

APPROVED

TOWN OF THOMPSON
PLANNING BOARD
June 28, 2023

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

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

A motion to approve the May 24, 2023 minutes, subject to the 2 changes Michael Hoyt wanted made, was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed

ACTION ITEMS:

218 HILLTOP

218 Hilltop Road, Monticello, NY
Zack Peters, Project engineer
Isaac, property manager

Chairman Lara – I know you are here tonight seeking approvals, but we have a few sticking points that we would like to discuss. I will let Michael and Kristin explain in more detail.

Kristin Boyd – The first thing is the wetland disturbance. We would like to ask you to come back to us with a proposal that shows no disturbance. Chairman Lara – No disturbance or as minimal as possible, but we really want to see no disturbance. Zack Peters – The federal wetlands or the DEC buffer? Paula Kay – I think what the Board is looking for is a way to eliminate disturbance to any and all wetlands. They want you to analyze anything that disturbs the wetlands and see if there is a way to eliminate that. Zack Peters – I will certainly take this concern back to Joel and the client, but I know previously there had been a comment about adjusting the most substantial impact area, which is where the access drive crosses where the wetlands drain through. We looked at adjusting that and what we found is, if we move the access drive down, it gets into the buffer for the DEC wetlands, which we thought was a more substantial impact because of the way the grading and everything works there. Keeping it how we are currently proposing is less impactful. Matt Sickler – Maybe if you sketched that alternative up in some detail and present it to the Board, they could take a look and decide their feelings on the magnitude of the impact. Zack Peters – okay.

Kristin Boyd – The second thing is the traffic on Hilltop Road. We would like to request you meet with the Highway Superintendent of the Town and see what can be done for the safety of pedestrians. Possibly widening of the shoulder or walking paths along the road. Something that creates a safe place for people walking down the road. There is no room to walk on the side of the road, especially if 2 cars, one going each way, is passing at the same time. Chairman Lara – With regards to that, I know Joel has told us that

the campers are prohibited from going on the road, but we would just like the owner to emphasize that to both the campers and the staff. Zack Peters – Is people walking on the road a current, existing concern? Chairman Lara – Yes. It is not just this development, but it is a serious issue. Zack Peters – So, are you looking for the shoulder to be widened along the road in front of this property? Paula Kay – I think you are going to find that our Superintendent will not love the idea of widening the shoulder, so you might need to do a walking path along the length of your property. Zack Peters – Would this walking path be for just the occupants of the facility only? I don't want to speak for the applicant, but I don't think they want to be inviting the public onto the site because that would be a liability issue for the camp. Kristin Boyd – Maybe just go back to your client with our concerns and see if you can come up with any way to mitigate our concerns. Isaac – You guys have mentioned a sidewalk. Chairman Lara – We know the Superintendent won't allow a sidewalk, so we are looking for another alternative. You will eventually be putting in more homes in the back and we want to make sure we have a way to mitigate more people walking on the road. Isaac – So, if you are talking about something we can do on our property, we have a road inside the project that serves this purpose and I believe was made for this reason. The road runs parallel to Hilltop Road and allows the buses to pull in off of the road and go from one location to another without having to be on the main road. Also, if the boys are walking around, they use this road and do not go onto Hilltop. Chairman Lara – We appreciate you explaining that, but we would still like you to sit down and see if you can come up with anything else that will help. Michael Hoyt – We are also concerned about the neighboring traffic that travels the road as well and the foot traffic that will be added. Zack Peters – Obviously it will be up to us to sort out, but I just want to make sure we have the same understanding. If it is existing public walking along the road, I would expect we are going to have to do something within the road right of way that will be open to the public, if that is what the concern is. If the concern is the campers walking along the road, then maybe we do a walking trail or some signage on our site that will mitigate that. Kristin Boyd – Both of those are concerns, so maybe there will need to be 2 solutions or maybe you can find 1 solution that will help with both. Zack Peters – Okay. I think we will try to meet with the Superintendent out at the site and see what we can do. Matt Sickler – And if you think it will be helpful for me to join in on that meeting, just reach out and I will make myself available.

Chairman Lara – Helen, do you have anything to add? Helen Budrock – I just had a question; does the Board want to rescind its negative declaration? If you are talking about revising the plans to mitigate potential impacts, you should probably rescind the motion previously made. Chairman Lara – That makes sense. Do we just do so by motion? Paula Kay – Yes and it will be a motion to rescind the negative declaration that was made on June 14th.

A motion to rescind the NEG DEC that was made on June 14, 2023 was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

SUNNY FOREST

127 Old Liberty Road, Monticello, NY
Mike Radonic, Property owner

Mike Radonic – Since I was last here, I submitted an updated site plan showing the use as a bungalow colony only and we put a fence around the area for the failed septic system. Chairman Lara – Did you do that with the Building Dept.? Mike Radonic – Yes and we got their approval. Jim Carnell – Right. The last time they were here there was mention of an engineer being hired for the site plan and septic. That engineer helped locate which units go to the system in failure and helped isolate the area where the sewer was leaking. That way it could be fenced off and vehicles would no longer drive over the pipes and cause additional damage. Mr. Radonic also supplied the Building Dept. with an agreement from a septic hauler to monitor and pump the tank when it gets full. With these things in place and the property being used as only a bungalow colony again, they should be able to fully operate this season. If there are still issues, they

will have to come back with an alternative plan, which may be to not occupying the units that feed into the compromised system. I also wanted to mention that at Tuesday's Town Board meeting, they did pass a resolution for injunctive action, so if the system is not mitigated, the town attorney can pursue that route. Michael Croissant – That is for the septic, right? Jim Carnell – Correct. We did not have any violations with the rest of the camp. Michael Croissant - And there is an agreement on file for the system to be pumped on a regular basis? Jim Carnell – Yes. Mike Radoncic – They actually came for the first time yesterday to pump the system and I have an invoice for that if you would like me to provide that.

Chairman Lara – My only other suggestion would be to get a trash compactor. I know it is the beginning of the season and I am not picking on you, but I drove by yesterday and there was a lot of trash out there. Mike Radoncic – I know. The garbage company came and drove away without taking the garbage, but they are coming back tomorrow to pick it up. Chairman Lara – Part of the issue is the enclosure was open so when you drive by you can see all of the garbage and the point of enclosure is so that you don't have to see it. So, I think keeping the enclosure closed and working on getting a compactor will help. Jim Carnell – We know it probably won't happen this year because they need to get power out there and pour a concrete slab, but that is something we will work with Mr. Radoncic on in the future.

Chairman Lara – Jim, do you have any reservation with us giving conditional approval? Jim Carnell – No. They are working hard to get the property back on track and we have a resolution for injunctive action if it becomes necessary. Chairman Lara – Matt, do you see any issue with that? Matt Sickler – They have the system in question blocked off and an agreement to have it pumped on a regular basis, so I don't see an issue. Chairman Lara – Paula? Paula Kay – I am also okay with that and glad the Town Board took the action they did so we can be ready in the event there is still an issue with sewer. I feel the owner has been working hard on this and am glad to see the switch. Chairman Lara – Helen, do have anything to add? Helen Budrock – I know it is far down on the priority list, but I would love to see the fence taken care of. Also, when I drove by today, I got stuck behind a school bus dropping off kids. Mike Radoncic – At our site? Helen Budrock – Yes. Mike Radoncic – What time was this? Helen Budrock – Around 9:15. Mike Radoncic – There shouldn't be any school aged kids there. I think the oldest kids are 4 years old. Helen Budrock – Okay. Maybe you just want to look into that because I know that was one of the biggest safety concerns when this was operating as a camp. Mike Radoncic – I am definitely going to ask around and I have cameras there so I am going to check them out. There should not be any buses there at all. As for the fencing, I want it repaired as much as you do and it is hazardous. Chairman Lara – It also helps to keep people from parking along Old Liberty Road because they can't just walk through and that is important because the road is very dangerous right there. Mike Radoncic – I also put like a million signs and locked all of the side entrances. They do still try to park on the road, but when they realize it's locked, they drive down to the parking lot. That's the most I can do for right now and maybe I can put some jersey barriers there in the future.

Helen Budrock – The Board had previously asked for a traffic study, which was done and is in the drive, but I'm not sure if it was reviewed by our traffic consultant. However, they are changing the use now, so there won't be a camp or a mikvah and the buses that would be associated with those. Paula Kay – Right. It is a much lesser impact now. Chairman Lara – So do we need to engage our traffic consultant? Paula Kay – Not as of right now. Chairman Lara – Okay. So, if you ever want to go back to a camp use, we will have to get our traffic consultant involved. Mike Radoncic – I never want to go back to a camp use.

Chairman Lara – Helen, do we need to do anything for SEQR? Helen Budrock – This is a type II action and I believe it is just a change of use, so there is nothing that needs to be done under SEQR. Jim Carnell – Right. There are no proposed buildings or anything like that.

A motion to approve the change of use back to a bungalow colony only, subject to installing a trash compactor, was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

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

CAMP GER

336 Whitaker Road, Monticello, NY
Glenn Smith, Project engineer

Glenn Smith – Good evening. Joel Kohn could not make it this evening, so I will be standing in for him. Chairman Lara – Great. The last time Joel was here we were discussing that there was an ownership issue, but we have received correspondence since then clearing that up. Glenn Smith – Right, I have a copy of the correspondence from the attorney and the case has been resolved. The person who signed the Planning Board application does have the authority to, so we are good on that. What I just passed out shows all of the violations highlighted in yellow. Those are in the process of being taken care of and once that has all been completed, and Jim’s office is satisfied, we will be looking for site plan approval. Matt and I have been in contact regarding the sewer system, which is a lagoon system way in the back for the property. We are not sure where they stand with the SPDES permit because all we can find on the DEC website is a permit that was issued in 1986 and has no expiration date, which is not uncommon. So, I have to contact the DEC to see what the permit conditions are. I will also take a walk up to the back of the property and see what the condition of the system is because I think it has been there since the 1950’s. It was also discussed at the last meeting that we would need a 239 review, but you didn’t want to do that until the ownership situation was resolved. Now that has been settled, maybe that is something we can start tonight.

Chairman Lara – Jim, can you just fill us in on the violations? Jim Carnell – Mostly they are for work that was done without permits. A few years ago, we were invited onto the property by one of the parties fighting for ownership to show us what was going on. A lot of the work was in the process at the time we went out there and there were a lot of electrical violations. Prior to last summer, they got electrical contactors and inspectors in there and got certifications on all of the work. The biggest outstanding issues were things like roofing and siding work. I would say about 99% of the safety issues were addressed prior to occupation last summer. There was a 2-story building that was boarded up because they gutted the 2nd floor and there was some minor collapsing. To my knowledge the repairs haven’t been made yet and that building should still be boarded up. Glenn Smith – I think you are talking about the building next to the shul and it is still boarded up. Jim Carnell – I think that is pretty much all of the structural concerns we had. Glenn Smith – Right. The majority of these violations were things like steps and decks being constructed without building permits. They did add on to the 2 middle dorm buildings to make room for more beds. Jim Carnell – Right and I think Matt had previously questioned what the new total bed count was to verify the sewer flow. Matt Sickler – That’s right. Glenn Smith – Matt, that information is on the bottom of page 2 and you can see the system is like 2,000 feet back in the woods. Michael Croissant – Is it gravity fed? Glenn Smith – No, there is a pump. Everything gets gravity fed to a tank that is located by the dining room and is pumped from there to the lagoon.

No further questions or concerns from the Board.

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

All in favor, 0 opposed.

CAMP ADAS

13 Norris Ave, Monticello, NY
Glenn Smith, Project engineer

Glenn Smith – This is the former Camp Shira site and we are here because the dining room building burned down last summer. On the first sheet of what I just passed out is the overall view of the camp and the highlighted building is the dining room building, which is currently under construction. The second sheet is an enlarged version of the building showing the relocated decks and doors. I colored all the paved walks and drives around the building to show the access to the building, which is a little better than it was prior. There were 2 pillars that were located at the end of Norris Ave. that created some restriction for fire trucks, so one of those pillars have been removed. I will update the plan to show they have at least a minimum of a 24-foot access drive going through there now so that there is no longer a restriction. I just found out today that Mike Messenger requested a grease trap be installed, so I will also show that on the plans.

Jim Carnell – To refresh the Boards memory, they came to this Board for approval to replace the dining room building, but at the time they did not have a site plan. The Board passed a resolution allowing the Building Dept. to issue a building permit so that they can started building while the site plan was being done. The permit was issued and the building is substantially built already. Chairman Lara – Jim, do you see any reason why they couldn't get approval tonight? Jim Carnell – I think the main concerns you had have been addressed, but now that you have a site plan to review, I don't know if there was anything else that you would want addressed. Chairman Lara – Matt, did you get a chance to review the site plan yet? Does it look good? Matt Sickler – I briefly reviewed it and I believe it references what we had requested of the applicant. We asked for a site plan showing everything that currently exists on the property, which they have provided. It shows the location of the new dining hall and Glenn said he will get the details of the drive on the plan so that we can see they meet access code. I don't see an issue with approval. Paula Kay – You can always condition it on Matt's final review, that way he can review the updated information Glenn is going to add to the plan.

Paula Kay – Helen, being there was never a site plan before, this would be for site plan approval and not a minor modification, so I am assuming we would need a NEG DEC, right? Helen Budrock – Right. This exceeds the threshold for a type II action and is an unlisted action, so you should do a NEG DEC prior to site plan approval.

No further questions or concerns from the Board.

A motion for NEG DEC was made by Michael Croissant and second by Arthur Knapp.

A motion for site plan approval, subject to the town engineer's final review, was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kristin Boyd.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

VERIZON WIRELESS

585 S Maplewood Road, Monticello, NY
Scott Olsen, Project representative

Scott Olsen – When we were here last, we said we would provide some information about photo locations for the balloon test. We have provided that information and are here to see if there are any additional locations you would like to add and possibly get the approval to schedule the balloon test.

Chairman Lara – I live in the same neighborhood and I could not think of any additional locations to add.

No other Board members had any locations to add.

Michael Croissant – Poli field definitely has the height for this. Chairman Lara – And there aren't any houses around it. We just have to look at it while driving home. Michael Croissant – Where will the actual tower be going? Scott Olsen – Down here at the bottom of the property, pretty close to Sackett Lake Road. Matt Sickler – It looks like it is about 120 feet from the road. Michael Croissant – I just don't understand why it's not going at the top of the hill. I know there are solar panels up there, but why can't it go back here behind them. Scott Olsen – I believe that is where we originally wanted it to go, but the owner made a deal for a solar farm. That project may also be before this Board. Michael Croissant – The solar panels are already there. Scott Olsen – I was not aware of that. I thought they were just proposed at this time. Michael Croissant – Is the issue that they cannot go in close proximity of each other? Scott Olsen – I don't think that is the issue because our proposed location is relatively close. There is a carved-out spot where there are no solar panels and we are kind of pushed up in there. Arthur Knapp – Maybe it has to do with the breakaway of the tower. Scott Olsen – That may be some of the problem, but we are doing the breakaway for zoning purposes. Michael Croissant – I personally don't like it at the bottom of there hill where it is currently proposed because I have to drive past it and look at it every day. I don't know how the rest of the Board feels about it, but I think it would be better if you could get placement somewhere at the top of the hill. Scott Olsen – I think one of the main issues is the lack of space at the top of the hill. The solar panels appear to come all the way to the top here and there is a small building up there as well, which I am not sure what that is for. Chairman Lara – It is actually a giant NYSEG substation. Scott Olsen – Okay, so I think that probably plays into it. Matt Sickler – I am not sure of the exact dimensions of the land already being leased for the solar panels, but sheet SP-1 shows the lease line comes right up to the back for your compound. Michael Croissant – I just don't agree with the location and don't think we should have to look at that. Scott Olsen – When we have the public hearing, we will have our RF engineer here and he can explain exactly why we chose the proposed location. Michael Croissant – I'm all for a cell tower, but don't think the residents should have to look at it. Scott Olsen – I get it. Jim Carnell – When the solar project came in front of the Board, one of the requirements was for landscaping along the road, which hasn't really grown in yet, but may help when it does. Michael Croissant – It wasn't really for along the road, but more for in front of it, and it is way easier to cover solar panels then a cell tower. Scott Olsen – It's next to impossible to screen this type of structure. Michael Croissant – Unless you put it up in the woods. Jim Carnell – Is there an issue with the Marcy South Powerline and/or the substation? Scott Olsen – That I don't know. Jim Carnell – Will it interfere will the operations of the tower? Scott Olsen – I don't think that is the case because before we knew of the solar panels, we had it up in that area. I think there was an issue with access to the tower if it was up there. Chairman Lara – Again, we know we need towers, it's just an interesting spot because it is literally be right next to a road. Michael Croissant – Do you know how big the pad it will sit on will be? Scott Olsen – The tower itself? Matt Sickler – I think it just sits on the 4 feet of the compound. Scott Olsen – Right, there won't be a pad. This is a latus tower so there will be case-on concrete under each triangular portion of it. Matt Sickler – Looking at the PDF supplied, it looks like there is going to be about a 10-foot cut back into the hill, but it is hard to tell exactly just looking at the PDF. They will probably cut back into the hill side and flip that to the front for fill to make a level pad.

Chairman Lara – Have you guys looked into other locations in the area? Scott Olsen – We have. We do a site selection analysis in the area we are looking to install a tower and for this area we found about 10 different locations, including this one. We looked into those other 9 locations as well and for various reasons, which can be found in exhibit or tab 6 on pages 4 and 5, those sites didn't work out. Jim Carnell – Does not being able to put the tower in the spot you initially wanted on this property, at the top of the hill, change any reasons why you may have ruled out other properties? Is there another property that would meet your needs better than this one now that you have to put the tower at the bottom of the hill? Scott Olsen – No because most of the properties we looked into just didn't want to lease the land for one reason or another, or just didn't return our calls, and other properties our engineer ruled out. Jim Carnell – I just

wanted to make sure that knowing the elevation change on the property wouldn't make another property now the better choice. Scott Olsen – Understood and it was a great question. Michael Croissant – And Rubin Road is quite a bit lower than this property is at its lowest elevation. Scott Olsen – What our engineer does is looks at the area that is in need of service and creates a circular area, that we refer to as the “search area”, and we then start looking onto any properties that fall in that area. Not all properties are created equal and some have higher elevations than others, but we still look at them to be able put our findings in our report to the Boards. Chairman Lara – So, what starts this search is Verizon realizes there is a need for service in a certain area? Scott Olsen – Right. We have RF engineers that look for any areas in need. They recognize we have a problem or that the network is not performing and start the process of trying to install a tower in that area. And the way that people are using their devices these days, sometimes multiple devices a day, we are finding that we are having to put towers closer and closer to each other. It is a big operation. Kristin Boyd – Is there a cap on looking into only 10 properties or could that search area be expanded creating more potential places? Scott Olsen – What we do is mark the area that we could potentially put a tower, that would serve the area in need, to get a list of potential sites. We look at the geographics of that area and some sites can be immediately ruled out because we won't meet the setbacks. So, these 10 sites are all the sites that were reasonably large enough to accommodate the facility.

Helen Budrock – Sometime before the public hearing, could you have the bulk table updated, or maybe just a note added, to somehow reflect that the tower is designed to collapse in on itself and therefore the setbacks there are not an issue. The public will probably zero in on that. Scott Olsen – I completely agree and will have that revised.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

Chairman Lara – Paula, what do we do next? Paula Kay – If you guys are ready to move forward, I think it would be time to schedule a date for the balloon test. If you are not ready, then maybe an option is to ask their RF engineer come to a meeting. Michael Croissant – I think that is a good idea because I would like to know more about why they can't put it up on top of the hill. Paula Kay – Okay. Can your RF engineer attend a meeting? He can join by Zoom. Scott Olsen – I think he would prefer that because he is in Westchester. Paula Kay – That is fine. Scott Olsen – And you guys meet every two weeks, right? Chairman Lara – Correct and again, we acknowledge there is a need in the Sackett Lake area, we just want to make sure there is no other place it can go. Arthur Knapp – We all drive on that road, locals and non-locals, and will have to see it. Michael Croissant – It is a nice country road and I would rather not see it there. I don't think they belong on any county road, especially so close to the road. Arthur Knapp – Right and maybe there is a way to put it up on top of the hill so that it is not so visible. Scott Olsen – Right. Paula Kay – I think having a meeting with their RF engineer, which we have done for other sites, will be helpful. Scott Olsen – I will ask the RF engineer to Zoom into the next meeting. Jim Carnell – If he has anything he would like to present at that meeting, just have him send it in by the Tuesday before the next meeting. Scott Olsen – Okay and I will contact the Town to get the Zoom arrangements for the next meeting. Chairman Lara – Great. See you next meeting.

LAKEVIEW ESTATES

329 Anawana Lake Road, Monticello, NY

Yonah Friedman, Property owner

Yonah Friedman – I am here because I am looking to extend my deck. I have a corner lot so my house sits on an angle and therefore does not have a wrap around porch like the other units do. I just have the bare minimum deck space and was told that I would have to come in front of this Board if I wanted to extend it.

Chairman Lara – Forgive me, but I am a little confused, is this a condominium? Are you the owner? Yonah

Friedman – I think it is in the process of changing to a condominium. Jim Carnell – I think that is right. Chairman Lara – Okay. That's what I wasn't sure about because the project is under Lakeview Estates and not Mr. Friedman. Jim Carnell – Right because when the project was originally approved by the Board, it was owned by the developer and once he sells or markets, I believe 80% of the development, it becomes a condominium and a HOA has to be developed. Chairman Lara – I see. Jim Carnell – I am not sure what the status of that is, but I believe all of the homes were sold more than a year or two ago. Chairman Lara – Okay. I just want to make sure that if are going to give approval, we do it the right way. Jim Carnell – Right and just like any other project in a HOA, the Board requires written approval from them. Do you know if an HOA has been formed? Do you pay and Dues or HOA fees? Yonah Friedman – We do have Board and I reach out to them and they said go right ahead, but I would need Town approval first. So, I called the Building Dept., who advised that I would have to come to the Planning Board for approval before I could get a building permit. Paula Kay – The Board is going to require written permission, so if you could go to your HOA and ask for something in writing that says that they do not have any problem with your deck extension. Yonah Friedman – Okay. Chairman Lara – We will need to wait to receive that, so if you could get written permission from your HOA into us by the Tuesday before the next meeting, you can be on the next meeting in 2 weeks. Paula Kay – Actually that Tuesday is the 4th of July, so what is the dead line for that meeting Laura? Laura Eppers – The Monday before; the 3rd. Yonah Friedman – Okay. Do I need anything besides that. Chairman Lara – No and it is just written approval so hopefully you can get it quickly and get on the July 12th agenda for approval.

MODERN GAS

Route 17B, Monticello, NY
Jude Colwell, Project engineer

Jude Colwell – This project was in front of this Board sometime last year with a very preliminary site plan and then was tabled by the owners. We are here again tonight because they are now looking to potentially scale back what was originally proposed to construct, more or less, a satellite location. This location will be for delivery drivers to fuel up their delivery vehicle for their deliveries that day. The extent and scope of work right now is really up to the determination of the owners, who I am meeting with next week. In the meantime, they asked me to appear and speak at tonight's meeting to get the process started again. I am not really sure how big this site will be, they mentioned 3 acres, but I suspect that will be scaled back to the minimum they will need. We will figure all of that out all of the details and get a full site plan submitted. I do understand that since we have removed the proposed building, we will no longer need a special hearing on this, is that correct?

Michael Croissant – I believe one would still be needed. Chairman Lara – I did too because it is on 17B. Jim Carnell – Let me just mention something that will likely affect your view on this. The original proposal was more of a retail and service facility. They were going to have an office with staff and materials to sell, as well as parking for staff and customers. Without the retail portion of this, it becomes more of a trucking terminal, which is not a permitted use in this zone. Chairman Lara – So, they would have to get a use variance. Jim Carnell – Yes. Paula Kay – Or add the retail back in, which might be easier than getting a use variance. Jim Carnell – Correct. Jude Colwell – Thank you. That is a point well taken and I will discuss that with the owners. I agree it will be much easier to make this a retail use again, than it will be to get a use variance. I don't know if we have a fight to fight and an actual hardship. Paula Kay – Right. You got it.

Michael Croissant – I don't know how big the propane tank currently being proposed is or if there will be more tanks being proposed after this goes back to retail, but is there some kind of guide lines for storage of gas tanks? Jim Carnell – They can probably put about 30 tanks on this lot. There will have to be a combined total of gallons, but as far as actual square footage and acreage, they have enough for a lot. Michael Croissant – Are there any federal regulations? Chairman Lara – I think there are when it comes to filling the tanks and things like that, but that is out of our hands. Michael Croissant – I just know that

Homeland Security gets involved in projects like this, especially when there are neighbors within close proximity on both sides. I think that is something that should be explained in a little more detail when this project gets further along. Matt Sickler – You can request the applicant to show the locations of the tanks and plot descriptions of how they comply with applicable code and setbacks from the neighboring properties, when they prepare their full site plan. Jude Colwell – I'm sure the owners of Modern Gas are very familiar with the regulations as they own 8 or 9 different locations, so I am sure they are of complete understanding of what needs to be done here and we will site whatever it is. Matt Sickler – Great.

Chairman Lara – So when you are ready, you will submit what you have come up with, come back to us, and we will go from there. Jude Colwell – As soon as I have direction, I will come back with an update and then hopefully shortly thereafter, we will have a full site plan prepared for submittal. Chairman Lara – Sounds good and thank you for coming back to us with an update.

BBIS AUTO ACTION

Route 17B, Monticello, NY
Zach Szabo, Project engineer

Zach Szabo – When this project was originally approved, they had a much larger phase III. I believe it was somewhere around 6 or more acres and we had all underground stormwater utilities, with asphalt curbing and catch basins. During Covid, their previous contractor suggested riprap swales and removing the asphalt curbs and catch basins, due to the lead times. So, we revised the entire plan to have riprap swales and removed a portion of phase III, which was also suggested by the contractor to reduce impact. Now we want to go back to what was originally planned starting in phase II. Phase I has been completed with riprap swells, but they would like to go back to underground utilities for Phase II and III. This will increase their parking area for their leases. They also want to go back to the full proposal for phase III. This was all a part of the original approval and therefore all stormwater is designed for this.

Chairman Lara – This sounds like something our town engineer needs to take a look at and not something the Board can just say yes to. Matt Sickler – Right and what I discussed earlier today with Zach, was returning to the originally approved method of collection and connivance of the stormwater from the parking area to their stormwater treatment facilities. They will put together the current plan set, highlight it, and I will then look at it in comparison to the old one to confirm that it is the same as what you have previously approved. I don't have any concern with them going back to the originally approved plan, I just want to make sure it is the same. Paul Kay – Matt, do you think they would be ready for action in July? Matt Sickler – I would think so.

Michael Croissant – This is still coming in front of us as BBIS, but I thought they sold the property. Zach Szabo – They own the property, but lease the parking area to IAA. Michael Croissant – Which I believe is owned by the Richy brothers. Zach Szabo – I am not quite sure. Michael Croissant – I just wanted to make sure we didn't have to re-do anything because of a change in ownership. Zach Szabo – The owner is still BBIS Auto Auction and they are just leasing out the parking area. Michael Croissant – Okay.

Jim Carnell – I would just like to point out that they have started phase II and are pretty much at the point that they will need to start installing utilities, so I think the sooner they can get approval would be beneficial to them. I don't know how long it will take Matt to finish up his review, but maybe this is something that can be approved conditioned on that. I think they already have material on-site and are ready to move along with this. Zach Szabo – They are currently working on the higher side of the site so they curbing is not holding them up, but it will once they start moving down towards the ponds. Jim Carnell – Do you know a time frame? Zach Szabo – They would like to get all of phase II done by the end of July. Jim Carnell – Which is what I was getting at. Arthur Knapp – Paula, can we do a conditional approval for this? Paula Kay – You can. I am assuming there isn't anything here that Matt can't work out with Zach,

so that would be okay. Arthur Knapp – Matt, do you agree? Matt Sickler – Yes. Arthur Knapp – Then I don't see why we couldn't give them conditional approval. Chairman Lara – I would also be amenable to that.

Jim Carnell - They also reach out to me for a second reason, which I also wanted to bring up tonight. When the original project came in front of the Board, we got cost estimates for the construction, that was reviewed by MH&E, and the applicant was amendable to all of the contract allowance and everything else, but only paid the inspection fees for phase I at that time because phases II & III only had condition approval. Now that they have approvals for all phases and are going back to the originally approved plan, I think MH&E should re-work the agreement. Dave was reluctant to go out to the site for phases II & III because technically they don't have a contractor working there and if they have catch basins and things like that already on-site, they should probably be inspected. I don't know the status of the site; I just know they are in phase II and have some basins and stuff there. Chairman Lara – Matt, have you already done estimates for phase II and III? Matt Sickler – Yes. As far as comparing the current plan to the original, I can do that at any time. Zach and I can get on Zoom and walk through everything together. Michael Croissant – So, they just need to tidy up their agreement and go from there. Jim Carnell – Well that is actually for the town and MH&E; they just need to provide the funds.

Chairman Lara – Helen, do you have anything to add? Helen Budrock – I just want to confirm for my notes the conditions would be, pending the town engineers review of the updated SWPP and payment of inspection fees for phases II and III. Chairman Lara – Right and do we need a NEG DEC? Helen Budrock – If you want you can just reaffirm the NEG DEC, like you did with a previous project, but there are no modifications that would increase any impacts.

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

A motion to approve the minor modification to an already approved site plan, subject to the town engineer's review and all inspection fees being paid, was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Croissant.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

WISE EQUITIES

Route 17B, Monticello, NY
Zach Szabo, Project engineer

Zach Szabo – At the time of the last meeting the only thing submitted was the sketch plan and that went to the County for a 239 review. We have developed more detailed engineering plans, provide a site plan, a grading plan, and an erosion sediment control plan. We are currently working through the landscaping and lighting plan as well as the SWPP. Those should be coming before the next meeting and we are here tonight to request to set a public hearing. We were hoping for the first meeting in August if possible.

Chairman Lara – So the elephant in the room here is Kroeger Road. I know the other warehouse applicant, who is not affiliated with this project, had recently submitted some things showing proposed ways of mitigating it. Even though these are 2 separate projects, have you guys worked together to come up with some solutions? Zach Szabo – Yes. We have the same traffic consultant. We have contracted him to start work on that, but at this time we don't have anything to add and are waiting for something from the traffic consultant. Chairman Lara – I am the Deputy County Treasure and there was talk about possibly requesting an easement on the two parcels on Kroeger Road that are owned by the County. I think somebody from both projects needs to write a letter to the County explaining this would be for economic development and ask them if they would be amenable to a right-of-way on their two parcels. I will ask Paula to reach out to the other applicant, but you know how government works and if you want this to move, somebody

needs to start the conversation. Laura Eppers – The Weiss warehouse is actually scheduled to be on the next meeting’s agenda. Paula Kay – It would actually be really helpful if this project could also come in for the next meeting. Again, we know you are 2 separate entities, but there are so many items that are going to be similar. I don’t see any issue with the Board setting your public hearing for August, but I think there may be some comments or questions on their project that will also relate to your project. You can even come by Zoom. Zach Szabo – Yeah, that works. Helen Budrock – I just wanted to mention that it might be helpful to have your traffic study done before the public hearing. Zach Szabo – We are hoping to get something within the next couple of weeks, but I will keep the Board updated. Helen Budrock – Okay. Just remember the 239 review is incomplete because the County requested a copy of the traffic impact study. So, everyone is kind of hanging in the balance of your traffic consultant. Chairman Lara – I think we can go ahead and schedule the public hearing and if for some reason your traffic study isn’t going to be in on time, you will let us know and we can reschedule it.

Paula Kay – Also, I don’t know if you took a look at the 239 determination on the Weiss warehouse, but their comments from the County included adding walking paths throughout the development, so I assume for your warehouse they are going to request the same thing. Zach Szabo – Do you mean something like trails? Paula Kay – Yes. Just something for the employees. Zach Szabo – For recreational purposes? Paula Kay – Right. Zach Szabo – It’s a pretty steep slope there, something like 50%, but we will see what we can implement.

Helen Budrock – The Board declared its intent to serve as Lead Agency back in March and Lead Agency notices were circulated to all involved agencies, so if you want, you can declare yourselves as Lead Agency tonight. Chairman Lara – Paula, does that sound okay to you. Paula Kay – Absolutely.

No more questions or comments from the Board.

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

A motion to schedule a public hearing for August 9, 2023 was made by Michael Croissant and second by Michael Hoyt.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

DOLLAR GENERAL – VILLAGE 239 REFERRAL

Route 42 & Evergreen Drive, Monticello, NY

No comments from the Board.

INTERDEVELOPMENT CORP – VILLAGE 239 REFERRAL

6 East Dillon Road, Monticello, NY

No comments from the Board.

SPRING HILL SUBDIVISION – VILLAGE 239 REFERRAL

Route 17B & Hamilton Road, Monticello, NY

It appears this project does not share a municipal boundary with the Town; however, the Board did review it and had the below comment:

Traffic – Commented on the proximity of the proposed curb cut to the existing curb cuts for both Stewart’s and Evergreen Drive. Are concerned there is not a great enough distance between them and this will cause issues with traffic. Suggested to eliminate the entrance off of Route 42 and redesign the entrance off of Evergreen Drive to handle both incoming and outgoing traffic.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers, Secretary

Town of Thompson Planning Board

DRAFT