

**TOWN OF EAST FISHKILL
PLANNING BOARD SPECIAL MEETING
JANUARY 18, 2022**

John Eickman called the meeting to order.

Members present:

John Eickman, Lori Gee, Ed Myoshi, Richard Campbell, Sarah Bledsoe; Michael Cunningham, Attorney; Michelle Robbins, Planner; Scott Bryant, Engineer; Staff: Jackie Keenan, Clerk; Julie Beyer, Meeting Secretary.

The meeting began with the Pledge of Allegiance.

CHAIRPERSON COMMENTS

Mr. Eickman stated that the upcoming meetings were Tuesday, February 24, 2022, and March 29, 2022.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

November 16, 2021

Motion made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Lori Gee, to approve the minutes of the November 16, 2021 meeting. Voted and carried unanimously.

Mr. Eickman stated the iPark Public Hearing that was originally scheduled for tonight has been postponed until the February 24, 2022 meeting.

EXTENSIONS:

#2021-007 – Forestiere, 8 Country Lane (6356-01-408655)

3 lot subdivision approved by the Planning Board on June 8, 2021. Applicant is requesting two three-month extensions through June 8, 2022 to complete the test well as required by the

Dutchess County Department of Health.

Michael Gillespie was present.

Mr. Gillespie stated this is a three lot subdivision off of Country Lane in the Lomala area. They received their preliminary final in June. They went back and forth with the Department of Health and should be wrapping up pretty soon. They still have to drill the test well. To allow enough time to get that drilled and get it tested they are looking for an extension of two three-month extensions from the original approval.

Mr. Eickman asked if there were any other questions or comments from Board members. There were none.

Motion made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Lori Gee, to approve two three-month extensions for this application. Voted and carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

PUBLIC HEARING:

2021-012 – Stormville Square, 194-198 Route 216 (655900 Route 82 (6457-01-442693)

New Public Hearing for revised site plan with larger storage building. Applicant is seeking Site Plan approval for a 36,000 sq. ft. (formerly proposed as 21,400 sq. ft.) climate-controlled storage building on an undeveloped parcel located near the intersection of Old Route 52 and Route 216.

Brian Stokosa, Pat and Paul Gigliotti were present.

Motion made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Ed Miyoshi, to open this Public

Hearing. Voted and carried unanimously.

Mr. Stokosa stated this has been in front of the Board since late last summer or early fall. It is at the intersection of Route 216 and Old Route 52. The applicant owns two parcels one of which is vacant and one contains the building where Stormville Pizza is located. It is a small retail plaza. He would like to combine the two lots and ultimately put a climate-controlled building toward the rear. They have developed a site plan he presented to the Board in the Fall and had a Public Hearing. They detailed the construction of a 21,000 sq. ft. climate-controlled building with associated parking. There was some landscaping and lighting provided as well as a retaining wall in the back due to the slope of the hill. They were going to excavate out for the building to set it down in the back. They were going to realign the entrance to the site. They are now proposing a new, larger site entrance that will be two lanes out and one lane in. In addition, there is an entrance to the North that serves the existing plaza and they are showing a small improvement to that entrance as well. At some point this area may be served by water and sewer in the future so there is also development potential that could happen then. What they're proposing now is the maximum that they can propose at this point because they are limited by central services. The previous meetings they were asked if this was the ultimate buildout for the climate-controlled building. There was always potential to add on to the site when it was proposed at 21,000 sq. ft. and they looked at the numbers for infrastructure and the construction of the wall and the applicant did a small market analysis with their real estate consultants, and they felt if this building was increased to 36,000 sq. ft. it could support itself with the increased residential development proposed in the area. There are some larger home developments that have been proposed and are under review.

The applicant is going with the addition of that space because he believes that proposed future building to the area will support this. The Public Hearing was in the fall and was opened and closed. There were some comments from the neighbors. They felt that the positioning of the building toward the rear of the property and the excavating down and the landscaping around it would have a minimal impact on some of the residential neighbors around it. This revision at 36,000 sq. ft. incorporates those concepts. Since they were here last they were asked to look at the retaining wall in the back and show some preliminary wall calculations. They did provide stability calculations and viability calculations. The Town Engineer has come back with a couple of comments and the applicant will provide additional information as they get more involved into the site plan approval process in regards to bearing capacity, construction phasing, and how that wall is constructed. They did try to incorporate some of the comments from the last meeting. They have added some additional landscaping behind the retaining wall. They added a chain-link fence around the property line to keep an added buffer between the property line and the retaining wall. They have added a notation to the plan that it is their intention to install motion activated lighting during periods of non-use. It will be security lighting. They have had a discussion with New York State DOT regarding the entrance and the possibility of future development of this parcel if central water and sewer does become available. If those services come through, the applicant will be coming before this Board again with an amended site plan. They did discuss circulation through the site. One of the proposals to DOT was to allow this entrance as it is shown. They would like to continue the use of the existing entrance and just modify it to an egress only out of the site. This would facilitate truck deliveries to the back of the restaurant and allow them to come around the building and then exit left or right. If they come back before the Board for additional development

on the site they would then abandoned that access and landscape it. They will provide additional parking for that existing commercial use. DOT seemed receptive to these concepts. The applicant has given them additional documentation. They do have a Highway Work Permit Application in with the DOT. Once the applicant has a firm understanding of the entrance and the configuration that they mentioned regarding future abandonment, they will fine tune the drainage analysis. They could also incorporate any public comments received and come back with a hard submission for a SEQRA determination. The architectural remain the same as before. The building is just stretched and enlarged to that 36,000 sq. ft. It is still one-story and still climate controlled.

Mr. Eickman stated they had spoken about fencing to keep neighbors or children from rolling down the hill. Mr. Stokosa stated that they added a black chain-link fence around the property line. Between the property line and the retaining wall along the back of the residential homes will have Evergreens spaced to provide a buffer. As you go up the hill there will be several plantings of zebra grass. There is a larger spot on the Eastern side of the property between the retaining wall and the fence line. He believes that is 15 to 18 feet and then it expands further from the property line. The parking for this type structure is relatively low-impact use. There were originally 10 spaces shown at the back of the building. They have removed those spaces and pushed the wall forward even more. By pushing the wall forward they reduce the wall height in that area. He believes around the back side of the building they are now at a 4 to 6-foot range whereas before it was in the 10 to 12 foot range. They did request a waiver of 10 parking spaces in this latest revision. If the Board is looking for additional barrier protection or fall protection the applicant will provide that.

Mr. Campbell asked if the emergency egress had changed around the back of the building. Mr. Stokosa stated no. They anticipate moving larger tractor-trailers through there. They will fine tune it more as they go forward. They can put in aerial fire truck or a tractor-trailer through there now.

Mr. Campbell asked if there was any increase in the height of the structure with the increased square footage. Mr. Stokosa stated no. He stated he did add a Cut and Fill Analysis to justify material being moved on the site. They did soil tests on site from the existing building all the way to the rear property line. The center of the property is a fine sand and gravel mix. As you move up the hill the material increases in density. It is still a gravelly mixture. It is all well-draining material. As part of the site plan development for the SEQRA process, they will detail a phasing plan of how the wall is actually installed. They did do preliminary deep test pits at the edge of the wall at its tallest portion. They were able to go 12 feet straight down. The walls were able to hold themselves, so it is a pretty cohesive soil. It did not collapse in on itself. The approach to install the walls will be to do a section at a time. They will not clear it at all at once.

Mr. Eickman asked if the applicant was open to another barrier to keep people from approaching the chain link fence. Mr. Stokosa stated they are showing black chain-link fence at the top of the hill currently. It originally was at the top of the wall. There were questions that if people came down the slope toward wall would they be able to get out. The applicant was asked to move the chain-link off of the top of the wall to align it with the property line. The chain-link is at the back of the property line and then there is their screening and then there is the wall. The applicant would

be open to adding an additional barrier to the wall if necessary.

Ms. Gee asked what's the difference between the highest point of the fence. Mr. Stokosa stated the highest point is 14 feet and that is only for a small section. It is at the corner when you turn around the building. It is starting at 4 feet on each side, and it transitions into six feet. Then there is a small section at 10 feet, a small section that is 12, and then a small section of it is 14. The 14-foot section is only approximately 15 feet.

Mr. Myoshi asked what happens to the rain when there is a big rainstorm with water coming down the driveway. Mr. Stokosa stated that they do have gravelly soil. The elevation after they grade it will be 12 feet from the finished grade to finished grade. The water table on the hillside was found to be nonexistent. Water does travel through the soil. They will have a cutoff swale at the top of the retaining wall. There will be catch basins at every intersection in the paved area. They are following DEC guidelines with capturing it, treating it, and putting it back into the ground via the a storm chambers. That is what the larger chamber area on the site is for. They are controlling it on-site and coming down the wall area.

Mr. Miyoshi asked how close the new entrance is to where Route 216 makes the turn. Mr. Stokosa stated they pushed it as far north as they could. It is right up to where the billiards used to be. They didn't want an entrance on Old Route 52 as that is a more residential area.

Ms. Gee stated the applicant has removed some of the parking spaces. She stated that Dutchess

County originally stated the applicant was over parked. Mr. Stokosa stated that the submission that the County received shows the spaces being removed. He believes that their take away is that even with the 10-space reduction, they are still over parked. He believes that ITE recommends seven parking spaces for the size of the building and they are currently at 26. He believes the code requires one space per thousand square feet so originally they had 36 spaces. Ms. Gee asked if all of the parking was in the front now and Mr. Stokosa said yes. That also forces all entry to the front. He stated that there will be an emergency egress from the rear door as per fire code.

Ms. Robbins stated she is envisioning people bringing in a truck and parking it right at the entrance. She was looking at areas of other storage places and it looks like a lot of them have some sort of loading zone. She was wondering if the applicant could make some of the spaces deeper or closer to the front of the structure or create some sort of loading zone, even if they had to get rid of some spaces to do that. She does agree that they are probably over parked. Mr. Stokosa stated they could flip-flop how they have it now and it would probably work better.

Ms. Robbins stated that as far as the fence line, part of the property behind the house that there is wooded. The neighbor there won't even see the fence. The other part is not very wooded so she believes there might need to be some landscaping or trees right back there. They may have to pull it in a little off of the property line to add in screening.

Ms. Robbins asked if there were going to be ADA ramps. Mr. Stokosa stated there are ramps shown on there. There is a 6-inch drop on each side of the curb but it will be more detailed in the

next submission. Ms. Gee suggested they do that more extensively as people could be bringing in things that are on rollers.

Ms. Robbins asked about signage for the site. Mr. Stokosa stated they have provided for some signage, but they will provide signage for direction in the parking lot. They were waiting for information from the DOT regarding the entrance configuration. They will detail on their plan a no parking area or temporary parking area for the loading zone. It is still two-way access around the building. They are providing 24 feet of pavement. Ms. Robbins asked if they were putting signage out for the business itself and if something was going on the entrance. Mr. Stokosa said yes. It will be going on the northern side of their entrance. Ms. Robbins asked if there was any signage going on the building itself. Mr. Stokosa stated there would probably be signage on it. Ms. Robbins would like that shown on the plans.

Engineer Bryant asked if the drainage tied into the DOT system and has there been any discussion with DOT regarding that. Mr. Stokosa stated the applicant did talk to DOT about tying into their system. They will provide a pre-and post-analysis that shows no adverse impact to their system. They are going to maintain the flow that goes into that system. That is why they are over sizing their storm chambers. Engineer Bryant asked if the idea was to have something approved in writing prior to their Board approval instead of as a condition. Mr. Stokosa stated that based upon the conversations they had with DOT this week he feels they will have something in writing prior to approval. Engineer Bryant stated there appears to be quite a bit of earthwork on-site. There is only removal of 130 yards so it does not require a special permit. He stated it looks like the applicant

will be raising the elevation in the front. He asked if that was going to be permanent or a temporary stockpile and how it was going to be maintained. Mr. Stokosa stated it will be done in a benched configuration so it will be easy to be maintained. In the front they show an elevated area of 3 to 4 feet depending on the current dips. The intention is to have it level and have it grass and mowed and maintained. They want to improve the site because they want to support the existing businesses there.

Engineer Bryant stated there was a comment regarding a bullnose prohibiting the trucks from getting into an area. He asked that the applicant clean that up. Engineer Bryant stated there was a comment regarding a fire truck riding over the lip of the curb behind the building. Mr. Stokosa stated they did run the turning template a little tight in that area but he did rerun it and they do have sufficient room to clear an area for a truck. It will be updated on the next plan set. Engineer Bryant stated they are looking for more detail on the retaining wall to make sure it will not encroach into the neighboring property during construction.

Ms. Bledsoe stated from a long-term planning perspectives she sees this parcel as being a key property in the very central part of the Hamlet of Stormville. She stated there are several proposals with over 1000 total homes proposed in total. She stated this is an incredible opportunity and for town to look at the Hamlet of Stormville and consider the opportunity for growth and economic development. She does not see this property and proposed used as the highest and best use for this cornerstone lots from the perspective of long-term planning she would like the ability to reevaluate how this parcel and property fits into the Hamlet of Stormville. This is a major improvement over

what is currently there. She does believe this is a huge opportunity to set the stage for what is to come. Mr. Stokosa stated he lives a mile and half from the site and would love to have more retail and a bigger commercial presence in the area. He does believe the one thing that is prohibiting commercial development in the town is the lack of central services. New York State is very strict in regard to the public water supplies. In order for any future development on the site, it would require a pretty heavy public water supply improvement for the well. Even with great soil the big problem is the location of a future well. Public water supply requires 200 feet of control around any well. That swallows up an acre of land. Within 100 feet of that you cannot have any impervious surface or storm water. He stated he would love to see Stormville and East Fishkill as a whole growing and that the first step in that is central services. Until that happens they are stuck with a use that does not use any water and that is why they are presenting this application. They are keeping the rental office in the front for restrooms. They are trying to plan the entrance for bigger retail in the future.

Ms. Gee asked if they see this building ever being adapted into a different use. Mr. Stokosa stated no. He sees it as storage moving forward.

Ms. Robbins stated if they can come back with ITE rates that show lesser parking that would be better. That way if they do need expansion in the front of the buildings they have adequate parking for them then. She suggested the applicant showing where they are parking if the ITE rate is lower. Mr. Stokosa stated he believes it is .2 per thousand per foot. That puts it at approximately 7 1/2 parking spaces for the entire building.

Engineer Bryant asked if there was natural gas available in the area. Mr. Stokosa said no. Engineer Bryant stated they need to give some consideration as to how this building is going to be heated and have it shown on the site plan. Mr. Stokosa stated that since there is no running water in the building the heat in that building will be mid 50s to 60s all winter. They do show the heat pumps throughout the site. They show them from the North and the South in the parking areas from the side of the building. They also show bollards around them for protection. They are still running some numbers, but at this point there are no propane tanks required.

Ms. Robbins stated that it appears that Mr. Fitzgerald heard from DOT on the access. Engineer Bryant stated he met with them months ago and they were fine with the location. They did want the existing one to be a right turn only. They did talk about reconfiguring it to actually limit it to be a right turn only. Mr. Stokosa stated that is what they were discussing on Tuesday.

Ms. Gee asked Ms. Robbins if the retaining wall needed another fence on top of it due to its height. Engineer Bryant stated the code says there has to be a rail over 4 feet high. Mr. Stokosa stated they had that in their last iteration, but they were asked to push it back. Engineer Bryant stated it could be set back as long as it closes the loop so someone cannot climb up the wall in front of the fence. Ms. Gee stated it sounds like the fence is 15 to 18 feet from the actual wall. Mr. Stokosa said yes, it is probably 15 feet at its closest point. He stated that it would be an easy detail to add back in.

Mr. Eickman asked if there were any other questions or comments from Board members. There

were none.

Mr. Eickman asked if there were any questions or comments from the public. There were none.

Motion made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Ed Miyoshi, to close this Public Hearing. Voted and carried unanimously.

DISCUSSIONS:

DISCUSSION:

#2022-026 – AZ Hopewell LLC., 793 NYS Route 82 (6457-01-210545)

The applicant is proposing to redevelop the former William Tell Hardware Store site with a 7,380 sq. ft. retail Auto Zone store generally located within the existing footprint of the former hardware store.

Kurt Hutter and Caryn Moldzianowski were present.

Mr. Hutter said he is from AZ Hopewell LLC, who are the developers and equitable owners of the property. They will be the landlords as well. He stated that this is the redevelopment of the old William Tell Hardware Store that burned down. Their proposed use is an AutoZone Parts Store. AutoZone is a Fortune 500 company with over 6000 stores in the United States. AutoZone does not franchise so every location is corporately run. This is strictly retail. There will be no automobile servicing at the site. The building is 7400 sq. ft., which is smaller than the old hardware store. The building is being situated within the footprint that is still there.

Ms. Moldzianowski stated they will be matching the layout that is currently there today. The parcel is about 7/10 of an acre in size in a B2 zoning district. The building they are proposing is 7400 sq. ft. They are proposing to reuse the existing access as well as hold the existing edge of pavement along the front of the site for their parking lot. They are proposing 21 parking spaces, which they feel is sufficient to support the store. They are requesting a waiver for reduction of parking for that. The site that was there had some nonconformities that will remain with their proposed redevelopment. Besides parking, a setback for the building that was there will remain a nonconformity. They are improving it by pushing it a little further from the property line. They are also holding the frontage of pavement and parking which is an existing nonconformance with the parking setback. They are leaving the green space in the sidewalks that are out front. Lastly, the maximum impervious coverage that is there is in noncompliance and would remain the case with the redevelopment as well. As far as site circulation, there would be tractor-trailers for deliveries so they are working with the adjacent neighbor on the Eastern side for a cross connection, which is shown on the plan. That way a truck would enter the entrance off of Route 82 and never have to back in or out of the site. It would go to the back unloading area of the store and could continue straight through to the adjacent parcel. It would line up with the existing drive aisle on the neighboring property. She stated they have submitted the architecture for AutoZone. It is their typical architecture. Some initial feedback they received had them enhance the architect and soften the look, which provided them a second set of elevations. The second version has more neutral tans and browns instead of the white and gray. They have added stone to the columns and to the

horizontal area below the storefront. They wanted to enhance the architecture to fit in with the character of the community.

Mr. Eickman asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board. He stated that he did appreciate their attempt to change the architecture, but he does not see a significant difference. He stated this is the entrance to the Hopewell Junction business district. It is a really important location and he would encourage them to take another look at a completely different look at the architecture for this location. He believes something more neutral than what they have shown with the oranges. He recommended the applicant spend time with the Professionals. Mr. Campbell stated he believes the ARB would have to chime in as well. Mr. Myoshi stated their proposal will definitely stand out compared to what is currently in the town. Ms. Bledsoe stated across the street is a very traditional style building with its 70 style architecture. It has a lot of brick and is very soft. She stated this proposal is very bright and does not blend in with the architecture of the town. Ms. Mlodzianowski stated that as far as their signage and branding, that would probably not change. They can look at other options from the building standpoint. Mr. Miyoshi stated that Dunkin' Donuts has a bright orange signage but it does not stand out like this application does. Mr. Campbell stated they have to be able to adapt to a more traditional core. As this is the initial corridor into the Town they are really looking for a more traditional feel. He stated the architecture is very jagged with sharp angles and they would prefer to see something more softened. Ms. Mlodzianowski stated that is their typical layout.

Mr. Miyoshi asked Ms. Robbins how the new proposed road was going to come to that location.

Ms. Robbins stated the road would run alongside this parcel from along Fishkill Road to connect to 82. That building would really be a 360° visual building. That is why it will be so important visually. She did state that she met with the applicant and explained this to them previously. This will be a connecting road from the residential developments into the Hopewell Hamlet and ends to the rail trail. It is very important to the Town that this is a very visually appealing building and also maintains the character of the Hamlet district. Mr. Hutter asked what the status of the road construction is at this point. Ms. Robbins stated they waiting to hear back from a CMAC Tap Grant, which is very late in being announced. It is the second time they have applied, and they have received very good feedback.

Ms. Robbins asked what the actual side setback was as well as the parking setback that they are not meeting. Ms. Mlodzianowski stated that the side setback for the building that was there was 5'7" and they are proposing 7'2". Ms. Robbins stated that the building burned down and it was not rebuilt so the applicant will still need a variance for their side setbacks because there were no variances granted on that site. Attorney Cunningham stated he believed variances will be required for this. Ms. Robbins stated it was pre-existing nonconforming, but it burned down and was not rebuilt within the amount of time, which is one year, that is allowed by code. Ms. Gee asked what the side setback was. Ms. Robbins stated this is a B2 zone, so it is 10 foot. Mr. Campbell stated that since they are building a brand-new building it was his belief everything had to meet code. Ms. Robbins said yes, or they need to get those variances. You don't want to continue to perpetuate bad designs. She also asked if they cannot get an easement from Pizza Village can trucks still get in and out of that site. Ms. Mlodzianowski said yes. Trucks should be able to go forward and back

in. If they need to they could widen the pavement so that it could. Engineer Bryant stated it is not just an agreement with Pizza Village. Pizza Village will be giving up parking spaces and that could be an issue. When they are busy they are packed. He stated if they allow this then it becomes a through road so anybody from Acme Plaza could cut through there. Ms. Mlodzianowski said yes it would all be connected. Engineer Bryant asked what keeps the trucks from trying to make a turn through Pizza Village parking to come straight out onto Route 82. Ms. Mlodzianowski stated there is nothing there now but if signage is required they will put it there. Engineer Bryant stated there is no signage there now because it doesn't exist. Ms. Mlodzianowski stated they could put signage up. Engineer Bryant stated if the truck gets in there and doesn't move in blocks up the whole Pizza Village entrance and that would be a nonstarter. That is how it is shown on their first submission. Ms. Mlodzianowski stated that is not how it will be shown on the next submission. Mr. Hutter stated that it will only be AutoZone trucks that will have any reason to go through this parking lot. They control all their deliveries and do not contract out to third-party tracking. Deliveries for stores typically only happened once a week. They can control the time of day of the delivery hours to make sure it is off of peak hours. They will regulate how the drivers go through the parking lots. Engineer Bryant stated that there are a lot of applicants who say they control the trucks and the hours and it does not always work out that way.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that there are two other auto parts businesses within a mile in each direction. Her concern would be the ability of those businesses to survive and not be pushed out by this addition. And then she would have to wonder what happens to those buildings. Ms. Mlodzianowski stated this is allowed use. They feel there is adequate customer volume to support their business.

They cannot control what happens off of their site. Ms. Gee asked if they identified a gap in availability and Ms. Mlodzianowski said it is a location that would provide sufficient customer volume.

Mr. Eickman asked how many parking spaces they have versus how many are they required to have by code. Ms. Mlodzianowski stated they have 21 that are proposed and 30 that are required by code. They do feel that 21 is sufficient. Ms. Bledsoe asked if that included employee parking and if so, how many employees would they have at any given time. Ms. Mlodzianowski said 3 to 4 during the peak time. Mr. Campbell asked on average, based on the scale of this store, how many other spaces do other stores have. Mr. Hutter stated this is a very low parking use. All of the stores are different. They have one store in Delaware that only has 14 spaces.

Engineer Bryant stated that in regard to circulation, they will be entering out onto the road owned by Unity Plaza. This is not a town road. He does not know if they need some sort of easement or agreement with Unity Plaza. Attorney Cunningham stated that any cross parking agreements will be something that the Zoning Board will be looking at. He stated the applicant should have a discussion with Unity Plaza. Mr. Eickman stated they will need a variance or the parking and he would like to see an analysis.

Motion made by Ed Miyoshi, seconded by Richard Campbell, to referred this application to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Voted and carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION:

#2022-028 – GlobalFoundries, 303 E. Drive (6356-04-955157)

Applicant is seeking to amend the site plan to install a new 3000kw emergency generator outside the northeast corner of B/323A.

Timothy M. MaKara was present.

Mr. Makara stated he is a site engineer for GlobalFoundries. This application is for a new proposed emergency generator for the FAB Building 323A. It is adjacent to West Drive. The proposed location of the generator is on the East side of the building on the North end. The generator would not be visible from West Drive. It would be a 3 MW generator that is a life safety purpose generator. A year and half ago they came before the Board for a proposal to install a 2 MW unit for Building 320B. This is basically the same unit just slightly bigger. The generator is outside on the North end of the building. The building itself is 70 feet high. The exhaust stacks come upside the side of the building to two exhaust fans that are mounted on the roof. Those fans are lower than the existing stacks, which you cannot see from West Drive either.

Ms. Gee asked if this would be put in the grass. Mr. Makara stated it would be put on concrete pad on the grass. They will be taking two trees down. Instead of installing a guard rail they will be using two boulders to make it aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Campbell asked if the generator operates on natural gas. Mr. Makara stated no. Due to its size it is a diesel unit. It will start once a month for the maintenance procedure and they will do a load bank test on it two times a year.

Engineer Bryant asked if this generator will run quietly. Mr. Makara stated this generator design has been specially designed to be 71° at approximately 5 feet. It is basically the same unit as the one at 320B. Engineer Bryant stated he believes this is just a minor amendment to their site.

Mr. Campbell asked if fire protection extends into this compartment. Mr. Makara stated yes. There is fire detection in it and it is connected to the site system as well. This will provide life safety services for 323A.

Mr. Eickman asked if there were any additional questions or comments from anyone. There were none.

RESOLUTION OF AMENDED SITE PLAN APPROVAL

NAME OF SITE PLAN: Global Foundries FAB 10 B/323A Emergency Generator
NAME OF APPLICANT: Global Foundries U.S. Inc.
LOCATION: 2070 Route 52, Hopewell Junction NY

Resolution offered by Planning Board Member John Eickman

WHEREAS, the applicant applied for amended site plan approval to install a new emergency generator at FAB 10 B/323A; and

WHEREAS, the proposed generator would be 158” (13 feet) by 640” (53 feet) and would be located at the northeast corner of B/323A; and

WHEREAS, the action is considered a Type 2 action under SEQR, for which a coordinated review was not undertaken; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has determined that the project would not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that the application for an amended site plan meets the requirements for a minor site plan approval; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Amended Site Plan application for the above project as represented on a map entitled “Global Foundries FAB 10 B/323A Generator and B323A UPS Project,” prepared by Engineering Ventures, P.C., and dated January 6, 2022 is hereby approved.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that within five (5) business days of the adoption of this resolution, the Chair or other duly authorized member of the Planning Board shall cause a copy of this resolution to be filed with the Town Clerk and a copy sent to the Applicant/Owner.

Resolution Seconded by Planning Board Member Rich Campbell

The votes were as follows:

Board Member Lori Gee	Aye
Board Member Craig Arco	Absent
Board Member Ed Miyoshi	Aye
Board Member Sarah Bledsoe	Aye
Board Member Richard Campbell	Aye
Chairperson John Eickman	Aye

SKETCH PLAN:

2022-027 – Stormville Landing, 416-428 NYS Route 216 (6657-01-7245828)

Applicant is proposing to redevelop the former 150-acre Stormville Airport with 254 residential

units in three different housing communities including active adults (55 and older), Next-Generation (homes with accessory apartment included), and homes for first time buyers. The proposed development will include recreational facilities such as a clubhouse, walking trails, playgrounds, pool, etc. as well as a small commercial development along Route 216.

Anthony Morando, Nathan Kahn, Joe Mataferry, and Peter Wintermantel were present.

Mr. Morando stated this is a 150+ acre parcel with frontage on Route 216. The property was rezoned into CRD, Conservation Residential Development, a few years ago. The applicant is proposing something incredibly consistent with what the intent of that zoning was. That zoning was to encourage a variety of housing types to serve a variety of income basis within the community. It includes associated and integrated retail and personal services and will include a multitude of active and passive recreational components to serve the community. It is to create a village type atmosphere. All of those are included in what you see as part of the preliminary concepts for the Stormville Landing project. The applicant has not formally filed the application with the Planning Board yet. They have been getting input from the Town Staff and members so that when they file they have a good concept of what everyone will be looking for. As part of those discussions, it was suggested that the applicant come to the Planning Board and introduce the project.

Mr. Kahn stated this is a unique site. There are very few developable sites anywhere and to have a site that is not full of rock or wetlands with a clear large open space that can be developed is really unique. The goal is to have it all come together. His history is mostly in Connecticut, and he was one of the pioneers who did active adult projects. On the left end of this site are the active

adult community homes. The majority of the residents have to be over the age of 55. They intend to have 20% who are over the age of 45. Most active adult projects have only people 55 and over or 45 and over. This is a village concept. It has all ages. When you move across the site there are different styles. The middle of the project is the multigenerational housing. This is a primary house with accessory apartments. Then on the right side of the property are the homes for first-time buyers. These are starter family houses. With this mass amount of uninterrupted acreage you have the ability to build in a unique amount of amenities and connect all three projects with the walking trail. The site is designed so that the active adult development on the left has a man gated entrance. There is a small building that is for storage packages. It also has a home for someone who would be an on-site superintendent for the community. It adds security and comfort. This will keep the Amazon and delivery trucks from driving through the community so the storage room would work for all three parts of the community. You can't drive from the other two communities into the active adult area. There is an emergency access gate and you can walk there. There is a putting green in the active adult area. The playgrounds are in the starter home area and there is a pool in each section. There are some shared amenities. The goal is to create a little village. This will not be the same style as Silo Ridge in Amenia, where the owners are worth \$500 million each.

Peter Wintermantle presented slides showing samples of all three housing areas. The units are designed with a modern farmhouse type of design. It includes gabled roofs and dormers. The exteriors are white or in a neutral palette with very clean lines. There will be many large windows. The semi-attached units will be broken up so that all of the buildings will look at scale. The façade will be stepped where units are joined. They will have open floor plans throughout all of the units.

The active adult units will have a larger bedroom in the back with a smaller bedroom the front. In the larger units with the addition of the extra dormers you can get an additional primary bedroom on the second floor. Most of the housing will have a primary suite on the main level with additional bedrooms upstairs and a dedicated space for extended family. In the end of the parcel, the family neighborhood could be connected units or standalone units.

Mr. Mataferry stated this is approximately a 150 acre parcel on the south side of Route 216. On the south side of the site and on the west side of the site there are some wetlands bordering the parcel. These have been flagged in 2018 and confirmed by the DEC in 2018. The bulk of the site, and even areas within the wetland buffer have been previously disturbed. They are trying to stay within that area and even reduce that disturbance as well as improve along the wetlands and wetland buffer. It will be consistent with the area. There are single family residences to the west and the town of Beekman is to the east.

Mr. Morando stated they were just here to show the Board what they are working on. They are looking forward to working with Town Staff and getting some feedback from the Building Department. They are working on their CRD plan submission and potential site plan application to go with it. They are also working on some of the environmental documents for SEQRA.

Mr. Miyoshi asked how close the rail trail is to this property. Mr. Kahn stated it is behind the adjacent property.

Mr. Eickman asked what the status of utilities was for this location. Mr. Mataferry stated they had been working with the Town and their own consultants drilling some test wells on the site and they are working with the Town looking at some sewer options as well. They need to figure those options out in order to have a plan to move forward with.

Mr. Campbell asked if the site would contain any commercial property at all. Mr. Mataferry stated there is a small commercial location proposed on the plan. They are aware there is a site down the street it does have some commercial business in it that is not doing very well. There was talk of other amenities that may be more beneficial. Mr. Campbell stated there is a blended use development in Poughkeepsie that has restaurants and some shops with residential and it seems to work well. Mr. Kahn stated the intention is to keep commercial minimal in this zoning. Mr. Campbell asked if the pools would have clubhouses. Mr. Kahn stated there would be two clubhouses; one for the adults area and one for the other two areas.

Ms. Gee asked if there was a specific way they are going to phase construction. Mr. Kahn stated that assuming all three get approved they could start simultaneously. He does believe there is a tremendous demand for all of these types housing.

Engineer Bryant asked if these were going to be private roads. Mr. Kahn said yes.

Ms. Bledsoe asked if they had any idea what the cost of the homes would be. Mr. Kahn stated building costs are increasing. Mr. Morando stated there are a variety of housing styles to hit

multiple income levels. There will also be affordable units included pursuant to code. Mr. Kahn stated the triplex units will be much cheaper than the stand-alones.

Mr. Eickman asked if they had done any other build like this. Mr. Kahn said never at this size. Because of the property size, they can keep the active adult separate. CRD allows two units per acre and they are not asking for anything additional. This is considered resort residential due to the amount and types amenities.

Mr. Eickman stated this is a very exciting project and Mr. Miyoshi stated he believes this would be something potentially great for the Town.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION made by Lori Gee, seconded by Richard Campbell, to adjourn the Planning Board meeting. Voted and carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted:

Julie J. Beyer, Meeting Secretary
East Fishkill Planning Board