

APPROVED

TOWN OF THOMPSON
PLANNING BOARD
September 13, 2023

IN ATTENDANCE: Michael Croissant, Acting Chairman Paula Elaine Kay, Attorney
Michael Hoyt Jim Carnell, Building, Planning, Zoning
Arthur Knapp
Christina Cellini, Alternate
Matthew Sickler, Consulting Engineer
Helen Budrock, Sr. Planner, Delaware Engineering

Michael Croissant brought the meeting to order at 7:00 pm with a pledge to the flag.

Michael Croissant appointed Christina Cellini as a voting member for tonight's meeting.

A motion to approve the August 9, 2023 minutes was made Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed

ACTION ITEMS

CONCORD ASSOCIATES

Concord Road, Kiamesha Lake, NY
Henry Zabatta, Project representative

Henry Zabatta – We are here tonight to request another 6-month extension. As I said before at our previous meetings, we have funded the Town of Thompson to get a map, plan, and report prepared so that we can annex into the Adelar water district. We are still waiting on that and in the meantime, we are looking for an extension from September 14th to March 14th of next year.

Paula Kay – Do you have any sense of a time frame on when that map, plan, and report will be done?

Henry Zabatta – I haven't heard anything. Matt Sickler – I know that the map and the narrative description for the addition are done and we are working on the financial analysis with the Town's Comptroller at this time. It is probably a few months away from being completed. Henry Zabatta – Okay and once that is done, we will be able to approach the members of the Adelar water system and see if we can get in there. Paula Kay – Okay.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion to approve the 6-month extension, good to March 14, 2024, was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

16 FELDMAN CIRCLE SUBDIVISION

16 Feldman Circle, Kiamesha Lake, NY

Joel Kohn, Project attorney

Joel Kohn – This is a proposed minor, 2-lot subdivision Gibber Community; PUD #4. We were here last meeting for our initial discussion and realized that this would need a variance or possibly two. We did receive those two variances last night at the Zoning Board meeting and are here tonight seeking final approval.

Michael Croissant – Matt do you have any comments for this? Matt Sickler – No, but if you do choose to act tonight, I would just recommend it be conditioned on Mike Messenger’s review of the facility services.

Jim Carnell – There was no public comment at last night’s meeting, however, the one thing the Zoning Board did bring up was that the lot numbers and parcel numbers are a little confusing because this is in the PUD, and I just wanted to make sure the lot number is on the site plan. Joel Kohn – Yes. Both the tax map and file map numbers are listed on the property and under the description; “being known as lot 43”.

Helen Budrock – Was the reference to PUD #4 and the code referenced fixed on the map? Joel Kohn – It is not yet fixed, but I was going to ask for that as a condition. I am actually just waiting on the surveyor to send me the revised map. The new map will say “Planned Unit District #4” instead of “Planned Unit District #49” and Section 250-123F should be, I believe, 250-135F, as the code was rearranged a couple years ago.

Helen Budrock – Just for the record, this is a Type II action under SEQ, so nothing is required there.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion for final site plan approval, subject to Mike Messenger’s final approval and the revised site plan being submitted, was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Christina Cellini.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

VIZNITZ – 27 LOT SUBDIVISION

Gaffen Lane & Feldman Circle, Kiamesha Lake, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This is a 27-lot subdivision with a total of 93 homes and has been in front of the Planning Board for a few of years now. They received preliminary approval from this Board about 2 years ago and submitted everything to the DOH in the summer of 2021. That took over 2 years to get approved, but now that we have DOH approval, we are seeking final Planning Board approval and possibly a reduction in rec fees. Even though it is not shown on this plan, there will be an area provided in the development for recreation. Also, the development agreement in place includes full park & rec fees, however, the applicant would like to ask for a reduction in those fees.

Paula Kay – I’m not sure if it is in the Google Drive yet, but a set of plans for a basic park/playground area has been submitted. When Helen, Jim, and I met with the Viznitz Community, a little over a month ago, one of the biggest issues was the lack of playgrounds and park land, so I know I am really pleased to see that.

Joel Kohn – The plans that I have here with me tonight are the plans that have been approved by the DOH. Paula Kay – So, you have water now? Joel Kohn – Yes. We got DEC approval about a year ago, and the SWPP was approved in 2020, so the only thing we were waiting on was DOH approval. Paula Kay – Also, I believe there was a NEG DEC done in 2021. Joel Kohn – Correct.

Paula Kay – There are two separate approvals needed, one for site plan and one for subdivision, and the approval resolutions drafted include list of conditions. One of those conditions were engineering comments by the town engineer and there were six comments submitted yesterday by Matt. Joel, did you get to see those yet? Joel Kohn – No, not yet. Paula Kay – Okay. Those comments will be part of the conditions. Joel Kohn – Okay. Paula Kay - Matt, do you want to go over those? Matt Sickler – I can touch on those quickly:

- 1) Off-site water improvements. The DOH approval is for the water system on-site, but there are some needed off-site improvements, which include things like the main within the town road, the treatment house, and booster pumps, that we will need to see
- 2) The addition of a note stating the DOH approval was for 36,000 gallons per day, which equals 325 bedrooms. The table on the front of the plan should also reflect the same.
- 3) The revised estimated cost of the off-site water improvements.
- 4) The DOH noted that water withdrawal reports will be need from the DEC prior to wells being placed in service. I feel that should also take place prior to building permits or any certificates of occupancy, whichever the Board feels is appropriate.
- 5) Timing of the sewer improvements. Part of that involves one of the existing towns pumpstations downstream from the development and that just needs to be completed prior to this project generating flows. We can work out the timing of that with Mike Messenger.
- 6) Copy of the NYSDEC approval of the sewer system extension.

Michael Croissant – Jim, Is the pumpstation Matt is referring to the same pumpstation Kathleen had asked me to bring up? Jim Carnell – Yes. Mike Messenger had asked for shop drawings on the pumpstations and stuff, which I believe he hasn't gotten yet. Matt Sickler – I believe we got the pre-casts for the sewer manholes and stuff, but I think Mike's main concern is the lead times on getting the pumps. It sounds like Viznitz is ready for construction, but it may take some time to get the pumps they need. They should get started on that sooner rather than later, so that it doesn't hold up any construction. Joel Kohn – The shop drawings are currently being worked on and we are waiting on the rest of them to come in. So, in the meanwhile, we did ask the town engineer to review the other shop drawings that we were able to submit. That was about 4 to 5 weeks ago now. Matt Sickler – Okay. We will get those reviewed. Michael Croissant – So, that will all fall under the first condition, right? Matt Sickler – Yes. I think that would cove it all.

Paula Kay – Other conditions are:

- All approvals required for construction shall be obtained, including the water supply system.
- Payment of all required fees to the Town, including recreation fees in the amount of \$2,500 per unit, infrastructure inspection fees as determined by the town engineer, and any and all consulting and Planning Board fees. All fees must be paid prior to the Chair signing either the subdivision or site plan.
- Final revision to the site plan map reflecting any additional comments made by the made by the Planning Board, not currently reflected in the latest map that has been submitted.

Paula Kay – Is there any other conditions that the Board feels should be added. Arthur Knapp – No. I feel the conditions already listed should cover just about anything that may come up.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

Michael Croissant – I think we are ready for final approvals, right? Paula Kay – Do you want to do a separate motion for each approval or do them together? Arthur Knapp – Two separate motions. Michael Croissant – Yeah, I agree.

A motion to approve the 27-lot subdivision, subject to all conditions listed in the approval resolution, was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Christina Cellini.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion for final site plan approval, subject to all conditions listed in the approval resolution, was made

by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

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

DEB EL FOODS

64 Kutger Road, Thompsonville, NY
David Higgins, Project representative
Stosh Zamonsky, Anderson Design Co.
Elliot Gibber, Property owner

Paula Kay advised that even though this project is not on as an Action Item, the Board can act tonight if they feel they are ready to.

David Higgins – We were here 3 weeks ago and went through the revised plans. We were advised at that meeting to prepare draft approval resolutions, one for the site plan and one for the NEG DEC, and the NEG DEC itself and submit those to the town attorney for review. We did do that and we were also able to meet with the neighbor to discuss their concerns on the additional impacts our expansion may have on their property. During the site visit we were able to determine and agree that the changes to the wetlands were not as a result to Mr. Gibber. We have provided an email outlining that, which hopefully you revived, as well as a revised site plan. The revised plans included the erosion sediment control, which was part of the SWPP. We feel that we are ready for final approvals and hopefully we can get those tonight.

Michael Croissant – Were you able to determine what cause the wetland change? David Higgins – Well, they had two different wetland consultants delineate the wetlands. One was done around 2003 and then the other around 2021. With there being 2 different consultants and the delineation being done approximately 17 years apart, it is hard to tell why. One map had Topo on it and the other one didn't. Neither of the maps were confirmed by the US Army Corp of Engineers and even if they had been, they are only valid for a period of 5 years. We were able to show that there used to be a lagoon where the stormwater basin currently is on our property, so basically it is discharging in the same location the lagoon used to. Mike Rielly was the representative present for the neighbor and we were all able to agree upon the same conclusion. Arthur Knapp – Matt, you are fine with all of that? Matt Sickler – Yes. Like Dave said the delineations were done some time part from each other and it is hard to tell why there were changes to the wetlands or even why each consultant flagged them the way they did. I don't think anything that has previously been done or is currently being proposed to be done on the Deb-El property has any effect on that. David Higgins - However, during the site visit we did recognize that there was one element of the previously approved stormwater plan that had not been implemented. It was a dry swell, which was basically proposed behind one of the waste treatment buildings, so that needs to be done. I sent an email to the engineers stating that Mr. Gibber has committed to having that done. So, our surveyor will go stake it out over the next couple of weeks and install it, per the previously approved plan.

Christina Cellini – Just to clarify, this expansion will help eliminate the traffic on Rock Hill Drive, right?

David Higgins – Right because the truck will now go straight from this site to their delivery destination.

Michael Hoyt – And we have already seen a big improvement over on Rock Hill Drive, since we have started review.

Michael Croissant – Should we add the change to the berm, to increase site distance, as a condition. Paula Kay – Sure. As of right now the conditions are:

- The applicant will comply with all mitigations required by the Neg DEC

- The site plan will not be signed until all comments from the Town's planner and engineers have been addressed to their satisfaction and all fees paid
- The applicant shall obtain all necessary approvals from the Town of Thompson Highway Dept.
- The applicant shall obtain a SPDES permit for construction related land disturbance from the NYSDEC and provide a copy to the Town
- The applicant shall pay the infrastructure inspection fees as determined by the town engineer

Helen Budrock – I have in my noted that there will be a condition stating that the applicant commits to coordinate with the Highway Superintendent to install some additional speed limit signs. It may also be help full to put some kind of sign(s) to indicate that there will be trucks entering and exiting ahead. Paula Kay – Okay. We will add that as a condition as say any signage as determined by the Highway Supervisor.

No further questions of comments from the Board.

A motion for a NEG DEC was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Christina Cellini.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion for final site plan approval, subject to all conditions listed in the approval resolution, was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Chritina Cellini.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

GLEN WILD RE HOLDING

47 Katrina Falls Road, Rock Hill, NY

Tim Gottlieb, Project representative

Tim Gottlieb – Since we were last here, we addressed the Building Departments comments from the last meeting and are back hopefully for approval.

Paula Kay – Is it the site plan dated August 31st? Tim Gottlieb – Yes.

Matt Sickler – One of the comments was to add the hours of operation to the site plan. They have been added and they seem pretty standard, but there are some service vehicles that start pretty early depending on the weather and season. Tim Gottlieb – Right. In the summer they will start earlier to beat the heat and traffic. Matt Sickler – Just so that the Board is aware they are now on the plan and state they could start as early as 1:00 a.m., I believe. Tim Gottlieb – That is correct. Matt Sickler – Some of the other things that were asked for were:

- no unregistered vehicles or boats on the site
- not to use the site as a transfer station
- no unloading or loading of trucks on the site
- locate the septic system and show that on the plans
- identify and strip the employee parking area
- be more specific about what will be stored where

Michael Croissant – Has all of that been done? Matt Sickler – I don't things like the stripping of the employee parking lot has been done, but it has been added to the plan.

Michael Croissant – Jim, do you have anything to add? Jim Carnell – Not for this project. Michael Hoyt – Things have pretty much been cleaned up. Michael Croissant – I agree. I drove by there the other day and it looked good. Michael Hoyt – A lot of it has been moved to their other facility. Tim Gottlieb – Correct.

No other questions or comments from the Board.

Michael Croissant – Paula, can we act on this tonight? Paula Kay – You certainly can. Michael Croissant – How does the rest of the Board feel? Arthur Knapp – I feel the applicant has completed more this time around than ever before and he just needs to complete those last few steps. Tim Gottlieb – He plans to. He is laid up in the hospital for a couple of weeks, but I'm sure he has someone on it. Michael Croissant – Can we do an approval conditioned on Matt's final approval? Paula Kay – Yes.

A motion to for final site plan approval, subject to the town engineers final review and approval, was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

ESTATES OF ROCK HILL – SECTION B

N. Emerald Drive & Treasure Lake Road, Rock Hill, NY
Ronald Steinberg, Project attorney
Richard Steinberg, property owner

Michael Hoyt was recused.

Ronald Steinberg – Since we were last here, we submitted a revised subdivision plan for 7 lots, instead of the 3 lots previously proposed. All 7 lots will be on Treasure Lake Road.

Paula Kay – That is only one side of the parcel. Helen Budrock – That was my concern as well. Do you have plans to do anything with the rest of the parcel? Ronald Steinberg – In the future. We were thinking about apartments and other stuff. Paula Kay – Right, so what we asked for at the last meeting was for you to show what is contemplated for the whole parcel. Ronald Steinberg – We thought we would just tell you because the engineer was unable to show everything. Depending on the zoning we were thinking maybe even 60 to 80 ranch style houses. Paula Kay – We will definitely need to see that on your plan. Ronald Steinberg – We can add that on and have at least a sketch ready by the next meeting. We just weren't able to get the whole sketch by tonight. Helen Budrock – Even if it is going to be phased, the Board needs to see all proposed development at one time. Ronald Steinberg – It is going to be phased and will pretty much just need site plan approval because we are not subdividing it. Paula Kay – Right, but we still need to see it. Richard Steinberg – That has nothing to do with this lot. Ronald Steinberg – Those are going to be separate single-family homes on a different road. Richard Steinberg – With a road as a boundary separating the two. Ronald Steinberg – There no lot improvements. Paula Kay – Understood, but the Board asked you to come back with anything proposed on the parent parcel so they can have something on paper. Richard Steinberg – But it's just a piece of paper. It can always change. Paula Kay – We understand that. Richard Steinberg – All I can do is give you something conceptual. Paula Kay – Right. Ronald Steinberg – We can have it added to plan by the next meeting and were hoping to be able to schedule the public hearing tonight. Paula Kay – I don't think we are ready for that yet. We need something, even conceptual, on the whole parcel. Ronald Steinberg – But these are separate lots with a natural subdivision. Matt Sickler – Right, but they are under common ownership and the Board is looking to look at the overall impact to the community and environment. If they know that you intend to do something that close in proximity, the Board will then know they might want to look into the road frontage and possible do something there. Richard Steinberg – What would you want on the road frontage? Matt Sickler – That may not be specific to this project; I was just using it as an example. All I was getting at is the Board needs to see the overall impact to this area and community. Ronald Steinberg – These are 7 single family houses that are clearly within the zoning and already have water and sewer, so there would be no impact on the existing road. Paula Kay – Okay, but what we need you to do is come back with a conceptual plan for the whole piece that you own. Ronald Steinberg – But this piece is separate. Helen Budrock – Even though there is a natural subdivision, it is all one lot. Richard Steinberg – All I have to do is go into the Assessor's office tomorrow and ask them to change it and give me another lot number. Paula Kay – If that is what you want to do. At this time, it is one lot and the Board needs to review the entire parcel. If you do a subdivision, then things change. That is up

to you or you can come back and show the Board everything you plan to do. Richard Steinberg – Let me ask you this, if we give you something conceptual for the whole parcel and only plan to develop these 7 lots at this time, what changes the fact that the rest can be changed at any time or not built? Paula Kay – We understand that. Helen Budrock – And that is the case with any plan. Richard Steinberg – Okay, but I can tell you this, if I commit myself to these 7 houses, they are definitely going to go up and right away. Paula Kay – Okay, but you are not going to get the chance to put them up if you don't show the Board the full conceptual plan or get two separate parcel numbers. I think the Board made it pretty clear at the last meeting what they wanted. Ronald Steinberg – Well, we just thought they wanted to know our intentions. Paula Kay – Yes, but on paper. Ronald Steinberg – Well, you can put it on the record. Paula Kay – No, we need to see a concept plan. Richard Steinberg – So, what you are saying is if I get the Assessor to give me another lot number for the other piece, I don't have to come in with a concept plan? Helen Budrock – Not for the remaining piece, only for the 7 lots being proposed. Ronald Steinberg – Okay. I don't mind giving you a concept plan but it is too early for me to be able to guarantee what is going to happen. Arthur Knapp – We are not looking for a guarantee. Richard Steinberg – I will just go into the Assessor's office and have them subdivided because I can do that by law. Paula Kay – Right. Arthur Knapp – That is your choice. Richard Steinberg – I want to be able to give you an idea of what we want to put there. At the moment the only thing I can do with the other side of the property is something with a site plan because I can't subdivide it. Helen Budrock – Because you have to wait the 3 years. Richard Steinberg – Right. Helen Budrock – So the already proposed 7-lot subdivision already puts the project in the realty subdivision category. Ronald Steinberg – Correct. Helen Budrock – So, you will have to have to get all of the approvals required there and I believe at the last meeting Matt also had a comment about needing a SWPP. Richard Steinberg – We have no problem with that. Ronald Steinberg – And we already have water and sewer for those 7 lots, but we will have to get DEC approval for an extension from the sewer main.

Helen Budrock – I am not familiar with the history of parcel 52.V-3-25, which I believe this part of this, right? Richard Steinberg- Right. Helen Budrock – On the survey it refers to that lot as "open space parcel #3", or a portion thereof. When So, when Westfield Court was originally developed, was that lot intended to be open space? Richard Steinberg – We intended to give it to Emerald Green but they didn't want to take it because they had already run into a situation on a neighboring property, were they had to install quite a bit of retaining walls and they didn't want to put in any more retaining walls. Ronald Steinberg – But we anticipated needing sewer to these properties in the future so we extended the sewer into that property and that's what that parcel is. We were going to take an easement for that and give the parcel to Emerald Green. Helen Budrock – Okay, I understand. But the Westfield Court project was one of your projects, right? Ronald Steinberg – Yes. Helen Budrock – Okay. So, I just want to make it clear that there are no deed restrictions or any other kind of restrictions for that parcel. Ronald Steinberg – No, there are no restrictions. Helen Budrock – The survey doesn't show that area has been subdivided and built out, so I just wanted to make sure that it had been. Richard Steinberg – Yes, it has been subdivided and developed. Ronald Steinberg – But there is a sewer on that parcel and it was built there in anticipation of developing this project. Helen Budrock – Okay.

Matt Sickler – Have you reviewed the sewer extension with Mike Messenger yet? Richard Steinberg – Yes. I met him and Kieth Rieber out at the site. The hadn't realized that the sewer ran out that far, so they didn't have any issues. Matt Sickler – Okay.

Richard Steinberg – So, basically what you want from me is a sketch of what I can do with the property as of right now. I can have the surveyor do that, but it won't have any topography. Paula Kay – We just need a concept plan. Helen Budrock – So, a sketch plan would be fine. Richard Steinberg – Okay. Arthur Knapp – That way we can probably schedule the public hearing at the next meeting. Richard Steinberg – Okay. But, again, I just to say that the plan might change and I don't want to be committed to what I submit. Helen Budrock – That is fine. You can even put a note on the concept plan that says it is subject to change. Richard Steinberg – Okay.

LAKEVIEW ESTATES LLC (DAVID LANDAU)

358 Fraser Road, Units 358A & 358C, Kiamesha Lake, NY

Yisroel Zelcer, Property architect

David Landau, Property owner

Yisroel Zelcer – This property once had three existing units and one was destroyed in a fire, so there are currently two remaining units. We are proposing to demolish the two remaining units and built two larger units. One of those two units will be in full compliance with the setbacks and the other one needed a variance from the Zoning Board, for encroachment into the side yard setback, which we got last night. The project has central sewer so we are proposing to connect each unit into the town sewer.

Matt Sickler – One of Mike Messenger’s comments was that each building has its own sewer lateral, so I think the plan just needs to be updated to show that. Then there are just a couple clarifications; with the driveway widening, it looks like the covert will have to be replaced, so just check with the Highway Superintendent on that. I would also check with him on what appears to be a proposed sidewalk that extends through the road. I don’t know if you intend to add a sidewalk that leads to a crosswalk, but if so, I would just check with him on that. He usually doesn’t allow anything to be build in the town road right-of-way. Yisroel Zelcer – Okay.

Matt Sickler – Also, there is a note about the landscaping by the parking area. I don’t know if that is sufficient for the Board or if they want to see something more detailed. Michael Hoyt – I think there should be a little more detail. Matt Sickler – I am not familiar with this parcel and what is currently there in the front of the property. Yisroel Zelcer – Currently there is just a chain-link fence with no greenery. Paula Kay – So, perhaps that can be a condition; a landscape plan being approved by our planner.

Matt Sickler – Finally, there is a well shown under the deck of the front unit, does that supply water to these units, because the plan also shows a water main connection out front? Yisroel Zelcer – That well is capped off and not used. Matt Sickler – Okay. Maybe just show on the plan that it is capped. Yisroel Zelcer – Okay.

Jim Carnell – At last night’s ZBA meeting there was a lot of discussion about the possibility of shifting the building to fit both buildings fully within the setbacks, but in reality, they actually improved all of the setbacks from what was previously existing and now only a corner of one of the buildings would be encroaching. So, the pre-existing non-conformity has been greatly improved. This property is right across the street from what is now Autum Lake, so they have a pretty nice view and they did look into shifting the buildings around, but this is really the best way for it to be done so that both houses can enjoy the view. So, I would recommend any proposed landscaping be low because the whole purpose of them situating the buildings like this is for a good view of the lake.

Paula Kay – Also at the ZBA meeting last night, there was one public comment from a gentleman who owns property on the lake and he had a discussion with the Board, but that was it. Charistina Cellini – What did he have to say? Jim Carnell – He had received the public hearing notice due to the proximity of his property from this project. He didn’t see the plan and didn’t know what was being proposed, but once he understood what they were proposing, he didn’t have any issues. Christina Cellini – Okay.

Helen Budrock – So, as a recap for my notes, the conditions for final approval are:

- final review of the sewer laterals/site plan by the town Water & Sewer Superintendent/town engineer
- approval of landscape plan by the town planner/building department
- review of the proposed road crossing/sidewalk and driveway widening by the town Highway Superintendent

Michael Croissant – And the capped well. Paula Kay – That will fall under Matt's final review. Michael Croissant – Okay.

A motion for final site-plan approval, subject to the conditions listed above, was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Hoyt.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

ZASS ROCK HILL LLC

270 Rock Hill Drive, Rock Hill, NY

Abhishek (Abi) Patel, Property owner

Abi Patel – I am here tonight to propose a modification to my previously approved site plan. I am proposing to add a 12'x20' covering over the area where the cars enter the carwash. The purpose of this is to keep snow and ice off the driveway and it will also help cars stay in line.

Michael Croissant – Will this be a permanent structure or is it more like a tent? Abi Patel – It will be permanent and the roof will match the roof of the building, but the covering will only be 10 to 11 feet tall is shorter than the building. Michael Hoyt – Will the roof be flat? Abi Patel - It will match the building exactly, only shorter because we just want to cover the entrance. Helen Budrock – So, almost like a car port that you will pull under prior to entering the carwash? Abi Patel – Right. Matt Sickler – Will the sides be open? The sides will be closed and the only opening will be at the front and back for the cars to get through. The siding will also match the building.

Jim Carnell – This doesn't affect any of the parking or traffic flows or anything about that, so we are good there. Michael Croissant – Okay.

Christina Cellini – I know Mike Messenger had some comments about water drainage and the soap and all of that. Abi Patel – We took care of all of that and put in a water reclaim unit. Matt Sickler – You can see it on the revised plan. It sits kind of to the front of the building. Christina Cellini – Okay.

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.

MENACHEM GUREVITCH

827 Starlight Road, Monticello, NY

Yanky Prager, Project representative

Yanky Prager -There is an existing modular home on the property that we moved over about 300 feet from where it originally sat so that we can build a house there. We would now like to use that modular home as an accessory building, but it exceeds the maximum permitted square footage of 1,000 sq. ft. to be considered an accessory building, so we were told we would need Planning Board approval. The modular home is 1,250 sq. ft., but it is an already existing building on the property that the owner wants to use primarily for storage of a boat, jet skis, quads, and things like; there will be no living in the building. It will be more cost effective to use what already exists there.

Michael Croissant – Is there water and sewer to it? Yanky Prager – No, just electric. There will be no living space at all. Christina Cellini – Will there be heat in there? Yanky Prager – No.

Helen Budrock – So, I think this is essentially like an oversized garage, which we are used to seeing, right?
Jim Carnell – Right.

Michael Hoyt – What was it? A trailer or a building? Michael Croissant – It was a modular home when Mr. Gurevitch bought it. Michael Hoyt – On a foundation and the whole nine yards? Michael Croissant – Yes and then it was moved to the back so that he could build his house there. Paula Kay – Does anyone have a photo of it? Michael Croissant – I would imagine that it is still sitting where they moved it to and is probably accurate on Google Maps. Even if they still show it in the original spot, you can see what it looks like. Jim Carnell – You probably won't get to see too much detail that way, but you can at least see the size. Yanky Prager – It is just a rectangular box. There's nothing really to it.

Christina Cellini – Do you have any intentions of ever expanding it? Yanky Prager – No. Christina Cellini – And it will have a garage door? Yanky Prager – Yes. Helen Budrock – So, you will basically be gutting it? Yanky Prager – No. There is already a garage door in it. Paula Kay – Is this like a big glass structure? Michael Croissant – No. You are thinking of the house a couple doors down. The site looks really good. They built a big, beautiful house there and it is definitely a big improvement.

No further questions or comment from the Board.

A motion to approve the oversized accessory building was made by Christina Cellini and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

E. TETZ & SONS

Starlight Road & Route 17B, Monticello, NY

Michael (Mike) Fogel, Project attorney

Tyler Crossfit, Project geologist

Mike Fogel – We are seeking site plan approval in connection with what is now a DEC approved modification to add approximately 95.5 acres to the existing Mongaup quarry, which has been operated by E. Tetz & Son's and their predecessor for decades. It took almost 5 years to get DEC to approve this modification, but it was finally approved in August of this year. They acted as Lead agency for SEQR purposes, which the Town was identified as an involved agency for. We studied everything you can think of in connection with this project; noise, air, resources, potential impacts to surface and ground water, and visual impacts. Pretty much everything that you would expect us to review and I have provided a copy of the NEG DEC that the DEC adopted. Just for a visual, the box here on the DEC approved site plan is the existing quarry and this is the 95.5 acres we got approval for. Prior to approval and the permit being issued, the DEC did have a public hearing and comment period, for which there were no public comments received. The other permit that we required was a water draw permit, which we had to go through the Delaware River Basin Commission (DRBC) for. That was also a lengthy process, but we got that approval in June of this year. What's really important is that this additional acreage gives them additional reserves and really the business inventory for a quarry operation. While this gives them additional reserves, there is no actual changes in connections with the operations. The hours of operation, the method of operations, and access to the site, from 17B, will all stay the same. The only difference is they will have more reserves to be able to continue to operate and supply the demand for aggregate for road building and other construction activities.

Helen Budrock – Was DOT on of the involved agencies? Mike Fogel – I will have to double check on that, but they might not have been because we didn't need any approvals or permits from them. The existing entrance has been used forever, so I don't think they were, but I will check on that. Helen Budrock – Okay.

Michael Croissant – What do they do at Camp Road? Mike Fogel – So, as you will see there is now a piece of the abandoned Camp Road that runs through the modification area. In 2012 Gary Tetz approached the Town, in anticipation of this modification, and asked to change the zoning on this property to the Extractive Industry (EI) zone, which got approved, so the whole quarry including those 95 acres are in the EI zone. Around that same time, in 2013, the Town adopted a resolution and certification of abandonment for that portion of Camp Road at the company's request. Copies of those are included as Appendix B if you would like to see them. Michael Croissant – But, there definitely won't be an entrance off of this road, right? Mike Fogel – Right. Only from Route 17B.

Michael Croissant – I'm not sure exactly what it is called, but the thing that is used to catch all the silt down behind the Mobile station, will that also service the additional acreage? Tyler Crossfit – Yes, and as we are mining, any water that runs into that area will be diverted back into the historical area. Michael Croissant – And that is going to be big enough for the additional 95 acres. Tyler Crossfit – Yes, and that is something that was also looked at during the DEC application process. This here is the approved reclamation plan map, which kind of shows what the grades will be at the end of the mining life. As you can see, for decades this was our historical rec grading plan and it pretty much marches right into that new area seamlessly and all the grades are basically draining to the north. Michael Croissant – Okay.

Michael Croissant – There are two active eagles' nests out there, what is the distance that you guys are required to maintain? Mike Fogel – As part of the review we had to look at species and that was part of the NEG DEC. We are actually moving further away from those nests, but the DEC determined them to be inactive for at least the last 5 years. Michael Croissant – Really because I watch 2 eagles come of each nest just the past weekend. Mike Fogel – I am just going by what DEC said. Christina Cellini – Do you know what the distance required is though? Mike Fogel – There's no real requirement. Michael Croissant – Is this something the DEC has to put in writing or anything like that? Mike Fogel – No. They determined that there is no impact so there are no permit conditions in relation to that. Helen Budrock – They do mention there is no impact.

Matt Sickler – What is the time frame on working through all of those acres? Tyler Crossfit – Many, many years. There are still reserves within the existing quarry, so there is still some time before those acres will be touched. Mike Fogel – We wanted to get this started early because this kind of stuff takes a while and we wanted to get approvals before prior to the need.

Jim Carnell – The only thing I have to mention is that if something, as far as the mining operation or relocation of any processing equipment, will change on the site, that will probably prompt for additional site plan review by this Board. Mike Fogel – The site utilizes a portable plant and that plant kind of follows along the base of the active mining. There are areas identified on the plan as "PP1", "PP2", "PP3", etc. and the plant will pretty much move along that path as the mining progresses. Tyler Crossfit – We do show a permanent structure right here on the map and at the time this was created there was a portable plant mining a separate unit of red stone. That portable plant has since been removed but the structure will remain. But, if at anytime we need a shorted cycle plan between our work phases and our processing facility, obviously we will be coming before the Town again. Michael Croissant – Okay.

Arthur Knapp – My only concern is the width of Starlight Road and trucks being on there. Tyler Crossfit – All trucks will be coming in off Route 17 so that won't be an issue. Paula Kay – Nothing about the operation should be changing. Tyler Crossfit – Right.

Helen Budrock – Do you know if this Board need to declare themselves as Lead Agency for SEQR for this portion of the review? Mike Fogel – No. I think DEC is the Lead Agency and the Town is just an involved agency. Helen Budrock – Okay and this is a permitted use in the zone, so this Board does not require a public hearing, but you always have the option to. I know the DEC's public hearing didn't generate any public comments, but I don't think their process involves notifying any adjoined property owners. Mike

Fogel – We did have to supply the DEC with a list of adjoining owners, so I think they were noticed. Helen Budrock – Okay. Michael Croissant – I think we should have one too. Paula Kay – Okay and you can schedule that tonight if you'd like, as well as request the 239 review. Michael Croissant – Okay – So when can we have the public hearing? Jim Carnell – The County needs at least 30 days for their review. Helen Budrock – How is the second meeting in October? That will be the 25th. Does that work for you guys? Tyler Crossfit – Sure.

A motion to refer this project to the County for a 239 review and schedule a public hearing for October 25, 2023 was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Christina Cellini.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

The Board discussed adding the Windsor Hill (a/k/a RNR) project to the next meeting's agenda so that they can come back in front of the Board and discuss the location of their trash compactor as it is not where it should be.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers, Secretary

Town of Thompson Planning Board

