

APPROVED

TOWN OF THOMPSON
PLANNING BOARD
March 22, 2023

IN ATTENDANCE: Kathleen Lara, Chairman
Michael Croissant
Kristin Boyd
Arthur Knapp
Jim Carnell, Building, Planning, Zoning
Matthew Sickler, Consulting Engineer
Helen Budrock, Sr. Planner, Delaware Engineering
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.

A motion to approve the February 8, 2023 minutes was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

Chairman Lara appointed Christina Cellini as a voting member for tonight's meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING:

ANES KURTAGIC

4342 NYS Route 42, Kiamesha Lake, NY
Tim Gottlieb, Project representative

Chairman Lara read the legal notice aloud.

Proof of mailings were received.

Tim Gottlieb – This is an existing building on Route 42 that the applicant is looking to change the use of. The use will change from personal storage to warehouse storage. The company that will be coming in sells and installs doors and windows. We received comments from the County, which were DOT and DPW related. We have some work to do, as far as the entrance onto the County road, but none of the comments were anything to worry about.

No questions or comments from the Board.

The meeting was opened to the public.

No public questions or comment.

A motion to close the public hearing and leave the written comment period open for 10 days was made by Michael Croissant and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

218 HILLTOP LLC

218 Hilltop Road, Monticello, NY

Zachary Peters, Project engineer

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Chairman Lara read the legal notice aloud.

Proof of mailings were received.

Zachary Peters - This is a proposed expansion for an existing facility at 218 Hilltop Road. We are proposing 19 additional staff housing buildings, a new dormitory, and a new shul. As well as, parking and storm water facilities. This portion of the project is proposed to be served by a water and sewer system, that will just serve the expansion. The existing facilities are part of the site and part of the site operation, but have a separate water and sewer system. We are working with DOH and DEC now on water and sewer. Submission have been made to them and we have gotten some very preliminary feedback, that we are working through. This project has been in the works for a little while now and there was a public hearing held back in December of 2020 that did have some public comments. They were primarily related to the traffic along Hilltop Road, so we had a traffic study done. We are here tonight for any new or additional comments anybody may have.

The meeting was opened to the public.

Henry Friedman @ 204 Hilltop Road – Expressed that when this project first came in front of the Board (back in 2018/2019), the applicant was asked if what they were presenting was everything they planned on doing in the future, and the Board was told yes. Believes that was instrumental in getting their original approval and now they are asking to expand. Stated his rights are important and is concerned about his, and other neighbors, quality of life being interrupted. Additionally, he is concerned about the site distance on Hilltop Road and that the roads do not have the capacity for the additional traffic this expansion will bring. Had the below questions in regards to his concerns:

- How long will him and his neighbors have to endure construction work this time?
- What will the capacity of the camp be with the new, proposed buildings?
- How many visitors are anticipated on “visiting day” and how many additional cars on the road will that bring?
- What is being done to prevent another bus from getting stuck in the ditch, when pulling in, and possibly overturning with children in it?

Frank Kobus @ 227 Hilltop Road – Agrees with all of Henry’s concerns and recalls the applicant stating they were not going to expand in the future and even recalls the Board stating they wouldn’t be able to and needed to present everything they wanted at the time of the original approval. Had additional concerns regarding the wetlands being disturbed and a dog barking all the time. Stated that the DEC plot map shows the project’s driveway is in the wetlands, which is not allowed, and that there is a dog that is left out all year long and barks constantly (was advised that he could call Nancy Marinchak in Dog Control to report the dog issue). Pleaded with the Board to take this expansion seriously and to keep in mind how it will affect everyone else in the area.

Richard Wool @ 118 Hilltop Road – Had most of the same concerns as the other neighbors. Additionally stated this project is devaluing his property and that the applicant started building other things after their last approval that they did not obtain approvals for. Sent in written comment, during the 10-day written comment period, expressing these concerns and listing questions he had. See below link for said correspondence:

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1Fqbut1cAWwVS9vdisVvbwj_VUV4Pw7eu&authuser=planning%40townofthompson.com&usp=drive_fs

No further public comment or questions.

Michael Croissant – Have the concerns with both the Army Corp. and DEC wetland delineation been addressed as of today? Zachary Peters – There was a prior wetland delineation completed, reviewed by DEC, and a validation was issued. There were some comments on that, that we responded to, and the information will be going back to the DEC as there is a permit required for the limited buffer disturbance for the stormwater drain outlet. Michael Croissant – Nothing has been done since the original DEC flagging? Zachary Peters – In terms of boundaries? Michael Croissant – Yes. Zachary Peters – The boundary was delineated when DEC came out to look at it, which was just before this project was put on hold due to Covid, and that’s pretty much where it was left off. Michael Croissant – Okay and the same with the Army Corp.? Yes. Those wetlands were added to the plan previously. That is all necessary for permits from the DEC and Army Corp, which we are in the process of submitting. Michael Croissant – Do you know approximately when that was done? Zachary Peters – No, but I can get an answer. Joel Kohn – It was in 2019. The DEC went out, flagged the wetlands, and certified it. Then the previous Town Engineer called them out on what they flagged and asked them why they didn’t take additional wetlands. So, there was another walk of the property with the Town Engineer, the DEC, our wetland guide, and the Building Department. The DEC sent an email stating they decided that they are going to keep the delineations as they are and will not change them until at least 2024. They did have additional comments as well, which MNTM responded to. Matt Sickler – There is a copy of that email from Mike Fraatz, at the DEC, on the Google Drive. He pretty much said that they will not revise the map, but those wetlands were eligible for protection. So, he made some suggestions in the email about ways to minimize the impact. The latest submission that came back in needs to be address, so we will put a response together for those comments. Joel Kohn – The flagging of the wetlands by the DEC also showed that the driveway into the camp is not in the wetlands.

Kristin Boyd – Did we get updated traffic counts? Chairman Lara – Yes, we got an email today from our consultant, Jay. He reviewed the prior data and said, typically, traffic data more than 3 years old should

not be utilized or can be utilized after cross verification. He recommended to perform sample counts, both south and north of the site, to verify there has been no changes since the original counts were performed, but full data collection is not necessary. Jay's email is on the Google Drive for anyone who would like to review it.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion to close the public hearing and leave the written comment period open for 10 days was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kristin Boyd.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

T & C SULLIVAN LLC SALON

Sheeley Lane, Rock Hill, NY

Glenn Smith, Project engineer

Chairman Lara read the legal notice aloud.

Proof of mailings were received.

Glenn Smith – This project consists of two parcels located in Rock Hill on Sheeley Drive, which is a private road off Glen Wild Road. One parcel is about an acre in size and has an existing house and garage on it. The second parcel is about 5 ½ acres and had an existing trailer on it. The intent is to convert the garage into a hair salon, which is a personal service shop in the Town's code, and is a permitted use in this zone, which is a highway commercial zone. There will be no additional construction on the site; they are just taking the existing building and converting it. We are also requesting a lot line change/adjustment to move the property line that goes to the edge of the garage back about 100 feet. That way there is not a property line going through a building. Currently, the proposed salon, or the existing garage, is on the same parcel as the existing house, which is considered 2 primary uses on the same property. That is allowed in the Town code, but we were required to show that both the house and the salon could be on their own lots with their own well and septic, in the event that they are subdivided in the future. We show that on this portion of the plan. The code also requires we show at least 1 parking space for every 150 sq. ft. of floor area, which works out to be about 12 spaces. The applicant has run a salon for many years, in another location, and in her experience, she does not require more than 8 or 10 spaces, so we show 10 parking space on the plan. We made sure to show that these parking spaces can be moved, if the parcel is subdivided, so that they will be on the same lot as the salon. We added a note to the existing site plan stating that maintenance, including snow plowing, we be provided by the applicant, T & C Sullivan LLC. We did get the 239 referral back from County Planning and the only comment that has was, recommending a local determination. That is essentially it.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

No public comment.

A motion to close the public hearing and leave the written comment period open for 10 days was made by Michael Croissant and second by Kristin Boyd.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Due to a scheduling issue, the below motion was made.

A motion to take the agenda out of order, so that the Board review the Center for Discovery project first, was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Croissant.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

WEISS REALTY & WISE EQUITIES

Kroeger Road, Monticello, NY

John O'Rourke, Project Engineer for Weiss Realty

Zach Szabo, Project Engineer for Wise Equities

Carlito Holt, Project Traffic Consultant for both projects

Helen Budrock shared the combined site plan (showing both warehouses) for everyone to see.

Paula Kay – At the last Board meeting we had with the applicants the Board asked that we have a work session with both applicants, their teams, and Town consultants to talk about the potential cumulative impact the two warehouses may have, especially the impact traffic will have on Kroeger Road. They asked to see them together, just as you see on the plan Helen is sharing. One is obviously further along in the process and the other one is just starting, but because they are contiguous, the Board wanted to have to opportunity to see them together before they make a determination on how to move forward. Helen Budrock – Just to clarify from a timing perspective, the Weiss Realty project, the one represented in blue on the map, came in over a year ago and have been making their way through the environmental review process. The other applicant, Wise Equities and the one in red, came in just this summer and therefore are just starting the process. The proximity of the two projects prompted the work session and the request by the Board to see cumulate impact.

John O'Rourke – I feel the workshop went well. We were able to coordinate both projects with the same traffic consultant. We asked them to hire our traffic consultant, Carlito Holt from DTS Provident, and they did. We documented that their septic and stormwater is all going in this direction and ours is going this way, in the opposite direction. Leaving really no cumulative impact on that. The only cumulative impact we anticipate is traffic. So, we directed our Carlito, at the cost of our client, to analyze the other project's development at its build out as proposed. Carlito did some preliminary numbers and will submit a report, documenting the cumulative impact, to the Board and your traffic consultant, but I will refer to Carlito for further discussion on that. Our goal is that you will continue to review our project and we will address any comments, regarding any shared improvements, that either our or your traffic consultants may have. One thing that we potentially could offer moving forward is shared access. Since we are extending our access drive and their proposed access, as your Planner had previously pointed out, is fairly close to the residence on the neighboring property, we would allow them to tie into our

access drive with an easement. I did not see any traffic reports so I don't know if that is necessary, but it may potentially help. Chairman Lara – I don't know if any other Board member has driven down Kroeger Road, but the couple houses that are there are very close to the road, so I feel that would be a great idea. Michael Croissant – Is someone living in the house next to the red project? John O'Rourke – Yes. The house across the street, neighboring our project, was taken into consideration when we started developing our project, so we pulled everything back and put the stormwater in-between as a buffer. We also move our loading dock to the back of the building because we originally planned for them to be in the front, which the Board was also a little concerned about. I believe we have tried to do everything we could for the area and went one step further by absorbing the cost for the other projects traffic consultant.

Michael Croissant – Do you know if their schedule is going to be the same as yours? John O'Rourke – I would have to refer to them for that answer, but from what I understand their plans are just sketch at this time and they are still closing on the property. Michael Croissant – Okay because it would be nice to see them done at the same time. John O'Rourke – I don't disagree, but our client really wants to proceed. Michael Croissant – I understand and that's why I asked. John O'Rourke - We still have to come back for final approval, so we were hoping that by the time we have all approvals from outside agencies, they would be far enough along to know if they would need to share our access drive.

Michael Croissant – is there planned improvement for Kroeger Road? John O'Rourke – As of now, no. When we first started there was no need for it because it was an industrial road prior. Chairman Lara – The road is pretty narrow. John O'Rourke – It is narrow, but the problem is we do not own it. The Town doesn't really either because some of these parcels go to the center of the road. If there were any improvements for that, we would usually have to say it will be "x" amount of dollars and give that to the Town so that they could potentially do the work, but we cannot go onto their property and do any work, which in this case goes to the center of the road.

Helen Budrock – I wanted to mention the 239 review that came back that included comments from DOT. They indicated that they had some concerns and were in the process of reviewing the traffic study. That was the original traffic study, so I just wanted to make sure you involve DOT in the new study as early as possible and let them know that that traffic study is being revised for cumulative impact. John O'Rourke – I will let Carlito take it from here. Carlito Holt – We originally prepared a study in December 2021 or early January 2022 for the Weiss Realty project and submitted it. We showed no significant impacts associated with that project at that time. We got a round of comments back from both the Town's and the County's traffic consultants, so we made some updates and submitted the updated study. We then got another round of comments from the Town's traffic engineer, which was around the same time the Wise Equities project came forward. We have since been retained by that applicant as well to look at an overall study. We did look at that, but unfortunately, did not have enough time to formalize it into a report and get it to the Town. I can tell you that the preliminary results are that there is still no significant impact. I would add that in one round of CHA's comments, our study got expanded by 3 or 4 study locations. They also asked us to update traffic counts as we were originally relying on data from the Kartrite's traffic study, as we were in the mist of Covid at that time. We have since gone out and done traffic counts at all the study locations and is in our updated analysis that will be submitted. It shows all levels of service are A's or B's and they all maintained at the study locations, so there is no significant impacts. In the original study we were showing about 85 new peak a.m. hours trips with the Weiss warehouse and 90 peak p.m. hours trips. The Wise warehouse application will add an additional 22 peak a.m. hour trips and 23 peak p.m. hour trips. What we intend to do is submit to different traffic studies so that they can be looked at cumulatively, but each application can stand on its own. So, the

Wiess project's study will show their incremental impact, with the Wise warehouse in the background traffic and vice versa for the Wise project. Helen Budrock – Are you or how are you addressing the proposed realignment of that intersection that is part of the Route 17 improvements? Or does that not impact this? Carlito Holt – Our analysis does not assume the Route 17 concept in our future geology because there is still a lot of uncertainty as to the extent of the DOT improvements and what is going to get authorized. So, we don't want to rely on that and then DOT decides that improvement would make it into their final plans. Anything we are doing does not prevent that from being done in the future and both applications can operate acceptably without those improvements being done. Obviously, those improvements will be an added benefit, but they are not included in our analysis. Helen Budrock – Do any of the turning movements change with the proposed realignment of that exit? Because I think they are proposing to close one of the ramps and change the Bridgeville intersection into a traditional diamond shape, right? Carlito Holt – Right. On the north side, by Heiden Road, will become more of a traditional diamond interchange. There will be some modern geometric changes on the southern side but essentially all the movements would be maintained. Helen Budrock – Okay. Paula Kay – So, when you are done preparing your report, that will be sent to the Board, as well as to our traffic consultant, to review. Carlito Holt – Yes and the County and DOT. Paula Kay – Do you have a timeline at this point? Carlito Holt – We would expect to get that out within the next week. Chairman Lara – Carlito, would you also send it to the commissioner of DPW, as County Planning is a little under staffed at this time and we want to keep this moving along. Carlito Holt – No problem. I will coordinate the submittal with Allen and Paula to make sure we are getting it to the right eyes as soon as possible.

Chairman Lara – I'd like to thank you on behalf of the Board for agreeing to work together. It does make a big difference and shows these things can be done in a respectful, positive manor.

WEISS REALTY

Kroeger Road, Monticello, NY
John O'Rourke, Project Engineer

John O'Rourke – As previously discussed, what we are looking for tonight is kind of a nod from the Board saying these are 2 separate projects, with traffic being the only combined impact, so that we may move forward with our projects.

Paula Kay – Just to remind the Board, this project had a public hearing that was close and the applicant responded in writing to the public hearing comments. The other application has not yet had a public hearing and once they are past the sketch stage, I think it would be helpful to also have a public hearing for them.

Chairman Lara – I agree that these should be treated as 2 different applications. However, just today we received an email from someone asking about these warehouses and any cumulative impact they may have with not just each other, but the Avon project as well. So, it is important for us to look at them together, but wouldn't be fair to stop your project from moving forward since you are working together on all cumulative impacts. Carlito Holt – I forgot to mention earlier that CHA also made that same comment. They wanted to make sure we were including Avon Park, Center for Discovery, Rock Hill Center and Hamaspik in our background traffic, which we have in our updated analysis. Chairman Lara - That will be helpful. Since the email received was concerning Avon Park, it was not something that we could necessarily put on the record, but is something we will make sure is addressed.

Helen Budrock – I think the next step for this project would be a SEQR determination of significance before any kind of approval, so we will wait for the updated traffic study to come back and then we can go through that process. Are there any other impact areas that the Board is concerned about at this stage? Chairman Lara – John, would you just go over the wetlands again. John O’Rourke – Sure. Everything on the other site is going in this direction. They have some state wetlands back in this area, along with their water storage, which is basically the opposite direction as our site. Our septic and well is over here and we have some ridging through here. Chairman Lara – Was there any wetlands on your site? John O’Rourke – There is an isolated wetland that went through this area. We had a biologist come out to confirm that and confirm that we do not have any bald eagle nesting. Those findings were submitted. Kristin Boyd – Can you walk us through what you plan to do with the land that is between the warehouse and the house next door? Are there any concerns there with noise? John O’Rourke – Currently there is a gate at the end of Kroger Road, right about where this house ends. We are extending that road straight back, about to where the power lines are, so that the trucks can pull down the road, past the warehouse, and then back behind to the loading docks. This road here is only for emergency access, which we are required to have. We just kind of looped the drive around the building for that purpose only. Employees will park in the front of the building and all trucks will be in the back. Kristine Boyd – Would the employees come through the back and loop back in to get to the parking or would they come around the front? John O’Rourke – They have the option to go either way. I think we are hoping people parking over on this side of the lot would come from one direction and people parking on the other side would come from the other direction to kind of split up the traffic. We really tried to have the least impact on this one existing house as possible. Again, that is why we did some grading and put our storm water basin in-between our property and theirs. We will also be adding some landscaping, which we will submit a plan for. Kristin Boyd – What will it look like from a visual perspective? John O’Rourke – The neighboring house does not face in the direction of the warehouse, so unless they are looking out their upstairs, side window, they won’t see us. Kristin Boyd – Will there be any fencing on that end or just tress and landscaping? John O’Rourke – No fence. Chairman Lara – I think there is already a fence there. John O’Rourke – There is currently a chain link fence, but that won’t do anything for filtering and I don’t know if it is going to stay.

Paula Kay – I think we have a pretty good idea of where this project is going. They are moving forward and we are now awaiting the new traffic study to review. I’d also ask the Board to review their response to the public hearing comments to make sure everything there is good to go. Matt Sickler – If the Board is okay with it, I’d like to meet with John and his crew to go through the SWPP as it is a sizable document and it would expedite the process. Chairman Lara – I don’t see any issue with that. John O’Rourke – Works for me. Chairman Lara – Matt, other than that, do you have any other comments for this project? Matt Sickler – No.

WISE EQUITIES

Kroeger Road, Monticello, NY
Zach Szabo, Project Engineer

Helen Budrock shared the site plan for everyone to see.

Zach Szabo – Since we were last in front of you, we had a consultant go out to the property and delineate all the wetlands. As you can see, there are DEC wetlands, which we provide a 100-foot buffer from, and some additional Army Corp. wetlands in near the project. We will be disturbing some of those Army Corp. wetlands, but also providing mitigation. Since our last submission, you can see the building orientation changed a little bit. We had a small piece come out this way with loading docks behind it, but we removed that due to the wetlands and steep slopes there. We also had a road way that went around and connected into Kroeger Road for secondary access, that was removed because it would be too steep for trucks to get around that way. I know we were just taking about potentially sharing the other projects access drive, but as that was just mentioned, currently our access comes off Kroeger Road only. We do still have two access drives because we have the gravel access along the back, which we actually pulled a little closer to the site, and our septic system is in the same spot. We provided an updated EAF and a cover letter outlining the changes we made. What we were looking for tonight is the Boards okay on the sketch plan and to possible start SEQR. We can provide a part II draft and part III outline at the next meeting.

Chairman Lara – I am not speaking for the whole Board, but I would suggest you take Weiss up on their offer to use their access drive because that is such a tight road. I think when you have your public hearing, it will be helpful to be able to say you are not going to be staging trucks in front of any houses. Zach Szabo – I will take that information back to our client and see how he feels about it. Obviously, we are having discussions about traffic so now would be an ideal time to discuss that. Paula Kay – Since our meeting it looks like you guys have done a lot of work together, which is very helpful to us, and I really appreciate that. Chairman Lara – Are you still going to have the loading docks in the back of the building? Zach Szabo – Yes, all trucks will be in the back and employee parking will be in the front.

Helen Budrock – In regards to SEQR, we usually like to prepare part II and part III of the EAF ourselves, so I think we just need to start with Lead Agency. Chairman Lara – Paula do you agree? Paula Kay – I agree and would also like to see a public hearing sooner rather than later. Only because we have a similar project adjacent to this one and at this point, I don't think much will change with the site, with the exception of the access drive. Helen Budrock – Zach, do foresee anything else changing with the layout? Do you think circulation issue and changing the location of the driveway is something that might happen? Would you want to make those changes before we schedule a public hearing or would you like to hear from the public and County first? Zach Szabo – As for the access, at this time I am not sure. I would like to go back to the client with that. I do not foresee the layout changing anytime soon, but that is also depending on detailed engineering plans. At this time, we are only at the preliminary sketch portion of the process and just wanted to make sure the Board was okay with the sketch and maybe start SEQR. Paula Kay – I think it may be a little preliminary to move ahead with SEQR because we don't have traffic completed. Helen Budrock – Right, but we could start with intent to serve Lead Agency, to get that out of the way as that could be a month's process by itself. Paula Kay – Absolutely, we can do that. Helen Budrock – That way the Board can make that resolution and Zach can coordinate with Laura, the Planning Board secretary, for notice circulation. Zach Szabo – Okay. Paula Kay – And maybe when you come back you can also let the Board know about access and whether your client is willing to make the recommended changes. Zach Szabo – Okay. Helen Budrock - So, when you come back the Board, we can probably accept Lead Agency status and move forward with scheduling a public hearing and referring it to the County for 239 review. Chairman Lara – Are we declaring intent for Lead Agency tonight? Helen Budrock – Yes, that way we can start that process.

A motion to take the agenda out of order, so that the Board can act on this project now, was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Croissant.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to declare intent for Lead Agency was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Christina Cellini.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

FAMILY FUN FARM

65 Friedman Road, Monticello, NY

Joseph Churgin, Project attorney

Chairman Lara – We received responses to the public hearing comments and those are on the Google Drive. Paula, would you please talk us through where we currently stand with this project. Paula Kay – They had their public hearing and it was closed. There were public comments, that were quite extensive, as well as written comments that came in post meeting, during the 10-day written comment period. The applicant submitted their responses and I believe the applicant was also planning on meeting with HOA representatives at Hidden Ridge. It is my understanding that meeting has not taken place yet and I'm not quite sure why. Being that Hidden Ridge homeowners were the majority of the public who commented and had serious concerns about the project and being the applicant has expressed on several occasions that he would have a meeting; I think maybe it is time for the Board to step in and take a handle on this. Maybe we do a work session with representatives from the Hidden Ridge Board and Mr. Churgin and his client. That way they can actually sit down and work through some of these items. Joseph Churgin – I agree that a meeting with Hidden Ridge is important and I did make several phone calls as well as at least two written efforts to try to schedule a meeting with them, but did not get any response. I am not trying to point any blame, but we did make the attempt. We would like to meet with them, so if the Town can help us do that, that would be great. Chairman Lara – I did speak to their Board's president who expressed that your client has made promises before that he didn't follow through with, so I believe having a sit down to clear the air in a constructive way, would be very helpful. Joseph Churgin – We are all for that. Paula Kay – Okay. What I will do is reach out to you to get some dates that work for you guys and then see what we can set up with Hidden Ridge. We should have at least 1 or 2 Planning Board members attend that meeting as well. We don't need any more than that as this really a private meeting and not a public one. Hopefully we will be able to get both parties together for a meeting of the minds and figure out what is important to each party.

Joseph Churgin – We are hoping not to lose a lot of momentum here and we did write an extensive response to the public comments, so if we are missing anything at this time, we would like to know now so that we can be prepared to address that. Chairman Lara – I just have minor, general comments, like signage also being in Yiddish. I know that sounds silly, but I think that is important. Joseph Churgin – No, I think that is a great idea. Chairman Lara – Also, maybe a physical barrier between you and Hidden Ridge, which can wait until you have your meeting with Hidden Ridge because you may come up with another agreed upon buffer. I was thinking maybe a split rail or chain link fence in the woods to have a visual buffer between the 2 properties. I think that may help the residence of Hidden Ridge feel a little

more comfortable with the project as it is right now. Joseph Churgin – I'm not disagreeing, but that is a long stretch of land. Are we talking about the entire border between the 2 properties and if so, would they be willing to contribute to that cost? Chairman Lara – that is something you can discuss with them at the work session. Paula Kay – I wouldn't get too far into the weeds here because these are some of the issues that Hidden Ridge has already raised and should be discussed at the work session. I would like to go through the entire written response at the work session and kind of see what issues are still outstanding or haven't been addressed. Chairman Lara – I agree.

Matt Sickler – If the Board or the applicant don't mind, I would like to reach out to their engineer as I am not clear as to the capacity of the septic system there. Joseph Churgin - We would be fine with direct contact. Matt Sickler – Okay. It appears that it is most likely sufficient but I just want to confirm. I will put my questions into an email and get back to the Board with the outcome.

Joseph Churgin – Can we set a meeting to come back to now? Chairman Lara – The next meeting is during Passover, so you are probably looking at the last meeting in April or first meeting in May. Joseph Churgin – Okay, so we will aim for the second meeting in April. Paula Kay – That's fine if we can get a work session set up and attended by the Wednesday before that meeting.

ROSSINI MANAGEMENT

82 Cold Spring Road, Monticello, NY

Joseph Rossini, Project owner

Jamie Banks, project representative

Chairman Lara – The last time we met the Board had asked you to submit a site plan, which was received. We asked you to show where you were going to store your concrete blocks and access off Schroder Road, which you have. Jim Carnell – I didn't see the Schroder Road access on the site plan. Matt Sickler – It shows a parking area there and labels the area to the rear, but it looks like there is a fence the whole length of Schroder. Joseph Rossini – There is a notation on the site plan showing the entrance. Michael Croissant – yeah, it's all the way at the bottom of the plan. Jim Carnell – Oh okay. I see it there down by the other building. Matt Sickler – Are there 2 parcels? Are these the same tax parcel? Kristin Boyd – No. Jim Carnell – I think they do have common ownership though. Joseph Rossini – Right, we purchased both parcels. Jim Carnell – If I remember correctly, I think they were combined and are now one parcel. Matt Sickler – Okay because I saw the property line and stopped looking past that. Chairman Lara – Matt, do you have any other questions. Matt Sickler – No, as long as there won't be any outdoor lighting above these areas. Jamie Banks – There won't be because we don't want to disrupt the neighbors. Matt Sickler – Okay. Chairman Lara - As for signage, what did you guys decide to do with that. Jamie Banks – We are going with a 4x5 foot sign in the front. I think it is on the site plan. Michael Croissant – Yeah, I see it right here. Chairman Lara – Okay. Christina Cellini – Will the sign be electronic? Jamie Banks – No. Kristin Boyd – Did we discuss landscaping? Jim Carnell – There was a brief discussion about landscaping, but since they are selling landscaping materials, I think you were kind of giving them a little latitude as to the type of product they were going to use. You did ask for some raised beds or something up front since it is paved. It wasn't finalized, but the Board did ask them to come back with something.

Helen Budrock – I wanted to remind the Board that this is a change of use, but is also a permitted use in the zone, I think we established it would be retail, so a public hearing is not required, but it is at the Boards discretion to schedule one if they feel one is necessary. However, we do need to refer it to the County for 239 review. That way we can get their feedback before you make your decision. Chairman Lara – I know the applicant is looking for some sort of approval, so they can open in time for spring as they are a landscaping company, and this project is pretty straight forward. Do we have to wait for the 239 response before we do anything? Helen Budrock – I will defer that question to Paula, but because it is on a county road and within 500 feet of a municipal boundary, it will have to be referred. Chairman Lara – What I was asking is if we can make a motion subject to their review. Jim Carnell – I don't have the information readily accessible, but I think the County gave both the Planning and Zoning Board a list, for the 239 reviews, of minor or incidental type of actions that would not require their review and I think this project may fall under that list. Paula, maybe you remember better. Paula Kay – I remember that and I am looking for the list now. Jim Carnell – There is going to be no change to the building or the traffic code and it is a similar use to the prior facility, so this may be exempt from the 239 review. Paula Kay – I think it is too and it would be similar to what the Board just did in Rock Hill with the car wash. Kristin Boyd – Plus there is no access from Cold Spring. Chairman Lara – Right and the whole project fits. Paula Kay – I don't think this will be subject to 239 because of the change in use and based on their new schedule. Matt Sickler – I can tell you that if DPW had any comments to make, it would probably be to put some kind of a barrier along the entrance for the customer parking, so that the vehicles are forced to come out onto Schroder, and not onto Cold Spring. This way there isn't a problem with someone turning in off Cold Spring and someone leaving. Michael Croissant – You can even do that with raised flower beds. Chairman Lara – True. It could be part of your landscaping. I think we could go ahead and give approvals subject to adding barriers as Matt Sickler had explained. Paula Kay – That would work. Matt Sickler – If you have any questions give me a call and we can go over it again. Jamie Banks – Okay.

A motion to take the agenda out of order, so the Board can act on this project now, was made by Michael Croissant and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to approve the site plan, subject to physical barriers being installed to prevent traffic from pulling out close to Cold Spring Road, was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Christina Cellini.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

PRESTIGE EST. BUNGALOW COLONY
220 Cold Spring Road, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn – Project representative

Joel Kohn – This is a project that Keystone is handling, but Ken Ellsworth couldn't be here tonight. This is a 100-unit bungalow colony that I was told was here in front of you a couple months ago. It is a 58-acre parcel located on Cold Spring Road in the RR-1 zone. It is currently a vacant lot. It will be a total of 58 single units and 21 duplex buildings, so that will be a total of another 42 units, making 100 units. There will also be some recreational facilities. They submitted a long form EAF today and their SWPP has been

completed and sent to the Town's engineer. Water and sewer are being worked on. Keystone had discussions with Matt and Mike Messenger and they have to extend the Town's water and sewer district. They will improve the Town's system that is in poor shape over in that area. They will basically develop a well, that is currently not on line, and they will put a 500,000-gallon water tank on their property, that will be dedicated to the Town afterwards. Their plan is 90% completed and they are looking tonight to have the Board declare themselves Lead Agency, refer it to the County for 239 review and schedule a public hearing.

Chairman Lara – Will the tank be used just by them? Joel Kohn – No. It is for the whole water district.

Joel Kohn – They will work with the Town's engineer and the Town Board to get the water and sewer district extension and sign the proposed improvements.

Chairman Lara – Bungalow are very specific to what they can be, right? Joel Kohn – Yes and they will fit

in with the definition of a bungalow colony. Helen Budrock – As you know, what we have seen in most of our existing bungalow colonies are, single story structures. The code has very specific requirements for converting a bungalow into a year-round use, any expansions, and stuff like that. The code doesn't really speak on new bungalow colonies, as much as existing bungalow colonies, so what we have to rely on is that they are primary 1-story structures. I spoke to Ken from Keystone on Monday and he indicated that these would be 1-story units on basements. Technically it meets the definition of a bungalow colony. I did suggest he maybe called the units attached and detached bungalows on the site plan, instead of duplexes. This way it fits the codes definition.

Chairman Lara – Joel, why a bungalow colony verses a cluster development? Joel Kohn – That is the type of development allowed in the RR-1 zoning.

Chairman Lara – So then, my only comment on that would be, that if they are going to be full basements, they need to plan and include them as potential bedrooms in the future. Joel Kohn – Definitely. They will have to do it as if they have a full build-out plan of the basement. Matt Sickler – And that will be something water and sewer will take under consideration. Chairman Lara – Okay, thank you.

Helen Budrock – The other thing I mentioned to Ken was the recreation calculation based on 4 residents per unit, which seems a little low, but would you remind him to take another look at that and make sure you are meeting the open space requirements. Joel Kohn – I believe the way the code reads is the maximum is 4, so that is the way they would have to calculate it. Helen Budrock – Perfect. Thanks Joel.

Michael Croissant – Is the wetland in the back state or federal? Joel Kohn – It is noted as an ACOE wetland, which is a federal wetland by engineer terms. Michael Kohn – Are there any delineations done on that? Joel Kohn – I will have to make a note and ask Ken to address that.

Kristin Boyd – Are there 2 spaces per unit in front of each unit for parking? Joel Kohn – Yes. Kristin Boyd – Is there a space for guest parking? Joel Kohn – Yes. If you look at sheet C100 it shows off-street parking. There is a total 242 parking spaces and they only require 200. Kristin Boyd – These are proposed walking trails that I see here, right? Joel Kohn – Yes. Chairman Lara – Great because that road is scary to walk on. Joel Kohn – They will be quite a way from Cold Spring Road. Chairman Lara – This is right down the street from another big development, Cozy Acres, and we don't have an issue with them parking on the road, so I think that won't be an issue.

Kristin Boyd – There are 2 access in and off Cold Spring, right? Joel Kohn – Yes. Kristin Boyd – How is sight distance on those? Joel Kohn – I’m sure the sight distance is on the plans somewhere because they will need that for a permit from the County DPW, but I will make a note on that as well for Ken to address.

Michael Croissant – What type of action is this under SEQR? Joel Kohn – I believe it is an unlisted action. Helen Budrock – Yes and like Joel mentioned, at this point you can declare your intent to serve as Lead Agency, that way they can start working on circulation. Joel Kohn – And a referral for 239 review. Helen Budrock – Correct. According to my notes it looks like the EAF we have was submitted back in 2021, when the application was submitted. I know you have been going back and forth with getting the utilities, but has anything changed since then? Joel Kohn – I believe there was a long form part I that was submitted and added to the drive today. Helen Budrock – Okay, I see it. Joel Kohn – They were also hoping to get a public hearing scheduled. Helen Budrock – It would have to be the second meeting in April, which is the 26th. Joel Kohn – Right. Chairman Lara – Do you think you will have your water and sewer ironed out by then? Joel Kohn – No. It won’t be all worked out with the Town by then, but there is a plan that shows the water tank, the lines, and everything like that. They still have a long way to go to get DEC and DOH approvals, but I don’t think that will really affect the public hearing. Matt Sickler – Right. They have the general scope of things and all the details needed. Chairman Lara – Okay.

Chairman Lara – Matt, do you have any other comments? Matt Sickler – No. We received the new SWPPP, but we haven’t gotten through it yet. They are currently working on water and sewer, so we will have to review that as it progresses. I do not have any additional comments that pertain to SEQR.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion to take the agenda out of order, so that the Board can act on this project now, was made by Arthur Kapp and second by Christina Cellini.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to declare intent for Lead Agency was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to refer this project to the County for a 239 review was made by Michael Croissant and second by Christina Cellini.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to schedule a public hearing for April 26, 2023 was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Christina Cellini.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

COLD SPRING COTTAGES

378 Cold Spring Road, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This project is right up the street from the last project and is an existing bungalow colony with 46 units. They were in front of the Planning Board in 2019 and receive approval for 20 additional bungalows at the back portion of the property. They got all their approvals, but they did not do anything yet so the approval lapsed. They are coming back now, but instead of doing 20 additional units, they only want to do 12 units, but on the property to the side instead of the back of the property. They also own that property and it was part of that over all map we presented when we first came to the Board. The units will be 6 2-family bungalows with basements. The location of the new entrance will be the same as the one that was already approved by the County. The sight distance and everything was already done, so we would just have to get the permit for that. Their water and sewer will also stay the same as it was with the proposed 20 units.

Chairman Lara – Did you look at water and sewer for this yet? Matt Sickler – No, not yet. I know the plan indicate capacity so we will take a look at that and confirm it. I'm sure as the plan develops, they will show they sewer and water line extensions and things like that. Joel Kohn – Right.

Jim Carnell – DO you want to brief the Board on the existing conditions of the property next door. Joel Kohn – It is a bunch of dilapidated buildings, so this will be an improvement. Jim Carnell – When this was originally in front of the Board and they got their approval for 20 units, one of the Building Dept. concerns was the condition of these buildings. At that time, they had just recently acquired this property and didn't really know what they were going to do with those buildings, so I think this is one way of getting rid of those decapitated buildings. For them to move forward, the existing structures will have to be demolished and the sooner the better. Joel Kohn – Right and the existing buildings are closer to the road then the setbacks allow and the new units will be within the setbacks, so it is a lot improvement. Michael Croissant – Why did you decide not to build in the back? Owner - This portion of the property is too steep to do the roadways and it was easier to build on the other property. Jim Carnell – Plus the back side of the property is heavily wooded and this one over here is pretty much already cleared at the front. Michael Croissant – Do you have it closer to the road now in preparation for more units later? Joel Kohn – They may come back in 5 years and request to add some more units, but currently there is no plan for any additional units. Michael Croissant – What is the setback to the road? Joel Kohn – 100 feet. Michael Croissant – And they are 2 separate parcels, right? Joel Kohn – Right. Chairman Lara – Are you looking to demolish those buildings now, while you are doing sketch plan review, or are you waiting until the SEQR process is started? Joel Kohn - I think it makes sense to wait to demolish everything until the site work is approved so it can all be done at one time.

Helen Budrock – Will these new units will be part of the exiting community and be using those community buildings and amenities? Joel Kohn – Yes. Helen Budrock – I know it is just conceptual at this point, but is there any way you can so pedestrian connection between the two? Maybe extend the existing walkway for people who need to go to the community buildings. Joel Kohn – Sure. We can show that. Helen Budrock – Is there a playground at the current bungalow colony? Joel Kohn – Yes, more than 1. Helen Budrock – Okay because maybe the new area would be a good spot for another one or some kind of other recreational amenity. Joel Kohn – Okay. We will discuss that further. Michael Croissant – Are you going to throw some landscaping in too? Joel Kohn – Sure.

Joel Kohn – If there is no other input from the Board, I think the next step would be to declare Lead Agency, request a 239 review and schedule a public hearing, when they are ready. Helen Budrock – This is a permitted use, so a public hearing is not required, but the Board can always request one. It is an unlisted action under SEQR, so you could do Lead Agency and a 239 referral tonight and then decide later as to if you think a public hearing would be helpful. Joel Kohn – Last time we were here we did do a public hearing and I believe that there was no public comment or any public that came out for this. Jim Carnell – We can go back and check the minutes. Joel Kohn – If there was no public comment, we would appreciate it if the Board would waive the public hearing. Paula Kay – I don't see a problem with that. Even if there was comment, it was very light and this is essentially the same project just with less units. Chairman Lara – Plus surrounding it is project just like this. Kristin Boyd – And it's improving an existing condition. Chairman Lara – I think the Board is in agreeance that a second public hearing is not necessary. Joel Kohn – Thank you. Do we need to recirculate Lead Agency notices? Helen Budrock – I don't think it needs to be recirculated as it is still the same agencies involved, unless Paula disagrees. Paula Kay – I agree. Helen Budrock – Okay, then you will come back after we get the County's comment and present any changes made to the plan.

A motion to take the agenda out of order, so the Board can act on this project now, was made by Michael Croissant and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to declare the intent to serve as Lead Agency was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kristin Boyd.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to refer this project to the County for 239 review was made by Christina Cellini and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

RAL HAL

Heiden Road & Basswood Place, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This is a property right on the boundary of Thompson and Fallsburg and was the old Raleigh Hotel. It is an 11.4-acre parcel that they are proposing to subdivided off a 2.5-acre parcel. This parcel will be for a residential house with water and sewer. The house is going to be used for the caretaker of the development behind it, which is a project in the Town of Fallsburg. This is Heiden Road and this is the main entrance and there is a private road here that goes to the development.

Chairman Lara – Matt, you have anything for this? Matt Sickler – I don't see an issue with the watts, we will just need the info for the septic and the well location.

Jim Carnell – This subdivision will be creating a land-locked parcel. Joel Kohn – There will be a drive. Jim Carnell – Although this private road may exist, it's not going to have deeded access to this parcel. Joel

Kohn – We can have that worked out. It is not an issue. Jim Carnell – Maybe we want to see something filed before we get too far ahead with this. Chairman Lara – Right. I didn't realize it was a private road. Michael Croissant – We would need to see deeded access. What does the road service now? Jim Carnell – It used to go to a parking lot for the Raleigh but has been improved since then. Joel Kohn – We will look into getting deeded access.

Kristin Boyd – The proposed house will meet setback and all of that? Joel Kohn – Yes. Minimum lot size is 40,000 sq. ft. and this is 120,000 sq. ft.

Jim Carnell – Why subdivide? There is already an existing house and this lot and you are proposing to build a house on this lot. Joel Kohn – That is a great point because I believe the zoning does allow for up to two houses, if we can show they're subdividable. They would still need an easement, but it can be done. I will discuss this with them, but they might want separate ownership. Paula Kay – You may need a road maintenance agreement too if they are going to be separate owners. Joel Kohn – Right. I think there is already one in place for the property behind, but I will check. Paula Kay – This will need its own. Joel Kohn – Okay.

Chairman Lara – We can but this back on for the last meeting in April. That should give you enough time to finish up everything, or decide if you are even going to go forward. Joel Kohn – Okay.

ACTION ITEMS:

CONCORD ASSOCIATES

Concord Road, Monticello, NY
Henry Zabotta, Project representative

Henry Zabotta – We are looking for a 6-month extension on the approval for this project tonight. Our approval expired March 16th of this year, so that would take us to September 16th. When I was here last asking for an extension for the Concord Fairways project, adjacent to this project, the Board asked for an update on these projects and our issue with water. We had discussions with the Town's supervisor and attorney and, subsequently, we received a letter requesting that we escrow funds to prepare a map plan and report for an extension of the Adalar water district. This way, we can enter in to it. We funded that escrow and I believe a resolution was past at the March 7th Town Board meeting requesting that the Town's engineer prepare the map plan and report to see if we can get in to the district. I don't know how long it will take to prepare that map plan and report, but I know we can start taking some actions and do something with the properties once that is done.

Matt Sickler – I am involved with map plan and report and we have had discussions about getting it started. It will be about a 4-to-6-week process. Henry Zabotta – Alright. Obviously, we can't do anything without water, but as soon as we have it, we can start to make some progress. Chairman Lara – Correct and that is the number one issue with most developments in the town right now.

Paula Kay – I wanted to point out for the record, that even though the extension ran out on March 16th, Concord Associates applied prior to the 16th and would have been at our prior meet, but it was cancelled due to there not being a forum.

A motion to approve the extension until September 14, 2023 was made by Michael Croissant and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

SACKETT LAKE LP

NYS Route 42 & Sackett Lake Road, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Steve

Rabbi Schwartz, Project owner

Joel Kohn – This project is on the corner of Route 42 and Sackett Lake Road. We were in front of this Board almost a year ago to combined some lots and then re-subdivide them into 5 separate lots. This way they can do a bungalow colony with 167 units, a townhouse development of 32 units, a commercial strip, and turning the Mr. Willy's building into a community building. Since the Town Board changed the definition of bungalow colonies in 2020 to predominantly 1-story structures, and this project was proposing to have predominantly 2-story structures, the Planning Board suggested we either go for a variance or go to the Town Board and create a Planned Unit Development (PUD). This past December, we submitted a draft of the PUD to the Town Board. They had some input on changes they wanted to see and adding additional language to the PUD. Those things were addressed and we went back in front of them last night. Paula has to make some additional changes to the language, but they referred it back to the Planning Board, at this time, for their input on the PUD. I guess the Planning Board will review that at the next meeting or the one after. Site plan engineering is advancing with wetland boundary and topographic surveys and a traffic study has been done. Lead agency notice were circulated, the Board previously declared themselves as Lead Agency. EAF parts I and II have been submitted and we got DOH well location approval for five wells. Three wells were already drilled and another two wells are planned to be drilled soon. We got building permits for the wells and got the fire department review. The traffic study was already reviewed by the Town's traffic engineer who had some comments. Our traffic engineer did respond to those, but I'm not sure if the Town's engineer got them. I forwarded them to Helen who forwarded them to Jay on Monday, but I don't think he has replied as of yet. This project was also already sent to the County for 239 review and they had some comments too. I'm not sure if you had a chance to review their 239 determination recently, but their first page was basically DPW comments, which will be cover as a requirement of applying for the County road permit, and the second page there are about four comments. Those comments were about circulation, wild life protection, lot configuration and EV charging stations. We can address them now, or we can address them when we come back for a public hearing, which we were hoping to get scheduled tonight for the April 26th meeting.

Helen Budrock – Was one of the changes the Town Board made a reduction to the number of units? Joel Kohn – No. It's still 199 units, which is below the maximum permitted density in the zone. Hellen Budrock – Has the site plan changed in any way since the discussions with the them? Paula Kay – No, I don't think so. Joel Kohn – That is correct.

Paula Kay – If the public hearing gets scheduled for the 26th, maybe the Board can discuss the PUD at that meeting as well. Joel Kohn – Right. Paula Kay – The changes I have to make to the PUD language is minimal. It is really just word choices and things like that. I just want to go through and make sure everything is consistent. Chairman Lara – I think this project will have a big public turn out and I know you are still looking to get a public hearing scheduled tonight for the Lefkowitz project, which will also probably have a big public turn out. I don't mind scheduling this project for a public hearing the second meeting in April, but Lefkowitz will have to wait until the first meeting in May. Plus, this would be the second public hearing scheduled for that April meeting and this project is further along than Lefkowitz. Joel Kohn – I was hoping to get them both on for the April 26th meeting, but I understand. Paula Kay – I think it would make more sense to see this project get the sooner public hearing date, as the Town sent a referral on this project. That way Joel does not have to make the decision between his clients. Kristin Boyd – Joel, just be ready to talk about lighting and stuff like that when you come for the public hearing. Chairman Lara – Walking paths, landscaping, etc. Joel Kohn – I don't know if you had a chance to look at the site plan, there is a lot of walking paths already and some more will be added. This will be a walking community and that's why the design is a lot of cul-de-sacs. That way there isn't a lot of vehicles going from one street to another. There will be walkability from one end of the project to the other. The Town Board also wanted all access to community buildings to be internal, to avoid walking on the roads. We do not show connection between all of the lots yet, but there will be. Helen Budrock – I had also made a comment previously about the lack of a playground or any kind of recreation on the Townhouse lot. That was before you started the PUD process, but I would appreciate it if you could still look into room that. Michael Croissant – Do recreational fees apply to a PUD as well? Paula Kay – Yes.

A motion to schedule a public hearing on April 26, 2023 was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Michael Croissant.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

CENTER FOR DISCOVERY – SPECIALTY HOSPITAL

Lake Louise Marie Road, Rock Hill, NY

Glenn Smith, Project engineer

The Board made a motion, after the public hearings, to take the agenda out of order so that the Board could discuss and/or act on this project first.

Glenn Smith – This is the former Frontier building that is being converted into the Center for Discovery's Specialty Hospital. They basically want to add a greenhouse to the previously approved site plan. It will be a 96'x120' building located at the back of the hospital. The Town code allows various uses for garden shops or greenhouses and permitted use is not subject to Planning Board approval, by in my opinion it is an accessory use as what they are growing in the greenhouse will be for Center for Discovery folks at the

Harris and Town of Fallsburg locations. They have way more parking than they need, so they will put it where one of the parking lots close to the building is, that way people from the hospital and people being bused in can access it easily. That is pretty much the gist of it.

Chairman Lara – Jim, is that allowed and permitted? Jim Carnell – Yes. Chairman Lara – Helen, do I need to do a NEG DEC? Helen Budrock – No, it is a Type II action.

No further questions from the Board.

A motion to approve the minor modification to a previously approved site plan was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kristin Boyd.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

LEFKOWITZ BUNGALOWS

177 Old Route 17, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Product representative

Joel Kohn – This is basically an existing bungalow colony that has been used as a camp for the last couple years it was open. It is my understanding that they did not get formal approval to change the use, so that will need to be part of the site plan approval. They are demolishing and replacing the 2-story building next to the road and that will become a 3-story dorm building. They got a building permit to demolish and replace building 29. They didn't need site plan approval for that, but will need it for the decks because they will make the building over the 15%. Building 23 is being renovated and building 31 is a proposed shul and dining room building. At the last meeting questions were raised about adequate parking. There has not been any issues in the past with parking, but the Board wanted to see delineated parking spaces. We are now showing parking here and additional gravel parking back here, which should be more than enough for day usage and visiting days. Lot coverage has been updated, as Helen had requested. It shows existing and proposed lot coverage. Water and sewer plans have not been completed yet, but I would say they are 50%-60% completed. We are looking to eventually replace all of the sewer systems on the property. As that will be for next season, and not this season, the Board asked we have smoke testing done on the current systems. That will be done prior to occupation to make sure we don't have any leaks or raw sewage on the ground. What we are looking for tonight is for the Board to declare Lead Agency, a referral to the County for 239 review, and to schedule a public hearing.

Chairman Lara – We previously asked about bus access. Joel Kohn – If you look at the plan, this is where the buses will come to load and unload. There will not be a lot of busing for this project as the campers will be sleeping there overnight. There may be two or three buses in the morning or in the afternoon taking campers to other camps off-site. Chairman Lara – As a Planning Board we have to think about what happens if they sell it. The current owner may not have a lot of busing needs, but the next one might. We want to make sure if it was ever sold and there was a need for more buses, there would be room. Joel Kohn – There is some open space in the back that could be used if needed in the future.

Chairman Lara – I have a note here that there was no SPDES permit, but don't remember why I wrote it. Joel Kohn – One of the first things I noticed was this property never had a SPDES permit, so we are working towards getting one. Chairman Lara – Matt, do you have anything to add. Matt Sickler – No. They are working to get a SPDES permit and as the stormwater and water/sewer develops, we will take a look at that. As of right now, I have nothing additional. Jim Carnell – Matt, maybe you or your team can stop by when they smoke test. That way if there are any breaks or failure of any kind, you can make suggestions about any repairs that need to be done. Matt Sickler – That is fine. We can stop by when it is time. Joel Kohn – Okay. We will start working on this and reach out to Matt's office when we are ready.

A motion to declare Lead Agency was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kristin Boyd.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to refer this project to the County for 239 review was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Christina Cellini.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to schedule a public hearing for May 9, 2023 was made by Christina Cellini and second by Kristin Boyd.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

JOYLAND GARDEN

123, 131 & 135 Joyland Road, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This project is a simple one as it is a lot improvement. This is currently 3 lots with a house on each. We are just looking to shift one of the lot lines so that we end up with 3 pretty equal lots. The houses are not in good condition, so they will be demolished and re-built with 2-family homes. We show the well and septic for each house on the plans. What we need from the Board is approval for the lot line improvement and site plan approval for the homes.

Chairman Lara – Jim, I believe this is the project that you said you were glad to see happen as these houses were in bad shape, right? Jim Carnell – Right and this is a true lot improvement. Chairman Lara – Okay. Just remember with lot improvements you need to file deeds to make it so. Joel Kohn – We will. No worries.

Chairman Lara – Matt, do you have any questions? Matt Sickler – No. As Joel mentioned each house has its own well and septic and they have been designed for a duplex unit.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion to approve the lot line change was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Christina Cellini.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion for final site plan approval was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Croissant.
All in favor, 0 opposed

Chairman Lara invited Board members and consultants to come to a 6:00 executive meeting the night of the next Planning Board meeting. This way they can discuss some possible changes to be made regarding the meetings and agendas.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers, Secretary

Town of Thompson Planning Board