

APPROVED

TOWN OF THOMPSON
PLANNING BOARD
June 22, 2022

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

Motion to approve the May 25, 2022 and June 8, 2022 minutes made by Kathleen Lara and second by Michael Hoyt.
5 in favor, 0 opposed

GENERAL DISCUSSION FOR THE PLANNING BOARD:

239 REQUEST FOR SPRING HILLS

Southside of NYS Route 17B
Monticello, NY 12701

Kathleen Lara – That corner there at Kaufman Road is starting to build up and traffic is going to be inevitable. Is the Planning Board going to engage a traffic consultant? George Duke – A traffic study was done at peak. Glen Smith – Also, this project is on the south side of 17B, not Kaufman Road. Kathleen Lara – The applicant put Kaufman Road on the application, that is why I was concerned but I understand now.

239 REQUEST FOR APPLE INC

Rose Valley Road
Monticello, NY 12701

Board had no comments on this project.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

BORO PARK

266 Fraser Road, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – The applicant is seeking approvals for additions/alterations that have been made to 8 buildings since previous site plan approval in 1995, without prior approval or building permits. Not sure if you want to get into all of the details with these additions, but this is a non-conforming bungalow colony and therefore, they can add up to 15% or 200 square feet, whichever is greater, to any bungalow with Planning Board approval. Some of the additions were more than the 15% allowed and some were closer than 25 feet to each other. Some of these violations needed Planning Board approval and some needed Zoning Board approval. We were able to get variances from the Zoning Board for all but two additions/alterations. The addition to the unit right on Fraser Road and the deck on Unit 10 did not get approval and will have to be removed.

Kathleen Lara – Are you here just to clean up some of these violations? Joel Kohn – Yes. Paula Kay – Most of them were done a number of years ago and only a few done recently so I would agree that the majority of this is a clean up bringing the site plan up to date so it can reflect what is truly on the property. Matt Sickler – It's nice to see them trying to clean this up and I do not see any issues with the work that remains.

Michael Croissant – Does the Building Department have any outstanding issues? Jim Carnell – As Joel had mentioned, we caught them a couple years ago on the addition that was up front and that triggered the initial stop work order and findings of all the other violations. They had to go back and re-survey the property and document all the improvements. They went back in forth with the Zoning Board on a few of them and agreed to remove some of the structures. They are currently on the right track. Kathleen Lara – The Building Department will assure that those structures are removed? Jim Carnell – Right and it is part of the variance approval, and you can make it a condition as well if you wish to move forward, that we will go inside of the units and verify that the smoke detectors and life safety stuff is functional and operational prior to occupancy. Joel Kohn – We are hoping to have the inspections done by next week. Another condition the ZBA had was to provide an engineering report for all the additions, the engineer has been out there and we are hoping to have the report in the next week or so. Jim Carnell – The ZBA also gave a time frame. Joel Kohn – Correct. It was for 3 months, which would be mid-July.

Arthur Knapp – Will it be occupied while the work is being done? Joel Kohn – There is no work to post right now, just the removals. Michael Croissant – Will the removals be done prior to the summer? Joel Kohn – I'm not sure if it will be done before the summer, but it's just removal of a deck.

Kathleen Lara – Should we put this on in a couple weeks from now, as an action item, to assure that everything gets done? I would think the engineer report is important and we would like to see that first before acting. Paula Kay – Right, because then you would have complied with the terms of the variance and it will be clean and simple for the Planning Board.

BINYAN UVIOS

334 South Maplewood Road, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This project was last in front of you last in October of 2020. We are here tonight as the applicant is proposing to construct a 50,215 square foot school building with associated parking. The school will be up on the hill, with dormitories and all amenities. There will be 125 to 150 students, plus

staff. This proposed project also involves lot consolidation and lot line adjustments to retain existing residential structures on separate lots. The original plan was to improve the entrance on 17B, but the Planning Board was not happy with that and DOT would not approve that either without possible signal lights. DOT suggested we try to create an entrance from Coopers Corners Road so the applicant acquired the two other parcels to be able to do so. They now propose a main entrance on Coopers Corners Road, which the DOT has okayed a concept for and a traffic study has been completed. The entrance on 17B will still be there, but for right hand turns only, both in and out. As for water, they do have existing wells for the single-family homes. The wells were pump tested, as required by the DOH, and the walls around them monitored. The outcome was that the wells, three of them, can be used to supply water for the school. Those reports will be submitted for your review.

Kathleen Lara – Besides the school will there be any other housing? Joel Kohn – It’s all one big building. Michael Croissant – What about the houses that are up there now? Are they going to be a part of it? Joel Kohn – They will remain single-family homes and the lots will be reconfigured. Kathleen Lara – Meaning you will be keeping separate lots and combining what you need to make this lot for the school bigger? Joel Kohn – It’s just basically a clean up to keep these four properties within code requirements. Matt Sickler – Does someone else own the adjoining lots? Joel Kohn – They actually bought those lots as well. They are not doing anything with the lots and are leaving them as is. They purchased them to prevent any issues with the neighbors. Michael Croissant – Are those single-family houses going to work in conjunction with the school or be part of the school project? Joel Kohn – I don’t know. They may have the staff family staying there as they are not going to have sleep in staff at the school. Kathleen Lara – That makes sense.

Kathleen Lara – What is the road frontage on Coopers Corners? Joel Kohn – It’s about 170 feet. Kathleen Lara – I’m happy that your client realizes that 17B is a bad place for the main entrance, but I’m concerned that that corner is pretty tight and is going to get busy. Joel Kohn – There will be minimal traffic due to the the nature of the school. The students will be there five months in the winter, five months in the summer and will be sleeping there. They will not be bussed in and out on a daily basis. Only staff will be coming in and out so there will not be a ton of traffic. Michael Croissant – I’m still a little skeptical about that entrance there on 17B. Kathleen Lara – I don’t disagree as people always tend to take the easier route and you are going to get people that still try to make that left hand turn. Michael Hoyt – Plus the lane close is right there. Does the project on the other side of Coopers Corners have an entrance on 17B? Kathleen Lara – Esther Manor. Joel Kohn – They have two. One on 17B and one on Coopers Corners as well but not across from where this entrance would be. Matt Sickler – Has the Board engaged a traffic consultant, previously on the plan, to review the traffic study? Michael Croissant – I don’t think so. Arthur Knapp – We have not. Kathleen Lara – Has the fire department looked at the access to the property? Joel Kohn – No, not yet but we will have them do so. Jim Carnell – Is the building going to require sprinklers? Joel Kohn – Definitely. Jim Carnell – Yeah, so you’ll have to document access.

Helen Budrock – Joel, can you provide a copy of the traffic study so we can put it on the Google Drive and then I guess the Board could resolve tonight to retain a traffic consultant. It would be considered an unlisted action. Are there any other agencies where a coordinated review would be required? Joel Kohn – Lead agency notices were already done and there have been no substantial changes made, with the exception of changing the main entrance. Helen Budrock – We did the 239 review, before we instituted the project overview form, so maybe you can dig out a copy of the notices that were circulated so we can have a copy for our file and everything can be in one place. Joel Kohn – I will get them and email them in. Helen Budrock – Then the next step would be a public hearing, correct? Joel Kohn – Right.

Helen Budrock – I feel like it is too premature at this point. Joel Kohn – We would like to move forward with the project and get a public hearing scheduled. Helen Budrock – Does the Board feel like the project is far enough along to put it on next meeting's agenda to schedule a public hearing? Maybe by that point we will have comments back from the traffic consultant. Jim Carnell – Has the DOT seen or commented on the new site plan? Joel Kohn – Yes. Jim Carnell – I'm just worried about if there will be enough time for everything to get done by the next meeting. Maybe we should schedule it for the meeting after. Joel Kohn – I think that is the plan. Helen Budrock – Correct, so there is time to work out all the details. Kathleen Lara – As you know, residents on Coopers Corners Road are going to want to see the traffic study and know what the site is going to look like. Joel Kohn – The building is at least 1,500 feet from the road so you will not be able to see it. Kathleen Lara – I'm fine with putting this on the next agenda to schedule the public hearing. Helen Budrock – So we will put this on for the next meeting and aim to schedule the public hearing by the following meeting, on the 22nd.

A motion to engage our traffic consultant was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp. 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

100 SEYMOUR HIRSCHMAN ROAD LLC

100 Seymour Hirschman Road, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – My client recently purchased this property. It's a 9-acre parcel with an existing site plan. They are requesting a change of use from the former Sackett Lake Clubhouse into a school and dormitory. A school is an allowed use in the SR zone. They want to keep everything as is and construct a 40' x 75' addition onto the existing building. It will be a year-round school with a maximum of 100 students and approximately 10 to 12 staff, of which 2 to 3 will stay on site. Note line #6 on the site plan states this and also mentions that the dormitory will be on the second floor and that the kids will only be there during the week, bussed out on Friday and back in on Sunday. There will be no visiting days.

Kathleen Lara – There are other vacant lots for sale around this property, does your client plan on buying any of those and developing on them? Joel Kohn – I'm not sure if he is interested in any of the other lots, but at this time he has only purchased this one. Kathleen Lara – It's not a terrible location and it has been vacant for a while so it is nice to see if being used.

Paula Kay – Did everyone see Mike Messengers comment that came in late this afternoon? Joel Kohn – I did not. Paula Kay – It just noted that the property is located within the Sacket Lake sewer district and proposed flow is needed to determine if the current pump station can handle any increase. Jim Carnell – When the DEC approved that expansion to the district, it was based of the current flows so I think he just wants to verify. Joel Kohn – We will provide a design flow. it will probably be about 8,000 to 9,000 gallons per day. Matt Sickler – I agree with that guesstimate. Just get us the report when you have one.

Helen Budrock – A 239 referral is not needed due to how remote the property is and it is a permitted use in the zone. I know this is the first time the Board is seeing this, but you might want to consider a public hearing given the residential nature of the community and the change in use. It not something you have to decide on tonight. Kathleen Lara – I do agree that there should be a public hearing for the

same reason. Helen Budrock – I don't want to rush this, but if Joel can get the additional information that was request, in regards to the water and sewer, to Matt we can put this on the next agenda to schedule the public hearing and possibly be able to have the public meeting by the end of July. Kathleen Lara – I was going to say that I would like to have the public hearing in the summer so all residents would be here and everyone would be fully aware, so I think that is a great plan. Joel Kohn – Okay. I will get the design flow to Matt and we will be ready for the public hearing.

ACTION ITEMS

WINDSOR HILLS (RNR HOUSING)

Pittaluga Road, Monticello, NY
Glen Smith, Project engineer

Glen Smith – You've seen this project many times over the years. It was approved for 120 double wide mobile homes. Phase I has been under construction for the past few years and there are about 45 homes currently complete at this time, infrastructure is in as well as sewer and water. The modular and mobile home companies are now saying they will only be able to supply one to two homes a month, at best, and we still need about 19 to 20 more to complete this phase and are hoping to do so by the end of the year or beginning of next year. As for Phase II, we started site work construction about 2 months ago, roughing the roads and everything else, hoping to be able to start bringing in homes for this phase by late 2022, early 2023. However, with the decrease in number of homes we can get per month, we are being told 2025, 2026. With that being said, the owners kicked around some ideas and were hoping to be able to stick build the homes, with the Planning Boards approval. They would build them to the exact same size, floor plan and exterior look. They would look exactly like the mobile homes, just stick built. This may require a use variance from the ZBA for the change in use, but we wanted to get this Boards approval first and see what your thoughts were.

Michael Hoyt – Who is their manufacturer? Glen Smith – I don't know the names, but they are dealing with 3 local manufacturers. Michael Hoyt – As of now, that industry has gotten better. When the pandemic first started it was a problem, but they are not that far out now. I just ordered two homes a couple months ago and they will be here by this December. Glen Smith – Maybe we can get more information from the manufacturers and possibly get something in writing as to a time frame. Michael Hoyt – I'm just not comfortable changing midstream without a little more clarification. Paula Kay – I'm with Michael on this and I think we need to get more information from the vendors and maybe there's been a change in production since your client originally suggested making this alteration. I think it is bigger than just stick built verses mobile home. It is a change in use when the project is half way completed and fully approved.

Kathleen Lara – Logan, can you explain what we discussed about the cluster development? Logan Morey – For this project they went with mobile homes because they could get 4 per acre. Normally wood framed or stick built homes would be found in a cluster development, which is not permitted in this zoning district, and would only allow 2 homes per acre. So not sure what you would change the use to. Glen Smith – The original density allowed was 7 per acres but we are nowhere near that, we are at 1.44

per acre. Kathleen Lara – You have to go in front of the Zoning Board anyway, right? Glen Smith – Yes. We basically have to prove the hardship waiting on the homes would cause to the ZBA, so I think my client will be happy to hear that mobile homes are now being manufactured at a faster rate. Kathleen Lara – I think it's difficult for us to say it's a good idea because it kind of sets things in motion that can spiral out of control. Glen Smith – Understood.

BENTON BROTHERS

Old Route 17, Ferndale, NY
Glen Smith, Project engineer
Mike Taylor, Property owner

Glen Smith – This is the former Skaters World roller rink and Mike is looking to convert it into self-storage units. We had a public hearing on this back in January, when it was a little bit more of an extensive project. We originally proposed a total of 6 buildings on the property with a total of 60,000 square feet. Mike is now looking to scale back the size of the project. The existing roller rink building is still going to be converted into 84 self-storage units plus an additional 4 buildings for a new total of 24,000 square feet. There are 2 30,000-gallon propane tanks on the property and a huge storm water management basin located at the lower part of the property. We still have to work with DPW on the drive entrance, but we are essentially asking to modify the existing building and building 4 new buildings. The reason I asked to be on as an action item tonight is to see whether or not the Board requires a new public hearing. The public hearing in January only generated a couple comment from one neighbor who was concerned about noise and seeing the aluminum roof of the buildings. We scaled back the project, to less than half the size, and there will still be a double row of tress along the property line. We also lowered the roof line. The buildings were originally going to be 30-35 feet high and now will be 1 story buildings, approximately 20 feet high.

Arthur Knapp – Do you still have the 80 feet on the Lipkowitz side? Glen Smith – The require setback is 25 feet for the zone. It did move back a little and is now 40 feet from the property line, but it still exceeds the setback.

Michael Hoyt – Is there still going to be storage tanks there? Glen Smith – No. Mike Taylor – The SWPP plan was huge. Glen Smith - We did do a whole SWPP plan, that was sent to Mike, but I asked him to stop looking at it because the project is being reduced so significantly. I will need to get him a revised SWPP.

Kathleen Lara – It's reducing impact, not making it worse, so I don't see why another public hearing is necessary. Arthur Knapp – I agree. Michael Hoyt – I agree.

Helen Budrock – Glen, I'm just recalling the 239 comments from the County. They recommended removing the billboards and screening the back of the building. Was that adjusted? Glen Smith – I recall the County mentioned downward lighting concerns. The comment on the billboards came from the DOT, who do that in conjunction with the County. Mike talked to the DOT guy and because the billboards are not on state property, thy are on the owner's property, they are not state regulated. Helen Budrock – What were the bill boards for again? Mike Taylor – Advertisement for the property. Kathleen Lara – Did you get something in writing from DOT stating the billboard were not an issue

anymore? Because they do state in the 239, twice, that the billboards were to be removed. Mike Taylor – Not something from her. I did tell her the billboards were not coming down. Kathleen Lara – I don't think they should. I just want to records to reflect that there is no issue. Glen Smith – We did have a conversation with the DOT people about the billboards and came to an understanding. Mike Taylor – Am I right in saying the County has no weight when it comes to the billboard, just a suggestion, and the Board gets to make the decision? Paula Kay – Yes, but if the County makes more than a suggestion, we need a supermajority of the Board to vote in favor, but that is not what happened here. Kathleen Lara – We can still do the approval subject to Matt's review of the SWPP. Helen Budrock – I don't think they changed a lot in terms of the landscaping plan, right? Glen Smith – We reduced it. There was a lot more landscaping before. Helen Budrock – If the Board is comfortable with approving it, conditional upon Matt's review, I am fine with that. We should do SEQRA first to just kind of get it out of the way. An unlisted action under SEQRA does not require any kind of coordinated review so you can make a motion for that first tonight.

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

A motion for NEGNEC was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Hoyt
5 in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to approve conditional site plan with SWPP review was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Michael Hoyt.
5 in favor, 0 opposed.

MONSTER GOLF COURSE

85 Chalet Road, Monticello, NY
George Duke, Project lawyer
Elaine Du, AKRF traffic engineer
Megan Taylor, Ownership representative
Justin Seeney, AKRF civil engineer
John Montgomery, AKRF civil engineer

George Duke – We are here tonight to finally finish off the golf course site plan. This is an application for a minor amendment to the existing site plan, regarding the clubhouse and incorporation of golf cart storage. Justin Seeney – It's a pretty straight forward plan. As you may know, at the clubhouse location there's an existing building that we propose to renovate and repurpose. As the clubhouse building, there will be a new golf cart storage building, approximately 4,000 square feet, and a staging area, consistent of permeable pavers. This is where the golf carts will stage as the golfers arrive. The driveway entrance, off of Resorts World Drive, will be reconfigured for this drop off area. The unique aspect of this is there will be a pro shop and/or golf reception area at the Alder Hotel. There will be signage and all golfers will be directed to the reservations area at the Alder. This way they park and check in there and then get shuttled to the clubhouse site. The shuttle will do a loop. It will pick up at the Alder, pick up at the Kartrite, drop off at the clubhouse and continue its loop. The shuttle service will run as needed. There will be a small parking lot, but it is not intended for patrons as they will be shuttled. There is some storm water management, both for quality treatment and detention control. That's really it and I'm open to any questions.

Kathleen Lara – What is the justification for having everyone check in at the hotel and then be shuttled, verses going straight to the golf course? George Duke – There is a couple reasons. The main one is to focus attention at the resort’s core, the casino, and the facilities exist already. The plan is to have the golf pro shop be the reception area and it’s an easy place to direct all central traffic. There is also plenty of capacity for parking and it’s an interior renovation only. Justin Seeney – There will be a locker room renovation as well, for people to be able to change their clothes before heading out and when they return. Kathleen Lara – I think it is a smart idea. Michael Croissant – Will there be cart access at the Alder? George Duke – No. No carts on the road, which was another purpose for the shuttle. Jim Carnell – What will the vehicle for the shuttle be? George Duke - I think it will be a 20 – 24 passenger bus so that there will be room for everyone and their bags in the back. Elain Du – That is correct and the loop will take about 20 to 25 minutes. Matt Sickler – So there is just drop off access at the golf course? George Duke – Correct. Even for employees. Employees are to go to employee parking, at the casino, and then get shuttled to the golf course. This minimizes any traffic. Michael Croissant – If people show up at the golf course in their cars, will they be redirected? George Duke – There are 4 parking spots but they will get redirected as those spots are for operational use, dropping off golf supplies and things like that. Elaine Du - Correct. Paula Kay – George, so a guest at the Kartrite would hop on the shuttle, go to the Alder, get checked in for golf, get back on the shuttle and go to the course. George Duke – At this point all check in is at the Alder, however, I think there has been discussion about bringing another POS at the Kartrite if there is need and/or interest for one. I know there is so much overflow and demand at the Kartrite rite now, that they already shuttle passengers to the casino.

Arthur Knapp – Will the golfer have any access to food and beverages once they are on the course? George Duke – I think there will be beverage carts there with the typical golf course stuff, but I will let Megan speak to that. Megan Taylor – Yes, there will be food and beverage options on the course. The clubhouse will be providing light snacks and beverages and like George said, there will be a beverage cart that will travel though out the course. Arthur Knapp – Very good.

George Duke – This materially conforms to the existing comprehensive development plan, that has previously been reviewed, and is well within the capacities evaluated and the adopted NEGDEC, back in 2015, so the idea, according to the code and CDP, is that the material performance is a threshold requirement. Helen Budrock – I believe there was a comment from Mike Messenger on this project. Paula Kay – Yes, there was. Matt Sickler – I actually talked to Mike today. He had questions about the existing water lines. His department wasn’t aware of what was installed, inspected or reviewed. We talked about trying to come up with the documentation for when it was put in, who observed it and what remains to be done. Arthur Knapp – It’s currently not tied in, right? Matt Sickler – No, it’s not. It’s my understanding that there is a section of main installed, but it is capped at both ends. Paula Kay – That can be a condition. Do you agree Matt? – Matt Sickler – Yes. Justin Seeney – There is a spur that comes off the line and heads towards the maintenance building and there will be a tee off of that line that will feed the clubhouse. It’s my understanding that most of that line is in and we’ve been in discussion with the contractors, who are remobilizing to wrap up the majority of the golf course and maintenance building, and they are fully aware of the need to finalize that connection. Matt Sickler – Can you have whoever is in charge on that end reach out to Mike Messenger so that we can coordinate whoever needs to be involved. Helen Budrock – Matt, did you get a chance to review the stormwater management report yet? Matt Sickler – Not yet. This one appears to be pretty straight forward so I can’t imagine there is a lot to it.

Kathleen Lara – I think it’s exciting as this is kind of the final step and people call weekly inquiring about it. I am also impressed with the set up and think it is brilliant because it shows people visiting a whole

other side of Sullivan County. Megan Taylor – I really appreciate those comments and from the entire team at Resorts World and all of our professionals, we are so excited to get this construction back under way and get the course open to the public. Thank you for your support.

Helen Budrock – I have down that the Board is amenable to a conditional approval. It's conditioning on the applicant supplying the documentation requested by Mike Messenger, on the water connections, and the review of the stormwater management report.

A motion to approve a conditional minor modification to an existing site plan, with Matt Sickler's review of the stormwater management report and submission of documents required from Mike Messenger, was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Arthur Knapp.
5 in favor, 0 opposed.

SEDLACK

3477 Route 42 South, Monticello, NY
Bill Sedlack, Property owner

Bill Sedlack – I am here for a lot line change to make it official and I have some maps to pass around.

Kathleen Lara – Please explain why you are making the lot line change. Bill Sedlack – In the 40's when these houses were built, they built the first house on the corner and when they built the second house, they should have they should have moved the lot line and divide then in half. They actually have the lot line up against the house. When I purchased the houses from the Valentine's, he made a comment that Mr. Gallagher never showed up 20 years ago for the survey and he didn't show up for me either, then he passed away. I had Lounsbury go and survey for me recently and found out that the lot line was up against the house. I thought it was supposed to be at the driveway of the adjacent house and there's even an elevation change right there that would suggest that is where the lots are separated. So, we changed the line over to that adjacent driveway and he gave me paperwork for a lot line change. Here are two maps, one that shows where the lot line currently is and an updated one, showing where we propose it should be.

Jim Carnell – Do they share a well? Bill Sedlack – No, they both have their own well and septic.

Michael Croissant – Paula, do we need to do anything special? Paula Kay – No.

A motion to approve the lot line change was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Hoyt.
5 in favor, 0 opposed.

SUNNY FOREST

127 OLD Liberty Road, Monticello, NY
Howard Perez, Project architect
Israel Miller, Property owner

Paula Kay – I believe this is on for a very specific purpose tonight. For the Board to schedule a public hearing and to send out for 239. Howard Perez – That is correct. Helen Budrock – Is there any updates since the last meeting. Howard Perez – I have a set of drawing here, that I want to submit as an update. I

made a couple notes and changes. They no longer want to be inclusive of a day camp, only a sleep away camp, and therefore modified different uses of the different structures. If you look on the matrix, you will see building 7, which includes some units, is no longer classified as a bungalow, but a dormitory for caretakers. Helen Budrock – Are these the same plans that you sent June 14th? Howard Perez – No, these are dated for today. Helen Budrock – Send a digital copy of these to the building department because if we do the public hearing notice and send 239, we want to have the latest versions of the plans. Howard Perez – Okay. That’s fine. Helen Budrock – The public hearing would then be at the next meeting, July 13th. I assume their submissions aren’t for noticing, right, as they have that extra week in there? Paula Kay – Yes. Helen Budrock – You can contact the building department if you need any guidance on the procedure for notifying the neighbors. Howard Perez – Okay. Also, the owner is willing to provide safety barriers on the edge there at Old Liberty Road, as there is a change in rungs of about 15 feet from north to south. Kathleen Lara – Okay. You are going to want to address that, in detail, at the public hearing. The public will want to know. Helen Budrock – Basically that is something Matt would review and comment on. Howard Perez – It was part of the previous site plan submission. Matt Sickler – My only request is that on SP 1, you provide a table with the breakdown of use in fixture accounts, which would be good for reviewing supply and waistline sizing for looking at capacity of the actual septic systems. Please provide the break down for gallons per day, tributary to each of those. Use the DEC or DOH guidance for help with that. Howard Perez – Okay.

A motion the schedule the public hearing on July 13, 2022 was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.

5 in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion for 239 review was made by made by Kathleen Lara and second by Arthur Knapp.

5 in favor, 0 opposed.

FAMILY FUN PARK

65 Friedman Road, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joe Churgin, Project attorney

Joel Kohn – We were here last month and the Board wanted to see a table showing all of the sheds and what they will be used for. I submitted a new site plan with these tables. If you look at sheet three you will see all the animals and the maximum of each animal, which we added 2 to each of the different types of animals to reach the maximum.

Michael Hoyt – You said 2 more of each? Joel Kohn – Yes. Helen Budrock – I have in my notes that there were 26 animals currently on site and there was an allowance for an additional 2 of each, bringing the total allowed up to 36. Matt Sickler – And that is listed on the tables? Paula Kay – Yes. Helen Budrock – If you are inclined, that can be a condition of the approval, not to specify the individual common needs of each, but just that the maximum does not exceed 36. Joel Kohn – I will have the engineer add a note for that on the site plan.

Matt Sickler – I don’t recall the area being cleared for the slide. Joel Kohn – We still need the revised SWPP plan. That was a condition previously. Matt Sickler – Okay. That’s good.

A motion to approval a conditional modification to the existing site plan, with review of SWPP plan and maximum of 36 animals, was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Michael Hoyt.

AVON PARK

Rock Hill Drive, Rock Hill, NY
George Duke, Project attorney
Glen Smith, Project engineer
Steve Vegliante, Project Representative

Paula Kay and Jim Carnell were recused.

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

Helen Budrock – We have a housekeeping issue to take care of before we get into the substance of this discussion. We have an invoice from WSDG, who is the noise consultant. You guys authorized the retaining of the noise consultant in August of 2021 and there was a fixed fee to review the noise impact study. Additional services were to be billed hourly. They completed their review in the fall and a bill was sent to the Town in October of 2021, which the fixed fee took care of. Then the project changed and the revised tech memo was submitted in December of 2021. So, WSDG was re-engaged to review the updated noise studies and because the contract included additional services to be billed on an hourly basis, they billed the Town for that additional work. Jim just wanted to get approval from the Planning Board to pay this as WSDG was not formally reengaged. I do have the details if anyone is interested in the terms of the hours. George Duke – I just asked a copy is provided to us for our records. Helen Budrock – Of course.

A motion to authorize the additional noise consultant fees was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Hoyt.

5 in favor, 0 opposed.

Larry Wolinsky – We left off last meeting with the Board adopting the determination of non-significance for the NEGDEC and subsequently authorizing myself to prepare a draft resolution of approval with conditions. I've done that and circulated a copy to you earlier this week. It would have been submitted sooner but there was a little bit of a delay because the plans did not yet include landscaping and lighting details. The updated plans have since been submitted and I was able to draft the resolution. I can take you through the whole resolution or we can just go over the conditions in a scalable fashion and see if there are any other conditions the Board feels are appropriate. I know Matt Sickler has some additional review he has to undertake, that he can describe, but the Boards choice tonight is really if you want to move forward with the approval or essentially wait for the next meeting to give more time for review. We are not under any statutory time frame here so it is up to you guys. Matt Sickler – I think there are a fair number of site details that will need to be developed by the applicant, and their project team, and then be reviewed. At this point, our review is primarily focused on the SEQRA process and the issues associated with that and I think the project team is pretty focused there as well. There has been quiet a bit of work done on the stormwater management and preparing the SWPP, as there was some concern there in the environmental review. There is other design work I feel needs to be done on their end, to get

through that sanitary system for the sewage disposal and a water system analysis to confirm there is sufficient water there. Then we need to put together details on their storage and the fire suppression. We don't have those things yet to review but I think they're still in the works. Once we get them, we will certainly review them quickly, but I don't see that occurring in the next couple of weeks. Steve Vegliante – Would that be a condition? Matt Sickler – They can be conditions. It depends on the Boards comfort level. Larry Wolinsky – I think we need to understand if they are planning on depicting sewer and water lines on the plan, are the utilities there, are they spec'd out. Is it just a matter of some additional elaboration or is there actual new design being done? If that was the case, you don't necessarily want to leave that to a conditional situation. You want to conditions to focus on technical clean up essentially. Matt Sickler – As of right now, the utilities have been shown on the plans, to be able to locate them and get them within the projects limits of disturbance and to identify construction activities associated with them. We haven't really gotten down into the weeds of the design yet to see if all the information is there or not. The plans indicate gravity sewer, force feed sewer, but the pump station hasn't been designed yet. Those types of things. Same with the water, wells have been located and water lines are shown to the water supply and treatment facility, but the details of that facility have not been developed yet. Michael Croissant – To Larry's point, do you have enough information in hand to make it a condition? Or would you like to see more? Matt Sickler – Probably the best idea would be for me to get with the project engineers, between now and their next meeting, and come up with a list of what is necessary to be part of the final plan set. We'll see where they're at and what kind of timeline they need to get everything submitted and by the next meeting we can give you a list of what that is. What we have on hand and what we are comfortable with being a condition. Helen Budrock – Larry, correct me if I'm wrong, but we have kind of a 2-step approval process happening here and we don't usually do it as 2 separate steps. Pulmonary site plan approval and final site plan approval are usually done all at once. I don't know with this case, with the level of complexity, whether it can be worked into the resolution that there is pulmonary site plan approval, pending review of those details, and they have to be satisfied before final site plan approval. Larry Wolinsky – It is strapped in now as a conditional final and it's probably better to keep it that way. They are going to want to move in that direction and they may need a couple weeks to bring these engineering items to an end and we should take care of it all in one swoop. I don't know what the benefit of granting a the pulmonary would be, even though your code does permit it. There is other procedure that will come into play if we take that step and it may delay the project even further. Matt as far as you can tell, is there any other areas, besides the utilities, that still need review? Matt Sickler – As far as the on-site details, we have a plan showing details for the road construction, parking construction, stormwater and things like that, so really, it's utilities on-site that we need to look at. As for off-site improvements, I don't know how you want to tie those into the conditional approval. For example, to traffic improvements. Larry Wolinsky – That is already part of the resolution. Logan Morey - I'd like to see more for the fire access plan. I know there has been some pulmonary sketches and some hand drawn information as far as distancing from the building, but aerial access is supposed to be between 15 to 30 feet from the building and that is not really spelled out yet. I think it needs to be in the full plan set. We were also talking about where the Siamese connections might be, will the trucks have adequate access. I know Brain Soller has asked for more information as well. Larry Wolinsky - at this time, I think it would be ideal to get some of this stuff cleaned up so that when you consider taking action and reviewing it, you know it has been advanced to an appropriate point for site plan approval. It will also give you more time to review the landscaping and lighting plans, that were just submitted the other day. Kathleen Lara – We had talked a little about this before, the

condition is not just for landscaping, and we have an obligation to look at all this stuff carefully before acting. This way we are thorough and don't push anything through. Michael Hoyt – I agree with Kathleen. Arthur Knapp – I also agree and our job is to look at everything and make sure it is in compliance, meets our code and all questions are answered. Steve Vegliante – We have spent a lot of time on this and hopefully we can work with your consultants over the next few weeks to get you to that comfort point. Michael Hoyt – I recommend you give us ample time to review the new information you will be submitting. Steve Vegliante – We do our best to get it to you as quickly as possible, but we do understand.

George Duke – While we are here tonight, do you want us to present the landscaping and lighting plans and go over any questions you may have on that? Would that be helpful? Arthur Knapp – I think once everything's presented to Matt, then bring it to us. Larry Wolinsky – They already submitted those plans and I think what they want to do is present only that tonight. Kathleen Lara – I don't think it is a bad idea. Glen Smith – There is approximately 60 proposed trees shown on the current plan. All the green shown on the map will be tree lines that will exist once the property is cleared. There will be a combination of sugar maples, pin oaks and white spruce trees. Of those 60 trees, 20 of them will be down by the intersection at the access drive. The other 40 to 50 trees will be along side of the entrance road up to the warehouse and at the corners of the building. As far as the lighting, there is about 11 or 12 streetlights. Each corner of the building will have a streetlight, there will be some along the road and in between the 2 buildings. I spoke to Matt earlier and we are also going to add some wall mounted lights on the building. Kathleen Lara – All downward facing lights? Glen Smith – Yes, all downward facing. Helen Budrock – I like the tree choices, especially being at the entrance and going up the drive. Perhaps you wanted to go with some smaller more ornamental trees at the entrance as it seems like the ones you propose now might over power the space. It's hard to get a good sense from the drawings. Glen Smith – I was thinking the same thing and maybe some lower shrubs and stuff down around the entrance. We will look into that. Helen Budrock – Other than that, I think the location for buffering and everything is sufficient. Logan Morey – I want to make sure everyone is on the same page; the grass meadow will not be maintained and will basically be a wild area. Glen Smith – No, I don't believe it will be mowed regularly. It's not going to be a lawn; it will be a meadow with higher grass and flowers. Logan Morey – You could add wild flowers into the mix when it is re-planted and call it a wild flower meadow. Helen Budrock – It actually has more economical benefits with it being a meadow.

Larry Wolinsky – Is there a defined limit of disturbance on the plans already? Glen Smith – Yes.

Logan Morey – What about signage? Will there be a monument sign at the road and/or mounted signs on the building? George Duke – Good question. We don't know yet, but will add it to our list. Logan Morey – And garbage location? Pallets, cardboard, compactor. How will you be handling that type of stuff? Steve Vegliante – We will add that as well.

Kristin Boyd – Will there be any gates or fencing visible from the street? Or will you just see the trees from the street? Glen Smith – The only gate will be for the emergency access road and that will be set back quite a way from the road. Matt Sickler – The gate is set back far enough for the emergency vehicle to be able to pull in off the road and then open the gate.

Helen Budrock – Does the Board have any questions in regards to the conditions for the resolution? Michael Croissant – No. Kathleen Lara – No. Larry Wolinsky – We tried to set those up so they were grouped by conditions you have to meet before the Chairman signs, before they can get a building

permit, before they can get a C/O and on-going conditions. Helen Budrock – At this time you will be scheduled as an action item for the July 13th meeting as long as you get the require information in for Matt's review.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers,
Secretary
Town of Thompson Planning Board