

**TOWN OF EAST FISHKILL
PLANNING BOARD SPECIAL MEETING
APRIL 19, 2022**

John Eickman called the meeting to order.

Members present:

Craig Arco, John Eickman, Lori Gee, Ed Myoshi, Sarah Bledsoe; Scott Bryant, Engineer; Michelle Robbins, Planner; Brandan Fitzgerald, Traffic Engineer, Christian Moore, Engineer; Matt Rickett, Zoning Administrator; 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, May 10, 2022, and June 21, 2022.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

March 29, 2022

Motion made by Lori Gee, seconded by Ed Myoshi, to approve the minutes of the March 29, 2022 meeting. Voted and carried unanimously.

EXTENSIONS:

#2020-35 –Stone Ridge Commons, Route 52 and Palen Road (6356-04-731304/776321)

Stone Ridge Commons received conditional final approval to construct two 3-story multi-family apartment buildings with 51 units and associated parking in a B1-A zone at the May 2021 Planning Board meeting. The applicant previously received a 6-month extension at the November 2021 Planning Board meeting which is expiring May 2022. Applicant is looking for a 6-month extension from May 2022 through Nov 2022. The applicant is working on finalizing sewer and water improvements.

No one was present.

Mr. Eickman stated this application has had no changes. The request is to have a six-month extension until November, 2022.

RESOLUTION EXTENDING FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL

NAME OF SITE PLAN: STONE RIDGE COMMONS APARTMENTS
NAME OF APPLICANT: 1525 Route 52 Partners LLC
LOCATION: Route 52 and Palen Road, Hopewell Junction, NY
GRID NUMBERS: 132800-6356-04-731304/776321

Resolution Offered by Planning Board Member: John Eickman

WHEREAS, Stone Ridge Commons Apartments was granted final approval on May 18, 2021 to allow the development of 51 apartments in two 3-story multi-family apartment buildings, 105 parking spaces, stormwater management practices, and associated site amenities on two parcels totaling 6.65 acres (Lot 22 is 3.24 acres and Lot 23 is 3.43 acres) located at Route 52 and Palen Road; and

WHEREAS, the applicant is requesting a 6-month extension to November 18, 2022 to complete the required Town sewer and water improvements; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby extends final approval for the Site Plan titled “Stone Ridge Commons” prepared by Day & Stokosa Engineering, P.C., dated 9/27/19 and last revised 4/19/21 subject to the applicant meeting the final site plan conditions contained within the May 18, 2021 resolution of site plan approval; and

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 Lori Gee

The votes were as follows:

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

At this point the applicants for iPark asked if they could do their applications together, with the application for Building A to go first. Mr. Eickman said they would take the Public Hearing application first then.

ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING:

#2021 – 019 – Hopewell EZ Storage Expansion, 896 Route 82 (6457-02-510638)

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

Mr. Eickman stated this application has been adjourned until May.

PUBLIC HEARING:

2022-029 – Estates at Phillips Farm

Applicant has submitted for an 11-lot subdivision for an existing 13.37-acre parcel.

Brian Stokosa was present.

**Motion made by Lori Gee, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to re-open this Public Hearing.
Voted and carried unanimously.**

Mr. Stokosa stated this application was before the Board last month. This is on the west side of

Route 82 at Phillips Farm. This is a 13-acre piece directly across from the existing farmhouse. It is in the R1 zone. They're looking to do a residential subdivision with single-family houses. To gain access into the piece there will be a 500-foot-long road that will be dedicated to the Town ending in a cul-de-sac. The environmental land analysis shows this land having a steep slopes, wetlands, and a dimensional analysis. This parcel could theoretically have 13 lots. This application is only proposing 11 lots. The lots will be accessed off of the Town road and one parcel will be accessed off of Route 82. The area of disturbance is slightly over 6 acres across the 13-acre parcel. They are proposing individual septic. Soil tests have been done and witnessed by the Department of Health so they are moving ahead with the design for the septic systems. This parcel is located in the Hopewell North Water District. They do know that there is central water running along the corridor. The applicant is aware that they are proceeding at their own risk with respect to water. Their objective is that when the district gets turned over to the Town, the applicant would access that water line with an 8 inch main extension into the cul-de-sac. Ultimately, they cannot get final subdivision approval until they have access to water. They do have a storm water management plan being put together with a full erosion and sediment control plan. They have done soil testing for the storm water aspect of it following the DEC protocol. They will try to treat on-site individually at each household and then at the bottom of the road at the entrance along Route 82, where there will be a surface storm water treatment chamber system to mitigate any peak increases. At the last meeting they discussed threatened and endangered species. They have been in contact with Mike Newicki and they will be doing their EAS along with his assessment report, which will be handed in at the end of this month. They do know that the Public Hearing has to be open to the noticing requirements. They will have all of the documentation they need at the May meeting.

They did try to keep the development in towards the proposed town road. If you drive down Route 82 there are some trees that are down. That is not part of this project. There are three individual lots owned by individual LLC's independently. They are in the process of obtaining a building permit as well. There are some comment letters from consultants that they went over at the last meeting. They will respond to those comments. They are still working on the SWPPP and erosion control and they will also be submitted if they are done this month. Comments from HVEA will be addressed regarding profile alignments. They did have a meeting with the DOT two weeks ago and went over sight distances. DOT did say that they were adequate but he will get that formalized. They also have a permit submission to DOT and he will carbon copy Mr. Fitzgerald with that information.

Ms. Gee stated they had talked about squaring up some of those lots. Mr. Stokosa stated they will adjust all of those changes for the May meeting submission.

Mr. Miyoshi asked if they had any idea when water would be approved. Engineer Bryant asked if the applicant intended to bring natural gas to the site. Mr. Stokosa stated they would if it was available. They have not gotten far enough in the process to discuss that with Central Hudson yet. Engineer Bryant asked if there were curb box locations and, if so, they need to not be in the driveways. He stated that the applicant is proceeding at their own risk in regard to water. The Department of Health is having more stringent regulations in regard to their water systems than the Town and applicants originally thought. At this point engineer Bryant is not able to answer the question as to when the applicant could expect to get water.

Mr. Eickman asked if there was anyone from the public to speak for or against this application. He also stated that they have received an e-mail which he read. That letter stated they believe the subdivision should be limited to 4-5 houses at most for several reasons. The letter can be found in the Planning Department for anyone who wants to review it.

Gregory Seifert stated that the over development in the area saddens him. This will put additional strain on the electric and water in the area. There will be an increase in cars that will require the road be widened. He presented a drawing to the Board with his suggestion for what should happen on that land.

Ernest Suter stated his property touches the property they are building on. He stated all three parcels are owned by the same person. There are thousands of bats and hawks in his yard due to the trees that were cut down on one parcel. He is not sure if they are Indiana Bats but would not be surprised if they are. They just had their water systems put in and don't want to see a strain on them. He feels the applicant is building way too many houses in his backyard. Traffic will be crazy. He feels it should be scaled back to a maximum of seven or eight houses combined between all three lots.

John Garbowski asked if there were any environmental impact studies done in regard to traffic or water. He asked if the septic system will be able to handle the supply demand. Engineer Bryant stated the application will not be approved as it is designed unless the system has enough capacity

for it. He stated at this time there is a certain reserved amount for existing lots. These are above and beyond that. Mr. Grabowski asked if they would be putting lights on Route 82 in the area at the farm. Mr. Fitzgerald stated the estimated traffic from this application is not estimated to reach the threshold required for that. Generally, they estimate it to be one car per single-family home during peak hour. In general, that needs to raise to 75 to 100 cars to generate a traffic study to have the DOT look at it. The applicant will have to get a permit from DOT so they will look at traffic and safety of the road at that point.

Branden Higgins stated there were a bunch of trees taken down and two days later there was a stop work order. He wants to know if it is the same person that is proposing this application. He also asked what the square footage of these houses would be. He stated three or four houses on the North end of that lot are in a very flat area. He asked what kind of drainage will be in there to guarantee there is no flooding of their yards or septic. Mr. Eickman stated the storm water plan will be part of the overall submission and it will be reviewed by Rennia. Ms. Robbins stated that at the last meeting the Planning Board declared their intent to be lead agency. There is a 30 day window that other environment agencies have for a chance to reply. At the next meeting the Planning Board will declare lead agency, which means they will coordinate the environmental review and all of these things will be looked at. It is up to the applicant to circulate their original application which would identify any potential for environmental impacts. The board will move forward with checking their information and see if there's anything that stands out that needs to be addressed. At this point, this is very preliminary and they have not received that detailed information yet.

Rob Killeen stated his property borders three of the lots. He asked exactly what it means when the application is proceeding at the applicant's own risk. Engineer Bryant stated each lot in Hopewell North is afforded one connection. They are taking one parcel and breaking into 10 so they are looking for 10 additional taps. They have to get approval for that. There has been an ongoing analysis to check for excess capacity in that district before this application is allowed additional taps. They are working with the Department of Health to see what is sufficient for the area. The applicant wants to get this plan approved but they will not be able to move forward with anything until they are guaranteed to have water. The existing lots in that district can move forward as they are each approved because they already have that connection. Mr. Killian asked if there were going to be any variances or changes in zoning required to break this one lot into 11 lots. Mr. Miyoshi stated that this is a 13 acre parcel and in this zone each house is required to have 1 acre so this could be broken down into 13 homes without any variances being required depending on the topography. There will be no zoning changes for this area.

Steve Miller stated his biggest concern is water. They have waited 13 to 15 years to get this water in the Superfund Site. They don't want to lose it at this point. He really does feel 13 houses are too many. As it was sold as three separate lots, their assumption was it would be three separate houses. He feels 13 to 14 houses total is unacceptable.

Andre Seifert asked when the Board thinks they could be breaking ground on this project. Mr. Eickman stated they have no way to know. Mr. Seifert stated he would like to purchase one of

those lots that were adjacent to his lot. Mr. Eickman stated he needs to contact the applicant directly.

Mr. Garbowski asked about the size of the water line. Engineer Bryant stated Route 82 is a 12-inch main. Creamery is currently 8 inches. Engineer Bryant stated town code is an 8-inch minimum. He stated that would not impact water pressure.

Gregory Siefert asked about the tax impact on the adjoining properties. Mr. Eickman stated that would be something that should be discussed with the Assessor. Ms. Bledsoe stated every house has its own value based on the value of the property.

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

Mr. Stokosa stated there have been a lot of public concerns expressed. This is an ongoing process and this is the very beginning of it. They know they cannot move forward with this project as far as bringing machines or constructing the road until they have water. That is the key to this project. They would like to help the residents and the Town. They want to make sure everybody has access to the water in the area. There is the drainage analysis that will be done. They cannot increase water onto anyone's property. The plan is to treat it individually at each individual house. The DOH is very involved with the wells and septic. The DOT is also very involved in the roadway and driveways. The Town also reviews all the water systems. This is an R1 zone so they are not

asking for any variances. Theoretically this parcel could yield 13 lots but after looking at all the criteria for steep slopes and wetlands they are only proposing 11. They will get more information to the Board and also address the public comments that were received tonight.

Mr. Suter asked who was the owner of the other lots. It was all sold at the same time. He stated he believes the one who cut down all the trees is the same owner as this proposal. Mr. Stokosa stated the parcels were sold individually as four parcels. There are four different LLC's that purchased the properties. They went on the market at the same time and were purchased at the same time. The three parcels to the north already have Board of Health approval for water and septic and have applications submitted to the Town. The DOT has also received applications.

Ms. Robbins said that as far as the SEQRA review, she does not recommend the Planning Board come to any determination without knowing the status of the water and sewer. She stated no Planning Department approval can be granted until SEQRA is closed. Engineer Bryant asked if the SEQRA was for just these 11 lots or for the additional three. Ms. Robbins stated theoretically they should have gone through the process before, but realistically these lots were probably created a long time ago and they probably will not go over an acre of disturbance as they are three individual lots. Mr. Stokosa stated he believes these lots were created before zoning as there are no maps associated with them. They each individually obtained Board of Health approval and each have their own DOT permit. They will each have their own plot plan for the Town and each lot is under an acre of disturbance. They do not meet DEC criteria as it relates to storm water. Ms. Robbins stated that in any subdivision the environmental review must be done. The other three

parcels are not being subdivided but this one is, which is why it will need an environmental review.

Ms. Bledsoe asked if they had considered an alternative plan for it if Town water is not an option.

Mr. Stokosa stated the applicant has looked into it but since it is in a water district it does get tricky with individual wells. Ms. Robbins stated the Planning Board is within its purview to ask for alternative layouts. They could ask for plans showing individual wells and septic or less lots. She stated she believed they did circulate but she feels it is premature because nobody can make a decision when they don't know where the water or sewer will be coming from. Engineer Bryant stated that the Town has been F.O.I.L.ed by the applicants for extensive information on the water systems.

Ms. Bledsoe asked if the applicant would still be interested in the subdivision if there is not public water. Mr. Stokosa stated he is unsure as he is not the applicant. Engineer Bryant stated he did meet with the applicant prior to any plans being drawn up so the applicant does understand these issues.

Mr. Eickman stated that additional information is needed from applicant before they can close this Public Hearing, so at this point it will be adjourned. Engineer Bryant stated the SWPPP is still outstanding. Mr. Fitzgerald stated they also need DOT's conceptual approval. Ms. Gee stated she would be willing to adjourn to a date uncertain and the applicant will have to be willing to re-notice the neighbors once the information is ready to be presented. Mr. Stokosa agreed to this.

Motion made by Lori Gee, seconded by Craig Arco, to adjourn this Public Hearing to a date uncertain, with the applicant required to re-notice all of the neighboring properties when it is reschedule. Voted and carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION:

2021 – 013A - iPark Building A, 200 North Road (6456-03-958962)

Applicant is seeking for Site Plan approval to add a 250,000 sf warehouse.

Troy Wojciekofsky, Joe Cottor, and Eugene Chrinian were present.

Mr. Cottor said that they had the applicant for this new building and it will be Ashley Furniture and the CEO of Ashley furniture is present tonight. He introduced Mr. Chrinian. Mr. Cotter stated they are a great company and he believes they will be an asset to the site as well as the community. This will be developing a parking lot that has been left empty for many years.

Mr. Chrinian stated they are a licensee of Ashley Furniture stores. It is a family run business that has been running for the last 30 years. They have businesses in New Jersey, Long Island, the boroughs, and Connecticut. They're looking to secure a second distribution center to serve the New York stores and Connecticut stores. He stated he is from Wappingers Falls and graduated in 1984. He is familiar with the area. Once fully occupied, the distribution center will have approximately 250 jobs. They will be everywhere from general labor to supervisors and managers. It is important to them when they open the store in the community to give back to the community. They have a Hope and Dream Program were a certain amount of proceeds go back to local areas. They do believe in being a good citizen to the area.

Mr. Eickman asked if they foresaw any retail expansion in the area. Mr. Chrinian stated they have a store in Poughkeepsie and in Middletown. They are always looking for opportunities in areas.

Mr. Miyoshi asked what the traffic projections would be for 250 employees and the trucks. Mr. Chrinian stated that there will be 40 to 50 trucks out early in the morning with the staggered return in the afternoon. Mr. Miyoshi asked what the hours of operation were. Mr. Chrinian stated the trucks are usually out at 6 AM and they come back between three and four. Probably everything will be done by 7 PM. They do have different shifts for employees. Employees could start coming in around 5 AM, with a skeleton crew on until approximately 7 PM.

Mr. Eickman asked where their other distribution facility was and Mr. Chrinian stated it is in Edison, New Jersey. Mr. Fitzgerald asked how it was size related to what they're doing here. Mr. Chrinian stated it will be about the same size.

Mr. Eickman asked if there were any other questions. There were none. He stated the Board looks forward to working with them. Mr. Cotter said they had their preliminary meeting with the Town professionals and they wanted the Board to meet the applicant.

Mr. Wojciekofsky stated this is an existing parking lot. They are proposing a 250,000 sf warehouse. This started as a 160,000 sf project, but this actually works out much nicer. All of the truck traffic and loading will be on the west side. That helps segregate the employee parking and

control the circulation. All of the existing utilities are already there, as well as water and sewer on-site. They will be connecting into the existing storm water and making whatever improvements are required from DEC. There will be some water quality structures put in. There are three access points to this location for truck traffic and there will be a connection on South Drive as well. They are still working on making sure they have adequate parking. All of the truck traffic will be through Gate 5. Mr. Cotter stated that all truck traffic will be restricted to Gate 5. They do not want to have any impact on the community.

Mr. Eickman asked if they would be doing a Noise Study considering the amount of truck traffic there will be. Mr. Cotter said if the Board deems it necessary, they will.

Engineer Bryant asked about the cutout area on the map. Mr. Wojciekofsky stated it is a wetlands buffer. They are going with the existing edge of pavement. Mr. Cotter stated he believes that entire area is paved. It has been paved for a long time, so they may need to just get a waiver from DEC. Engineer Bryant stated that, setting that issue aside, if the building was shifted to the west and they flipped the employee and truck parking than the building would become a buffer to all of the trucks. Mr. Cotter stated that the wetland buffer was what they were setting the building by but if they could work around that, they could swap the building orientation. It would make for a better plan. Engineer Bryant stated he does believe it is doable if they will work together through some of these issues. Mr. Cotter stated they will work on that.

DECISION:

#2021 – 013C – iPark Building C, 200 North Road (6456-03-073123)

Applicant is seeking for Site Plan approval to add a 153,000 sf of movie sets/backlots with a proposed 20,000 sf studio building.

Troy Wojciekofsky and Joe Cotto were present.

Mr. Eickman stated there were some outstanding items from prior meetings that were going to be put on the plans. Mr. Wojciekofsky stated he believes they were in pretty good shape. They did submit something today. There was one comment on last month's meeting regarding the guard shack. The entire perimeter of the studio is fenced in for security. The guard shack was originally shown along East Drive. There was concern regarding queuing issues. They have moved it to a different location to allow for longer queuing if necessary.

Mr. Eickman stated he believed they resolved the access to the lower left-hand parking lot and the roadway being a one-way. Mr. Wojciekofsky said yes, there will be a loop coming in off of the west side of the property to access the site with a one-way exit.

Mr. Eickman asked if there was a provision for pedestrian access. Mr. Cottor said no. This is totally enclosed. Meals will be brought in, and no one will be wandering around. Mr. Wojciekofsky said they did put a note on the plans, pending Board approval, that sidewalks can be constructed if they are required. Engineer Bryant reminded the applicants that parking outside of this parcel is not part of this application and any changes or connections will have to come before this Board for approval. The applicant stated they understood.

Mr. Arco asked if they had details on the streetscapes. Mr. Cotter stated he was with Hudson Scenic today and they are the ones who will be doing streetscapes. Hallmark is the most interested in this location so it would all depend on the shows they're doing. Mr. Arco asked if there were catwalks. Mr. Cottor said this is all outside. Mr. Arco asked if fire protection would be required. He stated if there are interior catwalks per NFPA 140 fire suppression would be required. Engineer Bryant stated he thought it was all illuminated streetscapes. Mr. Cotter stated it varies by production. There will be constructed streetscapes. There will be some lights that would be done in the indoor studio. Engineer Bryant stated there will still be a building permit application. Ms. Gee asked if this would require a new building permit with each change. Engineer Bryant stated they would have to look in to it as they go. As an example, if there is a specific height and it exceeds that for a filming then the applicant would have to come back. Ms. Bledsoe stated that the streetscapes could change weekly depending on the filming. Mr. Cottor stated they could ask other filming locations exactly how this is handled so that health and safety is protected, and they still comply with local code.

Mr. Eickman stated there was a Negative Declaration. The name of the action is iPark Building Area C (Movie Studio and Backlots). This is a Type 1 Conditioned Negative Declaration. A Full Form EAF, Supplemental Part III Information, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, and Traffic Study were analyzed in making this negative declaration. The proposed action would not be expected to result in any significant adverse impacts. Environmental issues identified as relevant:

- 1. Land Use and Zoning
- 2. Visual Character
- 3. Historic and Archeological Resources
- 4. Plants and animals
- 5. Transportation
- 6. Other

Based on a review of 6NYCRR 617.7, there appear to be no other significant adverse environmental impacts.

Motion made by Ed Miyoshi, seconded by Lori Gee, to approve this Negative Declaration. Voted and carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION AMENDED SITE PLAN APPROVAL

NAME OF SITE PLAN:	iPark Building Area C (Movie Studio and Backlots)
NAME OF APPLICANT:	iPark East Fishkill, LLC
LOCATION:	200 North Drive
GRID NO:	6456-03-073123

Resolution Offered by Planning Board Member: John Eickman

WHEREAS, the applicant is proposing to re-develop an existing parking area on the iPark property with a 20,000 sf film studio and three (3)backlots creating a 153,000 sf movie set with 110 car spaces, 8 bus spaces; and 19 truck spaces; and

WHEREAS, a portion of the existing parking area will be reconfigured into a separate 100-space parking lot fenced off from the movie set to serve the existing iPark Campus Building 745; and

WHEREAS, access to the movie set will be controlled by a gate; and

WHEREAS, it has been represented that all studio staff will remain on the movie set during operations and are unlikely to require pedestrian access to other areas of the iPark campus; and

WHEREAS, if the need for pedestrian access to other areas of the iPark Campus changes the pedestrian routes and circulation will need to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board; and

WHEREAS, the proposed project is an unlisted action under SEQR and a Negative

Declaration was adopted on April 19, 2022; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby approves the amended site plan set for iPark Building Area C (Movie Studio and Backlots) Sheets C-001, C-002, C-003, C-101, C-103, C-104, C-105, C-106, C-107, C-108, C-109, C-501, C-502, C-503, and C-504 as represented on a map entitled "iPark Amended Site Plan Set Building C," prepared by Stantec dated 7/30/21 and last revised 3/31/22 and as shown on Sheet C-102 dated 7/30/21 and last revised 4/19/22 and the Guardhouse Relocation Sketch dated 4/19/22 subject to the following conditions:

- 1) A cut/fill special permit will be required. The cut/fill calculations should be provided to the Town. If the material is kept on site, it needs to be graded, seeded and mulched.
- 2) The movie studio is proposed to be sprinklered. A meter and backflow protection device as approved by the Town and the County Health Department needs to be added to the water supply.
- 3) Review and approval of any required easements by the Town Attorney.
- 4) Satisfactory Resolution of CPL comment letter dated 4/18/22.
- 5) Any future occupancy of Building #745 will require a separate parking analysis and approval by the Planning Board of the parking demand, location, and access to the proposed parking generated by any future use. Planning Board approval of the proposed 100-space parking lot set aside for Building #745 shall not be construed as planning board acceptance of the number, location, or access to the set aside 100-space parking area.
- 6) Relocation of access gate shown on site plan closer to East Drive to prevent queuing at gate.

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 _____ Lori Gee

The votes were as follows:

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

DISCUSSION:

2022 – 032 – Cim Tech, 40 Corporate Park Drive (6456-02-958962)

Applicant is looking to construct a 6,400 sf addition to existing building.

Steven Whalen and Steve Teed were present.

Mr. Whalen stated this proposal is for a 6,400 sf addition to the existing building at 40 Corporate Park Drive. They are in receipt of a letter from Christian Moore containing questions and things that will be addressed. They will be preparing a brand-new survey that should answer all of these questions. It should be received by them within 10 days. They are meeting all the requirements. The turning radius are fine and they have more than enough parking.

Ms. Gee asked if this was an extension of the current use and Mr. Teed said yes. The company builds machines and they have been challenged with building larger and bigger equipment. They will have roughly the same amount of employees as well as the same hours of operation. Ms. Robbins asked if they have been in this location for all 30 years. Mr. Teed said they have been in this location for approximately 25 years. Ms. Robbins stated they will have 53 parking spaces left. Mr. Fitzgerald asked if the addition would be wiping out all of the parking in the back. Mr. Teed said yes. Mr. Fitzgerald stated they need to show truck circulation and they need to show fire apparatus movement. Mr. Teed stated trucks load outside. Engineer Bryant stated something looks to be out of size with the measurements on the survey. Mr. Moore stated there may have been a

lot line realignment that is not showing properly on the map.

Engineer Bryant asked what was in the trapezoid shown on the map. Mr. Whalen stated there is a discrepancy on the map but that will be cleared up as soon as they get the new survey.

Ms. Robbins asked if the public ever came into the site and Mr. Teed said no.

Ms. Robbins stated the applicant will need to go before the Architectural Review Committee. Mr. Moore stated they will also need to know where the existing septic is. The plan shows dry wells, but he is not sure they are being used.

Motion made by Ed Miyoshi, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to refer this application to the Architectural Review Committee. Voted and carried unanimously.

SKETCH PLAN:

2022 – 033 – Stormville Run Subdivision, Stormville Road (6557-02-711619/793545)

Applicant is proposing a 31-lot subdivision

Richard O'Rourke and Michael Gillespie were present.

Mr. O'Rourke stated this property is located on Stormville Road. They are here for sketch plan review as per code 163 – 7. This is a 57-acre parcel to create 31 lots.

Mr. Gillespie stated this property is not towards the intersection of Route 216. It is past the golf course on the right inside. The property is in an R1 zoning district. The layout is based on current zoning regulations. They are proposing one flag lot. They're laying this out with the presumption of wells and septic. This road typically gets more pedestrian traffic than car traffic. This proposal does incorporate a number of driveway locations along Stormville Road. They are also proposing a new road and a cul-de-sac. 11 will be entered off of Stormville Road and the remainder will be accessed from the cul-de-sac. This is one of Tucker's parcels. He also owns the property to the right of Route 216 and Stormville Road. Mr. Gillespie does not believe it is for sale at this point but does believe at some point it probably will be sold off. One idea is to extend that cul-de-sac to the property line to make an interconnection at a later date. Mr. Fitzgerald asked what the length of the cul-de-sac was. Anything over 1,000 feet of road requires two points of access. Engineer Bryant stated the enclave at Four Corners abuts this. They have a right of way there for a future extension. There may be some way to incorporate that into this plan for emergency access. Mr. Gillespie stated they would check into it. Engineer Bryant asked if they considered a loop road as some of the properties are longer. Mr. Gillespie stated that was a discussion they could have as well. There are some steep slopes in the area which makes it a little precarious. They will reevaluate it to see if it is possible. Ms. Bledsoe felt that a loop road would also give it more of a neighborhood and community feeling.

Ms. Robbins states the SEQRA for this has been segmented as they are developing multiple portions of the property in different subdivisions. All the reviews are being done separately. She did speak with the Town attorneys and there needs to be some sort of understanding of the future

contemplated development of the parcels so that they are not segmenting the environmental reviews. Mr. Gillespie stated this is currently the largest parcel at this point. There is another portion that is bigger, but it is currently not up for sale. Ms. Robbins said it would be considered the Planning Board's purview to review any other construction going on in the area that could be connected to these roads to see if there is better site design available. Mr. O'Rourke stated at this point they do not know what else is planned. Ms. Robbins stated that the owner knows what he is planning on selling off and they are already reviewing multiple applications. If there are adjacent or adjoining properties that are going within the same timeframe they should be looked at cumulatively. Mr. O'Rourke stated that he understands segregation but this applicant has no other plans at this point.

Ms. Bledsoe stated it is apparent that Stormville is in high demand for housing. She suggested this may be a time to do a mini master plan for the Hamlet of Stormville. This should be a cohesive neighborhood, not 11 individual driveways off of Stormville Road and two cul-de-sacs. Mr. O'Rourke stated the applicant owner of this parcel has no idea when the other owner of the remaining parcels plans on selling them. Mr. Gillespie stated that is more of a Town Board issue.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated he would like the applicant to look at a loop road. The Highway Superintendent is not in favor of more cul-de-sacs. They are very time-consuming and difficult to plow. He does suggest the applicant find a way to interconnect this roadway. Engineer Bryant asked what happens if four years from now Tucker sells the adjoining piece of property and wants to do a mirror development. Then there would be two cul-de-sacs that do not touch. Ms. Gee stated

that Mr. Gillespie started the presentation stating the cul-de-sac could be extended to the end of the property for a future connection. She does support that. Mr. Fitzgerald stated the code also says that there needs to be emergency access. Ms. Gee asked if the cul-de-sac length was from the end of the road or to the last driveway because if the driveway is constructed and then there is an extra 200 feet past the last driveway for future connection it really doesn't require emergency access. Mr. Fitzgerald stated he does not believe that the driveway location has anything to do with that 1,000 feet. Ms. Gee stated that maybe a recommendation the Planning Board can make to the Town Board is that when they are planning these developments with cul-de-sacs and future expansion it would make sense to plan it to the end of the property. Ms. Robbins stated she would draft a letter to the Town Board regarding this issue. Mr. O'Rourke stated they do not control the adjoining property. They are willing to extend the cul-de-sac to the end of their property. They would have to get a waiver on the limitation of the 1,000 feet. Engineer Bryant stated they could keep the cul-de-sac where it is and provide the right-of-way for future development. It could be paved and gated. Mr. Fitzgerald stated the cul-de-sac is already longer than 1,000 feet as it currently stands so they will need to do something. Mr. O'Rourke asked if they had waived the 1000 feet for any other applications. Ms. Robbins said not that she is aware of. Mr. Fitzgerald stated there is a provision in Summit Woods that if the connection is not made, the cul-de-sac will not be permitted. Mr. O'Rourke stated they could shorten the cul-de-sac and make the driveways longer. Ms. Bledsoe asked if it was possible to get rid of the shorter cul-de-sac and make that into a loop with the other one. She stated that would be putting all of the lots that exit on the Stormville Road into the subdivision and have it connect back to Stormville Road. Mr. Gillespie stated that would be more road and there are wetlands and steep slopes they have to work around. It is 57

acres and they are looking at 31 lots. This is considered a medium-size subdivision. They will look at the property and review it. This is just the sketch plan.

Mr. Eickman asked if there was any other business to come before the Board. There was none.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted:

Julie J. Beyer, Meeting Secretary
East Fishkill Planning Board