

APPROVED

TOWN OF THOMPSON
PLANNING BOARD
January 11, 2023

IN ATTENDANCE: Kathleen Lara, Chairman
Michael Croissant
Kristin Boyd
Arthur Knapp
Michael Hoyt
Jim Carnell, Building, Planning, Zoning
Matthew Sickler, Consulting Engineer

Christina Cellini, Alternate
Paula Elaine Kay, Attorney
Laura Eppers, Secretary

Chairman Lara brought the meeting to order at 7:00 pm with a pledge to the flag.

No minutes to be approved this meeting.

Public Hearing:

FAMILY FUN PARK

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

Chairman Lara read the legal notice out loud.

Joseph Churgin – This project is a recreational use located in a residential zone and we are here seeking site plan approval and special use permit. We are looking to take the existing lot that is housing the Family Fun Park and join it with an adjacent lot that is roughly the same size. On this new property we are looking to primarily install a bike path for 30 bikes. These will be bicycles, not motorized bikes or mopeds, and the blue you see on the map is the path. To aide with the bike path and maintenance of bikes, we propose 3 sheds that will be spread out around the path. We are also looking to install a carousel and a merry-go-round/swing combo on the existing property. The entrance and the parking will stay the same. Despite almost doubling in size and adding a few more features, we are not looking to increase the occupancy that currently exists. The site plan shows that is about 200 guests and that won't change. I know there was concern about increased traffic, but we are not bringing anymore people in at any point in time. I understand there is a lot of concern from the people in the condominiums located over here, but all of the work being done is primarily over on this side. There will not be much impact on the condominiums at all. There will be a merry-go-round and a carousel, but there are hundreds of feet of sloped property in-between, so I don't believe it will really impact their quality of life.

The meeting was opened up to the public. Chairman Lara explained that we will rotate between the people who signed up prior to the meeting to speak and the people on Zoom and then anyone else who wishes to speak.

Bonnie Siegel, president of Hidden Ridge HOA, residing at 6 Hidden Ridge Terrace – Opposed the Family Fun Farm when it was first proposed back in 2013 and still is. Read all questions and concerns about zoning, hours of operation, capacity, traffic, noise, animals, and property line boundaries from correspondence that was submitted after as part of the public record. Said correspondence with all questions and concerns can be accessed on the Google Drive or by using the below link:

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1nxvy4h3hkaBE9WCfuQYyJACT1MPE04f2&authuser=planning%40townofthompson.com&usp=drive_fs

Jay Wiprovnick residing at 48 Hidden Ridge Drive – New member to the Hidden Ridge community and Board. Concerned about permits for firearms and if there is a firing range on the property. Has heard rapid shooting emanating from the direction of the Family Fun Farm on multiple occasions during the summer.

Brian Kudler residing at 78 Hidden Ridge Drive – Member of the Hidden Ridge community that opposes the project. Concerned that proper mailings were not done as he did not receive a legal notice. Jim Carnell explained that only property owners within 300 feet from the Family Fun Park property line would have received notice. Mr. Kudler also had many of the same questions and concerns that Bonnie Siegel expressed. Including, zoning, noise, property line boundaries, animals and capacity. Additionally, he commented on the decrease in property appeal, leading to the decrease in property value. Written correspondence with his questions and concerns was submitted for the public record and can be accessed on the Google Drive or by using the below link:

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1ndOMRFRmI8iasrVE-C2f9D3r5EIJzWmw&authuser=planning%40townofthompson.com&usp=drive_fs

Also had a question for the Board – Can this Board limit the hours of operation for the park? Chairman Lara explained it is part of the site plan approval and being there are concerns, the Board will take that into consideration.

Charlie Redler residing at 84 Hidden Ridge Drive – Recently purchased home and is a member of the Hidden Ridge community that opposes the project. Expressed his concern about lights and noise from the attractions, hours of operation, zoning, and quality of life for his community.

Christina Herschel-Huebner residing at 37 Friedman Road. Neighbor who is opposed to the project. Questioned the intended use of the driveway currently being excavated on SBL 5.-1-16.13, that encroaches on her property, as it was not shown on any site plan, but the SBL is included on most documents pertaining to the project. Commented on many of the same issues others have already voiced as well as the environmental safety issues. Such as heavy machinery leaking diesel fluid, which involved the DEC once already, and the sludge filled pond as a result of improper excavating and drainage. Provided written comment with her questions and concerns for the record that can be accessed on the Google Drive or by using the below link:

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1nfaCS-1WtVvD8UIveDPAP9icBgOSQedQ&authuser=planning%40townofthompson.com&usp=drive_fs

Chet Smith residing on Rock Hill Drive, Rock Hill NY. Expressed his distain with the way the Board has handled this project from the beginning, especially because the area is not zoned for it. Asked the below questions:

- How many times a day does the 200 guests turn over?
- Are the rides regulated? If so, by who?
- How is the safety of the patrons being monitored?

Leonard Kirschenbaum residing at 151 Hidden Ridge Drive. Member of the Hidden Ridge community who is opposed to the project. Most of his concerns have been expressed already, such as noise and traffic, but is also concerned about proximity of the project. As he is one of the residents that received the legal notice and is therefore within that 300-foot radius of the project, he wanted to know:

- What is the exact distance between his unit and the project?

Lorenzo Motzolla (spelling of last name may be incorrect) residing at 97 Hidden Ridge Drive. Opposed to the Family Fun Park. Had most of the same concerns about lights/noise, traffic, zoning, animal maintenance and hours of operation. Also made mention that there are no traffic signs on the road to help with traffic and safety.

Nan Kristt residing at 146 Hidden Ridge Drive. A member of the Hidden Ridge community who has visited the Family Fun Park with her grandchildren. Had concerns about insufficient staffing, to monitor games and patrons, and the animals not being secured properly.

Cindy Karras residing at 197 Hidden Ridge Drive. Member of the Hidden Ridge community. Commended the Board for doing their diligence in having past noncompliance's rectified and is holding them to this going forward. Recommended that no further modifications be granted under a 2013 special use permit. Expressed issues and concerns with noise/lights, animals, environment, traffic, zoning, and use. Had the following questions:

- Was the Family Fun Park always in the RR-1 zoning district?
- When was the special use permit originally issued and at that time what was the parcel?
- What was approved/allowed when the special use permit was first issued?
- When was the second parcel purchased and added to the original parcel, under the same special use permit?
- How many times has the project been amended?
- Being the owner also owns other adjoining parcels, does he intend on expanding the park to these parcels as well?
- Was the waterslide ever approved?
- Is the Go-Kart track built in the approved spot?
- Being the wetlands were previously infringed upon and had to be mitigated, what assures they stay total compliant in the future so this doesn't happen again?
- Has new SEQR been required with the expansion?
- Are the current roads substantial for the bus traffic and additional vehicles?

- How many staff are currently employed and how many are anticipated after the expansion?
- How many people are using the property daily?
- How maximum bikes that can be used on any given day?
- What material will the bike trail be?
- How close will the trail be to the protected wetlands?
- What kind of bike will be used and if they are motorized, how are they environmentally friendly?
- How is the merry-go-around powered, hand gas or electric?
- What are the specifications of the merry-go-round and swings, size and capacity?
- Are there any plans to increase the bathroom facilities or leech field to accommodate the expansion?
- Has a sewer overflow ever been encountered?
- Is the park required to maintain SPEDES records?
- When was the last perc test performed by a licensed engineer and will a new one be required?
- How far is the leech field from the Federally protected wetlands?
- How many animals currently reside at the park and how many do you intend to have after the expansion?
- Is Family Fun Park aware if there are currently any animals that are pregnant?
- Is it true that the number of animals permitted have been exceeded? If so, how many times has that happened?
- A 2 year domestic animal health permit (DAHP) is required by NY Agriculture Markets, does the park have one? When was one last issued?
- Is Family Fun Park bonded for the animals and registered with USDA? When were these records last reviewed?
- Does Family Fun Park keep record of purchased, sold or otherwise handled animals?
- Who cares for the animals at the park?
- Do the animals live on the property all year round? If not, where do they go during the off season?
- Since 2013 has any of the animals had any illness or disease?
- Has there ever been any complaints, from either neighbors or patrons, about the animals? If so, how was it resolved?

Benjamin Lorick residing at 203 Hidden Ridge Drive. Member of the Hidden Ridge community and is opposed to this expansion. Stated that Family Fun Park has not been a good neighbor from the start and they should hear their neighbors out if they want to be a good neighbor. Paula Kay agreed and said it is something they should do sooner than later. Sent in correspondence prior to the meeting explaining this and articulating his concerns and requests. Said correspondence can be accessed on the Google drive or by clicking the below link:

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1mGL02LATFQxGqIzKVOXb_e4t252LCc6f&authuser=planning%40to_wnofthompson.com&usp=drive_fs

Robbie and Stanley Schecter residing at 54 Hidden Ridge Drive. Members of the Hidden Ridge community that recommend a complete denial of the application. Voiced their concern about the distance required between their community and the Family Fun Park, noise, pollution, reckless management, failure to keep the peace and hours of operation. Had the below questions:

- Is there a code or regulation for distance between residential and commercial properties?
- Where these regulations overlooked in regards to this project?

Christopher Matthews residing at 53 Hidden Ridge Terrace. Member of the Hidden Ridge community who agrees with pretty much of everything that others had said. Main concern is the gunshots heard from the area of the park and fact that the idea of a Carousel is even being entertained.

Katarzyna Puk residing at 159 Hidden Ridge Drive. Member of Hidden Ridge community along with her husband, children, and moth-in-law. Expressed her concern about the safety of the children in the community and the trespassing that is occurring. Provided written correspondence with other questions and concerns prior to the meeting. Said correspondence can be accessed on the Google drive or by clicking the below link:

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1mLgaH_yQrF3-aGk4v1f1v4NwNdiX4rD4&authuser=planning%40townofthompson.com&usp=drive_fs

No further public comments or questions.

Michael Croissant – Jim, the driveway that was questioned by the public and that you took pictures of, was that permitted? Jim Carnell – The property owner did obtain a driveway permit from the DOH, but that was just to cut the driveway in. There have been no other permits issued for that property. Michael Croissant – Can he make the driveway as long as he wants? Jim Carnell – The driveway permit is to put a covert in the Town’s easement. Michael Croissant – Do you know what the dimensions of that is supposed to be? Jim Carnell – No. Joseph Churgin – From what I have been told, it is 30 feet deep and that is as far as it is going. Kristin Boyd – What parcel is that on? Chairman Lara – It is this one here; right next to Huebner’s property. Michael Croissant – So, you are saying 30 feet? Joseph Churgin – Yes. Michael Croissant – Is the tape measure broken? Joseph Churgin – 30 feet is what I was told. Paula Kay – I think you need to look into that. Michael Croissant – I agree because it looks like over 100 feet. Chairman Lara – There are picture on the Drive that were uploaded by the Building Dept. that appear to show that it is longer than you were told, so please have your client address that. Joseph Churgin – Okay.

Christina Cellini – Do you know what the bike path will be made of? Joseph Churgin – I think it is going to be dirt, but I will get the answer for that, as it was also a question from the public. Christina Cellini – I would like to also know how wide it is proposed to be. Joseph Churgin – Sure.

Kristine Boyd – I would like to know how the applicant currently tracks the amount of people in and out. Is there a ticket taker or a system in place to insure there is no more then 200 people at a time?

Michael Hoyt – What are the hours of operation again and what months are they open? There are pictures on their website that do not correlate to what I recall. Joseph Churgin – I know there was an effort made to see if there would be a demand for a use for something called Motzei Shabbos, but there was no demand and therefore no intention of doing that. The primary use of the property is for the summer months, when the sun goes down later, and the intended use is when there is daylight. Paula Kay – I think it would be a good idea when you come back to have an updated business plan because it's

more than just hours of operation. There were 2 comments that concerned me and that was the comment in regards to buses parking on the shoulder, when the Board made it very clear there needed to be adequate bus parking, and the other comment was in regards to a person walking in and buying a ticket, as I thought the original plan was for groups to be brought in by bus and no individual walk-ins. Some things may have changed, but the Board needs to know what the plan is. Joseph Churgin – Looking at the plan, there appears to be plenty of bus parking. Paula Kay – If buses are still parking on the shoulder, then something isn't working right and your client needs to take a look at that. If the project has evolved from what was originally approved, the Board needs to know what those changes are. Chairman Lara – Right.

Michael Hoyt – Was the Lazer Tag on the original plan? Paula Kay – No. I have the original resolution pulled up and it was: the animals and an existing barn, playground elements including a jumping pillow, a pedal car track, some additional playground equipment for children, a merry-go-round, and a sand box. Michael Hoyt – All of that should also address in the business plan.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

Paula Kay explained how the 2-week written comment period works once the public hearing is closed. If the Board votes to close the public hearing tonight, the public could still submit any written comment they may have to the Building Dept. up to to 4:30 on January 25, 2023. Any written comments will be forwarded onto the Planning Board.

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

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

GLEN WILD RE HOLDING

47 Katrina Falls Road, Rock Hill, NY
Tim Gottlieb, Project representative

Tim Gottlieb – We are here tonight to resolve some issues with the Building Dept., that I believe the applicant is currently in court for. Jim Carnell – There was a building constructed at the Thompson Sanitation facility without a building permit. Tim Gottlieb – We were here back in 2019 to have a discussion, but nothing ever came to fruition so we are here again tonight.

Chairman Lara – How long has the building been constructed? Tim Gottlieb – I'm not sure which building. Jim Carnell – I think the dome building. Tim Gottlieb – That I am not sure about. Chairman Lara – Is this something the Building Dept. just found out about or is this something that has been ongoing and we are just trying to get it to move along? Jim Carnell – I don't remember exactly when we violated

them for building without a permit. Paula Kay – It has been a while and we are glad to see them back in front of tis Board. It is appreciated.

Matt Sickler – Are we referring to the “clear span tent” on your site plan? Tim Gottlieb – Yes. Chairman Lara – Matt, do you have any concerns? Matt Sickler – Just that I noticed there is a septic tank adjacent to it that appears to be kind of close. Tim Gottlieb – It is just outside of the concrete pad. Matt Sickler – Is there an absorption area? Tim Gottlieb – I don’t know for sure, but would assume there is. We will see if we can find it. Matt Sickler – Okay because we want to make sure what they are doing there is not on top of it. Tim Gottlieb – Right. Matt Sickler – It also looks like there were some comments from the 239 review when you were here a few years ago. They were comments from DOT about potentially limited access from Katrina Falls Road frontage. I don’t know if that was given any thought. Tim Gottlieb – That I was not aware of. Matt Sickler – The comments are from August of 2019. Jim Carnell – Did you get those comments? Tim Gottlieb -I don’t think so. Chairman Lara – Would it be appropriate to ask them to update them? Paula Kay – Yes. Jim Carnell – They are the same conditions, so I don’t know that they necessarily need to be updated. Chairman Lara – You’re right. Jim Carnell – Also, I don’t think Tim has had a chance to look at the original comments yet. Matt Sickler – The comments are on the Google Dive in the “239 review” folder for this project. Tim Gottlieb – Okay.

Chairman Lara – Since you are here in front of us, I would like to request some landscaping to make it look nicer. It is basically on the main drag of Rock Hill. Paula Kay – Did you have a specific place in mind? Chairman Lara – I know it’s tough because it is right there on the road, but anything they can do to spruce it up would be great. Jim Carnell – Maybe you want the applicant to come back with a landscaping plan showing what is existing and what would be proposed. Also showing all other utilities on the property including what Matt requested? Chairman Lara – Right. Jim Carnell – And I think there are some powerlines that run along there. Michael Hoyt – I think right down the front. Tim Gottlieb – Yes and then they run up the right side of the building.

Chairman Lara – Sounds like you have some work to do and we will see you back here soon.

218 HILLTOP

218 Hilltop Road, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This project was originally applied for back in 2018 or 2019 and came to a stop during Covid. They would like to now proceed. To refresh the Board’s memory this is an existing summer camp, that got their approvals back in 2015, and they are proposing to expand the camp by adding 30 units, for staff, another dormitory building, another shul building, and new water/sewer systems. This project already had a public hearing and we responded to all comments in writing back in 2020. There were 2 new wells drilled that where pump tested and monitored. Sewer plans were submitted to the DEC and those comments date back to 2020, which our engineer is currently working on addressing. We will resubmit that to the DEC within the next couple of weeks. A traffic study was completed and submitted to the Town’s traffic consultant. There were some comments from that, that our traffic engineer responded to. SWPP was submitted back in 2020 that resulted in some comments that we have

responded to and got approved by MH&E on December 28, 2022. That is basically where we are up to with this project and would like to get back on track.

Arthur Knapp – What is the estimated capacity of the new shul? Joel Kohn – If I remember correctly, I think it is about 150.

Michael Croissant – I recall the Board asking for wetland delineations back when this project first started. Joel Kohn – Yes and those were all done. Michael Croissant – Were they redone? Joel Kohn – The DEC basically kept their original verification. Michael Croissant – I remember MH&E had a question in regards to the delineations. Joel Kohn – Right. This is the wetlands map that was verified by the DEC. MH&E did call out the DEC and wanted them to take more wetlands, but the DEC stuck to their verified map. Michael Croissant – Matt, is that something you can look into? Matt Sickler – I can do that. As Joel said, we did get their revised SWPP back in response to our previous comments for our review and I do see we had some questions regarding the wetlands, so I will go back through those and compare them to what we have now. Jim Carnell – I don't necessarily know there was that much of a concern with the delineation of the wetlands, it was the actual flagging of them because it was done like 8 years prior. Michael Croissant – I remember that as well, but I also remember Richard McGoey saying he thought the setbacks wouldn't work with the current site plan. That's why he wanted it re-flagged. Matt Sickler – I see one of his previous comments expressed concern about the hydraulic connection between the federal wetlands and the state wetlands. I'll have to go back and see what happened in the discussion had with the DEC. Joel Kohn – There are both DEC and federal wetlands on the property. Richard wanted to make a point that they are hydraulically connected and therefore more of it should be considered DEC wetlands causing a 100-foot buffer to be necessary. He called out DEC to try and get them to say this portion should also be DEC wetlands. DEC came out, verified the wetland, and rehung flags where the original ones were, but they said that they would stick to their verified map and will not take this as additional wetlands. I can forward the email if you need. Matt Sickler – That would be helpful. Michael Croissant – Personally, I would like to see something more updated from the DEC. We have had some major weather events over the last 2 years and wetlands change. Joel Kohn – DEC has a certified map that expires in 2024 and waiting until that one expires means stalling the project for another year. Michael Croissant – It's not about stalling it, but about what is right and wrong. Joel Kohn – We could have them go out and verify them yet again, but that would probably take until spring. Michael Croissant – I would like to see that. This project sits in a hole and we have had major water events there over the last couple of years, more than we have ever had, and wetlands change. They could be bigger or they could be smaller. Chairman Lara – This has grown into a beautiful project, but it is doubling in size, if not more, so I get where Michael is coming from. I also know that DEC won't move fast, so is there something you can do to lessen our concerns about the wetlands? Joel Kohn – DEC has a 100-foot buffer and we are not encroaching in that buffer. There was a recent comment from DEC that we need a wetland disturbance permit for the road, outside of the buffer, which was accommodated. Chairman Lara – Do federal wetlands have different rules? Different rules, but they will still need a wetland disturbance permit for the road crossing and a temporary disturbance permit for water and sewer lines. Michael Croissant – I think we should first see what Matt finds out. Matt Sickler – I will look at the notes and everything Joel sends me and let you know by the next meeting.

Chairman Lara - A friend of mine lives on the corner of Hilltop and Maplewood, and last year someone driving to the camp ran off the road, into her yard, and took out her swing set because that road comes up so fast. She also sent me videos of buses that are driving around lost. I think we need some traffic signs on Hilltop Road to help with these issues and the applicant should look into putting some walking trails on their property. That road is scary and I have experienced for myself, kids on the side of the road that were not visible until it was almost too late. Michael Croissant – I have also encountered this and it has been a concern of mine since this project first hit the table. It is one of the worst spots for sight distance. Chairman Lara – I know that a public hearing was already done, but it has been 2 years and that is a long time. Please have your client work on putting up some signage and possibly better communication as to where the property is located, as this is clearly a major problem. Joel Kohn – I totally get it. Who do we work with to get some signage as this is a Town road? Jim Carnell – I think that would be superintendent Rich Benjamin. There are standards when it comes to the unloading of buses and the distance the sign should be from there. Joel Kohn – That’s not a concern because they do not load or unload on the road. Michael Croissant – There were actually a couple buses that went off the road trying to pull in and they almost ended up on their side. Chairman Lara – Signs to just help people slow down, not just people for the camp obviously. Jim Carnell – Maybe a sign that states “bus entrance ahead” since it is on a blind hill. Matt Sickler – Or a “trucks entering the road” sign. Joel Kohn – Okay.

Paula Kay – I think it would be helpful for everyone if we could get the minutes and/or responses from the public hearing on the Google Drive, so we can all be up to speed on that. Michael Croissant – Is it possible to do another public hearing on this project? Paula Kay – You would have to determine if conditions around the project changed, if there are other projects in the area that weren’t there when the first public hearing was held or other changes to the community. I think it is important to see what the original public comments were and then when Matt has further information you will have a better idea of where this project is so you can make a determination.

Michael Hoyt – Jim, do you have anything open with this project? Jim Carnell – No, I think we are good with everything out there. We haven’t had any issues.

Chairman Lara – Since there is no further comments from the board, we will see you next meeting.

MOONLIGHT COTTAGES

58 Rubin Road, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This is just an amendment to a previously approved site plan. The project was approved a little less than a year ago and now they are looking to put an addition on unit 64. The shaded building areas are the previously approved additions.

Paula Kay – Is there any separation issue? Joel Kohn – No.

Chairman Lara – I reviewed this with Jim and he said that this is not due to a violation, they are coming in to do everything the right way from the beginning, and I appreciate that. Jim Carnell – To remind the

Board, when this was approved, one of the conditions was to take down the old caretakers' unit and that was done prior to last summer.

Paula Kay – This would just be a minor modification and you can put it on the agenda next meeting as an action item if you want to. Chairman Lara – Sounds good.

MINSKY GLAMPING SITES

Starlight Road, Monticello, NY
Glenn Smith, Project engineer

Paula Kay was recused.

Glenn Smith – This project is for Jeff Minsky and as you know, he has a property out on Swinging Bridge with a 28-lot subdivision project that has been in front of this Board for the last year. We are very close to approval on that and just need to do 3 test wells for the DOH. That is the project on the top part of this drawing. Mr. Minsky bought 2 parcels, one has 10.5 acres and the other has 7.3 acres, that total about 18 acres on the south side. He kind of jump ahead of himself and purchased some glamping containers and moved them on that property a couple months ago. He apparently started to build some piers to set them on, in the wrong place, without any permits, which resulted in a stop work order and 2 violations from the Building Dept. That's when I was called. I submitted a building application last week, to be denied, and I heard he paid some kind of fine today to resolve some of this. Jim Carnell – It was a building without permit fee and we did receive the check today. Glenn Smith – Okay. The 2 new parcels are in the RR-2 zone, which permits campground use on 10 acres or more. On the 10.5 acre parcel we show 4 of those glamping containers. The reason for only 4 of them is if you have 5 or more, you need DOH approval. Staying at 4 only requires Planning Board action. I submitted pictures of sample containers, which are glassed enclosed, steel front units. What we are proposing at this time is to put those 4 units about 400 feet back from Swinging Bridge Road with a well and septic system; these are basically equivalent to a 4-bedroom home. We wanted to make the Board aware of this and if everything is okay, we will proceed with plans and whatever we must do for site plan approval.

Chairman Lara – Will people be coming off Swinging Bridge Road? Glenn Smith – Yes, Swinging Bridge Estates Road onto the trail there. We will improve that trail down to the campsite. He wants minimal clearing and to keep as many trees as possible. He refers to this as his luxury glamping site.

Christina Cellini – Will they have their own cooking that is done in unit. Glenn Smith – Yes. Basically, each unit will have a small kitchen, small bathroom, a bed, and a little sitting area. In the pictures I submitted, one of the units in there is a sauna hot tub. I didn't show it on this plan, but I think that is something Mr. Minsky is going to want in the future. It will be an enclosed unit that you will access through a sliding glass door and is heated inside.

Kristin Boyd – What distinguishes these units from tiny homes? Glenn Smith – I don't know what the specs are for tiny homes. I guess these could be considered tiny homes, but they will be used for camping/glamping. Kristin Boyd – What makes this camping/glamping? To me these just look like tiny

homes. Glenn Smith – There will be camp fires and it will be conforming to the Town’s code for campgrounds. Kristin Boyd – Well, I have a camp fire at my house. Glenn Smith – In a regular camp ground you would go to a central location for bathrooms and showers, here they will just be a small bathroom in each unit. Kristi Boyd – I walked past these units and to me, it seems like they will be 4 really tiny homes, they don’t look like camping. Glenn Smith – I guess because they will be back in the woods with trails and campfires, they are considered glamping units. These are similar to other “glamping” projects that have been done in other towns around the county. We are doing a couple in Liberty right now. Chairman Lara – Are these like cabin square footage Jim? Jim Carnell – We had a similar project to this where the applicant used geodesic dome style structures that were made of vinyl. Although they did make it through this Board, it became very challenging for them to comply with the building code and are still meeting challenges. I had a discussion with Eric in my department today and since this is technically not a campground, it will not be regulated by a campground use under the building code, they will be considered tiny homes or an individual dwelling unit. They will have to meet building code, right down to the threshold of blower door tests. Glenn Smith – Energy code and everything? Jim Carnell – Yes. There may be some consideration when it comes to frost protection due to the size of these. Fortunately for use the code changes every couple of years and they add all these wonderful things that we get to learn, but at this time we don’t have much more information about tiny homes. Michael Croissant – Do you get actual blueprint with these shipping containers homes? Jim Carnell – We haven’t seen these yet. Glenn Smith – We haven’t submitted anything yet, but I’m sure these units came with some sort of blueprint or model number. We will track that information down.

Michael Croissant – Are the units still onsite? Glenn Smith – Yes and they have been covered with a blue tarp. Michael Croissant – Aren’t they supposed to be removed? Jim Carnell – We did not require that. We issued the stop work order and violations and since the proper paperwork/application was made pretty diligently, we did not move forward with any court action. Michael Hoyt – Are the pictures you submit of what is there onsite? Glenn Smith – Yes. Michael Hoyt- Has he done anything permanent yet? Glenn Smith – No. Jim Carnell – The units themselves were prefabricated at another facility.

Kristin Boyd – Will there be any usage of facilities from the adjacent property? Glenn Smith – No. Matt Sickler – Is he looking to combine the 2 new parcels? Glenn Smith – Not at this time because the 10.5-acre parcel is big enough for what he wants to do. Christina Cellini – Will there be activities there for people to do, or just the sauna? Glenn Smith – They will have access to the lake for row boats. Michael Croissant – How is he going to obtain those lake rights or is he going to utilize his lake rights from the campground? If that is the case, then he is mingling the 2 projects. Glenn Smith – I am not sure about that, but I will find out.

Chairman Lara – As much as we appreciate Mr. Minsky’s ambition to move forward, the campground was something we obviously had a lot of concerns about and this is sort of falls in with that because his past actions are going to speak for him. I am definitely going to want to conduct a public hearing, so you guys are going to have to come up with all the things Jim and the Board touched on and anything the Town engineer may have to add. Matt Sickler – I have a few things. Glenn Smith – That’s why we are here for discussion. We want to find out what these items are. Chairman Lara – I will say this is something that is becoming increasingly popular and we are seeing an uptake in room tax. Places that were traditionally camper parks are building cabins for more of the glamping experience.

DEB EL FOODS

64 Kutger Road, Monticello, NY

David Higgins, Project engineer

Stosh Zamosky, Project architect

Elliot Gibber, Project owner

David Higgins – We were here back in 2017/2018 and got approvals for a number of improvements for the egg processing facility. Many of those improvements have been completed but some of them have not. The plan I submitted has a summary table that shows the existing structures, the ones that were approved in 2017 and built, and the ones approved in 2018, of which some have been built and some still shown as proposed. There are some buildings I did not show, which were previously approved, like the nutraceutical building. Elliot is not moving forward with that. He was looking to use the egg shells to make some sort of calcium based nutritional pill, but that is not longer part of the plan. What he is looking to do now is a freezer/cooler addition that will be towards the front of the property. It will be a couple hundred feet off the front property line and a total of 77,956 square feet. It will contain blast freezers, freezer space, a small amount of dry storage, a small office area, bathroom, and breakroom. They are figuring there will be 24 employees in the building, so we show a parking area on the south side of the building with 25 parking spaces, including 2 ADA accessible spaces. On the west side of the building is a loading dock with 19 loading bays. On the east side of the building is a new access drive out to Ranch Road for emergency access only. I don't think the plan shows a gate for that drive, but there will be one and it will be accessible to emergency vehicles. We show 2 trash compactors next to the loading dock. The water supply for this is an individual drilled well. It will be very small water use at roughly 300 gallons per day. We are proposing an underground, subsurface sewer disposal system. We still need to fully design that and do a soil test, but that is part of the plan. Sheet 2 and 3 shows, in some details, a pulmonary agreement plan. Stosh has brought some architectural drawings if you would like to see what the building will look like.

Michael Hoyt – What kind of time line are you looking at with the construction of the building? Stosh Zamosky – We were hoping to start immediately, but we have to get through this process to get the building permit. Michael Hoyt – Once you can start, how long do you think it will take? Stosh Zamosky – It will take at least 8 months to get the pre-cast panels we are using, so probably a year. Michael Hoyt – Okay.

Paula Kay – Before we get into more detail with the new plan, we should discuss the existing, ongoing issue with the Rock Hill property also owned by this applicant. Chairman Lara – David, you are aware of the issue, right? David Higgins – Yes and I should have mentioned that. Basically, one of the benefits of the freezer/cooler storage that they are proposing for this site, will eliminate the freezer storage they are using on the Rock Hill site. I understand the tractor trailers going to the Rock Hill facility can not get in and out of there fast enough and there is not enough space there, so they end up temporarily parking/standing on Rock Hill Drive. Paula Kay – Correct. They are on both sides of the road and left running and have been for years. David Higgins – The purpose of this application is to have freezer storage on Ranch Road and eliminate all of the freezer storage on Rock Hill Drive. Chairman Lara – Would he just use the Rock Hill facility for something else? David Higgins – I think he is just going to

maintain dry storage there. Paula Kay – My concern is you are looking at a new project, where the applicant is saying it will fix an existing problem, while the existing problem continues on a daily basis. Is there anything the applicant can do in the meantime, while the new application is in front of this Board, to address the situation on Rock Hill Drive? David Higgins – I don't know of anything, but many Stosh or Elliot does. It is my understanding this application is to resolve that problem and would think that if there was anything Elliot readily could do, he would do. Paula Kay – What has been done to try and address it? David Higgins – I know he has done some improvements to that site over the past couple years. He increased the 2 concrete pads at the Ranch Road site for extra trailer space. Beyond that, I don't know what he could do. Chairman Lara – I think the Board would want to know because right now it is an enforcement issue and residents on that road have trouble getting into their driveways because they are being blocked. We understand what the problem is, but maybe there is a way to minimize or elevate it. The promise of it not being there in the future is nice, but as Paula said, we would like to see something happen now. Michael Croissant – There have been truckers that ripped the parking signs out of the ground and threw them in the back of their trucks and have been abusive to the neighbors. It hasn't been a good situation. Michael Hoyt – They are also offloading outdated material on the side of the road and it has just been a mess over there. Elliot Gibber – I will explain what I have done to mitigate these issues. Since I was told about the garbage, we send someone out twice a day to make sure there is no garbage on our side of the road at all. Every time I go up to that site, I push the truckers to move the trucks; they have to pull in or go to the rest stop. The problem is they are all outside, over-the-road drives that I do not have any control of. We are doing our darndest to tell and instruct these drivers to move, but we can not do anything more than that. We have even told some of them that they can't get loaded unless they are out of there or temporarily move away. One of the reasons we are having this problem is we are moving more product then ever and need the relief the new freezer storage will provide. Paula Kay – Where do you tell them to move to? Elliot Gibber – That's really not my concern. They are all given phone number to check in with and that process only takes about 2 minutes. Where they go from there is on them. Some of them park at Walmart. Michael Hoyt – Are you going to make an area to for them to park on Ranch Road because you are going to end up with the same issue over there? Elliot Gibber - The building on Ranch Road will have 19 bays, opposed to the 6 bays that Rock Hill Drive has, and there will be additional parking at Ranch Road. There will be trailer parking available if we have to move them to the back of the building. Michael Hoyt – Is that shown on this site plan? Dave Higgins – It shows 19 bays on the east side and parking on the south side. There is currently trucks parking along the side of the entrance drive at the Ranch Road facility and it is definitely a bigger facility so there is more room there to keep truck off of the main road. Michael Hoyt – You should make some better accommodations for them. Elliot, I hope you have 19 trucks there and more waiting all the time, but we need to try to get behind this because we are already experiencing an issue on Rock Hill Drive and it's only going to over flow onto the facility at Ranch Road. Extra parking there for the trucks is not a bad idea. Elliot Gibber – That's okay with me. We inherited the building on Rock Hill Drive and have now out grown it causing the parking issue. Chairman Lara – I think what Michael is saying, is to add as much space as possible to provide enough parking for the amount of trucks you have coming now and possible more in the future. Obviously, with more storage there will be more demand for more trucks with will generate more traffic. Michael Hoyt – I get that the ae over-the-road drivers and they can go to Walmart to park, but that's not fair to Walmart either as they are coming to go to your facility. They should be able to come in to your facility and park if they need to wait. Elliot Gibber – The goal is to be more efficient and get the truck in and out quicker. This storage building will be much closer to the production

facility so there will be no waiting on product to come in. The efficiency on this will be 100% better.

Paula Kay – From the Town’s perspective, the goal is also to not have a negative impact on the neighbors, be it on Rock Hill Drive or Ranch Road, because currently there is a pretty significant impact and they are not happy.

Elliot Gibber – The facility in Rock hill is only on a couple acres and the facility on Ranch Road is on 163 acres so there is more space for truck parking.

Michael Hoyt – I guess the answer is you have already agreed to taking care of it and adding the extra parking, perfect.

Michael Croissant – While we have Elliot, what can we do in the meantime to resolve the issue on Rock Hill Drive? If this project does get approved, you are still talking a year or so down the road.

Paula Kay – It sounds like there is plenty of parking now on Ranch Road, correct?

Dave Higgins – There are certainly some areas.

Paula Kay – I don’t see why the drivers can’t get their number, go to Ranch Road and wait there until you are ready for them to come to Rock Hill Drive.

Elliot Gibber – I think that is a good idea. Then the drivers would only have to park long enough at Rock Hill Drive to give the phone number and get their pickup ticket. We can speak to all the drivers and explain this is the way it has to be.

Paula Kay – I think that would work and the Ranch Road facility is closer than Walmart.

Michael Croissant – I don’t understand the process. Why do they have to go to the site to get a phone number and then go to Ranch Road? Couldn’t they go to Ranch Road and get the phone number? Just move that whole process to Ranch Road so they can pick the phone number up there and when they get the phone call, they can go pick up their load.

Elliot Gibber – That doesn’t work because the Rock Hill facility has the dispatch paperwork and bill of lading so it gets picked up there.

Michael Croissant – Can’t they fax the bill of lading over to the other facility?

Elliot Gibber – If the driver goes to the wrong location for a pickup and he doesn’t get it, they just go away. That is one of the reasons we have to keep it separate. If the trucks are sitting on Rock Hill Drive idling all day, I can get what you are saying, but if we just give them the ticket and tell them to come back when their pick up is ready, they shouldn’t be parked there very long.

Michael Croissant – We wouldn’t be having this conversation if it wasn’t an ongoing problem. It is a huge problem in Rock hill and it needs to be addressed. You are going to have to change your process to meet the needs of the community that is being disrupted.

Elliot Gibber – I understand that and that is why we thought long and hard on whether or not we should just move the entire operations out of Sullivan County.

Michael Croissant – So be it. Right now, you need to figure out how to mitigate the problem.

Elliot Gibber - We did move some operations to Iowa that should have mitigated at least 50%.

Chairman Lara – Mr. Gibber, I am going to say this, we are very interested in this project moving forward and eliminating the issue going on in Rock Hill, but this back and forth is not going to work. We need some kind of a better resolution on how you are going to address the traffic issue on Rock Hill Drive. Even though you do not employ the drivers, they are there at your instance. So, instead of going back and forth and telling us what you can’t do, we need you to come back to the Board with some solutions.

Paula Kay – We can schedule a workshop.

Chairman Lara – That will work.

Elliot Gibber – I am more than glad to sit down with whom ever and come up with a working plan that is viable for everyone. I will be back up there after February 1st and will be any time after that.

Paula Kay – We will work with your consultants to come up with a meeting date. That meeting will be step one to talk about logistics and any approvals that you are seeking.

Dave Higgins – We certainly understand the Board’s concerns and the preference to have that worked out before we get further in the approval, but as we mentioned, there is a time frame for construction, equipment ordering, permitting, etc. All though there is not a significant amount of permitting needed outside of the building

permit, other than the SPDES permit from the DEC which will also take some time, can we work out proceeding with the Planning Board approval process. We will work out the issues with Elliot on Rock Hill Drive, but wish to not put this project on hold. Arthur Knapp – I don't think you can do one without the other. Michael Croissant – Right, but I think you can go ahead with your process while at the same time resolving this issue. Matt Sickler – You could probably go ahead with your design and get your SWPP prepared while dealing with work session and a solution. Paula Kay – I just want to make it clear that there needs to be a solution for short term and long term before anything gets built. Dave Higgins – Understood.

Chairman Lara – Stosh, can you give us the quick tour of the design for the building tonight? Stosh Zamosky – Sure. On the overall site, there is a high side and a low side, and this is the low side, so we propose a retaining wall adjacent to the road that enters the site. This is the fire access road that runs behind it. It's about 16 feet higher than the floor level here and then this driveway here where the loading docks are is 4 feet below the slab height. The storage facility is 78,000 square feet and mainly composed of freezer and cold storage. The product will be brought from the main facility, up the driveway, and into the loading docks. That product that needs to be frozen will be brought in through a series of blast freezers and stored in this main freezer section. This side here is cooler storage for product that is not frozen. There is also some dry storage on this end of the building along with an office, breakroom and bathroom. We have egress stairs at the back for the building; it's a bump out that is fully enclosed. We have 19 loading docks and 2 fully enclosed compactors that are attached to a loading dock. The top of the parapet is 38 feet above slab to give a 30-foot clearance to be able to rack up pallets. The building will be constructed of pre-cast concrete panels with holes punched in them to allow daylight into the building. Here is a pre-rendering of what the building should look like from the road.

Chairman Lara – Pretty much just a general commercial building. Stosh Zamosky – Yes. Chairman Lara – Thank you. I just wanted to get a visual. Michael Croissant - Is the building as big as what is allowed, or can you go bigger? Stosh Zamosky - We are already pretty tight with what we are proposing. Michael Croissant – I am only asking because it seems to make a lot of sense to me to just move the whole facility from Rock Hill Drive to this one. Stosh Zamosky – What is currently stored on Rock Hill Drive, is what will be stored here. Michael Croissant – Exactly, but I thought someone mentioned Rock Hill Drive would only be used for dry storage. Elliot Gibber – Rock Hill Drive will be storing packaging material. The only egg product we will be storing there dry and stays long term. Michael Croissant – From a business standpoint, it makes sense to me to have everything stored under one roof. Elliot Gibber – There are certain products we don't want to store with others. The truth of the matter is we may sell the property in Rock Hill. Michael Croissant – That's my point. Then you would have to store everything under one roof. Elliot Gibber – We are so jammed for space right now, that we may have to keep product we don't use everyday at Ranch Road and store it at Rock Hill Drive. There is also product like egg cartons and plastic bags that is now hard to get or may take a long time to get, so our goal is to build a huge inventory of things like that. This way we won't be affected by strikes, shut downs, pandemics, etc. Michael Hoyt – What is your idea of what truck traffic will be at that building after all of this is done? Elliot Gibber – The only truck traffic that will go into that property will be backed into a dock and maximum 4 or 5 trucks a day. Paula Kay – Will those be all your trucks, carrying your product. Elliot Gibber – No, there could be delivery trucks bringing in ordered product, but it would be limited trucks coming in. Paula Kay – Would those be regular trucks opposed to tractor trailers? Elliot Gibber – No, it would be tractor trailers as most of everything we move requires one. Paula Kay – Okay.

Chairman Lara – Can you point out on the site plan what is proposed? The dark grey is what is being proposed; the driveways and the building. Paula Kay – Can you show us parking? Stosh Zamosky – The parking for employees will be here and truck parking will happen inside the loading docks. There is also trailer parking here along the entrance road coming in and up here. Paula Kay – Is there a way to calculate how many trucks can park on what is currently shown? Dave Higgins – Yes, we can figure that out. Chairman Lara – Great.

Dave Higgins – Do we have a date for the work session or is this something we correlate later? Paula Kay – Reach out to Laura in the building Dept. and she can help with that.

ZASS ROCK HILL, LLC

270 Rock Hill Drive, Rock Hill, NY

Larry Marshall, Product engineer

Abhishek (Abi) Patel, Project applicant

Paula Kay – For the record, I represented the gentleman who sold this property.

Larry Marshall – Mr. Patel is looking for a change of use for the vacant building on Rock Hill Drive, next to Brew. It used to be an automobile sales facility and he would like to put an automated carwash there. The changes to the exterior of the building will be minimal. We will have to relocate 1 overhead door on the west side, the east side would get an overhead door of its own, and a couple of man doors for access. There will also be a small overhang on the exterior extending from the building to a small reverse gable on the corner to cover the secondary entrance. That will be shed roof material. The interior of the building will have all of the mechanics. That is the changes to the building. Mr. Patel would also like to change the gravel area in the front of the building by paving the entire parking area and adding some kiosks. Then a couple of vacuums on the east side. Everything is intended to be contained within the designated area. We are not looking to expand beyond the footprint that is already there. We would really be just cleaning it up and incorporating some of the things we will need for this to work.

Paula Kay – I think they are actually completing some of the original site plan that never got finished, like paving the front area and this is not your first carwash, right? Abi Patel – Correct, I have one in Pine Bush. Michael Croissant – Was the landscaping done from the original approval? Jim Carnell – No. Michael Croissant – We would want to make sure that is taken care of. Larry Marshall – Okay.

Michael Croissant – Is this going to be a tunnel type? Abi Patel – Yes. Larry Marshall - At the moment there is no well on the property, so we will be drilling one. Michel Croissant – Will this have a reclamation system in it? How will you be handling the water? Abi Patel – The well will be sufficient as the carwash will only be 15 to 20 gallons of water per minute. Arthur Knapp – Where does the waste water go? Larry Marshall – The waste water will go to the municipal system. Matt Sickler – I talked to Mike Messenger a little bit about this and he had some concerns about the waste water. Maybe you can schedule some time to meet with Mike and I to go over the plans for that and the pump station. Larry Marshall – Okay. Jim Carnell – Yeah, it's not much of a pump station. Right now it's really more of a pump you would see in a single family home. Larry Marshall – We are in the process of getting that pump pulled and getting specs on it to see if it can handle the new project. Matt Sickler – Once you have

that we can get together out there and go through your plans for that and any potential impacts to the system. Jim Carnell – I think Mike was concerned with what kind of chemicals would be used and balance the balance and treatment.

Christina Cellini – Does that driveway sit down a little bit? Larry Marshall – A couple feet. Christina Cellini – If someone is turning from the right, will that be an issue with cars backing up? Larry Marshall – There will be 2 full kiosks here, so there will be 2 lines. There will be some stacking of cars and I can get a figure for you, but I would estimate there is enough room there for about 20 cars; from the doorway of the carwash back until it would become an issue. Abi Patel – Also, it can wash 60 cars per hour, so it only take 1 minute to push the car through. Larry Marshall – It's touchless but there is a conveyer belt that moves the car through, instead of standing still and everything moving around you. This will be new technology, so it will be able to do what other carwashes with 120-foot-long tunnels can do in about 60 feet. There will be very minimal wait time. Christina Cellini – Okay. Chairman Lara – Good question Christina.

Paula Kay – How is payment taken? Larry Marshall – At the kiosks. You will drive up to one of them and make your payment.

Christian Cellini – What are you doing for signage? Larry Marshall – We will be using the existing sign onsite. It is a 3x4 stationary sign that we would like to change out for a digital sign.

Chairman Lara – I know we are early in the process, but would we need to have a public hearing for this?

Paula Kay – It's a change in use, but he is complying with the original approved site plan. It's certainly your prerogative, but to me it's similar enough that one is needed. He is making changes to the exterior of the building, so you are going through the site plan procedure.

ACTION ITEMS:

MONTICELLO MOTOR CLUB

67 Cantrell Road, Monticello, NY
Ken Ellsworth, Project engineer

Matt Sickler and Jim Carnell were recused.

Ken Ellsworth – At a previous meeting we got approval for the foundation work for the garage lofts. We went with the foundation plan because we were still working with the DOH and the DEC regarding the sewer plant. We have made some good progress with the DOH, but have not completed that process yet. We had a pump test done on the well and it generates 42 gallons per minute, which is a fairly decent size well. Our needs even with peak flow is only about 1.7 gallons per minute, so we have more than enough capacity for water. We are in the process of gaining the test results from the water. If this well is similar to other wells on the property, there will not be any substances in it that would not permit us from using a UV filter, which we have purchased in anticipation to be able to use it. Once we have those test results, we will be ready to submit to the DOH. I believe a SPDES permit was submitted to the

DEC and should that not occur, timing wise, we still have the opportunity to do a septic system on site. With that being said, we are here tonight to try and change our permit to build the full facility and the reason being is we are looing at a schedule that seems to be slipping on us and we are concerned with keeping our contractors well.

Chairman Lara – What was the reason we didn't give the full approval at the last meeting? Michael Hoyt – It had to do with the DOH. Glenn Smith – They needed DOH approval to occupy the upper levels of those garage lofts. I think what they are planning now is to not occupy those upper levels so no C/O would not be required. Basically, just build the building as a storage building, which would not need DOH approval. Chairman Lara – That's just a Building Dept. enforcement, right? Glenn Smith – Yes. This is pretty much just a modification that is one step up from what you gave them last time. Chairman Lara – Thanks Glenn. I don't see any issue with the approval, anyone else? Artur Knapp – I am fine with it. Michael Hoyt – I don't see any issue.

A motion to remove the previous conditions and approve the full building, for storage space only, was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

BBIS

Route 17B, Monticello, NY

Zach Zabo, Project representative

Zach Zabo – Back in February of 2020 we got approval for construction of Phase I. At this time all of the hardscapes have been completed within Phase I A & B. We initially went for a temporary C/O for Phase I A, which was issued at the start of this past summer, and IAA has already moved in with some cars. We will now be requesting a temporary C/O for Phase I B, which has also been completed, and the applicant has constructed temporary fences, similar to what was done for Phase I A. We are here tonight for approval for complete construction of Phase II. Phase III was never approved for tree clearing, so we are also requesting the bond be moved to Phase III so we can start that clearing before March 31st. They intend to start Phase III next year, upon the completion of Phase II, with a completion date of 2024.

Paula Kay – We had a work session and went over all of this. Chairman Lara – Sounds pretty reasonable. Jim, why temporary C/O's? Jim Carnell – The permanent building has not been completed. Several of the structures are still under construction, but they are isolated from the activity, which was one of the main things the Board had asked for and wanted the Building Dept. to delineate. Chairman Lara – Are you comfortable with this moving forward? Jim Carnell – Absolutely. Sequentially, this is pretty much the phasing that they presented. I believe the cash bond that was put up for tree clearing was \$200,000.00 and they are now ready to move that to Phase III, under whatever resolution the Board had. Kristin Boyd – Will the ground be stable after the tree clearing? Are you clearing the roots too? Zach Zabo – I believe the agreement was for them to be knocked down in Phase II, but because of the short turn around time, Phase III will also need removal. We will make sure they have stormwater erosion control structures in place. Chairman Lara – They did the same thing for the last phase. Jim Carnell there was some difficulty early on in the project, but I think that had a lot to do with the contractor not being familiar with the

type of soils. Since they got a new contractor, everything seems to be under control and a sediment utility box to coagulate the run off was brought in for Phase II.

Matt Sickler – I think we received the estimates for Phase II & III, but I don't know if you got approval yet. Zach Zabo – I haven't seen anything yet. Jim Carnell – They may need to run updated figures since it has been a while, so it may still be in the works and I don't remember off hand if they did the site inspections fees for the whole project. Matt Sickler – I think it was only for Phase I. Zach Zabo – Right. We need to do site inspection fees for Phase II and then Phase III eventually.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion for final site plan approval for Phase II and to move the bond, for tree clearing, from Phase II to Phase III was made by Michael Croissant and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

JOHN LONERGAN

105 Lakeshore Drive, Monticello, NY
John Lonergan, Property owner

John Lonergan – I am here tonight because I am looking to take an old, dilapidated shed and replace it with a garage.

Chairman Lara – Can you show us what you are planning on doing? Is this going to be on an adjoining property or across the street? John Lonergan – It is on the same property as the house and there is a shed already there. I have some photos here showing the idea of what we want it to look like. Chairman Lara – Why are you in front of the Board? John Lonergan – The garage will be 900 square feet, but there is a 2nd floor. Even though there will only be a piece of plywood there for storage, I was told I would need Planning Board approval. I believe they said it was oversized. Chairman Lara – Understood. John Lonergan – Also, it is very close to the adjacent property. If you look at the survey, the way it is situated with the lake and the road, no matter what we do, we cannot meet the side yard setback. This was one of the first houses on the lake and they did not accommodate for that and there is a lot of wasted property. Chairman Lara – Are the setbacks fine though, right? Matt Sickler – This shows 5.37 feet proposed and if I am reading this right, the existing is 4 feet. John Lonergan – It's hard to tell, but is between 4 and 5 feet. Jim Carnell – As this was a reoccurring issue with the lake communities, the Town Board changed the code to be a little different from other residential properties. When they made the amendment to the code, they also gave this Board the ability to deviate from what the required setbacks are, so that the applicant wouldn't have to go in front of both Boards. In this case it appears they will be improving the setback, so I don't think it would be an issue. If you wanted to incorporate any requirements in your approval you could, but Paula can confirm. Paula Kay – Correct, you guys have jurisdiction for an oversized garage. Chairman Lara – I don't have an issue with it and it looks beautiful. Paula Kay – Do we have the height detention? John Lonergan – It is less the 30 feet from the road. Matt Sickler – It looks like 26'8". Paula Kay – Okay. I would include the height in the motion to approve.

A motion to approve the oversized garage with a height of 26'8" was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

The Board requested we try to invite Karen Hatorah back again. They are still using the building and buses are still parking on the side of 17B. Jim Carnell suggested that we reach out to the owner of the property at this time and get them involved and the Board agreed.

Kristin Boyd asked if there was any update on Nob Hill yet and Paula Kay advised at there has not been any.

A motion to close the meeting was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Michael Hoyt.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers, Secretary

Town of Thompson Planning Board