

DRAFT

TOWN OF THOMPSON
PLANNING BOARD
November 12, 2025

IN ATTENDANCE:

Kathleen Lara, Chairman	Laura Eppers, Secretary
Michael Hoyt	Steve Vegliante, Consulting Attorney
Arthur Knapp	Helen Budrock, Consulting Planner
Christina Cellini	Matthew Sickler, Consulting Engineer
Kristin Boyd	
Shoshana Mitchell, Alternate	
Drew Taylor, Alternate	
James Carnell, Building, Planning, & Zoning	

PUBLIC SCOPING SESSION

HEIDEN ROAD RIVERSIDE WAREHOUSE

Heiden Road, Monticello, NY
David Higgins, Project Engineer
Kristen O'Donnell, Project Planner

Meeting started at 6:30 p.m.

Due to technical difficulties, Zoom was not available.

Link to Draft Scope for the preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) -
<https://townofthompsonny.municollab.com/planning-board/projects/heiden-road-riverside-warehouse-24-1-312-et-al-p-202-040/site-plan-subdivision-application/application/SEQR#fileModal=true&projectDataId=b55cc446-ffce-4b6a-bbec-928abd8f5f64>

Steve Vegliante explained this is a public scoping session and not a public hearing. The Board will be taking public comment/input in regards to the Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) only and a public hearing, for input on the project itself, will be held sometime in the future; project is in the very early stages of review at this time.

Helen Budrock explained that at this time, the positive declaration has been adopted and the next step in the SEQR process is the scoping session, which is for an in-depth review of the EAF/Draft Scope table of context. She also explained that due to the second Planning Board meeting in November being cancelled, this is the way it needs to be done to meet the 60-day time frame.

Review of the entire draft scoping document started and comments made on the below sections:

Involved Agencies/Interested Agencies – It was discussed that the Department of Transportation (DOT) requested to be an involved agency and the Delaware River Basin Commission (DRBC) should be added as an interested agency.

III. Existing Conditions, Potential Impacts as a Result of the Proposed Project and Proposed Mitigation Measures -

A. Land Use and Zoning

1. **Existing Conditions** – The first bullet was discussed. Is the proposed half mile a sufficient distance? It was determined that the distance should be increases to 1 mile to ensure The Town of Fallsburg is included.
- B. Soils, Geology, and Topography
 1. **Existing Conditions** – The fist bullet was discussed. Should the “areas of steep slopes” be more defined; even though they are sort of defined below in terms of ranges? It was determined that was not necessary.
- C. Ground and Surface Water Resources
 1. **Existing Conditions** – It was discussed and determined that an additional bullet should be added to include the Neversink River; even though it is located on the opposite side of the road where no development is being proposed.
 2. **Potential Impacts** – The fifth bullet was discussed. Is the 1,000-foot distance sufficient and should a hydrological study, to monitor the draw down on neighboring wells, be specifically mentioned? It was determined that the 1,000 to 1,200 feet is the typical/acceptable distance and the monitoring of neighboring wells is included in the preliminary water supply analysis so no need for it to be specified.
- D. Wastewater Management
 2. **Potential Impacts** - The second bullet was discussed. It was clarified the project is proposing on-site wastewater treatment with basically a big septic system, not a wastewater plant that discharges into any body of water. If there are any impacts they will have to be mitigated. It was also discussed that the Board would like to see the septic system on the same side of the road as the warehouse if possible.
- E. Vegetation and Wildlife
 1. **Existing Conditions** – The second bullet was discussed. It was determined that the project also include, but not limited to, the bald eagle and the brook floater. Additionally, it was also discussed that some of the bigger trees, especially around the wetlands, should be preserved to help with thermal regulation.
- F. Traffic
 1. **Existing Conditions** – The second bullet was discussed. It was determined that additional language will be added to specify that that the traffic counts be done during the summer, when they are the highest.
 2. **Future No-Build Conditions** – It was explained that “no-build conditions” means to include natural growth in the community that is not related to the project; including but not limited to, other proposed/approved projects in the area.
 3. **Potential Impacts/Future Build Conditions** – The first bullet was discussed. It was determined that the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation used should be a warehouse, opposed to a distribution center. Additionally, it was discussed and determined that the town’s traffic consultant should review the scoping document and provide some comments prior to closing the written comment period, including but not limited to the proper ITE Trip Generation to be used. Also, the distance being used for the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) should be extended further down Heiden Road, possibly all the way out to Route 42.
- G. Cultural Resources –
 1. **Existing Conditions** - The first bullet was discussed. It was explained that through the DEC process, they flagged the possibility that there may be some archeological resources; as a portion of the site is along the Neversink River. The applicant is proposing to do a Phase 1A investigation, which is looking at existing paper records, and based on those finding, a

Phase 1B may be required, which would be a physical investigation.

H. Visual Impacts –

1. **Potential Impacts** – It was discussed and determined that two additional bullets be added to this section. 1) to provide actual renderings/photo simulations showing the visibility from the locations identified, or at least a handful of them. 2) to include air resources, light, dust, and noise.

V. Alternatives – It was explained that the SEQR statute requires the applicant look at the “no action alternatives”, which is basically what will the impacts be if they do not move forward with the project versus if they did. Usually, we like to see something in the middle or some sort of alternative for a different, but similar type of use. It was determined that the applicant look at some of the several alternative uses, in the applicable zoning districts, and provide some analysis on those, such as residential housing.

Review of the entire Draft Scope was completed and Helen Budrock advised that if there is anything additional to be added/changed, that can be done before the 30th of November. The goal is to have a final draft scoping document a week before the December 10th meeting. Once that has been complete and adopted, the applicant can then move forward with all of the studies and analysis required. There is no time frame in which they have to be completed by and it generally takes several months to complete everything, especially as some studies are time sensitive. Therefore, it may take some time before any movement is seen.

As the December 10th meeting is a few days past the 60-day time frame, Steve Vegliante asked for a formal letter be submitted waiving the time frame.

The Board thanked everyone who came out for this project and the input provided. They explained that anyone from the public can go onto the Town’s website and sign up to “follow” the project, via the MuniCollab system, and receive any updates/new documentation provided in regards to this project. They also advised that a link, directly to this project, will be added to the Town’s website to assure there is ample access to the project.

Scoping session closed at 7:08 pm.

PLANNING BOARD MEETING

Chairman Lara brought the meeting to order at 7:12 pm with a pledge to the flag.

ACTION ITEM:

A motion to take the agenda out of order to discuss the 118 Bridgeville Road project first was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed

118 BRIDGEVILLE ROAD

118 Bridgeville Road, Monticello, NY

Kris Kyler, Property Owner

This project is back in front of the Board tonight for continued discussion.

The Board had the following question:

- Drove by the property and there were a lot of cars parked there; is that normal?

Kris Kyler advised that is not normal and the reason for all the cars was due to a training.

No further questions/comments from the Board.

Matt Sickler explained that he has been in communication with the project engineer via email and informed the Board that at this time there is only one outstanding comment and it is very minor; note needs to be added stating the use of the garage.

Helen Budrock advised that being the size of the proposed garage is significant; this project will require a negative declaration.

A motion for NEG DEC was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Hoyt.
All in favor, 0 opposed

A motion to approve the site plan, subject to last review comment being addressed, was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed

RHAPSODY – SPA EXPANSION & SOCCER FIELD

9 Anawana Lake Road, Monticello, NY
Rob Hayward, Project Representative

This project is back in front of the Board for continued discussion.

Rob Hayward explained that a site plan has been submitted showing both proposed modifications, the spa expansion and the new soccer field, and all required zoning tables.

No questions/comments from the Board.

Matt Sickler advised that all of his comments have been addressed at this time.

A motion to approve both modifications to the previously approved site plan was made by Christina Cellini and second by Kristin Boyd.
All in favor, 0 opposed

MOONLIGHT COTTAGES – UNIT 57

58 Rubin Road, Monticello, NY
Moshe Attie, Project Representative

This project is in front of the board tonight to request a minor modification to the previously approved site plan.

Moshe Attie explained that unit 57 is proposing a small addition, but they will require a variance from the ZBA first.

The Board had the following questions/comments:

- Will the bedroom count be increasing?

Moshe Attie advised that there will be an increase, but they were included in the original approval.

- Don't see lot coverage on the site plan provided.

Moshe Attie advised that he will have it added to the plan.

No further questions/comments from the Board at this time.

A motion to deny and refer this project to the ZBA was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed

FAMILY FUN FARM – ADDITIONAL ACCESS DRIVE

65 Friedman Road, Monticello, NY

Joe Churgin, Project Attorney

Joel Kohn, Project Representative

This project is back in front of the Board tonight for continued discussion.

Joel Kohn explained that at this time the public hearing has been held and public comments addressed. Also, review comments from the town's engineer have been received and addressed. Tonight, they were hoping to receive approval of the requested modification.

The Board had the following questions/comments:

- Still proposing just the additional driveway, right?

Joel Kohn confirmed that is correct.

- Need to keep the driveway at the approved length.
- Is there enough room now for vehicles/buses to turn around?

Joel Kohn advised there is because there is a parking lot.

No further questions/comments from the Board.

Steve Vegliante stated that comment #5 on the most recent review comments submitted by the town engineer, requests an updated or new SWPP be submitted for the area of disturbance the driveway will cause. Is that something that needs to be submitted/reviewed prior to approval being granted? Matt Sickler advised that they simply need to revise the existing SWPP to include the new driveway and has no objections to that being a condition of the approval.

A motion to approve the minor modification to the previously approved site plan, subject to the town engineer's final review/approval, was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Kristin Boyd.

All in favor, 0 opposed

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

KIAMESHA HILL DEVELOPMENT

State Route 42, Kiamesha Lake, NY

Glenn Smith, Project Engineer

This project is back in front of the Board tonight for an update and continued review.

Glenn Smith explained that this project was last in front of the Board back in May of 2024 and since then, some changes have been made to the site plan; a second entrance is now being proposed, the grading has been changed on the road connecting the upper and lower portions of the project, and some play grounds have been added. He also advised that due to the elevation of the upper section, the buildings up there will require a water pressure booster. They are waiting on a complete survey before they can continue.

The Board had the following questions/comments:

- As this project is in the Kiamesha water district, will there be an issue obtaining water?

Glenn Smith advised that they are not sure yet.

- Will the second entrance be for emergency access only?

Glenn Smith confirmed that is correct.

- The traffic at this intersection/stretch of road is awful and they wish there was a better spot for the access road.
- Suggested talking to the neighbors in regards to possibly gaining access to this property via an easement and to just let them know about the proposed project.

No further questions/comments from the Board at this time.

Helen Budrock advised that if the applicant does not anticipate any major changes to the site plan and the Board is comfortable, SEQR can be started tonight. Glenn Smith advised that they do not anticipate any major changes and advised that he has prepared and brought with him a long form EAF; incase the Board wanted to start the SEQR process tonight. Copy of the long form EAF was provided for the record.

A motion to declare intent to serve as Lead Agency was made by Christina Cellini and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed

BLUE STONE ESTATES

268 Cold Spring Road, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn, Project Representative

This project is back in front of the Board tonight for an update and continued discussion.

Joel Kohn explained that since this project was last in front of the Board, a more detailed site plan has been submitted, Lead Agency notices have been circulated, DOH approval has been received, test wells have been drilled, and a traffic study has been done. At this time, they were hoping to be referred for a 239 review and that the Board would declare themselves Lead Agency.

The Board had the following questions/comments:

- Will all units be sprinklered still?

Joel Kohn advised that is still the plan unless they can find another means of egress.

- Need a long form EAF.

Joel Kohn advised that one was completed and circulated with the Lead Agency notice. He will provide a copy for the record.

- Will need to engage the consulting traffic engineer and hydrogeologist.

No further questions/comments from the Board at this time.

Helen Budrock suggested the Board go through the parts 2 & 3 of the EAF to determine if this project will

require an EIS. She also advised that this project will require a public hearing and the Board can schedule that they feel the project is ready.

After some discussion, the Board decided that this project should come back to the December 10th meeting to go over the parts 2 & 3 of the EAF and schedule a public hearing for the first meeting in January.

A motion to engage the consulting traffic engineer and the consulting hydrogeologist was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed

A motion to declare Lead Agency was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Christina Cellini.

All in favor, 0 opposed

A motion to refer this project to the County for a 239 review was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Christina Cellini.

All in favor, 0 opposed

CATSKILL HOSPITALITY – EXTENDED STAY HOTEL

29 Golden Ridge Road, Monticello, NY

Brijesh Patel, Property Owner

This project is back in front of the Board tonight for an update and continued review.

Brijesh Patel explained that he is looking to change the new, proposed building from an extended stay hotel to another Hilton hotel. He has already received the okay from Hilton to build another hotel, but may need a variance for the acreage first.

The Board had the following questions/comments:

- Does the code permit 9x18 parking spaces?

Jim Carnell advised that the minimum size permitted is 10x20.

- Will need a variance for the undersized parking spaces.
- Appears the plan is to share parking; will there be enough parking?

Brijesh Patel advised that even when the existing hotel is busy, the parking lot is never packed.

- There was already a variance granted for a 40-foot front yard setback, will this building exceed that?

Brijesh Patel advised the building will not be any closer than originally proposed/approved by the ZBA.

- Keep track of the expiration date for the approved variance to make sure it does not expire.
- Will you be getting any closer to the wetlands?

Brijesh Patel advised that they will not get any closer.

- Requested another work session since the use is being changed.

No further questions/comments from the Board at this time.

ROCK HILL MOTEL

295 Lake Louise Marie Road, Rock Hill, NY

Tim Gottlieb, Project Representative

This project is back in front of the Board for continued discussion.

Tim Gottlieb explained that he has been hired to help the applicant re-establish an existing hotel. It is his

understanding that the Board had an issue with the previous site plans submitted and were looking for a proper site plan showing all required zoning table; which has now been submitted.

The Board had the following questions/comments:

- New site plan looks good, but needs more details on the proposed lighting and signage.
- Is there still an issue with the corridor constructed in front of the rooms?

Jim Carnell advised that he believes they have added a second means of egress, a door off the back of each room, to remedy the issue. They may still need to sprinkler the building though.

- The DOT will want to be involved.
- There is an issue already with traffic getting on and off the highway right there, so just keep that in mind.

No further questions/comments from the Board.

Per Helen Budrock, this is a Type 2 action under SEQR, so no action required there.

A motion to approve the site plan, subject to the town engineer's final review/approval, was made by Michael Hoyt ad second by Kristin Boyd.
All in favor, 0 opposed

PITULA – 2 LOT SUBDIVISION

Edwards Road, Rock Hill, NY
Joel Kohn, Project Representative

This project is in front of the Board tonight to request a minor subdivision.

Joel Kohn explained that this is a proposed 2-lot subdivision. Lot 1 will be 7.02 acres and Lot 2 will be the remainder of the parcel; approximately 81 acres. The property owner also owns the adjacent, land-locked parcel, so they are also proposing a 24' access easement, through Lot 1, to access it. They received and reviewed the review comments from Matt Sickler (MHE) and there will be no issues addressing them.

The Board had the following question:

- Is a 239 required?

Helen Budrock advised that one is not required and this is a Type 2 action under SEQR, so no SEQR required there either.

No further questions/comments from the Board.

Steve Vegliante advised that he needs to review the easement when drafted and before being filed.

A motion to approve the minor, 2-lot subdivision, subject to the town engineer's comments being addressed, was made by Christina Celini and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed

RADONCIC – 2 LOT SUBDIVISION

Pleasant Street Extension, Monticello, NY

Tim Gottlieb, Project Representative

Bato Radoncic, Property Owner

This project is in front of the Board tonight to request a minor subdivision.

Tim Gottlieb explained that this is a proposed 2-lot subdivision in the SR district. Parcel 1 will be 21,000 sq. ft. and Parcel 2 will be 21,554 sq. ft. with a proposed 12' access easement to access Parcel 2.

The Board had the following questions/comments:

- Is there an issue with water?

Jim Carnell advised that this property is an outside user for the Village of Monticello and they do not want any new connections, so they will need an approval letter from them first.

- Is a 12' easement wide enough?

Jim Carnell advised that we typically require/see a 20' easement; 12' is a little small. Matt Sickler suggested possibly expanding a few feet to the southern side.

No further questions/comments from the Board at this time.

Jim Carnell advised that the property owner also owns the property next door to this one and there are some open violations on that property. One for a pool and one for a deck built in the setback; both done without building permits. Bato Radoncic advised that the pool is being removed. Jim Carnell explained that if he intends to keep the deck, he will need to pull a building permit and get a variance from the Zoning Board.

Steve Vegliante advised that the violations will need to be addressed and an approval letter from the Village of Monticello received before any action can be taken. Also, he will need to review the easement prior to it being filed.

A motion to close the meeting at 8:04 p.m. was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Christina Cellini.
All in favor, 0 opposed

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers, Secretary

Town of Thompson Planning Board

DRAFT

DRAFT