, 0 opposed

ACTION ITEMS:

KRASNA

203 Anawana Lake Road, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

This project was not ready for action tonight.

THOMAS CARUSO

Big Woods Road, Harris, NY
Thomas Caruso, Property owner

A motion to take the agenda out of order was made so that this project could be acted on right after it was discussed.

No further questions or comments.

A motion to approve the lot combination was made by Michael Croissant and second by Arthur Knapp. All in favor, 0 opposed.

GARDEN HILL ESTATES

50 Strong Road, Ferndale, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This project was approved in August and since then, they wanted to change their approval slightly. Back in 2016 they got approval to add additions to a bunch of units. Among them were units 14/15 & 16/17. This past August, they got approval to eliminate all of unit 14, the existing and proposed, and replace it with unit 36. Since then, they have decided it would be a better option to not demolish the unit. Rather keep the unit and combined unit 16/17, instead of removing the unit. I told them if they were going to combined 16/17 and still add the previously approved addition, that they would need a modification to the previously approved site plan.

Chairman Sush – Isn't this what we talked about this last time you were here and you determined that they were not going to do this? Joel Kohn – We were talking about unit 14/15 at that time. We were going to demolish unit 14 at the time. We are now talking about not demolishing unit 14, but leave unit 14/15 as is, combined unit 16/17 and eliminate the previously approved addition to that. Meaning they won't be able to add to unit 16/17, which was part of the original approval. Chairman Sush – Unit 14/15 would stay with the original approval. Joel Kohn – Correct and 16/17 will be combined and not add the addition anymore. Chairman Sush – So, the last approval would pretty much be wiped out, like it never happened and kind of skip that part. Joel Kohn – Yes, we are going to kind of skip that one, but it's going to be a little bit different now. Unit 36 will still go here and instead of demolishing this unit, they will be

combining 2 of the units eliminating the approved expansion. Jim Carnell – Are the units built on piers? Joel Kohn – Yes. Helen Budrock – So, they do still propose to build unit 36? Joel Kohn – Correct. Arthur Knapp – Will the footprint stay the same? Joel Kohn – The footprint is slightly different. We got approval for 34 x 50 and it is now being proposed as 32 x 58. Helen Budrock – It looks like the orientation has changed too. Is that correct? Joel Kohn – That is correct. The orientation changed since the driveway is not going to be from this side of the road anymore. Helen Budrock – I know it's a little confusing but I will pull up both plans so you can compare the 2 and see the differences. This is the old plan with this and this being eliminated, this being expanded and this is the new unit. Then the updated plan. This goes back to the way it was, the addition goes away and these 2 combined instead, and then the new unit 36 is a slightly different configuration. Chairman Sush – Unit 36 is the same square footage, just a different dimension? Joel Kohn – It is a little bigger in square footage. It was 1,700 square feet and now it's 1856 square feet. Helen Budrock - The combined units of 16 & 17 become just unit 16 and unit 36 replaces unit 17. Joel Kohn – Right. Chairman Sush – As long as we are very clear on what is happening with unit 14/15. Joel Kohn – I think the notes on the updated site plan are pretty clear and it shows clearly what we are proposing at this time. It also shows all of the relocated storm drains that was asked for by the Town's engineer.

Paula Kay – Matt, anything else on your end that we need to be aware of? Matt Sickler – No. The drainage information and locations that we talked about previously works with this layout. Chairman Sush – The line that goes through the new addition of unit 16/17, is that the stormwater line? Matt Sickler – It's a sewer line. Chairman Sush – Will that have to be relocated? Joel Kohn – No, because unit 16/17 is staying how it is and they are no longer doing the addition, that the line would have run through. Chairman Sush – I see. The addition was never built, it is just on the plan showing it was previously proposed and approved. Matt Sickler – Correct. Chairman Sush – So, it is really close to the corner of that same unit it, but it is okay because the unit is already there? Matt Sickler – Correct. It can remain as is. Chairman Sush – Do you need to see how that sewer main ties into 14/15 or is that end just before the deck? Joel Kohn – That is also existing. Chairman Sush – So, because it is existing, you don't need to show it on the plan? Matt Sickler – Yes. I think they were providing locations before when we were looking at the potential expansions of those units, but it is an existing connection now and the addition of 16/17 is going away, so we don't need to reroute it.

Chairman Sus – Okay. Do we need any conditions? Paula Kay – No.

A motion to approve the minor modification to the previously approved site plan was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

VIZNITZ INST. – USE CHANGE

4656 State Route 42, Kiamesha Lake, NY
Naftula Nieman, Project representative

Kathleen Lara – So I see you were able to get the dumpster in the back. Naftula Nieman – Yes and we really appreciate all the help from Paula, Jim and everyone in the Building Dept. I did slightly change the location of the dumpster today because I realized it was on the right-of-way. I'm not sure why I didn't notice that before, so I just shifted it slightly. Chairman Sush – Will anything now be behind the lattice fence where the dumpster used to be? Naftula Nieman – Back behind it is an A/C unit and the offices are right there. Jim Carnell – It's not a refrigeration unit, it's just for A/C, right? Naftula Nieman – Yeah. The refrigeration units are inside the building. Jim Carnell – Right, from when it used to be the beverage company.

Jim Carnell – Did you see the message from Mike Messenger? Naftula Nieman – Yes and I spoke to him. We discussed that we are going to have to sit down and go over a few things before I can even get the building permit. To figure out exactly what the flow will be and how to upgrade it if need be. Matt Sickler – The only other thing you might want to talk to Mike Messenger about is the easement for the gravity sewer line. That shows on this plan, but the sewer force main does not. So, if we can just work with your surveyor to verify the width of those and get them on the final plan. I know Mike would appreciate that. Naftula Nieman – I did send him what I got late this afternoon from the title company showing the exact easement the own has on this property. Matt Sickler – Okay, that could have been after I talked with him. Naftula Nieman – Probably because I think I sent it around 5:00 this evening. Matt Sickler – Yeah, that was probably after I spoke to him, so we should be okay and be able to get that on there. Naftula Nieman – You can do that yourself or do I need my engineer? Paula Kay – Matt, what he sent over was the deed. Matt Sickler – Oh, okay. Paula Kay – And part of the deed is a survey. Matt Sickler – Yup. Paula Kay – I'm trying to see who the surveyor was and it looks like it might have been John Galligan. Matt Sickler – Okay. Paula Kay – So then Buzzy can do it? Matt Sickler – Yes.

Helen Budrock – I think the other concern was sprucing up the appearance of the existing building and you supplied a rendering. Naftula Nieman – Yes. We power washed the top and we are going to repaint the bottom portion, which I forgot to show, take out all the old landscaping and put in some new stuff.

Kathleen Lara – I think my only question is the parking. Didn't we discuss showing parking on the plan? I don't think this should hold anything up and you did mention there would only be 5 or so employees, but I thought we had asked for the parking to be shown. Naftula Nieman – Okay. Kathleen Lara – That's all.

Helen Budrock – The possible conditions you talked about were adding the additional easement information on the plan, power washing and painting the building and showing the specific location of the parking. Matt Sickler – And I believe we would need to confirm the flows of the pump station to verify the pump has capacity and incorporate grease traps to the satisfaction of the Town's superintendent. Naftula Nieman – Yes and we discussed this with Mike Messenger and he said we will get it done before the permit is issued. Paula Kay – Right, but it would be a condition of this approval so we can get you to the permit application stage. Naftula Nieman – Understood. Michael Croissant – Can you also repair the lattice fence there in front of the A/C unit? Looking at it here in the picture, the current condition of it is terrible. The lattice broken and the doors are all cocked in. Naftula Nieman – Just make it look better? Michael Croissant – Yes and it doesn't even look like the doors would operate honestly. It looks like they are overlapping each other. Naftula Nieman – So, just make it look nice. Michael Croissant – No, it needs to be repaired. Naftula Nieman – Okay. We will fix it.

A motion for final site plan approval, subject to finishing the cleanup to the exterior of the building, all sewer lines, in regards to the easement, being shown on the plan, parking being shown on the site plan,

the lattice gate in front of the A/C unit be fixed, and Mike Messenger's final review, was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Michael Croissant.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

PRIOR APPROVALS/ENFORCEMENT:

KEREN HATORAH

Route 17B, Monticello, NY

The Board asked this applicant to come back to tonight's meeting for an update on the work they said would be done and timeline they provided for said work. Applicant did not show up to the meeting in person nor via Zoom. Joel Kohn did confirm that they were advised of the Board's request to come to tonight's meeting, but gave no response. The Board asked the Building Dept. to issue violations and instruct Brian Kaplan, the Town's prosecutor, to start prosecution.

Jim Carnell brought up the November 23rd meeting to see if the Board wanted to make a decision tonight as to whether or not they wanted to cancel that meeting due to Thanksgiving. The Board decided to wait until the next meeting, November 9th, to make that decision so that they can see if there are any projects that need to be on for the November 23rd meeting. Helen Budrock pointed out that there is a 5th Wednesday in November so we can also schedule a meeting for then if need be.

A motion to close the meeting was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Michael Croissant.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers, Secretary

Town of Thompson Planning Board