

TOWN OF THOMPSON
PLANNING BOARD
September 27, 2023

IN ATTENDANCE: Kathleen Lara, Chairman
Kristin Boyd
Arthur Knapp
Matthew Sickler, Consulting Engineer
Helen Budrock, Sr. Planner, Delaware Engineering
Paula Elaine Kay, Attorney
Jim Carnell, Building, Planning, Zoning
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 August 9, 2023 minutes was made Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed

PUBLIC HEARING

GIBBER HOLDING

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

FRASER RESORT

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

Both the Board and the applicant's representative agreed to hold the public hearing for both project at the same time. Even though the projects are two completely separate projects/developments, they are adjoining properties, with similar proposed developments and have couple shared agreements making them depend on one another. Additionally, any public comment will most likely apply to both projects.

Helen Budrock shared the site plan showing both proposed developments side-by-side for everyone to see.

Joel Kohn – I will start with Fraser Resort. This project is a proposed cluster development located on Faser Road and Route 42 and will be accessed from Fraser Road. It is a 38.5-acre parcel located right behind the former bowling alley. It is in the SR zone which allows for a cluster development, with a special use permit, and has a density of 2 units per acre; net acreage. This proposed cluster development is composed of 59 single family homes, a community building, two pools, sports courts, and playground areas. The project will preserve the wooded area as much as possible, like the area inside the loop. There will be an emergency access connection for this project through the Gibber Holdings project. That way if for any reason emergency vehicles cannot access the property from Faser Road, they can do so from Gibber Road and this will be for emergency use only. This project will be serviced by on-site wells and will connect to the Kiamesha Lake sewer district.

Joel Kohn - Gibber Holdings is very similar. It is also a proposed cluster development, but is located on Gibber Road and will be accessed from Gibber Road. There will be 2 access drives off of Gibber Road; one will be for primary access and the other will be for emergency access. It is a 29-acre property also located

in the SR district. This project will have 54 units along with a community building, daycare building, swimming pools, and playground areas. And will also be serviced by on-site wells and the Kiamesha sewer district.

Chairman Lara – Michael Croissant, who could not be here tonight, wanted to know how close the buildings are to any wetlands and how many wetland crossings there will be? Joel Kohn – These are all federal wetlands and not state wetlands, so they are not required to have any buffer, but if I would have to guess, the closest building is at least 15 feet or so away. We will develop around them without disturbing them, but there will be disturbance for the 3 wetland crossings as well as a stream crossing. All together there will be disturbance to about a tenth of an acre and we will need permits to do so. Copies of those permits will be submitted to the Town.

Chairman Lara – The Town law talks about cluster developments and outlines some things we need to make sure gets done as a Board. Those things are making sure you are protecting or enhancing wildlife habitat, protecting surface water quality, protecting scenic quality, and the provision of recreation facilities. Can you tell us again what recreation facilities they will be putting in? Joel Kohn – Looking at a cluster development verses a traditional subdivision, a traditional subdivision, which we have prepared based on the request of the Planning Board, will not have any recreation proposed, but will still have the same number of units. That way will also create more disturbance and imperviable surface. By doing a cluster development, the way it is shown here, we will be preserving a lot of wooded areas and there will be less wetland disturbance. With this layout each project will have two swimming pools and three playground areas and Fraser Resort will also have sports courts. Being each project has included recreation on the property, we will be asking for the reduced recreation fee of \$1,250 per unit and per project.

Chairman Lara – Paula or Helen, Michael Croissant also wanted to know if we are allowed to create our own setback distances for wetlands in a cluster development. Can we deny wetland and/or stream crossings? Paula Kay – The Board cannot create its own code, but it is very clear in the code section for cluster developments, that you have to promote the most appropriate use of land. They are allowed to disturb the state wetlands, but you want to make sure that there are open spaces and preserved areas, like Joel pointed out. They currently show the areas that will not be disturbed now, but what you may think about doing is, putting some language, like a conservation easement, stating they can't be disturbed now or ever. Chairman Lara – Meaning if the wetlands change in the future? Paula Kay – Meaning that they cannot develop any further in the future. The whole purpose of doing a cluster development is to get the most units possible and preserve the most space possible. So, that doesn't work if 10 years from now they add additional units. If the applicants are proposing the projects this way to preserve the space in the middle, then it needs to stay that way. Chairman Lara – Joel, is what is being proposed the maximum number of units that would be permitted? Joel Kohn – The density for these projects is based on 250-26, which talks about cluster developments. It states that any right-of-ways and wetlands, along with their buffers, if applicable, have to be subtracted from the total acreage to get the buildable acreage. Helen Budrock – As stated in my memo, even though this towns code isn't specifically written to require a traditional subdivision plat to establish the maximum number of units, the whole intent behind a cluster is that you should not have more units than you would be able to have if you went with a traditional subdivision. Chairman Lara – Matt, I know you gave me those numbers and I think they were always below the maximum number, right? Matt Sickler – I don't remember off the top of my head, but I believe that is correct. Also, as for the stream crossing, I believe that is a category "A" or "B", so it will require DEC approval and permits. Chairman Lara – Okay. Kristin Boyd – What is the buffer on state wetlands? Joel Kohn – a 100 feet. Kristin Boyd – And what is the distinctions between federal and state wetlands? Matt Sickler – I believe for it to be a state wetland, it has to be over 10 contiguous acres that are hydraulically connected. Helen Budrock – Anything over 12.7 acres in size is regulated by the state and anything below that is regulated by the feds or army corp.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

The meeting was opened up to the public.

Steven & Lorraine Rivela, residing at 59 Gibber Road – Stated they have resided on Gibber Road for over 23 years and had the below comments:

Privacy - People trespass on their property. They sit on our lawn, come on our porch and look through our windows, approach us continuously to ask us to sell, and we have even been asked to put up a privacy fence around our pool so that their community can't see us swim.

Lack of permits/permission -LED lights have been installed up and down the road without any kind of approval/permits. As much as I can appreciate things like that, everyone should have to go through the appropriate authorities. Asked if the Town should be enforcing such things, to which Chairman Lara advised that the Town does have enforcement for things like this and it has been brought to their attention.

Noise - People walk up and down the road at all hours of the night signing and chanting loudly and it is to the point that they can no longer leave their windows open.

Garbage – People just leave bags of garbage on the road assuming it will be picked up instead of disposing of it themselves.

Also asked the below questions:

- How much privacy will be between our house and the Gibber project?

Joel Kohn showed where their house was in comparison to the Gibber project and said there would be at least a 50-foot buffer of trees between the two. Paula Kay asked if the applicant could do better than that. And Matt Sickler pointed out that the project's garbage enclosure is right next to their home and should be relocated.

- How will the new, proposed village benefit them? Said that they had no say in the new, proposed village and had to turn to the media for any answer.

Chairman Lara advised that the new village has nothing to do with these applications or this Board. Also advised neither does the development that they are complaining about, but the Board will ask the applicant to make them aware of the comments that were made. Joel Kohn went on to say that these two projects have been in front of this Board for over 2 years, which is way before the village was ever proposed. The owner of Gibber Holdings is in the same boat as them and did not sign the petition for the new village. He also clarified that only Gibber Holdings will be included in the village boundary and Fraser Resort will not be.

No further questions or comments from the public.

A motion to close both public hearings 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 HOLDING

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

FRASER RESORT

Fraser Road & NYS Route 42, Kiamesha Lake, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative
Thomas Shepstone, project planner

Joel Kohn - We have Tom Shepstone here with us tonight. He wrote the memo addressing the Town Planner's memo expressing her concerns about the projects being considered as cluster developments, so I will let him speak on that.

Chairman Lara – The Board has been fortunate enough to have the guidance of our town engineer and town planner, as well as your memo, to help us better understand the cluster development process and we all have our own thoughts on this. Arty, do you want to talk a little bit about your thoughts on this?

Arthur Knapp – I think one of the main things I am getting feedback on, is the high-density housing of a cluster development. People don't understand exactly what the benefit is and what I have been explaining to them is, there is a plot of land and it will be utilized one of two ways. The units are either going to be spread out across the entirety of the property or clustered together to leave as much green space as possible. Our idea of green space is seeing trees and not being able to see our neighbor, but green space to someone coming from a city is seeing grass in their front or back yard. So, I personally like the idea of well organized, well-developed, high-density housing or cluster housing because the benefit for the community at large is better. Chairman Lara – Kristin, do you have anything to add? Kristin Boyd – Not at this moment.

Chairman Lara – I'm going to kind of dovetail off what Arty said, so you have to remember that the cliental for this development is a family community and they want to live this way. What I liked about both of these projects is that they are leaving a lot of open green space. Yes, there are so wetlands, but by minimizing and keeping the homes in a condensed space helps with that. It fits the character of the neighborhood with Viznitz, which is fairly high-density development, being right across the street. The only thing I would ask is if there is intension of finishing any of the basements, that be included in the sewer counts. Joel Kohn – These houses are typically 3-bedroom homes with unfinished basements and we have calculated the sewer counts for a maximum of 5 bedrooms. That way the basements can be finished in the future with no issues. Jim Carnell – Also, both of these projects were annexed into one of the towns sewer districts, which had to be approved by the Town Board, so all of those sewer calculations were part of the map plan and reports that were reviewed at that time. Matt Sickler – Right. There was a capacity calculation for the plant and the fees associated with those connections done during that review.

Chairman Lara – Perfect. Also, Jim and I talked about possibly having a set of elevations done for the properties and I will let him explain that a little more. Jim Carnell – A few of the more recent developments that have come before the Board with a similar design to these, homes that all pretty much look alike and have the same detentions, don't always seem to be situated well for the topography of that area. So, when it comes to the design elements of the overall project and getting into the final topos, I think it would be good to have the final elevations of the houses. There is no topo on this map here, but I'm sure it is not all flat. Matt Sickler – We are in the mist of reviewing the full set of plans that have been submitted for each project and that is something that we will look at, in terms of the floor elevation to the road and to the sewer as well. Chairman Lara – Okay.

Paula Kay – Can we talk a little more about the common and open space? Our cluster development code says that it all has to be owned under common ownership, which is generally an HOA. Will that be the case here? Joel Kohn – Yes. It will be owned by the condominium. Paula Kay – So, with it being common ownership, it will be hard to develop those areas in the future. Joel Kohn – Right. Once you have a condominium in place, it is hard to amend the declaration. Paula Kay – Even so, there may be some benefit to adding some language, especially for the more forested areas. Matt Sickler – Like maintaining the vegetation and forest. Whatever the current condition is or what the Board would like it to be. Arthur Knapp – I think we should identify all of the components. Joel Kohn – There is a LOD (limit of Disturbance, now listed on the plan, showing all of the wooded areas that are not to be disturbed during construction. So, in addition to that we can add a note that states those same areas are to always remain undisturbed. Thomas Shepstone – I would also like to just point out that these types of agreements tend to self-enforcing because if you have just one member of the association that doesn't agree, it can't happen.

Paula Kay – As the design of these cluster developments aren't what a typical cluster development looks like or what we are used to seeing, I think it would just be beneficial to add the language and think it would help with these being more applicable to our code requirements in regards to open space. Chairman Lara – I'm sure the layout of these were guided by the conditions of the properties. Joel Kohn – Sure. Helen Budrock – I know we are discussing the projects as a group, but I just want to remind the Board that in the cluster provision, the Board has the discretion to reduce the maximum number of units if you don't feel like the requirements for protection of wildlife habitats or protection of surface water have been adequately met. I don't necessarily have an issue with the Gibber development because there is just a tiny sliver of wetlands in the corner of the property and the units are not encroaching as close, but the layout of the Fraser development, due to the location of the wetlands throughout the whole property, has units that are very close to the wetlands. I would just ask the Board to consider possibly reducing the number of units for that project. That way they can be pulled away from the wetlands a little more or possibly maybe just reconfiguring the layout to accomplish the same thing. Even though there is no buffer required for state wetlands, a lot of people don't understand what wetlands are and what their economic benefits. They just view them as a swamp that is undesirable so they just want to fill it in for additional outside area. It is important to preserve those resources and even though they are not going to be impacted, I think it is a reasonable request to ask for buildings and high impact areas to be kept as far away as possible. Paula Kay – Maybe we should take a more intensive look at Fraser and identify the units that are more problematic. Helen Budrock – There are 4 units by the entry that are sandwiched in between the road and the stream and those concern me a little, but I am more concerned about the development in the center. The units in that middle cluster are a little further away, but the sports courts there are very close. I would just say they should take a closer look at how the units are oriented and see if there is a way to rearrange them that would allow for more space, even if that means eliminating a couple units. Joel Kohn – I get it and appreciate the comment; however, I would just like to add that developing a project is tough and there is a minimum number of units a project would have to get to be economical feasible. This project is economically feasible with the current number of proposed units and losing some would make it tight and possibly make them subject to a loss. I think Helen's concern is more geared towards the future development in the wetlands, so I am proposing that we add some wetland marker, which I have seen on some projects. They would be permeant makers that would indicate to everyone exactly where the wetlands are located and that they are protected. Chairman Lara – Can that be part of our agreement? Paula Kay – Yes. Matt Sickler – I would put it right on the site plan as well. Kristin Boyd – Maybe even some small fences in the back yard. Anything that visually distinguishes for people where the wetlands are located. Chairman Lara – Especially if it states it's protected. People seem to understand that it is special. Kristin Boyd – Perhaps there can be something within the HOA rules as well and possibly a consequence if violated. Chairman Lara – That makes since if they are going to sign a conservation easement. Helen Budrock – Again, it's all about awareness. Chairman Lara – Are people allowed to build on wetlands? Jim Carnell – Not generally. There is a permitting process that would have to be done first. Chairman Lara – So, people wouldn't be allowed to build there anyway. Jim Carnell – Well, a flood plain is different from a wetland, but there are construction requirements to build in a flood plain. There is even a whole section in our code. Chairman Lara – Okay. I like the idea of wetland makers being installed and the conservation easement.

Paula Kay – We should talk about the Rivela house and what the applicant needs to do there. Chairman Lara – Joel, do you know the Rabbi's house next to Ichud? Joel Kohn – Yes. Chairman Lara - There are very tall trees around his house making it like the most private home on Route 42 ever. Perhaps your client could do something similar to that to create more privacy for the Rivelas'. As well as move the garbage compactor. Matt Sickler – If you relocate that, it looks like the next closest thing would be the access road, which has to be 100+ feet away. Joel Kohn – We will work on relocating the compactor site. As for the type of trees, it all depends on what already exists there because we don't want to remove the existing trees. Chairman Lara – I understand. Just do your best and 100 feet is much better than 50 feet, so the relocation of the garbage compactor will help. Thomas Shepstone – Maybe we can do some spruce trees or something like that. Something that will grow in-between what is existing and fill in the open space. Helen

Budrock – Does the Board want them to see if they can shift anything around to create a bigger buffer between the project and the neighbor? Joel Kohn – I think it will make a big difference just relocating the compactor. Chairman Lara – Right and I think the configuration of the buildings, as they are proposed, is nice. Joel Kohn – We will take a look into where we can relocate the garbage area and submit a revised plan showing that. Kristin Boyd – And if you could also keep the neighbors in mind when you finalize all the lighting for the project and any street lighting you may be doing. Just make sure it is nighttime friendly and not disrupting them in any way. Joel Kohn – Sure. Typically, these types of projects will have pole lighting on the interior of the property. Matt Sickler – Usually where the walking paths are. Joel Kohn – Correct and they are usually full cut-off lighting. Kristin Boyd – Okay, I think we are good there.

Chairman Lara – What are you hoping to get out of tonight's meeting? Joel Kohn – We are just here tonight to move the project along. We are not asking for any action tonight as we just had the public hearings and we appreciate the public comments that were made. Once we have addressed the public and the Board's concerns, we will submit a revised plan for review. Matt Sickler – We are also working through the SWPP review and comments with Joel and should have those addressed and submitted prior to the next meeting. Chairman Lara – Okay, so are you thinking you will be ready to come back to the next meeting? Joel Kohn – Yes and we will hopefully be looking for NEG DEC and preliminary approval at that meeting. Helen Budrock – The 239 review did come back and I think the DOT wants a traffic impact study. Joel Kohn – That is correct and thank you for bringing that up. It is interesting because the 239 came back recommendation for approval as long as we provide a traffic study and the SWPP to the DOT. Both have been completed, but I'm not sure if the traffic study has been reviewed yet. I will look into that and make sure I get the information to Laura. Helen Budrock – Okay because I don't see any traffic studies in the Google Drive. Chairman Lara – Okay. So, you will get everything straightened out and we will see you at the next meeting.

SACKETT LAKE LP

NYS Route 42 & Sackett Lake Road, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Steven Barshov, Project attorney

Joel Kohn – For a time line on this project, we were here on April 26th, which resulted in a work session that was held on May 17th. We were back in front of the Board on August 9th, which resulted in another work session, with the consultants only, that took place on August 17th, and this is our first time back since that last work session. We had a really good work session back in May and there were some suggestions from Board members and their consultants. We discussed those with the consultants in the August work session and I will show you the modifications that were done as a result of those two work sessions. Originally some of the cul-de-sacs were connected, but there was a comment made regarding that and emergency vehicles accessibility, so eliminated the cul-de-sac at the end of the site and connected that to the rest of the project. There was also a comment made about possibly eliminating some of the access drives off of Sackett Lake Road, so we eliminated the access closest to Route 42 and another one of the accesses will be gated off and used for emergency access only. We also added some pedestrian paths to the commercial site and vehicular access was added to connect Ichud to the commercial site. That way cars do not have to go out onto Route 42 to get to the grocery store. Now both people walking and driving can stay within the development. Chairman Lara – Thank you. I know that is going to make a big difference in traffic. Joel Kohn – Open space was also discussed and we have more than the required 35%. The green shaded area on the map shows 36.2% and there is more that we have not shown. Paula Kay – Is there any reason why you are not showing all of it? Joel Kohn – There is no need to show anymore because what we have already shown puts us over the required percent. The areas not shown are areas like the middle of the cul-de-sacs and the space between the homes, but they are areas that will remain open space. Paula Kay – Okay. Another change we made was that we eliminated the lot line for lot 4, which is the shul building, since it no longer has to be a separate lot. That is now part of the overall common area and PUD.

The PUD law was also revised in regards to the size of the sheds and making them subject to HOA approval, as a request of the Planning Board. At this time, we feel we have addressed all of the Planning Boards requests and concerns, as well as the modifications the Town Board requested, prior to coming to this Board. So, tonight we were hoping that the Planning Board would recommend the Town Board move forward with the PUD approval. Then we would come back to the Planning Board to finalize the review of the site plan. The SWPP, wells and traffic study are all in the works and we already had a public hearing for this project, so we are well on our way with that.

Chairman Lara – These are one parking spot per home, right? Joel Kohn – Yes. There will be additional parking in other areas of the site, but the PUD law reads that there will be one parking spot per unit.

Chairman Lara – How many entrances now remain on Sackett Lake Road? Joel Kohn - There are a total of four left, but one is for emergency use only. Chairman Lara – And you have to go through the County for those, right? Joel Kohn – Yes, we will need permitting from the County DPW for all four of the access drives, as well as any access drive off of Route 42. There was a preliminary 239 review done for this project and we will have to go back to the County to address some of those comments. Chairman Lara – Did the County have any issues with the number of entrances? Joel Kohn – They did and they also had an issue with the configuration of the entrance to the townhouses, because there was a fork there. So, we eliminated an access drive and changed the location of the entrance to the townhouses, which is actually now just an emergency access drive. Chairman Lara – Site distance is also an issue here, so if you could just make sure the entrances are as distinguishable as possible and have the proper signage. Maybe there is a way to get it down to two regular entrances and two emergency entrances. Joel Kohn – We can take another look and see if that is possible, but the entrances span over more than a ½ mile. They are not close to each other and there is at least 300 feet between these two and 500 feet between the others. Chairman Lara – Alright. Plus, the road doesn't start to go down until you get to the second to last entrance. Joel Kohn – And we will show the site distance on the plans to show that we meet the requirements. Kristin Boyd – Looking at the site plan, it looks like one of the two entrances to the left could be eliminated or at least turned into an emergency access. Matt Sickler – Or maybe take the two, combined them for one access in the middle, and put the parking on the side for these houses. Joel Kohn – We will take another look at it and see if we can reduce them anymore, but again, we are talking over 200 homes with three entrances and one for emergency access. So, that is one entrance for 66 homes. Chairman Lara – It's just that Sackett Lake Road is rough road, especially if you are not from the area, so anything we can do to minimize those impacts would be great. Kristin Boyd – Right and two prominent entrances that people know to look for might be safer.

Helen Budrock – Looking at the newest site plan in comparison to the site plan submitted before that, I don't see a lot of changes, which is fine, but I do still see there is some cul-de-sacks. If I remember correctly, I thought there was discussion of turning those in to loops. Did something change since then? Joel Kohn – Since the last work session, the only changes made were there: the internal vehicular connection to the commercial site, the calculated open space, and the addition of more emergency connections throughout the development. Jim did bring up the idea of possibly looping these to reduce traffic, but we had our traffic consultant do an internal review and that was not the case. Helen Budrock – But looking at the two site plans, it looks like the internal emergency connections already existed. Joel Kohn – We added one more connection, and if you look at the MNTM letter that was submitted along with the latest site plan, you will see we wanted to connect the last two as well, but there is a significant change in grade there, so we could not. Matt Sickler – Right. It looks like they are all connected now with the exception of the last one. Helen Budrock – What I was getting at, and I don't mean t sound like a broken record, is that since the beginning of this project, County Planning, myself, and even Jim asked about connecting those cul-de-sacks and making them loops. I thought we had Rabbi Schwartz's agreement about that when we left the work session, but obviously something has changed. My biggest concern about the cul-de-sacks is public safety. I know at one point you said you had a letter from the fire department stating they were fine with it, but the only thing I see in the drive is a letter with them asking for additional.

information. So, if you have a letter from the fire chief saying they are okay with it, we should get that on the Drive. I do understand why Rabbi Schwartz would want these as cul-de-sacs, but that was a concern from the beginning. Joel Kohn – I get it and I also don't want to sound like a broken record, but as we have also discussed, the market he anticipates having is for a walking community and he wants people to be able to go from one end to the other without have to cross vehicular paths. Jim did bring up that there might be more internal traffic having cul-de-sacs, so Rabbi and I discussed that with our traffic consultant and had him review the internal circulation. He provided us with a memo, which was submitted to the town, and basically says that it is not going to create more traffic the way it is currently designed, but suggested so more emergency access connections. Helen Budrock – It wasn't an issue of traffic; it was an issue of safety and fire protection. I think Jim recommended the loop design because they would allow you to put speed tables in. And I think Michael Hoyt, who isn't here tonight, who is a firefighter, brought up the point that even though cul-de-sacs are designed for fire trucks to turn around, the reality is that is not always possible when all of the emergency vehicles and people are also there and in the way. But, if the fire department did sign off on it, I would feel more comfortable from a fire safety perspective. Jim Carnell – I brought up the idea of loops because some of our more recent projects with cul-de-sacs have a speed bump every 50 feet or so. This preventing emergency vehicles from getting in and out in a timely manner. That's why bringing in elevated walkways and signage where the crosswalks are would make it safer. No matter how many playgrounds and open space there is, kids will still ride their bikes and scooters down the road. Paula Kay – I'd also like to see a letter from the fire department. Joel Kohn – We will revisit this again and go back to the fire department with our design plan. That way we can have their findings by the time we come back to this Board for site plan review. However, that is a site plan issue and we are just asking to proceed with the PUD tonight. Paula Kay – Right.

Chairman Lara – As this is the first PUD I have ever reviewed; I have a question regarding zoning. As this will now be a new zone, will they be able to add homes in the future? Paula Kay – This will be similar to the Viznitz PUD, who did have changes to their PUD. They added zero lot line developments, so yes, there can be changes. Chairman Lara – Which is okay, I just wanted to know if that was allowed. Paula Kay – The site plan could change, but the PUD law will list a maximum number of units and possibly commercial buildings, even though the more commercial there is on the site, the happier everyone will be, and that will be set in stone by the Town Board. Helen Budrock – Right now as the draft reads, they are not to exceed 199 residential units, 50,000 sq. ft. of commercial retail, and 30,000 sq. ft. of office space. If they want to amend that for any reason in the future, they will have to go back in front of the Town Board to do so. Kristin Boyd – Do they already meet those thresholds? Joel Kohn – We are at the maximum number of residential units, but we do not show the 80,000 sq. ft. in commercial. Meaning they have the ability to add more commercial in the future, by coming back in front of this Board with a modified site plan. If for any reason they want more than the 80,00 sq. ft. for commercial, they would have to go back to the Town Board for an amendment first. Kristin Boyd – Okay.

No further comments or questions from the Board.

Paula Kay – At this time the Board would refer this project back to the Town Board for them to review the PUD law and the revision you asked be made to the site plan. I don't believe this Board made recommendation to revise the language in the PUD law. Joel Kohn – If they did, it was revised. Kristin Boyd – Does the PUD law include the preservation of the green space? Paula Kay – Yes. Kristin Boyd – Okay.

A motion to refer this matter back to the Town Board was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kristin Boyd.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

SUNSHINE ESTATES

221 Ranch Road, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This is an existing bungalow colony on Ranch Road in the RR-1 zoning. It is a permitted use in the zone subject to site plan approval. They are looking to add an addition to unit #8 and started to add an illegal deck to two of the adjoining units; units #3 & #4. Paula Kay – Does that mean the deck is under construction? Joel Kohn – It was and they got a stop work order from the Building Department. Which is why they reached out to me and we had Tim Gottlieb go out to the site and update the site plan. They will need approval for anything within 200 sq. ft. and they will also need ZBA approval for a lot coverage variance and a front yard setback variance. Chairman Lara – Because the deck in the front setback? Joel Kohn – Yes, and the deck and addition puts them over their lot coverage. Chairman Lara – So, you need us to deny this and refer you to the ZBA? Joel Kohn – That is correct.

Matt Sickler – I just have one quick question. There is a note that refers to units 9, 10 and 11 as “construction of new units”, do those units already exist? Joel Kohn – Yes, they do and that note was from their last proposal. I also noticed that and already asked Tim to correct it, so that note will be removed on the final map.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion to deny this project was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

Chairman Lara explained that there was recently an issue with the parking for Deb El on Rock Hill Drive that was brought to the Town’s attention, Paula was able to resolve the issue with Mr. Gibber. Paula Kay explained that she spoke to Mr. Gibber who advised that the issue was from the mixture of some kind of union issue with the truck drivers, that took place over the weekend, and an error that his staff didn’t catch. Mr. Gibber also apologized, said that he is handling it, and that he will not let it happen again. Paula Kay advised that she believes the situation has already been resolved and that Mr. Gibber was equally upset that it happened. She also stated that if it ever becomes a problem again, the Town will be advised.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers, Secretary

Town of Thompson Planning Board

