

APPROVED

TOWN OF THOMPSON  
PLANNING BOARD  
May 10, 2023

IN ATTENDANCE: Kathleen Lara, Chairman  
Michael Croissant  
Kristin Boyd  
Arthur Knapp  
Michael Hoyt  
Matthew Sickler, Consulting Engineer  
Helen Budrock, Sr. Planner, Delaware Engineering  
Christina Cellini, Alternate  
Paula Elaine Kay, Attorney  
Jim Carnell, Building, Planning, Zoning  
Jay Patel, Consulting traffic engineer  
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 April 12, 2023 minutes was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Michael Croissant.  
All in favor, 0 opposed.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**LEFKOWITZ BUNGALOWS**

177 Old Route 17, Monticello, NY  
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Chairman Lara read the legal notice aloud.

Proof of mailings were received.

Joel Kohn – This project is known as Lefkowitz Bungalows and is located on Old Route 17. It is an old bungalow colony that has been used as a camp for the last couple years it was in operation and the new group that purchased the property would like to continue to use it as a summer camp. The property is in the RR-1 zone, which permits summer camps as a use subject to site plan review by the Planning Board. Along with the use change, they are looking to demolish buildings 25 & 26, which will be replaced with a dormitory building that will hold up to 170 campers, proposing a new shul/dining room building to the north of the site, and replacing building 29, which has already been demolished, with a building permit, and is currently being replaced. There was some paved parking added in front of the dormitory building and some gravel parking at the back of the property for additional parking if needed. This property has not had any issues in the past with parking, but extra parking has been added to the site plan just in case it will be needed in the future. Water and sewer are served by on-site wells and septic systems, which will be upgraded by prior to the next season.

Christina Cellini – Are buildings 7 – 16, along 17, already existing? Joel Kohn – Yes. Christina Cellini – How far away are they from 17? Joel Kohn – They are pretty far away from 17 as the property line itself is pretty far away and then there is the setback distance from that property line. I'm going to say at least 100 feet. Chairman Lara – The units on the Old Route 17 side are closer to the road than the units on the Route 17

side and those units aren't too close, but that was a good question.

Michael Croissant – What is the conditional of these buildings? Joel Kohn – Most of them are in fair condition. A few of them are not in the best condition and they will not be used for this summer. Obviously, the units being used this summer will be inspected prior to use. Jim Carnell – The building that has already been demolished and is starting to be re-built had the roof collapse a couple of summers ago and then there are a few units down towards the south side of the site that are in pretty rough shape. Joel Kohn – Those units will probably be replaced in the future, but any unsafe buildings will be boarded up for this summer. The camp will not be fully occupied this summer. Jim Carnell – They were not occupied by the last owner either and I believe one of them have already boarded up. Chairman Lara – Who or how do you determine they are not usable? Joel Kohn - We applied to the DOH for a permit, so they will come and do a pre-health inspection and go through all of the buildings. The Building Dept. typically would not go through all of the buildings. Chairman Lara – Okay. I wasn't sure how it worked. So, the DOH will tell you if a building can't be used, right? Joel Kohn – Correct.

Michael Croissant – How long has it been since this site was occupied? Joel Kohn – I believe it has been 2 years. Michael Croissant – Did they ever do smoke testing on the septic system? Joel Kohn – Not yet. They are working on it as that was something the Planning Board previously asked to be done. It should be done by in the next week or two.

Kristin Boyd – How is the landscaping and fencing on Old Route 17? Is it all in good shape? Jim Carnell – The answer to that is, what landscaping? Kristin Boyd – I see. Are there any plans for landscaping? Joel Kohn – We don't currently show any plans for landscaping, but we will add some. Chairman Lara – It would be nice to see some landscaping added. Jim Carnell – You really can't start seeing into the site until you are about where the paved parking on front of the dormitory is shown. Chairman Lara – When driving by in the past, I remember seeing a big building kind of close to the road, is that the building that has already been demolished? Jim Carnell – No, but it is the other building that is proposed to be demolished.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

No public turn out.

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

### **BLACK BEAR FUEL OIL**

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

Chairman Lara read the legal notice aloud.

Proof of mailings was received.

Glenn Smith – This project is in front of the Board proposing a minor modification to a previously approved site plan. This property is located on Old Route 17 in Harris and currently has a 80x60 foot building built after receiving their original site plan approval, over 10 years ago. At the last meeting we discussed putting a 30-foot addition onto the back of the building, but since then, we have added 2 pole barn structures. One pole barn is proposed to be 30x90 and the other is proposed to be 30x100. These will be used to park trucks and store equipment. Being we had already got the 239 review back from County Planning, we re-submitted the updated plan, with the 2 additional structures, to them. They responded quite quickly with

their new determination, which also recommended local determination. The 2 pole barns will not have any bathrooms so they will not have any water or sewer requirements. The addition on the back of the building will be increasing the office space, but even by adding additional staff, the current septic system is more than big enough to handle it. It was built oversized to begin with and I have added a note to the plans showing all of that. So, the plan changed a little bit, but this is still essentially a minor modification to the previously approved site plan.

Jim Carnell – The updated 239 response asked about the overall surface area and the lot coverage referenced on the bulk table on the updated site plan. Glenn Smith – I was emailing Helen about this yesterday, the maximum lot coverage allowed is 20% and the total increase was 5%, bringing the site to just over 15% in total. Jim Carnell – Okay and you updated the bulk table? Glenn Smith – Yes.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

No public turn out.

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.

#### **ACTION ITEMS:**

#### **218 HILLTOP**

218 Hilltop Road, Monticello, NY  
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – We were here 2 weeks ago and most items have been taken care. With the exception of traffic, which has been a big concern for the Board and is still being worked out. The updated traffic report was submitted a couple days ago and sent to your traffic engineer. I don't know if he had a chance to review it yet. Paula Kay – He has not been able to get to it yet but said he should have comments by sometime next week. Helen Budrock – That traffic study was for the updated counts, right? Joel Kohn – Right, basically the project engineer and town engineer met up and decided when and where new counts should take place to see if there is a difference between what we saw in the 2019 study and what we see now. Paula Kay – I think also the Board wanted more verification about the calculated road capacity. Maybe Jay and Matt can clarify further once they have reviewed the new traffic information dated May 4<sup>th</sup>. There was a lot of information given at the last meeting and I think it left the Board, and definitely myself, a little confused. Matt Sickler – I will get with Jay and go over the new information with him. I did skim it quickly, and as Joel mentioned, it looks like there were more recent, updated traffic counts along with a more detailed explanation on the road capacity. We should definitely have something to you by early next week so that everyone has plenty of time to review them before the next meeting.

Michael Croissant – When was the last time these plans were updated? Joel Kohn – I believe March 7, 2023.

Michael Hoyt – Joel, just refresh my memory, this is a sleep away camp, not a day camp, right? Joel Kohn – Right, it is now a sleep away camp. Michael Hoyt – And how many kids are usually there? Joel Kohn – With this proposed expansion, it will be up to 250 kids. Matt Sickler – I believe the septic is designed for 250 camps and 318 staff and family, right? Joel Kohn – Right. Jim Carnell – 318 total combined? Joel Kohn – No,

138 plus 250.

Paula Kay – I believe there was another open issue Matt Sickler was looking into. Matt, would you explain more about this. Matt Sickler – I have been asked to review the type of septic system proposed to see if it would be sufficient. I took a look at that today and had some questions that I talked to Zack Peters about. The type of system proposed is called a shallow absorption trench system and the sewer laterals are constructed so that the bottom lateral is in existing soil. Typically, they are 24 – 30 inches in, but a shallow system is raised up a little bit. The deeper you go the soils are a little less conducive to the waste water application, so these types of systems are becoming more common. I am just not use to these types of systems, so I had some questions that I went over with Zack. I will put them in a memo to you, so that you are aware of them and the recommendations that were discussed and things to be added to the plan. The only potential large issue I seen was the design that was prepared and submitted to the DEC. It is using a figure of somewhere around 36 gallons per day per camper, and DOH, when reviewing the water system, came back and asked why the figure was not 75 gallons per day per camper, which is what DEC currently has in their design manual for dormitories. Their older version had a breakdown of flows for campgrounds that broke out separate flows for dining, showers, etc. because there is a difference in those. That would obviously affect the size of the system, so DEC wanted them to use the higher design flow. The last thing I wanted to bring up is that the existing system was sized using older fixtures, making the flow rate 150 gallons per day per bedroom. Once you get into the era of water saving fixtures you are allowed to reduce that to 110 gallons per day, so they are now proposing to go through the old units and replace the old fixtures with water saving ones. This is a good idea in the long run, and then being able to use those reduced figures, they will have the capacity in the existing out fall. That might be something you want to have done while pulling permits with the Building Dept. and certified by an engineer. Joel Kohn – Actually when discussing a different camp last week with the DOH, they said we can use the old 50 or 55 gallons per day if you take everything into account, which I will discuss more with Zack. This is in with the DEC for review, so we will see what they have to say. We will modify whatever DEC comes back with, if anything is needed. Chairman Lara – I know it is a long process, but have you had any updates from the décor the Doh since our last discussion? Joel Kohn – We did receive comment back from the DOH and there are no deal breakers from them, we just have to figure out the proper flow number that we have been discussing. Other than that, I believe we are prepared to respond to them. Zach Peters – That is correct. We did receive a few, minor technical comments from the DOH. It was just stuff they wanted cleaned up and we have a revised plan ready to send back to them. We were hoping to get a response back from the DEC before we do so, so that everything can be concurrently and kept consistent. I did reach out to the DEC again today to see when they expect to get us comments, but I didn't get a response back yet. But as soon as we do, we will take their comments into account. To touch on what Matt has said about the flow rates, it really only impacts the dormitory use. So, it will have some impact on the sizing, but not a substantial impact in terms of all flows proposed. Matt Sickler – Right. The staff housing calculations are pretty straight forward, it is the portion of the flow contributed to the dormitories that is in question.

Michael Croissant – I have a question in regards to the wetlands. Going back to a Michael Fratz email with MH&E asking if anybody can verify if the Army Corp took jurisdiction of the wetlands, the email stated that usually they will send a jurisdiction of determination that states they have reviewed an accurate presentation of the wetlands, including the stream. Has that been received? Joel Kohn – The Army Corps does not do any JDs anymore. So, basically what we are doing is submitting that wetland disturbance permit to get correspondence from the Army Corps. That is how it is usually done these days. Michael Croissant – Is that in the process or have you done that already? Joel Kohn – That is in the process. Paula Kay – I think it might be helpful in closing this issue out if you could send us a copy of the transmission letter to the Town. Joel Kohn – It hasn't been submitted yet, but it has been prepared. Paula Kay – When you do, can you just send a copy to Planning? Joel Kohn – Sure. Matt Sickler – That will help keep everybody in the loop on that process. Paula Kay – Correct.

Kristin Boyd – In the same email Michael just referenced, there was some commentary about the

placement of the road and the disturbance it may have on the wetlands. I was wondering if someone could talk to that? Matt Sickler – If I'm remembering this correctly, I believe it was in regards to the location of the loop road, which goes around the new units, and the intermittent stream between the DEC and Army Corps wetlands. Joel Kohn – That is correct and I will let Zack answer to that. Zack Peters – Basically what happened was Mike Fratz had comment asking us to look into adjusting the location of the access drive in between the Army Corps and DEC buffer to try and limit the impacts to the Army Corp wetlands. We did look at adjusting that layout and basically found that if we shift that access drive over, we would have to shift all of the grading and the stormwater that is associated with that, which ended up creating an impact on the 100-foot DEC buffer that was just as substantial, if not a greater impact. When we started laying it out, it made more sense to stay where it is. Kristin Boyd – Were there other mitigations you explored? I think they suggested raising the road or the walkway. Zack Peters – That was in regards to the crossing and that will come down to DEC's review and what they issue. If they want a different type of walkway there, we will definitely look into that. Being it is not a substantial flow stream and there is not a huge change in elevation so I don't know if it makes much sense in this case, but it is something we will look into as part of the review with the DEC. Michael Croissant – I can't find the stream on the site plan, is it there? Joel Kohn – I will show it to you. Matt Sickler – I think it was labeled as intermittent stream, but I don't remember what plan it was on. Joel Kohn – It is shown on sheet 3 of 14 and again, it has to be shown as part of our submittal to DEC and Army Corps. Kristin Boyd – Is there a chance we will get a response from the Army Corps in the next 2 weeks? Joel Kohn – No.

Jim Carnell – Where does this project stand with the SWPP? Matt Sickler – I believe Zack has addressed all of our previous comments pertaining to the stormwater management for the water quality and quantity. Jim Carnell – Just no construction yet? Matt Sickler – It has been a while sense I have looked at it so I will confirm everything with Zack over the next couple of weeks.

Chairman Lara – I have notes about the SPDES permit, where do we stand with that? Matt Sickler – I believe they have a current SPDES permit and this application actually modifies that permit to add another outfall, so it will be a new permit with new approval and expiration dates. Joe Kohn – That is correct. Chairman Lara – And that process has been started, right? Matt Sickler – Yes. I believe it went to the DEC back in March.

Helen Budrock – From a SEQR prospective, the Board declared their intent to serve as Lead Agency earlier this year and I see the notices were circulated back in March, but I don't believe the Board has officially declared themselves Lead Agency. Is that something we can do tonight? Paula Kay – Yes, because this is on for action. Joel Kohn – The Board actually re-established Lead Agency in February of this year and left it up to the applicant whether or not to re-circulate and we did just to be safe. Helen Budrock – That was the February 18<sup>th</sup> meeting? Joel Kohn – Right.

Chairman Lara – Paula, we obviously have to wait for Jay's comments, right? Paula Kay – Right. Joel Kohn – Do you think you will be ready to act on the approval at the next meeting? Paula Kay – I think the Board would most likely be ready to act, but if they are looking at an approval, you will need to draft a resolution. Joel Kohn – That is exactly what I was getting to. We want to be as prepared as possible and if you know the conditions now, we can draft a resolution before the next meeting. Chairman Lara – We can do that now Paula? Paula Kay – Yes. Chairman Lara – Okay. We discussed a few things and we would like a bond for the infrastructure, which I believe Matt would decide an appropriate amount. Joel Kohn – Our engineer will come up with the amount and send it to Matt to be approved. Matt Sickler – Correct. Chairman Lara - Water and sewer has to be in place before building permits are issued. This is an increasing problem in the Town and has to be done for all projects going forward, not just this one. Jim, maybe you can elaborate on that. Jim Carnell – It seems to be a reoccurring issue that projects are coming in, putting up their bonds, starting their infrastructure, and come time for people to occupy the houses, water and sewer are still not in place. The bonds are not covering the work that still needs to be done, so to avoid some of that, we wouldn't get into issuing permits for occupying structures until we have a substantial completion of

infrastructure. This is a reoccurring issue on many projects and it makes things complicated, not just for my department, but the property owners and the people who are ready to move into these facilities. Joel Kohn – I understand your frustration with some of the project. Jim Carnell – If we can get to a point where substantial water and sewer infrastructures are completed, then we can reduce the bond, which we have done on other projects, as long as the approval resolution is worded that way. Joel Kohn – When you say substantial completion of infrastructure, some of the projects has sewer package plants and have to wait for DEC approval, construction approval, and then ordered by the manufacturer, that may take a year to 18 months. I think it is a little unreasonable to have to wait for all of that. Jim Carnell – I don't think it is because it is not the purview of this Board or the Town to be responsible for financing by sale of units. If this wasn't a problem that we have seen repeatedly, we wouldn't be talking about it. Joel Kohn – I understand and was just seeing if there is any other way we can work it out. Jim Carnell – If you have an idea, add it to the resolution for us to review. Joel Kohn – I have a suggestion tonight if I may. Michael Croissant – I think you should put it into the resolution instead of having a round table discussion about it tonight. Joel Kohn – I wanted to see how the Board would receive it before I do that. Helen Budrock – Is it specifically relate to this project? Because if not, I think it is a conversation you guys should have after the meeting. Joel Kohn – Yes and others as well. If you do allow for building permits to be issued, there can be a condition that you can't have your fanning inspection done until your infrastructure is in place. Jim Carnell – That sounds like a nightmare for my department, so I'm really not inclined to entertain that. Arthur Knapp – I believe this is an issue with management expectations and everyone just needs to start managing better. Matt Sickler – If I may suggest, I would incorporate some kind of wetland protection, during construction, into the resolution. Maybe some kind of fencing or something, so we don't end up with dirt stock piled in it. Joel Kohn – I believe we did address that already and we show fencing around the wetlands, but I will make sure it is in the resolution. Paula Kay – And all fees must be paid.

Chairman Lara – Okay. So, you will work with Paula on the resolution and we will see you back in 2 weeks.

#### **ANES KURTAGIC**

4342 State Route 42, Monticello, NY  
Tim Gottlieb, Project representative

Tim Gottlieb brought the latest site plan to show the Board (as the one emailed in was incorrect)

Tim Gottlieb – Since we were last here, we reviewed the DOT and County DPW comments. They commented on defining vehicular access to the property, so we placed pin bumpers along the DOT portion and along the County Road, to make the entrance a little bit more defined. We also placed split rail fence along this retaining wall and added to 2 signs; one that says “right turn only” and one that says “no left turns”. That was pretty much it.

Chairman Lara – Matt, do you have any comments on this? Matt Sickler – Just one, what direction are the lights facing that were added to the front of the building? Tim Gottlieb – Downward. Matt Sickler – Perfect. I just wanted to make sure since they are facing the county road.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

Chairman Lara – Do we need a NEG DEC on this? Helen Budrock – This is a type II action and is just a change in use, so you are good as far as SEQR goes.

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

A motion to approve the special use permit was made by Michael Croissant and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed

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

**BLACK BEAR FUEL OIL**

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

Chairman Lara explained that at the last meeting it was discussed that if no one came forward to speak at the public hearing, that was held tonight, and the Board did not have any additional questions, they would consider also taking action tonight.

Glenn Smith – You heard my explanation earlier in regards to the minor modification being proposed for this project and there was nobody here for the public hearing. It submitted a short form EAF, so I believe all we would need is a NEG DEC, if the Board is inclined to act on this tonight.

Helen Budrock – What is the total square feet of the 2 pole barns together? Glenn Smith – 5,700 square feet. Helen Budrock – So, we originally had this project classified as a type II action when it was just the addition to the building, but if you have an assessor structure or structures over 4,000 square feet it would become an unlisted action. It doesn't change that we need a NEG DEC, but all records should be updated.

Chairman Lara – These pole barns being aren't being built now and you just added to the site plan for so that they can be built in the future, right? Glenn Smith – Correct. Chairman Lara – Okay and we really appreciate that you are being proactive. Glenn Smith – I also explained to Bobby that this pole barn could be moved further back closer to the property line, with a variance, and since he also owns that adjoining property, he shouldn't have an issue getting the variance.

Chairman Lara – Matt, do you have anything? Matt Sickler – No. Somewhere I saw a comment about potential for stormwater runoff, but where this project is located you are replacing one imperviable surface with another. Glenn Smith – Right.

No further question or comments from the Board.

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

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

**GLEN WILD RE HOLDINGS**

47 Katrina Falls Road, Monticello, NY  
Tim Gottlieb, Project representative

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

Tim Gottlieb – We were last here in January and Matt advised me that there was a letter from DOT that I

never saw. We contacted DOT and went back and forth a little bit. We ended up meeting at the site and came up with a 30x6 concrete and landscaped berm that has been added to the site plan. That will be adjacent to the barn and limits the access going out onto Katrina Falls Road. We sent it to the State and they said it looks okay. We also added some landscaping to the other side of the barn.

Chairman Lara – Did you provide us something in writing from the DOT? Tim Gottlieb – All they gave me was an email. Chairman Lara – Okay, so we would just want a copy of that for our records. Tim Gottlieb – I believe it was part of my most recent cover letter. Kristin Boyd – It is page 2 of the cover letter dated 5/1/23. Chairman Lara – Perfect.

Chairman Lara – Matt, have you had a chance to look at the updated site plan? Matt Sickler – I took a look at the improvements proposed to limit access and I don't have any issues with them, plus DOT has signed off on them.

Chairman Lara – Paula, is this project still in front of the court right now? Paula Kay – Yes. It has been in front of the court for a number of years and I would love to see it not in front of them. Chairman Lara – So, what can we do to end this? Tim Gottlieb – I'm not sure what else do we need to do? Paula Kay – The Board needs to look at the updated plan and if you approve it, when Mr. Walsh goes back to court, we will advise the court that he has received Planning Board approval. Chairman Lara – I see. Jim, are their building violations cleared up? Jim Carnell -No. So, what I would ask is if you did approve this with a resolution, maybe you can establish a timeframe as to when the clean-up would have to be completed by. They were in court last Thursday and certainly the court and the judge are also looking for a resolution as the original tickets date back to 2018. Paula Kay – Right. Helen Budrock – Is there a list of the outstanding violations? Jim Carnell – Two of them were for not conforming to the site plan and building without a permit and we can't issue the building permit to clear the building without a permit violation until they get site plan approval. There are also a couple other violations for junk and debris on the property. Being able to go back to the court with site plan approval will help clear some of the violations up.

Chairman Lara – Paula, do you have anything? Paula Kay – Have you guys had a chance to look at the landscaping? Chairman Lara – I wasn't really sure where any was added, the berm, I guess. Tim Gottlieb – And on the other side of the barn. Paula Kay – It is a tough site for landscaping. Chairman Lara – Right and that is what I was trying to get at. Paula Kay – More importantly, I would like to know a time frame for the violations that won't be taken care of with site plan approval. Tim, can you know a time frame for those? Tim Gottlieb – I can find out. Chairman Lara – I would like something concrete if we are going to do a resolution. Something specific that can be put onto a calendar since these have been outstanding issues for so long. Paula Kay – And it is planting season. Jim Carnell – There would be no weather hinderance for the applicant to accomplish what has been proposed on the site plan and should be able to be done in a fairly easy, timely manner. Paula Kay – Should we just say by July 1<sup>st</sup>? Tim Gottlieb – I think that should work. Jim Carnell – Just keep in mind that it is pretty close to the road there so any landscape selected will be affected by snow removal. Matt Sickler – And you can't put anything that would be big enough to block the shoulder so you are pretty limited. Helen Budrock – Maybe some juniper or something along those lines. Jim Carnell – I would also suggest some sort of landscaping or fencing be added between this property and the residential property directly adjacent. Michael Croissant - I was also going to suggest that. It would be to the west side. Jim Carnell – Maybe some sort of big barrier fencing or some tall, thick landscaping. Chairman Lara – Fences make good neighbors. Tim Gottlieb – Okay.

Michael Hoyt – Is the equipment storage area being addressed? Tim Gottlieb – I'm not sure as that is part of the violations and not the site plan.

Chairman Lara – So, what is the Boards consensus? Are we ready to give site plan approval with a resolution that has very strict time frames of when certain items need to be done by? Paula Kay – Maybe this project should come back May 24<sup>th</sup> that way Tim can have a chance to talk to his client and maybe

some of this work can get started in the interim. Tim Gottlieb – I cannot do May 24<sup>th</sup>, but I can do the first meeting in June. Chairman Lara – That would make me feel more comfortable, but it is up the whole Board. How does the Board feel about June 14<sup>th</sup>? I am getting nods from everyone, so I think June 14<sup>th</sup> it is. Paula Kay – With the understanding that the July 1<sup>st</sup> time frame still stands. Tim Gottlieb – That works.

A motion to take the agenda out of order, to discuss the Arvin Warf project next, was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Michael Croissant.

All in favor, 0 opposed

### **NAFTALI & NECHAMA FOGIEL**

16 Demarest Drive, Kiamesha Lake, NY

Mark Weinberger, Project architect

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

Mark Weinberger – I believe this is our third time in front of this Board. Our client bought an existing property with 3 structures. They originally wanted to enlarge the first structure, but per the engineer that came out, it is compromised. So, what we are proposing to do is eliminate this first structure, closest to the street, and build a new structure that will be built off of the second structure. The third structure, in the back, is in ruins and we are not proposing anything with that structure at this time. The structure we are proposing off of the second structure is a single-family house. Our client has a disabled child and therefore, needs to have all the living spaces on the first floor. We were aiming for the whole structure to be on one floor, but they did not like what it looked like and we added a second story. It is a lot of fluff, but not much change to the footprint.

Helen Budrock – The Planning Board does not usually get involved with single-family homes, but they are here because of the multi-units, which is not an issue anymore, right? Jim Carnell – Well there is still the unit in the back. Helen Budrock – Okay.

Chairman Lara – I thought we had discussed that unit in the back and said we needed a plan for that. Jim Carnell – They may not have to renovate it right now, but what is the intent. Chairman Lara – Right. Mark Weinberger – The intent is to renovate it sometime in the future. Helen Budrock – For what kind of use, occupancy? Mark Weinberger – Yes, as an additional unit because if they have a legal occupancy for another unit, we want to try and not take away anything they may have grandfathered. Helen Budrock – Would it be rented out or would it be for the family? Mark Weinberger – I don't know. They are not really thinking about it at this time. They did contemplate building the new structure off of this one instead, but it sits too far back for them. Helen Budrock – Jim, what is the condition of this structure, is it just a foundation? Jim Carnell – No. There is an actual structure and should be fine as long as the doors are locked and the building is secured. Helen Budrock – At this time it is not an unsafe building, right. Jim Carnell – Right. It was the second structure that had the foundation issue.

Jim Carnell -The last time they were here Mike Messenger raised the question as to where the sewer line is for this property. We are assuming it comes down Demarest. It is technically not part of our system and is considered a lateral. He doesn't think there is much I&I (inflow & infiltration) in there, but there should be some kind of smoke testing or camera work on it to verify its integrity. Mark Weinberger – Okay. Who would we need to reach out to? Jim Carnell – I would have your engineer or contractor, whoever is going to do the work, reach out to our Water & Sewer superintendent, Mike Messenger, and our town engineer,

Matt Sickler, and set something up. I think starting with just a smoke test would be a good start. I'm assuming you are going to come in with a new connection from the new home and the lateral there is probably dated, so knowing where it comes from will be helpful. We just need to make sure to get proper abandonment. Mark Weinberger – Okay. I will reach out to them and figure out what the next step is. Matt Sickler – I can definitely work with Mike to get this taken care of, if you wanted to make it a condition.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion to approve the site plan, subject to the applicant working with the Town's Water and Sewer superintendent and the Town's engineer to locate the sewer lateral and checked for viability, was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

**CHRISTOPHR AND COLLEEN EDWARDS**

Adams Road, Rock Hill, NY  
Christopher Edwards, Property owner

Kristin Boyd was recused.

Christopher Edwards – My wife and I bought lot 11 of the Emerald Green subdivision and decided to build out forever home there. We have since purchased lot 10 as well and that is part of the reason I am here tonight. I am looking to combined lot 10 & 11 and need approval for an oversized garage. The garage will be a salt box style and we have kind of set it up like a courtyard. There will be a "U" shaped driveway, with the garage caddy cornered to the right. It will be for storage of a utility tractor, my classic Corvette, a truck, and I also have 5 children with lots of toys; such as quads and dirt bikes.

Chairman Lara – The reason for the lot combination being brought in front of us is because the parcels were part of a previous subdivision approved by the Planning Board and then the garage is at the Planning Board's discretion. Jim, do you have anything to add? Jim Carnell – No, but just as a reminder the zoning code was modified to allow this Board to approve oversized garages in certain zones, so that an applicant would not have to go back and forth between this Board and the Zoning Board to get their approval. Paula Kay – it was really just to mainline the process.

Paula Kay – What is a salt box garage. Jim Carnell – It has a steep, peaked roof with a long and short side. Christopher Edwards – I have a picture on my phone to show you. Chairman Lara – That is pretty smart as you can put something like a snowplow under the overhang. Christopher Edwards – Right or possibly some firwood.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion to approve the lot combination and the oversized garage was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Hoyt.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

**HITEN PATEL**

Katrina Falls Road, Rock Hill, NY  
Glenn Smith, Project engineer

Glenn Smith – My client and his brother are looking to build a 2-family home on Katrina Falls Road in Rock Hill. They own gas stations and convenience stores on the western part of the county and are good guys. This is a 20-acre parcel on the left-hand side of the road, right past the Marcy South powerlines, and across the road from the bungalow colony. We are here tonight because a 2-family home in this zone requires Planning Board approval. We will also be going in front of the Zoning Board on June 13th to request a variance for the height of the building. At the highest part of the peak the house is 36'9" and the permitted limit is 30'. Assuming we are successful there, we will come back to this Board on June 14<sup>th</sup> for the site plan review on the 2-family house. I just wanted to bring it to this Board tonight so that you can see it before we go to the Zoning Board.

Helen Budrock – What is the total square footage? Glenn Smith – Around 14,000 square feet. Each house has 4 bedrooms and a 2-car garages.

Chairman Lara – Matt, do you have anything you want to add this time? Matt Sickler – Nope. I will wait for the septic design.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

**ARVIN WARF**

171 Heiden Road, Monticello, NY  
Tim Gottlieb, Project representative

A motion was made to take the agenda out of order so that this project could be the next project discussed after the Glen Wild Re Holdings project.

Tim Gottlieb – All I can tell you about this project is Mr. Warf was in my office the other day and I wrote a letter for him addressed to the court stating he would complete the site plan when he was done with his clean-up. He said he is working on the clean-up and is getting there, but needed more time.

Paula Kay – If we can get the site plan, then the Board could do a conditional approval for the cleaning that still needs to be done. Michael Hoyt – Similar to the last one. Paula Kay – Correct. Jim Carnell – This has actually been set for trial since it has been in front of the court for so long. He did come into the Building Dept. and he has been responsive, but he forgets when the meetings are and forgets to come to court. He agrees to get things done, but the action part doesn't always happen. Paula Kay – I would love to see an as built site plan and then the Board can see what is currently there and give their input. Tim Gottlieb – Okay. We have old site plans for both parcels, so we will just update them. Paula Kay – And please be sure to show everything. Chairman Lara – because he has things that need to be removed, right? Paula Kay – Right. Tim Gottlieb – Got it. Michael Hoyt – Maybe we can see a plan and when it will be implicated by the next time you come back. Tim Gottlieb – I will do my best. Chairman Lara – Okay. So, does the June 14<sup>th</sup> meeting work for this project as well? Tim Gottlieb – That should be fine.

The Board discussed the Keren Hatorah project and what the next step of action would be. The Board previously invited them back to discuss if any progress has been made and they did not show. Due to the safety issues that are not being addressed and the main building being occupied without a Certificate of Occupancy, the Board asked the Building Dept. to take injunctive action.

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

