

**TOWN OF EAST FISHKILL
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
JULY 17, 2025**

Chairperson John Eickman called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

Members present:

John Giovagnoli, Donald Papae, Lori Gee, John Eickman, Richard Campbell, Sarah Bledsoe; Michael Cunningham, Attorney; Scott Bryant, Engineer; Michelle Robbins, Planner; Tom Harvey, Engineer; Dave Palin, Fire Advisory Board; Chris Jodlowski, Fire Commissioner; Staff: Jackie Keenan, Clerk.

The meeting began with the Pledge of Allegiance.

CHAIRPERSON COMMENTS

Chairperson Eickman stated that the upcoming meetings are Tuesday, August 19, 2025, and Thursday, September 18, 2025.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

May 20, 2025

MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Donald Papae, to accept the minutes of the May 20, 2025, meeting. Lori Gee abstained and all others voted aye and carried.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

PUBLIC HEARING:

2025-098 – Valley Christian Church, 1072 Route 82 (6458-04-688075/678055)

Alex Lammo and Matt were present.

MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Lori Gee, to open the Public Hearing. Voted and carried unanimously.

Mr. Lammo stated they have been in front of the Board before for the parking lot expansion. Chairperson Eickman asked if he could summarize the changes they have made since the last meeting. Mr. Lammo stated they have revised the parking lot. They have adjusted the number of spaces in the new lot. There is a total of 23 spaces in the new parking lot. They do have to strike one to allow movement for turning around if the parking lot is full. They have to reduce the existing parking by four spots so it is a total addition of 19 spots. They added a crosswalk that was suggested and they will strike that out. They will be losing a spot for that. They have added no parking signs that were suggested by the Fire Advisory Board.

The lighting has been adjusted and there are no foot candles at the perimeter of the property. There is a wood stockade fence at the perimeter of the property and a wood guard rail because it is a somewhat steep slope at the edge of the parking lot.

They updated stair drawings to have footings as was requested.

Matt stated the light poles had a height reduction from 15 feet to 10 feet. There is no foot candle trespassed onto the neighbors' property. The landscaping has remained pretty much the same as what was shown last time. They are 18 feet on center which is adequate for the species proposed. They did some testing on-site for the dry wells for storm water management. They found some shallow bedrock in the location where they wanted to put them. They will need to preplan that. It seems that the bedrock is a slope so they think if they push the dry wells back further into the parking lot a little bit, which would be to the west, they believe they will have better luck. They did not excavate that while they were there because they did not want to tear up the existing parking lot. It is definitely something they can do and were hoping to do it as a condition of approval. It would be to explore and find an adequate spot for the dry well.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board.

Mr. Campbell had a question about the parking spots that face the church. He asked if there were any parking stop blocks installed or planned to be installed in those spaces. He does understand there is a wooden guard rail there. He thinks they might want to add some additional guard as an additional precaution. He does not know how that wood barrier would hold up against a car if somebody were to come up against it. He does not believe they are that costly and that they would be an additional safety measure that the applicant should consider for that side. He asked if they know what the grade change is where the steps come down. Matt stated it is approximately 14 feet. Mr. Campbell stated this would be a small price to pay for additional safety. Matt stated he does believe that is a good comment. There is a detail for the wood guard rail. They are eight by eight posts buried five and a half feet into the ground.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there were any questions or comments from the Town Professionals. Engineer Bryant stated that they are okay with deferring the drainage as a condition but it would be at the applicant's own risk if they need to dig up the parking lot to find an adequate location. Matt stated he needs to speak to Mr. Renia about that as well because he is not exactly sure what standards he wants it designed to. He indicates calculations but Matt did not see anything in the code. He stated it is usually designed to a one-year storm or a 10 year storm. Engineer Bryant stated it is for a 25 year storm.

Ms. Robbins stated the last time they spoke about the lighting poles it was because she was concerned about them being visible from the neighboring properties. The applicant did reduce the height of the light poles by approximately 5 feet. They are still 10 feet tall so they are likely to be visible. The applicant did do a nice job with dropping the lighting levels off at the edges of the property but there are hot spots right under the lights. They did try to do as few poles as possible, partly because they take up a parking space. Once you have fewer poles you have hotter spots directly underneath those poles. She just wanted the Board to be aware of what it would look like visually. They also have a proposed fence but it is just the timber fence, like a stockade fence. That will have to be maintained over the years because those tend to deteriorate after time. Because of the slope on the rock that is there she is unsure of how well the landscaping will take so she did

add a condition that they will make sure that the landscaping is sufficient and that the visual buffering of the parking area was sufficient to the Town Engineer and the Town Planner. It may be a little bit of trial and error because it is kind of a tough spot. There are a few things that will carry over from the previous site plans that were not done. There is not an enclosure around the refuse container. She does believe that is in part because there is a shed on site right now where the enclosure would have been. She is not sure if the applicant is planning on keeping the shed or not. If they are planning to keep it, it needs to be relocated and put on the site plan. They also need the enclosure installed. There is some movement of handicap spaces that were discussed at the last meeting. Right now there are two over at the accessory building. She is not sure how many people require those handicap spots. There are also six in front of the church and there needs to be eight overall. The two at the accessory building are quite far from the actual church so she does not know if that is appropriate or not. She stated if they need to adjust that, they should do that on this plan.

Engineer Bryant stated they need to show a quantity of export. Matt stated it is in the earthwork notes. It is at 3800, which is similar to the last plan. Ms. Robbins stated they will need an Excavation and Fill Special Permit. She stated they will have to come back because the approval is granted through the Planning Board and that was not advertised. They are supposed to advertise for the special permit. Once they have a definitive quantity it has to be put in the advertisement. Mr. Lammo asked if that was part of the Public Hearing and Ms. Robbins said yes.

Chairperson Eickman stated he has received a letter to read into the record. It is from Tim Tarpy. He resides on a property that directly borders the Valley Christian Church. It stated that on March 10, 2025, he returned from work to discover the church had hired a tree company to clear the ridge that serves as a natural buffer between their property and his residential property. The clearing has impacted his privacy, especially during the months when the trees are bare. The church building is now clearly visible from his home. This is not the first issue they have had regarding the ridge. In 2023, someone was cutting brush and trees along the property line and was he told they were exploring the idea of expanding the parking lot onto the ridge. He did express his concern at that

time. When he reviewed the plans in 2024, it shows the ridge being designated as a wooded green space. That plan did alleviate his initial concerns however, without any notice or approvals the church proceeded to clear the ridge on March 10 of this year. A significant number of mature trees and the natural buffer were removed without any opportunity for the neighbors to speak about it. He stated there was not a public process for him to voice his concerns. He is requesting that the ridge be replanted with a mature, vegetative buffer to restore the privacy they previously enjoyed. He asks if they are going to consider a parking lot enlargement that the Town ensure that the proper privacy buffer is restored and maintained, that no overhead lighting would negatively impact his property, that the design prevents car headlights from shining toward his home, and that the vehicles are screened from view.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there were any questions or comments from anyone in the public. There were none.

Chairperson Eickman stated they will need to adjourn this Public Hearing because they need to address the Excavation Fill Special Permit. Mr. Lammo asked if it was a separate Public Hearing. Attorney Cunningham stated it is part of this action under SEQRA. Ms. Robbins stated the Planning Board issues the special permit.

MOTION made by Lori Gee, seconded by Richard Campbell, to adjourn the Public Hearing until August 19, 2025. Voted and carried unanimously.

Chairperson Eickman suggested that they make sure they address Mr. Tarpy's concerns. Ms. Robbins stated she does believe the biggest issue will be with the lighting and that they may need to think of some way to protect the neighbor from seeing those lighting poles. The headlights might be blocked from the fence. Ms. Robbins stated there is 11 foot candles under some of those lights and the neighbors will be able to see the poles. The poles will be 10 feet tall so they will extend above the fence and the plantings will not be mature enough to cover that. Mr. Campbell stated there was also a comment made regarding the headlights. He does not know if, with the grade change, the car headlights will be visible through the fence they have chosen. Stockade fencing

will have spacing that could allow light to go through. Matt stated the fence is tight with no spacing in between. It is 6 feet tall.

DISCUSSIONS:

DISCUSSION:

2025-100 – Shady Creek Road Subdivision, Hillside Lake Road (6458-01-364647)

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

Mark Day was present.

Chairperson Eickman asked Ms. Robbins if they were prepared to declare lead agency on this project. Ms. Robbins said yes.

Mr. Day stated this is a three lot proposed subdivision on the old Hillside Lake Fire proposal. It runs on Hillside Lake Road. It will be two lots in the front and a flag lot in the rear. There is an area of wetland in the back. They have reached out to DEC and have not heard back as of yet. Right now they are showing a 50 foot buffer around the wetland and it does not have any impact. Even if it was to be a 100 foot buffer they still have room to work. One of the issues that came up was the separation between the Town roads and the proposed driveways. Right now they are showing approximately 75 feet away from Jennifer Drive and the other road. They are going to submit to the Board of Health.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there were any questions or comments from Board members.

Ms. Gee asked the orientation of the house on the flag lot. It does not look like it is perpendicular to the road. Mr. Day stated it is tilted. Ms. Gee asked if it had to be. Mr. Day stated it would probably be at the discretion of the owner. It is back far and he doubts it would be an issue. They were trying to give it more privacy from the rear yards of the other two lots. Ms. Gee asked if it was code that houses face the roadway. Ms. Robbins stated they did discuss this at the last

meeting. She stated they are asking the Planning Board to determine the front yards, especially on flag lots. They do like to see them straight because it does end up causing problems for setbacks with anything that people want to do in the future like pools and sheds. If there is no compelling reason to turn it they do like to see it turned straight. If there is a specific reason to turn it, it could be considered. Mr. Day stated they did it so the house doesn't face directly into the back of the other two homes. He stated if there is a code requirement, which he is not aware of they can rotate it. Ms. Robbins stated they are seeing problems in the future when they are looking at accessory structures and things. Mr. Day stated they would rotate it.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there were any questions or comments from Town Professionals.

Ms. Robbins stated she knows they are meeting with the DEC, but they also got a habitat assessment in June. There are Blanding Turtles habitat in the pond. The habitat assessment stated they likely use the property for mating so this is all under DEC's jurisdiction. They will let the Town know what is needed for the Blanding Turtles. She asked that the recommendations and mitigation requirements that are in the habitat assessment be placed on the site plan. It would probably also be included in the resolution of approval. There are specific things that can be done to help mitigate any potential impacts to the Turtles and they will have to include all of those in all of the work and disturbances. She doesn't know if the 50 foot buffer would be enough. Sometimes the DEC will come back and add additional buffers for the turtles and sometimes they don't. Sometimes it's just a matter of making sure the right fence is up during construction. They will have to wait and see what DEC says about all of that.

Engineer Bryant asked if there were any shared driveways and Mr. Day said no. Mr. Harvey stated that plays into the issue they noticed. The Town Code asks for 125 feet between driveways and roads. The County road standard is 75 feet. This is a County road that it is on. It does seem like the sight distance and arrangement is good. The existing driveway is further from the road.

Ms. Robbins stated they could declare lead agency and also consider setting this application for a

Public Hearing.

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

MOTION made by Lori Gee, seconded by Richard Campbell, to declare Lead Agency. Voted and carried unanimously.

Chairperson Eickman asked if the applicant would be ready for a Public Hearing at the August meeting. Mr. Day said yes.

MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Lori Gee, to schedule this application for a Public Hearing on August 19, 2025. Voted and carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION:

2024-092 – SWF2 Fulfillment Center, 76-112 Patriot Way (6356-04-606028, 6355-00-501905)

Applicant is applying for an amended site plan to make safety and accessibility improvements to the pedestrian route between the warehouse building and the guardhouse entrance at the Amazon Facility. The improvements will include new side walk, re-pavement of existing sidewalk to comply with ADA slope requirements, new railing at the new ADA ramps, two crosswalks along the route, and a new retaining wall

No one was present.

Chairperson Eickman stated this applicant has asked to be withdrawn from a discussion at this meeting at this time.

DISCUSSION:

Montage Subdivision, Route 52 (6556-00-802836)

Applicant is requesting subdivision approval for a proposed cluster subdivision with 122 residential lots on a 385.5-acre parcel.

Mark Cannuli, Mark Day and Don Gueron were present.

Mr. Cannuli stated he is here with representation from Montage as they are working together on sewer and easements and asked if they could present together. Chairperson Eickman said yes. Mr. Cannuli stated the first scoping document for this project was adopted on July 19, 2005. It was a completely different project for senior housing that time. The Town was not in favor of a senior housing development and requested the conventional as of right approach. At that point the applicant opted for a cluster subdivision. They have been working on the project for 20 years. The last time they were here was for a Public Hearing in September 2022. That was after they had findings statements adopted for both Montage in East Fishkill in November 2019 and Summit Woods followed a few months after. They did have findings statements that permitted a 122 lot subdivision for Montage and a 175 lot subdivision for Summit Woods. Both plans went through the SEQRA process. They are both using a cluster subdivision layout. They are now working with the Town on a public sewer option. At that time the Town had asked that they run sewer up to Four Corners and connect the projects through pump stations. Not too long after that meeting the Town reconsidered where they think the best option would be for sewer for both projects. He believes in early 2023 it was determined that the best option would be to reconsider running sewer to the Hopewell Hamlet Sewer. They hired engineers and did a big study on capacity and how they could do that. Both projects worked through those details in 2023. They also encountered wetland validation issues. The maps were beyond 10 years old. They had to get their consultants out in the fields to walk and revisit the wetlands to remap those wetlands and get the DEC to validate the most current conditions out there. Both subdivisions were required to show if additional land and soil conditions had changed over time. Montage had a swale that was connected to an Army Corps of Engineers wetlands off of the rear of the property. The DEC decided it's connected hydraulically

to the larger wetlands. They could have fought it but they did not do it. They decided to move some lots around instead. He does believe that the buffer along one project pushes over to the other project and the wetland is connected. Both applications were back to the engineers to move things around to meet this condition. They were able to do that. Ms. Robbins had told them that they got lot count space on a conventional lot layout which showed the old wetlands. She requested that they show it with the new wetlands. They did discuss this last Thursday with Town staff. They were asked to go back to the old conventional lot layout and make sure that they can get the lot count and lot yield that they got before to prove it out to staff so that they can report back to the Planning Board. They have Montage on the as of right plan that had 126 lots. They may lose anywhere from 4 to 5 lots. As long as the as of right number of lots that they lose is still at least 122, they believe they still have the right. If they lose more than that, then they lose more. If they need to remove one lot closest to the wetland area they would create a little more open space. They are in the process of reviewing that and he believes they will have that done and almost ready to submit it to the Town Engineer and the Town Planner. The plan would be to get that agreed upon and get back on track. The DEC did validate the wetlands on both projects. They have three crossings and now another area that they have a road that goes through. That information is before them and the applicant is about to resubmit all of the details they have asked for. They have supplied additional details with bridge crossings. Each time they make a submission to the DEC they posted on the website. He also copies the Town as that was in agreement with the Planning Board all along. They are about to get the Army Corps permit, which not only acknowledges the wetlands on sites but also permits the off-site force main that will go to the sewer plant in Hopewell Hamlet. In addition to that there is a DOT permit for the intersection of Route 216 and Route 52 and their new road. They had initially proposed a signalized intersection to fix and align the intersection at Route 52. The DOT opted for a modern roundabout. That caused the need for the applicant to get additional land from an adjacent property owner, which they did acquire. He believes that was provided to the Town. They did provide that to the DOT as well. They have control of all of the land needed to build the improvements. Their plan now is to proceed with an application that they submitted back in October and November of 2022. At that time the Town had asked the applicant to get a better handle on how the sewer was going to be handled and draft a

Memorandum of Understanding or a Memorandum of Agreement with the Town Board which acknowledges the partnership with a private development community, Montage and Summit Woods, and the Town will be this project forward and sending the sewer to the Hopewell Hamlet Sewer Plan. The thought would be there would be a regional plant, which is currently shown on the Montage property. Both projects will drain sewer to that pump station and then pumped through a force main out to Route 52 up to the vicinity of the Fire Training Center and then there would be a second pump station which would come from the vicinity of that pump station up Route 376 to the Hopewell Hamlet Treatment Center. They have an MOU that has been through a few reviews with the Town. It will probably take a week or two and then will go before the Board for review and they will continue to work.

The Town had asked the applicant to consider getting water from the County system but that did not prove feasible. It was determined and agreed upon that they would continue to develop the wells on Montage property. They are in the process of learning the 72 hour pump test. The initial results are good. They are very high-yielding wells. They also drilled a third well, which was a requirement from when they started this project. That is pumping water at nearly 240 gallons per minute which is way over what they had assumed. Both projects would be served by a private water system initially which would eventually be turned over to the Town through this agreement. They are still working on how that will happen. Both applications will have public sewer and public water. He believes the main road that connects through Montage from Route 216 and Route 52 all the way through the project and goes through the Summit Woods project and comes out on Route 52 where Old Route 52 comes back out. They are planning on having sidewalks in certain areas. All of the details are shown on the plans. Ms. Gee asked him to the roads would be Town roads and Mr. Cannuli stated he believes they were all going to be turned over. That is why all the bridges are rated. There is a reserve fund set up for the bridge. At one point they were talking about the lighting district and a sidewalk district and that is the way they set up the plans.

Mr. Cannuli stated one of the other comments is addressing comments from Ms. Robbins' memo of May 30, 2025. They need to show the wetlands that have always been on the plan shown on an

as of right. They are working through that and will do some calculations with the ESL. He asked if the CRD zoning was no longer. Ms. Robbins stated the original project that was senior housing was asking for the property to be zoned CRD. When they went conventional it went to just strictly cluster, and she believed that was just a carryover on the cover page. Mr. Cannuli stated there were a few comments about tables and acreages that they are still working on. One of the big questions all along for this project was how you deal with the development with only one way out. They did work with Summit Woods and there is a developer's agreement in place that allows not only a connection of some of the infrastructures but also an emergency access. If one project is built before the other project, that project can build an emergency connection roadway. That was discussed during the SEQRA process. That would allow for another outlet. Now they need to show how they will do that. They are working on showing the legal description and a plan of easement. Each project has a long road into a section in the back that needs another way out.

They are working on landscaping. They did discuss there being no irrigation on individual lots and the applicant is fine with that. They usually put a notation on the deed and in the home owner language. Engineer Bryant had mentioned they could possibly install an irrigation well but that is not something that the applicant is currently planning on doing. They were also notified that there is an active mining operation with blasting occurring. That would have to be deed noticed as well. He does appreciate the Board's patience and willingness to hear them before they come back. They would like to submit the plan that shows the new as of right subdivisions and prove that they have the right number of lots. Then they will try to get on the next available agenda to reopen the Public Hearing and get the remaining comments so that they can close the public portion. Then they would be at a point where the Board could grant a decision based on conditions of approval like outside agency approvals, finalizing certain documents that they need from DOT and things that are typically associated with a planning order. He would love to be able to do this next month but is unsure if the Board is comfortable with that.

Mr. Campbell stated that although these are two separate projects there seem to be contingencies that are connected between them. He asked if there would be bonds posted to ensure emergency

road access and things that are contingent between both to make sure that those roads would be completed. They need to make sure that if one exists and is built and the other project does not go through, would someone be forced to post a bond to make sure that the egress is made. Engineer Bryant stated a performance bond is posted for all of the public works or all the features that are going to be dedicated to the Town. It would be the water, sewer, roads, sidewalks, and landscape. Typically it is for whatever is part of their project. In this case he believes each project would have to have another line item that in the event they have to build the other section, it is in the bond already. They both have to carry each other's burden in the bond. The applicant stated there would be an agreement that would exist legally to make sure that it would happen either way.

Ms. Gee asked Ms. Robbins if, with the changing of the wetlands, there is any changing of the mitigation measures for the endangered habitat that were listed on the original plans. Ms. Robbins stated they are still in the process of working with DEC. She has not seen the information back from DEC yet. She is making the assumption that they are handling the endangered species, the wetlands, and then the mitigation. There is a mitigation area proposed on the front of the site for some of the mitigation with regard to the wetlands. Ultimately it will depend on where the lots are and where the houses are built. If all of the houses remain outside of the wetland and there is no disturbance of those areas they will have less mitigation. She believes most of the mitigation right now has to do with the roadways and the coverts. They are basically crossing creeks or streams in three different locations and that is where most of the mitigation and concern for the habitat. SEQRA was completed and they have findings on this. This Board will be looking to approve the subdivision plat, the layout of the lots, and make sure that all of the lots meet zoning. There are a few things that have been updated over time. They have to go back and review some of the things they have not looked over in years. Since some of the boundaries have changed they will be modifying a few things. Then they will do a full review of all of the lots and the subdivision plat and then the Planning Board will weigh in on it.

Engineer Cronk stated DEC won't typically issue wetland permits individually. They will want to issue all of their permits together. They will only do that if all of their species information and

everything their department is concerned with is satisfied. Ms. Gee stated with two separate projects there is the potential that they would be satisfied with one project but not the other. She believes this will be very critical as this road is giving the secondary access so it is not a cul-de-sac and the road is where the DEC is trying to mitigate the need to understand what that will look like. Ms. Robbins stated that permits will have to be in place on both properties as they will be accessing the emergency access to the other property. It can all be done but the applicants will have to figure out the timing and they will have to work it out with their attorneys. That will have to all be in place before the Board can approve the subdivision plats. Mr. Cannuli stated they would not be able to file the plat until all the conditions were met and permits in hand for all areas they need to be working through even if it requires it on both sites. They did speak with the Town Professionals about this on Thursday and they are well aware of the issues. The last notice of incomplete application they got from the DEC was from March 19, 2025. They are about to resubmit to that letter and he will submit everything that he submits to DEC to the Town. The same thing applies to Summit Woods.

Mr. Campbell stated there was a requirement for the applicants to drill an additional well. He asked what was the reasoning. Engineer Bryant stated that the Town Board adopted a new regulation because they are finding with these more remote projects, that even though DEC says you only need one well for redundancy, when you lose that well and you have all of the wetlands around it can be very difficult to drill a new well. They have had an issue when the second well has collapsed. It can take years to find another location for a new well and there's no guarantee it will produce what it needs to produce. That is why they adopted a policy for double redundancy. That is for any project, not just this one. Mr. Campbell stated there may be neighboring properties affected by the fact that they had to drill that well because it is taking from the water table. Engineer Bryant stated just because they drill a third well does not mean they are increasing the amount of gallons that they need. DEC will only issue a permit for what they demonstrate that they need. Just because they drill a third well does not mean they will taking 50% more water. Mr. Cannuli stated they are in the process of pumping for the 72 hour test. They have off-site monitoring. There is a plan that Mr. Cronk reviewed and it monitors with the neighbors who signed up to have their wells assessed

while they are pumping, to see if there is any draw change. There has been nothing reported so far. That will be summarized in a quick report and then a full report will be done. There were people who signed up in 2022 and then additional people who said when the applicant did the well testing, they wanted to have their wells tested as well. They sent out letters and went door to door to ask if people wanted to participate. Getting that data is part of the process. Mr. Campbell asked if that was made public so people understand they have the opportunity to participate. Engineer Bryant stated it is part of the record. If it becomes an issue that a well is too shallow they will have to address it. So far they are having producing good capacity and very good quality which is also good should the Town ever need another water source. Ms. Gee asked if these three wells on the Montage site are for both projects. She asked if the Town Engineer was comfortable with that double redundancy. Engineer Bryant said yes. Ms. Gee asked if there was water storage from those wells proposed. Mr. Cannuli stated there is a tank shown on both. They are evaluating the engineering process to see whether or not two tanks are needed. Mr. Day stated they did show one at Summit Woods at the highest part of the property so they could get hydraulic. There was also one on Montage. Engineer Bryant stated that this is another area where, if one project goes and the other one doesn't, they need to have access to that tank if that is the site it is placed on. Mr. Day stated in the beginning both of these projects have separate sewer and water. The DEC had asked that they merge the two projects together for both water and sewer, which was a good idea. Since then they had originally proposed a tank on both sites. They do think it's prudent to keep it that way. That way water pumped from Montage will be treated at a tank on that site and does not have to get pumped to the other project. He stated those are probably the strongest and cleanest wells he has ever seen. They are very high producers. They ran chemical tests on them and got absolutely nothing. They are rock wells.

Ms. Bledsoe asked when their last data related to the school district was and if this project had its impacts updated and taken into consideration with the new plan for the school district. Ms. Robbins stated she knows the school district has been CCed on every single document and they have been included on the list of no builds. The last time she heard from the school district, they asked for an update on where these projects were, so they are aware of it and keeping up on them. She does not

know if they are in the latest reports. She does not know how the school district uses the information they are given on how the project is built out.

Ms. Gee asked about their proposed traffic intersection and if it was going to be for Route 216, Route 52, and the main entrance to Montage. Mr. Cannuli said yes. It now occupies a little less land to the northern side of Route 52 and takes a bigger chunk of the southern side on the Montage property. The rest of the geometry fits within Route 52. Mr. Gueron from Summit Woods, stated that the DOT has approved the two entrances to Summit Woods. Ms. Gee asked if they were actual entrances or if one was an emergency access only. Mr. stated they are both full entrances.

Dave Palin asked what was the flow from the well testing. Mr. Cannuli stated there were four wells. One of the original two wells has been abandoned and now there are three functioning wells. They are all producing over 180 gallons per minute and some as high as 240 gallons per minute. All the information will be provided in a plan that will also show what type of flow they will get once they provide water storage. Mr. Palin asked if they know what their storage capacity was. Mr. Day stated it is 20,000 – 22,000 gallons on the Summit Woods and similar on the Montage site. All total will be between 44,000 to 48,000. The way it is designed has fire flow on the top and average daily at the bottom. It is designed for ISO standard for the whole system for both subdivisions. The one tank is at the highest point in the area so they could hydraulically feed both subdivisions in the event that the other tank went down. Engineer Cronk asked what the height of the tank was and Mr. Day stated it is between 60 to 66 feet. Mr. Cronk asked if it was in the view shed of any of the homes. Mr. Day stated they did a balloon test years ago and they did a winding driveway so it cannot be seen.

Chairperson Eickman stated this conversation was very helpful.

DISCUSSION:

Summit Woods, 3162 Route 52 (6656-00-045715)

Applicant is requesting subdivision approval for a proposed cluster subdivision with 175 residential lots on a 325.22-acre parcel.

This conversation was included in the Montage discussion.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there was any further business to be brought before the Board. There was not.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted:

_____,
Julie J. Beyer, Meeting Secretary
East Fishkill Planning Board