

APPROVED

TOWN OF THOMPSON  
PLANNING BOARD  
March 13, 2024

IN ATTENDANCE: Michael Hoyt, Acting Chairman  
Kristin Boyd  
Arthur Knapp  
Michael Croissant  
Matthew Sickler, Consulting Engineer  
Jim Carnell, Building, Planning, & Zoning  
Christina Cellini, Alternate  
Shoshana Mitchell, Alternate  
Paula Elaine Kay, Attorney  
Laura Eppers, Secretary

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

Michael Hoyt appointed Christina Cellini and Shoshana Mitchell as alternating voting members for tonight's meeting, starting with Christina Cellini.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**CONCORD ASSOCIATES**

Concord Road, Monticello, NY  
Henry Zabatta, Project representative

Henry Zabatta – We are here tonight looking for another six-month extension. Back in September of last year you granted us an extension that was good till March 14<sup>th</sup> of this year. Another extension will take us to September 14, 2024. I have been working with the Town trying to figure out what we are going to do with water and I believe Matt said he would get me an update on that sometime later this week. I'm not sure if he has something to add tonight, but if not, that is where we stand with the water situation.

Matt Sickler – We have had several conversations over the last several months to try to accurately nail down their projected water demands. A few weeks ago, we came up with some alternatives and we are currently waiting for costs on those. That way we can summarize them in a report and provide them to the Town. We are probably still a few weeks out on getting the costs so, hopefully we can have a draft report to the Supervisor and Henry in a month's time. Paula Kay – At this time, what I would like to suggest is maybe after that report came back, it be submitted to this Board so they can see it and maybe Henry can also come back at that time with an update as well. Henry Zabatta – That is fine and I agree with you because at that time we should know better where we stand.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion to approve a six-month extension, making new expiration date September 14, 2024, was made by Michael Croissant and second by Arthur Knapp.  
All in favor, 0 opposed.

## **VERIZON WIRELESS**

585 South Maplewood Road, Monticello, NY

Scott Olsen, Project representative

Anthony Poli, Property owner

Scott Olsen – Since we were last here, I have submitted some additional information. Paula Kay – I see you flew another balloon. Scott Olsen – Yes, I didn't think they would, but when I spoke to them about your request, they said they would send somebody out to flat another balloon. It wasn't the best weather day, but it was good enough. We were able to take pictures closer to the site and provided simulations for those. We also submitted a two-page analysis for the stormwater. Matt Sickler – I did see that. Michael Croissant – I wasn't able to see the new pictures submitted. Scott Olsen - There are three additional pictures now, 24,25 and 26, and we tried to get as close to the site as possible. Paula Kay – They are on the drive, but maybe you can just show the Board what you have. Scott Olsen – Sure. These are the new simulations and we got as close as we could. If we went any closer, you would not be able to see the tower in the picture. Michael Croissant – They still don't depict how big the utility section that's on the ground. Scott Olsen – Right and that section is fairly small. We used to use a 12'x30' equipment shelter, but now we basically use a concrete pad and a steel "A" frame, which is 8'x11', give or take, and no higher than 10 feet tall. The outdoor equipment gets bolted to the steel "A" frame. Michael Croissant – I appreciate you guys doing this for us. Scott Olsen – No problem and the reason I didn't think they would float another balloon is because I have never seen it done, not because I was trying to be difficult. Michael Croissant – Is this picture here showing the enclosure? Scott Olsen – I believe so. So, the fenced area is generally a 50'x50' area, but our equipment is much smaller and there will be a chain link fence.

Michael Croissant – Will this just be a Verizon tower, or will you rent out space to other companies? Scott Olsen – Space will be available, and your code requires it to be, so I would say that is a possibility. Michael Croissant – So, could the height possibly change? Scott Olsen – No, no one would go above us and if they wanted to for any reason, they would have to come explain that to you. However, with a tower this tall, they should be below us.

Paula Kay – Matt, are you good with everything? Matt Sickler – Yes, they provided what I was looking for.

Michael Croissant – I am not against the cell tower by any means, but I definitely don't think the location is appropriate. I think if it was on top of the hill or anywhere else besides alongside of the road would be better because you cannot unsee the tower. The reason I have lived here for so many years and people come up to visit, is for the beautiful scenery and this tower is just not visually appealing. I don't think it is right to everybody who travels that road every day to have to look at that structure encased by a 50'x50' chain link fence. Scott Olsen – I understand and that comment was raised before. Michael Croissant – Right and that was the whole reason for seeing these photos and they kind of enforce my point that it doesn't fit on a scenic county road. Scott Olsen – We understand. It is a tall tower and it will be visible in that area. More visible from some area than other due to the topography, but from the road it will be very visible and there is no hiding that. We understand and I believe early on in this process I mentioned that we originally wanted to be further back on the property, but then realized that there was a solar farm also on the property so we couldn't be where we wanted to be. So, we did the best we could with what we had. Christina Cellini – The town engineer had at one point questioned why you picked way up in that corner when you were looking at other places in that circle. There was nowhere else you could have gone or is this just the only property that was available at the time? Scott Olsen – The big circle, or search area, that was originally presented was supposed to be condensed, which we talked about at the last meeting. We submitted an analysis stating that there was a mistake made with the search area and that it really should

have been a smaller area. But even with that smaller, condensed area, this is still the best location from the RF perspective. You hired your own RF engineer to review our work and I believe he confirmed what we had provided and was in agreement. Christina Cellini – I agree with my fellow Board member. I am not happy where it is, but under the desperate need for it in that area.

Paula Kay – The shot clock expires tonight and the applicant has certainly gone beyond what a normal applicant would have, in a case like this, by floating a second balloon. I think the issue is the visual impact assessment and they have provided everything the Board had asked for, including, to some extent, the review of alternate sites. The Board needs to act at this point. The only other thing I would say is, if the issue can be mitigated by some different design of the tower, you may want to see if the applicant or the property owner has a suggestion that may help with that. Obviously, you are going to have to do some screening, but that only mitigates the bottom portion. A cell tower is a cell tower and you are going to see it no matter where you put it. Anthony Poli – I was in Westchester today and there was a tower there with grassy stuff around it, so maybe they can go that route. Michael Croissant – We tried that with a cell tower before. I don't remember if it was a Verizon tower or not, but they told us they can't do that because it interferes with the frequency. Michael Hoyt – Is that something Verizon might entertain? Scott Olsen – I understand what you are getting at, but we have built cell towers that look like trees and other structures, but not at 180 feet. Plus, that would just make it more visible. Michael Croissant – And this is more of a monolithic tower and not a truss tower, right? So, it would be hard to make it look like a tree. Scott Olsen – That is correct. Once you get over a certain height, usually 150 or 160 feet, the structural engineer starts saying that a mono pole is really not what we want to be using. But if you do a tree tower here, you will have branches coming out 12 feet on each side. Then it will be much more noticeable and obvious because of the size. Paula Kay – I know this is a tough application, but I will say, that the applicant has complied with the telecommunication section of our code and our RF engineer has signed off. Michael Croissant – That whole side of it is fine, it's the visual component. I personally don't think the community sure has to endure looking at it every day. Unless you can show me a way that you can conceal the entire bottom of the tower so when you drive past it, you don't recognize it. Maybe you can plant 40-foot evergreens around it? Scott Olsen – I don't think you could, I think they would die. I don't think you can plant a 40-foot evergreen. But jolly green arborvitae might be an option and we have done that in a few places now. I have been told by a member of a different planning board that they grow pretty quickly and could get up to 30 feet in about 5 years. You can try to do something like that, but you will not conceal the entire tower. Paula Kay – I think Michael was referring to the base. Michael Croissant – Right, just the base. Scott Olsen – We could do something like that if that is what the Board wants. Michael Hoyt – So, you are talking about landscaping around the base? Michael Croissant – Right. Look at these natural trees and if the whole front of the road was a natural buffer, it would be harder to see the tower. Scott Olsen – I don't know the area, but it looks like you got some trees in the front. Michael Croissant – Right. Scott Olsen – And it looks like we have a fairly standard lease area, a 65'x65' compound, so that is something we probably could do. It looks like we have already added some trees. Matt Sickler – Yeah, there are some trees proposed on the plan. Michael Croissant – I remember them being sparse when I looked at the plan. Paula Kay – They would need to be fully enclosed. Michael Croissant – They grow for the trees would have to be touching. Scott Olsen – There is a build out and the manufacturer will say you plant them whatever feet on center because if you put them too close, they will crowd each other. But we can certainly work on something. Michael Hoyt – I know that you probably can't answer this question, but maybe some here can, will 30-foot trees effect the solar farm? Matt Sickler – No, they are pretty far up. Jim Carnell – Right. Scott Olsen – I think that they are far enough away that it wouldn't be an issue. Michael Hoyt – Then I agree that if we can get some landscaping done around the base of the tower, it will help to distract from the top of the tower and the tank you can see beyond the tower. Which has been there forever and has nothing to do with this application. Scott Olsen – The water tank? Michael Hoyt – Yes. Scott Olsen – Is it still being used? Michael Croissant – No. Scott Olsen – Okay. So, we do some landscaping on the plan but we can take another look and see what we can do about adding some more. Paula Kay – I think that if our engineer can

work with Verizon on a landscaping plan that accommodates the Boards request, which is it being dense on all four sides and reaches the minimum height required, it could be a condition. Michael Croissant – And they need to be staggered. Scott Olsen – The site plan currently proposes 6-to-8-foot spruce trees and only on three sides because of the solar farm. Paula Kay – Right, okay. Michael Croissant – And they are going to have to be bigger than that. Matt Sickler – I think they can look into what is available and work on that. Scott Olsen – Right. Michael Croissant – And there will be two rows of staggered trees? Scott Olsen – Sure. I understand what you are saying and we can definitely work on that. Paula Kay – I know this is not something that we would normally do, but maybe Matt could come back after he works with the applicant and show the Board what they came up with. Matt Sickler – That would be fine. Or we could drop it on the Drive. Paula Kay – And it could be a condition of the approval. Scott Olsen – When would you sign the plans? Paula Kay – When the condition is met. Scott Olsen – Okay. So, if we get approval tonight, we will work on that condition with Matt to make sure we satisfy it, so we can get the plans signed. Michael Hoyt – Okay.

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 the site plan and special use permit, subject to the Town Engineer’s review and approval of the landscaping plan, two rows of staggered dense trees that exceed the fence line, was made by Shoshana Mitchell and second by Michael Croissant.  
All in favor, 0 opposed.

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

**DEB EL FOODS**

64 Kutger Road, Thompsonville, NY  
David Higgins, project engineer

David Higgins – Last time we were here the Planning Board granted conditional site plan approval for the proposed cooler building for this site. As part the conditions we were to provide the construction cost estimate to the town engineer for review, which we did. Basically, there is a lot of site work for this project; a lot of road work, concrete slabs, drains and other things. We put the estimate together and submitted that and the total was \$1,875,000 and some change. The Town code has a requirement that anything over \$500,000 for construction cost estimate requires the applicant to post a bond for that estimate, even if the improvements are privately owner. The vast majority of this, with the exceptions of the connections to the town road, is privately owned. We understand that the Planning Board has the authority under your code to waive or reduce those bonding requirements. In accordance to that we submitted two different cost estimates. One in which I just out lined and one where we eliminated the asphalt of the roads, driveways and, parking lots and the concrete pads for an adjusted estimated costs of \$1,181,000 and change. The applicant is asking if the Board would consider reducing the cost of the bond for this project. Again, these are not public improvements and it seems hard to imagine that the Town would need to pull the bond and do a million dollars’ worth of work on a private property. Matt Sickler –

And I think we talked a little bit about the inspections that would be required. Normally those are things a third-party testing agency would inspect anyways. So, there will be some over site when those are being constructed; the concrete pads, the asphalt, and things like that. And those dees would be at the applicant's cost, not put of the bond. Michael Hoyt – Okay. Paula, do you have any concerns? Paula Kay – I don't have any concerns if Matt doesn't. Matt Sickler – I reviewed the revised estimate and I am comfortable with that. Michael Hoyt – What is the figure you are comfortable looking for? David Higgins – We have an estimated cost of \$1,181,942.95 and it is whatever the Board is comfortable with. Michael Hoyt – You can make an offer too and we can see if we can agree on it. Kristin Boyd – Is the purpose of the bond for stabilizing and restoring the site to its original state in case there is some reason they would have to stop in the middle? Matt Sickler – The scope of work would be up to the Town, but the primary purpose would to be to stabilize the site and make sure there is no issues with run off onto the road or neighboring property. Michael Croissant – And you are okay with that? Matt Sickler – With the revised estimate, yes. Jim Carnell – And that incorporated most of the stormwater management and a retaining wall on two sides of the building. David Higgins – Right. The only things we took off were basically just the asphalt and concrete pad. I'm sure if the Town had to come in and clean up things for any unseen reason, it would not cost anywhere near the \$1.1 million estimated. Paula Kay – Are you saying 1.1 or 1.2 million? Michael Croissant – Well, I'm saying 1.8 million if they can't rectify the trucks on Rock Hill Drive. It still has not been rectified to this day and it is still out of control. David Higgins – Jim mentioned that to me when I spoke to him about the estimates and said there are still some ongoing issues. Michael Croissant – It has never stopped. David Higgins – The only thing I can say is that I spoke to Mr. Gibber and he advised me that he monitors it regularly and the is rarely a truck there. There may be a truck parked, but it would only be long enough to fill out some paperwork. Again, I can only go by what I was told. Michael Croissant – What is your feelings on that? Michael Hoyt – The truck traffic is still a problem and is an on-going issue. David Higgins – I would have thought that it would have gotten much better. Michael Hoyt – I did get better, but there is still an issue going on there. I'm sure we can look back through some of the emails recently sent complaining about the situation. Michael Croissant – How I see it is that I'm going to stick at the higher 1.8 number because nothing has been done with that. I mean we can't keep getting smacked in the face. David Higgins – That is not our intension. Michael Hoyt – I know it is not you. David Higgins – All I can say is that I spoke to Mr. Gibber and I was under the impression that it was taken care of to a large degree. He said he monitors it, but I understand what you are saying and I don't know how many complaints come in from people in that area. Christina Cellini – What is his definition of monitoring it? Is it just viewing what is going on through a computer screen or is someone going out and saying something? David Higgins – I don't know. Michael Croissant – At the end of the day, the Town keeps getting harassed with calls and emails complaining about it. He doesn't live here, we do. David Higgins – I understand. I don't know if Elliot is on Zoom, but I would say, we certainly would appreciate the Board working with him on this. I will relay any information you give me as far as what you expect him to do. I know we had talked about him rectifying this problem and I thought it was largely taken care of, but if it's not, I will give him any information you want. Jim Carnell – It was just a temporary resolution. David Higgins – So, it worked for a little bit, but is not working now. Jim Carnell – Paula, can we link the Rock Hill site to this as far as the bond? Because again, the overall purpose of the Ranch Road facility being expanded is to eliminate the situation that is occurring in Rock Hill. Paula Kay – Right. Jim Carnell – So, I don't know if the board has the ability, through the bond, to utilize those funds for any improvements that may or may not be needed at the Rock Hill site when those trucks are no longer there. They have obviously done a lot of physical damage to the roads. Our highway department has been down there a couple of time to put in crusher run and it certainly wasn't Elliot. I don't know if there is something that can legally be done. Paula Kay – The locations are linked and the applicant linked them at the public hearing and at other times by telling the Board that the purpose of the new project is to cut down the truck traffic at the Rock Hill site. So, I would suggest that one, they are linked, and two, the Board does not enact on this tonight. Perhaps, the applicant can come back with an actual solution for Rock Hill Drive. There was a phone number that was given in the past and we talked a little, I believe at the last meeting, about people coming into the building

department because that is where they are told to go, so maybe that phone number can be posted somewhere or Mr. Gibber can make something happen. Michael Hoyt – Didn't we talk about stacking them all in Thompsonville, even now? David Higgins – Yes. They are not supposed to be waiting on Rock Hill Drive and there was supposed to be a number they can call. There was a name and number that Elliot provided, but I don't know what that is off hand. I think we even talked about the possibility of have a small sign there. Paula Kay – Exactly. David Higgins – Maybe following through on that may be the solution. Paula Kay – It may help and the question is really why are they still going to Rock Hill when they shouldn't be? David Higgins – I'm not sure exactly why. Maybe they are going to Thompsonville first and then to Rock Hill for another purpose. I don't know how long the truck are waiting there, but again, I spoke to Elliot and he advised me that they are not there longer than a minute or two filling out paperwork. Michael Croissant – Either way, it needs to be fixed. Kristin Boyd – The last time the situation got better was when there was a request in front of the Board, so hopefully it will again this time. David Higgins – I understand, and again, I certainly would appreciate any cooperation from the Board, which I know we have had in the past. I just know that when we did the estimate and provided it, it was a lot of money to be sitting on hold, or a couple of years, or however long the job takes. Paula Kay – What I think Jim is saying and I tend to agree, is that some of that bond may be used to fix Rock Hill Drive. Unless, there is another solution. Michael Hoyt – And we only act on promises and his promise was he would get the Rock Hill issue all taken care of. David Higgins – I understand.

Michael Hoyt – Do we want to revisit this at the next meeting? Can you do it by then? David Higgins – Is there any chance that the Board would accept this tonight so that we don't have to come back to the Board? Maybe a condition that Elliot will provide something acceptable? And if the sites are linked, the Town will still have \$1,181,000 and change for any road repairs. Michael Hoyt – If you want us to wiggle a little and negotiate, I would be willing to consider 1.4 million. David Higgins – I wish Elliot was on Zoom so that he could do the negotiating. Arthur Knapp – I am of the mindset that I am more concerned about compliance than I am the money at this point. Michael Hoyt – I agree. Do you think you can be ready to come back in two weeks? David Higgins – If that is what you would like to do. Michael Hoyt – I think it would make the Board feel a little bit better to get some closure on the Rock Hill issue that continuously pops up. Michael Croissant – Then you might get your 1.2. Michael Hoyt – Right and maybe with the reduction he gets there, he can have somebody sit down there and make sure no trucks part on the road. Paula Kay – Which is what I thought. Michael Croissant – Yeah, that was supposed to happen. David Higgins – Right. There was supposed to be someone monitoring and if there was a truck parked, they were supposed to come out and tell them to move. Obviously, he can't stop the trucks, like Elliot previously said, because they are private haulers. Paula Kay – But there is no reason for them to be on Rock Hill Drive. David Higgins – You're right. Maybe the truckers aren't aware that they couldn't get right in after they leave Thompsonville, because there is another truck still there, so they think they can just wait along the road. Again, I thought it was largely dealt with. Michael Hoyt – Maybe Elliot can come with you next time. David Higgins – Okay, we will be back in two weeks. It may not be me though because I am going away. Michael Hoyt – It can be the meeting after that. David Higgins – What would that date be? Paula Kay – April 10<sup>th</sup>. David Higgins – Okay.

## **MOONLIGHT COTTAGES**

58 Rubin Road, Monticello, NY

Tim Gottlieb, Project representative

Tim Gottlieb – This is an existing colony and two units are looking to modify the site plan; unit 4 and 65. The site currently has some open permits as they are working on other buildings and these units now also want to add on. Unit 4 wants to square off the building by adding a porch and unit 65 wants to extend the

rear by 6 feet and add a 10'x36' extension on the left side.

Jim Carnell – Will this cause any issues with the fire separation between the units? Tim Gottlieb – No. There was going to be an issue previously with unit 14, but they decided not to do it. Michael Croissant – And there is nothing in the setbacks? Tim Gottlieb – Nope. Jim Cranel – There has been a new Board there for probably about 8 to 10 years now and they are pretty on top of things. Michael Hoyt – Okay.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

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

All in favor, 0 opposed.

### **GIBBER HOLDINGS**

80 Gibber Road, Kiamesha Lake, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

### **FRASER ROAD**

Fraser Road & State Route 42, Kiamesha Lake, NY

Joel Kohn, Project representative

Joel Kohn – We are here tonight for both of these projects, which we have kind of grouped together even though they are complexly separate because they are right next to each other. Gibber Holdings is the 54-unit project off of Gibber Road and Fraser Resort is 59-unit project off of Fraser Road. Last time we were here was to discuss the traffic. We finally got the traffic review comments from the town's traffic consultant on Monday and our traffic consultant responded to those on Tuesday. I don't know if you guys had time to review that yet. Michael Croissant – You didn't leave us much time to review. Joel Kohn – I know, but the review was supposed to be done 6 weeks ago and we unfortunately only got it two days ago. Paula Kay – Right and their traffic consultant turned it around in a day. Michael Hoyt – Did we have someone leave in the middle of this? Joel Kohn – Yeah. There is someone new and honestly from the comments it doesn't seem like he is familiar with the area. I'm sure some of you saw the comments and they want us to do traffic counts in June, while school is in session, but the traffic peak here is during the summer. Michael Croissant – To be totally honest with you I haven't had the chance to review it yet, as it hasn't even been 24 hours, and I would love to chance to review it. Michael Hoyt – How does the rest of the Board feel? Arthur Knapp – I am not happy with the response that we got from our traffic engineer. I understand that doing it in June is going to be problematic. Joel Kohn – I think the traffic engineer is just not familiar with this area and will understand and be happy once he sees our response. Matt, what do you think? Matt Sickler – I did not have a chance to go through your consultants' responses, but I did skim our consultants' initial comments. Joel Kohn – I don't think the town's consultant will have an issue with our response and they will help him understand the nature of the area since he is out of state. Paula Kay – It sounds like the Board needs a little more time and our traffic consultant still needs time to review and respond to your responses. I read it and I think your consultant did a really good job explaining what the issues were, but both the Board and our traffic consultant need time to review it as well. Other than that, this should be ready for approval. The applicant has provided me with a resolution that I have reviewed, so once the traffic portion is done, I think we are ready on this. Matt Sickler – Also. we have been reviewing the SWPPs and there are a couple comments on Gibber that we are just wrapping up and I will get to Joel tomorrow. I don't think they will really change any major plan layout. We just received the second round on Fraser today, so we will get that in que and get that reviewed before the next meeting.

Michael Hoyt – So, are we okay with scheduling these for the next meeting? Paula Kay – As long as the traffic review is wrapped. Joel Kohn – Is there anyone who can apply some pressure on the Town’s traffic consultant? Paula Kay – Yes. Joel Kohn – Okay. Jim Carnell – I can reach out to him directly to make sure they got your responses and let them know that this is being rescheduled for two weeks so that they know the deadline. Joel Kohn – Okay, I’ll see you in two weeks.

### **THOMPSON SQUARE MALL**

State Route 42, Monticello, NY

Geraldine Tortorella, Project attorney

Pablo Medeiros, Project representative

Caryn Mlodzianowski, Project engineer

Geraldine Tortorella – When we were here last, we kind of gave you just a bare bones application and requested a work session, which was very helpful so thank you for that. Now that we got to hear all of the inputs from the consultants, we have been able to provide a proper application with a full site plan. We also provided architectural elevations and some floor plans, which you had indicated you would like to see. As well as a sign plan, with the initial pylon sign, and a proper short form EAF. I know that you did the referral to the County and I understand that you got comments back, so that has pretty much been taken care of. We just wanted to take tonight and kind of do a review on the changes we made to the site plan and answer any questions you might have.

Caryn Mlodzianowski – Since you have seen the site plan last, we have made some changes, but the size and scope of the building has remained the same. There will be 9,500 sq. ft. on the right side, 200 sq. ft. in the center, and 2,500 sq. ft., plus or minus, coffee shop with a drive through on the left side. As Gerry said, after the work session we were able to take this to a complete site plan modification application, so we have now included facilities, stormwater, grading, landscaping, those types of things. You will see on the revised plan that the main change was the parking field. Based on the feedback we got, we have changed everything from the proposed building up until the existing plaza. There was some importance and desire expressed to keep the drive isle as you come from Route 42 into the site the same. Rather than closing that off and having vehicles go left or right, which is how it was originally approved. This plan now shows one lane in each direction maintain that drive isle, which also increased and enhanced the green space on the side of that as you drive in. With that we are also proposing a further reduction and revision to the parking waiver that is in place for this project. From a site plan stand point, we added pedestrian improvements with crosswalks and sidewalks all along this side of the project area. The drive through wraps all the way around the building for a stack of about 19 vehicles and opens up with a bypass, so there should be no issues with traffic and circulation there. We are also increasing the green space here, widening this, and adding some within, in addition to the island as you enter that center drive isle. That’s pretty much it and we are happy to get the Boards inputs and any question you may have in regards to these changes.

Matt Sickler – What is the proposed parking count now? Caryn Mlodzianowski – The parking count for the whole parcel is 753 and 871 exist today. Geraldine Tortorella – But we do not anticipate any issues with the parking. Michael Hoyt – I think the small reduction to be able to reconfigure the entrance way is well worth it. I think it would have been a mess the other way.

Christina Cellini – Why is the parking where everyone will have to walk through the drive through to get to the facilities? Caryn Mlodzianowski – Are you talking about this here? Christina Cellini – No, people coming from the parking lot. If you park everyone behind the drive through line, they will have to talk through that to get to the stores. Caryn Mlodzianowski – The traffic will be split up between the two entrances. Some



cars will come in on this side and some will come in on the other side where they can just get online without driving past the parking lot. Christina Cellini – So, I work in Middletown and there are two Starbucks there and it is atrocious when people are trying to pull in while other people are crossing the parking lot. I don't know what coffee shop will be going there, but I am a little worried about people getting hit when trying to cross. Pablo Medeiros – If I may, that's not the actual drive through lane. The drive through entrance is here and from here all the way around, we have a stack of 19 cars. I realize that cars will come around and enter here or come around and enter here, but at some point, they are going to have to enter the line. Christina Celli – Is there anyway you can move that down and move the parking spaces up so that they have to come behind the majority of the space to enter the line? Pablo Medeiros – Or perhaps we can close off the entrance that would allow the cars to drive between the parking lot and the stores. Christina Cellini – Or maybe just flip it around? Paula Kay – I think that would cause them to lose a lot of parking spaces. Pablo Medeiros – Right, but we could just close up the entrance. Michael Croissant – Doing it that way might gain some parking. Except you might still lose some on the other side to utilize the lower entrance. Christina Cellini – I am just worried about people trying to walk through with small children or people on their cell phones not paying attention to cars coming through. Michael Croissant – And since it will be a coffee shop, people will probably be coming in from Route 42 and using the closer entrance more so that they can come in quick because everybody's in a rush. Michael Croissant – Is there parking right up to the building? Pablo Medeiros – Yes. Caryn Mlodzianowski – There are 11 spaces there. Matt Sickler – Maybe you can go back and revisit some of our previous conversations and add some speed tables and crosswalks. Chriatina Cellini – If that will help. Like I said, I'm just worried about people's safety there. I don't have an issue with anything else. Geraldine Tortorella – What if we put some sort of signage at that corner that points you to the drive through? Pablo Medeiros – We are already going to have direction signage to the drive through, so we can add whatever you are conformable with. We don't have a problem with that and I'm sure the tenant wouldn't either. Christina Cellini – I just don't like that section. I don't sit right with me, I'm sorry. Michael Croissant – I think it flows better closing off the side entrance there and using the lower entrance coming up along the side of the parking spaces. You will lose a couple spots at the end there, but I think it will flow a lot better. Right now, you have four entrances and exits, so if you bring that down to three, I think it will help with the traffic flow. Michael Hoyt – What if we move the drive through kind of out onto the main corridor? Jim Carnell – There is a stop sign there and you would end up with stacking on the road. Pablo Medeiros – Right, we wouldn't be able to do that. I think to eliminate your concern, the best solution would be to just close off the northwest entrance like you had suggested. Christina Cellini – Or maybe make it an exit only so that cars can back out that way. Michael Croissant – That's not a bad idea. You can actually just curb the side walk. Caryn Mlodzianowski – That would also prevent dead-end parking. Michael Croissant – And all you have to do is add a piece of concrete. Pablo Medeiros – Right, so we will just modify this island and extend it. That is not a problem.

Michael Hoyt – Can you show us the rendering you brought? Pablo Medeiros – Sure. This is a south view of the building elevations. You can see the 9,500 sq. ft. Five Below, The middle tenant, and the coffee shop at the end. Five Below has stacked stone EFIS up above and on the columns. We did not put that on the side of the coffee shop because it has a black brick veneer and it would look kind of weird. So anywhere that there is black veneer, we didn't put stacked stone, but there is some underneath the drive through window. On the front elevation we show wood paneling with the stacked stone down at the bottom. On the rear elevation, the side facing Town Hall, will have the same treatment along with some signage. I think it is a nice-looking building. Geraldine Tortorella – The elevations we just showed are slightly different from the ones we submitted, as there were some additional discussions since then and some changes made. But we will get this version submitted as well. Pablo Medeiros – The one we submitted had a tower, basically in the corner here and they decided that they would prefer not to have it that way.

Michael Hoyt – How will deliveries be handled? Pablo Medeiros – Five Below doesn't get deliveries from a giant, WB67 trailer. The biggest truck they would get is a WB50 and they don't get a lot of them. And the

other tenants wouldn't need the bigger tucks either. Paula Kay – I think the plan shows a lane for that. Pablo Medeiros – Right, this here is the dedicated loading area for the Five Below. It is not a loading dock, but there are double doors. Michael Hoyt – Okay.

Michael Croissant – Do you have a tenant for that small, middle store yet? Pablo Medeiros – No, not yet? Michael Croissant – And you do have a tenant for the coffee shop, right? Pablo Medeiros – Yes, but we are still in negotiations and until that is finalized, we can not disclose that. Michael Croissant – Okay.

Christina Cellini – Any shopping carts? Pablo Medeiros – No. Geraldine Tortorella – None that we anticipate.

Christina Cellini – Should we talk about landscaping or are we okay with what is proposed? Michael Croissant – I would like to see it. Will there be any parking lot signage for each business in the parking lot? Any small signage? Pablo Medeiros – No, there will only be drive through signage for the coffee shop and it will be on the private side. And like Caryn pointed out earlier, we are really, significantly increasing the green space in this area here. Michael Croissant – And will you be incorporating landscape within that? Pablo Medeiros – Yes, we will put trees along here so that you are not just looking at the back of a building. Michael Croissant – Is there a plan for that? Pablo Medeiros – No, not yet, but we can put something together. Caryn Mlodzianowski – We did show on the site plan some arborvitae and shrubs around both the dumpster enclosure and down through here. Geraldine Tortorella – And one of the plans also shows bushes in the green space along the side of the building. Also, the signage will be wall signage like you requested. Pablo Medeiros – We can modify the plan to show a little bit of landscaping though. Michael Croissant – That would be great. Just so that we can see what we are looking at.

No more questions or comments from the Board.

Geraldine Tortorella – What we were hoping to get tonight is confirmation that a public hearing is not required, to seek a SEQRA determination, and if we could be so pushy as to ask if we could also seek preliminary and final approval. This is a site plan modification and with in that we would just make sure the parking waiver is reaffirmed for the 753 spaces. Paula Kay – Right, this would be a minor modification of the previously approved site plan and we can do a NEG DEC if that's what the applicant wants. Geraldine Tortorella – It's more than 4,000 sq. ft., so that is why we thought we should do one. Paula Kay – Okay, so lets to a NEG DEC and the minor modification, along with the modified parking waiver reducing the parking spots. Matt Sickler – I did not do a full tech review on this yet, so if you want me to take a look at the traffic circulation, maybe the approval can be subject to that as well. Paula Kay – Yes. Also subject to the town engineers review and comments, which will also include landscaping, and the change in the parking island to make the northwest entrance a one-way, exit only. Michael Hoyt – Okay.

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

A Motion to approve a minor modification to the previously approved site plan, subject to the Town Engineer's technical review of the site plan and landscaping plan, an updated parking waiver, and the northwest entrance changed to an exit only, was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Christina Cellini.  
All in favor, 0 opposed.

## **MINSKY GLAMPING**

Swinging Bridge Estates Road, Monticello, NY

Dick McGoey, Project representative

Paula Kay was recused.

Dick McGoey – This project was here about a year ago proposing four glamping units. There has been some violation that I am pretty sure have been resolved and as for the question about whether the units are considered housing units or RVs, I think I straightened that out with the building department. I have a photo of what the units will look to pass around. Michael Hoyt – What about the cargo trailers that were originally proposed? Dick McGoey – Those will be going. They are slowly going now. Some of them are gone and some of them are still there. There are now more details on the plans and we moved the units somewhat in the direction, we now have a septic design, and we are showing some recreations, such as some pickleball courts and six holes of golf. This is that air strip, which is currently just a big wide-open field. We are not proposing any grading and the golf greens will be tuff that is basically laid right on top of the ground with some “T” boxes. A pretty simple operation. The recreation would be the two biggest changes. We are staying with the four units as to not required DOH approval and are here tonight to request a public hearing so we can move this forward.

Michael Hoyt – These units are what he is going with now? Dick McGoey – Yes. Michael Croissant – So, they are not containers? Dick McGoey – No, they are RVs. They are on wheels. Michael Hoyt – I never heard of them, but I am not in the industry. Michael Croissant – Will they be 1 or 2 bedrooms? Dick McGoey – I think it is a combination. Michael Croissant – Will there be one per site? Dick McGoey – He may put two, but I don’t know. Possible for other uses, like a sauna or a hot tub. That is a possibility. Michael Croissant – So that is four units, plus those other uses, will that still keep him under the DOH requirements? Dick McGoey – Yes. Kristin Boyd – So, there wouldn’t be more then four with bedrooms? Dick McGoey – Right. Four sites. Kistin Boyd – And no site would have more then one of these with bedrooms in it, right? Dick McGoey – Correct. Christina Cellini – These look like shipping containers to me, not RVs. Michael Hoyt – Right. Dick McGoey – They are RVs with wheels on them. Matt Sickler – It looks like there is a little skirt around the bottom or something. Christina Cellini – I think that is a shadow. Michael Hoyt – It’s a park model, not an RV. Dick McGoey – You can look them up. They are considered to be RVs.

Kristin Boyd – I noticed you also show 10 parking spaces, will the recreation be open to others? Or only for the people that are staying there? Dick McGoey – I think just for the people that are staying there, but I will confirm that before the public hearing. Michael Croissant – Is that going to be available after the build out? Dick McGoey – That is a good question. I will have to figure that out and also have an answer for that by the public hearing. I was just talking to the Feller’s and I know part of his other project is right next door to them. Michael Croissant – Correct and I think the shul is right there. Kristin Boyd – It just didn’t make since why 4 sites would need 10 parking spaces. Dick McGoey – When they campers come, they might come with 2 cars. Michael Croissant – The golf will be walking only, right? No golf carts? Dick McGoey – Right.

Christina – These have a full kitchen, so how will they get power or what kind of fuel will be used? Dick McGoey – It will be propane and there will be water and electrical connections. There is an existing well on-site that we will utilize and we will add a chlorination system to it, which we describe on the plans. There will also be a septic.

Christina – These have a full kitchen, so how will they get power or what kind of fuel will be used? Dick McGoey – It will be propane and there will be water and electrical connections. There is an existing well on-site that we will utilize and we will add a chlorination system to it, which we describe on the plans.

There will also be a septic. Kristin Boyd – Will these be year-round or seasonal? Dick McGoey - I wouldn't call them year-round, but they could be used in some of the colder weather. Michael Croissant – So, will they be heated? Dick McGoey – Yes. Jim Carnell – As for the power, since these are RVs, will there be a campground panel where they will be plugged in? And do you have any utility details on that for the building department? Dick McGoey – I will work on that. Michael Hoyt – That way we will know whether they are going to be standard or a petal stool. Jim Carnell – Right. Are they going to be hard wired in or will they just have a 50amp plug? Dick McGoey – Okay.

Michael Croissant – Where will people enter from? Dick McGoey – Right here where there will be a McKay sign. I did submit some pictures today for your Drive. They show the old air strip, where the golf will go and this entrance here. Jim Carnell – I don't think the email came through with any attachments. Laura Eppers – Correct and I emailed Mr. McGoey back letting him know that we didn't get any attachments. Dick McGoey – That's probably because I tried to send them myself.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

There was a member in the public who wanted to know if they could speak on this project tonight and was advised that they would have to wait for the public hearing. The Board explained how the public hearing works and that one would be scheduled tonight. Also advised that he could email his letter to the planning department to be circulated to the Board.

Michael Hoyt – When can we do a public hearing? Laura Eppers – Does this require a 239 review? Dick McGoey – I don't think so. It is not on a County Road. Jim Carnell – Right. No county road or municipal boundaries close enough. Laura Eppers – Then it can be the first meeting in April, which is April 10<sup>th</sup>. Dick McGoey – Does the applicant do the mailing? Laura Eppers – Yes, but I will email you the legal notice and mailing list. Dick McGoey – Okay.

A motion to schedule a public hearing for April 10, 2024 was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Michael Croissant.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

The Board brought up the topic of pursuing a new/different traffic consultant. After some discussion, it was decided that Matt Sickler and Jim Carnell will work together to obtain some proposals and rates from other traffic consultants for the Board to review.

A motion to close the meeting was made by Kristin Boyd and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers, Secretary

Town of Thompson Planning Board

