

**TOWN OF EAST FISHKILL
PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

JULY 16, 2024

Planning Board Chairperson John Eickman called the meeting to order.

CHAIRPERSON COMMENTS:

- a. Mr. Eickman began the Meeting with **The Pledge of Allegiance.**

Roll Call:

Members present during the Roll Call were John Greenan, Donald Papae, Lori Gee, John Eickman, Richard Campbell, Ed Miyoshi and Sarah Bledsoe. Alternate Member John Giovagnoli was also present for the meeting.

- b. Mr. Eickman announced the **Upcoming Meeting Dates** are:
August 20, 2024 & September 17, 2024

- c. **Approval of Minutes of Meetings Held: May 21, 2024 & June 18, 2024**

MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Lori Gee, to approve the Minutes of Meetings Held May 21, 2024 and June 18, 2024. Voted and carried unanimously.

Town Professionals and Consultants present were: Michelle Robbins, AICP, Town Planner, Brendan Fitzgerald, Traffic Consultant HVEA, and Rich Renna, Engineer.

Staff present were Jackie Keenan, Planning Board Clerk, Matt Rickett, Zoning Administrator, along with Chris Jodlowski, Board of Fire Commissioner, and Robert Odell, Fire Advisory Board.

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
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING:

1. #2023 – 067 – J.F.E. Associates, 2528 Route 52 (6456-02-885563)

Applicant is applying to amend their site plan and their special permit to install two practice softball fields.

No one was present for the matter. Mr. Eickman proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING:

2. #2024 – 080 – Vuktilaj Pajtim, 7 Hamlet Way, (6558-02-593800)

Applicant is applying for a Tier 2 solar special permit to install ground mounted solar panels at a residence. **(Application has been withdrawn)**

Mr. Eickman announced the solar permit application for this matter was withdrawn and that, accordingly, the public hearing could be closed.

MOTION made by John Greenan, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to close the Public Hearing for Vuktilaj Pajtim. Voted and carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION:

3. #2024 - 084 – Gabriella Rose (Flory's Gas Station), 1997 Route 52, (6356-04-635231)

Applicant is applying for an amended site plan to install a new vacuum station, air station, and outside cooler as well as to gain approval for an existing propane gas exchange station and ice chest.

1
2 Brian Stokosa, P.E., Day & Stokosa Engineering, PC was present.

3
4 Mr. Stokosa displayed the site plan, stating that the last time this was before the Board, an update
5 had been given and that the application was made to the ZBA. The Public Hearing has remained
6 open until they work with the Planning Board, specific to the new vacuum station and air station.
7 In addition, he said there is the propane chest, the ice chest on site that they are adding to the
8 application to formally have a permit for these. This Board had asked for the bollard locations
9 around the chest and propane cabinet and refuse enclosure, which, he said, have been added to
10 the plan. The Planning Board has been given the update plan that was given to the ZBA. The
11 addition of a sign in front of the air vacuum station was talked about, and he said it would limit
12 the parking to a couple of minutes, to hopefully ensure that the space would remain free for
13 patrons' use. Mr. Stokosa told the Board that was the update and there was nothing more added
14 to the plan.

15
16 Mr. Eickman asked if there were any comments from the Members. Mr. Miyoshi stated his
17 concern that the parking lot is already tight, and more stuff is being put there. Mr. Stokosa
18 responded that the air station is currently located in the back, where the refuse enclosure is. He
19 said that, basically, the air station is being repositioned, which is in front of a parking space now.
20 The thought is, by repositioning the air station up toward the front of the lot, how the hose is
21 extended could be controlled, and that it would not be in the Town right-of-way. He agrees that it
22 is a tight site and a lot of activity is there, and this is just something the applicant was hoping
23 could be entertained by the Board.

24
25 Ms. Gee asked if the vacuum was being moved back to where it was originally. She thinks it was
26 originally in the front and had not been approved when installed, Mr. Stokosa replied that it was
27 installed originally, right after they opened, and taken off the plan when they realized it needed a
28 permit, since it is considered a structure.

29
30 Mr. Papae asked the location of the ice chest; was it alongside the building. Mr. Stokosa replied
31 that it is along the rear property line; there is an ice chest and propane location; it is existing. He
32 pointed out the refuse enclosure on the displayed plan, as well as the existing propane cabinet
33 and the ice chest sitting alongside the fence and the refuse enclosure. It's tight and he said it is
34 existing; they are trying to formalize it the right way.

1
2 Mr. Eickman asked Mr. Stokosa if he had met with the ZBA and how did it go. Mr. Stokosa
3 replied that the Zoning Board entertained it. He thinks everyone agrees that it is a busy site and it
4 means the site is performing well. The thought process was to move the air station up front where
5 it is more accessible and people can use it, rather than have congestion in the back. He said the
6 ZBA's concern was the parking and how people utilized the space associated with that feature.
7 He said that is why they came up with the sign that will hopefully limit parking to a certain
8 period, so people can use it. He believes this was deferred to this Board for input, since this is a
9 site plan amendment. He explained that before the ZBA made the decision, they wanted to get
10 input from the Planning Board.

11
12 Ms. Gee questioned if there is any requirement to separate the propane from the refuse enclosure,
13 or because it is enclosed.

14
15 Mr. Eickman asked for any comments from the Board Members or Professionals.

16
17 Ms. Robbins stated that the Town had heard concerns from a few folks nearby about the parking
18 on Lake Road. She said they do not want to see any parking on Lake Road and, when the gas
19 station gets super busy, the gas people park along there. She added that this will be scheduled for
20 a Public Hearing to allow folks to speak their minds. Also, the Board can listen to the comments,
21 and it can be taken up for consideration. Mr. Campbell asked if there is curbing and Mr. Stokosa
22 replied that there is curbing on the inside and not outside. Mr. Campbell said it would then allow
23 anyone to just pull off and park there. He added that the site is crazy busy, which he thinks
24 everyone can agree with. Mr. Rickett told Mr. Campbell that some of the parking is for the plaza
25 to the west of there, whether it is employees parking there or patrons going to the doctors'
26 offices. He added that sometimes large trucks can be seen parked on the right side of Lake Road
27 when they go in to grab food; it is easier than pulling into the parking lot. Mr. Campbell said like
28 a big dump truck and Mr. Rickett said it could even be a contractor's truck. Mr. Stokosa said,
29 when the original site plan was done, he thinks the reason why people park there so much is that
30 the paving is extended in that portion of Lake Drive. He believes it was when the water line was
31 run across the street and along Lake Drive. The road was redone, and it actually became a little
32 bit wider; there is the opportunity to kind of park on the side of the road. Mr. Campbell asked if
33 there is any delineation stating that there is a shoulder. Mr. Stokosa replied that there is striping
34 and "no parking" signs along that street and that was part of the site plan approval; it was a

1 concern when the original site plan was done. Ms. Gee asked if this becomes an enforcement
2 issue and Mr. Rickett responded Yes; it is just like shopping plazas like at ACME. He said they
3 hear from time to time that people park in those spaces, but it is an enforcement issue. Ms.
4 Bledsoe commented that, with it being a gas station she is sure people are gone quick; when a
5 call is made to the police, they are gone. Mr. Campbell agreed.

6
7 Mr. Eickman told Mr. Stokosa that a Public Hearing needed to be scheduled and asked if he
8 would be ready for this by August 20th; there is enough time to get it done. Mr. Stokosa replied
9 Yes.

10
11 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Lori Gee, to**
12 **Schedule a Public Hearing for Gabriella Rose Flory's Gas Station to**
13 **be held on August 20, 2024. Voted and carried unanimously.**
14

15
16
17
18
19
20 **DISCUSSION:**

21
22
23 **4. #2024 – 086 – Shenandoah Lake Estates (Russo), Appalachian West,**
24 **(6454-01-117808)**

25
26 Applicant is requesting a revision to an approved subdivision plat for an
27 increase in fill.
28

29 Brian Stokosa, P.E., Day & Stokosa Engineering, PC was present.
30

31 Mr. Stokosa displayed the site plan and stated that the last time this was before the Board
32 was to discuss reducing the fill import on the Site. To refresh the Board’s memory, he
33 said the house is limited to a 3-bedroom max. Infiltrators are being done. The current
34 Health Department standards are lower flow rate per bedroom, and they are trying to
35 minimize the amount of fill the greatest that can be done from a Health Department

1 standpoint, relative to the septic. About 1300 yards of fill are coming in for that and the
2 number cannot be fooled around with because it is a Board of Health number. Moving to
3 the health side, he said he believed there was 1500 yards or thereabouts, of fill coming in
4 originally. They spoke with the owner and played around with some floor elevations by
5 pushing the basement down further so there is not as much fill around the bottom half of
6 the house, because it is a step-down. The grading has been tightened up around the house
7 and the number will be taken down to about 800 yards. He said the number tweaked
8 down to almost half by making it tighter. Every possible effort has been made to reduce
9 the fill import on this job and to obviously be sensitive to truck traffic with the neighbors
10 while construction is going on. He aid this is the real update, it had been given the Board
11 in the letter and grading around the house site has been reflected on this plan.

12
13 Ms. Gee asked if the grading was feasible, it is not just numbers being tweaked on a plan
14 and if it can be built that way. Mr. Stokosa replied that it is feasible because the wall
15 heights were increased and the basement and pushed down. Mr. Eickman asked if it was
16 half the amount of soil and Mr. Stokosa said Yes, it was about 1500 (yards) originally and
17 now it is at about 876, so it is a substantial reduction. Mr. Eickman commented, Indeed.

18
19 Mr. Eickman confirmed that there were no further comments or questions from the Board
20 Members of Professionals and said a Public Hearing would be scheduled. He asked Mr.
21 Stokosa if that was something he would be ready for on August 20th and he replied Yes.

22
23
24 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to**
25 **Schedule a Public Hearing for Shenandoah Lake Estates (Russo) to**
26 **be held on August 20, 2024. Voted and carried unanimously.**
27
28
29

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
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

DISCUSSION:

5. #2022 - 049 – Paradise Preserve Subdivision, 12 Deverly Ln. (6756-00-241319

Applicant is proposing a 6-lot subdivision on 93.3 acres in the R-3 zone

Ms. Robbins stated that she was recused from this matter and that she would speak only to the procedure. She believes that the Board consider opening the SEQR. Mr. Eickman said that the Board would do this with their intent to be Lead Agency.

MOTION made by Ed Miyoshi, seconded by Richard Campbell for the East Fishkill Planning Board to serve as Lead Agency for Paradise Preserve Subdivision. Voted and carried unanimously.

Mr. Eickman checked with Ms. Robbins to ask if it was correct that this matter was also being referred to the “CAC” -The Conservation Advisory Council. She replied that it would be standard procedure, Yes.

MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Lori Gee, for Paradise Preserve Subdivision to be referred to the CAC. Voted and carried unanimously.

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
27
28
29
30
31

DISCUSSION:

6. #2024 – 088 – Donovan Five LLC, 6 Nancy Court (6358-02-561646)

Applicant is requesting a minor amendment to the site plan to redesign the building façade and reduce the approved building footprint from 9,685 sf to 9,260 sf. and architecture of the approved site plan

Michael R. Berta, AIA was present

Mr. Eickman stated that it had been determined that this was a Minor Site Plan Amendment, although the Board wanted to hear the Applicant. In this case, he said, no Public Hearing will be required.

While the plan was being displayed, Ms. Robbins stated that, by way of introduction, the last time this matter was before the Board, there was a request for an Extension of their approved Site Plan. However, the Board realized that there had been some modifications, and an amended Site Plan was needed. The process was begun with the ARC and they went back to the ARC July 11th, who reviewed and made a recommendation for approval of the current building. There are some minor changes to the building footprint, some changes to the building’s appearance. The request is for the Board to consider this building, rather than the one that was currently approved, which is slightly smaller than the one that was previously approved. She said the architectural have been reviewed by the ARC.

1 Mr. Campbell said the perimeter had definitely changed from its original. Ms. Robbins stated that
2 they are very minor changes, but Yes. Mr. Campbell said it is smaller, to smaller and Ms.
3 Robbins replied Yes.

4
5 Ms. Bledsoe asked if the height was the same. Mr. Berta introduced himself as the architect for
6 the applicant. He responded that, technically, the building is lower. The original building that
7 was approved had a pitched roof on it that was 29 ft to the mean point and about 35 ft to the
8 ridge. This building will be about 26, 27 ft total and he said it is a flat roof. Mr. Campbell asked
9 if the original building was 2-story and Mr. Berta replied that it was 1-story. Mr. Campbell said it
10 is the same as this and Mr. Berta said that was correct; it had a lot of trusses with a steep roof
11 pitch and a lot of it unusable. He said it looked a lot like the building at 8 Nancy Court and it can
12 be seen how tall that is, to the ridge. He said they will be in the building in the front, which is 2
13 Nancy Court. If one looks at the building to the right, he said it is also about 35 ft to the ridge and
14 this building (6 Nancy Court) will actually be lower than the 2 of them.

15
16 Mr. Eickman asked if the parking lot, and things like landscaping and lighting are the same as the
17 original approval. Mr. Berta replied that the parking and lighting are the same. Regarding the
18 landscaping, he said in the back there was concrete all the way from the building to the road and
19 some of the concrete was eliminated as it was not needed. They are putting a little additional
20 landscaping in the back of the building. Other than that, he said the landscaping in the front and
21 the 2 sides is staying the same. Mr. Eickman stated OK. Mr. Eickman asked if the lighting was
22 all down and dark sky compliant. Mr. Berta responded Yes.

23
24 Mr. Campbell asked if there were any building code changes from when the original approvals
25 were given, from then to now. Ms. Robbins responded that there was a zoning change in that the
26 site was previously zoned industrial, and it is now zoned B-3. She said the proposed use is light

1 industrial and is not hardcore manufacturing, there are no chemicals being brought it, which is
2 actually an allowed use under the B-3 Zone.

3
4 Ms. Robbins asked Mr. Berta if the parking number was exactly the same number of spaces and
5 if he knew the total for that particular building. He replied that he did not have that information.
6 Ms. Robbins asked him if the number was on the plan and he replied it is not on his site plan, but
7 the original. Ms. Robbins said she would confirm the number and add it to the Resolution, as the
8 last Whereas clause, before the “Now Therefore Be It Resolved” clause in the Resolution. She
9 said it would be “the approved site plan and the revised site plan maintain the same number of
10 parking spaces.

11
12
13 **Discussion before Members voted:** Ms. Gee questioned if there had been something said about
14 minor changes from the ARC that needed to be incorporated. Ms. Robbins responded that they
15 have made changes, however they are not reflected on this plan. Mr. Berta stated that it was a
16 minor change or 2, as he displayed the rendering. He pointed out the areas that are to be bumped
17 out. Ms. Robbins said this would be added as a Condition in the Resolution, that the revised
18 plans be submitted to the ARC and the Planning Board. She said this would be added under the
19 “Now Therefore Be It Resolved, subject to the following Conditions” as “Revised plans per the
20 ARC approval”. The voting by Members then commenced accordingly.

21
22
23
24
25 **RESOLUTION OF AMENDED SITE PLAN APPROVAL**

26
27 **NAME OF SITE PLAN:** **Route 376 Business Park Lot #3**
28 **(aka Donovan Site Plan)**
29

1 NAME OF APPLICANT: Route 376 East Fishkill Developers, Inc.

2
3 LOCATION: 6 Nancy Court

4
5 GRID NO. 132800-6358-02-561646

6
7
8 Resolution Offered by Planning Board Member: John Eickman

9
10
11 WHEREAS, the Applicant received site plan approval for a commercial building on Lot
12 #3 of the East Fishkill Business Park on 6/2/2009; and

13 WHEREAS, the applicant previously received site plan approval extensions on 4/6/10,
14 6/21/11, 9/6/11, 12/20/11, 3/6/12, 4/1/14, 4/21/15, 4/20/16, 6/6/17, 6/18/18, 6/18/19, 4/1/20,
15 11/17/20, 5/31/21, 6/8/21, 6/8/22, 12/7/22, 6/7/23, 12/7/23 thru 6/7/24; and an additional 60 days
16 on June 18, 2024; and

17
18 WHEREAS, the applicant is requesting an amended site plan approval to redesign the
19 building façade and reduce the previously approved building footprint from 9,685 sf to 9,260 sf.;

20 WHEREAS, the site plan approved on June 2, 2009 and the revised site plan contain the
21 same number of parking spaces and no changes to the previously approved parking is proposed;
22 and

23 WHEREAS, the applicant submitted revised architectural plans to the ARC and met with
24 the ARC on January 4, 2024 and July 10, 2024 and received ARC approval on July 10, 2024;

25 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board approves the
26 amended site plan for the above project as represented on a map entitled "ARCHITECTURAL
27 SITE PLAN PROPOSED NEW OFFICE BUILDING FOR DONOVAN FIVE BMAC, LLC, 6
28 Nancy Court, Wappingers Falls, New York 12590, prepared by Michael R. Berta, AIA dated
29 December 6, 2023 and subject the following conditions:

- 30 1. Revised architectural plans per July 10, 2024 ARC approval.

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

35
36 Resolution Seconded by Planning Board Member Lori Gee

1 **The votes were as follows:**

- 2 Board Member Lori Gee Aye
- 3 Board Member Ed Miyoshi Aye
- 4 Board Member Sarah Bledsoe Aye
- 5 Board Member Richard Campbell Aye
- 6 Board Member Donald Papae Aye
- 7 Board Member John Greenan Aye
- 8 Chairperson John Eickman Aye
- 9 Alternate Board Member John Giovagnoli Present

10
11 Mr. Berta and Mr. Eickman thanked each other.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **DISCUSSION:**

20

21 **7. #2023 – 053 – Treetop Development,** Donovan Drive, Lime Kiln Road,
22 E. Hook Cross Rd. and Griffin Lane (6455-00-400593,
23 301596,540732,330505)

24
25
26

Applicant is proposing to build a 665,000sf and 100,000sf Warehouse.

27 Lucia Chiochio, Counsel, Cuddy & Feder LLP, Reuben Twersky, VP Treetop Development,
28 and Diego Villareale, Project Engineer, JMC Planning Engineering Landscape Architecture &
29 Land Surveying, PLLC were present.

30

1 As the plan was being displayed, Ms. Chiocchio introduced herself, Mr. Twersky and Mr.
2 Villareale. She thanked the Board for having them back again, from when they were present for
3 the Sketch Plan Review in February 2023. Since that time, she said they have been working on
4 and refining the plan. They did have a very productive Town staff meeting in December 2023,
5 which she said resulted in excellent feedback from the Town staff, and the plan was further
6 refined. The preliminary site plan and special permit for the parking waiver application have
7 been submitted, which she said would be discussed with the Board in this meeting tonight. Since
8 the last time this was before the Board, she said Treetop acquired 4 adjacent parcels, which now
9 make up the project site, which is approximately 143 acres in total. The proposal is for (2) Class
10 A warehouse buildings. The larger building is 665,000 sf and the smaller building is 100,000 sf.
11 She said that Mr. Villareale would be walking he Board through the plan. The few preliminary
12 zoning remarks she wanted to note were that the property is located in the I-1 Light Industrial
13 Zoning District where warehouse use is principally permitted, subject to the Planning Board's
14 site plan review. She reiterated that a waiver is being requested for the required number of
15 parking spaces and said the Planning Board is authorized to issue the special permit and waiver.
16 She said they would be providing some information based on Treetop's experience with other
17 similar sized projects about what is the workable number of parking spaces. The idea, she said, is
18 why should parking spaces be provided that are not needed and not used on all the extra
19 impervious surface area. The property is characterized by wetlands, and she said the Project
20 Team has been coordinating with the DEC with respect to wetlands and potential impacts to the
21 wetlands and buffer areas. It is anticipated that their application will be filed with the DEC
22 within the next week or few days. The site is also characterized by steep slopes of which, she
23 said, they will be seeking that approval, as well. The Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
24 (SWPPP) will be prepared, and she said they will be seeking approval for it.

25

1 Ms. Chiocchio turned the podium over to Mr. Villareale to walk through the plan, stating that
2 they would be happy to answer any questions. He introduced himself as being with JMC, the
3 planning and engineering consultant for the applicant. As Ms. Chiocchio had indicated, he said
4 they have been away for some time but have been working to update and refine the plan since the
5 one the Board last saw. He explained that some of the updates did revolve around meeting with
6 the DEC, as they tried to engage with them early, to look at the wetlands before the application
7 was made, after reviewing the plan with this Board. They tried to look at the potential impact of
8 wetlands on the property and to try to make some changes so that there would be preliminary
9 dialogue and to review with the DEC themselves.

10
11 Mr. Villareale continued, stating the displayed plan was a rendered version of the one included in
12 the application package submitted to the Board. He noted that the property line could be seen as
13 highlighted in red, which is the overall 143-acre parcel. This encompasses all of the parcels that
14 he said Ms. Chiocchio had mentioned earlier. He pointed out Donovan Drive, Lime Kiln Road
15 and where Route 84 is the location as first coming in off of Lime Kiln Road shown on the plan,
16 as well as the 2 proposed buildings, noting the one being 665,000 sf and the smaller building,
17 being approximately 10,000 sf. He said an aerial photograph was used and the improvements
18 highlighted, but they thought it important to show some of the environmental constraints on the
19 property as well. He said this is specifically the wetlands, which he pointed out as being
20 highlighted in blue, and stated they focus mostly on the Northern and Eastern sides of the
21 property. The wetlands have been delineated and were confirmed by the DEC. They were picked
22 up on the survey map, so they have been delineated, surveyed and verified. All of the wetlands
23 have the 100-ft buffer associated and he stated that there are wetland impacts, but they are only
24 associated with the crossings of the driveways. He pointed out on the displayed plan where the
25 driveway crosses over 2 fingers of the wetland itself, as well as the second one where they are
26 crossing a narrow portion of the wetlands. It is to the left of the building. To better point it out,

1 he described the driveway coming off of Lime Kiln Road, the access driveway that comes in,
2 moves its way down, and provides access to the building itself. He showed a different angle and
3 closer view on the plan where the driveway access is off of Lime Kiln Road, where the main
4 driveway comes into the property, and where the sliver of land comes out and extends towards
5 Lime Kiln Road. He explained that it is being used as the main access to the property. He said
6 this is a change from the original plan that was presented to the Board. Originally, they were
7 looking at connecting directly to Donovan Drive and using Donovan Drive but, since then, they
8 worked with the staff; there were some comments looked at where they could potentially utilize
9 this area. Now the driveway is directly accessing Lime Kiln Road and one can come in directly
10 off the main roadway, which provides access to Route 84.

11
12 Mr. Campbell asked about the building that was shown and what it was. It is a church, and Mr.
13 Campbell asked about the grade levels as the traffic comes in and out compared to there or was it
14 on grade. Mr. Villareale replied that it is pretty much on grade with the driveway from what he
15 recalled and that he would verify the exact grades with the site plans and let the Board know the
16 difference.

17
18 Mr. Villareale continued, pointing out and saying that, as the driveway comes in, there is the first
19 wetland crossing, where the driveway crosses the 2 wetland fingers, and then it comes into the
20 main portion of the building. He pointed out the first entrance, saying that truck traffic is
21 separated from vehicular traffic and parking spaces. One of the comments that staff made was
22 they are trying to separate vehicle traffic and parking from truck traffic entering in the loading
23 areas. Then, vehicle traffic and someone looking for a parking space would make a right-hand
24 turn and he pointed out the area coming into, where there would be a significant amount of
25 parking spaces. He said that all truck traffic would continue along, and he pointed out where the
26 driveway would be utilized, and they would enter the loading area. He said a lot of work was

1 done on the plan to separate out the 2 aspects. There is the vehicles, workers, employees going to
2 the parking areas. Then there are the loading spaces associated with the buildings themselves.

3
4 Mr. Campbell questioned if the plan as seen is looking at the amount of parking required for this
5 building. Mr. Villareale replied said it is not. Mr. Campbell said then they are looking at if there
6 was the variance for what is needed for parking. Mr. Villareale wanted to clarify that it is a
7 waiver, not a variance from the Town Code. He said there is a waiver provision that allows this
8 Board to reduce that count. What is shown on the plan is 529 parking spaces, as opposed to the
9 814 spaces required by the Town Code. He explained that it is something they feel, and that has
10 been proven out several times over, that parking is in excess of what is needed. He stated that
11 information will be provided to the Board to justify that position. He said information was
12 already provided in the traffic and parking analysis and they will continue to supplement this as
13 they go through this process.

14
15 Ms. Gee asked Mr. Villareale if they are maxed out on parking if there is a different use down the
16 road for the same building that needed the parking requires that it could be built – or is this right
17 up against the setbacks. Mr. Villareale responded no, there is space to increase the amount of
18 parking. He said the loading spaces take up a significant amount of paving area that could
19 otherwise be used for parking spaces. He said, if the thought is about other uses that could exist,
20 and not need the same loading requirements, that could be repurposed for parking. He said there
21 are also other areas on the site where additional parking spaces could be. He questioned if there
22 could be 814 spaces, saying he could not state that specifically, yes or not. However, he stated
23 that he knows for a fact, based on the studies prepared, that there are additional spaces that
24 parking could get laid out on for sure.

1 Mr. Campbell asked if the building had a specific use as of right now as it comes to the Board.
2 Mr. Villareale responded that it is warehouse use and that is what is proposed, the Industrial
3 warehouse use. It does not have a specific user, but the use under the Town's Code is Industrial
4 use.

5
6 Ms. Gee asked if there would be a single tenant and Mr. Villareale replied that it is unknown at
7 this time. Mr. Campbell asked if this was on both buildings. Mr. Villareale responded that was
8 correct, yes, and the actual user tenants' space had not yet been determined. Mr. Villareale turned
9 over the podium to Mr. Twersky to touch on this.

10
11 Mr. Twersky explained that it is intended to be Warehouse Industrial use and that no tenants
12 come until they know the project is happening for real and he said this is on spec right now.
13 When looking at the overall design, he said they had looked at if it was not single-tenant and how
14 it would operate with 2 or 3 tenants. He said they actually bifurcated the parking for employees
15 on each side of the building which allows for devising the building and allowing that type of use.
16 They are future planning just in case that happens. He said that Building 2 would usually be a
17 single tenant, it is small enough, but that also could be devisable. The parking is in the front of
18 the building, and he said that could work as well.

19
20 Ms. Gee asked if the second building is accessed by driving past the first one or is there a
21 different access point off of Donovan somewhere. Mr. Villareale returned to the podium to go
22 back to the site plan and the driveway. He said, when one drives along the Northern line, it is
23 separated from the loading spaces itself. It is the main driveway, so to get to the second building,
24 one would utilize that driveway, continue around, and then he pointed out the driveway to be
25 used that would provide access to the parking and loading spaces that surround the second
26 building. Ms. Gee asked if that is also how the second employee lot is accessed. Mr. Villareale

1 said that is correct and everything is from this area. He said that, basically, it is one main
2 driveway around the perimeter of the property that cars and trucks would utilize to circulate the
3 property. However, when they are maneuvering in and out of their respective parking spaces,
4 whether vehicle parking or truck parking, they are in a dedicated space. Trucks will not be in a
5 vehicle parking lot and cars will not be in a truck loading parking lot area. He said there is no
6 overlap between the 2 and they really tried to separate those 2 and make them independent of
7 each other.

8
9 Mr. Campbell said he is hearing the 100,000-sf building parking lot is the one attached to the
10 bigger building. Mr. Villareale said No, and showed where it is attached. He said there is the
11 parking lot at the back side of the building and then where the loading trucks go. If one comes in
12 and wants to go to that 100,000-sf space, if it was a truck, then it would stay to the left, load and
13 go back in and back out. If it is a vehicle that is looking to park at the building it would make the
14 right-hand turn and park in the back of the building. He said that everything is still inter-
15 connected, and it is important to still have interconnection for emergency services, fire access,
16 trucks to access circulation and protection around the building. He noted that there are still
17 driveways and interconnection, but the main driveway serves the trucks, vehicles, and the
18 parking spaces and loading areas have been broken out separately from that. Mr. Campbell said
19 then there is one single entrance and exit onto the entire site. Mr. Villareale responded that was
20 correct, with the exception of a second connection out to Donovan Drive for emergency and he
21 pointed out the location of this on the plan. He said they have it but it is for emergency access
22 only, and not to have it being a fully functioning driveway in that area. He said that area is really
23 intended to be for emergency purposes only,

24
25 Mr. Miyoshi questioned how they intended to transverse the wetland areas and he asked if that
26 would just be a culvert, a bridge. Mr. Villareale said this was proactive, trying to minimize areas.

1 He pointed out where the wetland widens and said it was highlighted in blue. It is the wetland
2 area itself. The buffer is highlighted in the orange/beige color He showed where they are
3 crossing, at the 2 fingers that come out, saying those are more water courses and streams. He said
4 they would be able to culvert these and come across to access the bigger portion of the property.
5 He said when one looks at the actual wetland disturbance it is very, very limited and the buffer
6 disturbance is somewhat limited. There is more buffer disturbances just based on the amount of
7 wetlands on the property themselves. He said, as Lucia indicated, the Board has received the
8 preliminary set of site plans, grading, utility and infrastructure plans to show how the stormwater
9 management is being handled and a full SWPPP plan has been developed with different ponds.
10 He displayed the stormwater management areas and the calculations that were done to
11 demonstrate that all the stormwater requirements could be satisfied. He said the full SWPPP will
12 be submitted, but all the preliminary analyses have been complete and the basis of the design that
13 was submitted to this Board. Water and sewer can be seen in the report that was provided. The
14 sewer onsite will be handled by a wastewater treatment plant and that would be approved by the
15 DEC as well. With regard to the water, he said there are 2 options. One is municipal water that is
16 accessible via Griffin Lane, which is immediately adjacent to the site. However, that requires
17 some improvements that would be on that private driveway – or they will look at a well system
18 onsite itself. He said it will be one of those 2 options.

19
20 Mr. Villareale said a traffic study was included with an analysis that looked at the intersections
21 along Lime Kiln Road, as well as the intersections with Interstate 84. He said it was shown
22 through that analysis that, based on the uses proposed, there would not be any significant impact
23 to the operations of those intersections. Some signal timing modifications were proposed as part
24 of that traffic study, to those intersections that are signalized, just to offset some of the delays
25 that could get created. He said he knows that was not reviewed as part of the review just

1 received, but he is sure it will work its way in to this system, and there will be a full review of
2 that traffic study as well.

3

4 Mr. Villareale said, as Lucia indicated, they are gearing up for submission to the DEC to start
5 that process and it is obvious that they cannot get through that full process until the SEQ
6 determination is received from this Board. He said they wanted to at least initiate that process
7 with he DEC to start understanding what, if any, additional modifications to the plans are needed
8 as a result of that.

9

10 Mr. Villareale concluded, saying that was the overview and he would be happy to dive in and
11 answer any other questions regarding the plan. He then asked if there were any preliminary
12 questions that the Board may have.

13

14 Ms. Gee said she realizes there are no specific tenants yet, but questioned if this is to be round
15 the clock operation 3 shifts, or what. Mr. Villareale responded that it is hard to say at this point,
16 but he referred this to Mr. Twersky, who returned to the podium and stated that they typically
17 would like it to be 24/7. He added that, typically, what is done for lighting, if that is a concern, is
18 any outdoor lighting would be on occupancy sensors, and after a certain time. Most of the 3rd
19 shift is really limited to inside work and he said there are really no truck deliveries during that
20 time. He reiterated that, typically, they like to be 24/7.

21

22 Mr. Villareale returned to the podium, saying a memory was just triggered of something that was
23 said last time and he thinks it is important to touch on. The topography on this property in
24 relation to the surrounding properties, some of which are residential to the South. He said, with
25 Interstate 84 to the North, and limited things to the East and West, it is really that Southern
26 property line. Mr. Miyoshi stated that this is not necessarily true. He lives across Route 84 and

1 looks right at it, at the end of Griffin Drive. He knows they are trying to build this into the
2 hillside to protect East Hook Cross and all of that, but he is going to be looking at it straight
3 across. He said he is not sure how that would be fixed so that it is not a scar on the side of the
4 hill. Mr. Villareale said they are building it into the hillside and would start with the Southern
5 property line because it is known that they are really immediately adjacent to it. In building it into
6 the hillside, he said part of the building is carried into the backhand side. He said they sit it down
7 a little lower. The topography really rises up when going beyond this so retaining walls that were
8 tiering in this area, everything is really set down from those adjacent properties. The wooded
9 buffer that exists between the properties is being maintained. He pointed out the area that
10 connects all the way down, the triangular shaped, and the area between the residential properties
11 to the left-hand side. He said they really tried to work hard to sync the buildings as much as
12 possible, create as much of the buffering in that area as much as can possibly be done. He told
13 Mr. Miyoshi, in regard to the view from Route 84, he cannot speak to where he is, how high he is
14 situated, so it is hard for him to exactly understand that. Mr. Miyoshi said he looks straight at it,
15 the last house on Griffin Drive. Mr. Villareale said, when looking at the plan, they are set back a
16 good distance from Route 84, so the view sheds from Route 84 itself, do have a significant
17 buffer. Again, he told Mr. Miyoshi how far he is set back, how far he is from an elevation
18 standpoint, he really cannot touch on this. He said they are focused on the surrounding properties
19 immediately adjacent to this and it is really a significant amount of buffering being maintained
20 around all perimeters of the property.

21
22 Ms. Gee asked the height of the tallest side of the building. Mr. Villareale responded that the
23 building is 50 ft high and that is the maxed height. On the loading area side is where the full 50 ft
24 exposure can be seen; it is the North side. Ms. Gee asked if it is single story inside though, and
25 Mr. Villareale replied Yes, it is single story.

26

1 There were no further comments or questions at this point from Board Members and Mr.
2 Eickman looked to the Professionals for theirs.
3
4 Traffic Consultant Fitzgerald asked if there was an alternate connection or access for the second,
5 smaller building and Mr. Villareale responded No. Mr. Fitzgerald asked if there is any potential
6 for that. He said it is if there is only one singular driveway and an emergency where it is blocked
7 and another way to get there. Mr. Villareale responded, saying it is limited because of the
8 location of the property and the wetlands that delineate it. The only alternative would be to have
9 emergency access to Griffin, however, he said, Griffin is a private roadway in that area. Mr.
10 Fitzgerald told Mr. Villareale that, due to the time frame, as he had indicated, there was not the
11 chance to go through the traffic study. Mr. Villareale said that is understood. Mr. Fitzgerald
12 referred to the levels of service and said there is some degradation of the level of service at the
13 Route 84 ramps. He said he would have to go back and look at the other traffic studies for I-park,
14 i.e. Amazon and Hudson Valley Logistics. He does not recall that these projects were in the “E”
15 and “F” Range, so he will have to take a close look to see where that is coming from. He thinks
16 this will certainly raise the DOT’s eyebrow if the levels of service on those ramps is seen to
17 degrade and noted the suggestions and timing. He said Lime Kiln is a different story because
18 there are multiple lanes and infrastructure built for what is being done. However, most of that is
19 going right – and not left. He thinks the left turn off of Route 84 to get to this site is one of the
20 levels of service that offers some problems. He will have to take a look at this closely to see if
21 there is some disconnect with the traffic, if that is truly the case, or what is going to be projected.
22 He told Mr. Villareale that, at some point when they are comfortable with the plan, the DOTs
23 review will need to be sought for their input. Ms. Gee asked Mr. Fitzgerald if he was thinking it
24 might need to be signalized then and he responded that one is signalized, and one is not. Ms. Gee
25 asked him if he was talking about the eastbound one that comes off, going left on Lime Kiln and
26 that one is not signalized, which is correct. Mr. Fitzgerald said they did look at signal warrants

1 and they were hit on. They fell short of that, but not significantly short. He said there may be
2 some other potential and he hesitated to say “roundabout”. There are 2 right lanes that come off,
3 which merge into Lime Kiln, and he said the singular lanes makes the left; the traffic gest
4 separated there. He said that is the movement that has to be looked at a little closer for impacts.
5 The Park & Ride is there, and he said the DOT is also evaluating a truck parking facility in that
6 area, as well as evaluating several sites, but Lime Kiln and Route 84 is one of the sites being
7 evaluated.

8
9 Mr. Villareale said that the traffic analysis was provided, and they will continue to work with the
10 staff to try to address comments. He said, as Mr. Fitzgerald had stated, the degradation did
11 happen at the unsignalized intersection. They did not meet the warrant analysis that they looked
12 at, but said it is always something that they can obviously have conversations with DOT about. If
13 it comes to a point where a signal is warranted at that location, he said then it is something they
14 would look at. Regarding t he other signal, he said that is where they looked at timing
15 modifications to see what they can do to improve the levels of service there.

16
17 Ms. Gee asked if this is something where scheduling could be tweaked so it is off peak hours, or
18 is it a constant first shift, second shift, etc. Mr. Twersky came to the podium to answer, stating it
19 was a tricky question. He could say, right off the bat, the truck drivers are always driving off-
20 peak. They do not want to be sitting in traffic when workers are going to work, people are going
21 to school, and they are always trying to navigate during off-peak hours anyway. He said it is hard
22 to dictate to the tenants when it is unknown at this point. Ms. Gee said then they would just do it
23 naturally because they are trying to avoid it anyway. Mr. Twersky replied Yes.

24
25 Mr. Fitzgerald stated that, from a traffic analysis perspective, they are trying to look at a worst-
26 case scenario because it is unpredictable, certainly for a lot of circumstances.

1
2 Mr. Campbell questioned if tenancy had some impact on this. He said he knows there is not yet a
3 tenant but a tenant like Amazon has a much different traffic pattern rather than a warehouse that
4 has just certain activities. Mr. Villareale acknowledged that it is a great point and, although they
5 still do not have a tenant, they still have to define the use. When the worst-case scenario is
6 looked at, an Amazon type facility is a sorting facility that has significantly more traffic
7 associated with it, than a non-sorting facility. The analysis being looked at now is a non-sorting
8 facility, so there isn't that and he said this was included in the traffic analysis. He said this is
9 something they would expect in any type of approval this Board, if and when it gets to that point,
10 and would identify it. He said they would not be able to look at a worst-case scenario that looks
11 at a non-sorting facility and then put in a "Last Mile" distribution center, or something like that.
12 Without having to come back or make modifications to the plan. Mr. Campbell said, then in
13 order for this to get a C.O., the occupancy would have to be known and then the decision is
14 made. Ms. Robbins said, if they had it approved, say, on spec and then come back with a
15 different use than what the Board approved, a supplemental traffic study would probably be
16 done. Ms. Gee told Ms. Robbins that, in the Board's approval it will need to be specific wording
17 and Ms. Robbins said that is correct. She said that, also it would be specific to the trip
18 generations and Mr. Fitzgerald would advise as to what would be put in the Resolution so that it
19 is covered. The Board may also require an additional traffic study, if they need to. Mr. Villareale
20 said that was discussed in the staff meeting and was the genesis of the traffic study. He added
21 that it was a clear discussion had and something they understood. Ms. Robbins explained it was
22 something that happened with one of the Town's warehouses; it was a higher traffic generator
23 then it went to a lower traffic generator.

24
25 Ms. Robbins had some preliminary comments she wanted to address in this meeting and told Mr.
26 Villareale that he would also be receiving them. In addition, she said a consulting planner would

1 be preparing comments and probably received by him in the beginning of August. She said she
2 thought at first this was a sketch plan until the formal application was received from the applicant
3 and her comments would get more formal.

4 -Bog Turtles, Indiana Bats- Ms. Robbins noted that a Bog Turtle study was prepared
5 and included in the submission. She said she did not see anything on Indiana Bats and asked Mr.
6 Villareale if they did not get a hit on them, which surprised her. Mr. Villareale responded that the
7 Indiana Bat is in this area and he knew that it would be the tree clearing through certain months,
8 for example, October through March. He told Ms. Robbins they would be identified, and she
9 replied to him to make sure that the Bog Turtle and anything about the Indiana Bat is included in
10 the circulation, when they get to this point, since it goes immediately to the DEC for their review.
11 She said there may be bats other than the Indiana Bat. She believes the only thing in the
12 submission was on Bog Turtles and that she didn't see anything specific, but maybe that piece on
13 the Indiana Bat just had not yet been included. Mr. Villareale said he thought it was, but he will
14 check that again. He knows it is just the limiting of tree clearing. She said that is good and that
15 they can weigh in on it when received; it ultimately is their decision.

16 -Waiver, Special Permit- Ms. Robbins told Mr. Villareale that, if a waiver is requested,
17 then a special permit is required. Also, she wanted to remind him that, if there is advertising for a
18 Public Hearing, then there is also the requirement of advertising for the special permit. She said
19 she saw that a noise study would probably be required because of the potential impacts to the
20 residential property lines. This is especially for the southern homes, those near the parking.

21 -Wetlands, Permits- Proposed Building 2 is surrounded by wetlands and Ms. Robbins
22 said there are wetland disturbance permits required, which have already been identified for
23 parking, access to the building and then buffer disturbance to the parking areas. This is for the
24 access drive to Building 1 as well. Although it may already be in the EAF, she said she would ask
25 the applicant to list and quantify the 1.85 acres of disturbance to the adjacent area and then the
26 .36 acres or so of disturbance to the wetlands itself. She said she was just giving him these

1 numbers quantified so it is understood what is being talked about as far as disturbance to the
2 wetlands.

3 -Retaining Walls- Ms. Robbins said it looks to be extensive retaining walls and, since
4 she is not an engineer, looked to Engineer Renna, saying this is more his purview, but she has
5 made some comments in regard to the retaining walls. She told Mr. Villareale that some
6 renderings may be needed, showing the buildings and the retaining walls, particularly from where
7 the residential properties will be. She said there are 2 retaining walls and she saw a difference of
8 20 ft or so at one point. With the significant topographical changes, she said the retaining walls
9 are significant to understand.

10 -Lighting- Ms. Robbins said there are folks who live around this, she said she has a
11 bunch of lighting comments for them to keep in mind when specking out the lights. All lighting
12 should be dark sky compliant, designed, located and installed, fitted and directed so that there is
13 not a hazard to drivers or pedestrians. Because there are so many wetlands, she said everything
14 should be shielded so that the lighting is not hitting the wetlands because the wetlands are
15 literally up against the parking lots. She said it is obvious that what is on the parking lot cannot
16 be controlled as far as a glare when looking at the parking lot, but anything that is beyond the
17 parking lot curbing should be black. She added that it can be done and is pretty easy to do with
18 the shielding. Mr. Twersky said that is pretty straightforward. Ms. Robbins said the lighting will
19 obviously be LED. It should have a correlated color temperature between 2000 k and 2700,
20 which is the warmer lights, not the blue lights. All fixtures shall be shielded to prevent light
21 trespass and glare. When it is more specific, she said that some color rendering could be talked
22 about and she suggested meeting with her at that time, as she has some ideas about just keeping
23 the lighting to a minimum there. She thinks that is something what would help with the
24 neighboring properties.

25 -Architectural Elevations and Renderings – Ms. Robbins said these should be provided
26 to the Board. She knows they have a bunch of locations for renderings being worked on that she

1 provided awhile back and she said she knows that is happening; however, she is just mentioning
2 it.

3 -Proposed Signage- Ms. Robbins said the locations of proposed signage needs to be
4 provided, as the Planning Board actually approves the locations of the signage. Since there will
5 be significant signage and way-finding signage, she said it should all be located on the map, to
6 the extent that they can. If there is a signage plan that they are coming up with, she said they
7 could have it be approved as part of the site plan, which helps in the future so that many building
8 permits do not have to be pulled out in the future, upon construction.

9 -Staff Break Areas – Ms. Robbins said there have been issues lately with warehouses
10 constructed where there is not adequate break areas outdoors where staff can go and sit. She said
11 the Board would like to see that as part of the design areas where staff can go and sit. Some
12 locations have them in the parking lot, which has created some hazardous conditions, so the
13 break areas need to be seen for this.

14
15 Engineer Rennia told Mr. Villareale that a formal memo outlining a few things had been done
16 and hopefully received by him.

17 -Remote Loading Area – Mr. Rennia noted that there is a remote loading area off the
18 emergency exit shown on the plan. He asked what would be happening with this since it is
19 remote from the building. Mr. Villareale replied that it was simply trailer storage only, not for
20 loading. Mr. Rennia suggested relabeling this, as it is different if it is something sitting quiet,
21 opposed to loads being dropped and reloaded. Mr. Villareale said it was a good point and
22 reiterated that it is only needed as storage for trailers on the site; that is where they would go.

23 -Wetlands Mitigation- Mr. Rennia noted the Crossings Buffer Area Usage and asked if
24 it is thought there will be wetlands mitigation and Mr. Villareale answered Yes, there will be a
25 wetlands mitigation plan. He said there are a lot of opportunities on the site to create additional
26 wetlands to provide some enhancements to the buffer. Accordingly, he said there would be a full

1 wetland mitigation plan to address both the wetlands and adjacent area impacts, as required by
2 the DEC.

3 -Wastewater Treatment Plant– Mr. Rennia noted this and asked the type of treatment.
4 Mr. Villareale said the types had been discussed and they are looking at some options. He thinks
5 they need to go further into the process before they engage in it. It is going to be one of the
6 proprietary devices that has the ability to discharge and be in compliance with all of DEC’s
7 regulations. Mr. Rennia said he wants to make sure that, when it gets to that point, there is
8 enough room and space to do that. Mr. Villareale said Yes, it was allocated on the plan, and
9 someone has been consulted at this point. He said they should get an understanding as to the size
10 of the building that’s required, any service areas to it and that is how they were delineated on the
11 plans accordingly.

12
13 Fire Commissioner Jodlowski stated that normally a lot of his questions would be about the
14 tenants, number inside the building, number of truck trips, number of employees inside, related
15 facilities and what kind of emergency level calls they have, i.e., EMS calls, Fire calls on a regular
16 basis. He said it has become a real problem for them with some of the Warehouses. He asked if
17 the emergency entrance was gated at all, or is it open access all the time. Mr. Villareale replied
18 that it would be gated; they would want some to of gate and he would coordinate obviously with
19 his for access. Mr. Jodlowski said the height of the building is 50 ft. Generally, in case of a fire,
20 he said they have to operate outside of a collapse zone, which is considered one- and one-half
21 times the height of the building, at least for a safe zone. In doing some rough math with the
22 loading zones and a 53 ft trailer, he said it is well outside that. He asked about the width of the
23 pavement for the western side of the south side of the building; He said it does not look like it
24 would be enough for them to be 75 ft away, to operate in that area. Mr. Villareale checked the
25 area on the plan and said that this part of the building is buried, so it is not the full 50 ft height
26 necessarily; some spots are and some spots are not. He said he would get some more information

1 on it. He explained that the parking width was about 60 ft., order of magnitude from face of
2 building to opposite curb line is someplace in that 75 ft range. He told Mr. Jodlowski if he was is
3 in the aisle, No, it would not be outside of that area.

4
5 Mr. Jodlowski asked if there was a plan for water cisterns. Mr. Villareale said they will work on
6 this; it depends on 2 things: 1) if they have access to the municipal water system; 2) if they have
7 to do wells on site, and they obviously would have some type of cistern available storage on the
8 property in the event they have to go with wells. Mr. Jodlowski told him, if they are not
9 connected to municipal water, and the fire company is shuttling water from someplace else for a
10 fire on the property, it is 2,000-3,000 gallons at a time. He told him to be aware that this is in an
11 entirely Volunteer Fire District, as it is something to keep in mind with regard to their fire
12 protection. Mr. Villareale said that obviously they would have some type of water storage on the
13 property designed in accordance with whatever requirements there are.

14
15 Fire Advisory Board member Robert Odell asked if it would be fully sprinkled and interior stem
16 pipes. Mr. Jodlowski said the sprinklers are not as much of a concern as the water that fills the
17 sprinklers; it has to come from somewhere and when it runs out, it runs out.

18
19 Mr. Odell stated that they will be looking for hydrants' exterior in case one of the trucks light up
20 or something. Mr. Villareale told him they will coordinate for exact hydrant locations. Some
21 preliminary locations were provided on the plan, but he will be sure they fully coordinate with
22 the Fire Board for how many and the specific locations where they want them to be. Mr. Odell
23 told him there is the other spot, the cul-de-sac on the south side of the building and he would like
24 the driveway continued right through there, so there is full circulation. Mr. Villareale responded
25 that it is something they will have to look at. He said there is grade change there, and that is how
26 the grade change was accommodated, by burying part of the building. He added that the loading

1 needs to sit at the lower location, because that is where there is access. He said he will always say
2 they will look at it, but his preliminary feedback is that it is because of the grade separation. He
3 added that keeping the loading area separate from the vehicles was important and full access was
4 given around all parts of the building there. Mr. Odell said the cul-de-sacs have to meet the Fire
5 Company's turning radius. Mr. Villareale said 100%; they are very large and would be able to
6 accommodate full-size vehicles turning in there.

7

8 Ms. Robbins stated that she had a couple things to add:

9 -Landscaping- She said this is to the extent that it may be preliminary right now, but it
10 can be thought about.

11 -Bus Station-Public Transportation- Ms. Robbins asked if there is a plan to have a bus
12 station or some sort of public transportation to this location. Mr. Villareale replied that he had
13 not discussed that yet, but he is sure they can. Ms. Robbins looked to Mr. Fitzgerald, saying she
14 did not know if it could be considered. Mr. Fitzgerald said that the county recently received a
15 grant to improve bus service to these facilities, like Amazon and the Logistic Center. He knows
16 that it is actively being worked on and a special bus being bought for direct service. It will be a
17 matter of the bus being able to get in and out a certain way and it might be at the entrance. Mr.
18 Villareale said they would be looking at this for sure. Mr. Fitzgerald said there were definitely
19 some transit areas for the other warehouses.

20

21 Mr. Eickman confirmed there were no further questions or comments from Board Members or
22 Town Professionals. He told Mr. Villareale that the Board will look forward to receiving further
23 information and he responded that they would get it in as soon as possible.

24

25

26

27

28

1 **EXTENSION:**

2
3 **8. #2022 – 037 – Firas Bridges Subdivision, Eder Road (6656-00-819763)**

4
5 Applicant is looking for a 3-month extension for a subdivision plan.

6
7 Brian Stokosa, P.E., Day & Stokosa Engineering, PC was present.

8
9 Mr. Stokosa stated that they are almost done with this one and have received Health Department
10 approval before the holiday. A final revision was submitted to the Town for review and he said
11 they were just present this evening to hopefully extend the approval so that they can file next
12 month.

13
14 Ms. Robbins gave a quick summary, stating that this Subdivision approval expired on April 18,
15 2024. The request for an Extension had previously been received. Due to waiting on a couple of
16 things, she said it had not been put on the agenda until now. They are asking the Planning Board
17 to consider a 3-month Extension through July 18th, with an additional 30 days granted to the
18 applicant. This is providing that the applicant gives the plan to the Town Engineer that
19 satisfactorily addresses and corrects some existing encroachments in the Town right-of-way. She
20 said she thinks there was some drainage that was put in the Town right-of-way., rather than on
21 the property. She said they are working through these things, but, in any case, she said the
22 applicant was going to revise the subdivision plat and then provide it to the Town engineer for
23 his review and approval. This, she said, is a condition in getting the additional 30 days. Ms. Gee
24 asked Mr. Stokosa if it is just the 30 days he needs to finish this last item. He responded that, as
25 Ms. Robbins said, they have been working with the applicant directly. He is working with
26 Engineer Bryant offline. In the latest submission to the Board, he said they tried to incorporate
27 the changes expressed to him, through the applicant, and his conversation with Mr. Bryant. He
28 said Mr. Bryant did a review memo on February 15th, the plans are revised, and the Town has
29 them. He would like to reflect that they will work with Mr. Bryant to address his February 15th

1 letter and said all his provisions speak to what Ms. Robbins said. She asked if that was going to
2 be added as a condition and if there was a specific memo. Mr. Stokosa gave her a copy of the
3 memo and she said the condition would be added as “satisfactory resolution of the Town
4 Engineer review memo”. Mr. Eickman asked her if that was condition #1 in the last version of
5 the Resolution that she gave him. She responded that there were also a couple of other things
6 there.

7
8
9
10
11 **RESOLUTION EXTENDING FINAL SUBDIVISION APPROVAL**

12
13 **NAME OF SUBDIVISION PLAN:** Firas Bridges Subdivision (3-Lot)
14 **NAME OF APPLICANT:** Firas Bridges
15 **LOCATION:** 520 Eder Road
16 **GRID NO:** 132800-6656-00-819763

17
18 **Resolution Offered by Planning Board Member: John Eickman**

19
20 **WHEREAS**, the Firas Bridges Subdivision was granted final approval for a 3-lot
21 subdivision on April 18, 2023; and

22 **WHEREAS**, the applicant is awaiting approval from the Department of Behavioral and
23 Community Health (DBCH); and

24 **WHEREAS**, the subdivision approval expired on April 18, 2024 at which time the
25 applicant submitted a request for an extension; and

26 **WHEREAS**, the Planning Board agreed to consider a three-month extension through
27 July 18, 2024 with an additional 30 days through August 18, 2024 contingent upon the applicant
28 providing a plan to the Town Engineer that satisfactorily addresses and corrects the existing
29 encroachments in the Town right-of-way by the applicant; and

30 **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Planning Board hereby extends
31 final subdivision approval through August 18, 2024 for the above project as represented on a
32 map entitled "Bridges Subdivision" prepared by Day & Stokosa, Engineering P.C., dated May 23,
33 2022 and last revised March 30, 2023 subject to the following conditions:

- 34 1) The submission of a plan to the Town Engineer that satisfactorily addresses and
35 corrects the existing encroachments in the Town right-of-way; and

- 2) All conditions contained in the original resolution of subdivision approval dated 4/18/23 must be met; and
- 3) Recreation fees in the amount of \$12,500 due to the Town of East Fishkill prior to the signing of the subdivision plat in final form by the duly authorized officer of the East Fishkill Planning Board; and
- 4) The applicant addresses the comments in 2/15/24 memorandum from the Town Engineer to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer.

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 Richard Campbell Aye
- Board Member Donald Papae Aye
- Board Member John Greenan Aye
- Chairperson John Eickman Aye
- Alternate Board Member John Giovagnoli Present

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
27
28
29
30

CORRESPONDENCE:

9. #2024 – 081 – Woodland Estates (Twin Creeks), 6457-18-344225, 343206, 300180, 398229, 406146, 473057, 402041, 355141

Applicant is requesting that the Planning Board initiate SEQR for the proposed residential development that would include 24 multi-family buildings with a total of 468 units of various sizes in the PRD district.

Mr. Eickman stated that this was the residential project the Board heard about at the last meeting. In order to start to move forward, he said the Applicant has asked that the Board declare it’s intent to be Lead Agency. Ms. Robbins said that is correct, in order for them to do their due diligence and start meeting with the agencies, the SEQR has to be initiated. By the Board declaring its intent to be Lead Agency tonight, she said it is initiating SEQR.

MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, declaring the Planning Board’s intent to be Lead Agency for Woodland Estates (Twin Creeks). Voted and carried unanimously.

IPARK WAREHOUSE DEVELOPMENT
ANNOUNCEMENT OF JOINT PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Eickman noted that there was an additional item that was not on the agenda, and he turned to Ms. Robbins. She stated that she did not know if the Board recalled, but previously there had been a joint public hearing that was scheduled with the Town Board for a project in the iPark site. She said they are going to reschedule this for July 25th. It would be a warehouse project for

1 East Fishkill iPark. An application and fees were submitted, and she said at this point it is a spec
2 warehouse, on the iPark site. The Town Board has already scheduled the Public Hearing and Ms.
3 Robbins explained that this is an announcement that it is a Joint Public Hearing of which the
4 Planning Board will be in attendance. At the public hearing, she said they will be talking to the
5 special permit that is required in order to do a warehouse facility in that location, Then, what has
6 happened in previous applications, the public hearings for the special permit would be completed
7 but adjourned for the site plan. At that point, she said it would come to the Planning Board to
8 complete the site plan review. Ms. Robbins said this is just the announcement of the joint public
9 hearing of the Town Board and Planning Board that starts at 6:00 on July 25, 2024.

10

11 Mr. Eickman said then this is pursuant to the previous adjournment and Ms. Robbins replied that
12 is correct. Mr. Jodlowski asked if that would include him, others the Fire Board as well. Ms.
13 Robbins said they could attend but that this will also be coming back to the Planning Board for
14 Site Plan approval, and they will be involved then.

15

16 Ms. Keenan asked the Members to let her know if they will be attending the joint public hearing.

17

18

19 Mr. Eickman confirmed that there was no further business this evening.

20

21

22

ADJOURNMENT

23

24

25

26

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

27

28

29

30

1 **Respectfully submitted:**
2
3

Kathleen Mahodil, Meeting Secretary
East Fishkill Planning Board