

**TOWN OF EAST FISHKILL  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

**OCTOBER 30, 2025**

Planning Board Chairperson John Eickman called the meeting to order.

**CHAIRPERSON COMMENTS:**

Members present were John Giovagnoli, Donald Papae, Lori Gee, John Eickman, Richard Campbell, Ed Miyoshi and Sarah Bledsoe.

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

b. Mr. Eickman announced the **Upcoming Meeting Dates are: November 20, 2025-Thursday and December 16, 2025-Tuesday**

c. **Approval of Minutes of Meeting Held: September 18, 2025**

**MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Lori Gee, to approve the Minutes of Meeting Held September 18, 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, Danielle Angyal JR., Town Planner, and Dave Palin, Fire Advisory Board.

**ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING:**

1. **#2025 – 098 – Valley Christian Church**, 1072 Route 82 (6458-04-688075/678055) Applicant is applying for an amended site plan to add a 2-way drive and 23 additional

1 parking spaces to the existing site plan. The site currently contains 142 spaces. The  
2 proposed amendment to the site plan would remove 4 spaces and add 23 spaces for a total  
3 of 161 spaces. (Adjourning until Nov 20th.)  
4

5 Mr. Eickman announced that the Valley Christian Church matter is an Adjourned Public  
6 Hearing and the applicant has requested an adjournment to the next meeting. He said he  
7 would accept a Motion to further adjourn this to the Planning Board’s November 20<sup>th</sup>  
8 meeting.  
9

10 **MOTION made by Ed Miyoshi, seconded by Richard Campbell, to further**  
11 **adjourn the Public Hearing for Valley Christian Church, to November 20,**  
12 **2025. Voted and carried unanimously.**  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 ***PUBLIC HEARING:***  
18

- 19 2. **#2025 – 104 – 45-49 Foster Rd**, 45 Foster Rd, (6458-04-659005) Applicant is applying  
20 for an amended site plan to add medical offices on the second floor in a space previously  
21 approved for storage. In addition, the applicant is requesting the former Miceli house on  
22 the property be converted to a care takers unit.  
23

24 Stephen A. Whalen, RA, Leed AP, Whalen Architecture PLLC was present, representing the  
25 owners and the tenants.  
26  
27

28 Mr. Whalen recapped the proposal, stating that they are looking to renovate the interior of the  
29 second floor of 49 Foster Road, for some additional doctors’ offices. For 45 Foster Road, he said  
30 they are looking to change the occupancy from a single-family residence to a caretaker’s  
31 residence. The footprint is not increasing for both the buildings, it is completely interior, and he  
32 said there will actually be no further work on the single-family residence.  
33

**MOTION made by Lori Gee, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to open the Public Public Hearing for 45-49 Foster Road. Voted and carried unanimously.**

There were no comments or questions from the Members.

Ms. Robbins spoke that there had been discussion at the last meeting, and then the professionals actually met with Mr. Whalen separately, when the septic location was talked about. This proposal, at one point, was for a site plan amendment, and she said there had been a past history of parking issues on the site. The parking requirements are met for the zoning. This is changing from storage space to medical space, and she said medical space, historically, has a very high parking need, parking demand. Typically, she said, if it becomes a little bit too much medical office space on a site, they will see parking issues. At some point in the past, prior to making the parking lot improvements that currently exist at the site, they did have a parking issue. She said there was some concern because people were parking at the complex across the street and then maybe some on Foster Road, which is a residential road that is fronted with commercial. She explained that this was in the past and they did some parking lot amendments and expansions. Additional parking was created and now they have exactly the number of parking spaces needed to make the parking demand for the proposed medical office use on the second floor, as well as in all the other buildings. The proposed use is medical, or medical spa and she said there is not a lot of history with medical spas. She is making the assumption that it would be a very similar parking demand as medical space, but it is unclear at this point. She said that it had been spoken about at the last meeting and with the applicant about potentially doing land banking some of the parking, since there have been historic parking issues on the site. There was an area in the front of the Miceli house that could, potentially, include landbank parking since this was before the Board for a site plan amendment anyway. It was thought that maybe this was thrown out in the event extra parking was needed. They could then go ahead and construct it with a Building

1 Permit, rather than having to come back to the Planning Board. However, she said, at that time it  
2 was realized that there was also an issue with some of the site plans that are on file. There are 3  
3 separate locations for the septic on the site and it is not certain where the septic is. The concern is  
4 that the septic may be in the location where the potentially proposed landbank parking would be.  
5 She said the applicant has been asked to confirm where the septic is on the site. Looking to Mr.  
6 Whalen, she said she did not know what they have decided, whether or not to do land banked  
7 parking and she is not sure what the Planning Board feels about potentially asking for land bank  
8 parking on the site. Ms. Robbins continued, saying that there are a few minor violations in the  
9 existing parking lot. She said a site visit was done; there is striping, some handicap signage  
10 issues and some pedestrian striping located behind some parking spaces that the professionals  
11 wanted removed. She said off of these are relatively minor and can be fixed pretty easily. A list  
12 was made and provided to the professionals, so they will have to do that as well. She said those  
13 are the main issues on the site right now. She told Mr. Whalen, she is not sure what his team has  
14 decided about moving forward, regarding land banked parking, or not, or where the septic is  
15 located. She asked for any information on that to be provided to the Board.

16  
17 Mr. Whalen responded that, later this very afternoon, he was able to confirm where the septic  
18 fields are. He referred to the monitor, saying it was an updated site plan displayed that will be  
19 resubmitt4ed. He said it does address all the site issues with the signage, the handicapped and  
20 using the correct symbol. He said there are 12 comments on it and those will be addressed. In  
21 addition to that, he said, the septic fields are located in a little island, which he pointed out on the  
22 displayed plan as being right where the emergency access is. He said his concern is that there are  
23 2 fields, or 2 sections of fields there. In parking on top of them, he said he would not want to  
24 damage them, even though they are land banked for future owners. He said if the Planning Board  
25 approves it, and say, 10 years from now asphalt parking is put over the top, it could be damaged.  
26 Accordingly, he said he is a little leery of showing land banked parking there

1  
2 Mr. Bryant asked Mr. Whalen if he was talking about the fields – or the tank. Mr. Whalen replied  
3 it is the fields. Mr. Bryant said he did not know that it would damage the fields, but he would be  
4 concerned with the roof of the tank. If it falls within the parking area, he would need to be sure it  
5 is strong enough. Mr. Whalen said he does not have any documents to say how deep the fields  
6 are. Mr. Bryant said if that is shown, then it is up to him to work out those details with an  
7 engineer, prior to actually installing it; but at least it is shown on the plan and he thinks this can  
8 be worked out.

9  
10 Ms. Robbins questioned if there is also still septic in front of the other building a well. Mr.  
11 Whalen said he believed so but it was just discovered this afternoon. He said even the displayed  
12 plan here is not 100% correct just yet.

13  
14 Ms. Bryant told Mr. Whalen it is really up to him. In the event there is an issue with the parking,  
15 in the future, Ms. Robbins said they would probably get a violation from the Town if people are  
16 parking across the street, or offsite. She explained that, at that point, they could come back to the  
17 Planning Board and apply for parking. It is just a suggestion that they might want to consider,  
18 since this is in front of the Board anyway. However, it is up to the Planning Board to ultimately  
19 consider whether or not they feel strongly enough about land banked parking – to require it or  
20 leave it up to the applicant to determine whether or not they want to do it.

21  
22 Mr. Bryant said if this is land banked, then all they have to do is give the Board a letter  
23 notification to proceed. He asked how that would work, if it is land banked. Ms. Robbins replied  
24 that, potentially if it is land banked and they are coming in to pave it, then they will have to deal  
25 with potentially storm water and other things, including circulation. She said it would depend on  
26 what the land banking entails. Mr. Bryant added that it depends on how much design is put into it

1 right now. Ms. Robbins said, in theory, if they were to get approved right now, it could just be  
2 built with a building permit; they could get whatever is needed from the Building Department.

3  
4 Mr. Campbell asked the number of structures on the site plan. Mr. Whalen replied that there are 2  
5 buildings with a shed, and Ms. Robbins added there is the Miceli house. Mr. Campbell  
6 questioned if the parking that is shown is acceptable for the entire site plan, including the Miceli  
7 house. Ms. Robbins replied that it is correct; the Miceli house has 2 places in front of the house  
8 for parking for the house itself. Then, she said, the parking is for the 2 medical buildings Mr.  
9 Campbell questioned if it is exact and Ms. Robbins stated it is exact. Mr. Whalen said it was  
10 considered to convert the house into 2 additional offices, but that pushed them over. He said they  
11 would have to go find and put in additional parking, not land banking.

12  
13 Ms. Robbins noted again that there were parking issues prior to this, with the exact parking that  
14 was needed for the previously existing amount of medical space that they had. She said one of  
15 the issues was before the plaza across the street was more open, and now there are medical  
16 offices across the street in what is called The Children’s Medical Group there. She said there is  
17 less parking even if people were to park over there and walk, which they are not permitted to do,  
18 but there is even less availability now than there was.

19  
20 Ms. Bledsoe asked if all the businesses have relatively the same hours. Mr. Whalen looked to  
21 Ms. Vasanti Mirchandani, sitting in the audience, asking if she knew the hours, and she replied  
22 she thinks the medical is open 7:00 AM to 7 PM.

23  
24 Ms. Robbins said the other thing that has been done with medical before, which could come at a  
25 later dated, depending on what parking there is, is stacked parking for employees was allowed.  
26 She said there is some valet parking on the medical sites, which is also a possibility and has been

1 done before, which requires some thought and consideration by the applicant as well. It is how  
2 they would do that and where they would do that. She said that, obviously, there would need to  
3 be an employee out there doing the valeting.

4  
5 Mr. Campbell questioned, if the septic field is being identified and the ability to potentially have  
6 land banked parking, wouldn't the applicant feel more comfortable having that available – rather  
7 than just being at maximum capacity. Mr. Whalen responded, Absolutely and that he would defer  
8 back to their civil consultant. If there is a way that they can design future parking spaces, or  
9 maybe even put them in now, as long as it won't disrupt the sewage system. Mr. Campbell  
10 reiterated that he thinks it would be more advantageous to them at this point, while going through  
11 all the motions here. If they can, he said he thinks it would be a good idea and Mr. Whalen  
12 responded Yes, he thinks it is a great idea.

13  
14 Mr. Bryant said he knows they are kind of anxious. He believes that a demo permit had been  
15 issued and he confirmed that the demo had not been started; there is a little more time yet. He  
16 was looking to see if it was something they could kind of proceed with, to some extent, while  
17 they are working through this. Mr. Campbell asked if it could be made conditional and Mr.  
18 Eickman said yes, he thinks that can be done.

19  
20 Dave Palin asked the location of the septic tank and Mr. Whalen replied that, when the site plan  
21 is resubmitted, it will be documented on that. Mr. Palin asked if it would be in any of the driving  
22 or parking areas. Mr. Whalen responded that he does not believe so. He showed the approximate  
23 locations on the displayed plan. He showed the gravel driveway and said they will get that  
24 confirmed; there may be one behind the driveway. Mr. Palin stated his concern that it would need  
25 to meet the weight of their heaviest firetruck. Mr. Whalen responded Absolutely. Mr. Bryant  
26 added that a reinforced slab could be put on the top of the existing slab, as long as it is concrete,

1 and not a metal tank. Ms. Mirchandani came to the podium, stating that one of the tanks is close  
2 to the caretaker’s house; it is directly in front of the house. She said there is actually a wall that  
3 was created, to prevent anyone from driving over it. She said the other septic tank is very close to  
4 building 49, in the grassy area and the driveway is not near that one either.

5  
6 Mr. Eickman confirmed that there was no one from the Public to speak for or against the 45-49  
7 Foster Road matter. He said there is just the outstanding question of how additional parking  
8 might be provided for. Looking to Mr. Whalen, he said this is whether it would be land banked  
9 parking, which he will check out. Or, he said it may be stacked parking, or valet parking; all 3.  
10 He told Mr. Whalen that he could bring that back to the next meeting, then things can get closed  
11 up and this could move forward. Mr. Whalen replied Excellent.

12  
13 Mr. Eickman said this is already in a Public Hearing and notifications were sent out. Ms. Gee  
14 asked if there was sufficient submission time for the Adjourned Public Hearing. Attorney  
15 Cunningham responded that he did not think there was an issue with timing, as long as they get it  
16 in reasonably, before the next meeting so there is time for everyone to review it.

17  
18 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Ed Miyoshi, to adjourn the**  
19 **Public Hearing for 45-49 Foster Road. Voted and carried unanimously.**

20  
21  
22  
23 ***DISCUSSION:***

- 24  
25  
26 3. **#2025 – 099 – Ridges at Stormville Mountain Subdivision**, 20 Stormville Mountain  
27 Rd. (6656-00-536587) Applicant is applying for a 10 lot subdivision on 41.19 acres in a  
28 R2 zone Town of East Fishkill Planning Board 330 Route 376, Hopewell Junction, New  
29 York 12533  
30

1 Aime Patane, Project Planner and Brittany Shakley, Project Engineer-Consultants, LRC Group,  
2 Engineering & Surveying were present.  
3  
4

5 **MOTION made by Lori Gee, seconded by Richard Campbell, for the Planning**  
6 **Board to Declare Lead Agency for Ridges at Stormville Mountain Subdivision.**  
7 **Voted and carried unanimously.**  
8  
9

10 Ms. Patane began the overview, saying this matter was last before the Planning Board in June  
11 and there had been some changes since then that would go over. She said the previous included a  
12 layout of an 11-lot subdivision, with single family homes. In the discussion with the Board at the  
13 meeting, it was mentioned what was being done with the neighbors regarding encroachments for  
14 the proposed lot 11, which she pointed out as being the larger lot. With those conversations, she  
15 said it led to a new layout. She went over the existing conditions, saying the project now involves  
16 20 Stormville Mountain Road, 15 Van Brook Drive, and 24 Van Brook Drive. The existing  
17 acreage for 15 Van Brook Drive is 1.26 and 24 Van Brook Drive is 3.47. In discussions with the  
18 neighbor, she said the previously proposed lot 11 is essentially going to be split between the 2.  
19 Each lot will be modified with the increased acreage. #15 Van Brook will be 4.38 and 24 Van  
20 Brook will be 14.87. The new layout for the subdivision will include 10 new residential lots for  
21 single family homes, to be served by septic and well. Ms. Patane then turned the podium over to  
22 Ms. Shakely for the engineering.  
23

24 Ms. Shakely stated that the layout has remained the same with the houses pretty much the same.  
25 One change made is Lot 1, which is closest to the intersection at Stormville Mountain Road. The  
26 driveway has been shifted so that it meets the requirements of 120 ft from the intersection, There  
27 will now be a bridge over crossing the exiting stream that is on the site. She said it is just going  
28 to be able to withstand a firetruck. It will be H2O loaded and there will not be any disturbance to  
29 the stream; It will be bank to bank. All the septic layouts have been designed, and they will be

1 either fill pads or inground. By eliminating Lot 11, she said they are now at only 4.5 acres of  
2 disturbance. No SWPPP will be required, nor stormwater management practices. However, she  
3 said the culvert under Stormville Mountain Road has been modified and, based on the proposed  
4 development, there is only a minor increase in the elevation of storm events. She said there is not  
5 a significant increase in what this development is going to be creating. With that creation, she  
6 said the impervious area is increasing by only .75 acres of impervious, so it is very minimal  
7 anyway. All of that goes into the existing stream that is on the site. Submission will be made to  
8 the Department of Health with all the design septic systems, so that is all going to be  
9 forthcoming.

10

11 Mr. Giovagnoli asked the lot size per dwelling and Ms. Patane replied that they range from 2.01  
12 to 5.27 acres for the new lots.

13

14 Mr. Miyoshi asked how the steep slopes that go along the right side of Stormville Mountain  
15 Road would be dealt with. Ms. Patane asked what area he was referring to. Mr. Miyoshi said it is  
16 where the left is made off of Route 52, going into Stormville Mountain Road, past the creek,  
17 going up the hill. Ms. Patane said then it is the section by Lot 2 and Mr. Miyoshi agreed. Ms.  
18 Shakely explained that, where the house is situated, it is outside the steep slope. The proposal is  
19 for no minimal disturbance in that area. When the site drops down into this site, she said they  
20 would have to create a driveway and go into that a little. However, it will be graded at slope so it  
21 won't be erosive or anything like that.

22

23 Mr. Bryant asked if the survey being used was a hard survey or a GIS survey. Ms. Shakely  
24 responded that it is a boundary survey done by aerial. Mr. Bryant said it is known that when it is  
25 aerial it can fluctuate. He then referred to the SWIPP and the 4.5 acres. His concern is that the  
26 lines are drawn, tucked around every little bit of disturbance and in one place it is 4 ft off the

1 edge of the house. He said, from a practical matter, he cannot see how a house could be  
2 constructed with the disturbance limits only 4 ft away and they would not want to run into this  
3 later on as they progress, to stay within the confines. They are being made to flag all out and  
4 fence them all out and he said there are meandering sections in some of the places. With the well  
5 rig going in, etc., he questioned where the soil is being stockpiled. If there are disturbance limits  
6 right behind the house, he said the detail showing the stockpile is behind the house. He  
7 questioned if it can't be put there, then where would it be put. He suggested taking a hard look at  
8 this disturbance limit and said he does not think it is reasonable; it is cutting it way to close. It is  
9 a 40 acre site, 10 homes and the thought that only 4 acres is being disturbed is mt realistic to him.  
10 Ms. Shakely said she would talk a look at this and maybe add a buffer on each of the houses, go  
11 15 to 20 ft off the edge of the houses. Mr. Bryant explained that, if it goes over, the contractor  
12 says it can't be built, and then this is like a can being kicked down the road. If the lots get split up  
13 and sold to different people, he said it would be the straw that breaks the camel's back to go over  
14 the 5 acres – and it will be a mess at some later point. He emphasized it really needs to be looked  
15 at. Ms. Shakely responded that she would take a look at that.

16  
17 Mr. Bryant told Ms. Shakely that he knew Engineer Rennia pointed out the flow through the  
18 culvert He said she had looked at the site, but did not incorporate the whole watershed, which is  
19 in his letter and a look needs to be taken. He said real profiles need to be seen for the driveways  
20 because, in other cases, down the road, a plot plan comes in, it is hard to meet the grade. If they  
21 are just relying on flyovers, and not a hard survey, he said that could create a problem. It could  
22 increase the disturbance limits and there are some steep slopes. He told Ms. Shakely to look hard  
23 at the driveways. He said he knows that she spoke about the sight distance off the driveways, and  
24 UVA needs more information to establish her position that this meets the sight distances. Ms.  
25 Shakely said that a label could be added to each of the sight distances to show that at least 300 ft  
26 is being met.

1  
2 Ms. Robbins confirmed with Ms. Shakely she knows there were not any wetland impacts  
3 anticipated to the stream and with the bridge being created, that she is going to try to avoid the  
4 wetlands and stream impacts, because it is a federal wetland, or stream. She then referred to what  
5 she thinks is Lot 4, saying it looks as though the house is being placed outside the building  
6 envelope. She questioned if this may have been a mistake and Ms. Shakely responded Yes and it  
7 will be adjusted.

8  
9 Mr. Eickman said that this was ready for a Public Hearing and Ms. Patane asked if it could be the  
10 December meeting. Mr. Eickman replied Yes, and that it would give them a little more time to  
11 get the notices out.

12  
13  
14 **MOTION made by Lori Gee, seconded by Richard Campbell, seconded by Ed**  
15 **Miyoshi, to schedule the Public Hearing for Ridges at Stormville Mountain**  
16 **Subdivision. Voted and carried unanimously.**

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 **SKETCH:**

- 23  
24 4. **#2025 – 102 – Hopewell Oaks**, 1486 Route 82 (6559-03-136067) Applicant is requesting  
25 the board to consider a proposed five-unit Multi Family residence in an R1 zone.

26  
27 Frank Villano was present.

28  
29 Mr. Villano displayed the concept plan for 1486 Route 82 and stated that he apologized for not  
30 being present at the last meeting. He said the hope is to transform the dilapidated fish market that  
31 has been in disrepair for some time. He said he and his wife were going to look at a house for

1 sale nearby above that and that is why they did not buy the house. He is hoping to change the  
2 entire area with five (5) beautiful apartments in one (1) building. He has comments from the  
3 engineer and thinks right now the biggest hurdle is that this was mixed use and the reasoning that  
4 is available to go to new apartments that are purely residential. It would have to be an existing  
5 structure, which he said it is not. He has inspected the structure, and the foundation could not  
6 support anything that would be any benefit to put any kind of residential units in it. The request  
7 from the Board is for a leniency requirement that it be a new structure for residential He has  
8 looked at the area surrounding this and said it is a lot of professional medicals. He feels that area  
9 is saturated and adding another medical building in that area is not of benefit to anyone. He said  
10 there would be a new septic system for the five (5) units. Parking is located closer to the street,  
11 and the building would be located further from the street, which he said does not make it as  
12 crowded. The stormwater management will have the Cultec system underneath the parking area,  
13 and there would be no net runoff with the bad storms that are pretty common lately.

14  
15 Mr. Eickman said there is a lot of history for this property with the Planning and Engineering  
16 departments. Ms. Robins said that is correct and there is a Special Permit that the applicant is  
17 hoping to take advantage of to redevelop the site. It is a Mixed-Use Redevelopment Special  
18 Permit. She said the problem is that there are some requirements in the application that would  
19 make it difficult for the applicant to meet. She said the intent of the Special Permit was to take  
20 buildings located in commercial areas and redevelop these buildings that may have laid foul for a  
21 while. They were largely commercial buildings that had been put in residential locations and she  
22 said there are several throughout the Town. They have not been able to be redeveloped  
23 commercially, and the intent of the Special Permit was to allow them, for economic development  
24 purposes, to be redeveloped and hopefully improve the appearance in the neighborhood. By  
25 allowing the redevelopment of these with low traffic, low intensity, commercial like office, and  
26 potentially allow some sort of residential, like second story residential use along with it, with the

1 requirements that the Special Permit lays out. In this particular case, she said the lot is about an  
2 acre, so it is pretty contained. With the existing buildings, one wouldn't be able to take down a  
3 building and rebuild something. She said it would have to be a reuse of an existing building. She  
4 explained that it would contain what could be constructed there and it would not change the  
5 character of the neighborhood significantly. In this case, she said it is only an acre, but other sites  
6 are larger, and one wouldn't be able to come in and take out the existing building and build a  
7 larger building there. The intent was for the site to be reused and fixed up.

8 The requirements that the applicant is not able to meet are (1) there is supposed to be some kind  
9 of mixed use, and it is considered a Mixed-Use Redevelopment Special Permit, so there is  
10 supposed to be some sort of commercial use incorporated into the building. (2) They are not  
11 supposed to be able to take the building down; they are to reuse the existing structure. Ms.  
12 Robbins said those are the 2 main things.

13  
14 Ms. Robbins also thinks on this site there are some constraints with regard to this property. There  
15 is drainage or a stream that's along one side that constrains the parking and makes it difficult in  
16 one location to add a lot of parking. She said one of the issues is, whatever is put here, there  
17 would be a limited number of parking spaces; it is a pretty small area that can be used for parking  
18 and that those are the major concerns.

19  
20 Mr. Villano said, regarding the mixed use, just the residential use is preferred; it has a better  
21 appeal in the residential area. He said there is a lot of mixed use along Route 82 in that area, but  
22 it is his preference not to add mixed use and just stick to residential. He said they are looking to  
23 reroute the drainage ditch that exists along the west side of the site, which would be a process  
24 with the DEC, and he understands that. It is more of a seasonal ditch, rather than a creek. He said  
25 he is sure it gets its fair share of runoff, but on an average day, he does not believe it is too much.  
26 It is more along the stormwater for precipitation events and is limited to that. The other ask that

1 he has is they cannot reuse the building, because the building is not structurally safe. He said the  
2 foundation is not adequate to even guild a stick-frame commercial mixed-use on it. He explained  
3 that it is dated, has been left for quite some time without repair and to reuse the building it would  
4 be more dangerous to repair it. He does not see any benefit to staying in the footprint, which is  
5 very close to Route 82. He feels it is beneficial to the community to the fact that he is trying to  
6 push the building back and keep the same overall footprint in size.

7  
8 Mr. Campbell wanted this to be clear and confirmed with Mr. Villano that his idea is to eliminate  
9 the building in its entirety, eliminate its foundation and build a completely new structure in a  
10 different position on the site. Mr. Villano responded that is correct on all of those and he is also  
11 trying to keep it within the same footprint as far as the area in plain view. Mr. Campbell said he  
12 is assuming that the septic would be redone. Mr. Villano responded that the existing septic is  
13 shown on the 1979 subdivision map as a circle; he doesn't know what it is and it has no benefit.

14  
15 Mr. Miyoshi asked if the issue was that he has to go to the Zoning Board to get the zoning  
16 changed to residential, since there is the big development across the street from there. Mr.  
17 Villano responded that his understanding is, with the mixed-use permit, that would be avoided  
18 and this could be kept with the Planning Board.

19  
20 Attorney Cunningham stated he was reading the Code and, if the building was being kept as it is,  
21 Section G says "the Planning Board, at its discretion can waive the requirement for commercial  
22 uses and permit residential use up to 100% of an existing building if it is determined that the site  
23 is incompatible with commercial use". He said a determination needs to be made whether this is  
24 incompatible with commercial use and the existing building has to be kept. Looking to Mr.  
25 Villano, he said if the building is knocked down, he thinks this has to go to the Zoning Board to  
26 actually get relief. Mr. Miyoshi said, if it is then zoned residential, nothing has to be done with a

1 special permit and anything can be done on it. Mr. Villano said his understanding was that he had  
2 to go to the Planning Board, get rejected, then go. Mr. Bryant said this is multi family; it is not  
3 just residential. Attorney Cunningham stated this does not necessarily mean rezoning, but they  
4 could offer relief on certain requirements in the Code.

5  
6 Mr. Eickman asked if this is currently zoned R-1 and asked what is permitted under R-1. Ms.  
7 Robbins replied that it is single-family homes. Mr. Eickman said this is one unit, and five (5) are  
8 being requested. Mr. Campbell said this is on one (1) acre. He asked if the fish market existed in  
9 there with anything else and were there living spaces above it. Ms. Robbins replied that she did  
10 not think so, and someone from the audience said there was an apartment. Mr. Campbell said that  
11 is what he thought.

12  
13 Ms. Bledsoe asked what the two (2) requirements were; one was the building not being knocked  
14 down and not reusing the building. She questioned what was the other. Ms. Robbins responded  
15 that they did not want to do commercial use, nor make it mixed use. Mr. Campbell said it would  
16 be residential use. Mr. Bryant added it could be multi-office use and could be professional use  
17 and not necessarily medical. Ms. Robbins stated No - it can be a general office, a professional  
18 office or medical office Ms. Bledsoe asked Mr. Villano if he had a plan of what he wanted to  
19 build there. He replied that there are floor plan layouts that are just schematic, just to show  
20 relative. He does not have renderings, or anything like that as this is just the beginning. He said  
21 the biggest hurdle is what they are asking for – not the mixed use/commercial and the non-reuse  
22 of the building. Ms. Robbins said she had not yet looked at the proposed plan but, judging from  
23 the way it is such a tight site, and where the building is located, she thinks there would also be  
24 dimensional variances as well. Mr. Campell noted if there would be a height requirement and if  
25 they are talking about proposing a 2-story. Mr. Villano said he believes all the current setbacks

1 have been met and where the building is laid out; that is his primary goal, to stay within the  
2 setback envelope.

3

4

5 Mr. Campbell questioned if there is enough space to do the septic for that many apartments. Mr.  
6 Villano replied that, the way he broke it down, is there are 2 septic systems that have separate  
7 tanks and there are 2 completely separate systems. If there were any more than the five (5) units,  
8 he said they would be required to go to the Health Department as a full-fledge wastewater  
9 treatment system. He said they are right at t he edge of this and the two (2) systems have worked  
10 in previous designs that he has done; they have the real estate for this. Mr. Campbell asked how  
11 many bedrooms in each apartment are proposed and Mr. Villano responded two (2). Mr.  
12 Campbell said then this is five (5) 2-bedroom apartments.

13

14 Mr. Giovagnoli asked, even if they get the residential, it is still zoned for the single family. Ms.  
15 Robbins said the Special Permit would allow him to, potentially. Mr. Giovagnoli said he  
16 understood. Mr. Bryant told him the rub is using the existing building.

17

18 Ms. Gee asked, even if he was to, what would the maximum number of units be. Ms. Robbins  
19 asked Mr. Villano if he had calculated how many units he could get if under the existing  
20 building. He responded that they did not, because of the building's condition. He said it is close  
21 in size to the footprint, but it has different levels of foundations that do not accommodate  
22 working together He said, in all honesty, he wonders how it has survived gravity all this time.  
23 Mr. Campbell asked if the building had technically been condemned and if the Building  
24 Department had anything. Mr. Bryant said they had not gone that far because they responded. An  
25 inquiry was done for the structural stability and they responded, so it is now what they figure out  
26 they want to do.

1

2 Mr. Villano said fencing has been added to make it safe to the public and he is just trying to get  
3 this moving forward, if possible.

4

5 Ms. Gee said, just to finish, the purpose of her question to Mr. Villano was to find out what could  
6 be built if he was going to use this building. She understands that it can't be done, but if it could  
7 be done, she asked what the number of units would be, based on the building right now. Mr.  
8 Villano responded that it would probably be close to the same – five (5), stepped. He said they  
9 are taking advantage of the fact that the topography, when it steps back in the back part, it is only  
10 one (1) story. Ms. Gee asked if it would be two (2) levels or five (5) one-story apartments, like a  
11 townhouse. Mr. Villano said he was not quite understanding the question. Ms. Bledsoe said like  
12 garden style apartments where each one level itself – or would it be stairs inside the apartment,  
13 like living room on the main floor and bedrooms above. Mr. Villano apologized, saying it is a  
14 unit downstairs, and a unit upstairs, with a stairway on the side and each has its own access.

15

16 Looking to Ms. Robbins, Ms. Gee said, if the building was being reused, and the Members of the  
17 Planning Board agreed they would waive the commercial use, then would the five (5) units be  
18 permissible under this permit. Mr. Bryant said only if it is subject to parking, septic and all those  
19 other things. Ms. Gee said she was just trying to make sure if it was that three (3) would be the  
20 max and that the Board is not just spinning its wheels or even considering something that just  
21 wouldn't happen under the Special Permit, even with the existing building.

22

23 Mr. Eickman asked Mr. Villano if he had looked at any other options. He replied that he had  
24 looked at the mixed use. He drives this daily and said there is a lot on the road, going more  
25 towards the Taconic, where there are vacancies that have been vacant for a while. He said he  
26 does not want to go down that road and believes the mixed-use part of it, the medical, is kind of

1 saturated there. He said he has not explored offices, but the residential seems to be in keeping  
2 with the area.

3

4 Ms. Bledsoe asked if any properties in the general area are anything other than residential and  
5 how far down does one have to go to get to the next commercial. Mr. Miyoshi said it is up  
6 around the corner and towards the Taconic. Mr. Giovagnoli said a quarter mile, towards the  
7 Taconic. Mr. Eickman said he would say it is mostly residential usage. There is a development  
8 neighborhood across the street. Mr. Campbell said he is trying to think of the magnitude of use  
9 that is being done now in that vicinity and asked if there is any type of 2-story building out that  
10 way. The Members randomly stated it is mostly residential, primarily single family. Mr. Villano  
11 said he is looking to improve some landscaping and some screening. There are a couple houses  
12 up from the original subdivision and another house that was not part of the subdivision that exists  
13 and he would like to screen that area; it is not shown on the plan yet as they did not get that far.  
14 He said that, definitely there would be evergreens and plantings along Route 82 to just bring up  
15 the overall character of that area because it has been defunct for a very long time and its  
16 commercial. Ms. Bledsoe said it does stick out when driving down the road. Mr. Miyoshi said it  
17 is surrounded by single family residents.

18  
19 Ms. Gee noted the one acre that is the fish market and asked if it is two (2) lots right now. Mr.  
20 Villano replied that it is a single lot, less than a quarter there as it is like a flag lot that goes up  
21 around the back that has the 2 other lots.

22  
23 Ms. Robbins stated that the closes commercial property is 2/10 of a mile which, Mr. Bryant  
24 added, is like 1,000 ft. Ms. Bledsoe said that is LaGrange Dental and Ms. Robbins added that is  
25 next to Cranberry Drive. She told Mr. Villano that this would need a variance for anything  
26 outside of the Hamlet area on a State road. She said it needs a 100 ft setback. Mr. Villano asked

1 if that would be from the DOT and Ms. Robbins replied that he would need to look at the  
2 Footnote 11 of Schedule A in the Code.

3  
4 Ms. Gee began to question about the options, since, she said, this is a 7 acres site layout. Ms.  
5 Robbins told her it is just one (1) acre. Ms. Gee said she was looking at the site dimensions, and  
6 she saw a six (6) acre lot and a one (1) acre. Mr. Giovagnoli said that is two (2) separate lots and  
7 it is all in the back. Mr. Villano added that, back in 1979, it was divided. Ms. Gee told him she  
8 was looking at the site picture, and it looks like the entire site. She asked him if it is incorrect.  
9 She told Mr. Villano his application is not for the entire parcel as shown in the site picture, in the  
10 area map. She told him he should be showing both parcels. Mr. Villano was examining the  
11 displayed plan and Ms. Robbins stated it is just the one (1) acre parcel. Ms. Gee told Mr. Villano  
12 that this needs to be corrected. She said she was going to suggest that a regular conventional  
13 subdivision be laid out.

14  
15 Mr. Eickman told Mr. Villano that, obviously he has a lot of hurdles to overcome and that the  
16 Board would love to be able to help him figure out a way to encourage him to improve the  
17 property. He said he thinks there are some legal issues as pointed out by counsel with regards to  
18 the need to reuse the existing building if he is going to take advantage of the Special Permit  
19 exception. Looking at the zoning as it currently exists, and considering the surrounding area, he  
20 said the five (5) units of apartments would be too much to go for. Mr. Villano asked if the next  
21 route he should go would be to the Zoning Board, or would the matter be kept with the Planning  
22 Board.

23  
24 Ms. Robbins referred to the drainage ditch that had been noted. She said she does not know for  
25 certain, but suspects the DEC would take control of that because it drains the DEC wetland in the  
26 back. She told Mr. Villano that she suggests this is something that has to be made clear before

1 going much further.as it really will constrain what can be done with regards to the parking, and  
2 maybe even the septic. She told Mr. Villano said she does not know how the DEC will look at  
3 that wetland resource and they may, if he is lucky. It is not part of their jurisdiction, but she does  
4 not know what they will do. She said it may be something he wants to clear up before going  
5 further with the design. Mr. Villano said he would discuss this with them.

6

7 Ms. Bledsoe asked, from the perspective of the Special Permit, if the Planning Board has the  
8 ability to offer relief of taking the building down. Mr. Bryant said he did not see that. Ms.  
9 Robbins said the only thing the Planning Board has the discretion to waive is based on the  
10 Special Permit – the commercial piece of it. Mr. Bryant said that is on an existing building. Ms.  
11 Robbins said that is the other issue. Ms. Bledsoe said then the Planning Board does not have the  
12 ability to offer relief on taking the building down, as part of the Special Permit. Ms. Robbins  
13 stated that is correct. Ms. Bledsoe questioned if their process then could only be to rezone the  
14 property in order to take the building down. Attorney Cunningham said he would not sue the  
15 word “Rezone”. He told Mr. Villano that he thinks the next step would be to talk with his team  
16 and then for him to set up a pre-application with the staff. He told him knows he already made  
17 an application, but this would be a more formal application. If he does have to go to the Zoning  
18 Board, and his heart is set on tearing down the building as his only path forward, then he would  
19 have to go to the Zoning Board. He would also have to get denial letter from the Building  
20 Department. He told Mr. Villano that he is not sure if it is an Area variance or a Use variance and  
21 that a variance is very difficult to get.

22

23 Mr. Campbell questioned if Mr. Villano could at least apply to start demolishing the building and  
24 is there a way he can do that. Mr. Bryant responded that he could take out a demo permit. Mr.  
25 Campbell said, in his opinion, it would be a start to get to a place he may find and told Mr.  
26 Villano that he has already determined the building is completely useless – and really, dangerous.

1 He said he would start by applying to the Building Department to demolish the building to the  
2 ground, because, regardless, he has to start from that point and then go forward from there.

3  
4 Ms. Gee questioned if this would preclude any of the Grandfather Rights from the fact that it had  
5 been a commercial building, if the commercial building is taken down. Mr. Bryant said it had not  
6 been used for a year. Ms. Robbins said Yes, they already lost the non-conforming status.  
7 Attorney Cunningham stated that, by taking the building down, then they wouldn't be using the  
8 existing building. The way the Code is written, he said they would lose their rights to apply under  
9 the Special Permit, without getting relief from the ZBA. Ms. Robbins told Mr. Villano that, right  
10 now he has a Grandfathered front setback, which she believes will be subject to the 100 ft - and  
11 he has only 34 ft from Route 82. If the existing building is used now, she said the Area variance  
12 would not be needed. She told Mr. Villano there are things to think about, as to how he wants to  
13 proceed.

14  
15 Mr. Bryant asked if there is any section of the old building that could be salvaged, which could  
16 then turn this into more of a renovation, versus a complete tear-down. He asked if there is any  
17 portion that could be saved. Mr. Villano responded that he could look into that; there is a rear  
18 part that has good parts and bad parts. He said the front part is the primary concern, structurally.  
19 He said he may be able to save a foundation wall area and portions of two (2) walls; he does not  
20 know if that is any benefit\ Mr. Campbell asked if any of it is steel structure or is it all wood  
21 frame and Mr. Villano replied that it is all wood, timber framed.

22  
23 Mr. Giovagnoli asked if there was a limit of how much building can be left. Mr. Bryant said he  
24 does not think it is specified. Ms. Robbins said it is really to reuse in the Code. She will have to  
25 look at the Code for a differentiation of when it is an alteration and it is full and Mr. Campbell  
26 said to see if there is a percentage. Ms. Robbins said she could see if this may apply; she will

1 look at it. Ms. Bledsoe questioned if, without the Special Permit a multi-family can be done. Ms.  
2 Robbins responded, without a Special Permit, only a single-family home can be there, that's it,  
3 anything that is allowed in a single-family district.

4  
5 Mr. Villano asked, if he were to save one (1) wall and one (1) foundation wall, is that considered  
6 a renovation. Ms. Robbins replied that she would have to look at the Code and she can do a little  
7 research for him; she will work with attorney Cuningham on this. Attorney Cuningham stated  
8 that, obviously there are a lot of moving parts here just on the fly. There are other sections of the  
9 Code that speak to this, and he does not want to give him a wrong answer now. Mr. Villano said  
10 that he understood and appreciated that.

11  
12 Mr. Giovagnoli asked if this is the R-1 area where it is one (1) unit per acre and Mr. Bryant  
13 responded that is what R-1 is, one (1) acre.

14  
15 Mr. Villano thanked the Board for all their input. Mr. Eickman wished him the very best on this  
16 and said he hopes he can come back to the Board again.

17  
18  
19  
20

21 **AMENDMENT TO SITE PLAN:**

22  
23 **5. Trump National Golf Course**

24  
25 Mr. Eickman announced that there was an item from the floor, a letter for an amendment  
26 requested by Trump National Golf Club. He continued to read the letter:

27  
28 "Dear Planning Board:

1 I am requesting a Minor Site Plan Amendment to add a monument sign to the Trump  
2 National Golf Course parcel at the corner of Route 216 and Stormville Road.

3 We have provided the Planning Department with a survey showing the location of the  
4 sign and have received approval from the New York State DOT with regard to the sight  
5 distance and location of the sign.

6 We will be applying for a Sign Permit through the Building Department.”  
7

8 Mr. Eickman told the Members that, assuming all are in favor of this, the public hearing can be  
9 waived, because this is a minor action.

10  
11 Mr. Miyoshi asked if there was any rationale given as to why this is needed. He said when one  
12 drives down 216 the driving range can be seen there and would know it is a golf course. Mr.  
13 Eickman questioned it, saying it was hard to see the driving range from 216. Mr. Miyoshi said he  
14 goes by there all the time. Ms. Bledsoe added that if you know it is there, it is there, but coming  
15 from out of the area it wouldn't be known it's there; it could be anything. Mr. Miyoshi said he  
16 makes a left off of 216 onto Stormville Road on an almost daily basis. Ms. Robbins stated that  
17 she believed that was the reasoning. They were concerned about when there are events and  
18 people from out of the area locating the golf course. Mr. Eickman said he could understand why  
19 they would want to announce the location. He said it is a Type 2 Action, so no SEQR is required,  
20 and they would still need to meet all the requirements of the Town's sign ordinance.

21  
22 There was no further discussion, no concerns or questions from the Members or Professionals.  
23

24  
25  
26 **RESOLUTION OF AMENDED SITE PLAN APPROVAL**  
27  
28

1 **NAME OF SITE PLAN: Trump National Golf Course**

2  
3 **NAME OF APPLICANT: Trump National Golf Course, Dutchess County, LLC.**

4  
5 **LOCATION: 178 Stormville Road (6557-04-600369)**

6  
7 Resolution Offered by Planning Board Member John Eickman

8  
9 **WHEREAS**, the applicant is seeking a minor amendment to the site plan to add a monument  
10 sign at the corner of Route 216 and Stormville Road; and

11 **WHEREAS**, the applicant has received an approval from the New York State Department of  
12 Transportation for the location of the sign with regards to site distance; and

13 **WHEREAS**, the applicant has provided the Planning Office a copy of a survey showing the  
14 location of the proposed monument sign; and

15 **WHEREAS**, the action is a minor amendment to the site plan and the Planning Board has  
16 waived the requirement for a public hearing; and

17 **WHEREAS**, the action is considered a Type II action under SEQR and no further SEQR review  
18 is required; and

19 **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Planning Board approves the addition of a  
20 monument sign at the corner of Route 216 and Stormville Road as depicted on a “Map of Survey  
21 for the Lands of Trump International Hudson Valley,” prepared by Robert V. Oswald, Land  
22 Surveying, dated June 20, 2025 and subject to the following conditions:

- 23 1) A sign permit from the Building Department.

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

27 Resolution Seconded by Planning Board Member Lori Gee

28  
29 The votes were as follows:

30  
31 Board Member Lori Gee Aye  
32 Board Member Ed Miyoshi Aye  
33 Board Member Sarah Bledsoe Aye  
34 Board Member Richard Campbell Abstain  
35 Board Member Donald Papae Aye  
36 Board Member John Giovagnoli Aye  
37 Chairperson John Eickman Aye

1 -----

2

3

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

5

6

7

8

9 ***ADJOURNMENT***

10

11

12 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Lori Gee, to adjourn**

13 **the Planning Board meeting. Voted and carried unanimously.**

14

15

16

17 **Respectfully submitted:** \_\_\_\_\_

18 **Kathleen Mahodil, Meeting Secretary**

19 **East Fishkill Planning Board**

20

21

22

23

24