



Paula Kay – Lets go over the site plan. Howard Perez – To be clear the surveyor has been engaged and preformed their survey, but have not submitted any documents to me yet, therefore this is a rough drawing relative to their drawings. Paula Kay – Who is the surveyor? Mike Radoncic – Clear Point. Howard Perez – The applicant is looking to rectify a portion of bungalow #31, that is in a dangerous condition and is falling down. They also want to add amenities such as ADA access. There is a proposed ADA parking spot, that has agreeable slopes, to one or two bungalows and a secondary ADA location, that will be located in the primary parking area, adjacent to the shul. They have upgraded the electrical, maintained the sewer tank, which was in dire need of maintenance, and checked the dry wells, that appear to be flowing properly. There are three dry wells on the property and one septic. The septic is located in the parking area. I checked most of the piping going towards the sewer and they appear to be within code requirements, slope and size. Same with the dry wells. I also checked the capacity of the sewer and wells and created a matrix on a separate sheet from the site plan. I noted all of the fixtures/parties, their directions and how they have been split up amongst the dry wells and the septic. I also noted all of the zoning codes, occupancy loads, occupancy types and square footages. Chairman Sush – Have these been submitted yet? Howard Perez – No, not yet. Paula Kay – You need to submit them electronically. Kathleen Lara – Jim, does your department have an old site plan on file from the previous owners? Jim Carnell – I do not think so. Most of the buildings were older, pre-dated with some additions added. Kathleen Lara – These buildings are hard to see from the road, what is the overall condition of the buildings? Jim Carnell – I believe there were only a couple buildings that we had concerns about. Logan Morey – The basement of the shul was converted to a classroom cafeteria, they started to do a mikvah, that has since been abandoned, and some of the two-story buildings now have dormitories on the second floor. Jim Carnell – As far a structurally, I believe we do not have any concerns. Howard Perez – I definitely have a concern with the structure of bungalow #31, it needs remedial foundation work. I've been a code enforcer for New York state since 2004 and know when something needs to be taped off, so I told the owner to tape it off and not to let anyone by it until we have a permit to fix it. There are two bathrooms with two tubs/sinks/toilets and no supporting brackets on the wood at all or proper joists. It's also supporting a high beam on an unlevel ground and there's differential settlement of the cement block that supports the structure.

Kathleen Lara – Do you plan on operating this year? Mike Radoncic – We do intend to operate this year if we meet all the requirements and the Board allows us to. Michael Hoyt – When do you plan on opening? Mike Radoncic – Depends on how soon we can make everything safe. Michael Hoyt – In a perfect world? Mike Radoncic – Three to four weeks' time. The biggest issues here were the foundation and sewers backing up, which the sewers have been fixed and we did get the okay from the building official. Howard Perez – I will be submitting foundation drawing to the building department to expedite if possible. Paula Kay – Procedurally, there are things this Board need to act on before the building department can issue any permits. You are here as a discussion item tonight and the Board is going to have to review site plans, when they are officially submitted, then we get into public hearing, change in use, etc. Howard Perez – I agree that a few weeks is not enough time and is a little aggressive. When is the next time this board meets? Paula Kay – This Board meets every two weeks. Helen Budrock – My suggestion to expedite the review, if the Board is comfortable moving forward, would be to put it as an action item on the next agenda to schedule a public hearing and send the 239 review out so that can get started while you review the site plans.

Jim Carnell – To reiterate, in the past this property was operated as a bungalow colony for many years, then the new owners started operating it as a camp so there was definitely a change in use that needs to be clarified. Logan Morey – I think it's being used as both uses. As bungalows and then they're busing kids in. Chairman Sush – Is that going to continue to happen? What is the intended use? Mike Radoncic – Similar, but at a slower rate. Chairman Sush – So there will be people living in the bungalows and people being bused in for day camp? Mike Radoncic – No, the people who stay there, don't leave. Michael Hoyt – I think they were busing in the past for mikvah purposes. Logan Morey – They have abandoned the Mikvah. Howard Perez – Correct and we showed that in the drawings. Helen Budrock – Is the campus just for residents of the bungalow colony or are you busing kids in and out? Mike Radoncic – No, there are no outsiders coming in. We were busing kids outside of the property to a local mikvah. Helen Budrock – So is that still going to happen since you still don't have your own mikvah? Mike Radoncic – Yes. Helen Budrock – Okay, so that traffic will still be there. Jim, to be clear this is not a modification of a previously approved site plan, it is a change in use and special use permit? Jim Carnell – It is for change in use and the numerous violations. Just so you know there are two different permits from the DOH for those uses and just like this application should have been in already. Logan Morey – That I know they did. Did you apply for a camp? Mike Radoncic – I would have to double check, but I believe we applied for a camp. Paula Kay – If you applied for a camp, then the board needs to review this as a camp. Logan Morey – The thing is the people staying on site are not really for the camp. From my understanding they are families and facility members. Mike Radoncic – Yes and most of them have kids that will be part of the camp. Paula Kay – You need to look carefully at our code for summer camp because I don't think what you are looking to do applies to that code. Howard Perez – In terms of dwellings? Paula Kay – In terms of what our definition of summer camp is and when you come back next time, the Board needs to know what use you are proposing. Howard Perez – Understood.

Chairman Sush – What will you need to do between the right of way of the road and the outside of the fence? Mike Radoncic – I was okay with closing up that corner entrance and having the main entrance being the parking lot. The only issue with that is ADA parking because the slope is too high. The one ADA parking we propose would have to be in the middle of the property, in between the laundry and the shul. Michael Hoyt – One of the concerns we had before was bus traffic on that corner. I believe they said they were having two or three buses a day coming in and out. Howard Perez – It's going to be a cost to the owner, but I had made the suggestion to put in water filled jersey barriers, which can be removed after the season. Michael Hoyt – Where would the busses be going in and out? Howard Perez – At the moment they are going to have to come into the parking lot. Michael Hoyt – So you are going to have to make sure you accommodate for swing. Howard Perez – On the drawing, I provided 24-foot file for the car but I can make that a little bigger. Paula Kay – I'm sure Matt will look at that. Matt Sickler – Sure, we will review that. Chairman Sush – In years past, the parking on the road was an issue. Mike Radoncic – We seen on the cameras that there was an accident there last year, so even if we close that entrance, we were thinking about still putting up jersey barriers. Logan Morey – Did you ever consider making the main entrance over on the other side, kind of by where the well is? There's a currently grass there and it is almost flat. Mike Radoncic – We did think about that as they were using that for maintenance access in the past, but even there it is still dangerous. It is an idea for the future but I would like to keep it to one entrance, by the parking area. Howard Perez – I think that would be the most dangerous place to put the main entrance as it is at the highest level of that curve. Logan Morey – I'm saying it would be a better spot in regards to ADA access if you could get far enough off the road. Mike Radoncic – That would probably be a better spot for ADA parking but buses should probably load

and unload in the parking lot. Chairman Sush – That is probably the best area because just past that I swamps right? Howard Perez – Correct, then you have other properties along there. Michael Hoyt – Do you use that well? Mike Radoncic – Yes, to fill the pool only. Michael Hoyt – Is it village water there? Mike Radoncic – Yes.

Helen Budrock – Do you have plans to do anything with the fencing? Howard Perez – The owner is planning on bringing it to code, six feet. Are you referring to the metal fencing? Helen Budrock – Yes, because it looks like it was kind of just sawed off at the moment and don't know if it is considered a fence by code. Logan Morey – There's not much fencing there. Paula Kay – Do we want to make them make it look nice, since they are here in front of you now? Mike Radoncic – We agree that it does not look nice and would like to update it, we just put it up as a sign of good faith to show you we are working on things. I don't know how soon we can replace it but we will add it to our agenda.

Chairman Sush – Are there any new proposed buildings? Howard Perez – Negative.

Paula Kay – For the next meeting you will need all of your documents submitted, preferably electronically, by the Wednesday before the meeting. Howard Perez – We will have them in by tomorrow. Paula Kay – You have a couple things you need to look at. Howard Perez – You mean an all-inclusive. Paula Kay – Yes and the next meeting is on the 22<sup>nd</sup> so you have to have it in by the 15<sup>th</sup>. Howard Perez – That's fine. Helen Budrock – Just looking ahead and being optimistic, if the Board feels you are ready you could get on July 13<sup>th</sup> agenda to schedule a public hearing and that public hearing could then be the last meeting in July. Just want you to have a realistic time line. Mike Radoncic – To be clear, we cannot get any permits or start any of the work until we have finished up with the Board? I just don't want any of houses to collapse in the meantime. Michael Hoyt – You can probably tear down the bungalow that is already falling down. Mike Radoncic – Well, it is only a portion of the bungalow that is falling. Logan Morey – Where is bungalow #31? Howard Perez – It's near the primary entrance where the new services are. A little bit south of where the mikvah was going to be. Jim Carnell – I would say, if the Board is amendable for them to move forward with any necessary repairs and they can provide the documentation we would require for a building permit, the building department is still a couple weeks behind schedule and therefore would take some time to have the permit ready. I don't know that they would be able to get much done before the next meeting. Chairman Sush – It's probably more efficient to get the work done before people come. Jim Carnell – They are working diligently but the Town Board is also prepared to issue an injunctive action if need be. Howard Perez – The owner was advised recently that this all should have been done last year but would still like to try to make this work somehow for this season.

Board discussed putting this on the next agenda for a public hearing but decided they want to see and review the fully proposed plan before opening it up to the public.

#### **ST FRANCIS RETREAT**

334 South Maplewood Road, Monticello, NY  
Glen Smith, Project engineer

Glen Smith – The applicant is requesting a modification to a previously approved site plan to construct a two-story detached building to house a chapel, two bedrooms and a bathroom. This Board previously

approved this as an addition to the farmhouse but now we are requesting a two-story detached building. The building department sent them back here for a new approval since it changed from an addition. Everything else is still the same so I don't know if you can act on this tonight as it is a discussion item.

Paula Kay – It's the first time the board has seen the plans this way so that is why it was put on as a discussion item. Chairman Sush – I know technically it should be put on the next agenda for an action item before we act, but I was also wondering why it was put on as a discussion item tonight and not an action as we have skipped this step in the past for other projects. Kathleen Lara – I agree. Paula Kay – It's up to the Board on how they would like to handle this.

A motion to move this to an action item on tonight's agenda was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Michael Hoyt.

All in favor, 0 opposed

### **FAMILY FUN PARK**

65 Friedman Road, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joe Churgin, Project attorney

Joel Kohn – I wasn't at the last meeting, it was the owner Mr. Oster, so I'm not exactly sure what happened. At this time, I have a fully revised site plan showing the modifications and conditions required. The applicant is requesting a site plan modification. They are now proposing to add a couple of sheds, a garage for the tractor, changing the location of the ping pong table and the location of the ball pit. Matt Sickler – Are those the purple items on the digital copy? Joel Kohn – Yes.

Chairman Sush – Can you clarify what was done without a permit? Joel Kohn – I believe the only thing done without a permit was the slide, which was not part of the original site plan approval. It is now shown on the as built conditions along with the orientation of the go karts, which is a little different from what was originally approved but nothing of significance. Chairman Sush – Thank you.

Matt Sickler – Have the stormwater facilities been constructed yet? Joel Kohn – The pond has been constructed but it's not completed, it's still lacking as a settlement basin because they are still not done with the construction. Matt Sickler – Okay and the septic? Joel Kohn – The septic has not been constructed yet but has been approved by the DOH. The SWPP pool has to be revised because it is now outside of the limit of disturbance and the engineer is going to have to work on that. Matt Sickler – Okay because it appears to not be contributory to the existing small water facility on property. Joel Kohn – There wasn't any improvement surface of that area but the SWPP will be revised. Jim Carnell – There is dialog and communication back and forth with the engineer and he is working on revising this and was hoping to have it submitted by the 31<sup>st</sup> of May but he is also backed up. The last correspondence was from the DEC asking when they could expect it and the engineer informed them that they are coming back in front of the board tonight hopefully to address this and check it off. It really just encompasses where the slide is.

Jim Carnell - Joel and I also discussed adding sheds for the purpose of housing animals and I believe there was one unit that did not meet our setbacks. Joel Kohn – There is one shed that sits about 100 feet from the property line, however that property is also owned by Mr. Oster and has his single-family home

on it. Paula Kay – We will need a note on the site plan that states that it is common ownership. Kathleen Lara – Also, we need clarification on the animals. The email from the DOA was kind of vague and not specific to the property. The owner had mentioned that he was breeding animals and we just want to make sure that is okay or if there is a limit to the number of animals allowed or if there are certain animals not permitted. Joel Kohn – He actually got a license from the USDA in 2019, I do have a copy of that if needed, and then was told by the USDA that he did not need a license because he is exempt. Jim Carnell – Can you email the exception to us to put in the Google Drive? Joel Kohn – Yes. Chairman Sush – What does the exemption give him the ability to do? Joel Kohn – Basically it is for domesticated farm animal exhibits. It's defined in the paperwork I will submit. Chairman Sush – Does it show quantities? Joel Kohn – No. Kathleen Lara – Does our code have a limit on that? Jim Carnell – No. Paula Kay – Are the animals there as part of the Fun Park? Joel Kohn – Yes. Helen Budrock – This project pre-dates me, but my notes show, and I thought this came up with the previous site plan approval, that they need to specify the maximum number of animals, so that would need to be updated. I'm not sure in what form and if that is just for the maximum number of animals allowed on the property at one time or do we need a list of what animals are there and how many of each? Paula Kay – There was previously a maximum number of animals agreed upon with Mr. Oster. Michael Hoyt – Yeah, but he couldn't guarantee it because of the breeding. Paula Kay – And when he came back this last time, there were more animals than originally. Joel Kohn – I am new to this project, but I recall this being a long-drawn-out part of the process, from being present at those meetings. It was Mr. Oster's first time for having animals and the Board was concerned about the maximum number of animals there would be. I know as of right now he has a total of 26 animals. Joe Churgin – I think it would be appropriate to document what kind of animals are there now and how many of each. Jim Carnell – At the time of the original approval, I believe Mr. Oster did not own the animals and Rubin was providing this service for them. They would bring the animals in for the season and then pick them back up when the season was over. However, I think they own their own animals now, which is why there is a request for the new sheds to house the animals. Should there be some sort of time frame that I would be healthy for them to be there as I assume they will be there year-round. Joel Kohn – Yes, that is the intention. I'm looking at the 2013 site plan, as I happen to have a digital copy of it, and back then they have a total of 17 animals compared to the 26 they have now. Paula Kay – Just think about a reasonable cap. Chairman Sush – Plus it is now a bigger facility. Kristin Boyd – Do the neighbors complain? Jim Carnell – We have not had any complaints in the last couple of years. Kathleen Lara – I recall the public hearing being a lot and then nothing after it was closed. Joel Kohn – I don't recall anybody coming out for the public hearing. Kathleen Lara – I'm just concerned about the neighbors, if there is no restriction put on the number of animals, since it's a big development. Michael Hoyt – Who will be caring for the animals? Joel Kohn – The owner will be as he lives right next door. Michael Hoyt – Does he know which animals he will be putting into these proposed sheds? Joel Kohn – I do not know which animals will be going into which shed but I do have a breakdown of what animals he has and the number of each. He has 5 goats, 8 sheep, 5 alpacas, 3 cows, 2 ponies and 3 bunny rabbits. Helen Budrock – My suggestion is maybe some sort of table for each shed showing how many animals will be housed, so you can get an idea of what the maximum number of animals should be. Kathleen Lara – I agree so that it doesn't become exponential and it's not unlimited. Joel Kohn – Maybe a maximum of what they currently have plus possibly 2 more of each animal. Michael Hoyt – It would be helpful to know the size of the sheds. Joel Kohn – They are different sizes, 8 x 10's and I think an 8 X 14.

Paula Kay – This project is on tonight’s meeting for both a discussion and action item as we felt you might be ready to act after discussion but I don’t know now due to the animal issue. Joel Kohn – I’m amendable to come back in front of the Board with the exact number of specific animals and a chart showing this, but I ask if we can get a conditional approval tonight so that they may get the sheds in before the season starts. Joe Churgin – We will not add any more animals than are there now. Kathleen Lara – I think that would work. Paula Kay – Well, they happen to be the next item on the list and first up for discussion.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **FAMILY FUN PARK**

65 Friedman Road, Monticello, NY  
Joel Kohn, Project representative  
Joe Churgin, Project attorney

Chairman Sush – Due to previous discussion I think we can move right on to a motion for this. Helen Budrock - We can stay at the 26-animal limit for the time being and then the Board can increase or decrease that once we know more information about shed sizes and things of that nature.

A motion was made to approve minor modification to an existing site plan with the condition of a 26-animal limit by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.  
All in favor, 0 opposed

\*A motion was made to take the agenda out of order to act on St Francis next was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kathleen Lara.  
All in favor, 0 opposed

#### **ST FRANCIS RETREAT**

334 South Maplewood Road, Monticello, NY  
Glen Smith, Project engineer

\*A motion was made during discussion to act on this project tonight.

Chairman Sush – We just need to make the motion. Anybody want to make the motion?

A motion to approve minor modification to a previously approved site plan was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Christina Cellini, alternate.

#### **CONCORD FAIRWAYS**

Concord Road, Monticello, NY  
Henry Zabatta, Project representative

Henry Zabatta – We are looking for an approval for a time extension for the 110-unit residential project on Concord Road. We are planning to co-develop the site with investors but we have a minor issue that needs to be resolved regarding our water supply. We have had discussions with both the town supervisor and attorney to try to resolve the issue and we are making some progress but we need some more time.

Paula Kay – Do you know off hand the date you are due to expire. Henry Zabatta – It expires on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of June. Chairman Sush – Do we do 6 months from the 23<sup>rd</sup>? Paula Kay – Yes.

A motion to grant a six-month extension was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Hoyt.  
All in favor, 0 opposed

### **ROSEWOOD BUNGALOW COLONY**

Old Liberty Road & Pittaluga Road, Monticello, NY  
Glen Smith, Project engineer

Glen Smith – Back in 2017 the Board approved a site plan for a small mikvah building, I am passing out a copy. The building is on both Old Liberty Road and Pittaluga Road, with one road being in the front and the other road in the back. It was built 2 or 3 years ago but they are having an issue getting the certificate of occupancy. The building department has a list of items that need to be addressed to finish up the site plan the way it was approved. As you can see on the approved plan, there is a walk way, approximately 300 feet long, going through the back of the Rosewood colony for people walk to and from the mikvah. Fact of the matter is only a few older gentlemen from the colony across the street use it a few times a week and nobody from the Rosewood colony uses it at all. The walkway is about a \$10,000 job and we are now proposing to take that money and pave a walk way from the parking lot to the front of the building and pave a spot for an ADA parking.

Chairman Sush – You are proposing to remove the long pathway all together? Glen Smith – Yes, as most of the people that use the mikvah walk from across the street or drive there. Chairman Sush – The original use of that walkway was to service the people from the Rosewood colony? Glen Smith – Yes, because that is the colony on the same side, but I have been told they are a younger group and don't wish to use the mikvah. Michael Hoyt – Eventually they are going to get older and might want to use it. Glen Smith – Without the walk way the grades are not bad so walking there without the it shouldn't be an issue.

A motion to approve a minor modification to a previously approved site plan was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Michael Hoyt.  
All in favor, 0 opposed

### **MONTICELLO RESORT**

Kaufman Road, Monticello, NY  
Joel Kohn - Project representative



Joel Kohn – We were here at the last meeting as a discussion item and we are here tonight for a minor modification to a previously approved site plan. As we discussed last meeting, unit 101/102 only has a crawl space and wants to raise the building and put a basement, another bungalow wants to add some decks and then there was a bungalow that already built a deck without a permit. If you want to go over the details again, we can.

Kathleen Lara – I think we went through this petty thoroughly at the last meeting. Michael Hoyt – Yeah, we beat it up pretty good. Kathleen Lara – I just want to ask the building department to make sure there are no other outstanding issues or violations. Jim Carnell – As long as it's in line with their perspectives, we should be good.

A motion to approve minor modification to a previously approved site plan was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.  
All in favor, 0 opposed.

#### **AVON PARK**

Rock Hill Drive, Rock Hill, NY  
George Duke, Project attorney  
Steve Vegliante, Project Representative  
Carlito Holt, Traffic Consultant

Paula Kay, Jim Carnell and Christina Cellini were recused.

Larry Wolinsky as consulting town attorney and Logan Morey as building inspector.

George Duke – We are here for the Avon Park project and at this time will turn it over to Larry.

Larry Wolinsky – At the last meeting the Board directed myself to draft a NEGDEC. I have done so and circulated it. At this time, I am happy to review it with the Board and answer any questions, concerns or comments you may have. To refresh the Boards recollection, the SEQR determination is not the approval for the project, it is the determination of whether the environmental impact statement will or will not have to be prepared. We do not need to prepare one if the evidence/record demonstrates that the project, as proposed, will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment. If the evidence indicates that it will have a significant adverse impact, an environmental impact statement must be prepared. The draft has been shared with the applicant and there are no substant changes to be addressed. However, there were some minor changes/clarifications made to get facts right in connection with the sewage treatment plant flows and the Northern Long Eared Bat language, as the regulatory environment for these bats is in flux. We have inserted a broader and more encompassing statement of general compliance and the applicant has stated, since day one, that they would comply with any federal or state guidelines. If the Board is prepared to adopt it tonight, you can do so by making a motion.

Chairman Sush – Did everyone get a chance to review it? Does anyone have any questions for Larry?

Kathleen Lara – I went through this, item by item, and thought that it was very clear and was worded perfectly to what the Board said/wanted. I was impressed and would be okay with making the motion.

Chairman Sush – Do you have an opinion of a timeframe as to when it should be posted to our website? Do we post it before a motion is made? Larry Wolinsky – There is no requirement that it has to be posted to the website prior to acting. In fact, that would be contrary because it's not adopted yet. So, what would happen is, if you adopted it, we would put it in final form, complete part three, which is basically a cover page that needs to be signed by you Mr. Chairman and then that would get posted to the website within the next 24 to 48 hours. It then has to be filed with all the involved agencies and published in the environmental notice bulletin.

Chairman Sush – Procedurally, are we way too early to talk about an order of how things are to be constructed or built? Larry Wolinsky – Do you mean like a phasing type of thing? Chairman Sush – Yes. Larry Wolinsky – Once the public hearing is closed, which is also on tonight's agenda, and if you adopt this, it moves towards the consideration of the site plan and special use permit criteria which would start to address things like what you were just asking about.

Helen Budrock – Larry, there was some confusion about the public hearing that has been open since January. There is no public hearing requirement for SEQR and the public hearing was just for the site plan and special use permit application, right? Larry Wolinsky – That is correct and it is up to the Board as to whether they want to close that tonight or leave it open for further comment. As we conducted a site specific SEQR review, this site plan is very well developed and we believe that all the comments that are going to come in on it has.

Larry Wolinsky – The only other thing that is on the table at this point is whether the Board wants to direct me to begin preparing any kind of decision resolutions or do you want to wait and take another look at the site plan materials. Chairman Sush – I don't think it is necessary to wait. Kathleen Lara – I agree. Larry Wolinsky – I will get going on that. This project will have a number for conditions attached to it that will show up in any kind of resolutions that you may adopt, so between Helen and I, we will give it some careful scrutiny and will hopefully have something prior to the next meeting.

A motion to adopt the NEGDEC was made by Michael Croissant and second by Kathleen Lara. 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Michael Hoyt. 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Michael Croissant and second by Arthur Knapp.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers,  
Secretary  
Town of Thompson Planning Board

