

APPROVED

TOWN OF THOMPSON
PLANNING BOARD
September 28, 2022

IN ATTENDANCE:

Matthew Sush, Chairman	Michael Croissant
Michael Hoyt	Christina Cellini, Alternate
Arthur Knapp	Kristin Boyd, Alternate
Kathleen Lara	Paula Elaine Kay, Attorney
Jim Carnell, Building, Planning, Zoning	Laura Eppers, Secretary
Matthew Sickler, Consulting Engineer	
Helen Budrock, Sr. Planner, Delaware Engineering	

A motion to approve the August 24, 2022 minutes was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Michael Hoyt.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

Public Hearing:

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

ROCK HILL VOL. AMBULANCE CORP

96 Lake Louise Marie Road, Rock Hill, NY
Thomas Bogursky, Project representative

Thomas Bogursky – We are looking to put a 12’ x 28’ shed on the property for storage of an ATV and other stuff we have.

Chairman Sush – Is this just the sketch plan stage? Thomas Bogursky – Yes. We know what kind of shed it will be and we have plans for it. Paula Kay – Tommy, where it says “old shed” on the map, is that shed staying? Thomas Bogursky – Yes and this shed will go 5 feet off of that shed.

Kathleen Lara – Sounds pretty cut and dry to me. Chairman Sush – Anyone else have any questions? Matt, did you have anything that needed to be addressed? Matt Sickler – No. It appears to be a shed that’s going to be water proof and set on a stone path. It doesn’t appear to violate any setbacks or zoning requirements, so I don’t see any issues. Arthur Knapp – Are you going to add color to it? Thomas Bogursky – No. Michael Hoyt – Is what is shown on the site plan from 2009 still what’s there now? Thomas Bogursky – I don’t have a copy of that. Helen Budrock – You want me to share the site plan? Michael Hoyt – Yeah and when I looked at it, I thought there was an addition to the existing building.

Thomas Bogursky – No. Michael Hoyt – So, you are just looking to for the 12' x 24' shed? Thomas Bogursky – Yes and I think it is 12' x 28'. Michael Hoyt – I'm good. Helen Budrock – Can you have Glenn update the site plan we have on file, just to show where the new shed is. Chairman Sush – So, just some updating on the map and bring it back at the next meeting as an action item.

SEAN BROOKS

86 Sacks Road, Harris, NY
Bruce Reynolds, Project representative

Arthur Knapp was recused.

Bruce Reynolds – I'm here tonight on behalf of Sean Brooks, who owns Prestige Towing. He is proposing a building in Harris, which is in the SR zone, and the property is an acre in size. I made a mistake on the application because the plans were not prepared by Lounsbury Builders, they are just giving a quote on the building. I prepared everything and the application. As you can see, the building is 42 x 100, which is slightly less than the 10% lot coverage requirement in the zone. I provided a picture of what the site looks like now and it will be a tremendously improved with a building there. He just wants the house trucks inside.

Chairman Sush – Will the building have amenities inside it? Any bathrooms or anything else? Bruce Reynolds – No, I don't even think there is going to be a bathroom. Just storage for trucks.

Helen Budrock – Is this for personal use, or is it an extension of the business, of Prestige? Bruce Reynolds – It's just to house trucks. Helen Budrock – But, will it be for business vehicles for Prestige rather than Sean's personal vehicles? Bruce Reynolds – Well, yeah. Helen Budrock – Paula, is there then an issue with the use? Paula Kay – I'm checking. Helen Budrock – Just so you are aware Tommy, the zoning code for the SR district specifically says private garages are permitted subject to Planning Board approval, providing that no business, occupation or service is conducted for profit. Bruce Reynolds – It's just to house the vehicles though. There will be nobody working in the building. Helen Budrock – Understood, but it is for the use of Prestige versus Sean's personal use and that is the question at hand. Bruce Reynolds – I guess. Yeah. Paula Kay – So, the way I look at it is that it is a commercial structure rather than a private garage. Helen Budrock – Which I believe is not permitted in the SR zone. Paula Kay – Right. Paula Kay – Most likely you will need to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a use variance. Is there any other zoning contingent to this project? Jim Carnell – Down the road, but I don't think it's contiguous. Paula Kay – Okay. Because there is nothing contiguous, the only option here would be a use change from the Zoning Board of Appeals. Bruce Reynolds – Okay. Kathleen Lara – I know it's not permitted, but I would just like to add that I would rather see this building when driving down this road than what is there now. Currently it is very busy there with lots of vehicles and I know he owns a business, so I get it. I think it would be worth it for him to try to get the variance because then they can, hopefully, limit the number of vehicles they have stored outside and make it look more like a residential setting and possibly make some conditions on how many vehicles can be stored outside of the garage. Paula Kay – If the ZBA approved the use variance, it would come back to you for approvals and then you could work on the site plan with Bruce and the owner, just as you have done with other commercial entities like this, to determine how many vehicles, where they should park and whether there needs to

be screening. Chairman Sush – Okay, because I was wondering how the colony behind the property, or whatever the entity is, view it as well. Bruce Reynolds – This will certainly clean the property up. Chairman Sush – I agree.

Chairman Sush – Do we need to make an official decision? Paula Kay – You need to do a denial, but you can also do an official recommendation to the ZBA so they have some guidance on what this Board is thinking. Kathleen Lara – I think we should do that because even though it's not permitted in the zone, it would considerably clean the property up and make it more residential than it is now. Right? Chairman Sush – Yes. Michael Hoyt – Yup. Paula Kay – Or just clean up an existing commercial use that has been an unpermitted use. Chairman Sush – Great. So, we need to build that all into an official recommendation. Is that 2 separate motions? Or do we do a motion for denial with a recommendation? Kathleen Lara – Do we need to move it to an action item to do that? Pala Kay – This kind of action can be done here. Helen Budrock – I think we established that the Planning Board doesn't need to formally refer anything to the Zoning Board, so it's not a formal action. Chairman Sush – Okay. Helen Budrock – Bruce, when you come back here to the Planning Board, can you make sure to have a short form EAF? This way we can have it for SEQR purposes, as the building will be over 4,000 square feet, and let Sean know that the Board will probably want some sort of rendering or elevation or something like that at some point. Bruce Reynolds – Do you think we need a survey? Matt Sickler – It's a sizable lot so that would probably be a good idea. Paula Kay – Yeah, that would be great.

A motion to deny applicants request and refer him to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a use variance was made by Michael Croissant and second by Michael Hoyt.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

KRASNA

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

Joel Kohn – We were here at the last meeting and got a public hearing scheduled for October 26th and the Board wanted us to come back with an update on violations and other things. We received the technical comments from the Town's engineer today and I don't see any issues with any of the items mentioned, we can discuss that in detail if needed. As far as violations, the Drive now has an updated list of violations that now only shows the open violations. A few of them have been closed, one was the fire inspection and one was the drainage that went into the sewer mains. Mike Messenger was out there and confirmed that there is no I & I and the manhole is dry. He did have some recommendations and suggestions as to what should be done, which will be done.

Helen Budrock – At the last meeting we basically said we would schedule a meeting for the public hearing to be on October 26th. Joel Kohn – We did schedule the public hearing and, again, this is just for the 2 buildings; the pavilion and the classroom. We will come back for the rest of the stuff after the County's approval for the pedestrian bridge. Kathleen Lara – Thanks for keeping your word and following through on this.

Jim Carnell – Mike was out there and I think he wrote a memo that is in the drive with everything else. Chairman Sush – What exactly was done to address the issue shown in Mike Messengers video and

photos? Joel Kohn – Those were taken back on 2018 and since then they have been fixed and smoke tested. Jim Carnell – Mike was not aware of the work that was completed because he was not involved with any of the remedial work that was done, but since the last meeting Mike and Sean Rieber did go out there and witnessed it working correctly. Again, there is a memo stating the work that was performed, mitigating whether infiltration was happening and, I think, there's a flume in one of the manholes that will need to be updated or repaired, but the majority of his concerns were addressed. Arthur Knapp - Matt, are you satisfied with where we are? Matt Sicker – Yeah, if Mike Messenger is good with the repair work that was done on the sanitary system on-site. I also provided some comments about the overall project. Primarily to take a good look at the accessibility of the fire apparatus around the site, in terms of turning radius, road widths and dead-end lines. That's about it for now. Then when the dining hall is clarified, there's going to have to be dumpsters or trash facilities close to it, that I didn't see on the plans. Also where are you going to be getting deliveries? But these are things that I think Joel said will be developed later on. Joel Kohn – Correct, as we are just dealing with the 2 buildings right now, and I will show fire access by the meeting with the public hearing. Matt Sickler - Good and then just the standard type of detailed information listed like stormwater management, limitations of the sewer and water lines and things like that. Is the bathroom storage facility going with the pavilion, in that space and will you put that as well. Joel Kohn – Yes. Matt Sickler – Okay. Matt Sickler – They are all 1-story buildings, right? Joel Kohn – Right and I can have an engineer prepare a plan that shows only what we are proposing now. Matt Sickler – I think that would be helpful. Arthur Knapp – I think that makes sense.

Chairman Sush – Is the DOT still involved with the overpass? Joel Kohn – Yes, as it takes forever to get anything back from the County. The required pedestrian study has been done and was submitted to them 3 or 4 weeks ago. I tried to follow up a couple of times, but didn't hear anything back from them yet. So, my clients are proposing to build only these 2 buildings immediately and holding off on the rest of it until we get the approvals from the County, or denial, who knows.

Chairman Sush – If you are just proposing the 2 buildings and not the parking area at this time, where are people who are now using these 2 buildings going to park? Joel Kohn – There is not additional occupancy with these buildings. One is basically going to be a covered steel building, which will be used for recreation when it is raining outside, and the other is only a classroom building. There is a gravel parking lot, across the street, and that's probably what they will be using. There is one shown on the side of the building, but that is not happening anymore because they were just parking behind anyway. Chairman Sush – This will kind of formalize the parking. Joel Kohn – Yes, this will formalize the parking lot and give them proper detentions, parking spaces and means of crossing the County Road. Christina Cellini – If the County does not approve the overpass, do you have a contingency to put another parking spot on the same side of the road? Joel Kohn – If the County doesn't approve it, mostly it will just be a cross walk on the County Road and I don't want to see that happen, but that may be what has to happen. Arthur Knapp- If that happens, will it be supervised? Joel Kohn – We will have to see if we get approval or not and then go from there. Kathleen Lara – We know this project needs more parking desperately, we will just have to wait and see how.

Helen Budrock – The County's 239 is kind of incomplete because of the pedestrian walkway. So, I'm wondering how we should handle that. Maybe Joel should send an email, or maybe the Town should, to County Planning to let them know that the project has been revised. Chairman Sush – And maybe break it out into 2 different project applications. Joel Kohn – I think the email should come from the Town to put a little bit more weight on it. Helen Budrock – Since it's just an email with an update and they already have all the information, I can just reference the number they assigned it, let them know they're

breaking out the pedestrian component of the project and ask them to issue a letter for just the 2 buildings being proposed now. Joel Kohn – Thank you.

JUMPCHA

410 Route 17B, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This is my first involvement with this project. I reviewed the minutes of the past meetings and saw all the comments, so it's all kind of fresh. Jumpcha is a recreational project located on 17B. It's a 5-acre parcel and the majority of the parcel is in the CI zoning district, which permits this use subject to site plan approval, and the rest is in the RR-1 zoning district. The project was last in front of this Board in January of this year and it has since been revised to show all of the recreational area outside of the 50-foot setback, as requested at the last meeting. Right now, everything is shown and there are 10 rides, a mixture of mechanical and inflatable. Those rides include a Swing, Ferris wheel, Meltdown, Slide, Marry-go-round, Bounce house, Kids swing, Ball Park, Bumper cars and a Boat ride. They will mainly be in the order that you see on the site plan but it may be switched around somewhat. There will be a 6-foot-wide paved walkway with a 12-foot-wide gravel base so that trucks can get back in if need be. The park will be open to the public during the summer months on Fridays and Sunday. During the week it will be open for "by appointment" groups only. They may also be open before and after the season for groups who make appointments. There will be a maximum of 5 groups per day, with a maximum of 250 kids per group, and each group will be there for 1 ½ hours with 30 minutes between groups. There will be 5 bus parking spaces and 24 regular parking spaces provided. During the week there shouldn't be many cars, because it will be groups and we anticipate them being bused in, and during the weekend there shouldn't be any busses.

Helen Budrock – Are there hours of operation? Joel Kohn – I believe from 10 to 6, but I will conform that.

Paula Kay – What about staffing. Joel Kohn - There should be about 12 employees. Paula Kay – Does that parking include employee parking as well? Joel Kohn - Yes. Michael Croissant – Is there enough turn radius there for the buses? Joel Kohn – We will confirm that. Mat Sickler – That is something that will be looked at before full approval. Kathleen Lara – That's a pretty busy spot on 17B. Do you have any information on how the buses are going to go in and out? Joel Kohn – Originally, they proposed 2 driveways, with one coming in and one going out. The DOT did not want to have that and wanted them to re-do the entrance with a 2-way entrance, one lane in and one lane out, in 1 driveway. This is being worked out with the DOT. They accepted the plan with some minor comments, that are in the works of being addressed. Kathleen Lara – I think the 1 lane entrance is much better. Jim Carnell – Joel, if you could, as I don't recall seeing any correspondence from the DOT for this project, can you provide what was submitted to them for our file. Joel Kohn – I will send it to you when we re-submit to them, and their response/comments. Jim Carnell – Okay, this way the Board is aware of what is going on with this 3rd party agency and can see what they previously had to say. Joel Kohn – They are basically asking us to re-do the entire entrance. Re-grade back into the site for the buses, new pavement, new culvert, etc. Jim Carnell – We will generally get notified of the approval, but don't always get to see the details of what is happening prior to the approval and since the Board has a lot of questions in regards to bus access, that would probably be helpful. Joel Kohn – I will have the engineer add the DOT plans to the next set of site plans submitted. Matt Sickler – Great. That way if they ask me for feedback, I can provide it.

Michael Hoyt – How do we handle rides? Do we have someone who inspects them? Jim Carnell – Usually Parks & Rec handles that. Joel Kohn – Correct. They have to get a certificate from them for each of their equipment and they have to be inspected once a year from the Dept. of Labor. Paula Kay – Let's say the Board approves the project and the Dept. of Labor does at will inspections, are those inspection reports submitted to the town? Jim Carnell – They will notify the Building Dept. if there is a problem. Michael Hoyt – Well, we want to avoid that. Jim Carnell – I know with the Kartrite, the water park rides, the rope course and everything else there, gets inspected by the DOL annually and prior to operation. Michael Hoyt – Are you notified of that stuff? Jim Carnell – I can tell you we are notified if there is a problem and they will take the ride out of service. Helen Budrock – Remember this is a special use permit, so it's one of those things that you can permit for only a year. Then they can come back next year with proof of re-inspection and if there is any problems parking or anything else, it can be addressed at that time. Matt Sickler – Or you can make it a condition that the owner or the operator notify the Building Dept. when the inspections occur. Jim Carnell – Typically we would issue a site permit and not authorize the user occupancy until we get DOL inspection reports.

Michael Hoyt – What kind of swing? A mechanical one? And what size Farris wheel are we talking? Joel Kohn – It's a smaller Farris wheel and they are all portable. All the rides are on the smaller side as it is for children and not adults. Chairman Sush – When you say they are portable, do you mean like the traveling carnival rides that are on trucks? Joel Kohn – The rides are not on a truck, but can be moved from one side to the other side. Chairman Sush – How would that work with the Boat ride and the Bumper cars? Would the pad for the Bumper cars and the pool for the Boat ride be permanent? Joel Kohn – I'll check on that as I am not sure. Chairman Sush – Would this then be set up for the season and left as is? Or will it move throughout the season? Joel Kohn – It will set up for the season and not moved during the season. Chairman Sush – Why temporary opposed to permanent, other than for costs? Joel Kohn – A ride may very well stay where it is for 5 or 10 years, I'm just saying the nature of it is to be portable. The owner has a company that he provides these facilities to at different sites on a temporary basis and so this is the kind of equipment he has. What we proposed is what he is going to have there and is most likely what is going to stay there. Michael Croissant – I see that they have some of those rides currently set up. Joel Kohn – Those are set up for the DOL inspection.

Kathleen Lara – I believe we previously expressed an issue with the building in the back and think I recall that it wasn't really a great building. I can't remember exactly what the issue was, but I see he is going to continue to use it. Helen Budrock – I think there was concern that it wasn't secure and there would be a lot of kids there. Michael Hoyt – Didn't they originally intend to do bathrooms there? Kathleen Lara – Maybe that's what it was, I wasn't really sure. Joel Kohn – At this time, the building will be used just for storage. Matthew Sush – And use wise, is everything okay with using portable bathrooms? Paula Kay – Yes.

Christina Cellini – Is there any plan for safety staff in case any of the kids get hurt? Joel Kohn – There will be 12 employees on site and each piece of equipment will have an employee to take care of it. I'm not sure of what kind of safety training they will have. Christina Cellini – With a possibility of up to 5 school buses of children, maybe there should be safety staff. Joel Kohn – With these school buses, they usually have EMT's with them, at least one. Christina Cellini – Okay.

Paula Kay – In my eyes this is a much-improved project from what we've seen of it so far. Joel Kohn – Thank you. Helen Budrock – After the next site plan submission, with the additional details requested, are you hoping to be ready for the public hearing and 239 referral? Joel Kohn – My hope was to get the public hearing scheduled tonight. Helen Budrock – Does the Board feel this project is advanced enough

to go ahead and set a public hearing? Joel won't be here for the next meeting so it would have to be the October 26th meeting and that would leave enough time to send legal notices. Paula Kay – I would love to see a public hearing on this. It has been such a long time and we have been going back and forth with this project, so if there are neighbors who have anything to say, they should be ready. Chairman Sush – I think that would be okay as it is pretty much minor things we have asked to be verified and there doesn't seem to be any concern with the equipment. Arthur Knapp – And to satisfy the DOT and get certificates from the DOL. Helen Budrock – Do we need to take the agenda out of order and make this an action item to be able to make the motions? Paula Kay – No, they can do it now.

A motion to request a 239 review was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kathleen Lara.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to schedule the public hearing for October 26, 2022 was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

WEISS REALTY

49 Kroeger Road, Bridgeville, NY
Kristin O'Donell, Project representative

Kristin O'Donell – This is not our first time here, but we haven't been here since January so I will give a recap. This is a 500,000 square foot warehouse building off of Kroeger Road. There was previously an industrial building on this site that was mostly torn down and this warehouse will replace that. There is no user identified at this time so it would just be a generic warehouse, with parking and circulation all the way around and some stormwater ponds. We have provided a full set of site plans and an extended part III EAF document, which I believe we went over the last time we were here. We tried to hit all of the potential impacts and provided a full SWPP, a full traffic study, the discussion on wetlands and habitat assessment, the letter from SHPO and things like that. The site does not have public water and sewer so it does rely on a septic system and a well. The Board declared Lead Agency in December of 2021. Everything was circulated at that time and then we haven't been back since. We are here tonight to provide some studied we have done and see where we need to go from here.

Helen Budrock – I believe we got some correspondence from the DEC that said that the Lead Agency notice was sent out without the EAF attached. Kristin O'Donell – We took care of that the same day and re-send everything to the DEC. They don't like their own rules that require a hard copy be sent and when you send a hard copy, they request you submit it electronically. Helen Budrock – Just for our records, because right now we don't show an intent to serve as Lead Agency was sent out, when did you send out the updated one? Kristin O'Donell – It was that same day, December 27th, and I think I sent you the proof of mailings for everyone. From those mailings, we got questions from the DOH and DEC and those were answered and sent back to both of those agencies via the same email that the questions were sent from. Paula Kay – We are looking at our Google Drive and we don't have it there, so after tonight if you could just re-send it. Kristin O'Donell – Okay. Do have the proof of mailings? Helen Budrock – You can send those to just to be on the safe side. Kristin O'Donell – No problem. I will just send the whole thing again. Helen Budrock – So, the intent to declare Lead Agency notice was sent out, but the Board has not declared themselves Lead Agency and we just wanted to make sure that the DEC got all the appropriate information. Paula Kay – Also, for whatever reason, the intent that we have on

file is blank under “date of mail”. It is possible it is in our old file, but it is not in the Drive. Kristin O’Donnell – Maybe you have the draft copy that was sent over for review before the notices went out. You should have a Word document and a PDF document, with the PDF copy having the proof of mailing and everything else attached. Helen Budrock – Okay, so once you re-send that, we can update the file with everything. There has been no change to the site plan or the design and you basically just submitted an updated long form EAF with attachments, right? Kristin O’Donnell – You mean just 2 weeks ago? Helen Budrock – Yes. Kristin O’Donnell – We submitted an extended part III EAF. Helen Budrock – That is a little bit confusing as well because the way this Board operates is that part I is prepared by the applicant, which includes any expanded studies to go along with it, and then we would fill out part II and part III. Kristin O’Donnell – On the DEC’s website, part III is just a form but the extended form, if you read it, says to attach any additional information, so I attached the studies. It basically goes with the part I EAF and follows all of the checks. The items that have potential to have an environmental impact get checked “yes”. Paula Kay – That’s part II. Kristin O’Donnell – Let me explain to you how I go through SEQR. Helen Budrock – You don’t have to explain how SEQR works to us, we understand. Paula Kay – Here’s the thing, the Board is actually the one who dictates the items they want reviewed, not the applicant. Kristin O’Donnell – We came here and had that discussion in January. Helen Budrock – It’s been almost 10 months and I don’t have that in the notes. Kristin O’Donnell – There was a discussion on the expanded analysis and that’s what went in there. Typically, you have a part I with checks to identify potential impacts. Helen Budrock – Part I does not have the check list, that is part II. Kristin O’Donnell – It’s not a check list, but a check mark that’s says if the site has wetlands, a traffic impact, archaeological sensitivity, etc. From there the Board prepares the part II, for which we have provided additional analysis on any potential impacts that were identified in part I for follow up. We know from the impacts identified in part I that we will need additional analysis on certain things so we went ahead and had those studies done, such as the traffic study, and submitted them. Paula Kay – Normally the Board helps the applicants determine where the impacts are and what studies they need, such as a traffic study. Kristin O’Donnell – Who is the reviewing traffic engineer? Jim Carnell – Usually CHA. Helen Budrock – At the last meeting, again, that was almost 10 months ago so forgive us if we have to refresh our memories a little, the Board authorized having a traffic consultant retain. However, we only just received the escrow payment tonight, so nobody has been retained. Paula Kay – Our traffic consultant and the Board would make the determination of what needs to go in the traffic study. Kristin O’Donnell – Of course and now that you have the escrow, I think you should be able to forward the study onto your traffic consultant. Paula Kay – We will do that, but again, we also need to determine what the impacts are, where the impacts are and what intersections should actually be studied. Kristin O’Donnell – Of course, but at least you have a starting point to look at and make that determination. I’m sure that our traffic engineer didn’t start from scratch so the inter sections they studied should be a good starting point.

Michael Hoyt – What type of building is it going to be? Kristin O’Donnell – I don’t think we have a user identified right now. Michael Hoyt – I mean how high and the dimensions. Kristin O’Donnell - We do not anticipate needing any variances, so we will be sticking to what the zone allows, which I think is 35 feet. Again, there’s no end user, so to move forward we just try to study the worst-case scenario within the confines of the zoning and then, if the end user need to exceed any of the thresholds that were established, they would have to come back themselves to take care of that.

Kristin Boyd – I’m looking at the operations, will it be open 24 hours? Kristin O’Donnell – If that’s what it states in the EAF, then I believe that is what the applicant wanted and what we would have done the

traffic study on. Paula Kay – Right, for a worst-case scenario. Kristin O'Donell – Correct, so we don't have to back track per say.

Chairman Sush – Is the circulation around the building 1-way or 2-way traffic? Kristin O'Donell – I believe it is intended to be 2-way. Chairman Sush – Would somebody coming in hit that triangle shaped stormwater and then, depending on where in the building they are going, go up or down? Kristin O'Donell – Looking at what was provided, it does not seem to me like they would be forced to go straight there, but we certainly could change that if that makes more sense. Chairman Sush – It appears that more pedestrian parking would be on that side of the building, where the main entrance is, and the other side seems more like truck parking. Kristin O'Donell – That is correct and we certainly intend to separate the truck traffic from the employee traffic. Chairman Sush – Entrance wise, on the pedestrian parking side, will it be just like a main entrance block or will there be multiple ways into the building? Kristin O'Donell – There will probably be multiple ways in. Chairman Sush – Will that be dependent on if it gets rented to more than 1 company, or is it intended for only 1 company? Kristin O'Donell – At this time I think it is intended to be only 1 use, but if it does get split up, the building code will dictate points of egress. There will definitely be egress on every side of the building just based on its size. Chairman Sush – Would each of the loading dock on the back have its own bay for the truck to pull into? Kristin O'Donell – I believe there are 70 loading bays in the back and those will each be individual loading docks.

Kathleen Lara – Do we need a motion to consult a traffic consultant? Jim Carnell – I am looking at the minutes right now from their last meeting in December and the Board made a motion to declare Lead Agency and a motion to engage CHE as a traffic consultant. Again, we just received the escrow and we can engage them to do the review. Helen Budrock – My recommendation would be to forward the traffic study already done to Jay, I will do a comment memo on the planning, zoning and short end of things and then Matt can do a comment memo on the SWPP. That way the next time we meet, we can all be on the same page and have an intelligent conversation. Paula Kay – Maybe Jay can come to the next meeting to discuss his findings with the Board and you may want to bring your traffic consultant as well, or maybe they can Zoom in. Kristin O'Donell – That sounds fine. Matt Sickler – I believe their consultant was Carlito. Kristin O'Donell – Yes. Matt Sickler – Okay. So, he is familiar with us. Helen Budrock – Do we need to make the applicant aware of the zoning definition issue, or is that something you want me address in my memo? Paula Kay – I think you should address it in the memo. Kristin O'Donell – Is there anything else we should be mindful of or would need to have prepare before the next meeting, other then the plans themselves? Kathleen Lara – I don't think so. Arthur Knapp – I would like to see everything at one time so I can put it all in perspective. Kathleen Lara – We just had a big warehouse project in front of us, so we definitely realize that we need to see the whole picture because it makes it much easier to review the whole project. It will make it go a lot faster. Chairman Sush – Okay, so we will wait for comments from our engineer and then have our next discussion meeting. Matt Sickler – And I will look at the SWPP and write comments on anything that needs to be addressed in regards to stormwater, septic, fire access and thing like that. Kristin O'Donell – Sounds good and if you need hard copies of the SWPP just let me know. Matt Sickler – I hard copy would be great and would make the review much easier. Kristin O'Donell – No problem and I will get you a plan set too.

VIZNITZ INST. – USE CHANGE

4656 Route 42, Kiamesha Lake, NY
Naftula Neiman, Owner

Naftula Neiman – We just bought this property after it was for sale for a long time. I think our attorney reached out to Paula prior to purchasing it to make sure that it is zoned to run a kitchen out of and it was confirmed that it was in the HC – 1 zone and is a permitted use. The building is pretty much staying the same. It has offices in front and 3 storage sections in the back and we will turn one of those storage spaces into a kitchen. We currently do not have enough kitchen space in the kitchen up by the Shul and boy's school. We actually pulled a permit, that is currently open, to renovate that kitchen and realized there is no way to make it work because it is just too tight and not enough room, so we started looking into buying this building. If the Board allows us to, we will put a kitchen in this building and then we will remove the other kitchen up top and make it just a space to serve the food out of. The actual producing of food will be done in the new building and then transported out. There are already dumpsters in the back of the building, that we can move to the side of the building where there is a gated area, so it really doesn't even need any site plan changes.

Paula Kay – Their attorney did email me asking for the zone and corresponding bulk chart, which was provided. Kathleen Lara – Is it permitted? Jim Carnell – Yes as it's a service establishment. Helen Budrock – Yes, if it's an existing building with only the use being changed, it is permitted.

Kathleen Lara – Is it going to be 3 meals a day? Naftula Neiman – Just breakfast and lunch. Kathleen Lara – Okay, so daytime hours and you will just prepare the food in the one kitchen and then move it up to the other building. Naftula Neiman – Correct and we also have another school, the girl's school, that we have to supply food to, so we will be using this kitchen for both.

Arthur Kapp – Are you also working with DOH? Naftula Neiman – We are going to have to work with them and I did already have a discussion with them.

Paula Kay – will there be any exterior construction changes? Naftula Neiman – No.

Matt Sickler – How many employees do you expect to have? Will they be parking here or will they be bused here? Naftula Neiman – We currently have 5 employees. Helen Budrock – It looks like there is some parking on the side. Naftula Neiman – That's correct. There is some in the front and some on the side. Kathleen Lara – I can't really tell, but I don't see the parking or the dumpster enclosure shown on the site plan, which is something we would want to see. Naftula Neiman – I can add them. Helen Budrock - Maybe you can just note them on the survey.

Paula Kay – Under code 250-50, if the building exists, the site is conforming with the previously approved site plan, there is no exterior changes and the new use is of the same type of intensity, then the Board can just simply determine that no revised site plan is required and they can go forward and get building permits. Kathleen Lara – This seems to fit the bill. Chairman Sush – Is there anything you will need to add because of the kitchen, like a grease trap or anything of that nature? And does that change anything with the code just read? Jim Carnell – We would handle that in the Building Dept. and more than likely, yes, Mike in the water and sewer dept. will require that. Matt Sickler – Yes and we will look at the pump station located behind the building and evaluate what is there.

Chairman Sush – Due to the proximity to the lake, is there any extra environmental related precautions that need to be taken? Jim Carnell – The building was previously the Furbearer building and I think they probably had more chemicals and other types of hazardous materials than Viznitz will have. Kathleen Lara – Plus they also had trucks adding to the impact.

Michael Croissant – Can we ask for the building to be a little more dressed up on the outside? Paula Kay – Sure you can. Naftula Neiman – We are trying to keep our cost as low as possible. That's why I didn't my attorney tonight. Jim Carnell – The building is slightly neglected due to the vacancy of it, but if anything needs to be addressed, like siding or a simple paint job, we can do that with the building permit. Kathleen Lara – Awesome. Chairman Sush – Great. Paula Kay – Where you thinking landscaping? Michael Croissant – Yes. Michael Hoyt – Well, as a whole. The property it's self as well as the building. Naftula Neiman – We took care of some landscaping as soon as we bought it. We trimmed the trees and cut the grass right away. Michael Hoyt – In the front of the building? Naftula Neiman – Yes, some things. Jim Carnell – The building was pretty neglected. Michael Hoyt – I'd like to see the building cleaned up and possibly painted. Naftula Neiman – We will do that. We are taking care of the outside of al the building now. Michael Hoyt – We just want to assure you definitely do it.

Helen Budrock – Do you want to make a motion to move the agenda out of order and act on this tonight? Paula Kay – You can do that. Kathleen Lara – I'm okay with doing that as long as you show the parking and dumpster enclosure on the survey. Naftula Neiman – So, we are not adding anything a dumpster or an enclosure. Kathleen Lara – Are they required to? Jim Carnell – The dumpsters were already there, right? Naftula Neiman – There was an enclosure there with dumpsters in the back, where you can't see it from the road. Jim Carnell – If you are going to relocate it, under the town code, it would require an enclosure. Naftula Neiman – So, what I was thinking is there is a fenced area to the left of the building the we could use for the dumpsters and I was going to ask the garbage removal company if they would be able to access that area. There is also a door on that side of the building to bring the garbage out of. Jim Carnell – Would the truck have to back in off of Route 42 or could they pull in? Naftula Neiman – This is what I want to talk to Waste Management about. Kathleen Lara – I pulled up the property on Google Maps to see the site. Are you talking about putting the garbage in this area back here? Naftula Neiman – I'm talking about the other side of the building, close to Route 42. Kathleen Lara – It looks like they could get in and out, the truck driver would just have to know how in order to not have to back out onto Route 42. Naftula Neiman – That's why I wanted to talk to them before I made any decisions. Kathleen Lara – If it goes there or not, you are going to need an enclosure so people don't see the garbage. Naftula Neiman – Of course and it is enclosed right now. Arthur Knapp – Once you talk to your sanitation guy, you'll make the determination and put it onto the survey. Michael Hoyt – Kathleen, can I see what you're looking at? Kathleen Lara – Sure. Michael Hoyt – Where is he talking about? Kathleen Lara – He is talking about right here where the existing sort of fence is. So, if a truck pulled in and then backed up to the dumpster, they would be able to pull straight out on to Route 42. Michael Hoyt – Why move the dumpster to the front by Route 42 instead of leaving it in the back of the building? Kathleen Lara – I'm not sure that this piece in the back is their property. Michael Hoyt – Well, they can move it a little bit to the side. Naftula Neiman – The dumpster is currently in the back and that is where it was and still is. Michael Hoyt – So, why would you have to talk to your garbage company about accessing the side of the building if it's in the back of the building? Naftula Neiman – I think there's a little confusion. It is in the back right now and we are thinking about moving in to the front, left

side of the building. Helen Budrock – Right here in the picture where you see the fenced area. Michael Hoyt – What’s there right now? Naftula Neiman – Nothing. Jim Carnell – That is where the dumpsters used to be. Naftula Neiman - I didn’t know that. Jim Carnell – The Furbearer had a small dumpster there with roll offs in the middle of the parking lot. Naftula Neiman – There is actually a large door on the side that would be ideal to use to take the garbage out of the building because it is very close to that area and that location shouldn’t be seen from the road at all because that fence is 15 to 20 feet high. It’s just the easiest, nicest place to put it. Michael Hoyt – Isn’t that where the offices are? Naftula Neiman – The offices are only like the first 15 to 20 feet. Michael Hoyt – Have they changed it since United Beverage was there? Jim Carnell – I’m not sure. Arthur Knapp – I think it is all the same.

Michael Croissant – What about signage? Are you going to put some up by the driveway? Naftula Neiman – The only thing we planned to do was take down the For Sale sign.

Jim Carnell – The question right now is whether they are coming back for Planning Board review. If you are making a determination that they don’t have to come back, then you don’t have to continue this discussion. Michael Hoyt – Okay, we can wait until they come back. Helen Budrock – Kathleen did you already make a motion? Kathleen Lara – Well, I would make a motion, but it sounds like some of us would like them to come back. Michael Hoyt – Right because I still want to discuss stuff like if that’s the Town’s pump station right behind the building. Kathleen Lara – It is. Helen Budrock – I think Kathleen’s motion was as long as the existing parking and the dumpster’s location was indicated on the survey that was submitted, they could get approval tonight. Kathleen Lara – Right. Paula Kay – You can make the motion and send it straight over for a building permit, where they would address this stuff. Kathleen Lara – It doesn’t need us. Helen Budrock – What I was getting at is I believe there is a motion on the table if someone wants to second it. Michael Croissant – Not if the dumpster is in front of the building. Naftula Neiman – It wouldn’t be in the front; it would be off to the left of the building. Paula Kay – So, you guys have a motion on the table. Kathleen Lara – I said it but I don’t think anyone wants to second it because they don’t want to garbage in the front, which I respect, I just thought that since we weren’t really getting into detail, we were ready for a motion. Arthur Knapp – Well, we talked about 3 or 4 items. We talked about the façade, we talked about the parking and we talked about the garbage. Paula Kay – So it sounds like what you want is for them to come back with a revised site plan and there won’t be any action tonight. Chairman Sush – Yes. Helen Budrock – Is there consensus on the Board as to where you would prefer the dumpster be located? Arthur Knapp – I think that if we continue to follow the Route 42 Gateway, they should have it up by the road. Naftula Neiman – We’re talking about it being by the entrance on the left side, what if we move it to the right side? But, on the right side everyone would be able to see it. I can push it further back on the left side of the building so it is further away from the entrance. There is a lot of wetland and overgrown grass in the back and it would be hard to get to it back there. Paula Kay – I think the Board is asking you to put it in the back and the best thing to do is come back with the revised site plan showing exactly where you want to put it and maybe that will help them make a determination. The revised site plan should show everything you plan on changing or adding; landscaping, fencing or anything structural you may want to do and maybe try to stay inline with everything else the Board has been doing or approving on Route 42. Naftula Neiman – What has the board been working on in regards to Route 42? Helen Budrock -There is actually some design guidelines for the Route 42 corridor, which I believe is on the website under the Building Dept. Jim Carnell – Yes, there is a link on our website. Helen Budrock – There are both landscaping and design

guidelines. Naftula Neiman – Even if I'm not changing anything. Paula Kay – It sounds like you are.
Naftula Neiman – Okay. Thank you.

ACTION ITEMS:

MICHAEL RIELLY

473 Wolf Lake Road, Rock Hill, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Michael Hoyt was recused.

Kathleen Lara and Paula Kay discussed if Kathleen should be recused due to her job position in the Real Property office and it was concluded that it was not necessary.

Chairman Sush appointed Kristin Boyd as a voting member for this project.

Joel Kohn – I was here at the last meeting to discuss how to handle this lot combination. It was decided that combining all 3 tax lots into one parcel would be the quickest, easiest, best way to handle it. We submitted revised plans last week showing all of the lots combined into one parcel.

Chairman Sush – Anyone have any additional questions on this? Arthur Knapp – Matt, do you have any questions or need to see anything else? Matt Sickler – No, not since they just combined it all into one parcel and made it super easy. Chairman Sush – Very good.

A motion to approve the lot improvement was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kristin Boyd.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

MONTICELLO MOTOR CLUB – GARAGE LOFTS

67 Cantrell Road, Monticello, NY
Hayden Carnell, Project representative

Jim Carnell, Helen Budrock and Matthew Sickler were recused.

Hayden Carnell – Last time we were here was as a discussion item and the only thing brought up was the sewer and whether or not you could approve this with the temporary sewer design. Next week the DEC will be getting the application from Delaware Engineer to apply for the waste water treatment plant, but we are not involved with that. The only thing we are proposing, in regards to the permanent sewer plant, is the holding tanks we show on our site plan. You needed a permanent solution before you could

approve this, so we are going to have a force main that ties into Delaware's plan and sewer. The sewer plant will handle the permanent solution and the holding tanks are just temporary and should only be in use for one season. So, right now it is just temporary tanks. The size of them will be based on the flow. We'll probably go with 55 gallons a day per loft and the 3,000-gallon tank will have to be pumped once a week, or more. Once there's a pump station and a plant, that tank will act as a septic tank. It will still collect solids and the pump station will pump everything to the plant. The plant is expected to be constructed in 2024 and this will take a year to build so it'll be a season at most.

Paula Kay – Who will be operating the plant? Hayden Carnell – Either the town will take over the plant or we have to get an operator. That will be determined by the Town Board. Paula Kay – Has that been addressed with them yet? Hayden Carnell – No and I'm not involved with that process. Matthew Sush – Do we have to wait for the Town Board's decision before we can act? Hayden Carnell – Well, if they don't take it over, we will hire an operator. Either way we will have to have a licensed operator. You can possibly issue a temporary C of O until the plant is in operation or some sort of restriction. They are hoping to have these buildings before 2025 or at least approval so they can start construction. They really only have November through April to do any construction, especially because this is right by the entrance. Their goal is to at least have it sealed off by spring, that way there is no construction going on during the season.

Chairman Sush – Is the visibility of the buildings too high? Will it bring additional traffic? Hayden Carnell – They will not be seen from the road and there will not be any additional traffic. It still needs to be determined if you will require a public hearing on this or not. We did have 3 or 4 public hearings over the past year on other projects here, with no public comment. Paula Kay – We also had other public hearings prior to Hayden. Hayden Carnell – There is also a previously approved building in this location. Paula Kay – However, some of those prior public hearings had a lot of public turn out. Hayden Carnell – Yes, that was early on in the project when they first started building.

Kathleen Lara – I would say my only concern is, and it's not a concern per say, we are very tough on applicants when it comes to water and sewer and at this time, there is only a temporary sewer in place. Hayden Carnell – At the last meeting we discussed water and there is an existing well that the well driller is going to do a part 5 analysis on at the beginning of October. They did know, when they drilled it, that the yield was enough for the building and I think it was 30 gallons a day. Kathleen Lara – It's the sewer I'm concerned about. Hayden Carnell – That we have to wait for DOH to approve. Kathleen Lara – Right and just so you know we have been beating our head against the wall with other applicants when it comes to sewer and water. I'm okay because there's a temporary solution, but what I want to say is, maybe we need to put this on for you to come back in a year or so for an update, that was there is some accountability that it actually gets done. Paula Kay – Also, being the goal is for the Town to take this over, I think while this Board is reviewing, it would be helpful if you go to the Town Board and make a formal application for the sewer. Hayden Carnell – Delaware Engineer is handling the sewer. Paula Kay – Somebody should go to the Town Board because unless that happens, I don't think this Board can proceed. Hayden Carnell – So, we are also next on the agenda tonight for the MMC subdivision project, which is also part of the sewer application and I can discuss that now if you'd like or we can wait to finish discussion with that project. Paula Kay – It needs to be formally brought up before the Town Board and the Town Board needs to start addressing this before this Board can approve these garages. If not, it's going to put this Board in a position of appearing like they are treating this project differently. Michael Croissant – Would that be the case knowing that they will revert to an operator if the town does

not take the pump station over? Hayden Carnell – And even if the town take it over, the tank, the pump and the utilities are still private. Artur Knapp – So are you saying that if the town walks away from it, you will still have a solution? Hayden Carnell – Yes, we can show a different solution, but the plant is a sure thing regardless of the town’s decision. Paula Kay – Maybe it will be helpful if the engineer designing the plant can come in and have a discussion with this Board and the Town Board. Hayden Carnell – Once we submit for the SPEDES permit, we are going to come in with Mike and a joint application for the plant, which we will be in November. I can show a leach field for everything to go to, just in case the plant doesn’t get built, if that helps. Kathleen Lara – I was going to suggest that. Can you just do that? Hayden Carnell – It’s just going to show a location off-site somewhere, that going to pump to the station regardless. Kathleen Lara – I’m just worried about an open-ended permit and then we never get an answer. Michael Hoyt – If you were to show us a leach field, where would that be? Hayden Carnell – It would have to go somewhere off-site. Michael Hoyt – You don’t have room there? Hayden Carnell – No. Kristin Boyd – So, we just need to know if all of the stuff with the Town Board isn’t approved, what the other permanent solution is. Kathleen Lara – Exactly. Hayden Carnell – We will map out a place for a leach field as a secondary option.

Chairman Sush – Is that something we have to wait on before we can determine Lead Agency or a public hearing? Maybe we should schedule a public hearing so we can see where that’s going to go. Hayden Carnell – We were hoping that if you required a public hearing, we could get that scheduled tonight. Kathleen Lara – We could. Paula Kay – It would have to be for the meeting of the 26th in order to have enough time to notice and it also gives Glen Smith a chance to review everything. Matt Sush – Should we make the motion contingent on Glenn’s review. Paula Kay – No, he should have enough time.

A motion to declare Lead Agency was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Michael Croissant.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to schedule a public hearing on October 26, 2022 was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

MONTICELLO MOTOR CLUB - SUBDIVISION

67 Cantrell Road, Monticello, NY

Hayden Carnell, Project representative

Jim Carnell, Helen Budrock and Matthew Sickler were recused.

Hayden Carnell – We are back tonight for final approval. Part of this project was to create enough lots to form a sewer district if the town was willing to take over. The other part was to get residential, which we have to go back to the Town Board for a locale law and public hearing on the zone change. We are at this Board just for the subdivision. My only question is, if you want to see this track on the survey? It was staked out just because it was a use on the site. I don’t know it really goes on the survey map, but it’s up to you. I would leave the cell tower, but the track isn’t a structure so I figured you would have the best input on that. It was used as a race course and we took the boundary on it.

Chairman Sush – My only issue is that that little tip there, goes into lot 4. I really don’t know how they would keep that separate to use the track. Does there need to be any kind of separation between the

edge of the track and the property line? Hayden Carnell – The track is no longer used because there is a new one on the runway. It's just a field now. That's why I thought we should take it off, but I didn't want to do so without consulting you. It was on there originally because it was part of the site when we did the survey. I'm not saying they won't ever use it again, but it hasn't been used in some time now. Kathleen Lara – I would imagine they would relocate it anyway because now they are going to have residential lots there.

Chairman Sush – Should we condition the motion on Glenn Smith's review? Paula Kay – Yes, because he is not here tonight. Hayden Carnell - I agree with that and this is on the first Town Board meeting in October for SEQR, so Glenn should have enough time if there's any comments from that meeting.

A motion for final site plan approval, subject to Glenn Smith's review and comment, was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Kathleen Lara.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

PRIOR APPROVALS/ENFORCEMENT:

Kathleen Lara requested that Hampton Lake's come back to the Board. As Glenn Smith was not at tonight's meeting, Paula Kay will email him and advise of the Board's request.

Paula Kay let the Board know that she will not be at the next meeting and will check to see if Michael Mednick can cover for her.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers, Secretary

Town of Thompson Planning Board