

APPROVED

TOWN OF THOMPSON
PLANNING BOARD
April 27, 2022

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

PUBLIC HEARING

Motion to approve the April 13, 2022 minutes made by Kathleen Lara and second by Michael Hoyt.

All in favor

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

FRASER RESORT

Fraser Road & Route 42, Monticello
Joel Kohn, Project Representative

Joel Kohn – 38-acre property that permits cluster developments. Proposed to be a 69-unit development, plus amenities, community building, swimming pools, playgrounds and sports courts. Property does not have public water; it will have onsite wells and a water distribution. Only a small portion of the property is within the sewer district. We petitioned the Town Board for a sewer district extension to cover this property and the neighboring property (Gibber Road project) so it can have town sewer. Sewer engineers are working on a report for that.

Kathleen Lara - What kind of ownership are you going to have on that? Joel Kohn – Condominium

Chairman Sush - Where is this property in relation to the bowling alley? Joel Kohn – North. Kind of touches the bowling alley. Jim Carnell showed the location of property in relation to the bowling alley on a map that was on the table. Joel Kohn - There is only one access point off Fraser Road but the state requires a second emergency access. There is a draft agreement with a neighboring parcel that goes out to Gibber Road that will allow them to use that as a secondary access for emergency. There will be a break away gate at that access point. Helen Budrock – Did you check with the property owner of the joining property, where the emergency exit goes though, to see if they were amenable to allowing usage? Joel Kohn –

Correct, as its separate ownership. I actually grouped them together and worked it out. Paula Kay – With an easement? Joel Kohn – Yes, with an easement.

Helen Budrock – Cluster developments are designed as a sort of innovated land use tool that allows a developer to cluster units closer together to preserve environmental resources. Obviously, this is a tough site because of the job and the significant wetlands but we may want to take a closer look at the wetland in “X”. It is just something to consider as there are a couple wetland crossings proposed and units proposed right on the boundaries of the wetlands. Chairman Sush - How much wetland disturbance is there? Joel Kohn – Roughly a 10th of an acre. Chairman Sush – How will the storm water interact with wetland that is right next to it? How will it be separated? Joel Kohn– We will do storm water management principles about the wetland areas and below the wetland areas. Matt Sickler – Most likely by fire retention basins, or something of that nature, were they will be separated for one point burn and then there will be a controlled discharge form.

Helen Budrock- Joel, did you look at a scenario were how many units you would be able to do if you just did what was possible? Joel Kohn – We can do a permissible project as of right for row housing which would allow us to do 4 units per acre. With row housing you could probably get about roughly 80 to 100 units on this property. We are doing a cluster and are actually going to 2 units per acre, doing a less dense project. We will have that option but it is better to have single family homes as a cluster development opposed to row housing having more units.

Michael Hoyt - How many rooms are we planning in the homes? Joel Kohn – Maximum of 5 bedrooms. We designed the projects to have water and sewer available for 5 bedrooms. The developer will only give them 3 or maybe 4 bedrooms. They will have the option to finish the basement and add another bedroom. Michael Hoyt – Are they going to be walkout basements? Joel Kohn – They will probably be half in and half out. This will be similar to the Lakeview Estates (another cluster project that is close by)

Paula Kay – So the board is aware, our code does allow that you may consult with the conservation advisory council (Don’t know if we have a full board right now) but I know in the past you have done that for clusters and that may be something you want to check with the Town Board between now and next meeting and you can make a decision if you want to refer it out. Once you guys are to the deep end of the review, you are going to be looking at things like provision of recreation facilities, protection for enhancement of wildlife habitat, surface water and scenic quality. What I would suggest is if we determine that there is a board, you would want to send that out sooner rather than later so the applicant can schedule. Kathleen Lara - We need to put that on as an action item. Can we do that? Paula Kay – Assuming there is a board, then yes. Joel Kohn – Board may be resolved. Helen Budrock – If the Board doesn’t exist anymore, I recommend using Natural Land. They may be a good substitute advisory group to sort of informally run the plans by. They were involved with the Delaware Water Shed.

Jim Carnell – I just have one thing to bring up alluded to water and sewer, being municipal as far as sewer. On the site plan I see, there are 2 wells, are those proposed or testing? Joel Kohn – They are proposed wells. Map will be submitted to the DOH for approval and then we will get the approval to drill the holes.

Jim Carnell – Property would have been/could have been served by Kiamesha Artesian Water, who does not have the capacity to serve any additional development at this time. Kathleen Lara – So wells are probably the right thing.

Chairman Sush – What about width of roadways, any sidewalks or signage within the cluster development? Joel Kohn – We proposed sidewalks throughout the development and roads will be 20 feet wide plus shoulders. Chairman Sush – Will either intersection have stop signs? Joel Kohn – One intersection is actually an emergency exit that will have a breakaway gate and there will most likely be a stop sign at the “T” by the community building.

Chairman Sush – Do we want to make a motion now to engage a traffic consultant? Kathleen Lara – Yes, but what about the conservation consultant? Do we have to go in front of the Town Board to figure out the conservation committee? Paula Kay – I will let you know next meeting.

Motion to engage our traffic consultant made by Kathleen Lara and second by Arthur Knapp.
5 in favor, 0 opposed

VIZNITZ INSTITUTIONS, INC.

24 / 32 Gibber Road, Monticello

Michael Morgante, P.E. or Steven Green, PLS, Project Representative

Steven Green – Last meeting we discussed what we were going to do with the buildings and you had some concerns about the parking. We are going to tear down the existing buildings and Mike rearranged parking and pushed parking away from the set back. I think that was the biggest thing. There was a question about tents in the parking lot. That was for handing out food during Covid and hopefully you can guarantee that. I think that was all the questions and concerns there were.

Helen Budrock – I think the parking ended up be reduced by almost 2/3rds. Steven Green – Yeah. A lot of it is bus parking and they are just coming in, dropping the kids off and leaving. The spaces will be update with bus parking to the rear and there is space for tractor trailer by the loading dock.

Matt Sickler - Is this severed by the Kiamesha water company as well and what’s the impact or increase in water usage? This will be a big concern going forward. Steve Green – I’m not sure. We are in the sketch process. Big question is how many students will be handled eventually. Property representative (man in audience) – As of now the quarterly bill is about \$30 or \$40. Currently using less than any regular house in the area. I believe there’s going to be 3 to 4 times the number of students so it should be a small impact. Matt Sickler – We are going to need to quantify that and confirm that that capacity exists and can be reliably met with a building this size, in a school use with students. I haven’t looked at the code to see if any kind of fire protection is required, but the ability to either have an onsite tank or something to provide that will have to be evaluated too.

Chairman Sush – Is it a 2-story building? Steven Green – At least

Paula Kay – Based on the email you sent out by Matt; I think the applicant needs to get something in writing from DOH to provide conformation that the connection is acceptable. So, if you can get that for the board. Steven Green – Yes. Kathleen Lara - Because that will essentially be a new connection, right? As you are acknowledging the two existing buildings and reconnection. Matt Sickler – Yeah. Steven Green – It may need new lines all the way up the street, which based on the age of the old building is probably bad anyways. Matt Sickler – Or going to be increased if there is fire protection. Mike should contact DOH and discuss that with them.

Kathleen Lara - At the last meeting you had requested some more details on the storm water management, did we get what you were looking for? Matt Sickler – Preliminarily they've indicated that they're going to address that with some subsurface facilities located to the front of the site. With the slips prepared we are going to have to review all of those requirements but this could possibly be a method to do it. They have at least indicated the area they intend to use for it. Arthur Knapp – So can we have all of this information based off the capacity of the school by population so we know? Steven Green – We should be able to do it by population based off of the other schools of similar size (neighboring schools) to see what their water usage would be. Paula Kay – Do you think you can have that by the first meeting in May (May 11th)? Steven Green – It all depends on how fast we can get stuff back but hoping to be ready by that meeting. I will let Mike know. Paula Kay – Okay. May 4th is the deadline

SILVERCREST TOWN HOMES

92 Fairground Road, Monticello

Amador Laput, Project Representative

* Chairman Sush – Appointed Kristen Boyd as a voting member for tonight's meeting. *

Amador Laput – We had a meeting on March 30th with Jim Carnell, Mike Messenger and Matt Sickler and the plan you are looking at is a combination of that meeting. Changes include a reconfiguration of the roadway so the Ripple Road entrance has been moved to the end where the cul- de- sac was and the 41 units get moved down towards Fair Grounds Road. We talked about the new water and sewer line going down the middle of the driving lane so the manholes would be in the middle of the driving lanes. At this point we are going to wait for the town and the village to work out the water situation. There was talk of the option to go through the private lands if the village didn't allow it and worst case we would be going the long way on the public roadways and down Fair Grounds.

Jim Carnell – Original plan had another entrance onto Ripple Road and another cul-de-sac “down here”. Talked with Mike in regards to dedication of any water and sewer lines for easements. We talked about just doing a full dedication of the road so that we would incorporate the easements within your metes and bounds. I think the developer was amenable to making the changes and then the Highway Dept. is not dealing with cul-de-sac, they can just do a thorough road to an existing town road. Leaving an area for recreation in the development for the kids. This way cars will not be coming/going and separating

their play area. Working on an easement with the village (as the Town's water/wells is adjacent to their property) to go directly to the development and create a loop within our own system so there's some redundancy/flows and we don't have dead spots in our water system. There are substantial improvements to be made to the water system. Mike, Matt and the developers engineer are trying to figure out the details on that. The next step is to really get with the village to make the easement happen across because it's only a couple hundred feet. Matt Sickler – Yeah, it's not far and it would be very beneficial to the existing system to create that loop. Jim Carnell – I think overall they just wanted to show the changes. Same number of units, just eliminating the cul-de-sac.

Chairman Sush – Is it too early for a landscaping plan of any kind? Jim Carnell – They just wanted to put this back in front of the board to see if they were amendable to the changes before doing too much with engineering. Amador Laput – That is correct. Kathleen Lara – I think it is laid out a lot nicer and help with the traffic. Chairman Sush – Now we just need to wait for the outcome of the water situation.

AVON PARK

Rock Hill Drive, Rock Hill

Glenn Smith, Project Engineer, George Duke, Project attorney, Steve Vegliante, Project Representative & Carlito Holt, Traffic Consultant

*Motion to take agenda out of order mad by Kathleen Lara and second by Michael Hoyt.

All in favor

Jim Carnell & Paula Kay were recused

Logan Morey as building inspector and Larry Wolinsky as Consulting Town Attorney*

Helen Budrock – To recap, we are at the point where the planning board has been requested to make a determination of significance under seeker. Went through all the impact areas. The one impact area that is still out there with a potential of having adverse environmental impact is traffic. At the last meeting the Board asked the applicant to make some revisions to that conceptual plan for the offsite improvements. There were 3 pieces of correspondence submitted since the meeting with DOT – updated conceptual plan from Carlito's traffic consultant, response from the Town's traffic consultant and then Carlito's response in turn. I will share the latest version of the concept plan on the screen to walk through some of the issues.

Carlito Holt – The two main changes we looked at were removing the proposed left turn lane on the Glen Wild Road approach to Rock Hill Drive and the dedicated left turn lane on Rock Hill Drive East bound as it approaches Glen Wild Road. So, you would still get the benefit of the two newly proposed traffic signals at the two intersections and an additional left turn lane on the Katrina Falls Road approach. Other items we took off the plan was the left turn restriction from the Citgo driveway as it would be difficult for tractor trailers to have to turn around after fueling to get back to Glen Wild Road and this wouldn't affect traffic traveling along Rock Hill Drive. Helen Budrock – On a related note, I think there was an issue with the que length that eliminating the left-hand turn lanes may have created.

Per Jay's (CHE) memo dated for April 26, 2022, attached herein, comments 1-7 were discussed.

Comment #2:

Helen Budrock – Need to wait for formal comment from DOT in regards to what they think about vehicles possibly backing up past the Westbound Route 17 off ramp, while cars sitting in que waiting to proceed down Rock Hill Drive. This could/would prevent cars from exiting the off ramp. George Duke – There is only 3 to 4 minutes a day this could possibly happen. Larry Wolinsky – Is there a way to play around with the signal time to improve this (95th percentile)? Carlito Holt – We looked into that and you would have to take significant green time away from the Glen Wild and Katrina Falls approach and we don't want to cause too much que between the two intersections. The only cause of the possible backup would be the rare left hand turn vehicle. Ideally other vehicles would go around on the right side when possible, but the que will empty when the signal changes and clear the backup.

Comment #4/#5:

Helen Budrock: Can we wrap the 3-foot curb around to the Katrina Falls Road side as well to stop vehicles from exiting on that side (between the tree and the utility pole)? Carlito Holt – No, because we are already going right up to the property line and that would mean putting it on private property. Chairman Sush – Does this cause Dutch's to lose any parking? Carlito Holt – It's not proposed. Chairman Sush – Do we need to consult emergency services? Steve Vegliante – I don't think so as S.L.A. would have had an issue with it and they don't.

Comment #6:

Carlito Holt – Jay's concern, in regards to the Trading Post's frontage on the Katrina Falls side, Is not really an issue as we are lessening the que length substantially as their will be a left turn lane and the signals will create gaps in the traffic. Logan Morey – There is almost always a semi-truck sitting at the loading dock and the cab would hang out into the through/right turn lane. Steve Vegliante – Unfortunately, that is an enforcement issue. Michael Hoyt – Did we discuss emergency services getting through the intersections? Carlito Holt – They would use their lights/sirens to get through and there is only a 20 second delay per vehicles, in the P.M. hour, if they got stuck behind any vehicles. We are amendable to putting a priority on the light, like an optacon device.

Moved onto D.O.T. comments

1st comment - were counts adequate as they were done in June and peak season is in July.

Carlito Holt - We adjusted to the peak season, using D.O.T. seasonal backers, and additionally adjusted for Covid, using backers in regards to historical data. CHA is okay with these changes.

2nd comment - were cumulative impacts considered, specifically with respect to the Hamaspik Resort.

Carlito Holt - We did include traffic in the background specifically for that project as well as two other adjacent development projects. On top of that we used the general growth rate to grow the existing volumes to the 2024 design year to account for any other incremental growth. CHA was okay with this.

3rd comment – dealt with consideration of other ITE land use codes in determining the trip generation

Carlito Holt – The lake community asked about land code 130 and 155. In George’s discussion with Larry today, we also look at land use code 154, 156 and 157. Land code 130 is not applicable as it is a non-permitted use in this zone. Land use code 154 - the trip generation rates are actually lower than the land use code 150 warehouse rates, we used in our traffic study. Land use code 155 – IT breaks that down into two subcategories, there is a non-sort fulfillment center use and a sort fulfillment center use. The non-sort fulfillment center use generates at lower rates than what we analyzed at the warehouse use and the sort fulfillment center use generates at higher rates. However, that’s based on data collected at only three other facilities around the country with an average size of almost 1.3 million square feet. As we are half the size and broke out between two buildings, we didn’t think that was a suitable use either. Land use 156 – again this is only based on surveys at four facilities around the country and the average size of those facilities was 329,000 square feet, 40% smaller than the proposed project, so we didn’t feel this was an appropriate use either. Last land use code 157, also uses a lower trip generation rate than what we used in our study. We were conservative and used the higher rate even though it will be outside the peak hour. Helen Budrock – Sounds like applicant is using the proper, allowable codes. Jay Patel – I agree with these codes on the basis that the fulfillment center use is not allowed in this zone.

Michael Hoyt – How many trucks a day are expected? Carlito Holt – Based on ITE trip generation, during the peak hour, was a total of 118 and 129 vehicles during the A.M and P.M. hour. Of those 35 trips during the A.M. hour and 29 trips will be trucks.

Kathleen Lara – Where do we stand with D.O.T. putting community alliance in writing? George Duke – This is a jurisdictional issue as we are not asking for any permits from D.O.T. Carlito Holt – This is an unusual circumstance as it was referred out by the County to D.O.T. and they felt obligated to comment on it. In their discussions, they acknowledge that their jurisdiction is fairly limited off the exit. They just want to ensure we are not doing anything to disrupt traffic out onto Route 17. They did acknowledge that they are aware of this and will review it. Helen Budrock – The issue is the departments with jurisdiction have expressed they would like to hear the comments from D.O.T. and we are in a holding pattern at this point.

Larry Wolinsky – The question before the Board is really whether it wishes it hear from these agencies before it makes a consensus of how it’s going to go into determination of significance or if it has enough information based on current records and give us some direction at this point in time. Helen Budrock – It’s not an action item, the only action the Board will be taking is to make a recommendation to counsel as to whether or not they want Larry to start preparing the documentation in support of either negative or positive declaration or should he wait. We could invite the Highway superintendent or the county representative to the next meeting. I will reach out to them tomorrow and let them know the Board asked them to expedite their comment or let you know they don’t have any comment to close out the Seeker.

ACTION ITEMS

STEVE MOSS CONCESSION

194, 196/200 Rock Hill Drive, Rock Hill
Steven Moss/Bill Sattler

Type 2 action

Chairman Sush – Does anyone have any questions? Then we can get right into making two separate motions. Paula Kay – Any conditions the building dept. needs? Jim Carnell – Once he gets his approval from you, we will get back into required fire separations for the spaces and whatever else we need to do with alarms and stuff.

Motion for site plan approval made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.
5 in favor, 0 opposed

Motion for special use permit made by Kathleen Lara and second by Michael Hoyt.
5 in favor, 0 opposed

LAURA SMITH

Hemlock Lane, Monticello
Michael Packer, Surveyor

Applicant was not at meeting. Item put on agenda in error

Logan Morey – She is going in front of the ZBA, I believe at the next meeting, because of setbacks. Jim Carnell – She is on the agenda for the ZBA. She did not get in trouble; she is independently trying to separate the buildings and do the right thing. Helen Budrock – We could do a motion for the ZBA. Paula Kay – We don't need a formal motion to refer it to the ZBA but it might be helpful if the board is recommending approval.

Motion to refer to the ZBA was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Arthur Knapp.
5 in favor, 0 opposed

COUNTRYSIDE ACRES

445 Old Liberty Road, Monticello
Joel Kohn, Project Representative

Joel Kohn – Countryside acres was here at the last meeting asking for a 240 square foot addition, which is more than what is allowed so I just deleted that. We also discussed about the compact. We did come up with a solution on that. They are going to use the same area for the compact, they are just going to turn the door to the other side of the compact. They will lose 2 parking space but that is okay. Helen

Budrock – That is a much better solution so that the trucks are not in the roadway. Kathleen Lara – And parking is not an issue there.

Chairman Sush – Anything else we need to discuss? Matt Sickler – No. There're no more utility conflicts with the addition so I don't see any issues.

Chairman Sush – Anybody want to make the motion for site plan approval for the addition? Jim Carnell – Shouldn't it be a minor modification to an existing site plan?

Motion for a minor modification pending the condition for the reconfiguration of trash compactor was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kathleen Lara.

5 in favor, 0 opposed

BBIS – AUTO AUCTION

Route 17B, Monticello

Zach Szabo, Project Engineer & John Cappello

Zach Szabo – About a month ago Ross was here discussing the changes that were made to phase 1 on BBIS Auto project. This included a wash bay that is interior to the building, which would lead to a storage tank, and there was a question regarding that storage tank. The storage tank is not for portable water. It's just going to collect whatever comes from the wash bay and then it will be shipped out by our private company to a recycling/treatment facility. Additionally in phase 1A, we have fencing to separate it from the rest of the project while construction continues and a temporary tailor will be used while the building is being put up. There is some additional lighting that was added to the drop zone area and we are limited the amount of the berm that we are completing so that we have a construction entrance. Those are all the changes to phase 1A and we are here for amended site plan approval.

Helen Budrock – Just for clarification, you are looking for the site plan modification but also a recommendation on granting the temporary switch? Paula Kay – We talked about that but I don't think that is premiere of the planning board. Once the board acts, then that can go to the Building Dept. Jim Carnell – We were satisfied and understand that the site plan may change during phasing, in regards to the fencing, as it will be moved accordingly throughout the project. Matthew Sickled – I agree as long as it stays maintained.

Motion for a minor modification to an existing site plan made by Kathleen Lara and second by Arthur Knapp.

5 in favor, 0 opposed

Motion to adjourn the meeting made by Kathleen Lara and second by Michael Hoyt.

5 in favor, 0 opposed

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers,
Secretary
Town of Thompson Planning Board