

TOWN OF THOMPSON
PLANNING BOARD
October 9, 2024

IN ATTENDANCE: Kathleen Lara, Chairman
Kristin Boyd
Michael Hoyt
Michael Croissant
Matthew Sickler, Consulting Engineer
James Carnell, Building, Planning, & Zoning
Shoshana Mitchell, Alternate
Laura Eppers, Secretary
Steve Vegliante, Consulting Attorney

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

A motion to approve the September 11, 2025 minutes was made by Michael Hoyt and seconded by Kristin Boyd.

All in favor, 0 opposed

A motion to approve the September 25, 2024 minutes was made by Kristin Boyd and seconded by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed

Steve Vegliante made a quick announcement explaining that any and all written correspondence, in regards to the public hearings, received prior to tonight's meeting has been distributed to the Board and entered as part of the record. He asked that out of respect for everyone and their time, speakers try to keep it brief, but get their point across.

Chairman Lara added that the public hearing is not a back and forth, so the applicant will not be responding to any questions or comments tonight. However, the applicant is required to respond to all questions and comments and submit those in writing, with no certain time frame, but prior to coming back to the Planning Board for any further discussion or action.

PUBLIC HEARING:

CATSKILL VET

23 Old Drive-In Road, Rock Hill, NY
Steve Green, Project Engineer
Joseph D'Abbraccio, Applicant
Daniela Carbone, Applicant

Chairman Lara read the legal notice aloud.

Proof of mailings were received.

Steve Green and Joseph D'Abbraccio presented the project to the public along with the most recent site plan and renderings.

Project Overview Form – https://drive.google.com/open?id=12RhkVxz-FFekVqYfQVLVNChI-Qmgc5-t&usp=drive_fs

10/30/24 Site Plan presented -

https://drive.google.com/open?id=18pT4ekAvVkcIREFvpgqxqUcoPdmh2U7m&usp=drive_fs

9/22/24 Floor Plans & Renderings -

https://drive.google.com/open?id=14Mk4Jdtfj7zM2dvwdxuKlivmwwSbl6h&usp=drive_fs

Link to the Google Drive folder -

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1dt3HNCL5c0DLxpiE4uL67UFqGhj3Uf6G&usp=drive_fs

Comments and questions from the Board:

- Chairman Lara commented that there is a storage container shown on the plan and those are not permitted in the town, so it will need to be updated to be a shed or something that is permitted.
- Chairman Lara – Asked if the proposed outdoor kennels will be used for boarding? Joe D'Abbraccio advised that the kennels will be used for patients only, during their medical stay, and there will be no long term kenneling.
- Chairman Lara – Asked if the remaining land around the building be maintained? Joe D'Abbraccio advised that they will do their own maintenance on the property, which is why they need the proposed pole barn to store that equipment, and that they will keep the property clean-cut and sufficiently lit.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

Meeting was opened up to the public for comment.

Arlene Rubin @ 38 Lakeview Terrace – Asked if this new building is going to replace their existing facility? Joe D'Abbraccio advised that yes, it would.

No further questions or comments from the public.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by Arthur Knapp and seconded by Michael Hoyt. All in favor, 0 opposed.

CAMP BOBOV

Goldfarb Road & Gartner Road, Harris, NY

Joel Kohn, Project Representative

Joel Rosenfeld, Project Manager

Rabbi Berish Rubin

Chairman Lara read the legal notice aloud.

Proof of mailings were received.

Joel Kohn and Rabbi Berish Rubin presented the project to the public and started off by explaining that the site plan is not a fully developed plan yet. The Planning Board allowed them to have this public hearing early on in the review process to get the input from the public now so they can adjust accordingly. They also provided pictures of the existing Yeshiva located in Monsey, NY, as a reference to appearance and conditions that can be expected of the proposed project, and advised that communication is always open for the neighbors and/or the Town to reach out if ever there is an issue.

Contact information can be found on the Planning Board Application submitted by the applicant; located in the Google Drive folder on the Town's website or via the link to the Google Drive folder below.

Project Overview Form - https://drive.google.com/open?id=1kexjbraTmombE5uQeM9PCU8_t7cLkJK-&usp=drive_fs

11/5/24 Site Plan presented - https://drive.google.com/open?id=1AvraWFQVGI5cAO1Rf2KNh_R-3kOO2hg5&usp=drive_fs

Pictures submitted of the Yeshiva located in Monsey -

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1EG3ZDp5FLgB7EV_Vg2Hx8NP6RoilutBt&usp=drive_fs

Link to the Google Drive folder -

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1kJR28_krF9YMB174xAjdGHNBPMSaEZLi&usp=drive_fs

Comments and questions from the Board:

- Chairman Lara commented that the building department noticed that there are no setbacks listed on the plan yet. Thought it was because the project is still in the sketch phase, but wanted to mention it for the record.
- Chairman Lara asked that a note be put on the plan that states there will be no PA systems or loud speakers.
- Michael Croissant asked if there was a maximum of 150 people in total for the camp, or 150 students plus staff?
Joel Kohn advised that there will be a maximum of 150 students, plus 32 staff.
- Michael Croissant asked if the 32 staff was just staff, or staff plus their families?
Joel Kohn advised that the 32 includes both staff and their families.
- Chairman Lara asked Rabbi Rubin if he would provide his contact information to the building department, when and if this project gets approved, so that they will be able to get in touch with him if there are any issues.
Rabbi Rubin agreed to do so.
- Michael Croissant commented that he disagrees with any through traffic, even for just the 2 or 3 days at the beginning and end of the season. Feels that Goldfarb Road should be avoided at all costs. Michael Hoyt agreed.
Joel Kohn advised that the applicant has no objections to that if that is what the Board is requesting. They were proposing it this way because of a conversation had with the Town's Highway Superintendent and his suggestions. They will use Goldfarb Road for emergency access only, to which the board agreed.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

The account was opened up to the public for comment.

Joseph Amorin @ 24 Goldfarb Road – Attended meeting to submit his written comment letters, expressing

his questions and concerns with the project, and to speak about them briefly in person. Link to the written comment below.

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1Eapaq0eRbYVfaEmAk8y9W0ofZDIsISoF&usp=drive_fs

Jay Azzato @ 26 Goldfarb Road – Attended the meeting to submit his written comment, which he read aloud in its entirety. Link to the written comments below.

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1EZ1ylr4xiivDa90_HzBfb05CEy8odOXs&usp=drive_fs

The Board allowed Johl Kohn to clarify some items:

- The proposed Yeshiva is only for the use of the kids who currently attend the exiting, year-round Yeshiva in Monsey, as well as staff and their families. Facilities located on this site will not be open to any outside users.
- Even though this project has no affiliation with Family Fun Farm in any way, it might have been a good idea to pursue the idea of having an access road installed connecting the two properties, but the land located in between is wetlands and that would require a lot of wetland disturbance.
- Moshe Pomerantsev is the seller and previous owner of this property and does not have any involvement with the project at all. However, there was an agreement made to allow Mr. Pomerantsev to remain in the existing house on the property for an additional 6-months after the property changed ownership.

Mr. Azzato also advised that Skender (Ken) Kukaj, the property owner of 98 Goldfarb Road, was never notified of the public hearing, so he could not attend the meeting in person. He asked Mr. Azzato to provide written comment on his behalf. Steve Vegliante confirmed and advised that a legal notice was certified mailed to the property owner at the address on file for his taxes. Mr. Kukaj's written comment was accepted and entered as part of the public record. Link to the written comment below.

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1EIXkIBlf3GxGDGrDLh_-plslv5RpfOBU&usp=drive_fs

Mr. Azzato also provided written comment on behalf of Ed DeFalco, located at 19 Goldfarb Road, which was also accepted and entered as part of the public record. Link to the written comment below.

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1EOqapeluLJoQMirdM005Su20wdYFIQ2z&usp=drive_fs

Chairman Lara reiterated that this project is still very early on in the review and design process and that the applicant requested to have the public hearing earlier than normal so that they can work with the neighbors and take their concerns and suggestions into consideration for the final plan.

Paul Migliaccio @ 29 Goldfarb Road – Attended the meeting to submit his written comment and ask the Board not to approve this project. Link to the written comment below.

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1EPzX568N9kPnCyaL6WrPb18MaVt8jgpd&usp=drive_fs

Mr. Migliaccio also expressed the below concerns:

- The applicant only cares about making money/turning a profit.
- Johl Kohn advised that the Yeshiva is a not-for-profit organization.
- The project will disrupt both his and his neighbor's quality of living.
 - The project will have an impact on traffic. Will there be some kind of guarantee in place stating that Goldfarb Road will not be used?

The Board advised that it will be a gated road for emergency access only.

- There are other properties located in better areas, so why does the applicant have to build on this one.

Steve Vegliante advised that if the proposed use is allowed under the zoning, this Board's, with the

help of their consultants, job is to listen to the application and help to minimize and/or eliminate any possible impact, but most importantly, to conform to SEQR. The Board cannot deny an application that meets all the criteria under the zoning code.

Chairman Lara explained that all documentation pertaining to this application is accessible via the Town's website, at townofthompson.com, and encouraged all interested parties to follow along. Interested parties may also attend or Zoom into any future meeting to follow along, but will not be able to participate as they will not be public hearings, and therefore open for public comment.

Bill James @ 255 Harris Road – Attended the meeting to express the below questions and comments:

- What is the date on the plans being presented tonight?

Joel Kohn advised the latest revised date on the plans is November 5, 2024.

- Are these plans available on the website yet because these are not the same plans he reviewed?

John Kohn advised that these plans were submitted and are on the website. Helen Budrock added that there are several versions on the website with different revised dates.

- Will there be any improvements made to Gartner Road and if so, by who?
- What is going to be the total number of structures on the property and of those, how many will be year-round?
- What is the total acreage to be disturbed?
- Will the lights be downward facing and night time friendly?
- Does the RR district allow for shuls and mikvahs?

Chairman Lara advised that shuls and mikvahs are not prohibited anywhere.

- Feels the RR district does not offer much protection to homeowners and that is probably why there is so much frustration being heard.
- What is the elevation of the leach field? He is concerned about the brook, Kenny Brook, that runs along the property and discharges into several other bodies of water. He provided a current picture of said brook.

Link to photo: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1EI2INGy1fpaFD1gDBMY-v67BAyGxoJoj&usp=drive_fs

Joel Kohn advised that the leach field will be on the other side of the hill and not near the brook. He also mentioned that the septic design will have to be submitted to and approved by the DOH.

- What is the area on the site plan by the proposed leach field?

John Kohn advised that that it is the reserved leach field area. They are required to have a reserved leach area in case the original one fails in the future.

- How many wells will there be?

Joel Kohn advised that they are showing 4 possible well locations, but they are not sure yet how many they will need.

- He is concerned about the effluent of water in the area and how the new wells will affect the existing, neighboring wells.

Chairman Lara reiterated that the applicant is willing to monitor any of the neighboring wells that wish to be monitored. Just reach out to the applicant and let them know if you are interested.

Steve Vegliante added that when a test well is drilled, it has to be pump tested for 72 hours and any well within 1,500 feet is automatically monitored for any impact. What the applicant is offering is to also monitor other wells in the area that are outside of those 1,500 feet. This is done by a third-party hydrogeologist and will be reviewed by the town's engineer, the DOH, and to some extent, the DEC.

Michael Schecter @ 38 Lakeview Terrace – Attended the meeting to express his concerns:

- The affect the wells will have on others in the area.
- The capacity of the septic system and if it will be sufficient for this project.

- If this can be considered a camp if it is a Yeshiva.
- The impacts to all nearby roads.
- The height of the buildings.
- The distance between the buildings.

Steve Vegliante advised that there are regulations in the code for the height and separation distance of buildings that will have to be met.

- The shul will not be closed off for outside users.

Roger Betters @ 1059 Old Liberty Road – Attended the meeting to express his concerns. Which are pretty much the same as everyone else, water, sewer, light pollutions, etc. But mainly concerned about the increase in traffic as traffic is already an issue on Old Liberty Road.

Phil Warren, previous resident of the town – Stated there is currently a housing and drug epidemic in the area and wanted to know how will the applicant work with the town and help the non-Jewish community?

Steve Vegliante advised that is a concern that is better brought up to the S.C. Legislature and is not in this Board's purview.

Arlene Rubin @ 38 Lakeview Terrace – Stated that she is concerned with the project and asked the below questions:

- Will there be fire hydrants added?
- How far will the buildings be from the forest?

All other written comment received prior to the meeting:

James Goldfarb:

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1AUtxf_g1A2XkcX_4bDMiMV8sOngCQ3c1&usp=drive_fs

Michael & Brenda Cohn:

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1BsTohVK8QxH3_Ou7GevuUM8QAcVGEOOs&usp=drive_fs

Vinny Tavanese on behalf of Unique Escapes:

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1BrqKbxbkPOHCg4AtRpC_E_8uUL0Utosf2&usp=drive_fs

Paige LoPut: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1E4JzxrVfP_VlwH8Z_iKZVCK_kwr5Vian&usp=drive_fs

Jay Azzato asked the Board why if this is zoned in the RR-1, which is residential, is there allowed to be commercial amenities? As the question has been raised a few times, Chairman Lara advised that the Board will have their attorney, Steve Vegliante, draw something up explaining it. Steve Vegliante said he would be happy to provide something in writing as well, but explained that this is an allowed use in the RR-1 zone and under that use, the amenities are permitted accessory buildings. They are not considered commercial in nature because they are not a business. Helen Budrock added that even though this use may not be considered commercial, there are commercial uses permitted in this zone. So, even though it is called "Roral Residential", certain commercial uses are still permitted with no variance required. Jay Azzato asked if he could still get something in writing.

No further questions or comments from the public.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by Michael Croissant and seconded by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed

ACTION ITEMS:

CAMP BOBOV

Goldfarb Road & Gartner Road, Harris, NY
Joel Kohn, Project Representative
Joel Rosenfeld, Project Manager
Rabbi Berish Rubin

Chairman Lara – Joel, this project is also on as an action item tonight because you want to start the SEQR process, correct? Joel Kohn – Correct. Chairman Lara – Helen, how do you feel about that? Helen Budrock – I think that it is probably a good idea to get the other agencies involved in the early stages as well. After conferring with Steve, because there is going to be more than 10 acres of disturbance, we are going to classify this as a Type 1 action under SEQR, which requires coordinated review. Chairman Lara – Is there anything we need to do tonight to get that going? Helen Budrock – You will need to make a motion to declare your intent to serve as lead agency. That way Joel can work with Laura to get the lead agency notices out.

A motion to declare the intent to serve as lead agency was made by Arthur Knapp and seconded by Kristin Boyd.

All in favor, 0 opposed

KITZ ROAD – PRESTIGE ENERGY

State Route 17B & Kitz Road, Monticello, NY
Glenn Smith, Project Engineer

Chairman Lara – This project is here tonight because we made a mistake and did not approve the special use permit when we granted their site plan approval. Glenn Smith – Right. On September 11th you granted conditional site plan approval and afterwards, Laura realized the special use permitted was never granted. That is essentially what we are here for tonight, but to give the Board a quick update on this project, since we were last here, we got our sign package together and submitted to the building department and I have those rendering with me tonight. We also have completed the SWPP and will get that out to Matt for his review shortly. That will pretty much take care of all the conditions. Chairman Lara – Great. Sounds like you are on the right track. So, we just need to make a motion for the special use permit, right? Laura Eppers – Do you want to make it conditioned on returning in a year for an update? Chairman Lara – I think this is in a really commercial area already, so there may not be a need for that. How does the rest of the Board feel? Michael Hoyt – I think they should come back in a year just to check on things and make sure everything is running smoothly. Steve Vegliante – Plus that has been the Boards practice and it is not a bad practice to have. Chairman Lara – Okay.

A motion to approve the special use permit, subject to the project returning in a year from the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for an update, was made by Michael Croissant and seconded by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed

AVID-CANDLEWOOD SUITES HOTEL

Rock Hill Drive, Rock Hill, NY

Larry Marshall, Project Engineer

Chairman Lara – Good evening, Larry. The Board has received both the NEG DEC and approval resolutions that you have submitted and we just wanted to go over those briefly. Helen and Steve, if you would. Helen Budrock – Sure. Steve reviewed the resolutions, but I drafted up parts 2 and 3 of the EAF and basically nothing was checked for a moderate to large impact. The part 3 basically says that any impacts will mostly involve stormwater, which will be addressed with the SWPP, so the recommendation is to adopt the NEG DEC tonight. Chairman Lara – Thank you Helen. Steve? Steve Vegliante – I reviewed the draft resolutions and there were minimal comments, but I am comfortable with them now. So, if it is the Board's pleasure tonight to issue both the NEG DEC and the site plan approval, you may. Chairman Lara – I believe this is also a special use permit. Helen Budrock – It is. Chairman Lara – Okay.

Chairman Lara - My only question is about the water. Did you straighten that out yet? Larry Marshall – You mean as far as accessibility? Chairman Lara – Yes. There's a well, right, and it is on your property? Larry Marshall – The well is on our property, but it serves the entire complex. So, that is just a supply well that we are keeping open for future use. It does connect to the Emerald Green system though. Chairman Lara – I thought the last time you were here there was a question about who owns the water because the county was turning it over to the town. Steve Vegliante – As of right now, it is still owned by the special corporation, that is essentially the county, but it is being transferred, at some point, to the Town of Thompson. Either way it will remain a special district. Chairman Lara – Okay, I knew it was something like that. Michael Hoyt – We are just trying to make sure you have a place to connect. Chairman Lara – Exactly. Larry Marshall – Understood and either way, we are allowed to connect to it. Steve Vegliante – They have deeded rights to the water system. Chairman Lara – Perfect.

Steve Vegliante – There are also a handful of conditions listed in the approval resolution that maybe Larry can go over. Larry Marshall – No problem. They are as follows:

- All fees due and owing for review of the Project and any other required fees shall be paid to the Town of Thompson
- Any outstanding technical review comments of the Town Engineer, Town Building Department, Rock Hill Fire Department, Town Planner or any other Planning Board consultants relating to the Site Plan, or any other Project related matter shall be satisfactorily addressed.
- All required approvals, permits or authorization from other agencies having jurisdiction over the Project shall be obtained
- All required approvals from the Planning Board engineer, including approval of the SWPP, be obtained
- The Applicant shall cause Tax Parcels 35.-1-9.5 and 35.-1-9.6 to be consolidated into one tax parcel
- No removal of trees or disturbance of the Project site shall be permitted until a Site Plan has been signed by the Planning Board chairman, a Notice of Intent for the SPDES General Permit for the Stormwater Discharges associated with construction activity has been filed with the NYSDEC and any required authorization from the Town of Thompson Building Department has been obtained
- Prior to commencing constructions, the Applicant must comply with the requirements of 6NYCRR part 750-2, relating to sewer connections and make applications to the Town of Thompson Water and Sewer Department requesting connection to the public sewer system to ensure that sufficient capacity is available

Chairman Lara – Thank you Larry. Any other questions? Laura Eppers – Does the Board also want to add a condition for the project to return in a year after opening for an update since this is also a special use permit? Chairman Lara – Yes. We would like to see this project back in 1 year after obtaining your C of O

from the building department for an update on how things are going.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion for NEG DEC was made by Michael Hoyt and seconded by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed

A motion to approve the site plan, subject to all conditions listed in the approval resolution, and the special use permit, subject to returning to the Board for an update after the first year of operations, was made by Michael Hoyt and seconded by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed

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

THOMPSON'S OWN SOLAR

Downs Road, Monticello, NY

Robert Romine, ClearPath Representative

Robert Romine – We had our workshop with Delaware Engineering and Shoshana, of the Board, and I think we were able to pinpoint the issues with the wetlands. I think what we settled on is that Delaware is looking for some sort of communication from us verifying that the DEC is not going to take jurisdiction over these wetlands and a confirmation from the Army Corp that the Nationwide 51 permit applies. We did get an email from the DEC as to the wetlands and submitted that. Did you guys get that? Chairman Lara – Yes, we did. Robert Romine – Okay, so that only leaves the Army Corp and as of right now, we are trying to obtain that and hope to be successful before the next meeting. If we are unsuccessful, I think what we discussed is possibly making it a condition of the approval. Steve Vegliante – The applicant did indicate a time issue, meaning before the new wetland rules take effect. So, I think it would be helpful if this Board wanted to consider allowing that as a condition. Chairman Lara – Just so the Board is aware, the DEC is making some sweeping changes that will take effect in January and will cause this project to have to start all over again with a clean slate. No pressure on us, I just wanted to clarify. Steve Vegliante – Correct. Also, there was an issue with the ZBA variance and it has to be ratified, but that could also be condition. Essentially, they will have to go back to the ZBA after they get site plan approval and have the variance that was granted ratified. Chairman Lara – Are you suggesting we do that this evening? Steve Vegliante – No. We are still waiting on the 30 days for SEQR, so no action can be taken tonight. Chairman Lara – Okay. Matt, do you have anything to add to this? Matt Sickler – Not really. Like Robert mentioned we had our work session and they just need to complete those couple items in regards to the wetlands. We had a couple comments on the SWPP, which we have forwarded to Justin, at AKRF, so those should be squared away in the next week or so. Robert Romine – Right. I know the comments were received and Justin has started to address those. They seemed pretty easy and straight forward, so it shouldn't take long. Also, Steve had asked for some draft resolutions for the SEQR NEG DEC and the site plan/special use approval, which we have provided. I believe he took a look at those. Steve Vegliante – I did and believe I sent them back, but I will double check that. Robert Romine – We are going to have to add the two conditions discussed tonight, so do you want us to add those and then send the resolutions back to you? Steve Vegliante – Yes. Robert Romine - And is there anything else you are looking for there? Matt Sickler – We

typically reference a condition for the posting of the decommission bond, so that should be added as well. Helen Budrock – And you usually come up with that amount, right? Matt Sickler – Right and we have been going back and forth with an amount, so I will check to see where we are at with that. Robert Romine – I think per your code, it has to be a little higher do we adjusted that and resubmitted. Matt Sickler – I believe that was the case, but just follow up with me after tonight and we will get that straightened out. Robert Romine – Okay. Helen Budrock – The other thing we need to work on are the parts 2 & 3 of the EAF. Robert Romine – I was going to ask about that. In the past we have sort of filled out the parts 2 & 3, just as a guide and to give an idea of what we think. Do you want us to do that? Helen Budrock – Sure. It would certainly be helpful. Robert Romine – Okay and with all of this, do you think we will be ready for the NEG DEC and conditional approval at the December 11th meeting? Steve Vegliante – Obviously that will be up to the Board, but I think that if you can get these things done, you will have a good chance. Chairman Lara – We have done the public hearing, which didn't seem to have much push back from the neighbors, and hopefully we can get something from the Army Corp of Engineers soon. They are pretty much at the end of the process with us and have done everything we have asked of them. There are just these last couple of things and I don't think Steve would suggest they could be conditions if he didn't feel comfortable with that. Shoshana Mitchell – Since there is a concern with the wetlands, should we do something addition for wetland buffers around the streams and downhill? Robert Romine – We do show a buffer around the stream. Shoshana Mitchell – Right, but that is after construction. I was thinking about post construction since we have been having a lot of big rain events and there was some concern about the quality of water and trying to preserve it. Cutting down all these trees will change the rate in which the runoff will be absorbed, so I was thinking just around the lower areas and the streams. Especially since this won't be regulated by the DEC. Matt Sickler – They do have a SWPP that they prepared for runoff, so if you want, I can jump on a call with you sometime next week and go over that. Shoshana Mitchell – I went through most of it and it mainly has to do with construction and the installation of the solar panels, but as time goes on and the vegetation gets ruined, it will change the absorption rate and the type of wetland it is. It is just something to think about. Robert Romine – I think the proposal is for it to be grass covered, so the storm water treatment calls for grass filter strips and because they won't be at too steep of a slope, they will provide treatment for the water that comes off of the panels. Shoshana Mitchell – So you will use wetland grass, but there won't be any additional wetland shrubs or trees. It will be more like a meadow, which has shorter root systems and I think it will change the existing wetlands. Chairman Lara – I think the Board agrees with you and we would not be asking them to reinvent the wheel or anything like that; just to add some additional plants to the two areas you mentioned. Shoshana Mitchell – Right, just the lower part of the property and the stream over on the west side. You are also going to have some fence there and it is right next to the buffer for the solar panels, so maybe some extra along there. Just keep those areas more vegetated than the rest of the site. Robert Romine – So, something more than grass? Maybe some low laying shrubs? Shoshana Mitchell – Yes. Robert Romine – Okay. Helen Budrock – Also, would you mind reviewing the site-specific conditions in the approval resolution and maybe add some language that would address all of that. Matt Sickler – Maybe Robert and I can get together and get some sort of a sketch over to you to look at and let us know if that was what you were thinking. Shoshana Mitchell – Okay. Robert Romine – We certainly can plant some additional vegetation, so that shouldn't be an issue.

ARTARCH USA LLC

Buchanan Road, Glenn Wild, NY

Marty Miller, Project Attorney

Bob

Marty Miller – First of all let me start by thanking you for letting me appear via Zoom last time and I did file an Owner's Proxy. Chairman Lara – We got it. Thank you. Marty Miller – So, this is basically a sketch plan

and the earlier one was missing a great deal of detail. The architect, David Rosenberg, was going to try to appear tonight, but he couldn't make it. This is a permitted use subject to site plan approval in the zone. Last time we were here we discussed that there was a proposed barn as well as some recreational facilities and the Board thought that didn't make sense. So, I had a discussion with Bob and they went back and came up with this new plan. This project consists of 2 parcels and they are contemplating putting a home on the smaller of the 2 parcels and that parcel overlooks a waterfall. We may come back to the Board at some point and ask for a lot line change, or maybe to merge the 2 lots. The reason for the lot line change is because the house may need additional land to allow for a septic system and well. As for the farm situation, this is intended to be an active farm, but not in the sense of commercial activity. Meaning, growing crops for purposes of resale, which that may be to some extent. But that is not the focus of the property. The focus is to provide a place for recreation and other activities to people who are enjoying the farm, which would be the barn we discussed earlier. Over here will be a utility building for farm equipment and other things associated with a farm, and to the side will be a green house. We are also showing various other green houses and over here we are contemplating using for horses. Moving across the site is a pond and moving a little further there are some proposed recreational areas, including a swimming pool and pool house. These facilities will also require water and sewer, so we are proposing another well and septic in this location, for this parcel. That constitutes the overall development of this site. There is no other development under consideration. Michael Hoyt – Never say never. Marty Miller – You always have to potentiality of expansion, but it is not contemplated and part of this plan.

Chairman Lara – Is this one owner? Marty Miller – Yes and there is actually a third parcel, but he does not want to develop that. Also, that parcel is located in the Town of Fallsburg. The two he wants to develop are located in Thompson. Shoshana Mitchell – Is the Fallsburg parcel right there on the other side of this line or is that some sort of access road? Marty Miller – The driveway is here and it comes off a town road in up into the property.

Michael Hoyt – How many people are you looking to house? Is this a commercial venture? Marty Miller – It technically has to be a commercial venture because this is part of a 1031, so we are saying it is a commercial venture. How it is actually enjoyed, may be another thing. As for housing, there will only be two houses in total; one for the farmer/caretaker and the other for the applicant and his wife.

Chairman Lara – The barn doesn't show any animal storage, but there is a "horse fancy" proposed, so if there are going to be animals, you may want to show that. Marty Miller – There is going to be both a barn and a shed and they are not sure at this time which one will be used. Chairman Lara – Okay. I think this project can benefit from a work session, that way we are not getting all the information in phases. Marty Miller – Absolutely. We just wanted to come tonight with a sketch of what we think is the ultimate build out and get the Board's input on it. Chairman Lara – And we appreciate that. Helen Budrock – Jim, would either the barn or the shed be considered an oversized garage that would possibly require a variance? Jim Carnell – That is purview of the Board's review under the site plan. But if it is a barn, it should be at least 150 feet from the property, line incase it will produce any odors. Helen Budrock – Okay. Marty Miller – There is significant space there and these structures are located internal to the property.

Steve Vegliante – What you are proposing is 2 separate parcels and they are going to remain 2 separate parcels? Marty Miller – At the present moment we are proposing it that way for the application. There is a single owner and we are not expecting to separate them at any point. Steve Vegliante – What we have seen with previous applications and is this Board's preference, is that the lots be combined and reviewed as one. Marty Miller – And that may be the case at some point, but we may need to have 2 separate

parcels for the purposes of approval, with a condition that they be merged after approval. They can't have 2 houses on one parcel, so we would just approvals and then we can combine them. Steve Vegliante – I'm fairly new to the Board and that might be something waivable, but essentially, if there is a main residence and then an accessory residence for a farmer, or something along those lines, I think that is a permitted use. Is that right? Helen Budrock – It does say there is a permitted use for a 1-family dwelling, not to exceed 1 per lot with a foot note that basically says that lots that have sufficient acreage to be subdivide, can have a second detached single-family dwelling as long as they have common ownership, the ability for both units to meet all required setbacks, and subdivision approval be obtained by this Board. You basically just have to show that they can stand alone. Marty Miller – If you take a look at the plan, even without the scale, you can see that there is plenty of room for both to meet their setbacks. Steve Vegliante – I think that these are just very preliminary comments and the next step would really be to get a site plan. Chairman Lara – I agree. Marty Miller – Okay and just so you know the topo has already been done and all of the basic engineering accomplished. So, if you have any additional comments, we will hear them now and if not, we will move on to the next step. Chairman Lara – I think everybody has sort have given their input, but the building department did ask if there was going to be an engineer? Marty Miller – Yes. The topo was done by the engineer and the layout done by the architect, but ultimately it will have to be engineered and we know that. Steve Vegliante – Okay and I think we all appreciate you returning tonight with a more detailed sketch plan so that everyone can have a better idea of what exactly is being proposed. Chairman Lara – Good enough. Jim, do you think this is something that can go for a work session at this point, or do you want to see full plans first? Jim Carnell – I am going to defer to Matt because I would guess he would want to see more of the engineering done first. Matt Sickler – Right. Just an overall site plan and maybe some of the preliminary layouts for the septic and well locations. I think it would be beneficial to have some of that first. Chairman Lara – Okay. Marty Miller – I think that makes sense as long as the concept is something that we can build on. I don't think we will be back in December, but maybe by January. Laura Eppers – Once we receive more engineered plans, can they go straight to a work session or would you like to see them first? Chairman Lara – I think they should come back first. Laura Eppers – Okay. Chairman Lara – So, I think you guys know what you need to do next and we will see you back when you are ready.

98 VARNELL

98 Varnell Road, Monticello, NY
Joel Kohn, Project Representative
Marty Miller, Project Attorney

Joel Kohn – This is the property located right next door to Garden Cottages and is kind of part of that. They are in violation for converting a single-family home into a three-family home, making it a multi-family use and that is not permitted in this zone. They were also short with the acreage and only have 32.2 feet from the front property line, so they needed variances for that. We went to the ZBA and they granted a variance for the front yard setback and compromised on the acreage variance by allowing a two-family to be in the house, instead of a three family. So, they are allowed to have a two-family dwelling in the existing house, plus there is also an existing trailer on the property, for a total of three dwelling in the property. Instead of the proposed four. Since those variances have been granted, we are not back in front of this Board for site plan review.

Chairman Lara – Is a three-family not allowed in the house? Why not just keep the house a three-family and ditch the trailer? Marty Miller – The trailer is used by a caretaker. Chairman Lara – Okay. So that means that the applicant is going to have to take the three-family home and reconfigure it to now be a

two-family home? Joel Kohn – That is correct and we already have plans showing how it will be converted. They have not been submitted to the building department yet, but hopefully we can get site plan approved and move forward with the building permit process.

Joel Kohn – We are also now showing some additional parking spaces so that this now complies with parking.

Chairman Lara – So really, whatever decision is made tonight is ultimately going to land back on the building department for enforcement, right? Jim Carnell – Well, that's why they are here. Chairman Lara – And this is still in court, right? Joel Kohn – Yes and they still have an open violation. Jim Carnell – Once they get site plan approval and a building permit to convert the house into a two-family, we can clear up that violation. Chairman Lara – And you got the variances you needed for this? Marty Miller – Yes, at the last Zoning Board meeting. Laura Eppers – I did put a copy of the ZBA approval letter in the folder for this project. Chairman Lara – Thank you. Jim Carnell – Did you update the site plan to reflect the variances? Joel Kohn – Yes. Chairman Lara – So, they need this approval to help clear up the violation? Jim Carnell – Yes.

Michael Hoyt – How is the caretaker's unit? Joel Kohn – It looks okay, but I have only ever seen it from the outside. Michael Hoyt – Is it a trailer or a manufactured home? Joel Kohn – It is a mobile home. Steve Vegliante – Are there any modifications proposed to the trailer? Joel Kohn – No. Michael Hoyt – Jim, would your office be able to check out the caretaker's unit next time you go out there? Jim Carnell – Only if the caretaker is willing to let us in. Shoshana Mitchell – How long do trailers normally last? Michael Hoyt – It depends on how well you take care of them.

Matt Sickler – Is this private water and sewer? Joel Kohn – Yes. Matt Sickler – And they are good to support a three-family? Marty Miller – Yes, because the total number of bedrooms did not change. Matt Sickler – Okay.

Chairman Lara – Helen, do we need to do anything on the SEQR side? Helen Budrock – I don't think so because I believe this is a Type II action. Chairman Lara – Then we just need a motion for site plan approval. Joel Kohn – Does this need a public hearing? It is a non-permitted use. Steve Vegliante – Keep in mind that there was a public hearing held by the ZBA for the variances. Marty Miller – And it would mostly be the same neighbors that would attend. Jim Carnell – I believe the bulk table requires site plan review for a multi-family use. Helen Budrock – This is the SR, right? Joel Kohn – Yes. Helen Budrock – The bulk table says two-family dwellings are not to exceed 1 per lot and is subject to site plan review and a special use permit. Steve Vegliante – Okay. In that case you should probably have a public hearing. Joel Kohn – We will also hopefully be back with the Garden Cottages project, after the December ZBA meeting, and that will also require a public hearing, so maybe we can get the scheduled for the same night. Chairman Lara – That makes sense. Joel Kohn – We are hoping to be back the first meeting in January with the updated site plan for Garden Cottages, so maybe we can aim to have a February public hearing, so that Garden Cottages has time to come back. Chairman Lara – I think the Board is fine with that. Joel Kohn – The first meeting in February is on the 12th, so that should be fine.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion to schedule a public hearing on February 12, 2025 was made by Arthur Knapp and seconded by Kristin Boyd.

All in favor, 0 opposed

THOMPSON LIVING

Kaufman Road, Monticello, NY

Joel Kohn, Project Representative

Joel Kohn – This is a new project and is a proposed 123-unit housing development as well as a 20-room hotel building. This is located on Kaufman Road, with 17B located up here, and is right next door to Monticello Resorts. It is in the HC-2 district and is a 66.75-acre parcel. The use we are proposing is allowed subject to site plan review and a special use permit. The row housing will consist of a mix of 4 and 5-unit buildings and as you can see, there will also be a community building, a couple swimming pools, some playground areas and then the hotel building. The hotel will be a 3-story, 20-room building and it is basically meant to be a place for family members who want to come out and visit for a weekend or so to stay. Chairman Lara – I did ask Logan in the building department about that and she did say that this is a very common. There is actually a big need for that is some of the bigger developments, but most of them don't have them. Access to the property is limited as it is pretty narrow in front and there are some wetlands over here. So, there will be only one access road to serve the entire property. Which means this will require all of the buildings to be sprinklered. Water will come from on-site wells. Our hydrogeologist has located some potential well locations and that has been submitted to the DOH already. It has also been submitted to the DEC because they are within the 100-foot buffer of the DEC wetland. All of the wetlands have been delineated and the DEC certified the map back in June of this year. This is with the town's sewer district, so I talked to Mike Messenger about a month or so ago and he said there is adequate capacity at the pump station this would be going to. So, there should be no issue with the sewer. Traffic counts were done this past summer and they are working on a traffic impact study for this. I have brought with me tonight a conceptual rendering of this project. They are 2-story townhouse buildings and each unit is about 950 square feet. That is pretty much the introduction to this project and we would like to get the Board's input on it.

Chairman Lara – First of all I would like to say that I don't hate the location of this. As giant as it is, the location will allow for a lower impact. Plus, Monticello Resorts is right next door.

Chairman Lara – What are the buildings that are to the right when you drive in? Joel Kohn – These are four caretaker units and this is for the compactor. Chairman Lara – Okay. Thank you.

Chairman Lara – I didn't see a mikvah or a shul being proposed. Joel Kohn – They are part of the community building.

Chairman Lara – Will these have basements or crawl spaces? Joel Kohn – We haven't really discussed that yet, but I would think they would want them to have unfinished basements, with the potential to be finished in the future. Chairman Lara – Logan said it really just comes down to bedroom count. Joel Kohn – Right.

Chairman Lara – Do you have any excess parking proposed? Joel Kohn – I think the parking requirements are listed down here on the map and they are required to have 269 spaces and they are proposing 285, so there is some excess parking. Michael Hoyt – You only need 1 handicap parking space per building? Joel Kohn – Actually you don't need that many, but that is what the engineer put on there.

Chairman Lara – Something else Logan mentioned is that these will now be two large developments next to each other and there is no commercial grocery out that way. That may be something your client might want to think about and if it is a possibility, even in the future, they may want to include it now.

Helen Budrock – Who will operate the hotel to make the reservations and stuff? Will it be the HOA? Joel Kohn – Most likely the sponsor for this will keep that as kind of a separate condo unit. Helen Budrock – Okay. Chairman Lara – So, they will be condominium? Joel Kohn – Most likely and the hotel will be one condo unit.

Matt Sickler – Will there be some sort of water storage for the sprinkler systems? Joel Kohn – Yes. Matt Sickler – Okay. We will just want to see placement of that and what that will look like. I assume there will be a pump system to maintain the pressure and that may also take up a little bit of space. Joel Kohn – My guess is that it is going to be right next to the water building, or maybe even within it. They are not required to have water storage for all of the units combined, they just need enough water for the largest building. So, there won't be a tremendous amount of storage. On a similar project I did, they only needed somewhere around 17,000 gallons. Matt Sickler – I believe Joel is pretty accurate, but we will calculate it all out and make sure they have what they need.

Joel Kohn - We are hoping to come back to the next meeting, or the meeting after that, to start the SEQR process on this, so I don't know if the Board would want to engage any additional consultants at this time.

Helen Budrock – I noticed that there is only a short form EAF in the drive, which is normal at this point of the process, but it is a large enough project that we will want to see a long form. That won't prevent the Board from being able to declare themselves lead agency, but it is something you might want to start working on now. Joel Kohn – Do you think they could declare intent tonight? Helen Budrock – Do you think this sketch plan is far enough along to do that? Joel Kohn – We will at least get the long form to you before we send the notices out, so that it will be part of that. This sketch plan has been revised probably about 15 now, so this is pretty much what they want and the DEC certified map is already from January, so you can see this has been in the works for almost a year now. Michael Hoyt – I think that we should wait until at least the next meeting. That way we can see all of the proper stuff before we do anything. Joel Kohn – Okay. Fair enough.

No further questions or comments from the board.

Chairman Lara – So, at this time I think the only thing we need to do is engage Helen to be our town planner. Matt Sickler – Do you also want to engage the traffic consultant and/or hydrogeologist at this time? Chairman Lara – Maybe our traffic consultant. Jim Carnell – Well, is Kaufman Road a County Road? Joel Kohn – Yes, it is and it will require a 239 review. Jim Carnell – And there was an extensive review done for the BBIS project and then again for the development next door, so maybe you want to wait to hear from the County before you engage the traffic consultant. Helen Budrock – But it is still a 123-unit project and even though there were recent traffic studies done; it couldn't hurt to have one for the record. Joel

Kohn – We will definitely have a traffic impact study because as I mentioned before, we have already done counts. It’s not like we are getting away with not doing one, it just does you think it needs to be reviewed by your consultant. Jim Carnell – Right and it is a county road right in between two state roads. They should submit the report when it is completed to see if there are any findings. Joel Kohn – There is a draft impact study that has been supplied to us and there are already some conclusions listed on it that I can read; “It is concluded that the proposed project will not add significant additional trips to the adjacent streets or at intersections”. I can submit that if you would like, but like I said it is just a draft. Chairman Lara – If you could Joel. That way we can see it before the next meeting.

A motion to engage the Town Planner was made by Michael Hoyt and seconded by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to close the meeting at 9:13 was made by Arthur Knapp and seconded by Michael Croissant.
All in favor, 0 opposed

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers, Secretary

Town of Thompson Planning Board

DRAFT