

APPROVED

TOWN OF THOMPSON
PLANNING BOARD
April 26, 2023

IN ATTENDANCE: Kathleen Lara, Chairman
Michael Croissant
Kristin Boyd
Arthur Knapp
Michael Hoyt
Matthew Sickler, Consulting Engineer
Helen Budrock, Sr. Planner, Delaware Engineering
Paula Elaine Kay, Attorney
Laura Eppers, Secretary
Jim Carnell, Building, Planning, Zoning
Jay Patel, Consulting traffic engineer

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

A motion to approve the February 22, 2023 minutes was made by Michael Croissant and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to approve the March 22, 2023 minutes was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kristin Boyd.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

PUBLIC HEARING:

SACKETT LAKE LP

State Route 42 & Sackett Lake Road, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative
Zach Peters, Project engineer
Steve Barshov, Project attorney

Chairman Lara read the legal notice aloud.

Proof of mailings were received.

Joel Kohn – This is a proposed Planned Unit Development project that will consist of 199 residential units and a commercial building. The property is on the corner of Route 42 and Sackett Lake Road, going down a stretch of Sackett Lake Road. The Marcy South powerlines cut through the north of the property. The property currently consists of five separate lots, which will be combined and reconfigured into three separate lots. The residential portion of the project consists of 165 2-family homes, in this area here, 2 single family homes, and 32 townhouse style homes, in this area here. There will be 3 community buildings dispersed throughout the project and 3 sets of swimming pools, for a total of 6 swimming pools. There will also be playground areas and walking trails through out. The goal is to make the property walkable from one side to the other, including to the existing grocery store and the proposed commercial building. The commercial portion of the project consists of a 15,750 sq. ft. building for retail and office space, which will be on Route 42. There will be 4 access roads from Sackett Lake Road and there will be 3 access roads from Route 42, one of which already exists. The project will be served by on-site wells. Some of the wells have already been drilled and 72-hour pump testing and monitoring is being done by the hydrogeologist. Those results will also be reviewed by the Town’s hydrogeologist. Sewer will be served by the Village of

Monticello. There is an agreement between the Village and the project for them to provide sewer for this project. There will be some improvements made to the pump station so that it will be able to accommodate this project. The site is mostly open and isn't very wooded, so we will put in some landscaping on Sackett Lake Road. Overall density for the project is 1.56 units per acres, taking into account the total residential portion of the project. A traffic study has been completed and submitted to the Town's traffic engineer for review. He had some comments on the report, which I believe we already addressed. We will have to finalize any outstanding comments, but that is pretty much it.

Chairman Lara – Paula, would you please explain to everyone what a PUD is. Paula Kay – This Board has not seen a PUD since Yeshiva Vitzniz, which was about 20 years ago. A PUD is a Planned Unit Development and is essentially a creating its own zoning. The definition in our code is “A tract of land which may provide more than one type of residential land use and ancillary or commercial use and designed to be maintained and operated as a unit, in single ownership or control, and sharing certain facilities in common, such as open space, yards, off-street parking and recreation facilities.” There are 2 elements to a PUD approval. One component is the actual site plan, which Joel has presented tonight, and the second component is the local law, that is written and then adopted by the Town Board. This puts into writing all of the zoning elements for the PUD, such as, the setbacks, size of the buildings, maximum number of units, and other things like that. In our Town Code we have sections for each of the pre-existing PUDs. Most of them are HOAs, but not all HOAs are a PUD. If this moves forward as a PUD, it will be added as a new section in our code. There are certain elements of a PUD that this Board has to look at to move the project along. Some of those things are creation of open space, recreational facilities, what the permitted uses are, protection or enhancement of wildlife habitats, protection of surface water, and protection or enhancement of scenic quality. There is a formula used to figure out the maximum number of development units, which our Town engineer will look at based on the plan provided. In essence another zoning district is being created, but this gives the Board a lot of leigh way to work with the developer and express things they wish to see done, or not to see done. So, this can be a good way to get the development that works for everybody. At this point our Town Board has looked at the proposed PUD law and sent it to this Board for plan review, which is why this project is also on the regular agenda tonight for discussion. Our code section is 250-27 for anyone who wants to take a look.

Chairman Lara – Joel, can you explain the owner types for each of the homes on the lot? Joel Kohn – It will most likely be condominium ownership. Meaning the common areas will be owned by the condominium and the homes will be owned individually. For the townhouses that are 2-family homes, each person will own the footprint of their home.

Chairman Lara – Can you show us the location of the wells you currently have? Joel Kohn – There is a big, open area here that has 3 existing wells. The other wells will be drilled to the east of the property, possibly one at the top and one at the bottom of the property. Those should be drilled within the next couple of weeks. Michael Croissant – Are you monitoring any neighboring wells? Joel Kohn – We will offer to monitor anything within 1,500 feet of the wells.

Chairman Lara – I know the applicant has work very hard to make sure this whole project is walkable in order to keep people from walking on the roads, but will people also be able to access the grocery store via car internally or will they have to drive out onto the road to access it? Joel Kohn – If they are going by car, they will have to drive on the road to go to the grocery store. Internally, there are walking trails to the grocery store. Also, we will be adding a side walk on Route 42, per the DOT comments and request, that will probably extend all the way to the Village eventually. The site was specifically designed in a cul-de-sac style, which is not what you typically see in other developments, to limit as much vehicular traffic as possible. Chairman Lara – How about parking? Joel Kohn – There are 2 spaces proposed in front of each home, parking areas next to the pools for the community buildings, and a parking area for the commercial building. We should have plenty of parking. Chairman Lara – Is there a sperate area for guest parking? Joel Kohn – There is not a designated area for guest parking, but between the 2 spaces per unit and the extra

parking at the community buildings, there should be plenty of parking for guests and residents. Michael Croissant – What is stopping you from having an interior road to the grocery store? Joel Kohn – It is a pretty steep area here with some wetlands, but we can certainly look into it and see if it is possible. Michael Croissant – It would definitely alleviate a lot of traffic on the roads. Chairman Lara – I know that Rabi Schwartz made the side entrance, that comes off Route 42 into the grocery store, more visible and it has made a considerable difference on the traffic there.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

The meeting was opened to the public.

Ben Richards @ 263 Cold Spring Road – Attended tonight’s meeting for the other public hearing, but had some questions and comments for this project:

- The end of this property slopes down into a valley with a lake, that goes under the road and feed Sackett Lake, so any drainage or sewer is going to flow down to the lake.

Chairman Lara – We generally wouldn’t answer any questions tonight and the applicant would address all questions and comments in writing, but the Town engineer will review any and all stormwater and septic prior to approval. Matt, would you just explain briefly. Matt Sickler – There will be a stormwater plan developed for the entire project, which will review current conditions and the developed conditions, both during construction and at the completion of the project. That will also evaluate the quality and quantity of water run-off.

- Can the current sewer system in the Village handle this project?

Chairman Lara – Again, that will be reviewed and approved by the Town’s consultants, our engineer and hydrogeologist, prior to any approval. Joel Kohn – Also the Village has a capacity of 3 million gallons per day and they are currently only using a little over 1 million gallons per day.

- Will the Town be getting tax money from this project?

Chairman Lara – We cannot ask the applicant to answer that question. Steve Barshov – I’ll address that if you don’t mind. The residential property, with homes on it, will be privately owned and the homeowners will be paying taxes. The commercial property taxes will be paid by the condominium owner.

Chet Smith @ Rock Hill, NY – Expressed that he believes there is a safety concern with the entrances/exits on the Sackett Lake Road side and the number of cul-de-sacs in the development. He doesn’t feel the access route for emergency vehicles meets egress and isn’t sufficient for multiple vehicles to come in and out at the same time. Questioned:

- Why so many cull-de-sacks instead of continuous circles, which would work better for the entrance/exit, specifically for large vehicles, as well as ease of traffic for the people not walking?
- The density plan, showing 1.4 homes per acre, takes into consideration all of the unbuildable land. What is the actual amount of buildable land in comparison to the number of units that are going in? This could also affect the egress of the access roads.

Rosa Gana @ 71 Sackett Lake Road – Expressed her concern about the increase in traffic, especially with the large construction vehicles, and the number of regular vehicles a project this size will bring. There are no sidewalks on Sackett Lake Road to walk on, to stay off of the road, and there are children who play outside. Also expressed that the increase in noise is going to ruin their quiet life style.

Brian Mendez @ 69 Sackett Lake Road – Is also concerned about the increase in traffic. Is a volunteer firefighter for the Monticello Fire Dept. and has seen plenty of accidents at this intersection, without the increase in traffic this project will bring. Mentioned his well is one of the neighboring wells included in the project’s well testing and hadn’t received any results for that yet. Wanted to know if he would be receiving any results. Paula Kay asked Joel Kohn to answer this question now. Joel advised that the 3 wells were tested and the results showed a decrease on the neighboring wells, so they are discussing adding another well or two. Once all testing is completed, reports will be submitted to the Town, showing results for all 7

neighboring wells that were used, to be added to the Google Drive.

Matthew Forman @ 3660 State Route 42. Did not speak at the meeting, but sent in below correspondence:

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1OlgzLskVuYBBhUHWGVs8BmSSTD_NniaK&authuser=planning%40townofthompson.com&usp=drive_fs

No further public questions or concerns.

A motion to close the public hearing, leaving the written comment period open for 10 days, was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

PRESTIGE ESTATES BUNGALOW COLONY

220 Cold Spring Road, Monticello, NY
Ken Ellsworth, Project engineer

Chairman Lara read the legal notice aloud.

Proof of mailings was received.

Ken Ellsworth – This project is located at 220 Cold Spring Road and is in the RR-1 district. The property is 58.05 acres and 5.49 acres of that will come from a lot line change with Aaron Village. There are 99 units proposed, 100 including the caretaker's unit, with 21 duplexes and 57 single units. There are 2 club houses proposed; one in the front of the property and one at the back of the property. There will also be 2 pools, a tennis court, a basketball court, a hand ball court, a baseball field, and playgrounds. With those amenities, we meet the recreational area required. We recently received the 239 comments from the County. We understand those comments and will be addressing them. For sewer we are tying into Waverly Ave. and DPW had some comments on that, which will also be addressed. As for water, there will be a water tank and a booster pump station on the property, but in recent conversations with the Town about their current system, we may change those locations to be on the Town's property. This would be to help improve the Town's system as well as supplying water to this project. However, the Town's engineer and Superintendent of Water & Sewer are still in discussions, so what you see now may change. So, as of right now, we need both a sewer and water extension for this property, which will include an extension for Aaron Village as well.

Chairman Lara – Have we engaged our traffic consultant for this project yet? Helen Budrock – Looking at my records it does not appear Jay was ever formally engaged, but you can do that tonight if you want.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

The meeting was opened to the public.

Ben Richards @ 263 Cold Spring Road – Is the neighbor right across the street and expressed that he is concerned about the project's water use/supply as they already encounter issues in the summer with a decrease in water pressure and sediments in the water supply. He had the below questions and concerns:

- Is this project using their own water?

Chairman Lara – Can you please explain the water situation further? Ken Ellsworth – The Town's current system does not have the ability to supply water to this project, but there are wells on an adjacent property that were previously drilled and never developed. There is information that indicates that those

are large producing wells, upwards of 200 gallons per minute. We are currently working with the Town to reach back out to the original hydrogeologist to get more information on those wells. They were drilled a long time ago for a project that never materialized. Our intent is to develop the wells, for both the projects and the Town's use, re-construct the Town's well house, and connect the new water supply, treatment system, and storage, to the Town's system to improve it. Additionally, we are going to have to run pump tests on the wells and will look to monitor neighboring wells. I would propose offering up your well for monitoring at that time to see what effect the new wells would have on your well.

- Shouldn't the water come from the Village, not the Town?

Chairman Lara – Jim can you explain where the Town's water district starts. Jim Carnell – The Town currently has a water and sewer district for this area. The current water district encompasses from the Village line, around Cold Spring Road and Fairground Road, all the way up to Cozy Acres, opposite Waverly Ave.

- Will they be bringing water up Cold Spring Road?

Jim Carnell – The sewer lines may come up the road, but the water will probably come from the back side of this project as that is where the wells are.

- If they are going to expand the sewer district and come up Cold Spring Road, how do I get in on this too?

Jim Carnell – You, and any other neighbors that may be interested, should have a discussion with the Town Board and let them know you are also interested in being annexed into the district.

- What happens to all the animals once they clear all this land?
- Appears they propose to put their dumpsters right by the road, next to the brook, and I am concerned the garbage will end up in the brook and swamp it empties into. Plus, it will attract more bears.

Chairman Lara – They will be required to have a compactor and our engineer will make sure the location of it is acceptable.

Clarence Rundle @ 245 Cold Spring Road – Expressed his two biggest concerns were water and garbage. Had the below questions and additional concerns:

- The trash compactor will not be used properly and it will get over filled, which would cause garbage to be everywhere.
- The garbage truck emptying the compactor will have to stop in the road, which will block traffic, and will be right in front of my house.

Jim Carnell – As this is the second time the location of the garbage has been brought up; can we show on the site plan where it is proposed now? Chairman Lara – Please. Matt Sickler – The garbage compactor is right above “clubhouse east” on the map. Clarence Rundle – Right and you can see how close that is the Cold Spring Road.

- Where exactly is 220 Cold Spring Road?

Jim Carnell – That is the name of the company and because the property is still vacant, they probably do not have a 911 address yet.

- Is it the piece of property by the power lines?

Jim Carnell – This black mark here on the site plan is the powerlines. Clarence Rundle – Okay. I know right where that is. It is an old bungalow colony. Jim Carnell – Yes. These light shaded units here are the old, dilapidated units that are currently there and they will be demolished as part of this project.

- Will these permits be monitored after they are issued? Because I have been watching people build across the street from me without permits.

Jim Carnell – They have permits for the work they are doing across the street. Clarence Rundle – Then someone should be checking on them. Jim Carnell – We have been doing inspections at the property. You can come into the Building Dept. if you want to discuss that further.

Patricia Coll – 263 Cold Spring Road and 11 Haddock Road (these two properties abut) – Agrees with her neighbor's concerns to garbage and water, especially the water. Water pressure and color is already a problem at both her properties and it is just going to keep getting worse as there are still vacant properties

in the area that can be built on. Also expressed the below concerns:

- There are already a lot of large developments in the area and all the developing is ruining the quality of life for the people who bought their homes in this area for country living.
- There are no sidewalks on Cold Spring Road and it is dangerous with the cars from the racetrack flying down the road. It is not safe for anyone to walk on the road, especially with baby carriages and in large groups.

Anthony Longobardo @ 251 Cold Spring Road – Did not speak at the meeting, but sent in below correspondence:

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1QEnsnF05uuZoye8M_dOJ603s2hkznag&authuser=planning%40townofthompson.com&usp=drive_fs

No further public comments or questions.

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

All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to engage the Town's traffic consultant for this project was made Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

ACTION ITEMS:

DEB-EL FOODS

64 Kutger Road, Monticello, NY

David Higgins, Project engineer

Sean O'Connell, **Project**

Paula Kay – As requested by the Board, we had a work session for this project to discuss the parking issue with trucks on Rock Hill Drive. The applicant came up with a great idea to hire a security guard to monitor the property until the operations are completely moved over to the Kutger Road location. The question now is, has someone been hired and if so, what is their contact information? David Higgins – I believe someone has been hired and I believe the contact person will still be Lewis Dennis, who is the logistics manager. Paula Kay – Okay. Please provide us with his number to have on file. David Higgins – I do not have the number with me tonight. Paula Kay – That's fine. You can provide it to the Building Dept. tomorrow. Michael Croissant – I believe the agreement was for someone to monitor on-site. Paula Kay – Is the security on-site at the Rock Hill location? David Higgins – That is my understanding. He may not be standing at the road, but he is on-site. Paula Kay – If the neighbors or the Town sees a truck parked or idling there, are they supposed to call Lewis who will in return call the security guard? David Higgins – I would have to confirm that as I don't believe Lewis is at that facility. Paula Kay – It just seems like it would be easier to have a direct number to the guard, instead of calling a third party. Michael Croissant – I believe the agreement was to have a direct number to the security guard. Paula Kay – That is correct. David Higgins – I will get that information and pass it on.

Chairman Lara – This project is here tonight to declare Lead Agency, request the 239 review, and to

schedule a public hearing. Paula, do you think we are ready for these things? Paula Kay – We are, but I think the applicant should give a brief overview of the plan and I believe Matt has now had a chance to review it and may have some comments.

Matt Sickler – I did give it a general overview and had some general comments on clean up and some clarifications. There is still some design work to be done, so we will do our in-depth review at that time. Chairman Lara – Thanks Matt.

David Higgins – This property is located on Kutger Road, is about 164 acres, and is in the RR-1 zone. This is currently an egg processing facility with approximately 89,000 square feet in existing structures and we are proposing to construct a new freezer/cooler building that will be roughly 78,000 square feet. This will eliminate all freezer/cooler storage at the Rock Hill facility and that facility will be used for dry storage of packaging materials and things like that. There will be loading docks on the west side of the building and 25 parking spots on the south side. The facility is intended to have a maximum of 24 employees. We have shown the location of our proposed well and sewer disposal system, which we just completed some soils testing on the sewer system. This plan also includes a second means of access for an emergency access road. We still have some things to work out with that, like where we are going to put the gate. We are working on the design elements of the stormwater facility, but there may be some feature located in the front here, and we may construct another facility adjacent to the existing stormwater pump. We haven't shown it yet, but the building will be screened from Ranch Road. I think that is about it and we have some renderings here if you would like to see them. Chairman Lara – Please. Sean O'Connell – This is a rendering of what the building will look like as you enter the facility and as of right now, the building is 38 feet tall. And this is a rendering of what the building will look like from the road, prior to any landscaping being added. Helen Budrock – Would you send those rendering to Laura in the Building Dept. so that she can add them to the Google Drive. Sean O'Connell – Sure.

Kristin Boyd – Does the 38 feet comply with the building height for this zone? Jim Carnell – I think it is 35 feet, but we measure from the street side, whereas they measured from the back side where the loading docks are. Matt Sickler – Right and the way the topography is, the back side is much lower than the front. Jim Carnell – We will take a closer look at that when reviewing the building plans and let them know if they need to apply for any variance. Kristin Boyd – Okay.

Kristin Boyd – I know you are still early on in this process, but just keep in mind that we are going to want to see what the exterior lighting is going to look like and that they will be night time friendly. Dave Higgins – Okay.

Chairman Lara – I would like if the agreement made in regards to the parking on Rock Hill Drive can be added to the site plan, so that it is a little more than a verbale agreement. Paula Kay – It will be part of the approval resolution. Chairman Lara – Okay. I just wanted to make sure it was in writing somewhere. Jim Carnell – I actually went out to the Rock Hill property today in anticipation of tonight's meeting. Chairman Lara – And what did you see? Jim Carnell – There was a vehicle parked on the road and by the time I got to the end of the road and turned around, he was told to leave. Chairman Lara – That's great. Michael Hoyt – Did you have call anyone? Jim Carnell – Nope.

Helen Budrock – We try to get the 239 process started as early as possible as there has been some staff changes over at the County, so just be prepared for them to comment back asking for additional stuff you may not be ready with yet. Chairman Lara – Correct and that is a great point. Helen Budrock – Also this project is an unlisted action, so it would not require circulation for Lead Agency. Chairman Lara – Perfect. Laura when can we do a public hearing for this. Laura Eppers – We need at least 30 days for the County review and that also gives plenty of time for legal notices to be mailed. Helen Budrock – The second meeting in May is not quite 30 days out and the first meeting in June isn't until the 14th. Dosed that work for you guys? Dave Higgins – Yes.

No further questions or comments from the board.

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

A motion to refer this project to the County for 239 review and to schedule a public hearing for June 14, 2023 was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

WISE EQUITIES

Kroeger Road & Bridgeville Road, Bridgeville, NY
Zach Szabo, Project engineer

Zach Szabo – At this time, there has not been any changes made and we are currently working on design plans. There was discussion at the prior meeting about possibly sharing the other warehouses' entrance. I brought it back to my client and they are not interested at this time. Frankly that was our first time hearing of this proposal and at this time they are not interested in combining the two driveways. At this time, we are here to simply request a 239 review.

Paula Kay – I think the County's comments on the road and driveway will be telling.

Chairman Lara – Has Jay been engaged to review traffic for this project yet? Paula Kay – No, he has only been engaged for the other warehouse.

Helen Budrock – Are you not looking to do Lead Agency tonight because the 30 days hasn't expired yet?

Zach Szabo – Correct. Helen Budrock – Okay and are you ready to schedule a public hearing? It wouldn't be until the middle of June. Zach Szabo – No, not yet. We are still in the design phase and probably wouldn't be ready to answer questions people may have. Chairman Lara – Fair enough.

A motion to engage the Town's traffic consultant for this project was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Croissant.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to refer this project to the County for 239 review was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Kristin Boyd.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

DISCUSSION/POTENTIAL ACTION ITEMS:

SACKETT LAKE LP

State Route 42 & Sackett Lake Road, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative
Steve Barshov, Project attorney

Paula Kay – This is a referral from the Town Board who has reviewed the PUD legislation submitted by the

applicant. Remember there are two elements to a PUD. There is the local law and the site plan, which have to match to move forward. This project just had their public hearing tonight and we heard some public comments and feedback. At this point in time the ball is in your court for any changes you may like to see done. Chairman Lara – I was wondering if this is something we can have a work session for. I read the law and I guess I just don't know enough about a PUD as this is the first time the current board members have seen one. Helen Budrock – Would you like me to see if the Dept. of State offers any tutorials? Paula Kay – Are you looking for a work session to go over this site plan and make possibly make changes that will work for everyone? Chairman Lara – Yes and then we won't feel rushed knowing we have other agenda items waiting. Steve Barshov – If I may weigh in, I think a work shop is a great idea because it does exactly what you are suggesting. It provides a longer period of time to ask as many questions you many have, not only of the applicant but of your consultants as well. That way we can all weigh in. We understand this is a learning curve for the Board, as you have never reviewed a PUD before, and we want to help, as we have been through this process before. This way everyone has a full and complete understanding of what a PUD is all about. Chairman Lara – Is that something the rest of the Board would be interested in doing? Arthur Knapp – Yes. Michael Hoyt – Yes. Chairman Lara – And in the meantime, Helen I would like to see if the Dept. of State does have something that can sort of guide us with PUDs. Helen Budrock – Cool. Paula Kay – The most important thing is to look at all the requirements in our code and make sure all of those requirements are contained within the PUD. Helen Budrock – Right now the local law is based off of this particular site plan and layout, so we need to make sure this Board is okay with everything on it and does not have any unanswered questions. I had a question on whether the lots would still need to be subdivided now that they wouldn't be under the constraints on the normal zoning and maybe the project could now all be under one common ownership, but that is something that we can discuss in detail at the work session. Chairman Lara – Exactly. Michael Hoyt – Would this work session be during the day or at night, because some of us cannot make it during the day? Paula Kay – If there will be a quorum of the Board, it will be considered a public hearing and will get noticed and a Zoom link will be set up. Helen Budrock – Also, we typically try to schedule these kinds of workshops for the Wednesday between meeting Planning Board meetings, so that the applicant has a week to submit any new or updated stuff that may be required.

The agreed upon date and time for the work session discussed above is May 17, 2023 at 1:00 pm. The meeting is to be noticed in the Democrat only, a Zoom meeting set up for those who cannot physically attend, and an event created on the Town's website.

CATSKILL HATZALAH

Fraser Road, Monticello, NY
Bernie Gibbs, Project representative
Ivan Kalter, Project attorney
Yahuda Feig, Project representative

Bernie Gibbs – We are looking to put a 2-bay ambulance garage on a property that was donated to us on Fraser Road. We are proud to say we cover and supply emergency services to 100 square miles here in this area. However, our headquarters is located on Brickman Road in Fallsburg, which is quite far from some areas we cover and time is of the essence in this type of work. With the increase in population in the summer, the local ambulances are overwhelmed so there is a need for this. We serve everybody regardless of religion or nationality and the sooner we can get to them the better. Having an additional facility, in a more central location would be very helpful in our response time.

Paula Kay – This is a referral from the Town Board. This project went in front of them with the request to add an “emergency dispatch center” use to the SR zoning district because an EMS facility is not listed anywhere in our code. Michael Croissant – Shouldn't they just go to the Zoning Board for a use variance. Helen Budrock – The Town Board is looking to change the whole zone to allow this type of use and any

time the Town Board makes a change to the zoning code, it has to come to the Planning Board for a recommendation. At this point they are looking for your recommendation, then it will go back to them to approve or deny the change. If it does get approved, the project would then have to come back in front of you for site plan approval. Ivan Kalter – We are basically asking for an emergency dispatch center to be a permissible use in the SR zone. It is constant with other permissive uses in the zone. You currently allow hotels, motels, clubhouses and other utility structures in the zone. Joel Kohn – We proposed a very specific definition so that it cannot be interpreted for any other kind of vague use.

Michael Croissant – Where is this property located? Paula Kay – It's not about where it is located, the ask is to allow this as a permissive use in every SR district located in the town. Kristin Boyd – Is this permitted in any other zone with a special use permit or anything like that? Paula Kay – No. Helen Budrock – The code is silent on it so by assumption, it is not permitted anywhere. This would allow it to be permitted in the SR zone only and town wide. One of the questions I had is why you decided on a permitted verses a special permit use because special permits give the Planning Board the flexibility to say this is would be an acceptable use for the area, on a case-by-case basis based on the project's location and circumstances. It also allows them to place conditions on certain aspects of the use. Joel Kohn – The Town Board actually asked for it to be a special permit use, not just a permitted use. Helen Budrock – Okay. Great. Arthur Knapp – So we will have more control if it is a special permitted use? Joel Kohn – Right. It would be subject to site plan review and any conditions the Board may have. Paula Kay – And it would require a public hearing. Michael Hoyt – So, why don't they just make it a special use permit instead of changing the whole code? Helen Budrock – Because you cannot give a special use permit to something that is not permitted. Paula Kay – Currently, it is not allowed anywhere. Jim Carnell – I just wanted to bring up that this property is in a residential zone in an area where there is very little commercial use. There are dormitories, which is a type of residence, and a hotel, which is where people stay and sleep. I just wanted to bring up to the Board that there are other options and there are commercial properties not too far from this location. If this project was proposed in a commercial zone, we have a use it could probably fit under. The commercial zones allow for retail or services establishments, not an emergency service facility exactly, but we could probably make it fit an already allowed use. I did so research and 44% of our town is in a residential zone and the remaining balance is in a commercial zone, minus the Village portion of the town. So, this project would be allowed, with just site plan approval, if they were in a commercial district, which is about 50% of the Town. Their request is to allow this type of use in a residential district. Chairman Lara – Paula, could they go to the Zoning Board rather than changing the law to permit this use in all SR zones. Paula Kay – They could, but it would be for a use change variance which has very specific criteria that needs to be met. I think this is a really important application and use, but there needs to be a way to craft this so that it doesn't impact the entire town. Bernie Gibbs – The reason we are looking to use this property, opposed to another one located in a commercial zone, is because it was donated to us. We are a not-for-profit organization whose members are all volunteers. Chairman Lara - Everybody on this Board knows the value of Hatzalah and I myself would ask for them if God forbid something happens to me. I have learned a lot about how amazing this organization is and how well trained the volunteers are. It is my understanding that members also have emergency packs in their cars, and I'm not trying to say that would replace an ambulance so please don't misunderstand what I am saying, and many times you also see a Hatzalah parked in in a development, which we don't mind and we understand why. My concern is if we allow this in a residential zone it could open the door up to places they shouldn't be. We don't think this is a bad idea, we just don't think the location is the best. Bernie Gibbs – You are right we do carry packs in the back of our cars, I have one in mine now, but like you said it does not replace an ambulance and the goal is to transport a patient to the hospital as soon as possible. We understand the concern about this being allowed in a residential zone, but it is something that would have to be looked at on a case-by-case basis. Paula Kay – Ivan, do you have a way to craft this so it would have a big impact? Is that what you are helping with? Ivan Kalter – Yes and that is what we are working on now. Paula Kay – Okay because I think that is what the Board is struggling with. Bernie Gibbs – We ran into the same situation in Fallsburg, but it works well there and we actually have an 8-bay garage there. That town has not encountered any issues with this and they thank us for the service we provide. Michael Hoyt – We all appreciate what you are

trying to do, we just don't want to allow something that may cause an issue in the future. Ivan Kalter – I think the answer might be to design the structure in a way that it is not an issue. Paula Kay – It's not the structure that is the problem, the issue is if the change is allowed, the way it has been written, it may impact about 50% of the town's properties. What I'm hearing is the Board doesn't necessarily have an issue with this particular location, but if this becomes permissible in the SR zone, it may be an issue in other locations. Ivan Kalter – If you're worried about other facilities doing this, I can't imagine there would be a lot of other emergency dispatch organizations looking to also build here. Arthur Knapp – It's not just this specific geographic location. It's the whole SR zone. Helen Budrock – Which also adds to why making this a special use permit would make sense. Then you can evaluate on a case-by-case basis to see if the proposed site is an appropriate location. I know each town is different, but as Mr. Gibbs mentioned their existing location in Fallsburg, which is right down the road from their high school, is in a residential zone. Maybe you can take some time and talk to some of the folks in Fallsburg and see their experience has been. Paula Kay – I would like to talk to Ivan and figure out if we can make the definition very specific. Ivan Kalter – Any ideas you have are applied and I am open to working together on this. Yahuda Feig – We wish the town would have an issue with people coming forward trying to put in facilities like this, but unfortunately, I don't think there is really any competition or concern that volunteer ambulance services will be popping up. I think by allowing this the Town is providing a most important service. I also wanted to emphasize how important a location can be to saving lives. Last summer we had a 3-year-old child who collapsed and went into cardiac arrest. Fortunately, we had an ambulance stationed at that location with a paramedic and 2 EMTs. Because of that and the additional equipment that was on the ambulance, in addition the first responders, that child is alive and walking today. The cardiologist said he had never seen a child, especially in a rural location, survive what happened and be normal and healthy. As much as we don't want these types of call, but when they do happen, we want to be there and be there fast. Having this substation would allow us to have less emergency vehicles responding greater distances and having to travel more. We have 17 ambulances throughout the county and this an area that we are lacking in and could really use a closer facility. Granted not every ambulance calls needs an ambulance there within 2 minutes, but for the ones that do, we want to have one as nearby as possible. We are asking the Board to support us in our life saving mission. Chairman Lara – It's definitely not that we don't support this, it's just the broadness of changing the zone that we are concerned with. This is not off the table and I think we have agreed that Paula and Ivan will discuss the definition of this use. Yahuda Feig – Understood and agreed. Paula Kay – Assuming Ivan and I work something out that the Board is comfortable with, it will go back to the Town Board and they will have to have a public hearing on the use change. Then they will come back here for site plan approval. Chairman Lara – Very good.

WEISS REALTY

49 Kroeger Road, Bridgeville, NY
John O'Rourke, Project engineer
Carlito Holt, Traffic engineer

John O'Rourke – This project has been in front of the Board for a little over a year now. We had a little delay when the Weiss project came into play. But I think we have straightened everything out now. Listening this evening I heard that they did not wish to take us up on our offer to share our driveway, but it is always there if they change their minds and we have noted on our site plan that we are willing to negotiate. Other than that, nothing has changed with our plan. We submitted plans to your engineer and will address any comments he may have. I believe we have addressed all current comments, with the exception of a couple minor comments we received from Carlito today. We are ready to proceed to outside agencies and are here tonight to ask for final approval.

Chairman Lara – I want to say that your willingness to share your entrance for everyone's benefit is very

neighborly of you and we appreciate it.

Helen Budrock – To bring everyone up to speed, there was quite a bit of back and forth with the traffic and that seems to be the primary concern, specifically the cumulative effect on traffic. There is the warehouse in Rock Hill, this warehouse, and now the one across the street from this one. We were also talked about the possibility of interchange at Bridgeville being changed. This project has updated their traffic study to include the additional counts. Our traffic consultant had some comments on which their traffic consultant responded to. I was hoping we could have them explain everything to us tonight in terms we may all better understand. Maybe they can give a quick brief of where we kind of landed. I was particularly interested in the traffic impacts and if they work giving the current interchange or do they depend upon the DOT reconfiguring that interchange. John O'Rourke – Yes, it works without any DOT improvements, but I will defer to the traffic engineers for more detail. Chairman Lara – Jay, would you tell us what your findings were for this project. Jay Patel – An updated traffic study was submitted with current traffic counts. I submitted my comments for the updated study on Friday and some of them have been addressed and some are still outstanding. One of the outstanding comments was in regards to updating the Seasonal Adjustment Factors utilized to match with the Town of Thompson's. That is going to change the exiting condition, but will not affect the conclusion. There are 2 more important issue to address. One is the space for trucks entering and exiting at the main intersection at Kroeger Road and what the truck maneuvers will look like. Based on the drawings there is conflict. Their inbound and outbound maneuvers are shown on separate sheets, but if you over lay them, there is a clear conflict and to resolve this conflict will be complicated. If there is a truck sitting at the stop sign after leaving the site and another truck wants to come in, the truck that wants to exit will have to back out. The second thing is I drove down Kroeger Road and I believe there is not enough width to allow 2 trucks on the road at the same time. Now that there is a second warehouse coming, the number of trucks coming and leaving will only increase. There are 2 items of a traffic analysis; one is level of service and the other is the operation. I do not believe there is a level of service issue and this looks like an operational issue that needs to be resolved. The last thing is if DOT proceeds with the interchange to Route 17, some of the ramps will change and that will resolve some issues we have with the trucks exiting the ramps, particularly the west bound ramp. As that ramp is now, the truck will take the entire ramp to turn onto Kroeger Road and I believe DOT also had a comment on this. Helen Budrock – Just to elaborate on that a little, when the 239 review was sent to the County, you guys sent the traffic impact study to the DOT who said they would review it an issue comment. We did not get any comments from them yet, but n the meantime you guys updated the traffic study to include the project across the street, right? John O'Rourke – Correct. Helen Budrock – Has the updated study been sent to DOT yet? Carlito Holt- We have not forwarded it directly to DOT, but we will. Helen Budrock – Please do. This way they know there has been a change made. John O'Rourke – Just for the record, DOT doesn't have any permitting over this project, correct? Carlito Holt – Right, I think the reason they are involved is because the County doesn't have a traffic engineer to review things so they typically defer to the DOT to look at on their behalf. Helen Budrock – I think the County DPW also had some comments in regards to truck maneuvers and whether or not there is adequate room. John O'Rourke – Is that a county road? Helen Budrock – Bridgeville Road is a county road. Carlito Holt – Correct and to touch upon Jay's overview, we definitely concur that there is no level of service or capacity issue. We analyzed 7 locations and they were all service "A" or "B". In regards to the Kroeger Road intersection, yes, the turning templates we did demonstrate that the truck can make the maneuver within the width of the pavement, but they would encroach into the opposing lane of traffic. Some context surrounding that is, based upon the trip generation numbers that are approved by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, this project would have 2 entering truck trips during the peak hour and 2 exiting truck trips. So, the frequency of having 1 truck exiting while another truck is entering would be very infrequent. Three are other instances like this and typically the truck drivers will stop short of the intersection to allow the other truck to exit first. We will look at what we can do at that intersection, but I think what we have shown in our traffic study is that the maneuvers can be made in the paved area that exists, but there will be some encroachment into the oncoming lane. Helen Budrock – On the 239 review back in December the county

indicated that the traffic impact to Route 17 and the intersection of Bridgeville Road are of a concern and a solution to the delays identified are requested by both the State and County. Those concerns are:

- NYS DOT suggests the minimal delays projected in the traffic impact study “may be unrealistic” and reinforces the Town’s request to add a section evaluating Friday evening peak summer travel times.
- Considering that the projected delay at the west bound off ramp onto Heiden Road south will be more severe than indicated in the current draft for the TIS, NYS DOT requests a solution to improve that situation
- SC DPW would like the applicant to include them in any coordination with NYS DOT and the Town of Thompson on proposed mitigations to ensure minimal impacts to the County Road.

Helen Budrock - It sounds like they do have some concerns so maybe you could reach out to Dermot Dowd at the County and Tony Signorelli at DPW to request a work session. This way you can work with them on a solution to these concerns as a final step, because I don’t think there is much more the Board can do at this time without getting final closure on the traffic issues. Chairman Lara – Again, I personally think this is a great site for a warehouse, but Kroeger Road itself is an issue and I know the Board agrees with that. Something has to be addressed. Maybe another entrance or a traffic light for Kroeger Road that would indicate not to drive on the road if a truck is exiting. I don’t know the answer but I know that is something we can’t leave as is. John O’Rourke – It is really limited as to what we can do to the road. Chairman Lara – I get it and there are houses on the street so it’s not like it can just be expanded, but there has to be something that can help. Michael Hoyt – I think there is more traffic out on Bridgeville Road than we realize. We just had a brush fire back in there 2 weeks ago and we had 6 firetrucks that sat quite a few minutes, after the call was done, waiting to pull off of Kroeger Road. That whole intersection there was quite busy. Kristin Boyd – Does the issue with the truck turning radius also occur when it is a car and a truck, or just a truck and a truck? I get that another truck coming would know to wait for the exiting truck, but would a car know? Carlito Holt – If there was a trucking approaching eastbound on Bridgeville Road and there is a passenger vehicle waiting at the stop sign, the truck will wait and let that car go. Once there are no vehicles opposing it on Kroeger Road, the truck will make that right hand turn, which would encroach into the other lane. Kristin Boyd – Are there signs that would typically be used in situations like this? Carlito Holt – Like a truck entering sign? Kristin Boyd – I’m not sure, but this can’t be the only place in the country with this kind of situation. I think some kind of signage could help. Chairman Lara – Right. Again, perfect site, you just need better access. Helen Budrock – Just like the other warehouse approved in Rock Hill, there may be some off-site improvements that may need to happen to make sure this is as safe as possible. Michael Croissant – If need be, you guys could put in a turning lane. There is plenty of room there. John O’Rourke – We could, but we don’t own the property there. Helen Budrock – When we grappled with this with the Rock Hill warehouse project, we waited until we got a definitive letter from DOT kind of signing off stating the outside improvements were good. If you can get them updated traffic study and get us a letter saying they don’t have any concerns, I think the Board would be more comfortable. Chairman Lara – Agreed. Carlito Holt – I just want to set expectations with that. They are going to comment on locations that are more immediately around the Route 17 interchange. The Kroeger Road intersection and its width is not going to be a DOT item. I am extremely confident that when DOT sees the updated study that they will not have many pressing concerns. Your traffic consultant has also confirmed there are no real operational or capacity issues at those intersection. The concern is more with the Kroeger Road intersection and that is not a DOT item. I just wanted to clarify that you will not get them to weigh in on Kroeger Road. Helen Budrock – Understood. Maybe you could get the County to do something similar, even if it is just an email from Derm saying everything looks good and they are not concerned about the impacts on the county road. Something like that may give the Board some level of comfort. Chairman Lara – Did Derm comment on the 239. Helen Budrock – When this was sent to the County for the 239 review they outscored to the County DPW who stated that they would like the applicant to include them in any coordination with DOT and the Town on proposed mitigations to ensure minimal impacts to the county road. Chairman Lara – And Kroeger Road is a town road, so it would involve our Town Highway Superintendent, so I just want to make sure everyone who needs to be involved. Michael Hoyt – Plus I think it all changes right there in that intersection from the State, to the County, to

the Town. Chairman Lara – Right. I think the Board would feel better knowing there is some sort of resolution or at least that everybody is coordinated.

Chairman Lara – Paula, what is our next step? Paula Kay – This project is on tonight for discussion with potential action, as determined by the Board, and it sounds like you want to see these traffic issues addressed further before you make your decision. Chairman Lara – Right. We know all the roads up to Kroeger Road aren't a problem, but Kroeger Road is. John O'Rourke – We understand and are willing to iron all of those issues out, but were hoping for at least a conditional approval so that we may proceed to the outside agencies while we work with the DOT. We have already been delayed due to the project across the street and would hate to be delayed any further. We would really like to submit to water and sewer as soon as possible, especially at this time of year. Paula Kay – I think with a project of this magnitude we would also need to work up an approval resolution that captures the contingencies and other details discussed. Helen Budrock – Also, I don't think we can get to the Neg Dec without the traffic straighten out. Chairman Lara – That is a good point. John O'Rourke – Okay. We did our best to get some kind of approval tonight. Now we will leave it in Carlito's hands to get the traffic straighten out. Paula Kay – Do you have someone who can draft a resolution that I can look at? John O'Rourke – Sure. Do you want us to draft the Neg Dec as well? Paula Kay – Yes. John O'Rourke – Okay, we will draft both of those and put them in our pocket until we can get some answers on traffic. Paula Kay – Send them to me prior to the next meeting you will be attending so that I can take a look at them before that meeting. John O'Rourke – Okay.

218 HILLTOP LLC

218 Hilltop Road, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative
Zack Peters – Project engineer
Ivan Kalter – Project attorney

Joel Kohn – We had a second public hearing for this project at the end of March and our engineer put together a response to that. There was an outstanding item in regards to traffic that the Board asked to be addressed. Our traffic consultant has worked with the Town's traffic consultant to figure out a method to get new, updated traffic counts, which will be finished Friday of this week. So far, they are seeing an increase on weekends of about 25 cars more than in the 2018 counts and about 50 cars more on the week days. Based on these numbers it is believed there will be approximately 300 vehicles per day in the summer months and the road is capable of handling between 900 vehicles per hour.

Chairman Lara – We were thinking that had to be a typo. Michael Croissant – That can't be right. Those numbers are like a busy 17B day on a sold-out concert night. Joel Kohn – That's what I was told, but I'm not a traffic consultant. Maybe your engineer can weigh in on that. Jay Patel – He is correct. Chairman Lara – Would you just explain that a little more. Can the road handle that many cars because it is not traveled? How do you get to that number? Jay Patel – That is the capacity of the road. It is an open road with no obstructions or traffic lights. Assuming there will not be a traffic light, that is the capacity of the road. Michael Croissant – Do you take into consideration things like turns, hills, bumps, or narrowness? Jay Patel – No. Kristin Boyd – Is that the way we really look at traffic? People have to turn and slow down and this just seems like a very theoretical number. Jay Patel – Based on how we drive on a paved road, the average distance we leave between vehicles is approximately 4 seconds. There is 3,600 seconds in an hour, so 3,600 divided by 4 equals the 900 vehicles per hour, which is how we got to that number. On a freeway where people keep a closer distance, 2 seconds between vehicles, that would double the capacity of vehicles per hour for each lane. If the road has hills and curves, vehicles will keep a greater distance apart, reducing the capacity of vehicles per hour. Same for the night time, when there is a 10 second distance between vehicles. Michael Croissant – No offence to you or any other engineer, but this is a classic example where it works on paper, but it does not work in the field. I know you are going off of a formula, but when you are

driving down any residential road, it does not work. Especially not with this road. Helen Budrock – This project pre dates me, but I was wondering why the counts are done in May when this is a summer camp. Shouldn't they be done in a summer month? Michael Croissant – That was going to be my next question. Joel Kohn – We have both pre-summer and summer counts. I don't remember why we have both, but we did counts for both when the study was first done. Jay Patel – The reason for the comparison and the counts being done before the camp season and during the camp season, at the same location, is to see the increase in the traffic and what direction it is coming from. Helen Budrock – So, you will do another count in the summer? Joel Kohn – No. Helen Budrock – Why is that? Joel Kohn – We were not planning to do another summer count because we can anticipate what the new summer counts will be based on the new pre-summer counts. Chairman Lara – I got it. You will just adjust those numbers accordingly. Joel Kohn – Right. The increase we are seeing now is not that much and based on the capacity of the road, they could double or even triple the counts without the need for mitigation. Jay, correct me if I am wrong. Michael Croissant – As long as I have been on the Board, we have made all projects of this size do traffic counts in the summer. Joel Kohn – Which we did. Michael Croissant – I understand you are going to do the math and get the new percentages for the summer month, but I am not good with that. Joel Kohn – That is why we have consultants here to help figure it out. Ivan Kalter – Page 19 of the traffic study mentions that there is a 20 MPH speed limit on this road and in the non-summer months an average car goes 50 MPH and 55MPH during the summer months. That is not a big increase, so that may indicate there is not that much more traffic during the summer months. Paula Kay – I think the Board still sounds pretty concerned about traffic and I think, like Michael said, the calculation are just calculations on paper and this is a difficult location. Matt and/or Jay, what would you guys suggest be done here to make the Board feel more comfortable about the reality of the road and not what is just shown on paper? Matt Sickler – That is a good question. It sounds like the counts are being completed now and I'm sure we will get an updated study when they are done, which we will review. Other than that maybe a site visit. Paula Kay – If we are just basing this on the 900 number that Jay has confirmed, then the summer counts wouldn't even matter because the counts will never get that high. Joel Kohn – Even if the capacity was a 10th of what it is now, 90 vehicles per hour would still be okay. This is going to be minimal impact on traffic. Ivan Kalter – Why would there be a lot more traffic because of a summer camp? It's a camp and the only additional traffic will be the buses. Paula Kay – And people from the staff housing. Michael Croissant – Plus it is going to be more buses and bigger buses. Ivan Kalter – At only 6 trips per day. Michael Croissant – Well it will be 12 because they are going in and out. Joel Kohn – Which is probably less than what you have now with year-round buses for the Monticello School District. The previous camp was a traffic disaster when they were picking the kids up. Chairman Lara – That is true. Michael Hoyt – But that was only one day a week. Joel Kohn – No, Winston Day Camp has pick up every day. Chairman Lara – Right. Michael Croissant – You are talking 35 years ago. Plus, I wasn't on the Board back then to have an input, but I am now and therefore can have an input. Joel Kohn – Sure. Chairman Lara – There is an issue there on that road and it's not just because of the camp, but you are doubling the size, which will bring more traffic. I think the Board is just looking to see if there is anything that can be done to make it safer. I know a lot of work went into this camp and it is nicer than it has even been, we just don't want to jump the gun. Michael Croissant – And let's not forget when you got the original approval for this camp, the owner sat right in one of these chairs and made a promise to the homeowners that they would not be expanding any further, which we now know is not true. He made them all feel comfortable and then pulled back on his promise. Chairman Lara – So it sounds like we wait for final counts and go from there.

Michael Croissant – There is also still the issue with the wetlands. Did you get anywhere with that Matt? Matt Sickler – As for as finding the correspondence from the DEC, Mike Fratz sent an email stating they would not be updating the DEC map until it expires in 2024. However, he indicated that the wetlands were eligible for DEC designation and he provided a few recommendations for the Board to consider during SEQRA. By those wetlands being eligible for DEC protection, he requested you consider providing them with the same level of protection as you would a DEC designated wetland, which would include a buffer area and things of that nature. Kristin Boyd – Are the current plans in conflict with those recommendations? Matt Sickler – I don't believe the plans have been modified based on his

recommendations. Joel Kohn – Our engineer provided a response to that email. Did you get a chance to review that yet Matt? Matt Sickler – I don't recall receiving one. Joel Kohn – I was sent about 6 weeks ago. Matt Sickler – I will look for it. Helen Budrock – The original email in regards to the wetlands is on the Google Drive, but I don't see their engineer's response. Joel Kohn – I sent it to you on March 17th. Matt Sickler – Okay. I will go back and look for it. Paula Kay – Joel, would you also send it to Planning so that we can get it on the Drive? Joel Kohn – Sure. I have said it before and I will say it again, the wetland issue began with the old Town engineer, Dick McGoey, who did not want to see this project approved and begged the DEC to take on more wetlands, which I have emails to prove this. Even after the DEC said the won't he still tried and even called them down to the property for a site meeting. I think it was inappropriate for a Town engineer to do and I think the DEC comments were to basically provide him some flexibility or satisfaction.

Chairman Lara – During the public hearing there was a comment made by a neighbor who said there was dogs on the property barking all the time. I do not see it addressed in the public hearing response, but assumed it was immediately addressed, right? Joel Kohn – Yes, it was. Chairman Lara – I figured it was a situation where the caretaker had a dog and just wanted to make sure it was taken care of.

Chairman Lara – Are there any legal or code compliant issue we need to address before we can move forward with this project? Paula Kay – There could be. This is a sleep away camp and I believe the current proposal has a number of duplex units. Our definition of a sleep away camp does not include staff housing, so are those duplexes for campers? Joel Kohn – No, it is staff housing, but if you remember when the Town updated the zoning, the new changes were only going to effect projects that didn't have Lead Agency established. Paula Kay – That's right. Joel Kohn – So, this is one of the projects that was exempt from that. Paula Kay – Okay and was that for the initial application, or this particular application? Joe Kohn – This one. The one that is in front of the Board today. Paula Kay – Okay, then that takes care of that.

Chairman Lara – Paula, where do we go from here? Paula Kay – I think we are still finalizing traffic so that we can finish SEQRA and I would ask the Board to review the public hearing comments, if you haven't already. Michael Croissant – I have the response here in front of me and #5 states the anticipated time of construction is 12 to 18 months and is not anticipated to significantly impact the existing residents. I don't know how one can say that when during that 12-to-18-month process you are going to have dozens and dozens of construction trucks every day, 5 to 6 days a week, up and down the road. They are going to come from 17B straight through and all of those houses are going to be affected. Saying there is not going to be significant impact is not true, there is going to be a huge impact. Then #11 states the encroachments into or violations of the existing NYS DEC and federal wetlands were noted by the applicant's environmental consultant during..... the rest of the sentence is not completed, so I was just wondering what it should say and when was that assessment done? Zack Peters – I think that assessment was prior to the delineation, which was on August 13, 2019. Kristin Boyd – I think #7 could be more complete. Even though the wetland map may not change it should say the potential wetlands should receive the same protection. Joel Kohn – I will bring these things up to the project's team. Chairman Lara – Perhaps you can limit the construction to certain hours of the day to lessen the impact on neighbors. Maybe 7 to 7 or something like that. Joel Kohn – That is fine and it can be part of the resolution.

Chairman Lara – I don't think the Board is ready to vote on this tonight. Are you available or ready to come back to the next meeting to go over the stuff we touched on tonight and see where the Board stands at that time? Joel Kohn – Yes.

HAMASPIK RESORT

283 Rock Hill Drive, Rock Hill, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Helen Budrock shared the updated site plan for everyone to see.

Joel Kohn – We are here tonight for a minor modification to the previously approved site plan and to renew the special use permit. The modification is to relocate the swimming pool from the right side of the site to behind the swimming pool to eliminate putting in this road up to it. It will now be on the northwest side and before it was on the northeast side.

Kristin Boyd – Is that the only change? Joel Kohn – Yes.

Paula Kay – This project has a special use permit and was asked to come back after the first season of operation to discuss any impact from operations for both the camp and the hotel. Joel Kohn – Right and we were to come back tonight whether or not there was a modification to the site plan. As part of the resolution, like Paula said, we were to come back to the Board after the first year of operations to renew the special use permit. Helen Budrock – I think the next step would be schedule a public hearing. Joel Kohn – Right. I didn't hear really of any complaints so far, but if anyone else did we would like to know and would appreciate your feedback. Jim Carnell – The Building Dept. did receive several calls, mostly because they saw work being done there. All of the work was permitted and we were out there all along doing inspections. There were no early operations of facilities or anything else like that. Helen Budrock – Did you start receiving calls when they broke ground on the rec Building? Jim Carnell – Yeah. People saw equipment there and things going on and called in to make sure they had permits. Helen Budrock – Did you receive any complaints during the summer while the camp was operational? Maybe with parking on the road or buses or any of that kind of stuff. Jim Carnell – No.

Michael Croissant – Was there an agreement with the County for the water supply there? Joel Kohn – Yes. It was for the sprinkler system for the new building and that hasn't been executed yet. The County changed their attorney and kind of hindered that process, but we have an alternative route in case that doesn't work out. They will basically have a storage tank in the basement that would supply the sprinkler, but we are still in contact with the County regarding the water agreement. Chairman Lara – In this instance, it has to do with ownership and County Planning is working with them. Jim Carnell – During the permit review there was discussion on tank size and requirements in the event that they didn't get an agreement with the County. Matt Sickler – In the recreation building? Jim Carnell – Yes because we issued a permit for foundation work.

Chairman Lara – What day works for a public hearing? Jim Carnell – We don't need to submit to the County this time so we don't have to wait as long and could do it at the next meeting. Helen Budrock – May 10th or May 24th? Joel Kohn – We can do May 10th. Helen Budrock – Does that give enough time? Laura Eppers – The notices for May 10th have already gone out. Joel Kohn – If the applicant pays for the extra notice, can that be done? Laura Eppers – Even if it was submitted tomorrow, it wouldn't be published until next Tuesday and that is too late. Paula Kay – Okay. The 24th it is and this is a limited public hearing in that it is only on the impacts, if any, from operations last summer. Chairman Lara – Paula will you work with Laura to make sure the legal notice is very specific because I don't want to open the proverbial can of worms. This hearing is strictly just to make sure Hamaspik has done everything they promised. Something in plain language so there is no confusion on what this hearing is for. Paula Kay – Okay.

A motion to schedule a public hearing for May 24, 2023 was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

ESTATES AT ROCK HILL

N Emerald Drive, Rock Hill, NY
Ronald Steinberg, Project attorney

Richard Steinberg, Property owner

Michael Hoyt was recused.

Ronald Steinberg – We are looking to break off 4 pieces from this parcel and build a house on each for a total of 4 houses. Richard Steinberg – All have permission form both water and sewer.

Helen Budrock – I think this is a 5-lot subdivision, not a 4-lot subdivision, and if so, there is a difference in the code. Richard Steinberg – That is why I stated it is not being developed at this time. Helen Budrock – It doesn't matter, if you are taking one parcel and dividing it up into more than 4 lots, it is considered a major subdivision. Matt, can you clarify if this is a 5-lot subdivision, does tht make it a realty subdivision and does DOH get involved in this? Matt Sickler – If it is 5 lots that are less than 5 acres in size it is a realty subdivision. So, if the 5th parcel is larger than 5 acres, which it looks like it is, it would be, but I will check and confirm that. Paula Kay – Is this part of the Emerald Green subdivision? Richard Steinberg – No. Jim Carnell – It was originally supposed to be.

Jim Carnell – We received an email from Mike Messenger, our water and sewer superintendent, regarding the services to this property and saying this is not in the district. I reached out to him as soon as I received it and clarified that the property as in the district, just not serviceable by the district. What he looked at the tax bill and because it has zero points assigned to it, he just assumed it wasn't in the district. We had recently redone the maps and when we spoke, he realized it was in the district. With that being said, we determined that 2 of the lots will have sewer in front of them and 2 will not. Chairman Lara – They would have to tie into the system, right? Jim Carnell – Right. There is a manhole right in front, but the sewer lines only go in one direction. Chairman Lara – Okay. So, we would just need some clarification from Mike on that. Plus, the DEC may have to get involved now. Jim Carnell – We were hoping to have something for this meeting. Matt Sickler – I will get with Mike Messenger and Jim and we can figure that all out. Richard Steinberg – We had to put in an extension on another project, so we are familiar with the process.

Chairman Lara – So what I think we will do is put this project back on for 2 weeks to give our engineer time to address the questions asked of him tonight. Helen Budrock – This project will need a public hearing. Jim Carnell – I think this is one of those situations where it can be waived. Helen Budrock – I think we first need to determine if this is a major subdivision or not. Paula, what do you think? Paula Kay – It is a major subdivision. Helen Budrock – Than a public hearing will be required. Richard Steinberg – I thought this is only considered 4-lots. Helen Budrock – No, because the original lot is considered a 5th lot. Richard Steinberg – So what if we only subdivide off 3 lots? Helen Budrock – That would make it a minor subdivision. Paula Kay – And then a public hearing would be at the Boards discretion. Richard Steinberg- Okay, then I will just take off 1 lot to avoid the public hearing so we can get these houses built this summer. Paula Kay – Taking a lot off doesn't necessarily mean you won't need a public hearing; it just means that one is not required and it is at the Boards discretion. Chairman Lara – Okay, then you would just have to come back with a new, revised subdivision map and clarification on water and sewer. Helen Budrock – We will also need you to fill out a short form EAF. Richard Steinberg – No problem.

NOB HILL – NEW & OLD

4599 State Route 42, Kiamesha Lake, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Helen Budrock shared the site plan for everyone to see.

Joel Kohn – I am basically only here for the “old” portion of the site plan, which I have been involved with since the beginning. That is for the replacement of 4 bungalows and an extension to the shul. I know there is some outstanding stuff with the “new” portion, but I will let Jim explain that.

Jim Carnell – This project was last here in September of 2022 for conditional approval for the “old” units, but there was a discussion about how both are connected. They share amenities, like the shul and the pools, and there is a fence around the whole property that does not split the old development from the new development in any way. There were still some outstanding items from the “new” development that had not been completed or resolved, so the Board basically granted conditional approval at that time, with the caveat that the pending stuff would be completed by December. They came back in December and it was the same situation. The work had not been completed, there were still several outstanding issue with the site plan, and by that time we had noticed that they had started to finish several of the basements without permits. They did end up getting permits for that, but the work was non-compliant because we issued permits for no bedrooms in the basement and when Brian went for final inspections, they were full of bunk rooms. The windows were a couple inches too high and therefore did not meet egress. I believe that issue has been resolved with the state because they applied for a variance, or a waiver, from the state department of codes for that. I did go out to the site last week and there were still a couple of outstanding items, but most of the stuff had been completed as far as the development. We did receive as built plans from Mike Rielly, but Randy Watson still refuses to sign off on the stormwater plans because there is a financial situation there. Two of the outstanding items is the landscaping by the front entrance, which I reiterated needs to be done, and storage under the deck, which I think we talked about briefly in December. However, now that those units have been completed and there are windows under the decks, nothing can impede those windows. I had a discussion with the president of the HOA and the developer for alternate locations or some other means of storage. They came up with 2 different locations on the property and sent in pictures showing the spaces they are now proposing. I believe they prosed a small portion of the shul and an old laundry building. The units now have their own washer and dryer in them, so there is no need for the laundry building anymore. They did have issues with things being left out after the season, which has not occurred for the last 2 seasons, and the garbage has been picked up. With this being a townhouse type of construction, the Board was pretty adamant that they needed some kind of storage, especially now that the basements are finished.

Michael Croissant – Is there any outstanding violations? Jim Carnell – No, they were all correct. Paula Kay – They may have taken care of the violations, but the are not in compliance with the existing site plan, which sounds like could easily be taken care of. Chairman Lara – I don’t think there is anything we can do without signed plans from Randy though. Paula Kay – Correct.

Helen Budrock – Is this related to the new or the old project? Jim Carnell – The Board kind of combined them back in December as it was determined there is no differentiation between the 2 projects. The amenities and utilities are shared, so even though there is a property line there, they function as one. Helen Budrock – So, can I comment on the landscaping now? Michael Croissant – I also have comments that I’m not sure if I should voice at this time. Like all the red they are looking to eliminate. Joel Kohn – I can’t really help with that, but maybe the contractor can. Paula Kay – I don’t think that is necessary because they need to do everything that was previously agreed to and need to get signed plans. Helen Budrock – It sounded like the Board as amenable to the idea of eliminating the storage units under the deck, right? Chairman Lara – I think we have to because it sounds like that is not an option any longer. Helen Budrock – So, you will work with the developer on the alternative to the storage units, but it sounds like the Board is adamant about keeping all of the original landscaping. Chairman Lara – Correct. Michael Croissant – I think there was something here with the playgrounds and a bond was collected. Jim Carnell – Right and we still hold that bond. Paula Kay – So, if the landscaping does not get taken care of, you can use that bond to do so.

Joel Kohn – Can I ask for a partial approval for the 4 replacement units and the shul extension? Jim Carnell – Well, you already got approval back in December with the condition that all outstanding site plan issue be resolved. Joel Kohn – The old development was really looking to get their things done by this summer. Michael Hoyt – And we really want these outstanding issues to be taken care of. Arthur Knapp – I think we

need to get the signed drawings to get this all buttoned up before we can approve any of the work being done. Chairman Lara – Right and this has been going on for too long now. Joel Kohn – Very well.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers, Secretary

Town of Thompson Planning Board

