



Jim Carnell – The building department would like to bring something to the Boards attention. The dumpster enclosure, located on the front, left corner of the project, has a fairly large slop behind it that leads up to the road making it very visible from the road no matter how high of a fence is put up. There is also a house on the adjacent lot and the dumpster would be very close to their residence. We suggest they relocate it. Joel – We will take a look at it and see where we can relocate it to.

Pula Kay – If this continues as a cluster development, there is some very specific criteria that the Board need to consider. There are four areas that need to be looked at and the site plan has to show - provisions of recreation, protection of wildlife habitat, protection of surface water and protection/enhancement of scenic quality. Helen Budrock – Correct. Cluster developments are usually used as a conservation tool. The term cluster development and conservation subdivision are used interchangeably. It is an innovated land use tool that has been around for a while but in concept, it is typically done with a subdivision. You would look at the traditional subdivision that is allowed under the zoning code and then a developer would propose a cluster subdivision with smaller lots so the houses are closer together to preserve open space and sensitive environmental areas. This is the first cluster I've seen as town planner and in my opinion this doesn't meet the definition of a traditional cluster development. It does meet the zoning code and Joel is correct that the developer could also propose a row house development, which would be higher density per acre, but as of right they could do a single family detached development. The single family detached has a greater setbacks and smaller lot coverage. The Planning Board could ask the applicant to do a side by side with the single family non clustered development for comparison if they want. Or even do the same with a town housing development to kind of compare apples to apples. Chairman Sush – What are the density ratio differences? Helen Budrock – It would be the same density, two units per acre. This way is a little more lenient as the cluster allows a little more due to lesser setbacks and more lot coverage. Chairman Sush – So you can use the area from the wetlands in the conventional but you can't build in the wet lands so it makes it denser in the buildable area? Joel Kohn – I don't know if it will be denser. Michael Hoyt – Are you looking to get around some of that wetland? Matt Sickler – The wetland areas are subtracted from the density. Paula Kay - There is also a line in the code that says the maximum number of units under zoning shall not be approved if the Planning Board determines the site plan does not indicate adequate design and management of open space. Arthur Knapp – what is the primary driver for choosing the cluster development? Joel Kohn – We think it would be a nicer project. It will look better and have single family homes, which there is a market for. With row housing we can fit in way more units but it is not as attractive. Paula Kay – How is this different from a traditional development? Other than calling it a cluster development, it doesn't fit in the definition of the code. Joel Kohn – You mean verses a traditional subdivision? Helen Budrock – Or a single family development because you can still do a single family detached development as a condo configuration. Joel Kohn – It has to be subdivision. There is no other form of developments that make sense and the code does not have any other way to do it unless we do a commercial subdivision. This may result in less units but economically it won't make too much sense to do a subdivision this size and add in all the roads and infrastructure. I'll talk to the owner to see if they want to do such a sketch plan but you're taking \$5,000 per plan and if it ends up resulting in less units, they will definitely not go with the subdivision and just look to do row housing.

Paula Kay – Can you show the Board the recreation and open space? Joel Kohn – In the center area of the loop, most of the woods will stay, there will be trees in between the development and the roads and other

places throughout the development as they are trying to preserve as many trees as possible. There will be a community building, swimming pools, playgrounds, etc.

Jim Carnell – Because you have so many common spaces, do we have square footage of the building so we can figure out parking calculations and is such large parking needed? Joel Kohn – We can take a look but the parking is really not that large, it's about 20 spaces. We don't have calculations yet but we will get that (is only a sketch plan).

Helen Budrock – Mike was nice enough to put the neighboring project (Fraser Road) and this project side by side on one plan sheet and also show the location of the wetland for both sites and get a better idea of the relationship of the emergency access from one development to the other. Chairman Sush – Will there be one service provider? Joel Kohn – No, these are two totally separate applicants/owners and have nothing to do with each other. I brought them together to work out site plans. I don't know who they will use for sanitation. Only thing that might be shared is the sewer main. Helen Budrock – Since both projects are waiting on a sewer extension at this time, it may not make sense to get too deep into review and ask the applicant to expend any additional funds reworking the layout until we know if the sewer extension gets approved. Do we have any kind of time frame on that? Joel Kohn – Not really but the town had expressed that they are amendable to it. Matt Sickler – Probably be by the end of the month. Joel Kohn – The applicants understand that it's kind of at their own risk to move forward without approval yet, but still would like to.

The Board agreed to move forward with this project as a cluster development.

Joel Kohn – This project does not need a 239 so next meeting we are just looking for the Board to declare lead agency so we can send out notices and possibly schedule a public hearing, we will see where we are at.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **LAURA SMITH**

Hemlock Lane, Monticello, NY  
Michael Packer, Project Surveyor

Paula Kay – They were in front of the Zoning Board last night because of the lot size issue and all variance requests were approved.

Michael Packer – Laura Smith owns two pieces of property on Hemlock. This is two lots with two dwellings and as you can see the current property line goes right through the house and we are looking to move it between the two dwellings (house and double wide). In doing so, we would not meet the 20 foot setback line and that is why we were in front of the Zoning Board last night. It's a preexisting condition and nothing would be changing in the neighborhood. Right now both homes are hooked up to

the same well and I'd like to keep an easement on that, but I was asked to show where a well site could be and that it would have proper isolation distances from the septic system, which I did. Paula Kay – Have you done an easement yet. Michael Packer – No, this is as far as I have gotten. Paula Kay – So it would be contingent on an easement.

Motion for a lot line change upon attorney's review was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Croissant.

5 in favor, 0 opposed

### **FRASER RESORT**

Fraser Road & Route 42, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project Representative

Joel Kohn – We are here for 239 and lead agency approval. Christian Cellini – I know at the last meeting we discussed the emergency exits a little bit. Did we get anyone involved in that? Matt Sickler – Board retained a traffic consultant for that.

Motion for to approve 239 review was made by Michael Croissant and second by Kristin Boyd.

5 in favor, 0 opposed

Motion to declare intent for lead agency was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Kristin Boyd.

5 in favor, 0 opposed

### **CENTER FOR DISCOVERY: 2 LOT SUBDIVISION**

219 Lake Louise-Marie Road, Rock Hill, NY

Glen Smith, Project engineer

Glen Smith – This is the former Frontier Insurance property which the Center for Discovery has acquired. Several years ago the property was subdivided into two separate parcels. The building was on one parcel, which the Center acquired years ago, and the parking lots and Nana's House were on the other parcel, which the Center did not own at the time. We got a conditional site plan approval to develop the former Frontier building into a specialty hospital, which has been under construction for a while now. The condition was if the Center did not acquire the other parcel with the parking lots, they would have to build parking on the parcel with the hospital. The other parcel was acquired last year. We asked the assessor to consolidate the two parcels last December and was told that this Board would have to approve that as this Board originally approved the subdivision, which you did. Everything has been done and the maps have been filed, this is now one parcel again. Back in December I asked for a six month extension, which was through the end of this month, to get to the consolidation process, which is now done. Basically the condition was met and are requesting final site plan approval.

Arthur Knapp – Matt, are you satisfied with everything? Matt Sickler – Yes.

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

**CENTER FOR DISCOVERY: NANA'S HOUSE**

219 Lake Louise-Marie Road, Rock Hill, NY

Glen Smith, Project engineer

Glen Smith – Same property as the previous action item, just referring to the building that used to be Nana's House. This building used to be a daycare facility and I was in front of this Board last year, in the middle of the Pandemic, to request a change in use to a school. That was approved and it has been operating as a school since then. Now they would like to request a change in use again to use roughly half the building as a school and the other half as a daycare, as Covid restrictions had lightened up and there is need for daycare again. It's pretty much the same operation as Nana's House. There will be the maximum 80 to 85 kids/staff and they would come in the morning and leave in the afternoon/evening, Monday through Friday. Only difference is it will now be owned and operated by the Center for Discovery.

Paula Kay – Essentially this comes under what was 250 – 50 of the code and a new site plan is kind of de Minimis as they are not changing anything inside or outside of the building or adding any new structure. They really just need the Boards blessing. Chairman Sush – Is there a way to title it whether it's school or daycare going forward? Glen Smith – They are looking to operate both simultaneously with the same age group of kids and a max of 20 staff. Nothing is really changing. Jim Carnell – I would let Dave weigh in on this only because they may need some sort of blessing from the Board as amended to the site plan only because they may be regulated by other agency, such as the department of education, showing they can operate. Dave Fanslau – The licensing agency for the daycare has approved the license so we are looking to convert by July 1<sup>st</sup>. The license is pending the approval from the town that we are seeking tonight. Paula Kay – So is it sufficient for the state if the Boards just approves the request for change in use. Dave Fanslau – I believe so. Paula Kay – Basically the Board just needs to approve the request for change in use without the need of a new site plan.

Helen Budrock – I have in my notes from the first change in use, that there was a special condition to investigate the I & I issues, have the sewer laterals been done? Glen Smith – We worked with the town's sewer superintendent on that and they are now satisfied.

Motion to approve change in use to a partial school and partial daycare to run simultaneously made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.  
5 in favor, 0 opposed

**1283 OLD ROUTE 17**

1283 Old Route 17, Harris, NY

\*This was taken off of the agenda\*

Helen Budrock - This was the solar panel project for a subdivision but we are ready took care of that when we approved the site plan.

### **155 HEIDEN ROAD STORAGE BUILDING**

155 Heiden Road, Monticello, NY

Hayden Carnell, Keystone Engineer representative

Jim Carnell and Arthur Knapp were recused

Logan Morey as building inspector and both alternates now voting members

Hayden Carnell – This project is existing warehouse storage buildings on Heiden Road. The original site plan approval was back in 2007 for private use. It is zoned commercial but at that point the owner just wanted to use it for private use. It has since been sold and the new owner is looking to lease the buildings so is looking for a change in use. There's already wells/septic and would be used for business storage. I believe when new owners purchased it, someone was already leasing a building to store cars, a porta potty company wants to store clean units in one of the buildings/possibly outside and a contractor is looking to lease the other building to store access materials. There will be no employees working out of them and no commercial traffic at least that is what they are saying now.

Paula Kay – Again this is under the same provision as then previous project, 250-50, and is up to the Board if they require any site plan change.

Matt Sickler – You might want identify what kind of materials they plan to store outside and be concerned with screening and how it is stored. Chairman Sush – I agree, it would be good to know what they plan to store outside and specific locations. Hayden Carnell – I don't think they know specifics at this time but wanted to bring it up now in hopes they don't have to come back in the future. Paula Kay - It sound like the Board is looking for more feedback before they can make a decision. Hayden Carnell – Understood, there's no parking shown or outside storage. Matt Sickler – I believe you are going to update the site plans from the 2007 ones. Hayden Carnell – Yes with whatever you want added to it. Matt Sickler – I would think access points for the units, parking areas, outdoor storage. Chairman Sush – Yeah, you know just sort of what the limitations would be on the outdoor storage/materials and other basic stuff.

Helen Budrock – Paula, is this property adjacent to a property the Board has seen before? Hayden Carnell – There was a lot line change in 2000. Helen Budrock – The Board has kind of been trying to clean up that corner for a while now. Logan Morey – To interject, this property is not really visible from the road. It is very minimally seen. There's plenty of room in the back for outdoor storage and that still wouldn't be seen.

Helen Budrock – Paula, the original approval was for accessory use to the residents and the commercial storage would be a special permit, so do they need a public hearing before the Board makes a decision? Paula kay – Yes. It can go on the agenda for next week as a discussion item, if they are ready by then, and then a public hearing.

**DAVID LORINCZ - SUBDIVISION**

178 Barnes Blvd., Monticello, NY  
Joel Kohn, Project Representative

Joel Kohn – This is a simple two lot subdivision. It’s in the Gibber Viznitz neighborhood community and is kind of PUD number four in the town. The house was built on half of the lot and the owner wants his son-in-law to build a house on the other half, which would be attached to him. This subdivisions needed some variances mainly to configure the lot from the minimum of 12,000 square feet to the minimum of 6,000 square feet, like the newer PUDs in the community, and the variances did get approved.

Jim Carnell – Did we update the map to show all the approved variances? Joel Kohn – The map shows the requested variances but does not show zoning board approval but the ones I submit to be signed will be updated.

Chairman Sush – Would the new lot line be against the edge of the building? Joel Kohn – Correct.  
Chairman Sush – Will anything, which is on what would be the new side, being removed from the existing house? Joel Kohn – There is an attached room and stair cases that will be removed.  
Chairman Sush – Then how will the steps work, will they be combined? Joel Kohn – That will be reconfigured to have steps going from the front and the back, so they have enough entrances.  
Chairman Sush – Will the new house/lot mirror the existing house/lot? Joel Kohn – Yes, lot one will be 6,064 square feet and lot two, with the existing house, will be 6,844 square feet.

Chairman Sush – Matt, are you okay with everything. Matt Sickler – Yes, everything seems to be in compliance.

Motion to approve a two lot subdivision was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Christina Cellini.  
5 in favor, 0 opposed

**KRASNA**

203 Anawana Lake Road, Monticello  
Joel Kohn, Project Representative

Joel Kohn – We are here tonight to get the Board to declare themselves as lead agency and I sent in the 239 for review.

Helen Budrock – They basically needed more information in regards to the overpass and what is to be expected. I think they have been going back and forth with DPW on that. Joel Kohn – Correct. Most of their comments was related to the pedestrian crossing, as the bridge goes over Anawana Lake Road, and some other minor comments. They wanted some sort of pedestrian traffic study, which will be done. Until then, I do not think we are ready for a public hearing.

Motion to declare lead agency was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Christina Cellini.

5 in favor, 0 opposed

**MORNINGSIDE ACRES**

71 Rock Ridge Drive, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project Representative

Joel Kohn – Morningside Acres has previously been approved by the Planning Board to replace unit number four, in addition to unit number one. We are in front of the Board tonight to discuss unit number five because they added some decks which resulted in an expansion of more than 15%. It ended up being a 15.8% expansion which is 18 square feet over. They could get it done with just a building permit but because of the extra 18 square feet, we need Board approval to modify a previously approved site plan.

Matt Sickler – It's the three decks you have on the plan? Joel Kohn – Yes and the unit size will remain the same.

Motion to approve modification to a previously approved site plan for unit number five was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Hoyt.

5 in favor, 0 opposed

**HAMASPIK RESORT**

283 Rock Hill Drive, Rock Hill, NY

Joel Kohn, Project Representative

Steven Barshov, Attorney

Meyer Wertheimer, property owner

Christina Cellini was recused.

Joel Kohn – Tonight we are here looking for change in use only. We will not do any improvements or additions to the site at this time, we will come back at another meeting for the rest of the site plan approval. We have complied with all request regarding the change in use and a resolution has been drafted.

Paula Kay – This will be a special use permit, which Steve, Helen and I have discussed and we do not have any problem considering. We were originally happy with a type two action but understand why you want to consider it as an unlisted action. If the Board chooses to go forward then it will be a special use permit approval for the camp use this summer with only what exists at the site as of today. The resolution has quite a number of conditions that we can go through as long as Steve is good with how everything is progressing. Steven Barshov – Absolutely, all is fine.

Chairman Sush – Let's go through those conditions.

Conditions on draft Resolution, attached herein, were discussed.



Comments on 1<sup>st</sup> condition - Paula Kay – I know the Board was concerned about specific dated and the Planning Dept, also needs to know exactly when they would go from one use to the other. The season/application resolution commences on July 1<sup>st</sup> and ends on September 1<sup>st</sup>. So one question I have is, does that mean the hotel use ends on June 30<sup>th</sup> or will there be a period of transition? Joel Kohn – The season will start July 4<sup>th</sup> so there will be a few days for transition. Paula Kay – Logan, are you okay with that? Logan Morey – Yes.

Comments on 7<sup>th</sup> condition - Paula Kay – Because it is a camp, it is subject to the DOH and Logan has requested the approval from the DOH be sent to the planning department.

Comments on 8<sup>th</sup> condition – Signage indicating change in use and signage indication additional parking in rear must be done by July 1<sup>st</sup>.

Paula Kay - I know there was talk of playgrounds being added. Chairman Sush – What is being potentially offer for this season? Is it something that can be added without building permits/approvals? Helen Budrock – I believe the earlier site plan showed an area for a playground that is now being showed for parking use. Maybe you can temporarily utilize some of that space for this camp season? Joel Kohn – It was originally supposed to be there but then they switch over to portable outside equipment. Paula Kay – We can make installation of temporary equipment another condition. Michael Hoyt – What kind of temporary playground equipment do you plan on using? Joel Kohn – Equipment from Home Depot and the permanent stuff take a long time to get. Arthur Knapp – It will be a secure area for the children though? Joel Kohn – Yes, there are gates and they are always locked. Michael Hoyt – Any idea of where that will be? Joel Kohn – In between the two buildings, the original spot proposed.

Paula Kay – Nice thing about this you will get to see how things go this year/season and make any changes necessary before the next year/season.

Michael Hoyt – What is the big hole to the left of the fireplace? Meyer Wertheimer – It's where we opened the foundation to remove the old tanks. That is now done and we just need to leave it open for the excavator to dig and then it will be closed back up.

Michael Hoyt – Where are we at with this project? Joel Kohn – An updated site plan was submitted last week, including the slip, showing the compactor as it was discussed, auto turn simulation for a firetruck and a subdivision sheet has been added. We worked on draft water agreements with Emerald Corporate Center in regards to providing water for the sprinkler system and submitted them to the fire department. They provided additional comments/concerns so we will be tweaking the site plan to fix those and will be out there with them next week. The Town's traffic consultant issued comments on the traffic report last Friday and just today I received a response from the project traffic engineer. I did not submit those yet to the Planning Department as they came in last minute and didn't want to cause any confusion. I do have a hard copy if anyone needs it. Paula Kay – Logan also had some comments that were submitted this afternoon and will get uploaded.

Motion to declare a NEGDEC made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kristin Boyd.  
5 in favor, 0 opposed

Motion to approve special use permit for change in use from hotel to camp made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.

5 in favor, 0 opposed

Motion to add Paula Kay to escrow account as consulting attorney for the Planning Board made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Croissant.

5 in favor, 0 opposed

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

5 in favor, 0 opposed

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers,  
Secretary  
Town of Thompson Planning Board