

**TOWN OF EAST FISHKILL
PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

MAY 10, 2022

Planning Board Chairperson John Eickman called the meeting to order.

CHAIRPERSON COMMENTS:

- a. Mr. Eickman began the Meeting with The Pledge of Allegiance.
- b. Mr. Eickman announced that the Upcoming Meeting Dates are:
June 21, 2022 and July 12, 2022.
- c. Approval of Minutes of Meetings Held April 19, 2022:

MOTION made by Craig Arco, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to approve the Minutes of Meeting Held April 19, 2022. Voted and carried. Don Papae abstained.

- d. Roll Call:

Members present for the Roll Call were Don Papae, Craig Arco, Richard Campbell, John Eickman, Ed Miyoshi and Sarah Bledsoe. Member Lori Gee was absent.

Town Consultants present were: Michelle Robbins, Town Planner, Thomas Wood, Esq., Town Attorney, and Scott Bryant, Town Engineer.

Jackie Keenan, Planning Board Clerk was also present.

1 **Mr. Eickman made an announcement that the first item on the Agenda, the Public Hearing*
2 *for Hopewell EZ Storage Expansion, had been adjourned to the June Planning Board*
3 *meeting.*

4
5 **AJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING: - ADJOURNED TO JUNE MEETING**

6
7 **1. #2021 – 019 – Hopewell EZ Storage Expansion, 896 Route 82 (6457-02-510638)**

8
9 Applicant proposes to construct two new self-storage buildings 8,700 sf and 7,500
10 sf in size. The buildings are proposed to be located behind the existing masonry
11 building on the site.

12
13
14
15 **DISCUSSION:**

16
17
18 **2. #2021 – 013A - iPark Building A, 200 North Road (6456-03-958962).**

19
20 Applicant is seeking Site Plan approval to add a 250,000 sf furniture distribution
21 warehouse.

22
23 **Troy Wojciekofsky, Engineer with Stantec, was present.**

24
25 Mr. Wojciekofsky introduced himself and said that last month their presentation was made for
26 Ashley Furniture (“Ashley”), the tenant for the site plan. A revised set of drawings had been
27 submitted in preparation for this meeting. He said there had been a meeting with Mr. Bryant, Mr.
28 Fitzgerald and Ms. Robbins before the submission and a few items had been worked out. He
29 referred to the detailed displayed plan, saying that Site A is in the southwest corner of the iPark
30 development, It is a 250,000 sf warehouse building with the main entrance at the south end
31 where there is a canopy bump-out shown, for customer pick-up. The changes made to the plan
32 were made in light of discussions regarding parking, in particular handicapped-accessible
33 parking, with tenants in the adjacent Building 700, which is the white building shown at the top
34 of the plan. He said that all bump-outs are entrances to the different the tenants. Also, there are

1 entrances on both the south and north ends. He said last month the plan showed a row of parallel
2 parking along the back side of the drive, which he explained, was kind of awkward, and that they
3 still haven't really figured out the parking. With the input from Mr. Bryant and Brendon
4 Fitzgerald, he said they got rid of the parallel parking along the drive that runs in the front of
5 Building 700. He pointed out on the plan the parking spaces, including the handicapped, and
6 showed that were green spaces not really utilized. There are still large green areas for break time
7 for employees. He said they think this works out better and the handicapped accessible grades are
8 there, which are a long, flat sidewalk that runs along the building, saying it is no issue
9 whatsoever. Another item is that the north side parking arrangement was tweaked, which would
10 allow the truck route to the north side of the building to work a lot better. He said there was a
11 situation where the truck was the first entrance on the north and that there are not a lot of trucks,
12 but it was awkward the way it was last time, and it has since been cleaned up with it now being a
13 direct shot to the north side loading. Besides that, he said they were able to add a walkway on the
14 north side of the building near the row of trees. They worked with the access drive on the north
15 side and said they actually built the building to make it narrow to give more room for a straight
16 walkway, running east to west/up and down on the plan. He said that will be a safe walkway for
17 the employee parking area on the north side, a little remote from Building 700 and allows for
18 more trees to be put in. By removing the row of parallel parking, he said it allowed for a
19 landscaped island along there, with a row of trees. It is a lot of pavement and a lot of building
20 and there are quite a few trees now, which he said is an improvement. Mr. Fitzgerald's and Mr.
21 Moore's review letters were received, and he said there are no issues with the comments; they are
22 pretty straightforward. With respect to the ADA, he said the handicapped spaces are now located
23 closer to the entrance now that they are getting more information from the Ashley consultants as
24 far as the laid-out entrance. Christian had asked for a little more detail of the sidewalk
25 arrangements to the front entrance and handicapped accessibility. He said the grades are no issue,

1 but they do have to how a little more detail. Mr. Wojciekofsky paused, asking if the Board had
2 any questions.

3
4 Mr. Campbell asked the general construction of the building; would it be block. Mr.
5 Wojciekofsky said he did not have that answer. Mr. Campbell asked the approximate number of
6 loading docks and Mr. Wojciekofsky replied that there are 65. Mr. Campbell asked how the
7 garbage refuse would be managed; was there an area where that would be managed. Mr.
8 Wojciekofsky said that, right now, it is not shown on the plan and that some of the details are
9 still being worked out with Ashely, such as the main entrance and the location was given to them
10 right before the last presentation. He said the questions, such as the refuse, would need to be
11 shown on the plan. A good point was made that it is such a large project taking up this whole
12 parking area and that a phasing plan would have to be provided to show how access to the
13 Building 700 tenants would be maintained during the construction process. He said that Ashley
14 has a national consultant that they use and would be interacting with, prior to the next
15 submission, with more information. He said he could find out about the building construction.

16
17 Mr. Campbell said the Board would like to understand the flow of traffic; how would trucks flow
18 into the site, around the site. Based on there is tenancy in the other building, he said it is how
19 they would have 65 plus trucks rolling through there at any given time; how it would happen.

20
21 Mr. Wojciekofsky replied that all the truck traffic is basically isolated to the west side of the
22 building, plan south, with the loading docks in that area so that there is a one-way in. He said the
23 tucks will come in, circulate, go back to the loading spaces. He pointed out the one-way exit on
24 the plan and showed where tall the truck traffic would basically stay. He also showed where the
25 occasional truck that Creppini has, would go. Employee parking is basically segregated from the
26 truck traffic, and he showed the entrance for the employees and said that, basically, truck traffic

1
2 Mr. Campbell asked if the truck traffic was isolated from and would they dock into the spaces.
3 He pointed out south side, saying a lot of them were trailers, and said that delivery trucks were in
4 the spots that he pointed out.

5
6 Mr. Campbell asked about the fueling facility on the site and Mr. Wojciekofsky replied that he
7 was not aware of any fueling facility on the site.

8
9 Mr. Miyoshi noted the canopy that is put up for customer pick up and asked if they were
10 expecting customers would be coming to pick up. Mr. Wojciekofsky said it is his understanding
11 that they have that operation, but he is not sure if it is on a limited basis; he will get more
12 information. Mr. Miyoshi asked how they would get in – or out. Mr. Wojciekofsky pointed this
13 out on the plan and said he would find out the frequency of customers and if it is a usual or rare
14 thing. Mr. Miyoshi said he thought this was a rare thing and a big distribution center where they
15 would be sending out to the stores, rather than people coming in.

16
17 Mr. Arco asked if the trucks were to be screened and would there be a curtain so that the parking
18 can't be seen from the road. Mr. Wojciekofsky said he thought the spacing would diffuse through
19 there and he believes they are all deciduous trees shown on the plan. He said he does not think it
20 is to block the views, but to break it up. Mr. Arco asked if the fencing was solid, is it open. Mr.
21 Wojciekofsky replied that fencing is not shown on this plan. Mr. Arco questioned if the storage
22 trucks and distribution trucks would be parked in the spots open to iPark. Mr. Wojciekofsky said
23 at this point he would say yes, but it is a good point for him to find this out. Mr. Arco said,
24 aesthetically, attention would be paid to these, rather than looking at the back of trucks just
25 waiting to load and unload. He said, typically, the off-bay parking is what will be seen without
26 the view barrier. Mr. Wojciekofsky agreed, saying that was true, even if it is not for security, but

1 for screening. Mr. Arco said that, typically, that would be the priority and the main entrance road
2 into iPark. He added that, when one drives down that road, the backs of pick-up trucks will be
3 seen, whether dirty, rusted. He said he has seen those types of parking lots and they are typically
4 with a visual barrier there. He asked Ms. Kennan if the drawing was on the drop box yet, as he
5 had not found it. Mr. Wojciekofsky said this displayed plan is in color and nothing in color had
6 yet been provided. Mr. Papae noted the ingress and egress. Mr. Arco asked if the
7 map could be provided because they try to look at these things at home and before the meetings
8 and it would help to be able to visualize more. His understanding is that the parking for the
9 trucks, the ingress and egress for trucks, are isolated from employees and Mr. Wojciekofsky said
10 that is correct.

11
12 Mr. Campbell noted that the accessibility of 360 degrees and asked if someone could technically
13 pass through the back end of the site, into where the truck area. Mr. Wojciekofsky said the north
14 circulation on this road is for fire and access but a car could potentially go down there. Mr.
15 Campbell said the emergency egress could pass 360 and Mr. Wojciekofsky said Yes, earlier on
16 they made sure it all worked with a fire truck. Mr. Eickman asked about signage was it at the
17 entrance or on the building. Mr. Wojciekofsky replied that he would look into that, as he did not
18 have information on signage yet. Mr. Arco asked if the height of the building had been
19 established and Mr. Wojciekofsky answered that it was taller than 30 ft. He said preliminary
20 elevations had been submitted and it looked like it is 43 ft. Mr. Eickman asked about a lighting
21 plan and Mr. Wojciekofsky said it was submitted with the package. Mr. Campbell asked if the
22 elevation exceeded the existing buildings that are by it; is it similar, higher, lower. Ms. Robbins
23 said the building height is higher than some of the buildings and lower than some, but the
24 existing buildings around this are probably lower. Mr. Arco said there is the Frito Lay building,
25 which is on the opposite side. Ms. Robbins said that part of it is 80 ft and the rest of it is about 40
26 ft.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Ms. Robbins stated that she had 2 comments. One is to add a sidewalk to the crosswalk connecting to Building 700, to make it clear, because there will be trucks coming out of that area. Mr. Bryant said it is heading towards 700, but not across the service lane, in line with the stock bar. He said it would be a pedestrian access way and it just dead ends. Ms. Robbins said the issue is probably the ADA parking spaces being included in the second 45 and that, right now, there is no handicapped parking shown in the smaller satellite parking area. She said she does not know where else the parking is for the building and pointed it out on the plan. Mr. Wojciekofsky said all ADA parking is up close to the building and Ms. Robbins said she does not know if they have any parking for the building other than what is allotted right now. Mr. Bryant said that has to be cleaned up as well because right now the parking is where the improvement is proposed, for the 700 Building. Ms. Robbins said it is creating a little parking for the 700. Mr. Wojciekofsky said the parking had been submitted. Ms. Robbins pointed out and questioned the parking for Ashley. Mr. Wojciekofsky said that everything south of the tree line on the north side of the building is for Ashley. Ms. Robbins said she is not sure the 4 there are going to be enough, and Mr. Bryant said they need to be shown on the south side of the building. Mr. Wojciekofsky said there is one exiting handicapped space, but more can be striped there.

Mr. Bryant said he wanted to understand the canopy a little better. He knows that big overhead doors are show, 10 x 10, 12 x 12, large, as if a truck could be backed in and out. He said the real intent needs to be known, the customer if there are any, the extent of those customers, are they a show room. He said the true extent needs to be clearly known and how it could potentially impact the handicapped parking. He said it is presumably for employees, but maybe not, it could be customers as well, there is no sidewalk; the south side of the warehouse doesn't have a

1 sidewalk that he saw, tying into the building. Now, he said, trucks are going to be backing up and
2 it seems like there is a lot going on there. Clarity is needed so there are no conflicts there. He said
3 signage was brought up and it is the same thing, there are employees, customers, trucks and
4 signage is very important around the entire perimeter of the building to keep employees where
5 they need to be, customers and trucks where they need to be. He said there are no physical
6 barriers between these places.

7
8 Mr. Bryant brought up snow storage, asking what will be done. Mr. Wojciekofsky replied that it
9 would have to be given some thought. Mr. Bryant said there could be a lot of snow when there
10 are storms. Mr. Bryant said, for public record, that someone said the pedestrian access for the
11 new remote parking area is not going to be maintained in the winter, so why is it needed. He
12 said that is not the right approach and the right approach is that it would be maintained in the
13 winter. It would be made a condition and then it has to be figured out where the snow will be put.
14 On the north side of West Drive is where the parking area was made and then there would be the
15 pedestrian path heading back towards the 700 building, basically relocating the 700-building
16 parking area. He said the pedestrian path has to be maintained during the winter. He said
17 sidewalks were talked about, Blocks were instead proposed, but he mentions this because the
18 snow can't just be dumped into the path during the wintertime, and he said this needs to be made
19 a condition. Otherwise, this is left with people walking out where the trucks are driving, which is
20 what they are trying to avoid in the first place. Mr. Wojciekofsky said he knows it is not on the
21 plan but snow storage can be shown on the plan until it is cleared.

22
23 Mr. Bryant went through the comments from CPL, saying they were waiting on further
24 information for the wetlands. Mr. Wojciekofsky said there is the survey and that was flagged last
25 week. Mr. Bryant said there are comments on this, until the flagging is done. He said there is
26 potential for a cut & fill permit, the export area, and asked if this had progressed any. Mr.

1 Wojciekofsky replied Yes, but he did not have the number off the top of his head; he did not
2 know if it was in the response letter. There is a net cut, a net export that they will either have to
3 find a place on the site or export it. Mr. Bryant said then there is clarity needed on that. He said,
4 as far as the HVA, there were a couple of comments and, as far as trip generation, whomever is
5 doing the work on this project provided a conclusion without anything supporting as to how they
6 got there. He said they came up with so many trips per hour, but they did not use another facility
7 as a basis for how they arrived at the number. He said that is a comment. Mr. Miyoshi said that
8 would be dependent on the function and if there is some sort of display, with people coming in.,
9 that is different. Mr. Bryant said that support for that number is needed.

10

11 Mr. Bryant said there was a comment specific about truck distribution between Gate 3, Gate 5,
12 and clarification is needed on that. It is in the HVA comment letter.

13

14 Mr. Bryant asked Ms. Robbins if she was looking at land banked parking. She replied that they
15 had asked for the maximum number of employees for any given shift. She told Mr. Wojciekofsky
16 that it needs to be understood so they know if the parking needs to be built here, or if some of it
17 can be land banked. It is the maximum number of employees and if there is going to be some sort
18 of retail portion, a different parking calculation will have to be done so that a certain number of
19 spaces are set aside for retail. She said, when they met, it sounded like there was not a retail
20 portion, but it looks like now there is. Mr. Wojciekofsky said that needs clarity; he does not think
21 it is a store, per se, and that it might be a pick-up at the canopy. Ms. Robbins said it needs to be
22 understood how often that happens and Mr. Bryant added that it might affect the trip generation.
23 Ms. Robbins said, because of how tall this building is, a Special Permit will be required for the
24 height, and she told Mr. Wojciekofsky it would need to be obtained through the Town Board.

25

1 Mr. Bryant said, in finishing up about the traffic, there was a comment about a large disparity
2 within the parking location and trip generation. In the trip generation, he said the peak hourly rate
3 of less than 30 vehicles was used, but yet there are 180 parking space. He does not think the shift
4 stretches over 6 hours of people showing up for work and that is why they are saying it is a
5 disparity with a lot more employees coming in, or there are too many spaces; something is not
6 adding up. Ms. Robbins said the due diligence memo based it on 180 vehicles on the old square
7 footage of the warehouse with 180,000 sf. She said told Mr. Wojciekofsky that this was a
8 comment that went back to his traffic consultant. Some of that may be explained by the shift, but
9 she said it is the number of employees certainly. The make-up of the office needs to be
10 understood and the warehousing in there, and she said it come to a better employee count. Mr.
11 Bryant asked if there was a second story office on the inside, as they were looking at the square
12 footage and it does not add up. Looking at the plan, Mr. Bryant said it is what is included in 253
13 and what is in addition to the 254. Mr. Wojciekofsky said he would have to clarify that, but he
14 believes that the building itself, including the office, is 253,800. He is not positive that the
15 canopy is included within, and he does not have, or has not seen, the floor plan yet, to know if
16 there is a mezzanine. Mr. Bryant said it is like there is 253 floor space and 15,000 sf mezzanine
17 within the building, and that is what he is trying to determine. Mr. Wojciekofsky said he would
18 get the information for this. Mr. Bryant said, even for the whole parking, is it 253 or 253 plus –
19 the gross number is needed.

20

21 Ms. Robbins asked Mr. Wojciekofsky when she could expect the noise study; was it being done.
22 He replied that h e did not know when it would be ready, but it could be the end of this month
23 when it would be submitted. Ms. Robbins told him that information is needed before the Public
24 Hearing and the results need to be talked about before the Public Hearing can be closed, and it is
25 the timing. She said there is also the number of trucks and cumulative impact on air quality for

1 all of these trucks in one area, which probably needs to be considered, not for just this site, but
2 for all of the other trucking operations.

3

4 Mr. Bryant asked Mr. Wojciekofsky if he knew if there would be 3 shifts and Ms. Robbins said
5 she had read that too and clarity is needed. Mr. Wojciekofsky said he was not sure about that.

6

7 Mr. Arco asked if there is a Master Plan that shows everything, every development, every
8 warehouse so it can be seen. Ms. Robbins said there is a Master Parking Plan that was created.

9 Mr. Wojciekofsky said it doesn't include the site plan, but maybe that could be imported into it.

10 Mr. Arco said it would give the Board a better overlay of the whole project. Ms. Robbins said the
11 problem is these buildings have very small area of engineering where there are maybe 15
12 employees that take up a section of the building and some are old and not showing anywhere.
13 She said it is more the new stuff, except for Frito Lay is on the new parking plan.

14

15 Ms. Bledsoe asked if it was Building 700 behind this, how full was it; was it mostly occupied,
16 half.

17

18 Ms. Robbins replied that it has , a call center and Mr. Bryant said there is something on the
19 north side. Mr. Wojciekofsky said his understanding is that it is mostly occupied. Ms. Beldsoe
20 asked if this small parking lot was the only one for this building or is there parking on the other
21 side. Ms, Robbins said thee is parking on the end of the building, which can be seen at the top of
22 the site plan, but a lot of that parking is already allocated to IBM. Ms. Bledsoe questioned if this
23 was going to seriously limit the potential for additional growth if Building 700 doesn't have any
24 parking and tenants won't be able to accommodate or meet the Town's requirements because,
25 basically, all the parking is being eliminated. Mr. Wojciekofsky replied that he did not think so.
26 With their submission, he said there was the color Master Parking Plan for the whole iPark

1 campus, and it is color-coded, showing each tenant's needs. Ms. Bledsoe said but that is the
2 current tenants. Mr. Wojciekofsky said the base white means it is not allocated to a current
3 tenant, so it shows the excess spaces throughout the iPark. He said, for instance, there are excess
4 spaces in the south lot, excess spaces on the north side, which cuts off on this plan. Ms. Bledsoe
5 asked if these are locations that can serve this Building 700. Mr. Bryant said that they got a map
6 about 3 months ago that had some irregularities and it was asked for an engineer to prepare that
7 on the map. He said he has not seen that yet, but the idea is to look at that so they can actually
8 service the building. Ms. Bledsoe said it seems as though they are taking this location. Ms.
9 Robbins told her she thinks that, right now, they can demonstrate that they have the right amount
10 of parking for the uses in there. She said, when there are changes of uses in the building, then
11 depending on whether or not there are a lot of public that would be invited, or if it is
12 warehousing, it could end up straining what can be done with these buildings, based on that. She
13 said this has continuously been a comment of hers since day-one for this site. It is a risk that they
14 are willing to take because, ultimately, they will need to prove that they can actually park in any
15 of the structures. As long as they can do that, she said that is a similar comment for the studio
16 building, with the parking lot that they created. She said she was concerned with that size of a
17 building and only 100 spaces, with no idea what the use will be. Ms. Bledsoe said she worries,
18 from a long-term perspective, whether this Building 700 is full, or it is not nearly full, whatever
19 the case may be, that the Town would totally limit any potential development because the people
20 can't park that need to park there. With a building this size, and the location it is taking up, she
21 said it is massive parking, but not to say that it shouldn't. It is to make sure parking can be
22 accommodated for future development. She said the future goal is to develop this as much as
23 possible, but then if it get to a point where more building is wanted and there is no parking, it
24 would be an annoying situation to have to remedy. Mr. Wojciekofsky said he does not think this
25 is a concern; it is not a concern to the applicant. They are in here to make money and leasing
26 space out. Leasing space out is a win-win to do that so he does not think the concern that any

1 parking is going to be cut off, the future build off of Building 700, He said there is some
2 available space but he does not think it is that much. Even just looking at the parking, he said the
3 Master Plan for Parking has opportunities for the south lot to make that more efficient and add
4 spaces there. When he was researching previous site plans, he said for Creppini, it showed future
5 striping and an additional 50 spaces on the north side of the building and he said there is even
6 room to build more parking if needed to. He said the applicant is not concerned and there is the
7 opportunity to utilize Building 700 in this case.

8
9
10
11 Mr. Eickman told Mr. Wojciekofsky he had quite a few things he needed to address and asked
12 him if he would be prepared for a public hearing on June 21st. Ms. Robbins stated that they
13 would need to get a special permit from the Town Board. She said the public hearing would have
14 to be run by the Town Board to get the special permit, based on the height of this structure now.
15 Mr. Wojciekofsky asked if the Planning Board would hold a public hearing as well and Mr.
16 Miyoshi said it would probably be a joint hearing. Mr. Eickman said the Amazon matter was also
17 a joint public hearing. Mr. Eickman asked if the Planning Board would still be responsible for
18 approving the site plan. Ms. Robbins replied that it is the same model as Frito Lay, because they
19 got an economic development special permit.

20
21 Mr. Eickman said that this would need to be referred to the Architectural Review Board.

22
23 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Ed Miyoshi, to refer the**
24 **iPark Building A matter to the ARB. Voted and carried unanimously.**
25

1 Mr. Wojciekofsky asked if the Town Board would be Lead Agency and Ms. Robbins replied that
2 the Planning Board declared itself to be Lead Agency for all 3 of the iPark matters and that it just
3 needs to be certain that all is circulated. She said if a wetland becomes a concern, to let them
4 know, since it wasn't addressed the last time.

5
6 Mr. Wojciekofsky thanked the Board.

7
8
9

10
11
12
13

14 **3. #2022 – 035 – McDonald's, 967 Route 376 (6358-02-570572).**

15
16 Applicant is applying for an Amended Site Plan to add a side-by-side drive thru
17 and a Special Permit for a parking waiver to reduce the parking count by five
18 spaces.

19
20 Matthew Ingber, from Brown, Altman & Dileo, Ethan Schukoske, from Atlantic Traffic &
21 Design LLC and Alex Lomei, from Bohler Engineering were present.

22
23 Mr. Ingber said they were present for Discussion item regarding McDonald's Amended Site Plan
24 to add a side-by-side drive through, as well as for a special permit for the number of off-street
25 parking spots. He said that Alex LeMay was with him, from Bohler Engineering, the project's
26 civil engineer, and Ethan Schukoske from Atlantic Traffic & Design LLC, the project's traffic
27 engineer. He said they are willing to discuss any questions the Board may have.

1
2 Mr. Inbger noted the location of the project, saying it is in the Brookmeade Plaza at 67 Route 376
3 in Wappingers Falls. Based on their review of the Town’s records, he said this McDonald’s has
4 been operating at this site since about 1995. As can be seen on the plan, the Brookmeade Plaza,
5 including the McDonald’s, has provided a full movement driveway along the eastbound Route
6 376. He said access won’t be changing as a result of this plan and the scope of the work is limited
7 to add a side-by-side drive thru to the existing single lane drive thru. The purposed of the double
8 drive thru is to make it work more efficiently as well as cueing the drive through and improve
9 overall site circulation. He said the existing restaurant is 2,321 sf and the size ill remain the
10 same. The parking stalls are 25 and, as a result of the site improvements, he said the number of
11 stalls would be reduced to 20. The seating count is 16 seats inside, as well as possibly 20 seats on
12 the outdoor patio that are going to remain. In the existing condition, he said the cueing lane has
13 the capacity for 9 vehicles, as measured from the pick-up window, before there would be any
14 impact to site circulation or parking. The proposed side by side is going to increase that capacity
15 from 9 vehicles to 12 vehicles so more cars could stack on the north and south sides for this drive
16 thru, which will create additional spaces and improve overall circulation. He paused, saying he
17 was open to any questions and that the project engineers were going to speak in further detail.

18
19 Mr. Papae said that, at lunch time when he has passed there, cars are backed up to Rt. 376. He
20 questioned if another window to order from would improve this and asked if another pay window
21 or another pick-up window were being added. Mr. Papae asked if there was an idea of what the
22 improvement in flow would be or cars per hour. Mr. Ingber said that Mr. Schukoske, the traffic
23 engineer, would address this.

24
25 Mr. Schukoske came to the podium, and introduced himself, stating that he has a professional
26 license in the state of New York. He said they had prepared the study for the traffic, parking and

1 cueing and it does, indeed, hit its capacity for cueing, and a little bit beyond peak periods. The
2 point of the side-by-side drive thru, per their research in this area is they come up with how to
3 improve the circulation. Their research found it takes about a minute to order on the average, 30
4 seconds to pay and 30 seconds to pick up. He said, allowing 2 orders to be taken at the same time
5 improves the efficiency of the drive thru operation. His example that he gave is a likened to a
6 minivan full of kids in a single lane drive thru and order point, it can hold up the whole process,
7 where if there is another lane, traffic can continue through. In addition to the capacity
8 improvements, he said it helps with the drive thru. Mr. Papae asked the percentage of how it
9 would improve the flow; is it 25%. Mr. Schukoske said he did not have the hard numbers on him,
10 and that they had only looked at the existing cue in the observations, on a week day, mid-day, a
11 Saturday mid-day, week day evening. He said there was a total of 9 cars cued and that the
12 Town's may have more. He did not have the hard number on the net improvement and will look
13 to see if there are any nationwide studies. Mr. Papae asked if this is being done in other places
14 and Mr. Schukoske replied that it is being done everywhere; it is a pretty common thing, and one
15 was just installed in Fishkill, about 15 minutes from this. He said he would have to talk to
16 McDonald's to see if they have any before and after studies. In general, he said many fast-food
17 restaurants are employing this method to improve the efficiency of the drive thru, especially
18 through Covid and more of a demand for this, especially with the indoor seating. Mr. Miyoshi
19 commented that it would be assumed people would know how to merge, because he has seen
20 how people drive at the one in Fishkill and it can get pretty serious sometimes. Mr. Schukoske
21 said there hasn't actually been an issue with the merge and that the site engineer can speak a little
22 more to this. He said these are designed specifically so the car in the other lane can be viewed.
23 Mr. Miyoshi said it is assumed that people will do that, and Mr. Schukoske said yes, it is not like
24 they are merging at 50 mph in traffic; people are moving slow through the drive-thru. To his
25 knowledge, he said there have not been issues with collisions in the drive-thrus and reiterated
26 that they are specifically designed to view the car next to one in a safe manner. Mr. Papae said he

1 guessed it depends on how hungry the drivers are and Mr. Campbell added, or how the kids are
2 screaming. He said in the initial, it was talked about decreasing the actual parking space, but no
3 decrease in capacity inside or outside the restaurant.

4
5 Mr. Campbell asked how this would affect the original site plan that there are approvals on and
6 he questioned how the Board would address this, moving forward. Ms. Robbins commented that
7 this is just shy 4 parking spaces; they are losing 5, but 4 were required. She asked Mr. Schukoske
8 when he did the capacity studies, were they looking at the parking studies at the same time. Mr.
9 Schukoske said yes, and they were looking at the same times and the study was submitted and
10 reviewed by an outside consultant. There was a maximum of 16 stalls found with 4 reserve
11 supply. He said they also looked at studies done prior to Covid, in 2017 – 2020. The looked at 10
12 McDonald’s restaurants in New York and they didn’t average the parking for the 10 restaurants,
13 but actually came up with a maximum of 16. Ms. Robbins said she was going on comments from
14 Brendan (Fitzgerald) and that the Planning Board had considered to look at, with the potentials as
15 well. She said if there is a concern about the parking, they were asked to landbank some of the
16 parking, because there is space on the site to do this. Mr. Campbell asked if these numbers
17 include actual staff because he knows there is the average number of employees inside the
18 restaurant at any time, and does it increase the necessity to park, beyond the customers’
19 requirements too. Mr. Schukoske said he did not have the number of employees, he was sure
20 that the attorney does, and he can get that. He does not believe that the proposed use would
21 increase the number of employees. Mr. Campbell said no, that is now what he is saying. It is that
22 the parking is being affected by adding this additional drive thru traffic lane and spaces are being
23 decreased. He questioned if anything else had changed, inside the restaurant, the capacity has not
24 been increased, the number of employees who will work inside the store has not been increased.
25 He said his initial concern every time when an approval was already given is, on a site like this,
26 when parking is decreased and the need has not been decreased, the square footage and existing

1 seating, it becomes an issue. He said part of it is that it is a heavy flow, and he has been by this
2 McDonald's quite a bit and kudos to them, but if the footprint is going to change and parking is
3 decreased, then there should be some type of allotment made or maybe expansion of the parking
4 to be put back, that they are at the capacities and to have that available. Mr. Schorske said that
5 Mr. Lomei could talk to the land banking. He said parking counts were done at this particular
6 location and it was found that the demand was 16, which is below the 20 proposed. Mr.
7 Campbell said he understands the study, but the study and what was already given to this, as an
8 existing layout, it is changing in that it is decreasing. He said there is always a concern Just as the
9 last proposal, as big as a site can be, he said parking is always a concern, especially when it is in
10 a plaza. As in a previous comment, he said there are cars that have come out. He said the
11 additional drive thru is all right but that he definitely thinks that the parking should really be
12 looked at closely with the parking not decreasing. He said he understands they did the
13 calculations, but the Boar is going on what is existing and there now. The proposes is to shrink
14 and he said they should be looking at trying at least put back, rearrange what is already there, to
15 the comment of both things.

16

17 Mr. Arco asked when the study had been performed and Mr. Schukoske said it was done in
18 April, 2022. Mr. Arco said that, in summer, the parking is full; the outside seating is full and that
19 McDonald's pulls off the rail trail. He added that, on a normal lunch day, the line is out to Route
20 376. He said it is only the 3-car benefit of having the duo and there are 6 more cars out on the
21 street. Mr. Schukoske said that is understood and he will talk with the client about follow up
22 studies, as needed. Mr. Arco said the studies should be staggered, off-peak, when kids are not out
23 eating a lot, then all of a sudden, families are coming in. There are people who come and sit and
24 eat at the picnic tables, which eats up parking. He added that 16 parking spots is not a lot for that
25 area and corrected himself to say 20. Mr. Schukoske said they could do a summer count.

1 Regarding the drive thru, he said it is not just the capacity but the efficiency. Mr. Arco said there
2 is still the choke point though and Mr. Schukoske said he understands.

3
4 Mr. Campbell asked if there were still 36 tables: 30 outside and 16 inside. It is total seating. Mr.
5 Schukoske said they can work with McDonald's about the seating and look at coming back at
6 some point.

7
8 Mr. Lomei came to the podium and introduced himself, saying he wanted to address the
9 efficiency piece of the drive-thru. He said that, not just for this site, but other McDonald's
10 typically have the one order board. When people go from that to the during configuration, they
11 see roughly 100% in the efficiency and orders are processed twice as fast. He said the choke
12 point is the order taking, with mom or dad and kids on their way home, 6 kids trying to order
13 things, and that can take a long time. With the side-by-side drive thru, he said the cool thing is
14 when the one is trying to take the order, they can switch over to the other one to continue to take
15 the orders, which facilitates this process He said the choke up may feel like it is the pay window
16 or pick up window, but it is really the order board. When waiting for their order, he said there are
17 2 pull forward spaces, they can pull away from the window, park and when the order is ready, the
18 other employee can run it out to that person. He reiterated the 2 pull forward spaces, 2 mobile
19 order spaces, like curb-side pick-up, which most are familiar with now, after the pandemic. He
20 said that all goes into the efficiency, and he would hope that it does not still back up onto Route
21 376, with the increase and efficiency of the drive thru driveway. He wanted to give more context
22 of the efficiency and how quickly they can get cars through the drive thru in that situation. From
23 the merging perspective, he said, in theory, they are alternating how the orders are being taken
24 from the 2 order points. If someone is now finished with their order, they are now pulling up into
25 the lane and the other person is then placing their order. The primary lane can still be held up and
26 people have to merge, but he said the alternating of taking the orders does help with the merging

1 situation. Mr. Papae asked if 2 people could operate the same ordering and Mr. Lomei said they
2 can't, in peak times have people operating the orders at the same time. There can be 2 people
3 operating taking orders, but typically, it is at non-peak time they will alternate. They have that
4 option, if it is middle summer or lunch time Sunday after a baseball game, they can go through
5 that process.

6
7 Ms. Bledsoe asked if there were 4 order boards, or 2 and Mr. Lomei replied that it is the menu
8 board and, prior to them, there is a pre order board., which has menu items to look at and browse,
9 prior to getting to the full menu board. Ms. Bledsoe asked how much further back toward the
10 driveway will the ordering now be. It is 2 cars instead of 1, but she said it is also back a lot
11 further. She thought the current ordering is around the corner and Mr. Lomei replied that it is the
12 close to the turn and, in its current condition, it is set further back maybe less than 10 ft; it is
13 McDonald's general geometry from a distance, where they meet the pavement and pull back to
14 allow for proper spacing of the vehicle, from the paying to the actual order itself. He added that it
15 is a little further back. M. Bledsoe said it is eliminating the space, from the ordering to the
16 driveway. She said she didn't know how many car lengths were being cut off, even with adding
17 the widths. Mr. Lomei replied that, if he moves it back 5 ft, he loses 5 ft. from cars stacking,
18 coming into the driveway. He said it probably isn't a car length and will be minimal from that
19 perspective. The car is spacing pretty much the same and there is the benefit of the 3 additional
20 cars that would save, with the 2 lanes. He said this is prior to even backing up into the entrance
21 coming into the center of the shopping center. Mr. Campbell said that is probably all on the
22 property that is taking place. Mr. Ingber said it is closer to the corner of the building. Mr. Lomei
23 said it is the difference of how far away it is from the pay window, further back of the drive thru.
24 Mr. Miyoshi asked if there would still be room for people to drive around that, without being in
25 that line. Mr. Lomei said if one doesn't want to do the drive thru and park on the south side there
26 is the 18 ft pass lane that goes all around the building and on the south side it expands up to 19 ft.

1 On the east, west side, back around the building is over 20 ft. Mr. Campbell said then it is never
2 less than 18 all the way around.

3
4 M. Bledsoe asked if the mobile order pick up counted as parking spaces and if they are signed as
5 parking spaces. Mr. Lomei replied that the parking mobile spaces are counted in the 20. Mr.
6 Arco said, on a normal busy day, those 4 spots are full and the 2 that are right near the window
7 are full. Mr. Lomei said, with it being a mobile order, he would expect people are cycling in and
8 out of there, for sure, on a busy day. Ms. Bledsoe said then there are really 16 parking spaces and.
9 Mr. Lomei replied that if it was for people to park and enter into the restaurant, then yes. Ms.
10 Bledsoe asked the number of employees Mr. Lomei said he would want to say that on a
11 maximum shift, it is 12 but that he would get a better number, for sure. He added that for the
12 discussion on land banking, If it gets back to 24, which is what is required per the Town’s Code.
13 He said he thinks that certainly can be done and that when it is looked at, they maybe would be
14 put back on the south side. He said he is just introducing this and wants to look at impervious
15 surface, so, he just wanted to be sure he was not introducing anything from a stormwater
16 perspective. He said the parking spaces can e accommodated, and he thinks they are reducing the
17 impervious surface with this layout, by a little over 300 sr. He said it is not much, but he wanted
18 to balance this out and didn’t want an issue from a stormwater perspective. Mr. Campbell said
19 that is very little to give, to get and then there is no real significant change to the parking; they
20 will have the flow that they are looking for. He said that these businesses recently do well with
21 the drive-thrus and he sees the activity here; he passes by this on a daily basis and that it would
22 be nice to see, especially because there is the continuing path around that doesn’t decrease
23 below 18 ft., which he feels is very important too, from the emergency perspective.

24
25 Ms. Bedsoe asked where the deliveries are and Mr. Lomei responded that he thought deliveries
26 were on the east side and now, in the current condition, they would probably be on the south side,

1 near the track enclosure. He added that, for the 10-15 minutes of unloading, there would be a
2 hold up with people doing the bypass with the drive thru and if going around may have some
3 kind of issue there. He was thinking that, in the proposed condition, on the east side of the
4 property, they would pull as far forward as they can to get into the 2 parking stalls that are there.
5 When there is an unload, the bypass lane may get jammed up with a delivery that takes 10-15
6 minutes. He said he would talk with McDonald's about the timing of the deliveries, to make sure
7 they are not impeding at all.

8
9 Ms. Robbins asked where they were thinking of doing the land banking and she pointed it out the
10 area in the site, on the plan. Mr. Lomei said that was his thought, but he could look at other
11 options. Ms. Robbins said she does not know where the door is for the deliveries, but it makes
12 sense to maybe have a pull-out space for a truck on that side and she pointed out her suggestion
13 for the land banked parking. Mr. Lomei said Yes, on the east side and some sort of angle could
14 be done for the land banked. Ms. Bledsoe said she does not see how the parking lines up. Ms.
15 Robbins showed where the pull out could be for the truck and where other spaces could be.

16
17 Mr. Arco asked how many spaces he had and Mr. Lomei replied that it was 12. Mr. Arco said that
18 is like 12 vehicles; the kids who work there bring their own cars. Mr. Lomei said he would ask
19 the franchise operator about that situation because, sometimes they get rides and are dropped off.
20 He said he understands the need to know the number of spaces taken up by employees, and that it
21 is a good point. Mr. Arco said they really can't park across the service road because that is
22 someone else's parking. Ms. Bledsoe said if there are 12 employees and 6 don't drive right now,
23 the 6 not driving can't be banked on and it should be banked on 12 employees being able to park.
24 Mr. Lomei said he understands. As everyone has seen, it has been fully parked in the summer and
25 the only thing he can say is that McDonald's has seen the trend of everyone wanting to use the
26 drive thru. They are using that more with the 2 lanes and if there isn't the backup onto Route 376,

1 he aid they will be more inclined to use the drive thru. That is not to say the parking for people
2 who use the restaurant should shrink, but the trend is going more towards using the drive thru.
3 He said that typically, McDonald's does 1 parking space for every 2 to 3 seats. If the outdoor
4 seating is counted, he said the demand would 15 or 16 spaces. He told the Board they have seen
5 it and it is worse, full n the summertime, and this would be the only thing he can say is it is
6 usually 1 space for every 2 to 3 seats that they would account for, from a demand perspective.

7

8 Mr. Bryant asked where the septic is and Mr. Lomei said it is near the land banking and he would
9 need to evaluate if parking spaces should be over that. He thinks the current parking spaces are
10 over a septic tank and leach fields; that is what he wants to evaluate when looking at the land
11 banked parking. Mr. Bryant said, by extending the window to the west, the existing door on the
12 south side of the building, is that locked, being moved, or is there no conflict with that. Mr.
13 Lomei responded that there is no conflict with the existing door. Mr. Bryant referred to past the
14 refuse area and asked what that is on the east side. Mr. Lomei said it is just grass and some trees
15 back there. Mr. Bryant said he is thinking in Wappingers, one has to go all the way around the
16 building to get to the drive thru and the traffic is looped around. He said that would eliminate any
17 backup immediately onto Route 376. Instead of bringing the entrance where it currently is, go
18 right to the window. It is a lot of blacktop but, if there is another loop around, in that space, so
19 that one actually circles the building and comes into the aisle, it would completely eliminate any
20 backup to Route 376. He said the stormwater has to be evaluated to see if it has to be treated. It
21 may help with the truck deliveries too. Right now it is splitting and a loop could be made around
22 the building, which takes all that backup right out of it. Mr. Lomei said he prefers not to do that,
23 just from the introduction and it is an expense. Mr. Bryant said it solves the problem. Mr. Lomei
24 thinks the increase in efficiency with the side by side, at the peak times, is drastic. He said he
25 hears this and agrees, but it is the increase in efficiency for the processing of the orders, and

1 getting cars processed in the drive thru that will help. He said it is either not out to 376 or they
2 can get through the process almost twice as fast.

3
4 Mr. Eickman asked if there were any further comments or questions from the Board Members or
5 Professionals.

6
7 Ms. Bledsoe said, going off the deliveries, the potential truck will just sit there and block the only
8 way around for potentially 15 minutes and she does not think that is acceptable. If there was an
9 emergency and someone had to get through, she said there is literally no where to go. Even if
10 there is a person experiencing an emergency, she said they are literally stuck for 15v minutes, or
11 waiting for someone to let them into the drive thru. It sounds like a disaster waiting to happen
12 and she said there has to be a better way to get the deliveries in where there isn't a truck blocking
13 the only pass through. Mr. Lomei said he would talk to the operator and believes that is the only
14 way that it occurs now, but he is saying that is not okay. He will see what the options are, from a
15 delivery perspective. A smaller truck could be used of they could find a better spot to load and
16 unload their trucks that don't block a bypass, or at least for a car 10 ft could get around n that
17 situation.

18
19 Mr. Campbell asked about the off-peak and how it would be monitored. Mr. Wood said they
20 need smaller trucks.

21
22 Mr. Eickman asked if this would be ready for a Public Hearing next month and Ms., Robbins
23 said they need to see some changes to the site plan. Mr. Eickman asked Mr. Lomei if those are
24 changes, he can made in time for the next meeting (June 21st). He asked how far from then
25 would the Town need to see the plans. Ms. Robbins said soon, by the end of this month (May
26 31st). Mr. Lomei said they would work towards this.

1
2 Mr. Eickman asked for a Motion to schedule the Public Hearing, but then asked that it be
3 stricken, as Ms. Robbins suggested that this be revised first, and then they could come back for
4 the Public Hearing since there may be significant changes, with the traffic and the parking. She
5 said this could actually come back for another Discussion, to show what the changes are and if
6 they have given the information that was asked for.

7
8 Mr. Eickman thanked the gentlemen and they thanked the Board.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

SKETCH PLAN:

17

18

19

4. #2022 – 036 – MBC Properties, Lime Kiln Rd (6455-00-265426).

20

21

Proposed contractors’ yard in the I-1 zone with a 40' X 60' foot pre-fab metal building with 4 bays; a total of 6 parking spaces have been shown as well as a 20,500 sf material stockpile and processing area.

22

23

24

25

Brian Stokosa, Day & Stokosa Engineer was present.

26

27

28

Mr. Stokosa displayed the plan and introduced himself. He said he wanted to get some initial input from the Board for the Sketch Plan application for the contractor storage unit, which is at the end of Donovan Drive, at the cul de sac. There are 2 lots that exit right now that are vacant and he said they are looking to the cul de sac to the southwest. There is a parcel in between the applicant’s parcel right now, the Bright Horizons Daycare is almost diagonal from the site. The applicant wants to do a contractor storage and processing facility. Off to the side is a 40 x 60 pre-

29

30

31

32

1 manufactured metal building and within the building there would be an office for the applicant.
2 The building would be to store vehicles onsite and also to have a processing component with it.
3 He said they understand that this component would be subject to the criteria in the Zoning Code,
4 which makes relief for the ZBA. When speaking to the processing, he said the applicant would
5 first of all like to get clarification from the Board. He has some logs that he would like to bring
6 into the site, process it for firewood and then resell offsite. There would be a wood processor
7 onsite and the way he looks to the Zoning Code, he said it speaks to the processing as being rock,
8 concrete, and it does not speak to the processing of logs. The question for the Board is if the
9 processing of firewood would be pushed to the ZBA for that processing relief – or is it just
10 subject to concrete and stone. He said that, ultimately, the applicant would like to proceed with
11 the ZBA for the question of cleaning concrete and stone. The processing is limited. It is a rented
12 piece of equipment, and they would like to maximize the use of that. It may be twice, three times
13 a month, but it ultimately is not a daily operation. The applicant would bring material in, let it
14 stockpile, then process and sell it. In the processing and vehicle storage area that can be seen on
15 the sketch plan, he said there is an area that is cross hatched. That area would be gravel and, he
16 said, the way the site looks right now is that it goes up in elevation, from the cul-de-sac area to
17 the back of the property. It is probably 25 ft from elevation going up. Where the cross-hatched
18 area is, he said that would be bringing the site down about 14 ft so they would be lowering it. He
19 said there is a residential component that abuts the property and, following the Code, they have
20 provided screening around the back with an evergreen tree. They would come in, showing the
21 tree line about 15 ft in and drainage would be directed around the site. Toward the lower portion
22 of the site, he said the evergreen planting would continue around the southwestern side of the
23 property. Along the property line between the applicant’s property and the vacant piece to the
24 east, they are showing an elevated berm of about 4 ft. Continuing the evergreen spacing, he said
25 it creates a landscaping buffer and berm buffer, from the contractor storage area. As one makes
26 way around, he said there would be a gate that is offset into the other parcel that will be

1 mechanical, fire activated with a radio and the gate would open up, provide security, and also a
2 visual turn coming into the site. As one makes way into the site, shown on the left on the plan,
3 there is a paved area, with parking in the front. The applicant's business is to have the machines
4 offsite and, if they are not working on a job, they would bring them back. He said there would be
5 under 10 vehicles onsite, and the focus is to have them operating, and not stored onsite. There is
6 no maintenance onsite, and all maintenance is offsite. Some of the smaller equipment would have
7 the ability to be located in the 20 x 40 building. The layout of the site is that there would a well to
8 the southeastern portion of the property, on the uphill side. There is the processing building, and
9 the office, bathroom and making the way down, he said within the cul de sac area there would be
10 stormwater management facility. On a typical site plan, he said they will provide a SWPP, area of
11 disturbance, stormwater management, lighting plan and landscaping plan. He said what they are
12 showing is a concept of how this site would be developed, starting from the bottom, and working
13 their way to the top, with separations. He said that is how they did the building configuration, and
14 they are sensitive to the fact that there is a Daycare in the Industrial Zone. When looking at the
15 Industrial Zone, he said it does not permit Daycare, however, it is there. As a preemptive measure
16 and the applicant's due diligence, he said they met onsite. The applicant did take into
17 consideration that sensitive use on the side. That is why the building was positioned more
18 towards the Daycare, so that an additional buffer can be created for any noise. The applicant did
19 reach out to the Daycare director, met and walked through the daycare with the director explained
20 the use and what they are doing and the nature of the business. He said the director was
21 encouraged because this use was coming because the kids would get excited to see yellow
22 machines coming through the development. She was positive that the kids could see what is
23 going to be and the changes. Mr. Stokosa said this obviously not be when they are working on it.
24 He said it was encouraging, they are sensitive to this and the director indicated that there is the
25 quiet time between 1 and 3, which the applicant is sensitive to. A lot of the operation that is
26 onsite is limited to capacity as the offsite, so there would be limited wood cutting, wood

1 processing onsite, a temporary stockpile of that wood. He said it is a processing machine that
2 goes on the stockpile and has the ability to breathe, moisture gets released and then it is sold
3 offsite. He said the grading on the site, in the cross hatched area, is being brought down. They
4 will be into the ZBA for moving material offsite, where they are in excess of the 375 cubic yard
5 threshold. The thought process is forming that area is obviously to sell the topsoil to local
6 vendors, suppliers and, as the site moves on into creation, that material would be sold or used on
7 other projects in the area. He said the applicant is sensitive to heavy truck traffic on the
8 residential road, so the proximity to Route 84 and some of the major state roads in the area
9 facilitates the movement of the material away from a residential zone. He said they have talked
10 about that with the applicant and the export of the material would be made as part of the site
11 plan.

12

13 Mr. Stokosa said he was just trying to give the Board an overview of what the applicant is
14 looking for, the additional processes and the relief that they would like to see from the ZBA. He
15 asked if there were any questions and said he would try to answer them best he can.

16

17 Mr. Campbell asked, based on the fact that it was mentioned there is processing beyond the logs,
18 how the incoming material would be monitored, that it is not coming from a waste site. He asked
19 if permitting would be required for this operation, beyond this Board, this municipality, for them
20 to operate this type of business. Mr. Stokosa said obviously, it behooves the applicant to process
21 clean material on the site. In other applications, he said there have been provisions on the site
22 plan where inspections can be made by the Building Department, to look at the material. He said
23 that, typically, the applications he has done in other towns, is a simple “sniff-test” of using the
24 equipment to see if there are anything associated with contaminated debris. They would gear the
25 plan so there is a mechanism for this so contaminated debris would not be on the site. Mr.
26 Campbell deferred to the Professionals, asking if there was a requirement beyond that. Mr.

1 Wood responded that it would be in the zoning process and asked how much material would be
2 activated on the site. Mr. Stokosa replied that, to create the site, they are at 1900 yards to have
3 the processing area seen in the cross hatched area on the plan and they are over the 375 (cubic
4 yards) threshold. They are going to be raising the building and using material onsite to meet the
5 stormwater thresholds. They are working their way down to be sure they have treatment and
6 outlet. The building has to be raised slightly from where they are showing it, which will facilitate
7 working through the stormwater management system. Earth berms are also being created around,
8 from the septic area to the entrance and he said there will be a 4 ft high earth berm, with trees on
9 top.

10

11 Mr. Arco said topsoil is being removed and, if he was not mistaken, there is a lot of rock there.
12 He asked how the rock would be removed. Mr. Stokosa said from the soil investigations that
13 they've had worked on the site next door, they had deep test pits that were done adjacent to the
14 septic system that is shown for this plan, on the vacant lot. The soil lines were down 14 ft. from
15 the property line, and he said he anticipates this to be the same on the applicant's parcel. Based
16 upon the spoil mappings that they've looked at, he said it is part of the stormwater and due
17 diligence; soil information will be provided. Mr. Arco questioned no blasting, chipping,
18 hammering because there is the concern about noise control, dust control, especially with the
19 occupancy that is there. Mr. Stokosa said they are sensitive to it, Yes.

20

21 Mr. Miyoshi asked, with the material stockpiled, was it just going to be a pile of material just
22 sitting there. Mr. Stokosa replied that it will be a pile of wood that was processed and there will
23 probably be stockpiles of material. As far as material onsite, he said this would probably be
24 phased over time but, yes, there will be material onsite. DEC requires that the material on the
25 ground hasn't been used or active for more than 14 days that it does have to be stabilized. Water
26 is being diverted around the site and he said they show the low part for the parcel where there is a

1 triangle that is cross hatched on the plan. There will be sediment basing and they anticipate that
2 the groundwater is slightly elevated in that area. The thought process was, in order to control
3 dust, there would be the ability to draw from that and keep the material stockpiles moistened, to
4 lessen the dust that could form. He said that typically DEC regulations are being followed and if
5 not disturbed for more than 14 days, it has to be temporarily stabilized to limit that. Mr. Miyoshi
6 asked if there would be a type of security system around this, as houses are mentioned and with a
7 pile of material, as when he was a kid, there could be kids playing on it. Mr. Stokosa replied,
8 from an access standpoint, that, along the vacant property to the west, there will be a berm with
9 trees on it, there will be a gate at the entrance that will be to Fire Department standpoints.
10 Regarding security, he said he would assume the applicant would have cameras with the
11 construction equipment there. Being there is a significant turn from Donovan Drive side, to get
12 into the site, he said one would really have to cross the berm to get in there to access the site.
13 They are hoping that would be deterrent enough but if the Board would like to see something
14 additional, he said they can certainly explore it. On the residential side, on the back side, he said
15 there is such a cut, to get a piece of equipment out of there; from a grade standpoint, he said it
16 would deter equipment coming through the backside. Mr. Arco asked if it was steep enough that
17 someone could fall. Mr. Stokosa replied that it is 2 and 1 and will require some erosion control as
18 far as stabilization but not an endangerment as to an injury or falling down. He said it is typical
19 on onsite plans. At its highest point, he said it is probably 12 ft. and, as far as cut, it is maybe 14
20 ft towards the back. The distance that will show in a future application will be with the aerials.
21 When looking at the residential component, he said it is more towards the east, a couple hundred
22 feet and he believes it is pretty heavily wooded. A ditch line comes down the fetes from the
23 mountain towards the bottom of Lime Kiln Road.

24

25 Mr. Eickman asked Mr. Stokosa about the stone and concrete processing and if it was a crushing
26 operation. Mr. Stokosa said Yes. Mr. Eickman said then this will be a tall piece of equipment

1 with conveyer belts and Mr. Stokosa said that is right; it is a rental piece, so it won't be onsite.
2 He said the object is to typically have the machines offsite; that is how they make their money.
3 He said there will be a period where the material will be brought in, crushed, and the piece of
4 equipment would be moved offsite as it is mobile. Mr. Arco asked if it was separating the rebar
5 from the concrete or just making it smaller. Mr. Stokosa thinks it is just crushing and said he was
6 not sure that they get into rebar removal, but he will look into this. Mr. Arco said the concern
7 with that would be dust control and also noise. He asked how the neighbor time of 1 to 3 would
8 get policed. Mr. Stokosa said it is to the applicant's benefit to be sensitive to the neighbors. If
9 there is a violation to the site plan, he said, as far as the enforcement capability, it is enforced. If a
10 violation is found, he said there is a process for that.

11
12 Mr. Eickman asked the typical decibel level for a crushing operation and Mr. Stokosa replied that
13 he would get and provide that information, with the decibels at different levels and the proximity
14 to the Daycare, as well as the residential component. He said the Daycare building is positioned
15 on their lot, the buildings on the front and side, and their outdoor activities are behind the
16 building. He said they actually have a buffer; the building acts as a buffer, not to say that
17 processing doesn't have noise with it. He reiterated that he would get the decibel levels.

18
19 Mr. Bryant asked if consideration had been made for alarms on the backup equipment as well
20 and Mr. Stokosa replied that would be talked about.

21
22 Ms. Robbins said that, basically, the Planning Board can't make any decisions on this because
23 this Board does not have jurisdiction over the use that is wanted – the vehicle storage,
24 potentially, but the processing materials; that would have to go to the ZBA.

25

1 Mr. Stokosa asked if, procedurally, to initiate the ZBA process, did he need a recommendation
2 from the Planning Board in order to go to the ZBA for that – and then come back to the Planning
3 Board. Mr. Wood said No.

4
5

6 Mr. Stokosa said he appreciated the input and that he will be in touch.

7
8 Mr. Eickman confirmed that there was no other business to be brought before the Planning Board
9 this evening.

10
11
12
13
14

15
16 **ADJOURNMENT**

17
18 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Ed Miyoshi, to adjourn the**
19 **Planning Board meeting. Voted and carried unanimously.**

20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Respectfully submitted: _____
Kathleen Mahodil, Meeting Secretary
East Fishkill Planning Board