

***TOWN OF EAST FISHKILL
PLANNING BOARD MEETING***

JUNE 12, 2025

Planning Board Chairperson John Eickman called the meeting to order.

CHAIRPERSON COMMENTS:

Members present during the roll call were John Giovagnoli, Donald Papae
John Eickman, Richard Campbell, Ed Miyoshi and Sarah Bledsoe.
Member Lori Gee was absent.

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

:

**b. Mr. Eickman announced the *Upcoming Meeting Dates* are:
*July 17, 2025-Thursday, and August 19, 2025-Tuesday.***

c. *Approval of Minutes of Meeting Held: May 20, 2025*

**MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Ed Miyoshi,
to approve the Minutes of Meeting Held May 20, 2025.
Voted and carried unanimously.**

Town Professionals and Consultants present were: Michael Cunningham, Esq., Town Attorney;
Michelle Robbins, AICP-Town Planner and Scott Bryant, Town Engineer.

Staff present were: Jackie Keenan, Planning Board Clerk, along with Matt Rickett, Zoning
Administrator, Chris Jodlowski, Fire Commissioner, Dave Palin, Fire Advisory Board, and
Danielle Angyal Jr., Town Planner.

1 **ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING:**

- 2
- 3
- 4 1. Receive Public Comments on the **Draft East Fishkill Comprehensive Plan** currently
- 5 under review by the Town Board.
- 6

7 Mr. Eickman announced that there was a meeting last month and last evening there was a public

8 workshop for this. He said several members of the community came and they had some excellent

9 questions and comments.

10

11

12 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to open**

13 **the Public Hearing for the Draft East Fishkill Comprehensive Plan.**

14 **Voted and carried unanimously.**

15

16

17 Mr. Eickman said he would read the comments from the June 11th workshop. Those attending on

18 behalf of the Comprehensive Master Plan committee were himself, Michelle Robbins, Maryanne

19 Flores, who he said is one of the Town Council members, and Emily Gardner, of Saratoga

20 Associates, who had advised all throughout the plan.

21

22 Mr. Eickman stated that some of the comments included the concerns about what they saw on the

23 Plan, as follows:

24

- 25 - When the State gets ready to remove the bridge on Route 82, there apparently is an
- 26 indication that it will be a 3-year Plan that may end up cutting people off from being
- 27 able to cross from one side of the Town to the other. It may be difficult to get to
- 28 businesses. Two (2) of the members actually suggested that the State consider a
- 29 temporary prefabricated bridge to mitigate that disruption. He said this will be part of
- 30 the things recommended, and it is a good point.
- 31
- 32 - There may be up to five (5) traffic circles going forward. Not all of that is conceptual
- 33 at this point and it will still take a lot of planning and, more importantly, funding for it.
- 34 He said that too may cause some disruptions, and they were concerned about that.
- 35

36 -

- The proposed Loop Trail crosses Routes 82 and 376. There were concerns about pedestrian safety and other concerns regarding adequate restroom facilities and maintenance of the path, particularly during the winter months for snow removal.
- One community member wanted to know if there would be recommendations on wayfinding signage and the answer to that was Yes, and actually a big item throughout the discussions. She also had a concern with making sure there is sufficient parking for people to park and walk from business to business which, he said, is also part of the conceptual plans. Also, proper signage to show people where parking will be located. Mr. Miyoshi stated that crosswalks may also be needed; that there aren't very many in Town and he expressed that if people are being expected to walk, it would be nice if they could cross the roads safely.
- Another question raised was the installation of sidewalks along Route 82. While the need for improved walkability was supported, questions asked were access to mailboxes, conflicts with utility poles, snow clearing by property owner, versus the Town. There were questions concerning the connections to the Community Center, and there were some recommendations made by one member of the community.
- There were some general comments, including support for small businesses, and requests for notification and public participation during the Zoning Review process.

Mr. Eickman stated that, all things considered, everyone was very positive about the Plan. He said a lot of these things are more operational or planning kinds of things that he is sure will go into discussions as this moves forward; but it was very well received.

Mr. Eickman addressed the public, asking if there were anyone present this evening to speak for or against the Comprehensive Master Plan. It appeared there was no one present to do so, He proceeded to take comments from the Board Members, whom he said hadn't had an opportunity to comment, up to this point:

1 -John Giovagnoli stated that, if there is anyone who has not looked at the Comprehensive
2 Plan, just the historic value alone is worth the read. He understands that the Comprehensive Plan
3 is to maintain development moving forward. He believes that, without proper zoning, this turns
4 into a Wishlist. Implementing these goals becomes very difficult, i.e., housing, green spaces,
5 farmlands, industrial development. He said the zoning becomes a key to developing any plan
6 moving forward here. He specifically noted a statement in the Plan: "The Town offers a blend of
7 rural charm and suburban convenience." He said he thinks that is why most moved here. He
8 believes, with the proper Zoning moving forward, it doesn't turn into a Wishlist, but it turns into
9 an actual Plan, moving forward. His biggest concern with this moving forward is Zoning, and
10 Zoning dictates all; it dictates what plans move forward and Zoning dictates what gets built. His
11 biggest concern out of this entire Plan is the Zoning that follows.

12 -Donald Papae stated that he agrees. He thinks the Board wants it to be a rural community
13 and not over develop this. With the roads now, they are going to be jammed up and, with over
14 development, he said people can't be asked to give up their property to increase the width of the
15 roads, to make them a 4-lane, when it is 2-lane. He said, as Mr. Giovagnoli did, that Zoning is
16 really critical here

17 -Richard. Campbell stated that, through the public and professional input, he thinks that he
18 sees a Plan really coming together. He sees it as something very attainable and said he feels very
19 comfortable where it is to this point. He would like to see more public input, rather than social
20 media criticism of it and it is interesting to see some of the dynamic in that. He prefers to see
21 people come out and tell the Board their thoughts and feelings, rather than trying to maintain battles
22 online. He would rather they bring them to the Board to let them understand so they can do their
23 jobs at that level.

24 -Ed Miyoshi stated that, from what he recalls in reading through the Plan, it seemed like it
25 is more of an aspirational document. He said it is not really concrete with what they want to do.
26 For example, he referred that it says they want to promote the Arts in the Town but questioned
27 how that is going to be done. He said he is a member of the Guitar Club that meets monthly in the

1 Library on Sunday afternoons. During the Summer, he said the Library is closed on Sundays, so
2 they did not have a home for a bit. They actually approached the Recreation Department about
3 potentially using the bandstand in the Rec. and they were told if they wanted to do that, they would
4 have to rent it. To him, he said that is not really encouraging the Arts and he noted that Beacon has
5 the First Saturdays, Second Saturdays, where there are different events in town. He said it draws
6 people into the town. He is envisioning artists displaying their works, maybe a couple dance
7 studios where they could have a recital in that space. He said it could be open to the public, have
8 open mic type of things, get some musicians out there, which could encourage people to gather in
9 a space.

10 Mr. Eickman responded that a lot of the implementation will be assigned to various groups,
11 various committees, groups of people by the Town Board once they approve the Plan and it is off
12 and running. Mr. Miyoshi said that is what is aspirational, and Mr. Eickman replied, Exactly. Ms.
13 Robbins told Mr. Miyoshi she wanted to add that, if there is something specific that might help
14 implement a goal that he sees, then he should send her some thoughts on paper. She said maybe it
15 is something that could be worked into one of the policies and make it a little more detailed.

16 Mr. Campbell said, to Mr. Miyoshi's good point, the Eastdale community has built a
17 community. It is flat ground, nothing there but it was easier and built around all those things,
18 together with businesses and it really has a downtown feel. He said maybe they could look to
19 attempt to mimic a little bit of it, take the finer points that would fit this community, and try to
20 assimilate them into the Plan and see how it goes from there.

21 -Sarah Bledsoe stated that she thinks everyone agrees, this is a big Town, but everyone
22 is craving community. They are looking for their own outlets for a sense of community To Mr.
23 Miyoshi's point, she said through Art, culture, maybe some nightlife, maybe sports, whatever it
24 might be. Maybe instead of fighting the social media aspect of it, she said that's the way to reach
25 the people since that is where they are. She said that is where they are willing to participate and
26 maybe through this implementation process there is a way, although it is challenging to open up
27 the forum to people who are willing to participate from behind their screens but are unwilling or

1 unable to come to the meetings. She hopes there is a way to reach the people who are looking for
2 things such as multigenerational living, a downtown, vibrant community that serves different
3 people in different ways, where they are. To Mr. Campbell's point, she said there is not the direct
4 ability to build the things wanted. Storefronts can't be updated by themselves; a neighborhood
5 can't be constructed. She hopes this plan will allow the Town to legislate for it, plan for it and
6 create the conditions that make it possible. She said that she, personally, is really looking forward
7 to the next process of taking this framework and seeing the implementation through.

8 Mr. Campbell commented that this is also a good point. He said he does not know how it
9 connects, but his family was involved with a pretty substantial project down in Westchester, in
10 Ossining. Going back to the 70s, and towards the 80s, he said the Main Street in Ossining was
11 pretty downtrodden, struggling. Urban renewal had come through Ossining, like a lot of towns,
12 ripped things down to the ground with the promise of building back; it never happened. It was
13 probably in the late 70s when there were community development grants made available to
14 businesses that were on Main Street, and storefronts there so that they could make improvements
15 to their places. It was at their own expense, but he said they obviously were grants provided to
16 some degree, and low interest, whatever they may have been. He said he did not know if the State
17 today is really aggressively pursuing that, some of the mixed use that this Town is looking to do.
18 Like Ms. Bledsoe said, maybe there is some kind of connectivity to bring that to the table, to these
19 businesses, or people who may have a desire, want to improve upon their storefronts or businesses.
20 He said maybe the Town can potentially connect some dots to help them get part of this plan and
21 get on board with action for it to happen.

22
23 Mr. Eickman thanked the Members and asked if there were any comments from the Town
24 Professionals or Fire Advisory Board.

25
26
27 - Chris Jodlowski, Fire Advisory Board, spoke, saying he was lucky enough to meet

1 with the team that put together the Plan early in the process and to present to them some of the
2 challenges that the Fire District faces as the Town grows. He stated that first and foremost is just
3 the call volume and trying to plan in a way that makes them able to maintain the Town's volunteer
4 Fire Department and Rescue Squad. He said that just 2 days ago, for instance, they answered 23
5 calls in 24 hours; it was a busy day, entirely volunteer and, as the Town grows, that becomes more
6 the normal than the exception. He said it puts a lot of pressure on. If there are the members to do
7 it, then it is not a problem. On social media it is seen that people say maybe it is just time to go
8 with a paid department, not realizing the expense that goes along with that. He said their taxes will
9 go up exponentially in the fire side. He said as they look to the kinds of businesses and entities that
10 they are going to try to attract to the Town, to keep in mind that there are some things that just
11 become too big for the fire department to handle. It puts such pressure on them, and it becomes
12 difficult to maintain what they have. He said what they have is a great benefit to the Town. From
13 a personal side as a business owner, he said it was interesting what Mr. Campbell said about
14 helping out businesses that are in the Town. He said a great effort is made to try and attract
15 businesses to Town, but what is done for the businesses that are in the Town, who have already
16 chosen this Town on their own. He said they chose to start a business here because they live here.
17 It is their community, and they chose to add to it that way. He said it was very difficult in a lot of
18 ways A lot of challenges were faced to do that while they watched other businesses kind of get
19 ushered in with all kinds of help, assistance and guidance He said he would like to see the kind of
20 help that is used to recruit businesses, offered to keep businesses, to maintain the small businesses
21 that are in the Town. Just recently, he said, a beloved restaurant was lost up the road. He reiterated
22 what can be done to maintain businesses that they have, first and foremost, before going out to try
23 and find new ones. Mr. Eickman responded that they were great points and thanked Mr. Jodlowski.
24
25 Me. Eickman announced that, since there were no members from the public present to speak this
26 evening on the Comprehensive Plan, the Public Hearing would be closed. However, he wanted to
27 note that written comments would be received in the Planning Department for the next 30 days.

1 He said that if any members of the public, or those from the Board, had any comments or questions,
2 they could be sent into the Planning Department via email. In addition, he said Ms. Robbins has
3 offered to meet with anyone who would like to meet with a question or concern. All one has to do
4 is to call the Planning Department to try to set up a meeting with Ms. Robbins to do that. He said
5 there was probably a couple of months where that could be accomplished, but he suggested doing
6 that sooner, rather than later, as there are ongoing things.

7
8 **MOTION made by Sarah Bledsoe, seconded by Richard Campbell, to close**
9 **the Public Hearing for the Draft East Fishkill Comprehensive Plan.**
10 **Voted and carried unanimously.**
11

12
13
14 ***DISCUSSION:***

- 15
16 2. **#2025-098 Valley Christian Church,** 1072 Route 82
17 (6458-04-688075/678055) 1072 Route 82 (6458-04-688075/678055)
18

19 Applicant is applying for an amended site plan to add a 2-way drive and 24
20 additional parking spaces to the existing site plan. The site currently contains 142
21 spaces. he proposed amendment to the site plan would remove 2 spaces and add
22 24 spaces for a total of 164 spaces.
23

24 Alex Alamo, Whalen Architecture PLLC, Matt Towne, Engineer, Willingham Towne, and Dan
25 Gilman, on behalf of Applicant, were present.
26

27 Mr. Alamo began by saying this had been before the Board in April with a schematic idea. To
28 summarize the comments, he said they did not dig anymore as they were told to get a full
29 engineering plan together. It was suggested they do a drilling program, which he said was not
30 done. Instead, they went straight to the engineering, since they figured that was the most critical
31 information and they can figure out how to deal with the rock later. He said they hired Matt Towne,
32 from Willingham Towne Engineers. The plan was revised a bit, and he said they figured out the
33 grading necessary for a lot, the number of spaces, which was refined down to 24. He said it is a

1 24-spot lot, with the stairs going up. Comments were just received from the Fire Advisory Board
2 about some signage for No-Parking. He said they should have enough clear space at the entry
3 ramp and the general design kind of remains similar. They are just fine tuning the radius on the
4 ramp, the slopes and the grades. He pointed out their architectural plan on the display, as well as
5 the civil plans. He wanted to turn the podium over to Mr. Towne next and asked if there were any
6 questions from the Board first.

7
8 Mr. Eickman stated that, without the geotechnical investigation, that was recommended by the
9 Town Engineer that they may be faced with restoration in the event they cannot do what the plan
10 is at this point. Mr. Alamo responded, if there is a risk and they get up there and absolutely can't
11 blast or hammer, then he thinks if the church wants to pay the expense of a geotechnical program
12 or scrap the parking lot at that point. He said that is up to their discretion and he thinks the last
13 time some kind of conservatory or covenant was talked about, maybe a bond for restoration. Mr.
14 Bryant stated that if they don't come through then they have to restore it. Mr. Eickman asked Mr.
15 Alamo if that essentially is the route they are looking to go down. Mr. Alamo responded Yes, but
16 that he does not think it will be required. He would like the church to have the permission to work
17 up there and if it comes to the point where they know they cannot do anything then, he said they
18 would definitely be restoring anything they can.

19
20 Mr. Eickman said there is still some process to go through and that they want to complete some
21 discussion this evening. He told Mr. Alamo he was waiting to hear from his associate. He noted
22 that there would need to be a public hearing so that members of the public would have the
23 opportunity to come and speak about the project, because it is a pretty significant change. During
24 this month or so, he told Mr. Alamo that he thinks he can expect without knowing for sure what
25 they are able to do, the Town will require restoration back. Mr. Alamo responded that they know
26 for sure what they are going to do and have the engineer plans, lighting. Mr. Eickman said in the
27 event they run into the kind of rock that wouldn't permit them to complete the plan, then the

1 agreement, or the indication by their side, is that the site would be restored to its original condition.
2 He said then the Town would need a bond to ensure that that happens. Mr. Alamo responded that
3 he did not understand this was conditional, based on if they did not do the geotechnical probing.
4 He said it is still the same situation; they could have done the probing and tried to dig, they
5 couldn't, right? He said he does not know if that is a definite answer either. Mr. Miyoshi told Mr.
6 Alamo the probing was supposed to tell them exactly what is there. So they would know if they
7 could do it, before they even started.

8
9 Dan Gilman came to the podium, stating he is the Operations Pastor at the church and that they
10 did reach out to 3 different Geotech firms. He said they were asked if they investigated it and they
11 did go back and investigated it. At the high end, he said it was \$20,000 to get a machine up there
12 and drill down into the rock. He said he sent information and pictures to them they all said there
13 should be no problem removing that rock. He said they were told there are multiple ways, the rock
14 looks soft, they experienced removing part of it in the last site revision. They all agreed, as well
15 as the excavator, saying that there shouldn't be any problem executing this plan. He told the
16 Board he wanted them to know that the Board's advice was not ignored; they did reach out and it
17 was very costly. Instead of spending \$20,000 for the guy who said it was okay to go ahead and
18 hammer the rock, they would just spend \$15,000 - \$20,000 hammering the rock. Mr. Eickman
19 said he just wanted to make it clear that there is a risk and told Mr. Gilman he is aware of the risk
20 of the possibility that it is not what everybody thinks. He said it will be incorporated into the
21 Decision and, hopefully, everything will work out perfectly for them. Mr. Campbell told Mr.
22 Gilman the risk is, if they don't get the parking lot completed is that a Bond has been posted by
23 them that would ensure the restoration of the property back to its original condition. Mr. Gilman
24 questioned the original condition. Mr. Campbell responded that there is a stop-work Order on the
25 site; they went beyond the scope of what they should have done. He explained that what he was
26 saying was, if this goes down the road and there is a permit to do this, and it does not work out
27 the way they expect it to as has been advised by the other professionals, or the professionals with

1 him tonight, that a Bond is being posted to restore it back to when the work that was not permitted
2 was started. Mr. Gilman wanted to confirm it would be like planting trees, getting grass. Mr.
3 Campbell said yes, bring it back to its original. Mr. Gilman said they would just leave it. Mr.
4 Campbell said it can't be facilitated to be brought back to exactly the same, but it would have to
5 be restored back to the type of space it was, prior to the work being done. Mr. Gilman said he
6 agrees and does not have a problem with that, and he wanted to reserve the right to make it a green
7 space for the church to use, if possible. He said then they would certainly bring it back to the
8 Board for review. Mr. Eickman replied Yes, and Mr. Gilman thanked the Board.

9
10 Mr. Towne came to the podium and said he wanted to echo that, in the previous project, there was
11 a lot of hammering required. and the rock broke up really easy, in talking with the excavator. He
12 said they did dig a little up there to inspect it and it was the same. That is what is anticipated, but
13 it is unknown, obviously; it is underground. He said it is a 24-car parking lot; 2 spaces are being
14 removed and there would be signs put up for "No-Parking". Mr. Palin said it looked like 1 ½
15 spaces. Mr. Towne said there are 2. Mr. Palin asked if the spaces were 10 ft wide and Mr. Towne
16 asked if he meant the existing one. Mr. Palin said he was going by the drawing that was submitted
17 to the Planning Board and, when he measured it, it was more like 15 ft. instead of 20 ft. He said,
18 even that, it will work for the Fire District and the only thing they ask for is "No-Parking" signs.
19 He said there will be a space there and, "if it looks like a duck, quacks like a duck, then parks like
20 a duck" it is probably a parking space. Mr. Towne said that was fair enough and brought the
21 drawing to the table to show him the location of 2 separate spots and No Parking.

22
23 Ms. Robbins wanted to piggy-back on the discussion about the parking space. She noted the space
24 that is marked off where the pedestrian walk comes in off of the hillside and said she does not
25 know where folks would go when they get there; it has to be safe pedestrian access to the building.
26 She said they may have to stripe another space or just figure out a way to get people safely across

1 the parking lot. Since they are being dropped on the parking lot, another space may be lost there;
2 it is something to be looked at.

3
4 Ms. Robbins had some other comments. There is a fence proposed along the property line, along
5 with 22 spruce trees and 5 heritage river birch. She noted the spacing is pretty tight, 10 ft behind
6 the line, and she does not know the topography at that point, but space is needed to plant these
7 trees. She said it has to be made sure that the plantings soften the site so that the residential
8 property next door is not looking at the lights from this parking lot. Her concern is that the poles
9 are about 15 ft tall and she knows full cutoff fixtures are being used. She said to be sure there is
10 no light spillover behind the site. If the fixtures have to be shielded, she said sometimes there are
11 devices that are put on so that the light stops right at the fixture line and doesn't go beyond. She
12 said this is going to be above the neighbor's property, and he was seeing just woods before. In
13 fairness, she said this was supposed to be a non-disturbance area and as much as possible has to
14 be done so that they are not disturbed by light poles in their backyard. Because it is taller, she said
15 it will be a little bit of a challenge. She suggested they could maybe consider different light fixtures
16 than what they have, such as lower ones, bollard types and do what they can to soften the lighting
17 as much as possible, since it is high above the other property.

18
19 Mr. Eickman asked the detail of the proposed fence such as material, color, height. Mr. Towne
20 stated it is on sheet CP3. Mr. Eickman did not have a copy of the plan. Mr. Towne explained that
21 the fence is stockade, 6 ft tall, with vertical wood slats. Ms. Robbins asked Mr. Eickman if it had
22 to be decided whether this is a stockade or vinyl and it may be less maintenance required. She
23 said the lighting levels right now are low near the stairway. They may be okay but she said she
24 did not know if it takes into consideration all the lighting that may be on the church building itself.
25 She said it needs to be made sure that safety is maintained because of where it comes down the
26 staircase, right into the parking lot; it is low.

1 Ms. Robbins noted that there are also 6 required ADA spaces and one (1) van parking space for
2 the number of parking spaces on the plan. She said 2 spaces are located near the secondary
3 building. She said all of the ADA spaces need to be put near the main church; two (2) of them are
4 near the offices and she thinks there should be two (2) more spaces near the church. If a van space
5 is not shown, she said that is a requirement to show it. Mr. Towne questioned if the parking lot
6 was changing. Ms. Robbins said, if there are the required number of parking spaces, Six (6) ADA
7 and one (1) for a van; all of the ADA spaces should be near the building. Mr. Towne\ said they are
8 all van accessible and Ms. Robbins replied OK.

9
10 In summarizing, Ms. Robbins told the Board she would advise them to add the Restoration Bond
11 as a condition of Site Plan Approval. She said the final parking spaces will be done once they take
12 a look at the pedestrian issues; another space may be lost here or there.

13
14 Mr. Bryant wanted to add that there are two (2) drywells proposed at the entrance to the separate
15 parking lot. Some excavation will need to be done there to determine whether the drywells are
16 really feasible. He said the Board should give permission for that exercise to determine that is
17 going to work. Mr. Towne asked if that is something that they can do.

18
19 Mr. Bryant stated this is something that would be witnessed, as well. Mr. Eickman told Mr. Towne
20 and the team at the podium to notify the Town Engineer before they do it, so that he can go out to
21 the site himself or send someone to do so.

22
23
24 **MOTION made by Ed Miyoshi, seconded by Richard Campbell, to approve**
25 **excavation work described in finite, in two (2) limited areas for the Valley**
26 **Christian Church.** Voted and carried unanimously.
27
28
29

1 Mr. Eickman confirmed the date for a public hearing and asked the team to bring a large set of
2 plans so that anyone from the public would be able to view them a little easier. Mr. Alamo said
3 that would work for them, they have full set plans and would bring an easel.

4
5
6 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell seconded by Ed Miyoshi, to schedule a**
7 **Public Hearing for the Valley Christian Church, to be held on July 17, 2025.**
8 **Voted and carried unanimously.**
9

10
11 Mr. Alamo asked if it would be the public hearing, and then the Board will look at it then or was
12 it the next one. Mr. Eickman responded that there would be a public hearing, but first of all he
13 should check with Ms. Keenan as there are mailings to be sent out. He suggested they would want
14 to spend some time with Mr. Bryant or Ms. Robbins so that it can be determined if there would be
15 a Resolution at that time, or not. He said his guess is that it will be. Ms. Robbins stated that it
16 would depend on public comments be received and how quickly they can turn around the plan and
17 address the comments heard from the Board tonight. Mr. Campbell said to check to see if the
18 drywell perks the right way.

19
20 Mr. Alamo asked about the restoration bond and if that is something that gets written up. Attorney
21 Cunningham responded that they would go to a bonding company to do that. Mr. Bryant said it
22 could be a cash bond, and Ms. Robbins said it could be held through escrow. Mr. Alamo said then
23 it is literally just the Bond. Mr. Campbell suggested they go to the person who does their property
24 insurance, and they should be able to give an idea or can direct them to someone. Mr. Campbell
25 asked how they would determine how much the Bond would be, and Mr. Bryant said that would
26 be worked out. Mr. Campbell told the team at the podium when they know how much it is, then
27 they can go to the insurance company Mr. Bryant added that, for the smaller amounts, generally it
28 would be a cash Bond posted. Mr. Eickman suggested they do this right away and wrap up as much
29 as possible and quickly, so that this doesn't go to the last-minute Mr. Alamo said then the Bond

1 would not come until after it is approved. Mr. Bryant told them it would be about \$20,000, as a
2 matter of magnitude

3
4
5
6
7 ***DISCUSSION:***

8
9 **3. #2025 – 099 – Ridges at Stormville Mountain Subdivision, 20 Stormville**
10 **Mountain Rd. (6656-00-536587)**

11
12 Applicant is applying for an 11-lot subdivision on 41.19 acres in a R2 zone.

13
14 Aime Patane, Project Planner and Britney Shakley, Project Engineer-Consultants, LRC Group,
15 Engineering & Surveying

16
17 Aime. Patane began, stating that she was with the LRC Group representing Roya Development
18 LLC for the proposed Ridges at Stormville Mountain Subdivision project, which is approximately
19 41 acres, located at 20 Stormville Mountain Road and in a R-2 Zoning District. The proposed
20 project is an 11-lot subdivision for single family residential lots ranging in size from just under 2
21 acres to about 14.5 acres. The proposed dwellings will be served with individual septic and wells
22 and the driveways proposed lots 1 through 10 will have proposed driveways off of Stormville
23 Mountain Road. Lot 11 would be a shared driveway off of the cul-de-sac off Van Brook Drive.
24 She said they were present to discuss any comment from the Board.

25
26 Brittany Shakley came to the podium and after introducing herself stated that preliminary testing
27 for all the septic systems had been done at the site. Generally, sand and gravel were found. Some
28 groundwater was found at about 7 ft, which she said they would maneuver around. Their limit of
29 work is approximately 4.88 acres, and she said they are under the 5-acre threshold for a SWPPP.
30 If it should come to exceed that, she said they would end up doing some rain gardens, or something,

1 for each of the houses. However, since right now they are under the 5 acres, she said they would
2 not be required to. Each of the proposed driveways are at a maximum of 10% slope coming down;
3 there are only 2 driveways at that slope. However, she said they would come in at 20 ft for 4%, so
4 they are meeting the driveway requirements. Mr. Bryant stated that it is 30 ft and Ms. Shakley
5 agreed. With the SWPPP, and it being under the threshold, she said an Erosion Control plan will
6 be done. Some silt fences will be put in, and a construction entrance established.

7
8 Ms. Patane returned to the podium and Mr. Eickman asked the Board Members if they had any
9 questions or comments, He asked Ms. Patane and Ms. Shakley if the HVEA and Rennia
10 Engineering letters had been seen; they had come in a little late. Ms. Patane replied Yes, both
11 letters were received and reviewed this day, and said they will work on addressing those comments
12 before the next submission.

13
14 Mr. Miyoshi commented that, going up Stormville Mountain Road, there is a creek that runs close
15 to route 52. He told Ms. Patane he was not sure where it was on their map, but he knows there are
16 some steep slopes in that area, as well. Ms. Patane pointed out the creek on their displayed plan,
17 stating that a wetland biologist had been engaged. They are working with the biologist and the
18 DEC He has done the delineation; they have started the jurisdictional determination process and
19 are still working through it.

20
21 Ms. Bledsoe asked Ms. Patane if they had accessed the larger lot and in response,. Ms. Patane
22 showed on the plan where it was, stating that the big lot comes in from the cul-de-sac at Van Brook
23 Road and it will be a shared driveway. Ms. Robbins added that the adjacent lot is encroaching on
24 that part parcel and their driveway goes through Lot 11 and then connects into their home. She
25 thinks there may be some other encroachments from that and told Ms. Patane she imagines they
26 are working with the neighbor. She said the big lot shared driveway needs a Special Permit and
27 maybe an easement from the Board, to maintain access to their parcel. She said there is also a

1 secondary access to a garage that is next door, but she thinks they will have to maintain that
2 driveway to get to their house. She said it looks like their garage comes from that way. Referring
3 again to lot 11, she said it needs the shared driveway Special Permit, and she told Ms. Patane to
4 remember that this would have to be advertised for when doing the advertising for the public
5 hearing. Ms. Robbins continued, saying that because there have been issues regarding what is a
6 front yard, side yard, especially on lots that have multiple frontages. She suggested that the
7 Planning Board designate what the front yard is, so there are no issues in the future. She said to
8 take a look at the plan. She thinks it should be facing Van Brook Drive but said the Planning Board
9 should weigh in on this. Mr. Campbell asked if that would be addressed there; would it have a Van
10 Brook Drive address. Ms. Robbins replied Yes. Mr. Campbell said that is just the one, bottom
11 parcel, which is one big lot, all the way across the bottom of the plan. Mr. Miyoshi stated that is
12 the 141 acres. Ms. Robbins stated sometimes applicants come in later with plot plans where they
13 have changed the direction of a house and it faces in a different direction. The Planning Board
14 likes to clarify and determine this at the time of the subdivision so that there are no issues later, or
15 in the future, which helps the Board. She noted that with Lot 1, there is a bit of an issue in that one
16 driveway does not comply with Section A19776-Driveways in the Code. She asked if something
17 could be redesigned. Mr. Bryant asked if it could be done directly off of Route 52. Ms. Patane
18 replied that they will have to take a look at this and see what their options are and will do their
19 best. Ms. Robbins stated, for clarification to the Board, that Stormville Mountain Road and Route
20 52 are pretty close and the driveway is close to that intersection. She said the Town Code requires
21 that the driveway be a certain distance off the intersection and currently, right now, it is not. She
22 said they can probably figure out another way to bring that in and they have to take a look at it
23 again because, right now, it does not meet Code.

24
25 Ms. Robbins then noted that there is a culvert at the bottom that crosses Stormville Mountain Road.
26 She said it has to be made sure when the stormwater is done that the culvert can handle the
27 stormwater from the project.

1
2 There were no other questions or comments at this point from the Members. Mr. Eickman told Ms.
3 Patane and Ms. Shakley that the Board looks forward to seeing them again when they have been
4 able to address all of the comments from this evening, as well as the letters, and that they will go
5 from there.

6
7 Ms. Robbins wanted to add that most of the driveways off of Route 52 are 50 ft. back exactly, so
8 the houses are pretty close to Route 52, or as close as they can make them to Route 52. She knows
9 they are under the 5-acre limited disturbance, but noted that, if anything gets pushed back with the
10 driveway, then there will be more disturbance. She told the Members, they need to be cognizant
11 of that because, ultimately, during the plot plan, the folks might want to take advantage of the
12 building envelope and move the houses back a little further. She said she just wanted the Board to
13 be aware of this. Mr. Bryant said they will be married to the filed map at that point and there will
14 be restrictions. Ms. Robbins said Yes, the Board needs to think about that to be sure they are not
15 being put in a position where people are going to be asking to put their driveway or house back a
16 little further. It is something she said they might want to consider as part of this subdivision. Mr.
17 Campbell said, because they have such big backyards. Ms. Robbins said maybe they want it that
18 way, but she is just a site layout thing to consider. Mr. Campbell asked if there was a reason that
19 it was laid out that way; was it just to shorten the driveways. Ms. Shakley came to the podium and
20 stated it was to shorten the driveways and also it was a matter of the slopes coming in. They wanted
21 to be able to meet, not necessarily come down so that it is sitting 15 ft. above or below the road,
22 but at a happy medium to the road.

23
24 Ms. Bledsoe asked if all the driveways were on Stormville Mountain Road. They are, except for
25 Lot 11, which is off the cul-de-sac. Mr. Bryant said there is also the possibility of Lot 1, depending
26 on what they do with that.

1 Ms. Patane asked about the next steps with the Board aside from addressing the comments, and do
2 they start the circulation for lead agency. Mr. Eickman replied that is a good point and thanked
3 Ms. Patane.

4
5 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, for the**
6 **Planning Board to declare its intent to be Lead Agency for Ridges at Stormville**
7 **Mountain Subdivision. Voted and carried unanimously.**
8

9 Mr. Eickman stated that, at a subsequent meeting, they should be able to establish a Public Hearing
10 and go through the process. Ms. Patane and Ms. Shakley thanked the Board.

11
12
13
14 **4. #2025 – 100 – Shady Creek Rd Subdivision, Hillside Lake Rd. (6458-01-**
15 **364647)**

16
17 Applicant is applying for a 3-lot subdivision on 5.6 acres in an R1 zone.

18
19 Brian Stokosa, P.E, Day Stokosa Engineering, P.C., was present.

20
21 Mr. Stokosa stated that this is an existing 5+ acre parcel located along Hillside Lake Road and this
22 piece of property was before the Board 25 years ago when a possible firehouse was discussed.
23 Since that time, he said the parcel had been put up for sale. The current applicant is looking for
24 input from the Board for a 3-lot conventional subdivision -Two (2) lots are standard, and the third
25 lot will be a flag lot. He said the parcels are relatively flat with a wet area in the back. He said
26 Wetland biologists have been engaged for flagging and, obviously, locating those flags. This parcel
27 is in a one-acre zone, so there is well and septic, along with sand and gravel onsite. A preliminary
28 analysis was done and there have been talks with the Dutchess County Department of Public
29 Works since it is on a County Road. He said the discussion was the access along the County Road,
30 and they had no issues with the access points. Their concern was making sure that the water is
31 shed away from the County Road and that it is directed inward so that there is no ponding.

1 Comments from the Town Engineer have been received and Mr. Stokosa said they will make sure
2 the driveway offsets from Jennifer Drive work. The project will require a basic SWPPP; it is under
3 the 5-acre requirement and an Erosion Sediment Control Plan will be done. He said he was present
4 to begin the process with the Board and that they will continue to work with their biologists. He
5 said he would give updated information to the Board as it related to flagging and working with
6 their agencies.

7
8 There were no questions or comments from the Board Members and Mr. Eickman asked the
9 Professionals for theirs.

10
11 Ms. Robbins responded that she had a few and told Mr. Stokosa she knew he had received the
12 comments about the driveway offset. She asked if the County was not going to make them come
13 out and go right across from the driveway but were going to let them offset a little bit. She said
14 both driveways are offset, from the two (2) roads across. She said she knows the parcel angles
15 that way, that is the trick but questioned if there is sight distance. Mr. Stokosa said there is sight
16 distance, and they met with the Permit Engineer on the site. Discussion was had before the
17 submission made to the Town to make sure they had that assurance. Mr. Bryant asked Mr. Stokosa
18 if the flag lot could be flipped for the offset distance, and he replied that is what they are doing.

19
20 Ms. Robbins asked if delineation was done or was the wetlands mapping off of the current maps.
21 Mr. Stokosa replied that the wetlands delineation seen was done by Mike Nowicke back when the
22 firehouse layout was proposed and that he held that. He said they did go back there on the site and
23 it is based on groundwater out there as standing gravel. The flag locations that were depicted on
24 this plan generally match what was seen out on the site. He said they did re-engage Mr. Nowike
25 to confirm that, and he should be on the site this week. Ms. Robbins asked if it was largely the
26 pond's edge, then it doesn't go into the forest area at all and pretty much ends at the bank. Mr.
27 Stokosa replied that it is pretty defined because it slopes up good.

1
2 Ms. Robbins referred to the flag lot and she understands this might change if it is flipped, but the
3 houses is shown as angled, which sometimes gives the Board a little bit of trouble. She asked if
4 the house was angled for a particular reason and, if the lot is flipped, she said maybe the house
5 won't be angled. Mr. Stokosa replied that there was no specific reason why that was done. To give
6 it a little bit of character, he said he could flip it. Mr. Bryant said another thing then is to parallel
7 setback and parallel with the property line. Ms. Robbins said it is something the Board is seeing
8 with variances and all sorts of things with these issues, and she is trying to get the Planning Board
9 more engaged with how the houses are laid out in some instances, especially on corner lots and
10 flag lots. She said it is just something to be made aware of as they are going through the subdivision
11 process.

12
13 Ms. Robbins asked if there was any proposed landscaping along the frontage of the parcels. She
14 said she thinks some landscaping needs to be put in along the frontage. Mr. Stokosa said nothing
15 had been proposed in the initial submission but told Ms. Robbins he would work with her to meet
16 that intent.

17
18 There were no further comments and Mr. Eickman said he would accept a Motion for the Planning
19 Board's intent for Lead Agency.

20
21 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, for the**
22 **Planning Board to declare its intent to be Lead Agency for Shady Creek Rd**
23 **Subdivision. Voted and carried unanimously.**
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

1 Mr. Eickman confirmed that there was no further business to be conducted this evening.
2
3
4
5

6 ***ADJOURNMENT***
7
8

9 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell seconded by Ed Miyoshi, to adjourn**
10 **the Planning Board meeting. Voted and carried unanimously.**
11
12
13

14 **Respectfully submitted:**

15 **Kathleen Mahodil, Meeting Secretary**
16 **East Fishkill Planning Board**