

**TOWN OF EAST FISHKILL
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
JANUARY 20, 2026**

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

Members present:

John Giovagnoli, Donald Papae, John Eickman, Richard Campbell, Ed Miyoshi; Michael Cunningham, Attorney; Scott Bryant, Engineer; Michelle Robbins, Planner; Rich Renna, Engineer; Danielle Angyal – Assistant Planner; Chris Jodlowski, Fire Commissioner; Dave Palin, Fire Advisory Board; Staff: Jackie Keenan, Clerk.

The meeting began with the Pledge of Allegiance.

CHAIRPERSON COMMENTS

Chairperson Eickman stated that the upcoming meeting is Tuesday, February 17, 2026.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

December 16, 2025

MOTION made by Ed Miyoshi, seconded by John Giovagnoli, to accept the minutes of the December 16, 2025, meeting. Voted and carried unanimously.

ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING:

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 parking spaces to the existing site plan. The site currently contains 142 spaces. The proposed amendment to the site plan would remove 4 spaces and add 23 for a total of 161 spaces. **(Adjourning until February 17th, 2026)**

Chairperson Eickman stated the applicant has requested this be adjourned until the February 17th meeting.

MOTION made by Donald Papae, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to adjourn this Public Hearing until February 17, 2026. Voted and carried unanimously.

ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING:

2025-099 – Ridges at Stormville Mountain Subdivision, 20 Stormville Mountain Road (6656-00-536587)

Applicant is applying for an amended site plan to add a 2-way drive and 23 additional parking spaces to the existing site plan. The site currently contains 142 spaces. The proposed amendment to the site plan would remove 4 spaces and add 23 spaces for a total of 161 spaces. (Adjourning until February 17, 2026)

Chairperson Eickman stated the applicant has requested this be adjourned until the February 17th meeting.

MOTION made by Donald Papae, seconded by Ed Miyoshi, to adjourn this Public Hearing until February 17, 2026. Voted and carried unanimously.

ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING:

Montage Subdivision, Route 52 (6556-00-0445715)

Applicant is requesting subdivision approval for a proposed cluster subdivision with 122 residential lots on a 325.22-acre parcel.

Jennifer Grey, Tom Troy, Mark Cannuli, and various consultants were present.

MOTION made by Donald Papae, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to open this Public Hearing. Voted and carried unanimously.

Ms. Grey stated this subdivision had been pending for 20 plus years. It is a proposed cluster subdivision with 122 residential lots. There are two open space parcels, a water supply parcel, and two parcels that will be retained by the seller. The applicant is the contract vendee for the property. The seller will retain a one-acre parcel for a single-family lot and also a 44-acre parcel. The total assemblage is 385.5 acres that they are planning to subdivide, but because this is a cluster subdivision, the development is concentrated on only about 70 acres. The rest will remain open space. The property is on the south side of Route 52 near the intersection of Route 216 in an R1 zoning district. Procedurally in terms of SEQRA, they have completed their SEQRA review. The project went through a Full Environmental Impact Statement, Supplemental Impact Statement, and Findings Statement was adopted by the Planning Board in 2019. They are here tonight for a Public Hearing on the Preliminary and Final Subdivision. The applicant was before the Planning Board several times in 2021 and 2022. The Public Hearing was opened in August 2022. The last submission before the one just made in December 2025 was made in October and November 2024. They do believe they are ready to have the Public Hearing closed and a resolution to be drafted for the Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval.

Tom Troy stated he is the President of Sharbell Dutchess. He expressed his condolences on the passing of Lori Gee. This application has been before the Board for a little over 20 years. They are here to resolve any of the outstanding issues that have been heard over the last few years, based on the most recent subdivision. Since their last meeting here a few things have happened that he wanted to give them an overview of. They have been working with the town engineering and administration on a plan to consolidate their wastewater and drinking water infrastructure such that it works and ties into the hamlet plant. They have been meeting with the town over the last couple of years, more intensely recently, and they are close to having a plan and a Memorandum of Understanding. That will ultimately allow a process that will allow the work to go out to bid and that will satisfy not only the sanitary sewer and water for their project but also for Summit Woods. They had discussed many plans over the years including having it on site or taking it up

to Four Corners. That has all been clarified now. Secondly they now own the land. They had been under contract with the Tucker family for many years, but they took title to the land back in October. There are two parcels that will be deeded back to the Tucker family for their retention that are not part of this land use application. They have also negotiated and agreed with the property owner to the north side of Route 52 for the pie shaped parcel between Route 52 and Route 216. They acquired from them the dedication of the real estate necessary to allow the roundabout to be constructed as part of their infrastructure on this project.

Mr. Cannuli offered his condolences on the passing of Ms. Gee. She had been very instrumental in this project for a very long time. He stated this application has been here several times. He was here most recently in July with Summitt Woods to give an update of where they were and what has been going on. On July 19th of 2005 was when they had their first scoping document approved and that was for a different project for a senior/non-senior hybrid project. Since then, they have proceeded with an as of right conventional lot layout to establish a lot count. They achieved 122 lots using R1 zone. Through SEQRA they proceeded with a cluster lot layout. For this application, the scoping document was adopted in October of 2008. Through SEQRA they had the SEIS, FEIS and eventually the board issued a finding statement in November 2019. They were here in October of 2021, August of 2022, and September of 2022 where they opened the Public Hearing for public comment. At those hearings they had testimony by the applicant, himself, their company president, Thomas Troy, their civil engineer, their ecological environmental consultants, their hydrogeologist, and their traffic consultants. They have received comments from staff and the public and have addressed them each time they have returned. They are here tonight to open it back up for more comments and if the board is so inclined they would like to ask that they close the public comment portion. Their entire team is here to address any substantial comments, and he believes they can get those addressed and on the record. The project is located on the South side of Route 52 with the intersection of 216. The site totals approximately 385 acres which includes the land mentioned earlier that remains with the seller. There is still a one-acre lot and a 44-acre lot that remains with the seller. The initial action was a conventional residential subdivision layout under the SEQRA R1 zoning. The board decided the better solution would be to utilize a cluster

subdivision that would have the least amount of impacts on the environment. None of their lots in the cluster plan extend into the wetland or the wetland buffer areas. There are three wetland crossings and a fourth culvert crossing in the project, which are currently under review. The lots range in size from 80 feet wide to 120 feet deep and some are 90 feet wide and 110 feet deep with an average lot area of a quarter acre. The cluster subdivision limits the development of their project to just about 70 acres while preserving just over 275 acres of open space which will be permanently preserved. They are currently working with North American Land Trust who will be the easement holder of these areas. Some important project updates include that the original wetland delineation expired after 10 years. Staff asks that they get that revalidated and that map was reapproved in March of 2024. The delineation identified a small portion of wetlands that were added to the original wetland area and associated buffer areas. He believes it was approximately just under 5 acres. The updated delineation expanded that area and staff requested that they revisit the cluster lot layout to make sure that the 122 lots they achieved before it could still be achieved with the new wetlands on the plan. Since July they have worked with their engineers. They have developed a new cluster lot layout and worked with Mr. Rennia and were able to achieve 122 lots. They received approval from Mr. Rennia's office on January 17th, 2026. It does require a few details to be added to that plan, and they are already working on that. Their current cluster plan was revised to eliminate lots within the expanded wetland areas. In terms of offsite sewer, Mr. Troy mentioned that they are now running their sewer through a series of pump stations and force mains from the project site to another pump station on the East Fishkill Fire Department premises and from there through a force main to the Hopewell Hamlet Wastewater Treatment Plant. They are working on a Memorandum of Understanding. They also have their attorney working closely with Attorney Wood and staff pulling together the Memorandum of Understanding to help document moving forward with scheduling, phasing, and financing. They will probably get to the point where that document is finalized hopefully within the next month. That process to run sewer to the Hopewell Hamlet Wastewater Treatment plant was decided by the town. After they concluded their SEQRA they hired Colliers engineering who evaluated the alternatives on where the pump stations should go and where the force main alignment should go. In the end, the alignment that was decided upon was the one he just explained. They are working on the details of that engineering now. In terms

of water, it was decided after a series of options that were evaluated that the water will be supplied with on-site wells. Their water engineer, WSP, is here and their hydrogeologist is here who performed water quality testing. In May of 2025 they performed the required 72-hour pump test. The town requires that your maximum daily demand is met with your two best wells out of service. They met the water quality standards, and all PAS were non-detected. You will pull together the details of the on-site sewer, the off-site sewer, and the on-site water systems, which will all become Township owned facilities after they are completed and deeded over to the town. They recently had their Army Corps application for their crossings submitted. The public notice for the Army Corps expired on January 9th, 2026, and he believes there were two comments which were received, and they will be responding to them within the 20-day public comment response time. The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation application for Wetland and Stream Processing Applications has been pending for several years. They did update their permit applications recently and resubmitted documentation that they had requested or another notice of incomplete application. The last submission was August 27th, 2025. All of that has been posted to their website. All of the submissions that they make do get posted onto their website. Another pending application will be their Water Withdrawal Permit and that is a DC application. They are pulling the details of that application together and submitting that within a week or two. The last application they need is their New York State DOT Intersection Application for Route 52 and Route 216. It was the DOT who decided that rather than a signalized intersection with the traffic light they opted for a modern roundabout. That application is pending with the DOT. The project will have a homeowners association that will maintain the interior open spaces. The larger open spaces and wetlands will be managed by the easement holder, North American Land Trust. They recently received a memo from HVEA Traffic Consultants dated August 2023 and they will address those comments as well tonight. There is lighting in the project where they will need a lighting district, and they will work with Engineer Bryant on that. There will be sidewalks on certain sides of the roadways throughout the development for pedestrian circulation so they will have a sidewalk district. Because they have the bridge crossings and these are on private public roads they will need a water district as well.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there were any questions or comments from board members. There were none.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there were any questions or comments from town professionals. Mr. Renna stated he had no additional comments. He has reviewed the conventional lot layout since the Army Corps took over some of the wetlands and added additional buffer areas. They did make sure that the sensitive lands were not counted towards the conventional and then looked in detail at the zoning to make sure the lots were laid out correctly. The most recent version they found satisfied all of that. They have given them a list of items they would like to include on the final map that they are working on.

Engineer Bryant stated his understanding was that they were here before the board to update the community on the water source only. The town's traffic consultant is not present because they were not under the impression that all of these things were going to be discussed. Mr. Cannuli stated that Ms. Stieber would give an update on the water tests.

Ms. Stieber stated they did complete the 72-hour pumping test on the three on site wells. It was wells 2, 3, and 4 on the project site. All three wells demonstrated adequate yield to meet the maximum day demand of the project, which included the Montage and Summit Woods developments water requirements. They collected Part 5 water quality samples at the end of that testing, and the water quality came back more than adequate to meet the needs of the project. During that test they did do offset well monitoring and they saw no impact on offsite wells during that monitoring program. They also did surface water assessments to see if there was drawdown in the wetlands and they did not see any drawdown impact in the wetland area either. They are actively preparing the water withdrawal permit application, and it should be submitted to the DEC by the end of this week. Engineer Bryant stated at the last public meeting there were people who were concerned about their local wells. He asked if they had a list of the local wells that were monitored during the test. He wants to make sure that everyone who had expressed concern was contacted. Ms. Stieber stated that prior to the testing they did a mailing to property owners within

2000 feet of the on-site wells to see if they wanted to have their wells measured at part of that testing program. They ultimately ended up monitoring 10 off-site wells. Three of those wells were located on the Summit Woods property. They were the formerly proposed supply wells on that property. Seven other residential off-site wells were monitored. Engineer Bryant asked how many letters they sent out. Ms. Stieber stated they sent out 37 letters. Engineer Bryant asked if there were follow-up phone calls made to people to make sure they received their letters. Ms. Stieber stated they did Postal Service mailings and to follow up in person solicitations where they knocked on doors and left letters for people they did not receive responses from. Engineer Bryant asked if anybody in the audience was involved with the monitoring. One woman did say yes, but when a representative came to her house he said the well was too old and they could not monitor it. Ms. Stieber stated in some instances if the well has a jet pump or suction lift pump they are not able to open the well without breaking the suction. If that happens the well pump cannot be used and their goal for the monitoring program is to do an overall aquifer impact assessment. For that they do not need to measure every single well, and they do not want to harm anybody's well while they are doing it. The goal is to have the homeowner continue to use their well while they are doing the testing. In some instances, they are not able to monitor the wells if they are buried or they have a suction lift pump that they cannot open the well with. Engineer Bryant asked then how they would know that someone like that's well was not impacted. Ms. Stieber stated they use the assessment of all of the wells that they monitor, which were the 10 off-site wells as well as the on-site wells. They measure to assess whether they are seeing drawdown in impacts on off-site properties and they did not see any. They also installed three additional overburden monitoring wells because they did encounter a couple of wells that they could not measure. They added wells on the project site towards the boundary to add additional data points to see if they were seeing a drawdown impact between their wells, the intermediate monitoring wells they installed, and then the off-site wells which were further out. Engineer Bryant asked when the testing was done and Ms. Stieber said in May of 2025. Engineer Bryant stated he would like to see the list of the 37 people so they can follow up and verify. Ms. Stieber stated she could supply the list of the 35 people that were contacted. They did pull the mailing lists from the town tax assessor rolls so if the mailing address were different than the property address it would have been sent to the mailing address. Engineer

Bryant asked if anyone else had comments regarding their wells. Jana Mills stated she had water questions, but not specifically on the water testing. She stated her question is in regard to the well impacts. From what she read on the documents the test is a 72-hour test for 100,000 gallons per day. Ms. Stieber stated it was 72-hour testing for each of the three wells. They did three 72-hour tests, and the wells were pumped at roughly 320,000 gallons per day each. Ms. Mills stated that her well is impacted by the weather, the seasons, and pressure changes. They have quality changes especially during droughts. With that quantity of water being pumped out a three-day test in May when there is a lot of rain she does not feel is enough to justify being OK with drawing that much water out. Her second question is in regard to the water quality because it states in one of the documents that they found Radium 228 and 226 in the water and they were going to mitigate it with water softeners. She does not believe you can mitigate Radium with water softeners. Ms. Stieber stated there is hard water and that would be mitigated with a water softener system. Radium 226 and 228 are parameters that are included in the part 5 analysis. There were Sections of radium in the water which is normal. There was nothing that exceeded what is called the maximum contaminant level for radium, so no treatment is required for that. Engineer Bryant asked Ms. Stieber to explain the process of getting the permit from the DEC and what is required. Ms. Stieber stated that this testing will be included with the DEC water withdrawal permit application. They will view the testing for quantity. They authorized through a groundwater withdrawal permit the quantity and they will have their staff geologists reviewing the data that was collected as part of that permitting process. In addition, the Dutchess County Department of Health will be reviewing the water quality and determining whether any treatment or anything else is needed.

Mr. Miyoshi stated since they will be feeding all of the houses from the central wells he is assuming they would have some sort of water tower or something to store the water. Ms. Stieber stated that it would be a question for Colliers Engineering because they are doing the water distribution design.

Fire Commissioner Jodlowski asked about the septic system, and they had mentioned something about a pump station at the fire district property. Mr. Cannuli stated they are evaluating a location

for what the town is considering the Town Center pump station. Somewhere within that area they are evaluating in areas where that infrastructure can be placed. Mr. Jodlowski stated to be clear that it is not town property. That is fire district property, and they are two separate entities. Mr. Cannuli stated he thought that would be something the Town would have discussed and that it would be picked up in the Memorandum of Understanding. He stated he may have misspoke and that it would be in that vicinity.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there was anyone from the public who wanted to speak for or against this application.

Jennifer Cauthers stated she is a resident in Stormville, and this application is across the street from her at the bottom of the mountain. She stated her primary concern is about the water. They have had a lot of issues with Four Corners. Her husband is part of the fire department and Rescue Squad and there have been problems with Devon Farms as well. When they respond to fires at these developments the hydrants don't work or the water system doesn't work. At one point they talked about Montage being a lifeboat for Four Corners. She does not know if that is something that is still being considered and she would like to know how they are going to avoid the same issues and disasters that have been there. This will be two developments going in here as well. Her other concern is whether they will be able to support all of these homes going into an already crowded area. The fire department is at the edge of this district and Gayhead Elementary school is very full and they are adding a couple hundred homes. Engineer Bryant stated when they built Four Corners the Health Department only required 1 spare well. The town has adopted a new law for East Fishkill that you have to have two spare wells so that is how they are addressing the Four Corners issues from happening here. Ms. Cauthers asked if this was for 2 developments. Engineer Bryant stated it is one well field. They have to figure out the total amount of demand and have two wells out of service and still meet that total demand. In regard to the water supply permit it is one permit for both developments. It goes by the number of homes not the number of communities. Ms. Cauthers stated at one point they were talking about a water system to help Four Corners. She asked if that was not happening anymore. Engineer Bryant stated they had asked to evaluate what

the excess capacity would be for this case, but he does not believe there is enough for Four Corners. They are looking at another plan to supply Four Corners from a different source in the future. Ms. Stieber stated when they did the quantity testing they did account for the additional supply capacity that Summit Woods would require. The wells were tested to demonstrate that all three could meet the demand of both project needs. When they go to do the DEC application, the quantity that they will be asking for will be for both developments. Chairperson Eickman clarified that each individual well can meet the maximum daily combined demand of both projects and Ms. Stieber said yes.

Tirtsa Malaverda asked how many homes in total they were discussing. Ms. Stieber stated that this hearing is for the Montage development, which has 122 homes but as far as the water system is being developed to supply both projects. The status of the Summit Woods review is not part of this as far as the subdivision plan. When they did the testing they went in with the understanding that they needed to develop the capacity to supply both of those projects. Ms. Malaverda asked if they were going to discuss the discharge of fill material during construction. She received a letter that stated during construction they were going to be discharging fill material into the water into some tributary leading to Fishkill Creek. She wanted to know more information about that. Amy Bombardieri said that the discharge is incidental to the crossings that they are putting in for the three bridges and the box culvert. Through that construction process there will be some fill material of virgin soil that will end up in the wetland area. Ms. Malaverda stated when they were doing the test planning they have water running into the wetlands. When she pointed that out to them they admitted they did not realize where they were putting the water and they did redirect it. She is concerned if that was done during testing, where are they going to put materials when they are building. Ms. Bombardieri stated the water she is referring to was the groundwater that was coming out of the wells that they were testing. There are three bridges and in those areas there will be some incidental disturbance to the wetlands. They are getting permits for that disturbance. The materials that would be discharged into the water will be virgin soil. It is the soil that is surrounding the wetlands. Ms. Malaverda stated that the water issues are so bad in regard to flooding along Route 52 that they can't even plant grass. She is concerned that water going into any tributary will

contribute to their water issues. Ms. Bombardieri stated that they are required to attenuate any stormwater runoff that is created from this development. It will not be contributing to stormwater runoff that contributes to the flooding that is affecting the homes. There are areas where they have to mitigate wetlands, so they are creating more wetland area. The net loss of wetlands is zero. Anything that would get into the wetland is native virgin material that would not contaminate the area. Ms. Malaverda asked if she would get a letter in response to her letter and Ms. Bombardieri said yes. Mr. Cannuli stated the website is www.Montageateastfishkill.com.

Matt Milanesi stated he lives at the top of the mountain on Route 52. He stated his well is temperamental during weather as well. During the summer dry months, they can run their well dry in 20 minutes and they don't water their lawn anymore because of it. The Firehouse at the top of the mountain is only two bays. That is a big concern for him in regard to not having support for a development of this size. He stated Route 52 is a thoroughfare and when there is an accident on Interstate 84 which happens quite often, there is a ton of truck traffic. There is also a lot of truck traffic from package pavement out as well. His does know that traffic studies were done but he was wondering if there was a study that showed how many were cars versus trucks and if that traffic circle would be big enough to handle that kind of traffic. Mr. Cannuli stated that the roundabout was designed to handle truck traffic and emergency vehicles. Pete Russillo from Colliers Engineering stated that the Roundabout design is capable of supporting WB67 tractor trailers. The State made them run a profile of circulation of the roundabout to prove that a lowboy type of trailer can actually negotiate around the roundabout. Mr. Miyoshi asked them if a truck was coming down Route 52 and making a right onto 216 would it be able to maneuver that roundabout and Mr. Russillo said yes. This has all been part of the process with the state. The last set of comments they had were from four years ago and the process was interrupted because of land acquisition issues. They didn't go much further into the design because they were not sure how that would turn out. Since the sale went through they have responded this past August to the State's comments. There are two sets of comments. One comes from the regional office in Poughkeepsie, and the other set comes from the main office in Albany. All roundabouts get reviewed by both offices. They critiqued the plan and their comments have been addressed. They

are waiting to hear back from them on the latest submission which was made in August. He is surprised it is taking this long. They did answer all of their questions and respond to all of their inquiries in terms of alignment of the approaches to the roundabout. It is according to State standards, and it will support heavy vehicles. Engineer Bryant asked if someone could speak to the timing of the roundabout. Mr. Russillo stated there is a Work Zone Traffic control plan that identifies the sequence of active construction. In this case they will likely do the quadrant where the triangular piece is being obtained first. Then they will do the site side, and the last piece will be eliminating the 216 approach. Engineer Bryant asked if they were going to do the traffic circle before the 1st house gets built. Mr. Russillo stated the findings would probably indicate exactly when that has to happen. He is unsure if it is a phased development or all at once. Engineer Bryant stated there will be a lot of construction traffic coming in and out of the road for some period of time as well. Mr. Troy stated that part of the process of the permitting, the application, and the design require a developers agreement that obligates certain construction events to happen in some sequence relative to the roundabout itself. His intention would be to have the roundabout completed before they got to approximately 1/3 of the number of homes completed in the project. It would be in the first phase. They have to have the sanitary sewer and water in before they can move anybody in but once that goes in the understanding in their mind was to get the infrastructure in that serves all the underground and then come back and build the traffic circle. That would be part of the first third of this project. Mr. Miyoshi stated that would be approximately 40 houses. Troy understands this is going to be difficult enough to build, which is why they need the detailed phasing plan from DOT. In terms of the commitment to have it done, it would be logical to do the work as early in the process as they can. The project will be built in phases in any case. Mr. Miyoshi stated that 52 and 216 is already a dangerous intersection. If they are going to be adding 40 houses before there is any improvement he does not see it going well. Mr. Troy stated he is not sure what condition DOT is going to put on them when they start building this. If it is not covered in the DOT permit their intention is to build it in the first phase of the project. Mr. Cannuli stated there is a section of road that is the emergency exit. If this development were to go before Summit Woods there is a certain linear feet of roadway that they cannot exceed. Once they exceed that point they are required to have a second access under the cul-de-sac requirement. At some point

there will be the blue section of road on the map through Summit Woods which will be another way around to avoid the intersection. It will exit the property on the southeast side and go through the adjacent property to exit out onto Route 52. Mr. Palin asked at what point the second road would be usable. Mr. Cannuli stated if they were to proceed before Summit Woods there is a certain point when that road would need to be built as an emergency access. When Summit Woods develops that is one of their main roads through the development. Mr. Palin wanted to know exactly what that point was because without that road if one of their bridges or crossings fails there is no access. Mr. Cannuli stated it is in the early phase. Mr. Miyoshi stated he believes it is 1500 feet in requires a second access. Mrs. Cauthers stated the speed coming down Route 52 in that area is 55 miles an hour. Trucks coming down that hill do not slow down very quickly and coming around that bend into a roundabout would be difficult. She asked if this speed was going to be changed. Chairperson Eickman stated he believes that is under the purview of the DOT. He is confident they will address that. Mr. Russillo stated it is under the purview of the DOT, but the town could request a speed reduction as well. The State would require documentation as to why that would be necessary. There will be advance signs approaching the roundabout from each of the four approaches with a reduced speed to 15 mph. Those will be put far in advance of the actual roundabout itself. The latest set of plans has a crosswalk actually across the western approach to lead to the rail trail. With that in mind the State is going to require some lighting around the roundabout as well. That is still being worked on.

Sharon Schreiber stated she lives in Stormville. She did not know about the website. She asked how many houses were going to be allowed in Summit Woods with 122 going into Montage. Mr. Cannuli stated there is 175 homes proposed. They are also working on a revised conventional lot layout with Mr. Renna's firm. Ms. Schrieber asked if the impact studies done on each development were done individually without consideration of the other development. She asked if that meant there was a double impact that was not counted on if both developments go in. Ms. Robbins stated she could not speak in regard to the environmental impacts of the traffic. She stated they did take into consideration cumulative impacts in both of the documents. It is a required part of the EIS. They are supposed to include both projects as well as assess any projects that are under

consideration by the Town at the same time and talk about what those potential cumulative impacts are. Both projects were on each other's no build list so the traffic for both projects should have been calculated in the traffic studies. The school children from both projects should have been considered in the school studies. Ms. Schreiber asked if they knew for sure if both actually were. Ms. Robbins stated she cannot speak to the traffic but in the other cases it was. Ms. Schreiber asked when the Town is given the wastewater piping and the pump houses after they are built who pays to maintain them. Engineer Bryant stated that it is paid by the district which is the people that benefit directly from it. It is not a General Fund expense. Ms. Schrieber asked that in consideration of pumping down to the wastewater treatment facility, water would be taken from that project pumped down to somewhere in Town. Engineer Bryant stated no. They had inquired about extra capacity for possibly Four Corners but not coming into town. Mr. Russillo stated the traffic study did take into consideration the cumulative impacts of other developments. They had Summit Woods, Project Red Tail, Blue Hill, Par 4G, and Stormville airport. They received from the town traffic consultant the generation from those other developments, and they were included as part of the study. Subsequent to all the environmental, the State is part of the roundabout program and asked them to go out 10 years beyond the completion of this project and they had to grow the traffic and read you the numbers around the interchange with Taconic, so their report went way beyond what was necessary.

Mr. Robert Talavi submitted a written statement for the record. His concerns were about the preservation of the archaeological studies and findings on the site. Mr. Cannuli stated there were several studies performed during the SEIS portion by Harkin associates. There was a phase 1A, 1B, phase two, phase three, and a data recovery plan. There were areas identified throughout the site that had historic significance. There were archaeological excavations and there were pottery chip flakes and things that dated back 3000 years period all of those were collected and sent to the state historic preservation office. They are now at the New York State museum. They did receive a letter of no further action required or mitigation required.

Mark Alexander stated he lives on Old Route 52. His question was regarding the bridge at the

entrance of this new development. He stated the water raises there. He lives right next to the wetlands and in between the summertime and the winter he can see it go from being neck deep in the wetlands to being completely dry. He has a well and he wishes his could have been tested but he does have a jet pump so it probably could not have been tested. He does truly think with this new development he will be running out of water. He asked what will happen when he does run out of water. There are times when it does flood out Route 52 and he asked what they are going to do before they put that road in at the other entrance. He asked what would happen when the bridge floods out itself. He asked how big of a bridge it was going to be. Chairperson Eickman stated there is a stormwater plan. The water will not be permitted to flood the bridge. The stormwater plan should be sufficient to actually eliminate the problem that he is speaking about. Mr. Cannuli stated there are currently old culverts and farm roads that get clogged up. They have actually had them cleaned out. The new roads will have multiple bridge crossings, habitat crossings underneath to allow those wetlands to remain hydraulically connected. The spans get even bigger, so the water doesn't get restricted. This is part of their DEC crossing requirements. Mr. Alexander stated that coming down Route 52, Old Route 52 was allowed for the trucks to pass through because they could not make the turn onto 216. He asked if that would be restricted now so trucks will not be allowed to go through that way and will have to go to the roundabout. He stated it is a nuisance to him to have the trucks pass his house every day and this would be a way to correct that. Chairperson Eickman stated he believes that would be correct, but they would have to ask the traffic engineer. Engineer Bryant stated that it would be a Town Board action as that is a town road. This board can make that recommendation, but it would be their final decision.

Cathy Prubnell said she lives on Beekman Road, and she asked which way the sewer line was going to go. Mr. Cannuli stated the force main will be going towards Route 376. She asked if they are going to put more than three wells on the property and Mr. Cannuli stated no, the requirement is for the three wells. Ms. Prubnell Asked what the average square foot per house was going to be. Mr. Cannuli stated they would range at approximately 2700 to 2800 square feet. She asked if they had a general idea how much the houses would sell for and Mr. Troy said upwards of \$700,000. She stated it sounds like the homes are going to all have water softeners because of the hard water

and she asked what they would be doing with the salt. Mr. Troy stated that the state has a process that requires them to address all of the components within the drinking water. Ms. Stieber stated that water softeners do use a brine and have a brine discharge. They will not be discharging to septic systems. The Department of Health is in charge of the treatment design and when that design is implemented part of the approval is how to handle any discharge from the water treatment. She stated if treatment becomes necessary there is sometimes a backwash and that would be addressed when necessary. They did test the wells at a slightly higher capacity than just the water demand in the event that some additional water would be required for treatment. They do not know in advance if additional water is required for treatment because you don't know that until the water quality data comes in. They did add on some additional water to the capacity in the event that it was needed. Ms. Prubnell asked how deep the three wells were and how many gallons a minute they were pumping. Ms. Stieber stated the wells are between 400 and 500 feet deep and when they tested them the yields were 223 gallons a minute, 127 gallons a minute, and 238 gallons a minute.

Engineer Bryant asked if irrigation was going to be prohibited in this development and Mr. Cannuli said yes. Engineer Bryant stated that was one of the bigger issues at Four Corners. It was grossly underestimated how much water people would use and that was part of the problem there.

Georgeann Small stated she lives off of Collarbark Road. She asked where the last house in the development is in proximity to the existing homes property and if it affects anyone on Collarbark Road. She asked if this was the development that wanted to put the sanitation building on the top of Collarbark Road. Engineer Bryant stated there is no longer a sewer plant proposed. It is being pumped off site to the hamlet plant. He does not know if there is a visual view shed from Collarbark or not. There is no interconnection or emergency access connecting the two. Ms. Small stated she does know there is a right of way and she is concerned they will be using that if they need another access road. Engineer Bryant stated that it is not currently proposed. Her opinion is that there is no benefit to this whole development for the people of the Town of East Fishkill. There are residents that grew up here that would love to reside in this area, but they will not be able to afford those homes. Some people will say it's a benefit because it brings business to the community, but she

feels that people who work down South are going to stop down south in Westchester or Putnam County to get home and not detour into town to buy local. Nobody wants to go into Hopewell on a weekend and try to battle the traffic then either. Hopewell is a disaster. She can't get out onto Route 52 because there is so much traffic as it is. She cannot imagine how bad it will be when they add 100 plus houses. Most houses today have three cars so now there are 300 plus more cars on Route 52, which cannot handle the traffic they have now. The Highway Department is going to have to maintain these additional roads, and she does not think they can handle what they have now. Her road has never even been paved for 37 years. When she moved here there were a lot of different species, and she was reading the Army Corps report that listed approximately 8 endangered species on that list for this property. If they do the landfilling of the wetlands where are those animals going to go. Building these new developments are crushing out the endangered species. She stated the bat population has decreased which is causing an increase in the mosquitoes in the town. She does not see the benefit of any of this. She asked if they had green space provided for and if they are donating it to the Town of East Fishkill. Mr. Cannuli stated that they are only developing approximately 70 and 275 acres will be permanently preserved in conservation easements held by the North American Land Trust. They are large land stewards in the area who manage properties like this. Project requires 3 bridge crossings and one culvert crossing. The project will disturb less than one acre. As part of that application they're required to restore over an acre of wetlands. He showed her approximately where her property would be located as it is not on the map presented for the hearing. Ms. Small stated they have a problem with low water pressure as well. She is wondering if any of this will impede their water.

Corina Ricard-Farzan Asked what kind of landscaping is planned and are they making sure that the plants being put in are native and that no invasive species are included. Mr. Cannuli stated there is a landscape plan with street trees. There is a wetland mitigation plan which are all native species. They are recreating some wetlands for mitigation. The street trees would be native species. The website shows an actual landscape plan. Ms. Ricard-Farzan asked about the strain on resources like the fire department, the school, and the library and if there is any kind of plan to make sure that those resources are expanded to meet the additional needs. Commissioner Jodlowski stated

there is no plan to expand as the fire district is 100% volunteer. They can only expand as fast as people come to them. Mr. Palin stated there are 6 stations in the town, not just one. The one in the Stormville hamlet is just a few minutes away from this subdivision. Their concern is with having enough water to fight fires. Ms. Bombardieri stated they are required to supply fire flow. Mr. Palin asked if they knew what volume for fire flow they were providing because 220 gallons a minute will not work. Mr. Cannuli stated that it is just the wells. They are designing a water storage system that will provide the pressure to provide fire flow. Commissioner Jodlowski asked about the volume of the storage. Mr. Cannuli said they have not determined that yet. Commissioner Jodlowski asked if there were hydrants throughout and Mr. Cannuli said yes. Ms. Ricard-Farzan asked if the fact that the well tests were done in May and now they are seeing more drought seasons has been taken into account. Ms. Stieber stated the change of seasons are taken into account when they do the well testing. They have to meet the maximum anticipated demand which typically occurs once a year. They pumped the wells continuously for three days at that volume to see what kind of impact it will have on the aquifer. They take that data and assess it against potential long-term pumping. They do projections called 180-day projections where they project out pumping water levels for six months of continuous withdrawal to assess whether the volume of water is there and whether the available drawdown is there to determine expected long-term impacts from this pumping.

Chairperson Eickman stated he did receive an email which was read and kept for the record. It is from Hugh O'Neill a longtime resident from Stormville. He stated he is not opposed to the Montage development. His concerns include environmental air and water impacts from the ongoing material operations on adjacent parcels. Mr. Cannuli stated he believes that is referring to the parcel to the north which is an aggregate use off of Route 52 and also Dolomite. Those have to do with this project. The e-mail asked if there was a recreational area that this project was providing and Mr. Cannuli stated that there is passive open space. There are connections through the sidewalk system to the rail trail. There was also a requirement for a recreation fee to be paid. The e-mail mentioned the impact on the school district. Chairperson Eickman asked if there had been any update anticipated to the study they have done years ago for the schools. Mr. Cannuli stated the last time

they looked at that was before the finding statement concluded. They had additional data in the FEIS and that was the last time they were asked for updates. The e-mail also asked about the impact of traffic on Route 52 which they have discussed at length. It also asked about the impact on the Volunteer Fire Department and ambulance. Commissioner Jodlowski stated there is a concern in regard to the ambulance service. In 2025 the district responded to 3338 calls, which is approximately 1 call every 2 1/2 hours every 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. 80% of those calls are ambulance calls. Every time you add a single house you add to the possibility that one of those people is going to be calling for an ambulance for one reason or another period adding 300 houses obviously has an impact on the Rescue Squad. Right now, the fire district spends approximately \$800,000 a year to have a paid ambulance service within the district as well. The county also has two ambulances that float around the county and there are times when we have to call those ambulances down because both of our ambulances are out of service on calls. An average call lasts about 90 minutes to 2 hours for an ambulance round trip. If both ambulances are out now you're waiting on an ambulance to come from Route 9 at old Hopewell Rd. Beyond that we are looking to other towns, usually Beekman, for assistance and there are times when we have had four to six simultaneous calls going on at one time. There will be a breaking point at some point. EMS is a nationwide problem right now. It is not a problem that is particular to our Town or State. Until something major is done to mitigate this problem it's going to continue to be an issue and given the rising population and density, the traffic, the car accidents, and everything that comes along with that as well as an aging population it becomes a problem that is outrunning any solution at this point. It is something that weighs heavily on the fire district. Chairperson Eickman stated he does understand this is the subject of many conversations at county level with all of the towns and cities. Supervisor D'Alessandro is making comments at every town board meeting and is determined to make sure that he helps solve or at least mitigate that problem for East Fishkill.

Ms. Malaverda asked if there was a timeline for how this was going to progress. Mr. Troy stated that everything is driven on demand. It is tied to mortgage rates, economic general climate, pandemics, moratoriums, and any number of things. They have been here for 20 years. In his opinion this project is very viable, and he believes they have done an excellent job of mitigating

every concern that they have been asked to address environmentally, infrastructure, density, traffic, and all of it. He believes this will be a successful plan. The sequence will be the first thing that happens with this project once they receive all of their permits and finalize all of their development agreements will be starting the construction on the infrastructure. First there will be wetland protection, environmentally sensitive area protection and then they will start the storm drainage and earthwork. That way any impacts that are generated on site will be mitigated on site. While that is happening, the assumption is that the off-track sanitary sewer system will be under construction. It is being designed as a two-leg project. One piece is from their entrance onto 52 out to the intersection of Route 376 which is being built by them and Summit Woods jointly. Then they will tie into the piece that the town is constructing in the area near the fire department or highway department up into the treatment plant. Those two legs will most likely be done at the same time. They cannot put the first family into those homes until this infrastructure is completed. Within that first phase will be the traffic circle infrastructure. As the demand for the project increases they will then bring in the second and third phase of the project. That is tied to supply and demand. This project could take three years, or it could take five years. He cannot speak to Summit Woods, but he does know they are doing a somewhat similar product to this. He does think they are relatively close in terms of the process.

Mr. Milanesi asked if there was any proposed affordable housing within this development. Mr. Troy stated his company has built integrated projects that include low- and moderate-income housing. Some municipalities call it income restricted or workforce housing. It responds to a very real issue. He stated he cannot build this project if he cannot sell these houses for more than \$700,000. He asked if there were any builders who knew how much it would cost per square foot to build a 2400 square foot house with four bedrooms and a two-car garage not including the Land, sewer, water, or approvals. Mr. Luis Sosh stated in this area just the building costs alone are around \$500,000. Mr. Troy stated if he sells it for less than \$700,000 per home he loses money. He stated they have been working in Princeton NJ and New Jersey has a very rigid series of law call the Mount Laurel Doctrine. It has very strict requirements that have been fought in all the courts. His first proposal for this project was to do age restricted with some smaller units and the

administration at that time did not want to have anything to do with it. They came back under the town's prevailing guidelines and did exactly what the Town's zoning ordinance allows them to do. This project as currently conceived does not have any affordable housing. He stated an affordable housing project does not belong on this type of property. It needs to be closer to town and built-in townhouse type settings where the units are more affordable. It should be within walkable distance to services. Chairperson Eickman stated the Town just completed its Master Plan and part of that was to look at what type of housing needs there are for people who live here and work here. It will all be looked at but it will not be happening in 2026. They need to be reviewed for what type of houses are affordable and what type of houses they would be and where they would fit with the character of the community.

Mr. Sosh stated he is a 20-year resident of Stormville. He is also a contractor in the area. He stated there have been a lot of valid concerns raised. He does understand that you can be in one location and have great water and next door the well could be terrible. Location is very important. He stated it is usually an individual problem. He does understand the cost of materials, land, regulations and labor costs make it very prohibitive to do building on a small scale. These homes will all be paying property taxes so there will provide more resources for the fire department, library, and the roads. He believes it will increase the value of all of the surrounding homes as well.

Ms. Mills stated if you look online under the county website there are several projects in Stormville listed as in the works. She asked if the town has any studies that have been made taking into consideration all of those projects. Ms. Robbins stated both of these projects came in around the same time, so they had to assess each other because they were on the no build list for each other. The school districts were taking into account both projects as were the traffic studies. As far as the impacts to the wetlands both are under review by the New York State DEC, both of those projects had their impacts evaluated in the same time frame. There are a lot of other projects that may have come in before or after and some that may or may not ever be built. Depending on when they come in and what they were required to include in their studies they may or may not have been within these projects no build. As far as these projects are concerned there are two websites you can go

to view all of the reports. One is www.Montageateastfishkill.com and the one for Summitt Woods. She does believe that the traffic study did include additional projects such as the airport. There is currently not anything proposed at the airport. Ms. Mills asked if another project comes in after these two are done do they have to consider their impact in addition to these two projects and Engineer Bryant said yes. Ms. Robbins stated there was also a background growth that has to be included in a traffic study as well which is just a standard percentage. Theoretically the different agencies are keeping all of these projects, and they are considering all of the impacts from all of these projects which is ultimately included in their permitting process. Ms. Mills asked what the best way for residents is to keep up on these projects and Engineer Bryant stated that the Planning Board agenda has the current projects plus the projects that are somehow in process. Ms. Robbins stated the Dutchess County website gets updated annually as well. You can also contact her directly or contact the Planning Office.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there were any final questions or comments from the town professionals. Mr. Rennia stated they are looking at the flooding issues. They have just recently got a copy of the updated flood map so they will ensure that that is looked at with the full utility design with the bridges and the water and sewer crossings. Engineer Bryant stated they want to see the MOU close to finalized before they close the Public Hearing. Chairperson Eickman stated they may have additional questions or comments from the Town traffic engineer who is unfortunately not present at this meeting.

Chairperson Eickman congratulated the applicant on making extraordinary progress and having acquired the property. It seems like they have a solid sewer and water plan. He does believe they want to adjourn the Public Hearing and continue it at the next meeting. Mr. Cannuli stated he believed they had an understanding that they are further along with the MOU. He did thank the board, staff, and the public for their comments. He thanked their consultants as well as this takes a lot of tenacity and patience to work on a project like this. 20 years has been a long time, and a lot has happened during that time. They do believe this is a very viable plan and they believe the design and layout respects much of the concerns for the environment. There is no flood insurance

necessary on any of the locations where houses are proposed. It will provide those details to Mr. Rennia. He does believe they have addressed public comments each and every time they have been here. The MOU is when they work with the Town Board that pulls together all of the details of how they build the system and when they build the system and the phasing, financing, and design. It is not directly related to the subdivision application that the Planning Board is voting on. Engineer Bryant stated it is because without sewer they do not have a project. He stated they do have a concept and a verbal understanding, but it needs to be memorialized. Mr. Cannuli stated that will be voted on and approved by the Town Board. Engineer Bryant stated they do not even have an agreed to draft in place yet.

Judson Siebert stated with regard to the MOU, there is a draft that has been back and forth. His position is that what is being negotiated right now does not address the physical or environmental impacts of what is going to be built. They know that they need to lay sewer infrastructure from the Montage site. They know they need to build a pumping station at the Montage site that will be shared with Summit to accommodate those flows. The plan will be to move sewage from those sites to the property at the East Fishkill Fire District property and then up to the hamlet on Route 376. He does not believe there are core planning issues with that as they are more financial. In regard to the sewer connection it will not only accommodate some and Montage but part of it will also provide access for underutilized or underserved commercial properties at the Route 376 and 52 intersection so there is a benefit to this. His view is to keep the Public Hearing open while they negotiate the MOU is just going to extend the Public Hearing process when there is really not much more to say about that with regard to what the Planning Board is going to do. He asks that they would close the Public Hearing and if there is any concern in regard to closing the Public Hearing and starting the time clock because they do recognize that is something under town law that puts a timeline for decision, the applicant is not going to press that. To come back next month or the month after that is costly with all of the professionals involved. At some point this process can wrap up with comfort that they will not be under time pressure, and the MOU will be played out with the Town Board. The engineering will have those specifics worked out internally but not done in public month after month. His request is to close the Public Hearing with an understanding

they are not going to press the Planning Board for a determination. If they want to keep it open for written comments for 10 to 30 days, they are amenable to that.

Engineer Bryant stated he just became aware that of the 37 people that were attempted to be contacted only 7 actually responded to the monitoring. They know they have at least one person whose well was not able to be tested. He believes they need to spend a little time understanding that for these people. He does appreciate the people that came tonight, and he does understand it is costly. What was represented to him was that this discussion would be on water only. He does not feel they should be obligated to close the Public Hearing because of the people that were brought here tonight. Attorney Cunningham stated it might be helpful to the public if the Town's own traffic engineer was at the next Public Hearing, so you hear from a neutral third party and what the Town's position on the traffic is. They did have an internal discussion today and they do think it is important to have the MOU in place before closing the Public Hearing. Chairperson Eickman stated the intent is not to drag this out month after month. He believes the intent is to wrap up the MOU as quickly and expeditiously as possible. He does appreciate all of the professionals that were brought and does understand the expense associated with that. The last thing they want to do is exacerbate that situation. He does believe a lot of the technical questions have been answered tonight and they can refer people to the minutes of the meeting should the same questions come up again. Given the circumstances it does leave them with the need to extend this at least another month.

Mr. Cannuli stated they are agreeable to that, but he does not know who represented to Engineer Bryant that they would be here just for water discussion. Engineer Bryant stated it was Mr. Cannuli who said that during a Zoom call. Mr. Cannuli stated he does not recall ever saying that and he would not have brought everyone here if that was the case. He stated they would like to focus on addressing Mr. Renna's comments about the conventional layout which he believes will be wrapped up before they come back. He does also believe that they will have a final formal MOU before they come back as well. Engineer Bryant stated they need to have a discussion on the water sampling. Mr. Cannuli stated hopefully if they come in providing those three things then they

would be able to close the Public Hearing. Obviously, any decisions will be contingent upon outside agency approvals and all of the details being met in the resolution compliance.

MOTION made by Ed Miyoshi, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to adjourn this Public Hearing to the February 17, 2026, meeting. Voted and carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING:

2025-110 – Townsend Estates, 5 Townsend Road (6556-00-105125)

Applicant is applying for a 4-lot subdivision on an existing 24.87-acre lot.

MOTION made by Sarah Bledsoe, seconded by Ed Miyoshi, to open this Public Hearing. Voted and carried unanimously.

Amy Bombardieri was present.

Ms. Bombardieri stated this is a four-lot subdivision off of Townsend Rd. Two of the lots will be accessed off of Somerset Rd. They will have access off of the cul-de-sac. The other two lots will have a shared apron and shared driveway access on to Townsend Rd. One of the lots accessing onto Somerset does have frontage on Townsend and they could get a driveway through but that would require wetland permitting and it would be a long and winding driveway. All four lots can get access off the roads that they have frontage on. That justifies the shared driveway. They have wetland that has been signed off of by DEC for the wetland flagging. The density calculation provides for 5.9 lots, but they are proposing four. They will have individual wells and septic. There was a comment about the shared driveway on the South end and having it relocated to a different location to separate it. Engineer Bryant stated it was to relocate it to the existing driveway, and he did agree with that. Ms. Bombardieri stated the only reason she can think that they would not want to relocate it was due to sight distance, but she is unsure if that is an issue there. Engineer

Bryant stated the two driveways on to Somerset should have a shared apron. He stated they may have to expand the easement to make that happen and Ms. Bombardieri stated that should not be a problem.

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

Chairperson Eickman asked if there were questions or comments from the professionals. Ms. Robbins stated at the last meeting they had only shown the front wetlands as flagged. Mr. Stokosa stated DEC was coming out but they only looked at the front wetland and not the back portion. That does matter for lot count formula. She will be asking that the entire site is included in the lot count formula. She is unsure what the line they are showing right now is based on. She is guessing it could be an aerial view. No one has confirmed it. She stated they will need to review the area that is closer to Townsend. Engineer Bryant stated they basically estimated it instead of flagging it and having it verified. Mr. Renna suggested having Mr. Stokosa call the office to clarify exactly what area needs to be flagged. It may have already been done but they are unsure.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there was anyone from the public to speak for or against this application.

Dave Bolk lives on Somerset Rd. He stated the letter they received did not show where the construction was going to be. The signage was only on Townsend Rd. with nothing on Somerset Rd. There are a lot of young children on the street and no fire hydrants on the street. They all bought the property knowing that there were wetlands behind them, and they were told that it was protected area. They enjoy the wildlife they see in their backyards and are not happy about development going in there. All of the neighbors on Somerset are firmly against this. They still don't understand the impact of the view from their houses, the impact on the little dead end, and are there going to be connections to Townsend. Ms. Bombardieri stated there will be no connection between Somerset and Townsend. That is protected wetland back there so it cannot be disturbed.

The parcels drop down 10 to 15 feet so these houses will be much lower than the cul-de-sac elevation. Mr. Bolk stated they can see I84 in the winter. Engineer Bryant stated it will have no impact on the I84 area as there is a 100-foot setback required for that. They will not be disturbed and cannot be built on. He stated the original filed map for Somerset left a 50-foot swath at that location for the road to be extended. 2 houses going in is much better than a full road. Mr. Bolk ask who was building it and how big the houses would be and Ms. Bombardieri said Mid-Hudson Development Corp. They will probably be in the 3000 square foot range. Mr. Bolk stated when his house was built a lot of construction material was buried on site and he just had to spend \$10,000 to repair his driveway from sinkholes. They value the peace and quiet and feel the construction will lose that. He does not feel that they need more houses. He purposely bought on a dead-end street for quiet..

Vivian Morales stated she moved to Dutchess County 24 years ago from Westchester. She stated her son almost got killed in her driveway in Westchester. She lives in the cul-de-sac. Her bathroom window faces those woods, so she is very upset about losing her view and her privacy. She contributes to the community and shops locally. She has a legally blind mother who lives with her six months out of the year so having two driveways next to her house is very impactful. Her grandson plays in the cul-de-sac.

Seema Bhatt stated she also lives on Somerset Road. It is 23 homes with a cul-de-sac. There are no sidewalks. It is a turnover community now as new families with young children are moving in. Having construction on the street would be a lot. She wants to know why all 23 homes were not notified. Ms. Bombardieri stated there is a 500-foot distance from the parcel requirement for the mailings, and they get the list off of parcel access. The public notice was in the newspaper and the signs were up. Mr. Bolk stated there was a sign up at the dead end and then it was taken down. They are now only on Townsend Rd. Ms. Bombardieri stated the developer did not remove the signs. It might have been a neighbor or somebody who didn't want the development to happen. They did not take them down. Ms. Morales stated everybody at the top of the street does not go into the dead-end part, so they never saw the signs when they were there.

Engineer Bryant asked if any of them were original owners and Ms. Morales said she was. Engineer Bryant asked who told them nothing could be built there and she stated Toll Brothers had told them that when they purchased. Engineer Bryant stated when they filed the map they brought the cul-de-sac right to the property line and left 50 feet touching the property line. If they really wanted to make it so it couldn't be further developed they should have left a spite strip that property owners would own so that there would be no access, but they didn't do that. That would allow it to be extended sometime in the future, so they misrepresented that to the homeowners, in his opinion.

Ms. Morales asked what the next steps would be. Ms. Bombardieri stated the parcels are currently under review at the Department of Health. They would need the planning board approval and health department approval for the water and septic. That could happen in a matter of two months optimistically. They could be building this year.

Engineer Bryant suggested staking out where the driveway is going to be. The Board can entertain requests for screening, landscaping, and trees of that nature so the homeowners can have their view lessened. Mr. Bolk stated they never saw the breakout of the properties before.

Ms. Bombardieri stated that these houses will be in much lower elevation than the existing houses. Ms. Morales stated her house sits up high. Ms. Bombardieri stated they should not be able to see into the existing homes. Ms. Morales stated that when people walk behind her home they can see in and she can see them, so this is going to be an invasion of her privacy. Ms. Bombardieri stated the proposed home will be parallel with the asphalt for the cul-de-sac and will be at least 10 feet lower than her home. Engineer Bryant stated they could request some Evergreen or Norwegian spruce, which grows quickly, to be put in between the homes.

Attorney Cunningham stated that he understands one of the concerns is that not enough members of the community knew about this. He is going to suggest that the Public Hearing be kept open

because they do want to know more about the wetlands and the lot count formula so that gives them time to notify the neighborhood.

Mr. Bolk stated Somerset has no fire hydrants so he asked how the fire department will deal with that. Mr. Palin stated that the fire department has tanker trucks that bring water and there is a draft on Townsend Road they can access. There might be one on Brookside, but he is not sure it is a viable stream to draft from as well.

Chairperson Eickman stated that there are some wetland comments that need to be addressed, There are some driveway placements that need to be looked at and possibly add some of Engineer Bryant's suggestions to mitigate some of the issues with the cul-de-sac.

MOTION made by Ed Miyoshi, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to adjourn this Public Hearing to the February 17, 2026, meeting. Voted and carried unanimously.

Chairperson Eickman stated that this will give the residents another time to speak, or they can submit written comments or emails to the Planning Office, and they can be read into the meeting minutes.

A resident asked how much the houses would go for and how big they would be and Ms. Bombardieri stated they probably start at around \$500,000 and go upwards of \$750,000. They can build any home the way the customer wants it to be built, so she is unsure of what size they would be. The resident asked how far back into the property the homes would be built and Ms. Bombardieri stated they can't go that deeply in because there are wetlands behind So they will probably be between 100 and 200 feet into the parcels. They also don't want to go too far in for other reasons such as driveway costs.

Chairperson Eickman stated the next meeting is scheduled for February 17th. There are three other Public Hearings on that night so he is not sure how long it will take to get to this application. Clerk Keenan said people could come into her office to review the plans as well and Engineer Bryant

stated they could be emailed out also.

DISCUSSION:

2026-111 – Jan-Care, 1061 Route 82 (6458-04-642062)

Applicant is applying for an amended site plan.

No one was present.

Ms. Robbins stated this was a former chiropractic office that did some interior and exterior improvements to the site. There was no existing site plan on record. The applicant was asked to prepare an as-built survey to function as a site plan ultimately. They did that and they have created a survey with all of the new captured improvements on the survey. Now they have what's basically functioning as a site plan. They had just wanted review and approval from the Planning Board. She stated it is up to the Board as to whether or not they agree to waive the Public Hearing because the building hasn't changed as far as the footprint. It has just changed its facade. It could be approved tonight if they don't require the Public Hearing.

Engineer Bryant asked about the screening in the front and Ms. Robbins stated there is a fence that runs along the front of the property and they have put turf on it. There is a condition that she included in the resolution, if they choose to adopt it tonight, that talks to the maintenance of that. She was trying to capture that the town would need to enforce the maintenance of it.

Chairperson Eickman stated he drives past this property two times a day. They have done a beautiful job with the building exterior, and you can see through some of the windows and the interior looks wonderful as well. They have been before the board one other time when they had done some things they needed to get approved after the fact. There was something about a stairway and a pergola and maybe some other improvements. At that point they must have forgotten they were going to do the hedge. Engineer Bryant stated this is a repeat of the prior issues. Chairperson Eickman stated the hedge does look like a nice improvement.

MOTION made by Donald Papae, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to waive the Public Hearing for this application. Voted and carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION OF AMENDED SITE PLAN APPROVAL

NAME OF SITE PLAN: Jancare Sitework
NAME OF APPLICANT: Dg & Jag Realty Group (Janice Green)
LOCATION: 1061 Route 82
GRID NO: 132800-6458-04-642062

Resolution Offered by Planning Board Member: John Eickman

WHEREAS, the applicant is applying for amended site plan approval for the conversion of a chiropractor’s office to home health care offices on Route 82; and

WHEREAS, the parcel is zoned B-1; and

WHEREAS, the applicant completed a renovation of the interior and exterior of the building as well as façade and site improvements including fencing; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board determined that the proposed change of use and building and site improvements are minor in nature and waived the requirement for a public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the proposed action is a Type II action under SEQR and no further SEQR review was undertaken; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby approves the as-built site plan as represented on a plan set entitled "Site Plan As-Built Site Plan for Jancare Sitework" prepared by Liscum McCormack Van Vorhiis, LLP 12/23/25; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that within five (5) business days of the adoption of this resolution, the Chair or other duly authorized member of the Planning Board shall cause a copy of this resolution to be filed with the Town Clerk and a copy sent to the Applicant/Owner subject to the following conditions:

1. The site fencing must be maintained to the satisfaction of the Town and the decorative turf placed over the fencing must be properly affixed at all times and maintained.

Resolution Seconded by Planning Board Member: Ed Miyoshi

The votes were as follows:

Board Member Ed Miyoshi	Aye
Board Member Sarah Bledsoe	Aye
Board Member Richard Campbell	Absent
Board Member Donald Papae	Aye
Board Member John Giovagnoli	Aye
Chairperson John Eickman	Aye

EXTENSION

2020-035 – Stone Ridge Commons, Route 52, and Palen Road (6356-04-731304/776321)

Stone Ridge Commons received conditional final approval to construct two 3-story multi-family apartment buildings with 51 units and associated parking in a B1-A zone at the May 2021 Planning Board meeting. Applicant is requesting an extension from the last expiration date of November 18, 2025, through May 18, 2026.

No one was present.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there were any questions or comments from the board. There were none.

RESOLUTION EXTENDING FINAL SITE PLAN AND SPECIAL PERMIT APPROVAL

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

Resolution Offered by Planning Board Member: John Eickman

WHEREAS, Stone Ridge Commons Apartments was granted final approval on May 18, 2021 to allow the development of 51 apartments in two 3-story multi-family apartment buildings,

105 parking spaces, stormwater management practices, and associated site amenities on two parcels totaling 6.65 acres (Lot 22 is 3.24 acres and Lot 23 is 3.43 acres) located at Route 52 and Palen Road; and

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

WHEREAS, the applicant continues to work to complete the required Town sewer and water improvements; and

WHEREAS, the applicant is requesting additional extensions through May 18, 2026 to complete these improvements; and

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

1. Payment of a fee not to exceed \$100,000.00 towards the traffic improvements to be made prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy.
2. Payment of \$100,000.00 fee for the new sidewalks broken down in four equal Payments with due dates of February 1, 2026, April 1, 2026, June 1, 2026, August 1, 2026.

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

Resolution Seconded by Planning Board Member: Sarah Bledsoe

The votes were as follows:

Board Member Ed Miyoshi	Aye
Board Member Sarah Bledsoe	Aye
Board Member Richard Campbell	Absent
Board Member Donald Papae	Aye
Board Member John Giovagnoli	Aye

Chairperson John Eickman

Aye

DISCUSSION:

2023-051 – Rising Sky Housing, Donovan Drive (6455-00-288434)

Applicant is requesting an additional 2 six-month extension from the last expiration date February 28, 2026, of the site plan approval.

No one was present.

No one was present.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there were any questions or comments from the board. There were none.

**RESOLUTION
EXTENSION OF SITE PLAN APPROVAL AND SPECIAL PERMIT**

NAME OF SITE PLAN: Rising Sky Housing LLC Contractor Building
NAME OF APPLICANT: Rising Sky Housing, LLC
LOCATION: Donovan Drive
GRID NO: 6455-00-288434

Resolution Offered by Planning Board Member: John Eickman

WHEREAS, the applicant received site plan approval and an excavation/fill special permit per §194-75 of the East Fishkill Zoning Code for a contractor’s yard located in an I-1 zone on August 15, 2023; and

WHEREAS, the applicant received an extension of site plan approval through 2/28/26; and

WHEREAS, the applicant is seeking an additional one (1) year extension of the site plan approval and excavation fill special permit through 2/28/27; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby approves a one (1) year extension of the Site Plan approval and Excavation & Fill Special Permit for Rising

Sky Housing LLC through 2/28/27 as represented on a map entitled "Rising Sky Housing LLC Contractor Building," prepared by Berger Engineering and Surveying, LLC dated 1/27/23 and last revised 7/31/23.

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

Resolution Seconded by Planning Board Member: Donald Papae
The votes were as follows:

Board Member Ed Miyoshi	Aye
Board Member Sarah Bledsoe	Aye
Board Member Richard Campbell	Absent
Board Member Donald Papae	Aye
Board Member John Giovagnoli	Aye
Chairperson John Eickman	Aye

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

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION made by Ed Miyoshi, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to adjourn the Planning Board meeting. Voted and carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted:

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