

# APPROVED

TOWN OF THOMPSON  
PLANNING BOARD  
February 28, 2024

IN ATTENDANCE: Kathleen Lara, Chairman  
Kristin Boyd  
Arthur Knapp  
Michael Croissant  
Matthew Sickler, Consulting Engineer  
Jim Carnell, Building, Planning, & Zoning  
Paula Elaine Kay, Attorney  
Laura Eppers, Secretary  
Hellen Budrock, Consulting Planner  
Bill Johnson, Consulting RF Engineer

Chairman Lara brought the meeting to order at 7:00 pm with a pledge to the flag.

A motion to approve the January 10, 2024 minutes was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Arthur Knapp. All in favor, 0 opposed.

The Board decided to hold off on approving the January 24, 2024 minutes until all attending members are present.

A motion to approve the February 14, 2024 minutes was made by Michael Croissant and second by Arthur Knapp. All in favor, 0 opposed.

## **ACTION ITEMS:**

### **VERIZON WIRELESS**

585 South Maplewood Road, Monticello, NY  
Scott Olsen, Project representative

Chairman Lara advised that at the last meeting, which this project did not attend, the Board extended the shot clock a little bit more to give some additional time to clear up the few items that are still hanging out there.

Scott Olsen – Since we were here last, we submitted two letters. One was on the 16<sup>th</sup> of February and it was basically a transmittal of the RF engineer’s supplement. What he explained in that letter is that there was basically a discrepancy with the search area that was in the original report, which was not done by the same RF engineer and I think that the switch during this process created part of this issue. When they started out with the original search ring, they thought they could cover the area with one site/tower, but as we were going through the process, they realized they were not going to be able to do that, due to the topography. So, we are going to need a second site to cover the area in need and I believe I previously mentioned the Swinging Bridge Marina site, which is to the west. We don’t like the fact that the mistake was made and presented that way, but it was and the purpose of the letter was to point out the mistake and own up to it. Hopefully the explanation was clear, but if you or your RF engineer have any questions,

we would be happy to answer them. Chairman Lara – Bill, do you get a chance to review this yet? Bill Johnson – Yes, I did and I provided a report on the new RF information and the discrepancy regarding the search area. That was resolved to my satisfaction and nothing about the new search ring would change any of the analysis that I have done for the Board. As it is, it looks good and there is no change in facts at this point.

Chairman Lara – Matt, would you like to share your comments on this? Matt Sickler – Sure. Looking at the site now that we have progressed further with the search analysis, the only comment, or should I say request, that I would have at this time is to have the site engineer provide a brief analysis of the stormwater on the site. Primarily because of the location in relation to the intersection with the County Road. Just a brief analysis of the runoff and what is being done to assure it doesn't cause a problem at the intersection. Scott Olsen – Okay, I can certainly pass that request along to the engineer. I don't think that will be an issue because we certainly are not over the one-acre for a SWPP. Matt Sickler – Right. It's just the creation of the driveway, the entire pad, and the ground treatment, and that is 60' x60'. The swale on the uphill side of the driveway catches what ever runoff comes down from the solar farm. Just something to document that there is not going to be a problem at the intersection. Scott Olsen – We can do that.

Chairman Lara – We did discuss this before and there was supposed to be some landscaping completed with the solar farm, Jim, was that all done? Jim Carnell – They did come back and asked to reduce some of it along the road and the hillside because they ended up putting in overhead lines and there was a conflict with that. I believe the stuff up on the hill of the Sackett Lake side was also reduced, but they did come back and get Board approval for that. Chairman Lara – Okay. Obviously, you can't really cover up a cell tower with bushes or anything like that and we are just trying to do what we can to soften its impact on the neighborhood. So, that is why I brought that up. Scott Olsen – Sure.

Chairman Lara – Paula, what is our next step? Paula Kay – I know Mike had asked for some renderings from the different sides, so maybe you want to take a look at that real quick. Michael Croissant – Well there is really nothing to take a look at because what I asked for wasn't presented; probably by design. You gave us renderings from areas where it really doesn't show the sides of the tower up close, only from like a mile away. We requested rendering coming up and down Sackett Lake and Maplewood Road and we didn't get those. Scott Olsen – I think that is because we initially agreed on locations for photographs and what you are asking for now is new and after the fact that the balloon was floated. We provided a list of locations where the photographs should be taken from and asked the Board if you wanted any additional locations. I don't recall if you requested additional locations, maybe you did, but when the new request came in, we gave you what we had. Michael Croissant – I find it disappointing and it almost look like you didn't want to actually show a monstrosity next to the road, but that is my own personal opinion. Scott Olsen – And you are entitled to that, but, again, that is not what we did. We worked with the Board and asked where you would like to have photos taken from. Kristin Boyd – I'm looking at the balloon test photos and they do not align with the views from the renderings. Scott Olsen – Are you saying the locations are different? Chairman Lara – Kristin, why don't you show him. Kristin Boyd – I'm looking at the photos we revived from the balloon test and there are some over the lake and over here. Jim Carnell – Those are the photos I took. Paula Kay – Then that would explain the confusion. Kristin Boyd – I would think that one of the key views would be what you see looking up the road, so I would like to go back and look at the balloon test. Scott Olsen – I would be more than happy to. Helen Budrock – There is a photo in their renderings that looks like it may be from the road, but I don't know if that is what we are looking for. Scott Olsen – What is the location on it? Helen Budrock – South Maplewood Road. Kristin Boyd – There were also a lot more photograph locations that we listed then renderings we received. Scott Olsen – I would have to look, but it looks like we analyzed 23 locations. Kristin Boyd – And none of those were from the road, looking right at it? Scott Olsen – We did do one right on Sackett Lake Road and Rubin Road. Kind of where the intersection is right in front of it. And I did pull that one out as part of what I recently submitted to you, stating that it is

one of the closest pictures we took to the Marcy South. So, we took one along Sackett Lake and one to the west. Which wasn't visible, probably because of the topography. Kristin Boyd – There were a lot of locations listed and I was just wondering why you picked the ones that you did for the rendering. Scott Olsen – When you say rendering, so you mean simulation? Kristin Boyd – The one with the tower in the photo. Scott Olsen – Okay, so you are not necessarily saying that the number of locations is less than what we originally agreed to and/or provided. You are saying that every location wasn't simulated. Kristin Boyd – Yes. Chairman Lara – And more importantly, the one that everyone is going to drive by and look at. I think that is really more what they were getting out. Scott Olsen – Okay. I don't know if we simulated them all, but #6 is the Rubin Road location and that is pretty close. It is right behind the house. Jim Carnell – Paul's house. Michael Croissant – Right and that is not on the intersection; it is about a quarter of a mile away. Scott Olsen – The location states northwest from Rubin Road and County Route 5, but I wouldn't know exactly where that is. There may have been locations where it was visible from but not simulated, so I can ask for those to be simulated also. Kristin Boyd – Okay. Scott Olsen – Fair enough, I just wanted to make sure I understood your concern correctly. Paula Kay – We have to March 14<sup>th</sup> for the shot clock, so the next meeting on March 13<sup>th</sup> will be fine. Scott Olsen – Okay and I can have those simulations submitted in time for that meeting. And Michael, if that is what you were looking for, I apologize because I didn't quite understand. We weren't trying to not supply you with what you were asking for. We will definitely get you the simulations from any location that the balloon was visible from. Michael Croissant – Especially any from the road. Maybe one from this way and one from this way. Helen Budrock – Are you able to simulate it if you didn't do a balloon test from that location? Scott Olsen – That's the problem because we can't do that. So, looking at this page here, the star is the location of the tower and all of these little dots were the locations being considered. If it wasn't taken from one of those locations, I don't think it can be simulated. Michael Croissant – Maybe just from these two directions. Scott Olsen – That's hard to do because we don't have the balloon floating still. Michael Croissant – With the balloon not floating, that just doesn't give you the height, right? Scott Olsen – Yes. Michael Croissant – But it does give you the base of the tower? Even if it gets cut off at 100 feet, I think that is more than sufficient. It's more to see what people would be looking at driving down the road. Scott Olsen – I'm not the one who does the simulations, so I will ask and see what can be done. We may not be able to get what you are looking for without re-floating a balloon and that is an additional expense, but I will see what we can do. Chairman Lara – Other than that I believe most of our concerns have been addressed and this is kind of the last item we are looking for. Scott Olsen – Okay. We will aim to have something to you in the next week or so, in time for the March 13<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **MONSTER GOLF**

84 Chalet Road, Monticello, NY  
George Duke, Project attorney

George Duke – We are here today because we have two Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO) that expired a couple weeks ago and we are requesting an extension for those. There are still a couple of loose ends that need to be tied up and submitted to Jim's department; one is the submission of an as built and it is my understanding that the catch basin for the stormwater needed to be raised. To do so, they had to raise the topography around it and that was held up by weather. I have been told that the as built has been drafted, but they don't actually match the built conditions. Once the topography has been built up, they can verify the as built is true. From what has been explained to me it is handwork and it's not a lot of grading needs to be done; they just need to wait for better weather conditions. The next thing would then be a notice of termination for the sewer and a substance conformance approval from our landlord. That is the last few steps. Again, we are here tonight to respectfully request extensions for the TCOs so that the golf course can operate while we get these last few things taken care of and submitted to you.

Paula Kay – So, essentially, I think this Board just needs to give a recommendation to the building department. Chairman Lara – Jim, do have any objections to this? Jim Carnell – No.

Chairman Lara – I have heard nothing but great things about the golf course and it is neat when we get to hear things like that.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

George Duke – Should we assign a new expiration date? Even though the remaining work is minimal, I don't want to have to come back here again because it expired. Chairman Lara – What should we do, six months or maybe a year. George Duke – I don't think we need that much time. Chairman Lara – So, six months is, okay? George Duke – Yes. Paula Kay – Again, you guys are not issuing an extension, just giving your recommendation to the building department, who will most likely issue the six-month extension dating back to the day it expired. George Duke – Great and six months should be more than enough time for us to complete everything.

The Board made a recommendation to the building department to allow for a six-month extension of the TCOs.

#### **WEISS REALTY**

49 Kroeger Road, Bridgeville, NY  
John O'Rourke, Project engineer

John O'Rourke – We are here tonight as our six month is up since we got this project approved. Currently we are we are in front of the NYSDEC for the septic system that was submitted, but they have been quite slow in responding. We also are coordinating with our adjoining neighbor. We thought we had an agreement to take the land in front of his property for the road improvement. If you can remember we were going to widen the road to allow for the truck traffic and we approached the neighboring property, who agreed to sell the roadside portion of his property to us so that we may improve the road. Last week he backed out of that, looking for a little bit more money. So, we are going to negotiate with him because his well is on our property. Chairman Lara – I thought I remembered it was something like that. John O'Rourke – Yeah and we were trying to work with him and offered him a lot of money, but now we are approaching the property owner of the house on the other side of the road, next to the other proposed warehouse. We were told that they backed out of their contract, so we went through this headache for nothing, but are now approaching their neighboring property to get road on that side. We have no issues with the rest of the road as the county and the town signed off on, just this portion, which we are trying to work out.

Chairman Lara – Are you looking for six months? John O'Rourke – I believe we asked for eighteen months in our letter. Chairman Lara – I don't think we usually do that. John O'Rourke – I think we can work with a year. Hopefully we should be done with the DEC within the next six months. Paula Kay – If for any reason a year isn't enough, you can always come back to request another extension and give the Board an update on where you are.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion to approve a six-month extension, until August 9, 2024, was made by Michael Croissant and

second by Arthur Knapp.  
All in favor, 0 opposed.

### **ALAN KESTEN**

1 Schroeder Street, Monticello, NY  
Shmiel Breuer, project representative

Shmiel Breuer – We are here because we want to change the use of this building. It was an old repair garage and they want to use it as a small kitchen to provide food to camp Yeshiva TYY Skver.

Michael Croissant – Will it be packaged food? Chairman Lara – Will you prepare it here and then ship it out? Shmiel Breuer – Yes. Paula Kay – Will there be cooking? Shmiel Breuer – Yes. Chairman Lara – We know you are going to need a grease trap. Shmiel Breuer – Right and we have some of these for other kitchens. Chairman Lara – And this has town water and sewer, which is why we need the grease trap, right? Shmiel Breuer – Yes and we are working with the water and sewer department. Chairman Lara – Great. Jim Carnell – I know Mike Messenger also mentioned something about trying to figure out their water demand. I know they are making some improvements over there, but Mike's two comments were the grease trap and the water flows. Shmiel Breuer – I don't know exactly who I spoke with at the water department, but they told me if it's not going to be more than 1,000 gallons per day, we will be fine. And we will not be more than that. Chairman Lara – Okay, so we are going to ask that you just get something in writing from them that we can have on file. This way we can all be on the same page and there are no problems in the future. Shmiel Breuer – Okay.

Michael Croissant – How many meals a day do you think you will be putting out? Shmiel Breuer – There is about 60 boys in the camp, so let's say about 100 meals a day. Jim Carnell – Is it just lunch, or will there be other meals? Shmiel Breuer – Breakfast and lunch. Jim Carnell – So, about 200 meals a day? Shmiel Breuer – Yes. Chairman Lara – And most of the installation of the equipment is covered by the DOH, right? Jim Carnell – Right. Shmiel Breuer – And we are in the process of working with them as well. Chairman Lara – Great.

Chairman Lara – Also I know you are planning on cleaning up the building. Shmiel Breuer – Yes. We wanted to make it nice for the community. We submitted renderings and as you can see, we want parking to only be over here that way we can clean up the property and add some bushes.

Paula Kay – What kind of traffic do you foresee? Will there be trucks coming in and out? Shmiel Breuer – I think they are using a small van for delivery. There will be some trucks coming in, but there shouldn't be any interference with the road. Jim Carnell – If you look at the rendering, there is a proposed loading dock kind of off of the parking lot and that is where everything is going to come in and out. Shmiel Breuer - We changed it so that the trucks will come off of the side road and they will not be blocking anything. Paula Kay – Just for some clarification, will the camps send their own van, or will you supply the van that goes out to the various camps? Shmiel Breuer – I'm not sure who owns the van, I would have to ask. I'm not sure if the person who drives the van is the owner. Paula Kay – That's okay, I was just trying to understand a little bit more about the flow. Matt Sickler – Will there be two or three camps coming to pick up food at the same time or is going to be primarily only one camp? Shmiel Breuer – As of now they only have an agreement with one camp and I'm not sure if there will be more because most of the camps try to have their own kitchen. This Yeshiva requested to have the kitchen separate so that the boys do not see the food or the menu and ask for something different.

Chairman Lara – Roughly how many people will be in the building? Shmiel Breuer – It will just be the workers and there will be about four to five workers.

Chairman Lara – We appreciate the effort that has been put into this and obviously if you start using more than 1,000 gallons a day, you will have to work that out with the water and sewer department. I have no objections to this, but, Paula, does this have to go to the county for a 239 review? Paula Kay – Yes, for the change of use because it is on a county road. Chairman Lara – Okay. So, we will send a 239 request to the county tomorrow, which is the 29th, and they require 30 days, so we are looking at the first meeting in April. In the meantime, you can work on getting something in writing from the water and sewer superintendent. Shmiel Breuer – I am just wondering why this requires a 239 review? Chairman Lara – Because it is on a county road. Shmiel Breuer – Cold Spring Road? Jim Carnell – Yes. Shmiel Breuer – And any change on a county road goes to them? Chairman Lara – Correct and they are very responsive to our 239 requests. Most of the time they will leave it up to us, but they provide their comments and DPW comments. Shmiel Breuer – To better understand how this work, we wait for their comments and then sit down to address them to get our approval? Chairman Lara – Right and they don't usually have many comments on something like this. They may have something to say about the ingress or egress that they want you to be mindful of or possibly request some additional landscaping, but nothing too major. If there are no major issues, you should be able to be approved that the next meeting you attend. Shmiel Breuer – Okay.

A motion to refer this project to the County for a 239 review was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kristin Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

### **SILVERCREST TOWN HOMES**

92 Fairground Road, Monticello, NY

This project asked to be removed from the agenda.

### **LAND ROVER**

State Route 17B & Maplewood Garden Road, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – We first introduced this project at the January 10<sup>th</sup> meeting and we had a work session on January 23<sup>rd</sup>. As a recap the site is on Route 17B right after the Monticello Lawn & Garden store and they also have road frontage on Maplewood Garden Road. This project is proposed to be a mixed housing project with 52 units in the bungalow colony portion and 29 mobile homes in the mobile home portion. There will be a total of 129 homes, a community building, a pool, and some recreation buildings; maybe a playground and some sports courts. Primary access to the site will be from Maplewood Garden Road and 17B will be used just as an emergency access because of the lack of site distance there. Wells will be drilled for water to service the site. We had our hydrogeologist provide us with potential well locations and we are working on submitting them to the DOH for approval. Once we have their approval, we will get a permit from the town to drill the wells. Sewer will be a waste water treatment plant on the site. At the work session we discussed what type of treatment plant it should be, as not all of them work properly in sites used only for seasonal occupancy. So, we are working on that and we have submitted a request to the DEC for preliminary affluent limits. Once we have those affluent limits, we will be able to have a further discussion on manufactures for sewer plants. I have several conversations with a manufacture and they

are basically just waiting for the limits to come in to see what they can provide. A DEC certified wetland map has been submitted to the town as well as an EAF long form. At the work session we determined this would be an unlisted action and will be subject to coordinated review. Tonight, we are looking for the Board to declare their intent to serve as Lead Agency, so that we can get notices out to any potentially involved agencies.

Matt Sickler – As Joel said, a DEC wetland map was done and the DEC came to the site and agreed with the wetland delineation that is under their jurisdiction. In the density calculations wetlands are subtracted and just looking at the definition of wetlands in the zoning ordinance, it references the area under NYSDEC jurisdiction including the 100-foot buffer. I wasn't sure if that was included in the area that was subtracted or if it needs to be; just as a point of discussion. I'm not sure it really impacts this project because I think the proposed density is less than what was calculated. I just thought that definition should be revised and the areas verified. Joel Kohn – Sure. That is a good point and actually, for all of the projects I work in the Town of Thompson I always include the buffer because I am aware of the definition. So, the buffers were included. Matt Sickler – Okay, great. Chairman Lara – So, I noticed there were a lot of wetlands on this site and as you know that is always a big concern of ours. When did the DEC certify those wetlands? Joel Kohn – The map was validated on December 6, 2022, so just a couple months ago, and you can see that on the map I provided. Matt Sickler – The original delineation was done in July of 2023 and then DEC came out in December for their portion. Joel Kohn – With the wetlands that on site, there are two areas that will require a disturbance permit for the road. That disturbance is only .05 of an acre, so it is less than the .10 of an acre that you can do with a quick permit from the Army Corps.

Chairman Lara – Did we refer this for a 239 review yet? I see it is checked on the Overview Form, but that might just mean that it is required. Helen Budrock – Right, it means one will be required. Chairman Lara – Okay. Joel Kohn – I wouldn't mind if this went for a preliminary 239 review though. Even if it comes back as an incomplete application. This way we can see if they have any comments and get some kind of direction. Chairman Lara – I agree, especially to see if DPW has any comments. The more time they have the more it will benefit the whole neighborhood. Helen Budrock – My intent is to do kind of a zoning compliance review since this is a new project and I should have that ready by the next meeting this project is on the agenda for, so I would be interested in seeing their comments as well. Chairman Lara – Okay.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion to declare the intent to serve as Lead Agency was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Croissant.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to refer this project to the County for a preliminary 239 review was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

### **DYNASTY COTTAGES**

Hamilton Road & State Route 17B, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Glenn Smith, Project engineer

Joel Kohn – This project was in front of the Board a couple weeks ago and we needed to get some variance from the ZBA. We got those variances on February 13<sup>th</sup>. We back tonight to hopefully get an approval or

possibly a conditional approval.

Glenn Smith – Those variances were for three sets of bungalows with separation distances less than the allowed 25', a side yard setback for one bungalow, a rear yard setback for another bungalow, and for an increase of density, so that they can add another bungalow making a total of 21.

Chairman Lara – Jim, is there any building department issues with this site? Jim Carnell – No.

Chairman Lara – Matt, do you have anything? Matt Sickler – No. It was pretty straight forward once they received their variances. Glenn Smith – We applied to the DEC for a SPDES permit and submitted the septic system to the DOH for review, so we are working with both agencies on the septic.

No further questions from the Board.

Chairman Lara – This is just a minor modification to the previously approved site plan so this does not need a NEG DEC and I don't think it needs to be conditional as they are doing everything they need to do with the DEC and DOH.

A motion to approve a minor modification to the previously approved site plan was made by Michael Croissant and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

### **NOB HILL COUNTRY CLUB**

State Route 42, Kiamesha Lake, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This is for unit 13 and it was in front of the Board in January. This also needed a variance from the, for the square footage because the proposed unit was over the allowed 15% or 200 sq. ft. We got that variance on February 13<sup>th</sup>, but it was a partial variance; allowing the expansion to be a 1,500 sq. ft., one-story unit. The plans have been updated to reflect the variance and we are back tonight seeking final approval for this modification.

Paula Kay – Just so this Board understands better, what was presented to the Zoning Board was that this unit owner has a special needs child who has an aide and the reason for this expansion request is because that aide now needs to live in. So, what the Zoning Board did, because they didn't love the initial ask and felt it was much too large, is they worked something out with the applicant reduce it some.

Chairman Lara – Matt, do you have any questions or comments? Matt Sickler – No. They received their variance and updated the site plan.

Chairman Lara – Jim, are there any issues with this site? Jim Carnell – There is some expansion of decks and some other work being done without permits on the new units. We issued stop work orders, but I don't know the status of those. I don't believe they came in with anything yet. It did only happen like two weeks ago, so they may not have had enough time yet to get something together. However, I don't know if those violations were technically this project, because there are two projects for Nob Hill and these are the new units. This request is for a unit in the old development, but the two developments do share some amenities. Chairman Lara – Okay. So, you are just sharing this with us because the two are sort of linked? Jim Carnell – Yes. Chairman Lara – We know that Nob Hill is two separate projects and they have been



working hard on cleaning the property up, so I don't have a problem with this modification, but I don't know how the rest of the Board feels. And I do want to put on the record that we don't want to make it a habit of working with one, while the other is not doing what they should be. Even though it is not his client, I'm sure Joel will pass that along to the right people. Michael Croissant – I think given the circumstances; I agree. But it's not happening next time Joel. Jim Carnell – I don't know if they were even aware of the violation because, again, this only happened a few weeks ago and it is a different development. Chairman Lara – Right.

Chairman Lara – Paula, does this need a NEG DEC? Paula Kay – Yes.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion for a NEG DEC was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kristin Boyd.  
All in favor, 0 opposed.

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

**DISCUSSION/POTENTIAL ACTION ITEMS**  
**(as determined by the board):**

**SACKETT LAKE LP**

585 South Maplewood Road, Monticello, NY  
Joel Kohn, Project representative  
Steve Barshov  
Rabbi Schwartz

Joel Kohn – We are basically here tonight to give the Board an update on this project and are not asking for any action at this time. This project has been going on for two plus years now and we just got approval from the Town Board last month for the Planned Unit Development (PUD). Now that we have that approval we wanted to come back to this Board and make sure that you are still okay with conceptual plan before we do a full dive into the engineering of this project. I did get the review memo from Helen and we will submit an updated long form to reflect the changes as a PUD and get a letter from the fire department with respect to the roads and the traffic. The one question I believe still remains is about the open space that Helen was questioning and whether the stormwater ponds can be considered part of the open space. As a PUD we are required to have 35% of open space and at this time we are showing those ponds as part of the open space. We mostly can show enough open space without the stormwater ponds, but I would like to get clarification on that. Also, stormwater ponds can be a feature for recreation as well. They can have nice plantings around them and maybe some benches. They have been used as recreation in certain developments. Helen Budrock. That's really the Boards call as the code is not specific about that. It talks about lands having significant ecological and recreational characteristic, but lands to be used for recreational are to be preserved in their original state. So, it is really the Boards call as to whether you will allow them to include them as open space, or not. If you do decide to include it, then I think that would give you a little more standing to ask for the full recreation fees, as you are being flexible by allowing the stormwater ponds to be considered recreation. Chairman Lara – Right. Matt Sickler – And a little more

detail as the project develops will help do that as well. Some features might only have six inches to a foot of water at its maximum rain event, so you wouldn't really be concerned about people walking or sitting around them. If it is going to be something that might have up to six to eight feet of water and it takes two to three days to drain, you might want to take safety measurements to make sure that a child chasing a ball doesn't fall in. But they can be developed so that they are visually appealing. I don't know that we want to encourage people to be in them, but I think depending upon the feature and safety considerations, it could work. Aurthur Knapp – I think the Board is going to want the flexibility as part of your site plan to determine the safety measures. Matt Sickler – It would be part of the site plan and as part of the site plan review, I think it is something to definitely consider. Kristin Boyd – I think it would be a higher bar to consider them as part of the open space. Michael Croissant – Agreed. Chairman Lara – Are you saying they should be part of the open space? Kristin Boyd – No, I think they would need some sort of a justification why that feature meets the spirit of recreation. Chairman Lara – This is a big project with a big impact and there is a lot of green space, which I like, but any time we can see green space in other areas other than under the power lines or in the buffer areas, is nice. So, I tend to agree with Kristin, but I think we need to wait and see what these stormwater ponds are going to entail. Helen Budrock – If the applicant thinks they can take a second look at this and they can meet that minimum open space requirement, including the stormwater ponds, I think that would be the most desirable option. Kind of like plan "A" and if they can't do that without losing units or other things, then maybe as a plan "B", they can provide a little more detail on the engineering for Matt to review. Chairman Lara – Okay. Does that make sense Joel? Joel Kohn – Yes, and I did go over this with the engineer a little today, and there is a good chance we can meet the minimum without the stormwater ponds. We will work on providing that to you, and if for some reason we can't meet that, we will work on getting the details of the stormwater ponds and show that it is a recreational. Open space feature. Helen Budrock – A ecological feature. Joe Kohn – Got it.

Joel Kohn – We have also provided a landscaping plan for the front of the site, along Sackett Lake Road, and I believe that is sheet three. I don't know if you have had a chance to look at that and have any questions or comments. I know that trying to screen the property more was a topic previously discussed. Most of the land is open land, meaning not wooded, so we have tried to add a lot more trees where we could. Michael Croissant – We like that. Chairman Lara – Right, considering there is nothing there now. Helen Budrock – It looks like a nice mixture of deciduous and evergreen trees, so I think we are off to a good start. Joel Kohn – Thank you and, Helen, if you have any suggestions after you review it some more, we are all open for that. Chairman Lara – A certainly you would want to make it more of a neighborhood, and right now it is just rolling hills, so putting in landscaping like that would give it more of a neighborhood feel. Helen Budrock – Also going forward, as great as the landscaping along the road is, you may also want to add street trees and other landscaping within the residential portion. As a neighborhood, you want to see lawns and trees between the houses. Joel Kohn – Okay.

Chairman Lara – I know you told us that you spoke to the fire department in regards to the cul-de-sacs, but can you just fill us all in on that? Joel Kohn – I sent them an email this morning and they responded saying that they would look into the project and get back to us. So, we should have their comments by the time we come back in a few months with engineered plans. If we need to make any significant changes as a result to their response, we will consult with the Planning Board prior to making any changes. If it just minor, I guess we can just make the adjustment and come back when the plans are ready. Chairman Lara – Sounds good.

Matt Sickler – I doubt you are far enough along in your water system design, but there is a water tower indicated on the plan, and maybe as soon as you have some idea as to the type of tower, other words will it be a lower or a at grade tank with a booster pump or a taller, elevated tower, consider the viability of it. I

just thought that we could start that discussion sooner than later. Chairman Lara – Smart. Joel Kohn – Okay. Noted. We are not that far with the water system yet, as we are probably going to drill another two wells and perform 72-hour tests for them first. But we will keep the viability in mind.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

The project will be back when they have fully engineered plans and periodically in between with updates.

### **HOLLYWOOD COUNTRY CLUB**

215 Cold Spring Road, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – This is an existing bungalow colony on Cold Spring Road; kind of across from Aaron Village/Paradise Village. It is in the RR-1 zone, where bungalow colonies are a permitted use, and they are proposing to construct a 600 sq. ft. addition to one of the units and add a 20'x30' shed for storage.

Chairman Lara – I did speak to Paula prior to the meeting regarding the 239 requirement for this project. This project is not exempt and will need to be referred to the County for review. Paula Kay – The reason it is not exempt is because it is not a single-family house because it is part of the bungalow colony. Joel Kohn – Okay. So, I guess this will be referred for the 239 and then we will be back next month at the second meeting.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion to refer this project to the County for a 239 review was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kristin Boyd.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

### **CAMP MAYIN TOHAR**

Ranch Road & Fred Road, Thompsonville, NY

Michael Berta, Project architect

Jacob Billig, Project attorney

Chairman Lara – The last time you were here the Board wanted the building department to go out to the site and do an inspection. Can you tell us how that worked out? Michael Berta – We met with Logan on-site, I believe on Monday, and we walked through a number of units and the staff housing. She was able to see that the bed counts matched the occupancy table on the plans. Jim Carnell – They removed the beds. Chairman Lara – So, there were no beds? Michael Berta – There were beds, but in a two-bedroom unit there are four occupants, so there will only be four beds. Chairman Lara – Okay and I think that was our only outstanding issue. Does anyone have any other questions? I mean it is subject to inspection and would be enforcement by the building department if necessary. Michael Berta – And we did talk to Logan about scheduling that inspection and we are going to do it around the same time as the DOH. Chairman Lara – Makes sense. Paula Kay – I think we should get something from the building department in writing for the file. Just something from Logan confirming everything. Jim Carnell – The inspection is in our system. Paula Kay – Okay, so maybe we can just pull it and save it to the Drive just so that it is there. Chairman Lara – I agree. Kristin Boyd – And regular inspections are done, right? Jim Canell – A fire inspection has to be done every year and we try to do that when they are in operations. Kristin Boyd – So, if there was a bed

count change, that would come up during the inspection? Jim Carnell – Yes and the DOH does their inspections pre-operations and during operations. Kristin Boyd – Okay.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

Chairman Lara – Paula, does this need a NEG DEC? Paula Kay – Yes.

A motion for a NEG DEC was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Arthur Knapp.  
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion for site plan approval was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Arthur Knapp.  
All in favor, 0 opposed.

### **WINDSOR HILLS a/k/a RNR**

Pittaluga Road, Monticello, NY

Glenn Smith, Project engineer

Glenn Smith – We are here for two minor things tonight. We have been working on finding a good dumpster location for the Windsor Hills Development for a while now and we are now proposing this new area here. This is a wetlands area where we can put the compactor and a wide “T” turn around for the trucks; that way the trucks can pull in off the road. It is not next to any houses and there’s plenty of room there to fence in the compactor and still leave room for the trucks. We just wanted to present the new location to the Board and see if you are okay with it. The other item is the one-acre property that was subdivided off that the Board previously approved with a single-family home. We were here back in January proposing to change that to a two-family, mother-daughter home, which is permitted in the zone with Planning Board approval. I believe the Board was okay with that proposal, but wanted the dumpster location taken care of first. So, if you guys are okay with the new proposed dumpster location, we would like to get approval on that and the two-family as well.

Chairman Lara – So, I looked back at my notes and I think you are right about everything. The only thing I would like to mention is that I would like the compactor stay where it is currently being proposed, even if they do acquire the property on the corner there. I don’t want them to move it back over there. I like where it currently is. Glenn Smith – I agree and it is a good spot for the trucks.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

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

A motion to approve the two-family house was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kristin Boyd.  
All in favor, 0 opposed.

Jim Carnell advised the Board that Deb El was requesting a reduction in their existing bond amount and that the Planning Board has the ability to waive/reduce fees under code 250-58. Planning Board brought up that there is still an issue with trucks parking on Rock Hill Drive. It did get a little better, but it is still happening. Board suggested they come back at the next meeting to discuss everything.

A motion to close the meeting was made by Michael Croissant and second by Arthur Knapp.  
All in favor, 0 opposed.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers, Secretary

Town of Thompson Planning Board

