

APPROVED

TOWN OF THOMPSON
PLANNING BOARD
August 24, 2022

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

A motion to approve the July 27, 2022 minutes was made by Michael Hoyt and Michael Croissant.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to approve the August 10, 2022 minutes was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Kristin Boyd.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

Chairman Sush appointed Kristin Boyd as a voting member.

Paula Kay explained that the official meeting is the in-person meeting and Zoom access is just offered as a courtesy. She also explained that the link on the bottom of the agenda for tonight's meeting may not be working but the access code is correct and the meeting can be accessed by going to zoom.com and entering that code.

Jim Carnell went over the memo received from the water and sewer superintendent, Mike Messenger. The DEC is not approving construction of any water or sewer infrastructure projects until they have full approval from the required agency, so moving forward that will have to be addressed. There is a new director at the head office that is taking a slightly different approach. The pending projects that have started water and/or sewer infrastructure but don't have full approval are in violation.

Public Hearing:

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

JAN MACH

5 Friedman Road, Monticello, NY

No one was present at the meeting or on Zoom. Paula Kay offered to reach out to the applicant and/or Tim Gottlieb and see if they would be attending tonight.

A motion to move this item out of order until applicant and/or project representative is present was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Kathleen Lara.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

No one ever showed up or responded to Paula Kay.

WINDSOR HILL ESTATES a/k/a RNR HOUSING

Pittaluga Road, Monticello, NY

Glenn Smith, Project engineer

Solomon Zweibel, Project developer

Glenn Smith – This project has been in front of you for a couple years now. It's a double wide trailer park home approved for 120 homes. The water and sewer systems are in and most of the utilities. Phase I is 64 of the units and had been under construction for a couple years now with about 42 of those units completed. As I explained at a previous meeting, the mobile homes are coming in really slow due to the pandemic and therefore asked if the homes in Phase II could be stick built. They would look exactly like the mobile homes, with the same floor plan and exterior view. I would imagine this would require a use variance from the Zoning Board. One of your comments at the last meeting was to get some evidence from the suppliers on just how far out they are. I have Solomon here with me tonight and a letter he gave me from Commodore Homes, in Pennsylvania. The letter states that they continue to experience production delays due to supply chain and Covid issues and anticipate the delivery of the remaining 78 units by the fall of 2024 as long as there are no further delays. Phase II started a few months ago. It has been cleared for the roads and the top soil has been picked up. The plan is to have most of Phase II in place by spring of next year, meaning the piping and those kinds of things, and to keep it going, we are looking to stick build those homes. Solomon Zweibel – Things did get better after Covid, but because we are asking for specialized homes, with things such as 9-foot ceilings, we were told it would delay the process another 6 months to a year. To us the 9-foot ceilings are important as that is a great selling point. We discussed our options to keep this going as fast as possible and stick built seemed like the best route. Like Glenn said, if you approve this, they will be built exactly the same with the same number of bedrooms, same layout and no change what-so-ever.

Paula Kay – Was Commodore Homes your supplier for Phase I? Solomon Zweibel – Yes and we had another supplier, Marlette Homes, but they stopped with any special orders and only supply standard models at this time, which is not an option for my customers. We did also get several other companies on the phone, but ran into the same issue, as they are not willing to take special orders. Michael Hoyt - How many of the 20 something remaining homes for Phase I have been ordered? Solomon Zweibel – All of them have been ordered. Michael Hoyt – From Commodore? Solomon Zweibel – Correct. Michael Hoyt – What is the estimated time for those? Solomon Zweibel – They didn't give me an exact time frame, but supposedly starting in September, we will hopefully get 3 per month. Michael Hoyt – Just to confirm, they have all been ordered and are in production? Solomon Zweibel – Yes.

Chairman Sush – Work has been started on Phase II, right? Glenn Smith – Clearing and roads, but no infrastructure and due to the number of wetlands on the property, the roads will have to stay where they are.

Matt Sickler -Do these homes have crawl spaces or piers? Solomon Zweibel – They are all slabs. Kathleen Lara – Are all the slabs in already or at least in Phase I? Solomon Zweibel – Only Phase I. Paula Kay – Does Phase II have any slabs in yet? Solomon Zweibel – No.

Kathleen Lara – First I want to say I was at the sight and it is beautiful and not what I expected for a mobile home park. However, my concern is if we agree to allow you to stick build the rest, which is not permitted in the zone because I believe it would become a cluster development, it will open a can of worms for future projects who may then ask to be able to do the same. Development is at an all-time high in Sullivan County right now and I don't want to give my blessing on something that could potentially set a precedent. Chairman Sush – I am also concerned this will create a density issue. What would the ratio change be for the new use? Does the density or distance between buildings change? Helen Budrock – I don't have the distance between buildings in front of me, but I agree with Kathleen and I think it is more than just a matter of use. The density was based on the use of a mobile home park, which is 4 per acre, versus single family dwellings that are at 1 per acre. Paula Kay – They would defiantly need a variance. Kathleen Lara – I think a cluster is 2 per acre. Helen Budrock – A cluster is 2 per acre. Even if you consider a bungalow colony, as a new development, it would have to be one-story and would be 2 per acre. Glenn Smith – When this was approved years ago, the density then was 7 per acre for mobile home parks but we planned to build only 1.45 per acre as you can't fit 7 per acre on the property. I know the density has decreased over the past years but it is still a pretty high number per acre. Chairman Sush – So it's 1 per acre for the use? Helen Budrock – Well, a single-family dwelling in the RR-1 district is 1 per acre. Chairman Sush – An you are currently at 1.45? Glenn Smith – Yes. Chairman Sush – How many units would you have to lose to get to 1? Glenn Smith – The intent is not really to lose any units. If we went for a use variance, would that variance cover the substitution of units 65 - 120 from mobile home to wood frame? I know if that is the case we would have to come back to this Board at some point, but is it a Zoning Board issue at this time? Chairman Sush – It was just thinking of another option instead of going through the process of getting the variance. You could just change the density to be able to build what you are asking to build. Matt Sickler – If you have 80 acres and need to get to 1 per acre, that's 80 units so that would be losing 40 units and you would have to subdivide for single family homes. Kathleen Lara – Then that would change the development completely. Paula Kay – Either way there's a change. You can defiantly go to the Zoning Board but I'm sure the Zoning Board will look at the minutes of this Board to see that there are concerns. Helen Budrock – Also, if you go to the Zoning Board, it would not just be a use variance but an area variance as well. This way you cover all of your bases or it could be challenged. Solomon Zweibel – Could we change to a bungalow colony, which I believe is 2 per acre? Helen Budrock – That is permitted in the zone, but not cluster developments. Paula Kay – That would change the nature of the project being you would have a mobile home park and bungalow colony co-existing. You would have to do some more planning with Glenn. A bungalow colony would still need a subdivision to make 2 separate parcels and probably another public hearing. Kathleen Lara – That's easy enough, I mean it's still a lot of work, but only 1 subdivision to be able to stay at the same density. Chairman Sush – Does the size of each building also effect the different categories of use? Is there enough living space? Jim Carnell – There's enough space that I don't think that would be an issue. Paula Kay – I would suggest that if you are considering changing the use, you and your team need to review that and come back to the Board as it is not their purgative to make decisions on the use. Kathleen Lara – Jim, is there something different that happens in the Building Dept. if it's stick built versus mobile home? Jim Carnell – The mobile homes are designed and based off of the HUD regulations so it's a different code. We don't really do anything as far as the building itself or the interior, only the install and there is basically a manual for that and the work has to be done by someone HUD certified. If it was stick built, it would have to be designed and built to the state building code and we would do the inspections thorough out the phases.

Jim Carnell – I wanted to bring up that even though this is a mobile home park, I believe it was approved to eventually go into condominium ownership. Solomon Zweibel – That is correct. Jim Carnell – At this point, with the amount that has been developed in Phase I, has the offering plan been done and submitted to the attorney general? Solomon Zweibel – Yes. Jim Carnell – What about Phase II? Glenn Smith – No, nothing in Phase II. Jim Carnell – Do you have to have them sold off before you can the offering? Glenn Smith – It's an

as built condo plan and we showed all of the existing buildings on the plan that was filed with the county, but that is about as far as we got. Jim Carnell – Again, it was just Phase I that has been submitted to the attorney general? Glenn Smith – Yes. Kathleen Lara – What was submitted to the county is very specific in showing the units and thing like that. Jim Carnell – That’s why I was asking because we had a couple of other developments where, as part of the master plan, we approved the offering and I just wanted to make sure what was filed and/or will be filed showed the specific dimensions of the units, decks, etc. Glenn Smith – I think the intent, if this goes through, would be to put the units where the plan already shows them, instead of going with the subdivision, as Matt Sickler mentioned, which we would have to do to put 1 unit per acre.

HAMPTON LAKE, LLC

Starlight Road, Monticello, NY
Glenn Smith, Project engineer
Jeff Minsky, Property owner

Paula Kay was recused from this project.

Discussion was started without Jeff Minsky being present. Went back to discussion later during the meeting when Jeff Minsky joined via Zoom.

Glenn Smith – This project is a subdivision for Hampton Lake, LLC. or the Swinging Bridge campground. We had a public hearing earlier this year with a lot of written and oral comments, that I responded to. The Health Dept. still has to approve the plans. We submitted all of the plans and the application back on March 29th but have not heard back from them yet, in spite of calls and everything else. So, we went ahead and finished the storm water retention plan and submitted that to Matt, a week or 2 ago, to have his people look at. Hopefully that will be underway sometime soon. What we show in the storm water plan is there’s still 28 lots and homes and each lot will have 6, 8 or even 10 rain guards and bioretention basins on them. The majority of the sites drain down towards swinging bridge so we put all of the drains down along the bottom. I’m sure Matt’s office will get us comments and let us know if we need to make any changes. Mr. Minsky has a demolition permit from the Town, which he has had for a year or more, and has been tearing out all of the old bungalows, outhouses, utilities and camp sites since then. A lot of materials have been taken out. There is a lot of piles of scrap material that I heard caught on fire a few months ago. It is kind of suspicious as no one knows who started the fire. The DEC and the fire department did come out to the site and since Mr. Minsky had a demolition permit, the DEC did not issue any violations nor did anybody else. Since then, Mr. Minsky installed cameras all over the site to be able to watch who comes in and out. That’s pretty much it.

Michael Croissant – In regards to the fire, that was the 3rd fire, not the 1st and there were tickets issued by the DEC at least 2 out of the 3 times, but I think all 3 times. Glenn Smith – Even this last time? Michael Croissant – Yes and what was burning was construction debris that was stacked up in a pile. There was metal, tires, parts of camper, you know stuff he is cleaning up on the site and I believe it was all in the pool that was there. Kind of by design in my opinion, but I can’t point fingers. The fire was so bad that when I went to work the next morning, you couldn’t see across the lake and you had to cover your nose from the smell of the burning debris. It was an enormous fire. I believe it took 110 to 120 thousand gallons of water to put it out. Kristin Boyd – I received a photo of the fire that night and I am looking at it now, the flames were above the tree line and those are tall trees. I saw the site in the morning and it was still smoking. That’s pretty scary and thankfully someone found it that night or it would have continued to burn until it hit Lake Shore Drive in the morning. I just need to draw a line under the safety concerns I have for what happened there and would like to be informed of any future fires on the property so that we can make sure

we are aware of what is going on.

Michael Croissant – I'm totally in favor of this project. It's right in my back yard, I like it and think it's a good project. What I don't like is it seems like everything came to a stand still there and there is garbage everywhere. Glenn Smith – On site? Michael Croissant – Yes and blowing into the lake. There has been more garbage in the lake this year than there's been in 50 years. Kathleen Lara – I agree. Michael Croissant – There's never been this bad and it all seems to be coming from that site. I don't know how the rest of the Board feels, but there needs to be some kind of progress with the cleanup. Kathleen Lara – I agree with Michael and I know everyone who lives on that lake was happy and very excited to have that place cleaned up, as it was disgusting, however I think at this time it is worse than what it was. Only thing is there is now silt fence that catches some of the garbage. Michael Croissant – There's only 1 section of silt fence and there are piles of garbage down by the water all piled up that has been there for 6 months, not being touched. That garbage just blows into the Lake. Glen Smith – Do you know if there has been any kind of or attempt for cleanup in those 6 months? Michael Croissant – No, the piles have been there for months and have not been touched. Kathleen Lara – I would like if he could come up with a plan that he can give to the Board explaining what he plans to do next and how he plans to button things up before the winter. Michael Croissant – I think we should put them on a time line, if we can, to assure the garbage is clean up. How has it been since they started working on this? Glenn Smith – Since last fall. Michael Croissant – Right, and it's almost like nothing has been done with the exception of some trees being moved. Kathleen Lara – We understand that this was a difficult project. Michael Croissant - Correct, everyone knew it was a lot of work, but it's just dragging on way to long. Glenn – Smith – We will we do a response and put together a timeline for you to take a look at.

When Jeff Minsky joined the meeting Chairman Sush gave him a brief synopsis of what was discussed in his absence and outlined the Boards main concerns.

Jeff Minsky addressed the garbage issue and said that he disagrees that the garbage is coming from the site. He uses a silt fence at the area they are doing the work and are moving the debris from the bottom level, where all the work is being done, up to the second level to be removed. Said he was using dumpsters but the trucks were getting stuck when trying to access them. He mentioned that he also lives on the lake and does not have any garbage in the lake by him.

Jeff Minsky then addressed the fire issue. He said that the latest fire was on a Friday night and he didn't find out until Saturday night. There we excavators sitting close to the fire this time and is very grateful that they did not catch fire as well. Agrees it is a problem and therefore installed cameras to be able to watch what is going on when he is not there.

Jeff Minsky addressed the final concern regarding the time frame it is taking to get the work done. Said it is hard to find people to work and when he does, they don't last long. He is currently in touch with Mike Watkins and 2 other guys and has ordered 60 containers for debris removal. Mentioned that it is a big property, 140 acers, and they are finding new stuff to take care of and get rid of all the time, but hopes to have everything cleaned up in a months' time. Understands things are moving slow and there was a delay in the beginning as the debris was not sorted correctly, but wants to get things done right. Said there is no one else who wants this to work more then him.

Board asked owner to sit down with engineer, Glenn Smith, and draw up a remediation plan. Jim Carnell said in the meantime, he will go out to the site to take pictures and document what is going on. He will also follow up with the DEC as to what actions they may have taken, if there were any violations issued and if there was any timeframe given by them. He also mentioned that the permits that were issued are most likely expired by now and would need to be reissued, which he will go over with Glenn Smith.

MEP WHOLESALERS

11 Fairground Road, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – MEP Wholesales is located on Fairground Road and Cold Spring Road. It's the site where Williamsburg Plumbing is. It's on the north side of Fairground Road and their other building, that as approved a couple years ago, is on the west side. They are now looking to add another building that will be 21,000 square feet and will have a separate entrance on Cold Spring Road. It will be used to sell HVAC and electrical supplies. The property is in the HC-2 zone and this use is permitted subject to site plan review and approval. At this time, we are just looking to move forward with this.

Jim Carnell – Is there another building already there to the right of the existing building? Joel Kohn – Yes. There is an old black concrete platform. If that is what you are talking about, it will be removed when we start. This will be a big improvement on that big crappy black structure. Jim Carnell – I was just asking because it wasn't really depicted well on the site plan. Joel Kohn – The site plan does show the platform to be removed. Jim Carnell – I just thought it was much bigger than what the site plan shows. Joel Kohn showed on the site plan where the existing building is, where some older buildings are that are currently being used for storage, where some existing outdoor storage is, where the two structures that will be removed are and where they propose to put the new building. He mentioned that they might shift the new building forward some, closer to the road. Matt Sickler – The site plan is a little confusing as most things are labeled as proposed and some of the stuff is actually existing. Joel Kohn – It is a little confusing because it is a previously approved site plan that we made modifications on. Joel Kohn clarified what on the site plan is currently existing, what will be removed and what is proposed. Chairman Sush – So, this stuff is existing and you are cleaning up the site by removing this platform, this building and building a new building? Joel Kohn – Correct. Paula Kay – Okay, I just wanted to make sure that we aren't preserving something that isn't necessary for the new use. Jim Carnell – Do you need to demolish the ruin to gain access to where the new building will be going? Joel Kohn – Yes. Matt Sickler – And a new driveway I assume. Joel Kohn – Yes. Helen Budrock – Just to clarify the new building is the proposed modification? Joel Kohn – Correct and we submitted a new application.

Chairman Sush – Will there be any vehicles going in between the existing building and the new building or any kind of interior connection between the 2 buildings? Joel Kohn – There is no plan to connect the building in anyway. They will be completely separate. Chairman Sush – Separate types of businesses with one ownership? Joel Kohn – Yes because there is a possibility that they will want to subdivide it at some point in the future so they want to maintain them separately. There will be separate septic systems and wells.

Chairman Sush – I see a loading dock proposed. What kind of vehicle will be there, a tractor trailer? Joel Kohn – Yes. Chairman Sush – Will they back up first? Joel Kohn – There will be a little bit more space in the front so they can pull in and then back up to the dock. Chairman Sush – So is that curb line in the design or will it be gravel? Joel Kohn – There's no curb. I think it will be pavement. Chairman Sush – Will they be driving on dirt? Joel Kohn – No. It will at least be gravel, but most likely pavement. Chairman Sush – Will there be enough room on the pavement to pull in and turn around to back up? Joel Kohn – Yes, but not as it is currently shown. The plan will be revised to make more space in the front for them to be able to turn around. Matt Sickler – You can ask Tim to add the turning details on the site plan. Joel Kohn – Will do. Chairman Sush – Will there be enough space to turn around without interfering with the parking spaces. Joel Kohn – Yes. Chairman Sush – The amount of parking spaces shown, is that based on the number of employees or the size of the building? Joel Kohn – It is based on the requirements for the square footage. We don't think we will need as many parking spaces as it's not a typical retail store. What we would like to do is have a smaller paved area for travel/parking and have a grass area for over flow parking if need be.

Chairman us – This is not going to be retail? Joel Kohn – It is retail, just not a typical retail store where a lot of people would be parking at one time. It will be mostly contractors and more than half of the building will be storage. Matt Sickler – So it's more like a supply house. Joel Kohn – Correct. It will be just like their other building on the other side that they sell plumbing supplies from, just a different se. Kathleen Lara – I don't object to the smaller parking at first and if it becomes a problem, they can add more.

Chairman Sush – Will there be out door storage? Joel Kohn – No. Chairman Sush – Anything in the front? Landscaping? Signage? Joel Kohn – We will show landscaping and signage. Chairman Sush – Is this a project we had issue in past with in regards to the landscaping on previous approvals? Jim Carnell – I think you are talking about the one down the street, but this one had some pretty matured landscaping along the Cold Spring side, in front of the building, that they took care of when they did all of their landscaping.

Kristin Boyd – Can we refer this for the 239 tonight? Paula Kay – Yes. Helen Budrock – The 239 request will need to go to both the County and the Village for review. Also, did you see Matt's comments. Joel Kohn – Yes, I saw them. Helen Budrock – Do you want to do some foot work before you want to come back and/or address the County. Joel Kohn – There is 3 weeks until the next meeting and think I can be ready by then. The first comment was about quantifying improvements from what is existing and what is proposed, so the proposed notes need to be removed. The septic plan will be provided along with limits of tree clearing and site grading. It should be under an acre so no SWPP will be required, but we have the drainage analysis. DPW will have their input as we will do the 239 review and will need to get a permit for the county opening. There are dumpster locations. Fire Department access should be reviewed. What do you want to do on that? Do you want me to send it to the fire department? Matt Sickler – Either that or just show the access and confirmation that you have the width to accommodate the turn radius. Joel Kohn – o we need a public hearing for this one? Paula kay – It's a modification to a previously approved site plan and very similar to what is there now so I would say no. Kathleen Lara – Plus there's really not a lot of impact on the neighborhood. Joel Kohn – Maybe it doesn't make sense to come back at the next meeting. Maybe just wait for the 239 review, address everything and it can be an action item for the meeting after next.

A motion to request a 239 review, after updated plans have been submitted, was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Kristin Boyd.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

CHARM ESTATES

295 Ranch Road, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This is a redevelopment of an existing bungalow colony, which was demolished and replaced with 35 new units. A survey was done back when the original site plan was worked out that showed the property had a total of 24 acres. However, I happen to be involved in the property behind this one and when I looked at their survey I noticed a big gap between the 2 properties, meaning one of the surveys are wrong. We ordered a new survey for this property and found another 8 acres belonging to this property. With that being said, they are now looking for approval to add another 7 units, which will utilize the already existing roads.

Kathleen Lara – Were the tax maps correct even though the surveys were wrong? Joel Kohn – No. Kathleen Lara – Would you please file a copy of the new survey with the County so they can update the tax map. Joel Kohn – Sure. Can I email it to you. Kathleen Lara – That would be fine. Matt Sickler – Did the property behind lose some acres? Joel Kohn – No, the acres were never accounted for and were sort of nomad's land. They went back and looked at the old deeds and figured out that the 8 acres slice of land belonged to

this property. There wasn't any kind of dispute or overlap or anything. Helen Budrock – It looks like a lot of it was wetlands anyway. Joel Kohn – Yes, there is a lot of wetlands.

Kristin Boyed – How does adding the 7 units effect water and sewer? Joel Kohn – There should be enough water, but we might have to revise the reports to show the property has adequate water and sewer. The SPEDES is permitted at 25,200 gallons per day and the current sewer flow, for the 35 units, is less than 20,000, plus some for the pool and the Shull. They have enough capacity and will still be below the SPEDES level. Jim Carnell – The new units will require a pump station, correct. Joel Kohn – Correct. It will be pumped into a man hole and will not cross any roads. Matt Sickler – If you're revising the SWPP, updating the water and sewer reports and showing the proposed grading, I think you should be good.

Chairman Sush – Will there be undisturbed trees between the new and old parking? Joel Kohn – I think the new parking is showing bigger on the plan than it's actually going to be. Chairman Sush – Why not move the units closer to the parking spots to have more undisturbed land behind them? Joel Kohn – I think they want to have some kind of buffer between the new units and the road. Helen Budrock – I am going to share a picture on the screen and want to make sure the Board is aware that there is a stream that borders the property. The purple area shown here is what was mapped on the parcel viewer as a flood hazard area and from an environmental perspective, it makes more sense to preserve the forest along the stream than it does to push the new units closer to the stream and preserve the forest next to the road. I'm not sure how recent this photo is but there does seem to be an area here that is mostly clear and it would be easier to build there. Chairman Sush – Is the area you are referencing and circling on the picture, where units 36 & 37 are proposed to be? Helen Budrock – It is hard to compare. Chairman Sush – I don't think that area is disturbed from the current construction so it is probably thinned from the soil there. Jim Carnell – I believe this photo was taken in the fall and therefore not a lot of foliage there. The green that you see is probably evergreen and spruce trees. Joel Kohn – And that is more in the wetlands area. Helen Budrock – For comparison I will show you the old map and the new map. You can see the additional 7 units down here. Chairman Sush – Is that delineated in a similar way that a wetland would be or is it sort of like an ambiguous line and it runs the risk of either insurance or financing? Joel Kohn – The stream is not delineated and the wetlands have not been re-delineated. The bank is quite steep over there but we will have an engineer show the property line and overlay it on the map to make sure we are outside of that. Kathleen Lara – I think that would be smart. Matt Sickler – And maybe also the setback from the actual stream itself. It shows here the property line, which is though the middle of the stream. Helen Budrock – Yeah, that was the main concern. Chairman Sush – And how the storm water effects the flooding, if that's the retention pond and then it floods. Joel Kohn – The stormwater retention plan will have to be revised to accommodate that and probably another bio retention area behind the units. Helen Budrock – Joel, when you did the updated density calculation on the new plan, I see you provided the acreage of wetlands, but I didn't see that acreage provided on the original plan, was there a difference? Because the far corner is all wetlands and then there's another wetland here, so I just wanted to make sure that those wetlands were accounted for when you did the updated calculations and calculated you could squeeze another 7 units in. Joel Kohn – I'm sure they were. The difference between the new and old survey is about 8 acres and if you were to do the 2 units per acre, that would be another 16 units. Helen Budrock – But you would have to take out the wetlands so I would prefer to see the calculations. Joel Kohn – What I'm saying is 7 units is only a 3 ½ acre net and that's what we added. The density calculations are down on the bottom of the plan and it shows the total gross acreage and total wetland area. Helen Budrock – On the new plan, but not the original, right? Joel Kohn – It's on the original plan as well. I believe it's on sheet 2 or in the notes on page 1. Helen Budrock – I see it. What are you comparing that to? How many acres of wetland? Joel Kohn – A total of 11.38 acres of wetlands. Matt Sickler – So the wetlands when from 6.8 to 11.3 acres. Helen Budrock – Okay, I just wanted to make sure. Joel Kohn – Like you had said, most of the new land is covered by wetlands. Helen Budrock – If you could just take some serious consideration to preserving more of a buffer along that stream. Joel Kohn – We will take a look and see how we can compromise.

Chairman Sush – Any other changes to the site plan? Joel Kohn – Yes. They are proposing to add another 8 feet to the Shull building. Kathleen Lara – Makes sense, more people, means more Shull.

Helen Budrock – Joel, did you submit a new EAF or an updated one? Joel Kohn – No, but we will update that. Joel Kohn – Do you want a short form? Helen Budrock – That will be fine. It's an unlisted action but we just want to make sure you have it on file.

CONGREGATION ICHED ANASH

473 Anawana Lake Road, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

This project was removed from the agenda.

MONTICELLO MOTOR CLUB – GARAGE LOFTS

67 Cantrell Road, Monticello, NY

Hayden Carnell, Project representative

Jim Carnell, Helen Budrock and Matt Sickler were recused. Logan Morey for Building, Planning and Zoning and Glenn Smith for town engineer.

Hayden Carnell – This is a new project and this is the first time you are seeing it. If you are not familiar with the property, the front gate is here on Cantrell Road. We are looking to build private garages that will be leased to members. I have been in discussion with the Building Dept. about the designated use and I think they would be classified as private garages. There are no bedrooms proposed, so there will be no overnight stays, but there is loft space above the garages for day use only. The current square footage is slightly over 1,000 square feet so we are going to add a room to the first floor to reduce it to 1,000 square feet, so they don't need sprinklers and can be considered private garages. They propose to build one cluster at a time and want to do so during the off-season, for obvious reasons, and hope to start this fall. We are working on a designing flow for sewer and water use. There's an existing well for the Guard building that we're going to see if we can use instead of drilling a new well. We have to test to see what the capacity is and what we would have to treat it for. There is a master plan for sewer and Delaware has started to build a treatment plant. We will ultimately use that plant but because it will take a lot less time than a plant, we are proposing a temporary holding tank. The tank will have a water alarm and will be pumped on a regular basis and holding tanks are allowed as long as they are temporary. Stormwater is currently not designed, but we are looking to collect it and send it to an existing detention pond in the area. So that's kind of where we're at.

Kathleen Lara – Glenn, do you have any issues or questions in regards to the water and sewer? Glenn Smith – I would just need copies of the plans, when available, then I can review them and let you know if I have any comments. Hayden Carnell – Even though this is not residential, I think the DEC will still want to review it as well. Glenn Smith – Agreed. They are very strict about holding tanks and will want to make sure there is a plant or something in the works for the future. Hayden Carnell – Yeah and that's why we did a part-time analysis on the well and things like that. Kathleen Lara – Will the DEC provide a date that the permanent sewer will have to be installed? Glenn Smith – Yes, they will make sure there is a timeline in which certain things will have to be done by. Hayden Carnell – We have an estimate of 5 years for a completed sewer plan, but probably won't take that long.

Paula Kay – What exactly will the lofts be used for? Hayden Carnell – A building layout, like a building plan, was provided. There’s just going to be a living space with a couch so when people come up with their families, they don’t have to sit in the Clubhouse. Kathleen Lara – Will there be restrooms? Hayden Carnell – Yes. Paula Kay – Kitchen? Hayden Carnell – No Kitchen. Only a sink and counter top, but no appliances. There’s a full kitchen in the Clubhouse.

Kathleen Lara – Logan, how come these garages are permitted? In a normal situation you wouldn’t be able to have an accessory building without a primary house and the public may have questions about this. Paula Kay – This is a commercial site and is commercial use. Logan Morey – They have always had garages. Hayden Carnell – They currently have over 100 garages and the original approved plan showed a garage here, but without a loft above it. They are kind of out of space in the Clubhouse and thought this would help. Kathleen Lara – I totally understand and it make sense. Paula Kay – Will you add that to the plan for the next meeting? Hayden Carnell – Yes. Chairman Sush – These garages are probably bigger than the ones that are currently there. Hayden Carnell – They will be and we don’t show any parking because you can fit 4 vehicles inside of these garages, so nobody’s parking outside.

Michael Croissant – There’s no connection to the track from the garage, right? Hayden Carnell – No. They don’t want any full-time people in there or overnight stays because of security reasons. That’s why it’s only day use and they don’t want people there after hours. Chairman Sush – What prevents people from staying overnight? Hayden Carnell – It will be part of their policy and it will be on the site plan. We can provide a letter that states this as well. Chairman Sush – Does security come after hours to ensure this? Hayden Carnell – Well there’s always security there.

MONTICELLO MOTOR CLUB – SUBDIVISION

110 Cantrell Road, Monticello, NY
Hayden Carnell, Project representative

Jim Carnell, Helen Budrock and Matt Sickler were recused. Logan Morey for Building, Planning and Zoning and Glenn Smith for town engineer.

Hayden Carnell – Monticello Motor Club owns a 54-acre parcel across the street from the track. The entrance is here on the map, this is Rupp Road and the employee/security housing building, that was approved for this fall, is here. They are looking to subdivided this parcel. A piece was given to the Fire Dept., but that was never filed or anything, so we fixed the boundary on that and extended it to center road. There is a piece that has a garage and storage and stuff that they are looking to possibly combine, but we don’t have a full answer on that yet. We are proposing that as “lot 2” and then the rest of these lots, for possible housing in the future. There are no plans as of right now, but we wanted to have the lots there. Because they wanted smaller lots, we are also going to need a zone change. This piece will now be an accessory use on its own lot. Across the street is RR-1 zoning, so we are going to go to the Town Board to ask to have these added to that zone, which will allow the use of dormitories.

Paula Kay - We met about this and I think the consensus between Glenn, Logan Hayden and myself, was that it fits better as a dormitory for employees then just housing for security because it’s really for all motor club employees. A lot of the employees live far away so the idea is to be able to attract employees by offering housing during their work week and they can return home on their off days. Glenn Sith -The definition of dormitory in the zone is almost exactly what you’re looking to do there and only requires a minimum of a 3-acre parcel size. Hayden Carnell – We made the lots slightly larger than 3 acres as to meet the 15% density, make them about 10.5% right now. Kathleen Lara – It makes sense as it is a residential area. Hayden Carnell – yeah. I believe the zoning on both sides and actually all around is RR-1. Chairman

Sush – Will this effect the little dirt track ? Hayden Carnell – No, that was just the boundary we surveyed and it picked up everything that was there. It won't be shown on the actual subdivision plan. Glenn Smith – What about the cell tower there? Hayden Carnell – It's not on any of these parcels and we did a ball radius on the plant and it's not within the vicinity either.

Hayden Carnell - Once we go in front of the Town Board and do the public hearing, I believe we come back to this Board. Michael Hoyt – Very good. Paula Kay – The Town Board is going to refer it back to you guys for the zone change, so this way you have some background. Chairman Sush – Would it be too soon to make any decisions being they haven't asked us for anything yet? Would it change the process and stop them from having to come back? Paula Kay – They would still have to come back but you can signal anything to the Town Board in the minutes. So, however you are feeling about it might be helpful. Chairman Sush – Knowing they are going to ask us for a recommendation, should we make a formal recommendation now? Hayden Carnell – I believe the zone change still won't be approve until the subdivision is, at least not the whole parcel, right? Kathleen Lara – That makes sense. Chairman Sush – I think if they were to ask us for our recommendation, we would give it. Michael Hoyt – I think what we are trying to say is we support it so it can go in the minutes. Hayden Carnell – Would we need 2 separate public hearings being it is a major subdivision and a zone change? One for each Board? Paula Kay – Yes. Hayden Carnell – Is there a way to have the public hearings more concurrently so we don't have to drag it out to the next month? Paula Kay – It's hard to say. I think first you have to get your zone change. Hayden Carnell – Okay. Paula Kay – I don't think you will have any issue getting the zone change. Kathleen Lara – Me either. It makes sense in the area and it will make it less complicated. I like it. Logan Morey – The next meeting is 3 weeks out, so if you go to the Town Board on the September 6th and come back to us on September 14th for approval, you can then go back to the Town on September 20th. Paula Kay – Just remember all Town Board action is discretionary so they don't have to do a thing with it. Hayden Carnell – Right. Paula Kay – You can do your motion tonight to schedule the public hearing and then wait to get the referral.

A motion to schedule a public hearing on September 14, 2022 was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Michael Hoyt.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

ACTION ITEMS:

CONCORD ASSOCIATES

Concord Road, Monticello, NY

Henry Zabatta, Project representative

Henry Zabatta – I am here tonight to request an extension for Concord Associates for the hotel. On March 9, 2022 you gave us an extension to September 15, 2022 and now we are looking for another 6-month extension to March 15, 2023. We are currently in discussions with EPR to try to get into their water system and it appears we are making some progress. In the past we weren't sure if we would be able to tap into their system, but at this time it looks like we are going to be able to. That is help us both with the hotel site and the Fairways projects.

Chairman Sush – Is this site secure? Henry Zabatta – The main fence in the front fell and I have to repair it.

Kathleen Lara – I heard there was an issue with access to water in that whole area so I'm okay with

another 6-month extension.

A motion to grant the 6-month extension to March 15, 2023 was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Kristin Boyd.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

MONTICELLO MOTOR CLUB – EMPLOYEE BUILDING

67 Cantrell Road, Monticello, NY

Hayden Carnell, Project representative

Jim Carnell, Helen Budrock and Matt Sickler were recused. Logan Morey for Building, Planning and Zoning and Glenn Smith for town engineer.

Hayden Carnell – This project was approved almost a year ago. I actually just received the comment letter from the DOH tonight at 5:01, which is what we have been waiting for. There were just a few comments on water and sewer that I will address and get everything sent to Glenn as well. Hopefully we can get everything addressed a final letter within the next 6 months.

Glenn Smith – I did a response letter back in November of 2021. Hayden Carnell – After that we submitted to the DEC who referred it to the DOH based on the request for reduced flows, because we went from double occupancy bedrooms to single occupancy bedrooms, and the DOH has finally responded today.

Chairman Sush – Does this need an extension? Hayden Carnell – Yes. Paula Kay – When was this from? Hayden Carnell – I believe approval was in September of 2021. Paula Kay – So it's 6 months from September 21, 2022 making the new deadline March 21, 2023.

Chairman Sush – Are we discussing the title of the building tonight? Haydn Carnell – I believe the use will stay the same and we are not changing any property lines on this.

A motion to grant a 6-month extension to March 21, 2023 was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Kristin Boyd.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

155 HEIDEN ROAD

155 Heiden Road, Thompsonville, NY

Hayden Carnell, Project representative

Jim Carnell was recused. Logan Morey for Building, Planning and Zoning.

Hayden Carnell – We are here tonight for final site plan approval. Last meeting, we were here for a public hearing and the written comment period was left open for 10 days, in which no comments were received.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Kathleen Lara.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

Chairman Sush – Anything else we need to review? Has anything changed on the site plan? Hayden Carnell – Nothing has changed. I have used the same site plan for the last 3 meetings. Kathleen Lara – I think its pretty straight forward as the site is not changing, just the use. Chairman Sush – Any conditions we need to

review? Hayden Carnell – We submitted an operational letter that addressed the Boards previous comments about lighting, hours of operation and thing like that. Matt Sickler – I was satisfied with what was submitted and I think we are all set there.

A motion for final site plan approval and special use permit was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Michael Croissant.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

LEISURE ACRES

Waverly Ave & Cold Spring Road, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Meyer Silber, Project developer

Ben Geller, Project developer

Joel Kohn – This project received preliminary approval back in December of 2022. The plans have since been submitted to all third-party agencies, including the town engineer for review of the SWPP and everything else. The SWPP has been reviewed and commented on. We have submitted a revised SWPP to Matt, based on his last set of comments, and hopefully this plan will be approval and the SWPP will be done. We received comments from the DEC and responded to those. DOH comments were also received. Matt’s office reviewed the infrastructure cost estimates and the recreation cost estimates and they were approved and I believe the developer’s agreement was okay. What we are looking for tonight is to have the Planning Board allow the project to proceed with infrastructure, subject to the developer’s agreement being approved by the Town Board and all fees being paid.

Paula Kay – Also subject to Mike Messengers comments that were received earlier this week, I believe on Monday. Mike stated that he feels allowing work on the infrastructure to begin is premature. He had concerns as they have not yet received NYS DOH approval for the water system, they have not yet received NYS DEC approval for the sanitary sewer extension and that extension is intended to serve more than one separately owned property (condominium ownership) and therefore must comply with 6 NYCRR 785-1.6(f). He also stated the SEQR EAF filed on July 20, 2022, by Mike Rielly, stated the project will be condominium ownership and will require a sewage disposal corporation to be formed. Joel Kohn – I guess what we are really asking for tonight is to allow the project to start clearing, roughen the roads and stormwater management. Then once we get our approvals from DEC and DOH, we can move on to infrastructure. Kathleen Lara – Does all of that fall under the spirit of Mike Rielly’s comments? Joel Kohn – Yes. Chairman Sush – Part of your request included stormwater, is that okay at this time? Matt Sickler – Stormwater, yes. They are going to have to start with erosion and sanitation control to rough that in, which will then be converted into the permanent stormwater. Chairman Sush – Understood, because they have to have that in place before they can start do earth work. What about the restoration bond? Joel Kohn – That is part of the developer’s agreement, so yes, also subject to that.

Paula Kay – There are some conditions in the developer’s agreement that I can go over with the Board. Joel and I may not agree on all of them, but most of them we do. They are as follows:

- There will be a 12% satisfaction fee that needs to be paid, which amounts to about \$162,000.00.
- There will be park and recreation fees that need to be established by the Planning Board and will be based upon the 70 units. These fees have to be paid prior to the inception of any infrastructure.
- The Town acknowledges receipt of the additional \$329,000.00 for the restoration bond, that Matt worked on. However, there is a performance bond of about \$4 million that will be due at the time the project receives final approval from the Planning Board.
- Once the Town receives the inspection fee, the recreation fee, all fees due to Town consultants and the

restoration bond, the company may begin construction of only initial infrastructure work. This would include things like roughing out the road and stormwater management. I think this may need to be amended to specify exactly what that initial infrastructure work is.

- No maps are to be signed or building permits issued unless all fees are paid, all comments have been addressed and all regulatory agency approvals have been received.

That's in essence the developer's agreement, which gets approved by the Town Board, but this Board still needs to have input and let us know if there is anything you want to be changed or added. Kathleen Lara – I think it covered everything with the exception of specifying the initial infrastructure work, like Paula had said.

Kristin Boyd – What type of infrastructure cannot be done before the DEC and DOH approvals are in? Joel

Kohn – Installation of water and sewer mains. Michael Croissant – pretty much no digging underground.

Paula Kay – Foundation work. Chairman Sush – Would that include trenching for sewer and water? Joel

Kohn – Yes and there's no sense in doing that before approvals. Matt Sickler – I think on this project, a lot of the water work was outside of the road area. So, coming back and trenching later after the fact, wouldn't really disturb anything we did to make the roads. Joel Kohn – Right and the way it is designed, the water is looped inside all of the units and the sewer is outside, to keep them separate.

Paula Kay – We need to discuss the park and recreation fees. Joel Kohn – As provided on the plans for recreation, there are 3 swimming pools and 3 separate playground areas. So, what we would like to ask

the Board is to consider the lower fee of \$1,250.00 per unit, which the Planning Board has done in the past for similar types of developments. Paula Kay – The Board hasn't done this in a while, but the code states that the fees shall be \$2,500.00 per unit or lot, whichever is higher, and the Planning Board may reduce the fee to a minimum of \$1,250.00 per unit or lot, by reviewing, on a case-to-case basis, the criteria. That's population, demographics of proposed development, the types of recreational facilities proposed for the site, the nature of the facilities proposed, the number of housing units proposed, the acres of the proposed site, the seasonality of the development's population, as well as seasonality of the on-site facilities and the location of the proposed development relative to other proposed or existing public recreational facilities. We do not have on the agenda for you to review and make a decision on this tonight, but you certainly can as part of the approval if you feel comfortable doing so. Michael Croissant –

I'd like to see what the playground areas are going to look like in a little more depth. It's going to be just a swing, or a slide or will there be multiples of each? Chairman Sush – Do you know what types of

playground equipment you will be using? Joel Kohn – Typically in developments like this there's a couple

swings and slides and not just one of each. Michael Hoyt – I don't see any courts of any kind. Meyer Silber

– The playgrounds are going to be full playgrounds. Michael Hoyt – So, are you going to provide us with

pictures and information on what the playgrounds are going to consist of? Meyer Silber – Yes. Helen

Budrock – And that is for the purpose of setting the recreational fees, right? Michael Hoyt – Yes. Kathleen

Lara – I think what we are getting at is it would be in your benefit to show us the playground spec so we

can make the best determination on what the fee should be. Chairman Sush – Is there any passive

recreation, like walking trails? Joel Kohn – There is a path, that is almost a ½ mile long and 5 feet wide,

inside of the development. This path keeps people from having to walk on any roads but can be used as a

walking path as well.

Kathleen Lara – This is a tough site due to the location and is best to keep everything on-site, so I see that.

The 3 pools on top of each other is interesting. Are they going to be 3 separate fenced pools? Joel Kohn –

Yes. There will also be wading pools, which will be in the same fenced in areas. Chairman Sush – What is

the height of the fence there? Is it going to be higher than a typical fence? Joel Kohn – We might need it to be

a little bit higher on one side, but we are not sure yet. Chairman Sush – When will that be determined?

Joel Kohn – We will have to get a permit for the pool that will include the fencing information. If the fence

is going to be higher than 8 feet, we are going to need a variance. Kathleen Lara – Right.

Michael Hoyt – I know it's kind of early in the process, but is there any plans for landscaping and stuff like that. Joel Kohn – Not yet as landscaping is typically done towards the end of the project. Michael Hoyt – Typically, but as we have been having problems with that, I thought I would ask. Joel Kohn – Understood but you can't really figure that out at the beginning of the plan. Michael Hoyt – Maybe dress it up around the corner a little bit. Just think about it. Joel Kohn – We will take a look and see what can be done.

Jim Carnell – I know you acquired the adjoining parcels with the vacant buildings and 2 mobile homes on it, are buildings still on the one parcel and the mobile homes on the other and what's the timeframe on those? Meyer Silber – Well, people are still living in the mobile homes and the rest we can take care of right away. Kristin Boyd – Is that going to be part of the current site plan? Joel Kohn – Yes. Kathleen Lara – Are those mobile homes up here on the map? Joel Kohn – Yes. Kathleen Lara – Just so you know they get stuck there in the winter time because the driveway is steep and you might want to look at looking into fixing that. Jim Carnell – Do you have a timeframe in which the tenants are going to vacate and have the buildings removed? Meyer Silber – The plan was to leave the mobile homes and use them as kind of an office for the project, but if it disturbs anything, we can demolish them. Jim Carnell – I don't necessarily have a problem with that, but typically you would let the Board know you are going to have a job trailer, but my main concern is there are people occupying them and you are going to start to bring in equipment. They shouldn't be there when site work is being done. Kathleen Lara – That's a good point and if they are not going to leave willingly, you might want to think of what the next step is. Jim Carnell – Do you currently have an arrangement for them to leave? Meyer Silber – No, but there's no children there and is only one person so it can be done quickly. Joel Kohn – If for some reason they are not out on time, we can just put up a fence to secure the area. Kathleen Lara – Okay. Kristin Boyd – Does this introduce any necessary conditions for the approval tonight? Jim Carnell – Well they are going to be moving out so I think it's okay as long as it is in a reasonable timeframe.

Paula Kay – Tonight, you can make a determination on the application, on the site plan, and then they can come back for the recreation fees. Ben Geller – Will that hold off the approval to start the infrastructure? Paula Kay – No, but everything is based on the developer's agreement. Joel Kohn – I would like to set a date as to when the fees are due. Chairman Sush – I thought they had to be paid before a certain aspect of the approval process. Paula Kay – Before issuance of building permits, but in the agreement states before any infrastructure. Chairman Sush – Is that paid or just determined? Paula Kay – Paid. Ben Geller – Is it possible to wait on the one fee until, since have to get we proof of the playgrounds, so it won't hold us back? Kristin Boyd – Can we hold something in escrow? Paula Kay – I think the issue is it's going to take you some time to get the special recreational information. Joel Kohn – It's not that. The next meeting will be in 3 weeks and when we are done with the Planning Board meeting, we still have to go to the Town Board and that will delay the start of the infrastructure by a couple of weeks. If we can get the Board to signal the green light tonight, we come back with spec for the playground areas and approve recreational fees at the next meeting. Paula Kay – That's what I was saying. The Board would approve the site plan tonight and then you will come back at the next meeting to determine recreational fees. Joel Kohn – Great and in the meanwhile, we will go to the Town Board meeting to get the developer's agreement. Paula Kay – And then once you get the recreation fees and all is paid up, you can start the work. Logan Morey – You will need a site work permit. Joel Kohn – I have it prepared and will bring it in to the Building Dept. tomorrow.

A motion to allow developer to start infrastructure work, subject to the conditions in the developer's approval, once approved by the Town Board, was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Kristin Boyd. All in favor, 0 opposed.

GARDEN HILL ESTATES

50 Strong Road, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This modification was to removed unit 14 and replace it in a new location. At the last meeting the Board had asked for clarification that unit 14 will be completely removed from unit 15 and that unit 15 did not just want to add an addition at this time. We hashed this out and at this time are only going to remove unit 14 and relocate it. The Board also asked us to show a walkway from the parking to the unit, which is now shown. We also show the relocation of the drainage that went through the porch and corner of the building.

Chairman Sush – Matt, has everything from your end been addressed. Matt Sickler – Yes.

No further questions from the Board.

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

STEVE MOSS CONCESSION

94/200 Rock Hill Drive, Rock Hill, NY
Bill Sattler, Project representative

Bill Sattler – A few months ago the Planning Board was kind enough to grant us site plan approval. Part of that approval was to allow the one store front to become 3 small store fronts. However, we have now decided that’s not piratical, as each store requires its own handicap bathroom and 2 of the 3 stores would have raised bathrooms and would not be compliant. We are now asking to stay with the 1 store front, which currently has a compliant ADA bathroom and paperwork on that has been submitted to the Building Dept.

Chairman Sush – Is 1 store the most stores you can now get? Bill Sattler – Yes because the other 2 stores would have elevated bathrooms and would need elevators to access them, which is just not practical in such small stores.

Chairman Sush – Is this back in front of us now solely because the site plan we gave final approval for showed 3 stores and you are now reverting back to just the 1? Bill Sattler – Exactly and I spoke to Logan, at the Building Dept., about this and she suggested we ask the Planning Board to keep the site plan approval, just remove the 3 stores and let the building stay as it is today with just the 1 store.

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

POPEYE’S CHICKEN

4438 State Route 42, Monticello, NY

No one showed up to represent Popeye’s. Jim Carnell explained why this project was on the agenda.

Jim Carnell – Popeye’s approached the Building Dept. about utilizing one of the parking spaces to put a little storage pod, for roughly 4 to 6 weeks after opening, to store material and objects such as merchandise giveaways for the grand opening. I explained that the Building Dept. didn’t have the authority to approve that and they would have to get approval from this Board. I’m not sure if they still want to move forward with this as they didn’t come tonight.

Kathleen Lara – I would be oaky with it as long as there was a timeline set and bond for removal. Jim Carnell – I believe they still have a bond on the project. Helen Budrock – Do you where the location of the pod is going to be? Jim Carnell – No. They didn’t specify any location and I thought they would be here tonight. Chairman Sush – Other than this, do they have everything else in place for opening? Jim Carnell – Yes, I believe so. Logan Morey – I believe they intend to open on Monday. Jim Carnell – I spoke with the mall owners and they didn’t have any issue with the pod. Kathleen Lara – I would prefer they put in a space close to the building and not in the middle of the parking lot as they are obviously going to be busy the first couple weeks of opening. Chairman Sush – Can it go somewhere else? Jim Carnell – I don’t think the mall owners were amendable to that. Matt Sickler – Plus that might cause crossing of the parking lot and possibly roads. Jim Carnell – It’s probably ideal for it to be some place close to the building and you can establish some kind of a time frame to have it removed by. Maybe 30 or 60 days from when it is installed. They mentioned 6 weeks. Helen Budrock – As long as the location doesn’t impede the flow of traffic. Paula Kay – I think we should kind of put the ball back in the Building Depts. court and ask them to determine an acceptable spot. Kathleen Lara – Being they are not here tonight can we still act? Paula Kay - This is something the Building Dept. requested, so I think it is fine in this case and if they don’t utilize it, that is also fine.

A motion to approve the minor modification to the previously approved site plan to permit the use of a storage pod up to 60 days, as long as it is not obstructing any traffic and is contained to 1 parking spot, was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Michael Hoyt.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

PRIOR APPROVALS/ENFORCEMENT:

Kathleen Lara requested that Keren Hatorah be invited back again to the next meeting. They were asked to come back to this one and did not. She asked if violations could be issued at this time. Paula Kay suggested to let her make a phone call at this point and see what the outcome of that will be. Michael Hoyt expressed that movement needs to be made and Michael Croissant expressed that there needs to be some kind of recourse if nothing is done.

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Kristen Boyd and second by Michael Hoyt. All in favor, 0 opposed.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers,
Secretary
Town of Thompson Planning Board