

APPROVED

TOWN OF THOMPSON
PLANNING BOARD
December 13, 2023

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

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

A motion to approve the October 25, 2023 minutes was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Christina Cellini.

All in favor, 0 opposed

PUBLIC HEARING:

VERIZON WIRELESS

585 South Maplewood Road, Monticello, NY
Scott Olsen, Project Representative

Chairman Lara read the legal notice aloud.

Legal notice mailings were received.

Scott Olsen – We are proposing to build a new cell tower facility at the intersection of South Maplewood Road and Sackett Lake Road. It is the same property as the solar farm and because of its existence, we are proposing to build the cell tower on the southern portion of the property. I know that some members of the Board, if not all, do not like how close it is proposed to be to Sackett Lake Road, however, there is really no other place on this property that it could go. The tower will be 180 feet tall, which is a tall tower, but due to the topography in this region, the height is necessary to provide service. We did perform a balloon test for visual analysis and we were pleasantly surprised because we expected a tower of this height to be more visible. I am not saying it will not be visible, but from the 23 locations we looked at, it was visible from 5 of them. We also have provided a pretty extensive analysis from our RF engineer, which your RF engineer, Mr. Johnson, has reviewed. Mr. Johnson had some questions to which we provided supplemental reviews for. One of the supplemental reviews looked into the minimum height justification.

Our engineer determined that the 180 feet is the minimum height required and I believe Mr. Johnson was in agreement with that. The other supplemental review was to see if there is any alternative location. We looked into three other possible locations; two located on Rubin Road and the third being the recreational property located to the east of the proposed property. We provided RF documentation on those and the outcome is that they would not cover the six focus areas that we are looking to cover in order to provide service to this area. If we use one of the other alternative sites, one or more of those focus areas would suffer and we would not be able to accomplish what we are looking to do. Both RF engineers have joined the meeting tonight via Zoom, so I will let them speak to those reports and answer any questions you may have.

Chairman Lara – As this property is a hill, can you explain what will need to be done for the tower to sit straight? Scott Olson – We will have to do some excavation work and dig into the side of the hill, so that the tower can stand straight. There will also be an access drive off South Maplewood Road, so there will need to be some grading done for both the tower and the access drive. Chairman Lara – What size will the base of the tower be? Scott Olson – Our lease area is 100'x100', but the fenced compound will only be 65'x65'. Michael Croissant – Will you be grading the whole 100'x100' leased area? Scott Olson – No, it looks like it will only be the 65'x65' area with a little feathering off of that. Matt Sickler – But it will all be within the leased area? Scott Olson – Correct. Christina Cellini – Do you know what road the machinery used to excavate will be accessing the property from? Scott Olson – Not that I am aware of, but the usually do that kind of stuff during the design process.

Chairman Lara – Can you describe how Verizon determines a focus area? Scott Olson – It all starts by looking at the existing network and determining where there is a lack of coverage. Then an engineer will do an analysis to determine where a tower would need to go to provide coverage to those areas and prevent any gaps. The idea is for each area to overlap each other slightly so that when you leave one area your service is picked up by the next area before your call drops. And topography play a big role in determining a location.

Michael Croissant – What is the difference in coverage between this site and the other two Rubin Road sites? How many people would it actually affect if you chose one of those two locations instead? Scott Olson – We would not be able to reach or cover all 6 of the focus areas from either of the alternative sites and that would affect both residential and road coverage in those areas. Michael Croissant – But in return you would be shifting more coverage to another area, right? Scott Olson – Essentially, but we already have coverage in those areas and are looking to stay as central as possible in the search area. With this tower, in the proposed location, and the other three towers we have, we will be able to provide full coverage to all of Sullivan County.

Chairman Lara – One thing the Board is concerned about the aesthetics of the tower because Sackett Lake Road is the gateway into a lot of lake communities in the area and Town of Forestburgh. On top of that, it is proposed to be very close to the road and even though everyone in the area know there is a need for more coverage, they don't want to see it. Michael Croissant – I think you will find that this will be one of the biggest concerns the public will have. Scott Olson – We totally get it and if we could find another location that would work for all of our needs and help with the aesthetics, we would be proposing that site instead.

Chairman Lara – Bill, do you have anything you would like to add? Bill Johnson – I will screen share page #20 of the November 8th submission, which shows that the proposed site is pretty central to their six focus areas, but yet the search ring is dramatically to the west and south of those focus areas. Something must have changed during the design process to cause this change. There seems to be some disconnect

between the focus areas and the search ring, so that would be a question we would have. Scott Olsen – I think the answer to that can be found under exhibit or tab #6 of our analysis report, which is the site selection analysis portion. Bill Johnson – I don't think this is a question that needs to be answered tonight, but it is certainly one that is on the table and perhaps, when you get a chance, an engineer from your team can give a further explanation. Scott Olsen – Okay. I will make a note of that, so that we can address it.

No further questions and concerns from the Board.

The meeting was opened up to the public for comment.

Paula Kay brought to the Board's attention that there may be an issue with the Zoom link provided at the bottom of the agenda. There are people stating they cannot join the meeting using it. The people that were able to join the meeting stated they used the link provided on the website calendar. However, the website appeared to be down by the time this was discovered. Due to all of this, Paula Kay advised the Board that they might want to consider leaving the public hearing open for two weeks or until the next meeting.

Anthony (Tony) Poli, owner of proposed property – Stated that he felt that Verizon's engineer already explained clearly to the Board, at a previous meeting, why this site was not only the best choice and why the alternative sites would not work, but also the reason for them choosing this specific location on this site. He also mentioned that there are about 20 other things located along Sackett Lake that are worse to look at than a cell phone tower, including the solar farm located on the same property, and wanted to make it known that he is in favor for the proposed tower.

No further questions or comments from the public.

Due to the technical difficulties experienced when trying to access Zoom and even though Zoom is only offered as a courtesy and the actual meeting is the in-person meeting, the Board decided to leave the written portion of the public hearing open for 2 weeks. That way anyone who was unable to speak tonight can submit their comments in writing for the applicant to address. The Board also stated that this project still needs to be referred to the County for a 239 review, so there is still time before any approval can be granted.

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

All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to refer this project to the County for a 239 review was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kristin Boyd.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

ACTION ITEMS:

SUNSHINE ESTATES

221 Ranch Road, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – Previously this Board referred this project to the Zoning Board for some variance needed for a

proposed addition to one building and a deck that was started on another building. We went before the Zoning Board and the requested variances were approved, however, when the chairman from that Board, Mac, was out at the property, he noticed a deck that was added to unit 10 without a building permit or site plan approval. With that being said, we are back here tonight to get site plan approval for everything, except the deck on unit #10.

Chairman Lara – Can we approve this tonight knowing there is a violation on the property? Jim Carnell – I was also at the ZBA meeting and to the best of my knowledge, Mac did not see something under construction. He just saw something that he didn't think conformed to the site plan. I asked Brian from y department about it, but he wasn't aware of any violation. Chairman Lara – Okay, so we will go with the building department on this one.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

Chairman Lara – Do we need a NEG DEC for this project? Helen Budrock – I believe this is a type II action. Paula Kay – I think we should do one just to be safe as this is a colony.

A motion for a NEG DEC was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kristin Boyd.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to approve the minor modification to a previously approved site plan was made by Michel Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

LEISURE ACRES

Waverly Ave & Cold Spring Road, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This project is located at the intersection of Waverly Ave and Cold Spring Road and has been around for a few years. They got preliminary approve back in December of 2021 and the Planning Board allowed the start of infrastructure subject to a developer's agreement. That agreement was submitted in August of 2022 and approved in September of 2022, along with the establishing of park and rec frees. Since then, the infrastructure work has begun and DOH approval was recently obtained. The SWPP has been approved and has been acknowledged by the DEC. A performance bond was also excepted by the Town Board in September of this year, so just a few months ago. We are here tonight seeking final approval subject to any other comments that the Board may have.

Matt Sickler – I think the only other administrative item we would still need is the DEC approval for the sewer main extension. Joel Kohn – Which we don't have yet because we were waiting on one more item; a letter from the Village stating they have the capacity to treat this, which we have been waiting on since February. It was just handed over to the Village's engineer last week and we got approval from the engineer just yesterday. Matt Sickler – Okay. So, once we receive DEC's approval on that, I think we are good to go. Chairman Lara – So, is that something we can make conditioned on your final approval? Matt Sickler – That would be fine.

Joel Kohn – I also provided a draft approval resolution, but I'm not sure if Paula has had a chance to review that yet for final approval. Paula Kay – I did a brief review, but that is something that can also be a condition.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

Chairman Lara – Helen, do we need a NEG DEC for this project? Helen Budrock – One was already done.

Paula Kay – And just to remind the Board, this is also a special use permit. Joel Kohn – And a lot combo of 3 lots.

A motion to approve the site plan, special use permit, and the lot combination, subject to Matt Sickler's review of the DEC's approval of the sewer main extension and Paula Kay's review and approval of the approval resolution, was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

EXPRESS BSD

4682 State Route 42, Kiamesha Lake, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Maria Zeno, Project attorney

Maria Zeno – We are here seeking final approval for this project as we were able to get the expired variance re-approved by the Zoning Board.

Chairman Lara – This is here for both site plan approval and the combination of 3 lots, right? Joel Kohn – Right. Chairman Lara – And we still need full DOT approval and permitting? Joel Kohn – Correct.

Matt Sickler – Also, the site plan should show the final grading of the parking lot. Joel Kohn – Sure.

Helen Budrock – Previously the Board had an issue with the appearance of the property. Do we know if it has been cleaned up or maybe you want to make that a condition if you act tonight. There is currently a lot of banners and temporary signs. Maria Zeno – We can supply a rendering if the Board would like and maybe the approval can be conditioned on that. Chairman Lara – That would be great because we did previously ask for the site to be cleaned up. Michael Croissant – If it is not done by now, are they going to do it? Maria Zeno – They did clean it up and the trailers are gone, but I think you are now referring to the façade of the building. Helen Budrock – Right. There is a lot that can be improved. Maria Zeno – Okay. We can work on that and show it in a rendering.

Michael Croissant – My opinion is that we should wait for all of this stuff to be finished before we go any further. Michael Hoyt – I agree. Do we have plans for the proposed building yet? Joel Kohn – You mean building plans? Michael Hoyt – Just the dimensions and what they plan to do with the outside of the building. Joel Kohn – Are you talking about just the proposed building or the existing one as well? Michael Hoyt – Both. Joel Kohn – I have elevation views for the proposed building, which is the addition off the back of the existing building, but there are no colors or anything like that yet. Michael Croissant – I think we need to see that first. Chairman Lara – Helen, is this located in the Gateway? Helen Budrock – No, but it is on the Route 42 corridor and obviously very visible. Also, Gourmet Glatt is on the opposite corner and is coming along beautifully, so it would be nice if this could be comparable. Chairman Lara – I agree. Kristin Boyd – The rendering should also show any proposed lighting for the outside of the building. Joel Kohn – Any lighting will be night sky compliant, but we will make a note of that.

Chairman Lara – Will you guys be ready to come back in 2 weeks? Maria Zeno – I think so. What is that date? Joel Kohn – It will be the 27th. Maria Zeno – Okay. Paula Kay – And I'm sure you guys are keeping track, but you received ZBA approval back in August and that is good for 6 months. If you exceed that, you

will need to request a 6-month extension from the building department.

17 GIBBER ROAD

17 Gibber Road, Kiamesha Lake, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This is a simple request for a lot line change and they are looking to move the rear lot line up about 56 feet. Chairman Lara – Do you know why? Joel Kohn – I am not sure; I just know the 2 property owners have a deal to do this.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

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

DISCUSSION/POTENTIAL ACTION ITEMS
(as determined by the board):

GIBBER HOLDINGS

80 Gibber Road, Kiamesha Lake, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

FRASER RESORT

Fraser Road & State Route 42, Kiamesha Lake, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Chairman Lara – As we have been reviewing these two projects side by side, are you okay if we discuss them together tonight? Joel Kohn – That is fine.

Joel Kohn – We had a public hearing for both of these projects on September 27th and the only comment that was relevant to the projects pertained to Gibber Holdings. That comment was regarding the location of the garbage compactor because it was pretty close to the neighboring house. We have since relocated that and it is now a couple hundred feet from the property line, instead of right on the corner of the property. Other than that, we have addressed most of the SEQR requirements, wetlands have been addressed, traffic studies have been completed, even though I did not see any comments from your traffic consultant for those, wells were drilled and water samples submitted to DOH, final approval for the sewer district extensions, submission of both a NEG DEC and an approval resolution for attorney review, and SWPP plans for both projects have been submitted to the Town’s engineer for review. We did receive technical comments for the SWPPs and addressing those will be a little difficult for Faser Resorts, but should be pretty easy for Gibber Holdings.

Chairman Lara – Matt, can you briefly explain the SWPP issue for Faser Resorts? Matt Sickler – It has to do with modeling the post construction runoff. One of the first steps we take is to calculate is the time of concentration, which is the time it will take a raindrop to travel across the site. That is then input into the hydro pad model, along with other factors, and that generates the detention requirements for the site. Then the retention basins for the stormwater features is designed and input into the model. That tells you if you have reduced your post construction flows, to ensure you are not increasing water runoff onto other

properties. The design engineer who incorporated the travel time, in the time concentration calculation, used some stormwater features that I don't agree are appropriate. I think it lengthens the time of concentration which then reduces the required detention. I have gone back and forth with him a few times and got some information from DEC that was conveyed back to the design engineer a week or two ago. Hopefully they will take that into consideration and re-work their model for post construction.

Chairman Lara – Helen, I noticed there were some questions on the Project Overview form in regards to the EAF. Helen Budrock – It is not really questions, it is more of a reminder to fill out parts II and III of the EAF after the motion for a NEG DEC has been made, which it has. Giving the size of the project, we should make sure parts II & III get filled out. Joel Kohn – Should we fill those out? Paula Kay – Yes. Helen Budrock - However, I did have a question in regards to the traffic studies and if we ever received comments back as we have previously engaged our traffic consultant. Matt Sickler – I do not see any traffic information on the Drive for either project. Helen Budrock – I noticed the same thing, but my notes say we did engage our traffic consultant. Joel Kohn – I will check into that and re-send the studies if need be. Helen Budrock – Okay and once we have them, we can forward them on to our consultant and hopefully they can get us a response sometime in the next 2 weeks. Chairman Lara – That will also give Matt time to iron out the issues with the SWPP so that it is hopefully heading in the direction of being approved. Paula Kay – Also the Board has to authorize me to review the resolutions submitted.

The Board authorized Paula to review the resolutions.

CAMP ARUGATH HABOSEM

203 Whittaker Road, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – Back in 2021 this project got approvals for a couple of additions and a new shul building. Some of those approvals have been built and some have not been. The shul has not been built yet and they now want to change the configuration of that. Instead of being 50' x 60' building, with a basement, they now want it to be 50' x 80' one-story building, with no basement. They are also now proposing to add a porch to building #38 and an addition to building #6.

Chairman Lara – Jim, do you have any comments on this? Jim Carnell – I did a brief review and what they are proposing appears to meet all zoning requirements.

Chairman Lara – Matt, do you have any comments? Matt Sickler – No. I also took a brief look at this and it looks like the area of disturbance is less than an acre, so I just provided some erosion control details for the construction activities. I don't believe there is an increase in occupancy. Joel Kohn – There is not. Matt Sickler – So, their sewer capacity will not change.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

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

All in favor, 0 opposed.

CONG. ICHED ANASH – REPLACEMENT BUILDINGS

473 Anawana Lake Road, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This property is located on Anawana Lake Road and basically what they are looking to do is demolish buildings #1 & #2 and replace it with one larger building. They are not adding a lot of square footage. Building #1, which is an infirmary, is a one-story structure, but building #2, which is staff housing, is a 3 or 4-story building. The new building will only be a two-story structure with a basement. The square footage of the existing buildings is about 8,125 sq. ft. and the proposed building will be 8,604 sq. ft.

Jim Carnell – Is this tied into town sewer? Joel Kohn – No and the occupancy will remain the same. Jim Carnell – Okay. We will just have to make sure the old sewer lines get capped, which the building department will do as part of the inspection process.

Matt Sickler – Is this project also on the other side of the road? Joel Kohn – Yes. There is a pedestrian bridge because there is a classroom building and mikvah on the other side of the road. Matt Sickler – Does this side have a SWPPP? Joel Kohn – No. Matt Sickler – Okay, then we will just need the erosion control details. Joel Kohn – I believe sheet 3 shows that. Chairman Lara – Okay and to give Matt some time to review that, we can make his review a condition if we grant approval tonight.

Chairman Lara – Helen, does this need a NEG DEC? Helen Budrock – Yes, because it is over 400 sq. ft. and it is an accessory building.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion for a NEG DEC was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kristin Boyd.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to approve a minor modification to a previously approved site plan, subject to Matt Sickler's review of the erosion control details, was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

GARDEN HILL ESTATES

50 Strong Road, Harris, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This project got their overall approval back in 2016, which included a bunch of additions to units. Most of those additions have been built, but some of them have not been. They have been back over the last couple of years to modify and add some more additions to their site plan; the last time was in August for an addition to unit #1. They are now here tonight seeking approval to add an addition to unit #28.

Chairman Lara – How big is the addition? Joel John – 730 sq. ft. Chairman Lara – Matt, does that effect lot coverage or any other calculations? Matt Sickler – The addition will only affect the lot coverage minimally and it looks like there is some drainage that will need to be relocated, but that has been noted on the map. Joel Kohn – Right, the drainage will be re-routed and a new water line ran. Matt Sickler - It also looks like the addition will extend into 2 parking spaces, but I assume they will be relocating them to accommodate. Joel Kohn – That is correct. They will be shifted to the other side and that is shown on page 3.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion to approve a minor modification to a previously approved site plan was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Kristin Boyd.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

JUMPCHA PICNIC GROVE

410 Route 17B, Monticello, NY

Paula Kay advised that the representative for this project emailed in and is experiencing issues accessing the meeting via Zoom due to the technical difficulties. She suggested the Board make a motion to take the agenda out of order and revisit this project at the end of the meeting to give them some more time, but also advised the representative that the official meeting is the in-person meeting

A motion to take the agenda out of order was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Kristin Boyd.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

The Board came back to this project at the end of the meeting, but the representative was still not able to join the meeting, so they decided to move this project to the December 27th meeting.

CAMP MAYIN TOHAR

20 Fred Road, Monticello, NY

Michael Berta, project engineer

Michael Berta – The applicant is looking to add a couple of small additions. They want to build additions on two of the dorm buildings and increase the size of the shul. However, increasing the size of the shul building encroaches on the space required between it and the classroom building next to it. So, they are proposing to just connect the two buildings and add a couple off office spaces with the extra room.

Chairman Lara – Matt, would you speak on the density confusion please. Matt Sickler – The density on the bulk table is listed as two dwelling units per acre and the proposed number of dwelling units is 14. I wasn't sure how you got that from the number of staff and students. Michael Berta – I am new to this project and the last engineer has since retired, so getting information from him is challenging. I am trying to play catch up myself. Chairman Lara – We understand and just ask that you work on getting the correct information as soon as you can. Jim Carnell - Also, we checked with DOH, since they are the ones who issued the temporary residence for the camp, and the application submitted to them last year reflected 112 campers. So, again the numbers on the site plan are not coordinating with the numbers in the bulk table. Michael Berta – The addition to the dorms and the shul is so that they can increase the number of students. From what I have read on the DOH, they have an active SPDES permit that allows up to 80,000 gallons per day, and I believe are calculations are below that. I know that we cannot ever exceed that number and will work on getting the numbers fixed.

Chairman Lara – Jim, I know the building department has some issues with this site, can you please explain them? Jim Carnell – It is actually not as bad as you may think. In the past this project has come before the Board for some changes to their site plan, such as adding some new duplexes and a mikvah. They got their approvals and got their building permits for those approvals, but also did some work without a building permit, such as converting the old mikvah into a duplex. There were several things that were discovered during a routine fire inspection that took place after the new work was done. I have here with me tonight a

list of violations and even though it looks pretty bad, a lot of them have been closed out. Typically, when an applicant comes back in front of the Board, it is an opportune time to rectify any violations that may exist. I am sure this is the first time you are hearing of these violations, so you can come into the building department and we will work with you to get the information you need to be able to take care of these violations. Michael Berta – Okay.

Chairman Lara – I am not speaking for the Board, but I feel that this is a good opportunity to clean up the existing violations and then come back to us for site plan approval. Michael Hoyt – When was this last in front of us? Jim Carnell – I believe somewhere around 2017 or 2018. Michael Hoyt – I feel that we should also go back and make sure there are no outstanding conditions or promises that haven't been upheld from any of the previous approvals. Jim Carnell – Again, I would suggest you set up an appointment with the building department so that you can review any documents that are on file and maybe you can set up a site visit, so that someone can walk the site with you. Chairman Lara – I think that is a great idea. Michael Berta – I agree and that way I can become more familiar with this project.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

Chairman Lara – So, you will set up an appointment with the building department so that you can get everything buttoned up and then come back to us when you are done.

BLACK BEAR FUEL OIL

884 Old Route 17, Harris, NY
Glenn Smith, Project engineer

Glenn Smith – We were last here in May of this year and received approval to modify the site plan by expanding the existing building, for additional office space, and adding 2 pole barns to the property; one was 30'x90' and the other was 30'x100'. We are here tonight proposing to change the size of those pole barns to 35'x90' and 35'x100' as the trucks will not fit otherwise. This will reduce the opening of the driveway between the proposed pole barn and the office building from 20 feet to 15feet, however, the other side of the building has a 25' access drive, so there is access for the truck to get to the back of the building. It will also restrict the yard area as the additional 5 feet will be coming inwards as to not exceed the 30-foot setbacks, but the owner is fine with that because he needs the pole barn space.

No questions or comments from the Board.

A motion to approve a minor modification to the previously approved site plan was made by Michael Croissant and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

KITZ ROAD PRESTIGE ENERGY

Kitz Road, Mongaup Valley, NY
Glenn Smith, Project engineer

Paula Kay was recused.

Glenn Smith – This property is located on Kitz Road, which is off of Route 17B in Mongaup Valley, next to the Collin's Field. It is a 1.78-acre parcel of vacant land in the HC-1 zone, which permits warehouses, and

what the applicant is looking to do is build 2 commercial buildings; one for himself, Prestige Energy, and one for Silverman Mechanical. Access for these buildings will be off of Kits Road, so DOT will not have to get involved. Also, a big chunk of the field's parking is actually on this property and the owner is aware of that, so he wants to give them parking rights to the property because he has more than enough parking for his 2 buildings. Which by the way, will not be operating on evenings or the weekends, which is when most of the ball games are, so it shouldn't be a problem at all. Another option is to lay down some gravel on the portion of his property that is pushed up against the ball field's fence for additional field parking. There is also a big clearing if you drive back behind the field. I don't know if people already park there, but they may not because I believe that is technically part of Tetz's property. My point is that there is potential for plenty of parking. Each building will have its own well and there will be very little water usage. I think there will be about 12 employees in one building and 15 in the other, so they will only require a small septic system. It is all sand and gravel out there so we did not have any trouble with percolation or the test pits. That is pretty much it. The owner wanted to show this idea to the Board and get your feedback before he goes any further.

Chairman Lara – 17B can be scary, but I feel this is a half way decent intersection. Glenn Smith – Right, it would be the same as people accessing the ball field or Minsky's ice cream shop. They would turn off of 17B before they would need to stop to access the property. Plus, there is a 100 foot DOT right-of-way along that stretch of 17B for site distance purposes. Chairman Lara – I know this is not the applicant's problem, but that intersection is so wide that it is kind of a free for all there, so that is something he should just be aware of. Glenn Smith – I think as part of the 239 review the County will bring the DOT in on this, so we will be able to see if they have any comments. Kristin Boyd – Okay, because I make that turn a lot and I can confirm it is a little dicey there.

Chairman Lara – I would like to see some rendering of what the buildings will look like. Glenn Smith – The owner has already picked everything out, so we will get those submitted for our next meeting.

Matt Sickler – I know there is a delay in getting SWPPs reviewed these days, so I would suggest maybe submitting some kind of abbreviated report detailing how the stormwater will be managed. That way the Board may feel comfortable with what the process is going to be while waiting on DOH approvals.
Chairman Lara – I agree.

Glenn Smith – We will get you some more details so that you can refer this to the County for a 239 review and then come back to hopefully schedule a public hearing. Chairman Lara – And hopefully you can have a parking agreement in place by the time you come back.

SILVERCREST TOWN HOMES

92 Fairground Road, Monticello, NY

Amador Laput, Project Engineer

Lucas Spensieri, Property owner

Amador Laput – Since we were last here, we have been working with the town to figure out the water issue and there was some talk of hiring a hydrogeologist, but I don't know if that has been done yet.

Matt Sickler – To give a little back ground on this, this project has been in front of the Board for a while now and getting water and connecting to the Cold Spring water district has been the topic of discussion a few times. We also have the Prestige Estate project that are also looking to connect to the same water district, so each project will be responsible for their share of the improvement costs needed to make these

extensions happen. We have been in discussions with both projects regarding about what their projects requirements would consist of and the need for some additional source capacity; in other words, some more wells need to be developed at the Cold Spring site. That was started years ago by a different project that has since backed away. The Town Board has received a proposal from the hydrogeologist who was involved with the initial development of those wells, to do the additional testing that is now necessary; such as, pump testing for capacity, laboratory testing for DOH, and things like that. The Town Board just needs to engage him, if that is what the wish to do. At the same time, we have also been working with Mike Messenger on what the current systems needs are, so that we can group all of the requirements together for each project. I believe we have come up with the initial phase, which will consist of working on the existing wells, adding some additional storage at the wellhouse site, new busted pumps, and extending the main from the well house to the back of this project. All of that is in the works with the Town Board and I think that can probably be pursued concurrently with the Planning Board process. Ultimately, they will need to get their DEC and DOH approvals as well and hopefully all of that come together at the same time for them. Amador Laput – Do you know if the hydrogeologist matter is on the upcoming Town Board agenda? Matt Sickler – I am not sure, but I will follow up with the supervisor.

Amador Laput – Okay, so to keep this moving forward, I believe you mentioned that we would need a public hearing and I was wondering if that is something we can schedule tonight? Chairman Lara – Looking at the Project Overview form, it looks like we were asking for some more detail on the landscaping and the playground area. We haven't seen a landscaping plan yet and the only thing we have seen on recreation is a fenced in area, so I don't think we have really seen a full set of plans yet. Why don't you tell us what you have done to change the plans since you have last been here. Amador Laput – We are now proposing a total of 42 bigger townhouses, 26'x50', with 2 parking spaces each. There is also the fenced area for the playground, but we do not have any details on that equipment yet. Chairman Lara – We will want to see that for the public hearing. Matt Sickler – What other projects have presented to the Board in the past is renderings of what the playground equipment will look like or walking trials with exercise equipment on it or other things such as that. That way the Board can get an idea of the type and amount of recreation that is being proposed. Chairman Lara – Also, the public would probably like to see renderings of what the townhouses will look like. Remember you are basically selling this project to the public, so colored renderings would be nice. Paula Kay – And you might want to start looking at recreation in total for this project because there are rec fees that will be assessed by this Board and the more you have, the better chance you will have of those fees possibly being reduced. I don't think 1 or 2 playgrounds will warrant that reduction, so maybe you want to add some walking trails and/or ball courts as well. Amador Laput – Okay. Paula Kay – I think this will also require a 239. Chairman Lara – Right and I think we were waiting for better plans before we did that. If we did request a 239 review tonight, we would have to wait the 30 they require putting the public hearing into January. Helen Budrock – I think it will come back as incomplete if we send it without the landscaping/lighting plans. Chairman Lara – We could schedule it for the last meeting in January so that you would have a little bit of time to get the requested stuff together. Amador Laput – Okay and we will come up with the landscaping plans and the colored renderings we discussed. Paula Kay – You would have to have your updated plans submitted by the 24th of December to have time for the 239 review and legal notices. Chairman Lara – So, we can tentatively schedule it for the 24th and if that date doesn't work out, we can always reschedule it. Matt Sickler – And I will work to have an update on the water system improvements by the 24th as well.

A motion to schedule a public hearing for January 24, 2025 and refer this project to the County for a 239 review, only once all required updates have been made to the site plan and submitted, was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Michael Croissant.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

MONTICELLO KOSHER SUPERMARKET – VILLAGE 239 REFERRAL

507 Broadway, Monticello NY

This project received their approvals at last night's Village Planning Board meeting, so there was no need for this Board to review it anymore. Also, the project was not within 500 feet of any of the Town's boundary lines and should not have been referred to the Town for review.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers, Secretary

Town of Thompson Planning Board

