

**TOWN OF EAST FISHKILL  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 17, 2026**

Planning Board Chairperson John Eickman called the meeting to order.

**CHAIRPERSON COMMENTS:**

Members present were John Giovagnoli, Donald Papae, 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 Date: March 17, 2026**

c. **Approval of Minutes of Meeting Held: January 20, 2026.**

**Mr. Eickman announced that the Approval would be at the next meeting to give the Planning Board Members sufficient chance to review the January 20<sup>th</sup> Minutes.**

Town Professionals and Consultants present were: Michael Cunningham, Esq., Town Attorney; Michelle Robbins, AICP-Town Planner. Scott Bryant, Town Engineer, Rich Rennia, Engineer and Brendan Fitzgerald, P.E., Traffic Consultant.

Staff present were: Jackie Keenan, Planning Board Clerk, Chris Jodlowsky, Fire Commissioner, Dave Palin, Fire Advisory Board and Danielle Angyal JR., Town Planner

**SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT:**

Mr. Eickman turned the meeting over to Attorney Michael Cunningham, who stated that, as everyone knows, he had been working with Tom Wood, the Town's attorney, for many years. He then announced and introduced Sinead McLoughlin-Parisi as the newest member of the attorney team. He said this was Ms. McLoughlin's first meeting and that she will be sitting with both the Planning Board and Zoning Board. Going forward, he will still be at meetings for a few months.

1 The Members offered a Welcome to Ms. McLoughlin.

2  
3

4 ***ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING:***

5

6 1. #2025 – 110 – **Townsend Estates**, 95 Townsend Road, (6556-00-105125)

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

8 Amy Bombardieri, Civil Engineer, Day/Stokosa Engineering, was present.

9

10 Ms. Bombardieri began at the podium, stating that this 4-lot subdivision was before the Board  
11 last month. She said the only thing outstanding was the lot calculation for the density. It has  
12 been reworked and she believes everyone is on the same page that there is enough for 4 lots,  
13 and 4 lots are proposed.

14 Mr. Eickman announced the Public Hearing for this project had been Adjourned at the last  
15 meeting and that he would accept a motion to reopen.

16

17 **MOTION made by Sarah Bledsoe, seconded by Richard Campbell, to open the**  
18 **Adjourned Public Hearing for Townsend Estates.**  
19 **Voted and carried unanimously.**

20

21 Mr. Eickman asked if the Board Members had any questions or comments. There were none, so  
22 he opened up the public hearing to those present to speak for or against the project. He directed  
23 that people wishing to speak in the public hearing to come to the podium, always stand at the  
24 podium to speak into the microphone, and, while there, to sign in. He told Ms. Bombardieri if there  
25 were any responses that she would like to make they could be done at the microphone in front of  
26 the Fire Commissioner.

27

28 Dave Bulk, 86 Sunset Road, spoke that last time the concern about the notifications was discussed;  
29 only a few people on the street had received them. He said it is a Cul-de-sac and not everyone had  
30 heard of this. He stated his main concerns are the construction vehicles, traffic, and children on

1 the street, because of it being a Cul-de-sac. Last month he spoke questioning the type of housing,  
2 he was told it was imagined to be around a \$500,000 house. He said the street is lined with million-  
3 dollar houses. He referred to the barrier for (Route) 84 and asked that there be some type of sound  
4 barrier built there, whether trees or something aesthetically pleasing, fencing that could block the  
5 sound from (Route) 84, where there are trees being taken down. In addition, he said, they would  
6 like to make sure the homes being built are fit with the neighborhood and that it is aesthetically  
7 pleasing to have houses of similar build so it doesn't look out of place. He added that it sounded  
8 like they would not be able to stop this; these are his main concerns.

9

10 Mr. Eickman questioned Ms. Bombardieri about the few changes that had been made to the site  
11 plan since the last meeting. He asked if she could share these, in response to some of the comments  
12 heard. Ms. Bombardieri returned to the podium, stating that the driveway was realigned coming  
13 off the Cul-de-sac. There are only 2 lots that are accessed off the Cul-de-sac; the rest are accessed  
14 off of Townsend. She believes there was extra vegetation put in along the property line, adjacent  
15 to the Cul-de-sac. There is over a 100-ft setback to (Route) 84 and that cannot be touched; it is off  
16 the property. She stated any clearing happening would be minimal and there would be extra  
17 plantings along the property line.

18

19 Mr. Bryant asked if there was a plan that showed the plantings. He said a house had been shifted  
20 back further from the Cul-de-sac.; that had been a comment at the last meeting. Ms. Bombardieri  
21 replied, pointing out the houses on the displayed plan where the houses are set fairly far back. She  
22 showed Mr. Bulk where she said a house is 100 ft from the Cul-de-sac and 200 ft from the Cul-  
23 de-sac.

24

25 While both were still at the podium, Mr. Bulk asked how long the planned construction was. Ms.  
26 Bombardieri replied that, once a site breaks ground, she would say an individual house would be  
27 8 months from ground-breaking to people living there. She said she misspoke at the last meeting

1 and these houses will probably start at around \$750,000. Mr. Bulk asked if they would fit with the  
2 neighborhood and Ms. Bombardieri replied Yes. Mr. Bulk questioned whether there would be  
3 concerns about flooding since they are so far down, and Ms. Bombardieri replied that they look  
4 like they are a little over 10 ft from the edge of the wetland, elevation wise and she does not think  
5 flooding is a concern. Mr. Bulk said he was just thinking about this since rain goes down the hill;  
6 his house is on top of the hill and he has no worries. Ms. Bombardieri responded Yes, it is fairly  
7 steep there and the houses will be a lot lower than his. He asked if there was any chance of getting  
8 vegetation on the back of the property as well, behind the houses, and Ms. Bombardieri replied  
9 that they only clear as far as they have to. She showed on the plan where the well is about 100 ft  
10 from the one house and said the clearing is usually kept contained. She reiterated they do not want  
11 to clear more than they have to, it is also related to cost. Mr. Bulk commented that, if he owned  
12 the house, he would probably want some yard. Ms. Bombardieri pointed out the limit of clearing  
13 right now, the locations of the well and septic, which would be a lawn area.

14  
15 Mr. Bulk said at the last meeting he had noted that, when Somerset went in, there were issues of  
16 dumping material, burying of stumps. Looking to the Board Members, he asked if it was their  
17 responsibility that this does not happen, or who is monitoring. Mr. Eickman replied it is not their  
18 responsibility. Mr. Bryant advised that they are not out there every day when houses are being  
19 built and that this was up to the owner, the owner’s representative, the contractor who was engaged.  
20 He said the Town is not out there policing every day and there for only certain, specific inspections.  
21 Mr. Bulk asked if they could bury stuff on the property. Mr. Bryant replied he did not know if  
22 there are any prohibitions about burying stumps. Ms. Bombardieri said if there is, it is natural  
23 material. Mr. Bryant added Yes, but that they have to be mindful of where it is put. Mr. Bulk said  
24 he had an issue with stumps buried under his driveway and the holes caused him to have to put in  
25 a new driveway and said he was just looking out for the new owners.

26  
27 Mr. Eickman called on the Professionals to see if they had any comments or questions.

1  
2 Ms. Robbins wanted to note, as part of the mitigation for potential threatened and endangered  
3 species on the site, that there is going to be an Environmental Monitor. She said there are supposed  
4 to be daily inspections of the silt fencing, to make sure there are no holes of restricted barriers for  
5 the turtles. She stated that there would have to be some sort of monitoring. Rich Renna added that  
6 if it is in season, that is the monitor, the expert. Ms. Robbins said the notes are on the plan. Ms.  
7 Bombardieri said she believes the builder would pay for the consultant that is DEC approved for  
8 that. Mr. Renna added that the owner will set up an escrow with the Town and the Town will  
9 retain the consultant to go out and inspect and do any monitoring.

10  
11 There were no further comments from the Public, Board Members or Town Professionals.

12  
13 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to close the**  
14 **Public Hearing for Townsend Estates. Voted and carried unanimously.**  
15

16 Mr. Eickman proceeded to summarize and read the Negative Declaration:

17 Name of Action: **Townsend Estates Subdivision**

18  
19 He stated that this is an unlisted action.

20  
21 The Environmental issues identified as relevant are:

- 22  
23 **1. Land Use and Zoning**  
24 **2. Visual Character**  
25 **3. Wetlands, Plants and animals (which includes the Indiana Bat and Bog Turtles**  
26 **referenced this evening.)**  
27 **4. Transportation**  
28 **5. Other**  
29

30 He stated that in all cases there is no significant issue, with the exception of Wetlands, Plants and  
31 Animals, and mitigation requirements that will be on the plans and will survive any owner,

32



1           **WHEREAS**, mitigation measures to avoid impacts to Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and  
2 Bog turtle (*Emys blandingii*) are proposed and included as notes on the subdivision plat; and

3           **WHEREAS**, the mitigation measures include tree removal restrictions, soil conservation  
4 and dust control best management practices, restrictive barriers and other temporary measures  
5 during construction; and

6           **WHEREAS**, a public hearing was opened on January 20, 2026 and closed on February 17,  
7 2026; and

8           **WHEREAS**, a negative declaration was adopted by the Planning Board on February 17,  
9 2026; and

10           **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Planning Board hereby grants  
11 subdivision approval for the above project as represented on a map entitled "Townsend Estates"  
12 prepared by Day & Stokosa, Engineering P.C., dated August 21, 2025 and last revised January 29,  
13 2026 subject to the following conditions:

- 14           1. Approval from Dutchess County Board of Health; and
- 15           2. Recreation fees in the amount of the \$19,500 due to the Town of East Fishkill prior  
16           to the signing of the subdivision plat in final form by the duly authorized officer of  
17           the East Fishkill Planning Board; and
- 18           3. Applicant shall fund an escrow in the amount to be determined by the Town  
19           Engineer for an environmental monitor during construction; and
- 20           4. Applicant must follow NYSDEC tree clearing restrictions, soil conservation and  
21           dust control best management practices as well as restrictive barrier measures  
22           related to the protection of the Indiana bat and the Bog turtle; and
- 23           5. All required mitigation measures for the Indian bat and Bog turtle as presented in  
24           the Threatened and Endangered Species Habitat Suitability Assessment Report  
25           prepared by the applicant's consultant, Michael Nowicki of Ecological Solutions  
26           and dated November 21, 2025 must be included as notes on the subdivision plat;  
27           and

- 1           6. Satisfactory resolution of all comments in the Renna Engineering Review memo
- 2           dated February 12, 2026; and
- 3           7. Satisfactory resolution of all comments in the HVEA Review memo dated February
- 4           11, 2026; and
- 5           8. Applicant must obtain any required permits and approvals from all involved
- 6           agencies including but not limited to NYSDEC and Dutchess County.

7  
8   **Resolution Seconded by Planning Board Member:           Richard Campbell**

9  
10 The votes were as follows:

- 11
- 12 Board Member Ed Miyoshi           Aye
- 13 Board Member Sarah Bledsoe       Aye
- 14 Board Member Richard Campbell   Aye
- 15 Board Member Donald Papae        Aye
- 16 Board Member John Giovagnoli     Aye
- 17 Chairperson John Eickman          Aye

18  
19  
20 ***ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING:***

- 21
- 22           **2. 2025 – 099- Ridges at Stormville Mountain Subdivision, 20 Stormville Mtn**
- 23           **Rd. (6656-00-536587)**

24  
25 Applicant is applying for a 10 lot subdivision on 41.19 acres in a R2 zone.

26  
27  
28 Aime Patane, Project Planner and Britney Shakley, Project Engineer-Consultants, LRC Group,

29 Engineering & Surveying and John Kuroda were present for Roya Development LLC.

30  
31  
32           **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe to open the**

33           **Adjourned Public Hearing for Ridges at Stormville Mountain Subdivision. Voted**

34           **and carried unanimously.**

35

1 Ms. Patane began, stating that this last was before the Board in December 2025 and, since then,  
2 there was a Public Hearing. She gave a brief overview and review of the letter received for the  
3 project, which involves 3 existing parcels located at 20 Stormville Mountain Road, 15 Van Brook  
4 Drive and 24 Van Brook Drive. The proposed subdivision involves 10 new lots for single-family  
5 homes and 2 modified lots for 15 and 24 Van Brook Drive. All the new single family lots proposed  
6 are to be served by individual septic and well. Of the new lots, she said the sizes range from a little  
7 over 2 acres to 5.27 acres. In previous discussions with the Board, the limit of disturbance was  
8 discussed, and clarifying that on the plan. She said this was upped to 7.1 acres as the limit of  
9 disturbance. She noted there were public comments from the previous meeting regarding the  
10 concerns over the traffic on Stormville Mountain Road and safety with the new driveways going  
11 in. She explained that, with the updated disturbance, they had to implement Stormwater design  
12 and regarding the site distance easements along the road, which she said had to be discussed with  
13 the engineer. For the specifics of this, Ms. Patane turned the podium over to Ms. Shakley, the  
14 Project Engineer.

15  
16 Ms. Shakley stated that the limit of disturbance had been increased and underground chambers  
17 have now been put in. Chambers are proposed for each lot, to mitigate all of the Stormwater. They  
18 have also met on the site with the traffic Engineer and the Town Engineer to discuss the site  
19 easements and site lines. Since then, she said, there has been an agreement as to what exactly the  
20 sight distance needs to be. They are working to make sure that any clearing necessary is – and has  
21 been included in the plans. Each driveway will have approximately 390 ft to left and right, to be  
22 able to see that far. She stated that those were the major changes that have happened. There is one  
23 lot they are looking at, to shift the driveway to maximize the amount of sight-distance but, other  
24 than that, she said these were the changes made.

25  
26 Mr. Eickman told Ms. Patane the letter he was referring to earlier was where the applicant was  
27 asking for permission to do some clearing in order to be able to take care of the sight-distance

1 issues. Ms. Patane said that is correct. Mr. Eickman said a letter from Roya Development LLC had  
2 been given to the Board requesting and indicating that, attached to the letter was a tree-felling plan  
3 dated January 30, 2026. Ms. Patane said the plans have been updated since then, following the  
4 meeting they had with the Town Engineer. She noted the displayed plan, saying the sight distance  
5 is the same, but they did change the lots they would be putting more clearing on, which were Lot  
6 2 and Lot 10, where before it was Lot 3 and Lot 4.

7  
8 There were no comments or questions from the Board Members and Mr. Eickman looked to the  
9 Town Professionals for theirs, knowing there would be comments on the SWIPP Plan. Mr. Rennia  
10 responded Yes, prior to this round, it was thought that they would be under the 5-acre Limit of  
11 Disturbance, which would trigger a full SWIPP. Now, he said, they have re-evaluated. He said he  
12 thought they were tight on that before, it was re-evaluated, and now they are over the 5 acres. They  
13 will, as the project progresses, need to develop a full SWIPP. On-site testing has been done and he  
14 believes they cannot handle all their Stormwater needs on site, at each individual lot.

15  
16 Mr. Fitzgerald wanted to add to what Ms. Shakley said, stating that all the proposed driveways  
17 will have standard sight distance based upon the speed of 30 MPH, and adding 5 MPH to that. So,  
18 he said, they are looking to have enough sight distance from each driveway for 35 MPH; that is  
19 the condition laid out. In addition to having to do tree clearing, they will also have to do some  
20 grading so that the sight lines stay open. In looking to get the existing grade cut down a few feet  
21 from the sight line, he said it would be so vegetation doesn't grow quickly and disturb that sight  
22 line again. It will need, certainly, an amount of clearing along the road and he said to do that, it is  
23 a windy, hilly road. They will have to be sure that each driveway is actually designed to the  
24 standard for sight distance from the driveway. Mr. Campbell asked if this would also affect the  
25 Stormwater, the runoffs from the driveways to the connections to Stormville Mountain Road. Mr.  
26 Fitzgerald replied that it affects the overall disturbance. Mr. Rennia said they would need to direct  
27 any runoff away from the road and that part of it is not yet detailed. Right now they are looking to

1 get Preliminary Approval on the subdivision plat. He said they have proven it enough to show they  
2 can do it. However, once they obtain that approval and then go to get Health Department approvals,  
3 he said he would be looking for that level of detail before the Planning Board looks at the Final  
4 Plat.

5  
6 Mr. Eickman questioned Ms. Patane if the action being asked of the Board tonight is not to approve  
7 the project, but to approve the tree-felling plan so they can proceed. She replied Yes, it is to clear  
8 trees prior to the (Indiana) Bat clearing.

9  
10 Looking to the Professionals, Mr. Eickman asked, as a part of the overall plan, who would be  
11 approving the tree-felling plan. Mr. Bryant replied that they would lay out the layouts of the limits  
12 of what they are proposing and, if the Board approves it, they will do the monitoring. Mr. Campbell  
13 questioned if the Board would see it before the limits. Mr. Bryant said Yes, they will flag it.

14  
15 Mr. Eickman noted to Ms. Patane they were also offering to issue a Restoration Bond, as well as  
16 additional escrow funds for the Environmental Monitoring during that process. Ms. Patane said  
17 that is correct.

18  
19 **MOTION made by Ed Miyoshi, seconded by Richard Campbell, to approve the**  
20 **implementation of the tree-felling plan, together with the requirement of the**  
21 **Restoration Bond, and additional funds for the Environmental Monitoring, for**  
22 **Ridges at Stormville Mountain Subdivision. Voted and carried unanimously.**  
23

24 Mr. Eickman stated that, for the Applicant and the Public to know, this is only to proceed with that  
25 plan He believes that they are to come back to the Board when the restrictions on felling trees, due  
26 to the Indiana Bats is over which, he said is sometime in November. They would come back to  
27 this Board to then pursue the rest, the Final Approval. Ms. Patane replied that is Correct.

28

1 Mr. Eickman asked Ms. Robbins if the Public Hearing would be adjourned during that period.  
2 Attorney Cunningham asked Ms. Patane if her plan was to not come back to this Board for 6  
3 months. She replied that it would not necessarily be 6 months, but they would want to fell the trees,  
4 then they would come back.

5  
6 John Kuroda came to the podium, stating that it is not that they are going to leave the application,  
7 but rather, it is important when the Planning Board can review. Also, as soon as the Planning Board  
8 can review if there is anything to be amended, specific to the driveway movement. As Applicant,  
9 he said Yes, they would like to be back next month and asked if there are material changes that  
10 need to be adjusted, or anything they can do. Mr. Bryant told Mr. Kuroda there were some loose  
11 ends he was chasing down, in order to come back for Preliminary. Mr. Kuroda replied Yes, the  
12 one amendment, the additional piece of information is that on Lot 3, it would seem that the  
13 driveway could be moved towards Lot 2. Then, he said, they would be able to do a garage under  
14 and work with sight distance and gradings entirely on the subject lot and that this piece was  
15 developing more clarity today. If that is something from the public standpoint and the Planning  
16 Board standpoint, he said they are ready to commit themselves to that. But they fully understand  
17 if it needs to be submitted and then reviewed at the March meeting; he is just not sure how that  
18 works. Mr. Eickman told the team they are welcome to come back when they are prepared to  
19 submit. Ms. Patane questioned if they were good with the tree-felling, and as they work through  
20 what they need to do, then they would come back for the rest of the process. Mr. Eickman  
21 responded that this is correct. He said the tree-felling process is at their sole risk, because the Board  
22 has not taken any action on the rest of the site plan; the Board is happy to have this come back  
23 when they are ready.

24  
25 Looking to the Professionals, Mr. Eickman asked if the Public Hearing would be adjourned until  
26 such time this comes back. Mr. Bryant stated he thinks one thing that has not been elaborated for  
27 the Public is that this is not the clearing for the entire project. It is to establish sight distance on the

1 road, which is an improvement and he believes there are 2 test wells that need to be drilled to get  
2 Final Approval and they need to access the 2 Lots. It is not like they are clearing the whole project;  
3 it is limited clearing. Mr. Eickman thanked him for the clarification, saying it was a good point.  
4

5 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to Adjourn the**  
6 **Public Hearing for Ridges at Stormville Mountain Subdivision. Voted and carried**  
7 **unanimously.**  
8

9  
10  
11 ***ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING:***  
12

13  
14  
15 **3. Montage Subdivision, Route 52 (6556-00-045715)**  
16

17 Applicant is requesting subdivision approval for a proposed cluster subdivision with 122  
18 residential lots on a 385.5 - acre parcel  
19

20  
21 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Ed Miyoshi, to open the**  
22 **Adjourned Public Hearing for Montage Subdivision. Voted and carried**  
23 **unanimously.**  
24

25 Jennifer L. Gray, Esq., applicant’s counsel, from Keane & Beane, PC, Tom Troy, President,  
26 Sharbell Dutchess, Inc., Mark Cannuli, Senior V.P. for Development, Sharbell, Dutchess Inc.,  
27 Amy Bombarderi, P.E., Day & Stokosa, Dan Sakosa, Civil Engineer, Stacy Stieber,  
28 Hydrogeologist, WSP and Peter Russillo, Senior Traffic Engineer, from Collier Engineering, P.C.  
29 were present.  
30

31 Attorney Gray introduced herself and introduced several members of the project team, as  
32 referenced above who were present with her. She said she was before the Board on January 20,  
33 (2026) and gave a pretty full presentation of the project for the reopening of the Public Hearing at

1 that time. She said she would not go through that all again, but that she would give a few updates  
2 since the January 20<sup>th</sup> appearance.  
3  
4 Ms. Gray stated that, on January 27<sup>th</sup>, in response to Mr. Bryant’s request, a summary was  
5 submitted of the off-site well monitoring program that was performed by WSP for the 72-hour  
6 pump test that was performed last year, which she told the Board they should have in their  
7 materials. She said if there were any further questions about the off-site well monitoring program  
8 from Ms. Stieber, the Hydrogeologist present who could answer any of those questions. She said  
9 this was submitted in advance of this evening’s meeting. She said she understands there was a  
10 relatively productive technical meeting with the Traffic Consultants, Mr. Fitzgerald, their Traffic  
11 Consultant and others who met to speak about the traffic. She said Mr. Russillo was present and  
12 he could go through the designs for the roundabout that is proposed for the intersection of Routes  
13 216 and 52. She said she also did respond regarding the outstanding to the HVEA member and  
14 that is submitted for the Planning Board’s materials. She said she also had a conversation with  
15 Attorney Cunningham about the MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) for the installation of the  
16 sewer infrastructure that will go down Route 52 and up Route 376 to connect this site, and Summit  
17 Woods, to the Wastewater Treatment Plan. Her understanding is that the Town Attorney will not  
18 object to the closing of the Public Hearing, based upon the status of the MOU, which she said is  
19 in draft form and she is awaiting comments from the Town Attorneys’ office. Progress has been  
20 made on the MOU and her understanding is that it will have to be finalized prior to a Resolution  
21 but would not necessarily hold up closing of the Public Hearing. She wanted to confirm again what  
22 she said was confirmed on the record at the last meeting: They will not seek to enforce, are  
23 completely waiving the 62-day time clock for subdivision approval or subdivision applications.  
24 She said that as soon as a public hearing is closed on a subdivision application, as is known, the  
25 62-day clock starts to tick for when a Decision has to be rendered on the application. She reiterated  
26 that they waive that 62-day requirement. She said there is plenty of time to finalize the MOU and  
27 prepare any Resolution.

1  
2 Ms. Gray wanted to update the Board on the Army Corps Permit and stated there was a public  
3 comment period that just closed a couple months ago. There were some public comments that were  
4 received by the Army Corps and she said they responded to those comments last week. A copy has  
5 been provided to the Town .for their records, of which she told the Board should be in their  
6 materials as well.

7  
8 Ms. Gray said there were some exhibits for the Public Hearing. She turned the podium over to Mr.  
9 Cannuli, saying that it would then turn over to Mr. Russillo to go through the roundabout plan.

10  
11 Mr. Campbell asked for clarification of the term MOU, in thinking that not everyone would  
12 understand that. Ms. Gray responded, explaining that the MOU is a “Memorandum of  
13 Understanding” or MOA “Memorandum of Agreement”, which she said are basically the same  
14 thing. She said it is basically an Agreement that lays out, in this instance, the Terms and  
15 Conditions, Phasing and Financing conditions. She said it is between Sharbel Dutchess, Inc., the  
16 developer for Summit Woods, and the Town of East Fishkill. It lays out who is responsible for  
17 what, in terms of the construction of the force mains, the pump stations that will go from the site,  
18 down Route 52, then up Route 376 to ultimately connect to the Wastewater Treatment Plant. She  
19 said that this development, and the next-door development, Summit Woods would ultimately then  
20 be connected to sewer, as a result of this infrastructure. She said this also opens up the possibility  
21 for other properties to connect to the sewer as well; properties that would not otherwise have access  
22 to sewer, which is a pretty good public benefit in that regard. Mr. Campbell and other Board  
23 members thanked her.

24  
25 Mr. Cannuli came to the podium stating that he could not give more than what was just heard in  
26 terms of an update, which he appreciated. From the last meeting to now, he said they did have their  
27 meeting with staff and went through a few other items, as Ms. Gray had just mentioned.

1  
2 Mr. Cannuli said some exhibits have been prepared, which they have for this evening. He thinks  
3 this would be helpful when it is opened for public comment, to help answer some of the questions.  
4 The first one displayed was an aerial exhibit that he said shows the intersection of Routes 216 and  
5 52 and the location of the proposed roundabout. He said there would be an update from “Pricilla”  
6 regarding the permitting He pointed out where he said it is understood there is some concern about  
7 the distance from the hill to that circle, and that information is provided. He said the roundabout  
8 plan was there as well to take a look at in detail, if needed, and the well testing plan, should there  
9 be a question as to how and where they tested. There were also some other items with regard to  
10 phasing, in case that comes up also. He deferred to the Board to see if they wished to open this up  
11 to the Public and would address the comments as they come up. He turned over the podium to hear  
12 from the Traffic Consultant, Mr. Russillo, to give the update, based on the Friday meeting.

13  
14 Mr. Russillo came to the podium and introduced himself as the roundabout plan was displayed.  
15 He said this was the latest plan in front of the State (DOT), not only at the regional office, but it is  
16 also at the main office in Albany. He said this was submitted back in August (2025) and they are  
17 waiting to hear from them. He said he spoke with Jason Brenner at the State, who indicated that  
18 he expected to hear from them on (February) the 10<sup>th</sup>, last week. Nothing has been heard just yet  
19 and he said he is pushing them to try to get their input so that these plans can be finalized. The  
20 plans represent the comments that the regional office and main office made in April and May last  
21 year, which he said included the extension of the splitter islands. It is also putting in a slight reverse  
22 curvature through those approaches that assists in slowing traffic down as it comes into the  
23 roundabout. Originally there was a right turn from 216 onto 52 Westbound, separate from the  
24 roundabout, so that it would actually bypass the roundabout. He said the State did not want that. It  
25 has heavy volume going that way; like 400 vehicles in the peak hour, but they want to keep  
26 everything in the roundabout to keep the speeds down, their intent for safety. This was also  
27 originally going to be a “T” intersection, a 4-way with a signal. The reason the State went along

1 with this was because it does increase safety by reducing speeds. He said it also helps them in  
2 terms of maintenance; they do not have to maintain the traffic signal. These are only 2 of the  
3 reasons why they prefer to see this.

4  
5 Mr. Russillo said the plan also shows a sidewalk that goes over to what he believes will be the  
6 future trailway This was a request to be put in and has been done. The advanced signing can be  
7 seen, that will be introduced and indicates an advisory speed of 15 mph for the roundabout. He  
8 said the latest plan set has also provided to the State typical sections around the roundabout as well  
9 as tracking for lowboy tractor trailers to make sure they can negotiate the roundabout. He said this  
10 will support a WB67 tractor trailer, the largest permitted on this type of roadway.

11  
12 He said Mr. Cannuli had mentioned the speed seems to have been an issue coming down (Route)  
13 52. He said the base of that hill is a bit more than a half mile away. Mr. Miyoshi commented that  
14 he did not think that the issue was with the speed, but the issue is that it is a 55-mph speed limit  
15 until one hits (Route) 216, at which point it drops down. Mr. Russillo responded that it will actually  
16 work out better; it will have advanced signing for all of this. In fact, before and as this is being  
17 developed, he said variable message signs can be put in advance, on or about; there is a sequence  
18 of construction that will have to happen in this process. He said it is staged in quadrants and the  
19 plans that the Town has, and the State has, have that sequence down. There is advanced signing  
20 for that, as well as the work zone traffic control measures. Mr. Miyoshi asked Mr. Russillo to point  
21 out the existing 216 and 52 where they are on the map. His understanding is the roundabout is  
22 being moved East of there. Mr. Russillo replied Yes, it is slightly East and pointed out the existing  
23 line for 216, saying that (Route) 52's alignment is the same; it does not change. He said if this  
24 went to a 4-way signalized intersection, this would be the exact same alignment except for the  
25 signal, instead of a roundabout. That dedication was always to create this new intersection. He  
26 mentioned that the roundabout, the way it is designed, whether there was a Stop sign or signal,  
27 there would still be the same problem coming down 52 to a Stop condition. In this case, one is able

1 to travel through at about 15 mph. The major reason also that the State likes these and promotes  
2 them is that any accident had is much-much less severe than it would be in a T-Bone type of  
3 accident.

4  
5 Mr. Russillo concluded, saying that right now he is waiting on the State's final comments on it.  
6 He suspects that, because a crosswalk is proposed, that the State is going to ask for a lighting plan  
7 as part of the final documentation. They may ask for a preference from the Town as to the type of  
8 luminaire to see there. He said from his experience that is what they do; they leave it open to the  
9 local agency to decide on the type of luminaire preferred. He said that it is probably because the  
10 Town will be asked to maintain it. He asked for any questions.

11  
12 Mr. Bryant noted that the only thing he thought that was not touched on was the timing of it, in  
13 terms of when. Looking to Mr. Cannuli, Mr. Russillo replied that he was not sure if that comes in  
14 the first phase or second phase of development. Mr. Cannuli came to the podium, stating that,  
15 during the approval process, the DOT will have jurisdiction over what generates the need, and  
16 when. He said that was also the discussion had on Friday, regarding a certain number of C.O.s that  
17 could be granted prior to the roadway improvement being completed. Mr. Bryant said that is just  
18 one item that still has to be done and even prior to the first C.O., he said there is a lot of construction  
19 going on. He said to see what the DOT feedback is and he can take it from there; the timing was  
20 the one item not covered. Mr. Cannuli said Mr. Russillo would be around for any questions and  
21 that there were other team members and exhibits to go. He asked Mr. Eickman how he should  
22 proceed. He replied that he would like him to provide a brief discussion on the Army Corps of  
23 Engineers (ACOE) letter that came in somewhat recently; he has not had a chance to review it. He  
24 asked if there was anything substantive in the letter. Mr. Cannuli replied that 2 comments were  
25 received from the Public. He said one of the gentlemen was there at the last meeting regarding  
26 Phase 1 and the cultural study. He said the comments have been addressed in detail. The comment  
27 letter was sent to the Planning Board and he said all of the submissions are posted on their website.

1 Another comment from one of the neighbors who was there has also been addressed. He said the  
2 third comment is from the EPA, who asked for a 2-week extension, the comments of which have  
3 also been addressed in detail. There are some more technological ones that they were able to  
4 address and meet what they are required to do and he said they will see if there is any more  
5 additional information needed. If not, then they have fulfilled the public comment period, and  
6 permits are typically within a month from then to get issued.

7

8 Mr. Cannuli referred to the aerial photograph where the development is highlighted in yellow and  
9 he said this was gone through in detail at the last meeting. He wanted to also show the connection  
10 from the project through the project on the North side of (Route) 52 that connects to the Rail trail  
11 He believes that is an easement that was granted through a prior approval. The crosswalk is shown  
12 in the roundabout, and a sidewalk portion that connects directly to that. He said this is the updated  
13 plan, which reflects the additional wetlands that were identified through the process last year. It  
14 shows some of the lots that were shifted, and now shows the 122 lots, based on the revised  
15 conventional lot layout. He said it also shows the connection through the project, through the  
16 adjacent Summit Woods property, which he said was talked about briefly at the last meeting. That  
17 is the road that would be needed should Montage at East Fishkill proceed before Summit Woods;  
18 there would have to be another connection out to 52.

19

20 Mr. Cannuli referred to the displayed Phasing Plan that had been prepared and what is seen  
21 highlighted in red is Phase 1, which he said this was talked about briefly. There are 29 residential  
22 lots in that section along with the Water Treatment Plant, and he said the construction of the offsite  
23 sanitary sewer would be part of that. There was talk with staff about how and when the roundabout,  
24 shown as Phase 1A, as well as the emergency road through Summit Woods and when that would  
25 be required. He said that would be reflected in the Resolution of Approval and further developers'  
26 agreement, beyond the Resolution.

27

1 Mr. Cannuli proceeded to show Phase 2, highlighted in pink and purple, saying there were 49 lots  
2 in Phase Two and the last section, showing Phase 3, which is 44 lots. He said sometimes Phase  
3 can come before Phase 2, depending on how they want to build out the project. However, he said  
4 Phase 1, highlighted in red would be the first Phase needed to get the early infrastructure in that  
5 would be needed to support the rest of the construction.

6

7 Another exhibit shown by Mr. Cannuli was the roundabout, which he said shows some additional  
8 improvements that they would propose. They met and communicated with the neighbor on the  
9 North side of Route 52. He showed the berm that he said would help mitigate some of the  
10 headlights and glare that would be encountered around the circle. The location of the proposed  
11 Rail Trail is shown in green.

12

13 The well testing plan was available to be shown, if needed, and Mr. Cannuli said there may be  
14 some need to look at the locations where the test wells are up and where the Water Treatment Plant  
15 and production wells are. The test wells are shown highlighted as well on the plan. Mr. Cannuli  
16 said he would let Ms. Stieber from WSP go into the detail of that, if needed.

17

18 Mr. Cannuli showed the older versions of the architecture, which he said were shown at the last  
19 meeting and would likely be updated with current designs. This is what was in the SEQR  
20 document, showing the 4-bedroom home typical and he said the lot size, the pricing of the homes  
21 and square footage of the homes had been gone through at the last meeting. He said this  
22 information is also available, if needed.

23

24 Lastly, he said an exhibit was done to show how the letter of map amendment with FEMA allows  
25 them to use the layout they are using. Both are conventional lot layouts as asked for by Mr.  
26 Rennia's firm and he said the details can be provided, with some additional items that his firm  
27 requires, based on his review of the conventional lot layout. He said those items would be added

1 to the future plan set. Mr. Cannuli said he did not have anything more to update, but that they were  
2 available to answer any questions that may arise.

3  
4 Someone asked if they were still showing no disturbance of wetlands. Mr. Cannuli replied that  
5 there is a .93-acre disturbance as part of the Army Corps permit which, he said is the same that it  
6 has been, in fact, decreased. There is also a mitigation plan where it is increased by 3 to 1 increase  
7 in wetland. They are building roughly 3 acres wetlands into the project . He said that is what was  
8 recently reviewed by the Army Corps and is getting through the permitting process now.

9  
10 There were no further questions or comments from Board Members or Professionals. Mr. Eickman  
11 opened the hearing up to the Public for comments, starting with a letter dated February 3, 2026  
12 that the Planning Board had received. He said it was given to them by John Horam, and he  
13 proceeded to read the letter, as summarized by him, stating:

14 “Mr. Horam states that “the quality of life in the Hudson Valley, and in particular, Hopewell  
15 Junction is wonderful. He says one of the factors making this a great place is the relatively low  
16 population. Learning that the development under consideration proposes approximately 130  
17 homes and that an adjacent project seeks to construct its own similar amount gave him some  
18 concern. He said he understands that the homes are intended to sell well into the \$700,000 price  
19 range, which would put them out of reach for many of his fellow residents. One of the factors that  
20 makes this a great place to live is the relative population size. Any sudden, large increase works  
21 directly against that quality, and others that have made this Town a great place to live.”

22 Mr. Eickman said he had summarized the contents of the letter but that it would be in the Planning  
23 Department for review.

24  
25 Mr. Eickman opened up the hearing to members of the public and reiterated that if one wished to  
26 speak, to please come to the podium, sign in and speak into the microphone. He said if one wants  
27 to respond in any way, to please be sure it is into the microphone, and not from one’s seat.

1  
2 Christopher Tamulonis came to the podium, stating he lived on Judith Drive in Stormville the past  
3 12 years. He said he was excited about the roundabout there, it is a little crazy and he takes that  
4 turn often throughout the day and was almost T-boned before. Referring to the other end of 216,  
5 in front of the Post Office, at 52 and Old 52, he asked if there was any discussion, plans or impacts  
6 in that area and if so, what is it. Mr. Eickman responded that it is not part of this project and he  
7 does not know of any plans. Mr. Bryant responded that it is kind of indirectly related and he would  
8 let Mr. Cannuli speak to that. Mr. Myoshi commented that there is certainly going to be more  
9 traffic. Mr. Tamulonis explained that he was asking if there were going to be any closures, or  
10 anything of that nature; basically, if the traffic pattern would stay the same, with no impact. He  
11 asked if there were any plans for development or any kind of construction in that area, related to t  
12 his project. Mr. Bryant said he does not believe there is anything at that existing intersection. Mr.  
13 Tamulonis' other question was about the estimated impact on the schools, which he said was  
14 probably dealt with at the last meeting, of which he could not attend. He said it is especially  
15 Gayhead, which has 900 plus kids, bursting through the seams. He said everyone says 6<sup>th</sup> grade is  
16 going to go to Van Wyck, and Van Wyck has no space. If the 6<sup>th</sup> graders are going there, then he  
17 is questioning what the domino plan is; has it been thought of. Mr. Eickman asked Mr. Cannuli to  
18 respond regarding the impact on the school and Ms. Gray returned to the podium. She said, with  
19 regard to the school-age children's impacts, that is part of the SEQR review that was completed.  
20 There were a Full Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and a Supplemental Environmental  
21 Impact Statement (SEIS), and the generation of school age children impacts on the school district,  
22 something that was studied at that time. She said this Board issued its Findings Statement with  
23 respect to that. She had the 2019 Findings Statement and said she could give the numbers, but it  
24 would take a moment. Mr. Tamulonis expressed that it was 2019? Ms. Gray replied Yes; she  
25 believed the Environmental Review was done in 2006 and then updated again in 2019. Mr.  
26 Tamulonis said his concern is that was in 2019, Pre-Covid, and since then there are 10 lots off the  
27 mountain, this development here. He said he, and all, can correctly assume what Hopewell

1 Junction was before, and what it is now; that is not an accurate census. Ms. Gray responded that,  
2 under NY State Law, the passage of time takes many years to go through the process and would  
3 have to be updated continuously, into infinity. She stated that the Courts have said that is not a  
4 requirement to update the studies, based on the passage of time. Mr. Tamulonis questioned if there  
5 had been any discussion with the school district and said this is going to run into a big issue. He  
6 said it is not 60 kids, or whatever the case may be, but again questioned if there had been serious  
7 thought about down the line, whether it is Van Wyck, or Gayhead. He asked what the solid plan  
8 was for what the Town and the District are going to do, when this is fully developed. Mr.  
9 Tamulonis emphasized that it is going to get approved, developed; he is not naïve, and said the  
10 other development will be done eventually. He asked what is being done; what has the  
11 communication been. Ms. Robbins responded, saying she could assure him that the school district  
12 was an Interested agency and involved; it received every bit of the SEQR documentation. She  
13 believes that they sent a couple of letters. She does not know of their plans are with regard to the  
14 capacity challenges that may or may not occur. She said she is not privy to their numbers; they  
15 were informed throughout the entire process of what the proposal was and how many expected  
16 students there would be. She said they did weigh in and reiterated that correspondence was  
17 received from them a couple of times during the SEQR Review. She said she actually met with  
18 “Daren” (Lolkema) at that time, who was the Superintendent of schools, about this and several  
19 other projects that were happening because he was trying to get a sense of what was going on. She  
20 said she knows they were included in the long-range planning for this project in the district. Mr.  
21 Tamulonis questioned what was the general response in the letters and Ms. Robbins replied that  
22 she could show them to him if he wanted to come into the Planning office. Mr. Tamulonis said he  
23 is curious and reiterated that Gayhead and Van Wyck are capacity, unless trailers are put outside  
24 the Middle School, and it is a real concern. He said he has 3 kids at Gayhead; one will age out in  
25 a year. But, his youngest one eventually will, most likely, get impacted by this project, at the  
26 Middle School level. He said he is not the only parent; he may be the only parent speaking about  
27 it, but he said he guarantees that once things come to fruition, people will ask what is going on.

1 He said he is happy that the intersection by the Post Office is not being impacted. Mr. Eickman  
2 stated he can assure him, as he said Ms. Robbins pointed out, that it was given a great deal of  
3 consideration by both the School District, as well as the Planning Board at the time SEQR was  
4 being worked on. He said the study that was done by the applicant was something that had  
5 projected out for a number of years. He does not think that anyone was alarmed, but they recognize  
6 it needs to be watched-and planned for. He told Mr. Tamulonis he could take up Ms. Robbins offer  
7 to show him the documents and Mr. Tamulonis said he definitely would.

8

9 John Mills, Sherwood Lane, came to the podium saying he was not the only parent and that he  
10 almost did not come because he felt like he was holding back the tide, with all these proposed  
11 developments. He said he is not sure how people haven't learned, in the state or this country,  
12 allowing developers to come into these smaller communities, building subdivisions and close  
13 quarter housing. It puts more of a strain and is changing those communities, in his opinion, for the  
14 worse, forever. He said one doesn't need to look far to see the congested roads or traffic jams  
15 because infrastructures were not designed for the influx being dropped on them. This development,  
16 along with the rest, he said are more than likely looking here, because of the proximity to the City.  
17 (Route) 84 and the Taconic Parkway, being the main thoroughfares, he said Luddington exit gets  
18 backed up past the highway some days and the Taconic is one of the most dangerous roads in the  
19 country, per mile. He said it does not need more volume and most of the exits off the Taconic are  
20 shocking. He said he feels like he is holding back the tide with this but putting more of a strain on  
21 the volunteer Fire Department, the classrooms, the roads and aquifers makes it make sense. He  
22 said at the last meeting he heard a lot of concern about the water, as well. He understands there  
23 was a 3-day test, a 72-hour test done in May, a 72-hour test done in the wettest month of the year.  
24 If one looks at the states, he said last year May was well over the average rainfall. He is questioning  
25 how this would be ok once 122 units, and another development next to that are put in. He reiterated  
26 that he almost did not come, since it is going to happen anyway, but it is concerning. He agreed  
27 with what the other gentlemen said, he has 2 children himself. He would like to not have to worry

1 about some of this. Looking to the Board, he said who from the community sent the letter, he said  
2 he does not know why this is being rushed, to become like Long Island; it is a lot. Mr. Mills  
3 thanked the Board for their time.

4  
5 Ms. Gray came to the podium, saying she was able to find some numbers with regard to the  
6 estimate done several years ago. The estimate was 50, a total of 59 students from the entire project  
7 that was done. She said it was done with the standard Ruckers analysis that Ruckers puts out. She  
8 said a series of multipliers are used in the professional planning field for a standardized way to  
9 estimate the number of school age children generated from a residential project. She said, in  
10 addition to that, a study was done of local, East Fishkill subdivisions to find out how many school  
11 age children would actually be generated from those subdivisions. Based on those numbers, she  
12 said 59 students was the estimate. There is also a fiscal analysis done that estimates, with the tax  
13 revenue that will be generated from these homes, the School District would actually have a surplus  
14 in revenue, when considering the cost to educate a child. She said she just wanted to provide the  
15 Board with this information and update the response to the comment.

16  
17 Ms. Gray asked the Board if they would close the Public Hearing this evening. She said this has  
18 been back a couple times now, after a hiatus of a couple years, and she thinks they have responded  
19 to the outstanding staff and consultants' comments. She said Public comments have been  
20 responded to in real time and again asked the Board to close the Public Hearing.

21  
22 Mr. Eickman announced that he wished to thank the members of the public who have come and  
23 expressed their concerns and questions. He said this project has been in the works for a long, long  
24 time and sometimes it is forgotten where it has been, when coming down a very long road. He also  
25 wanted to congratulate and thank the applicant and all the consultants who have been a part of  
26 responding to all these things. He thinks it is right that the responses received last meeting and this

1 evening have been wonderful. With that, he said he would accept a Motion to close the Public  
2 Hearing.

3  
4 Ms. Bledsoe asked if there was an avenue where the Board would be able to get a comment from  
5 the School District. She said she knows they have already responded to the SEQR process, but  
6 with respect to the new plan that was just adopted this year. There are new classrooms being bult  
7 and a new plan put in place that the people, as a tax base, have voted on. She said it is how the  
8 Board can maybe understand how the impact would fit into that. She said that, obviously, they  
9 have planned for it; they've had this information that has been built in, and it is so the Board, and  
10 the Public, can have a better understanding. Attorney Cunningham said if that is the Board's  
11 request, of course, staff can reach out and submit anything, to see if there is further comment from  
12 the School District. He stated that he thinks part of closing the Public Hearing this evening, as part  
13 of what Ms. Gray had mentioned, the 62-day Decision clock has already been waived. He said he  
14 thinks too, if the Board closes the public Hearing this evening, it is with the understanding that any  
15 significant change in either the plan or some sort of circumstances, they can always reopen the  
16 Public Hearing subsequently. He said if there is some sort of impact to the school, that is also  
17 something that can be addressed at the Board level, with the applicant, while the Public Hearing  
18 is closing, and for some reason it needs to be reopened, it could be.

19  
20 An unknown gentleman came to the podium who did not state his name, nor did he write on the  
21 sign-in sheet at the podium. His name could not be provided for the meeting minutes. He thanked  
22 Ms. Bledsoe for her comment from the Education Department. He said they should be present,  
23 someone who is competent. Their budget is going to increase, yes, but he is questioning if there is  
24 going to be an increase in the classrooms, are they going to expand the school, are they going to  
25 open up a new school. He said he also has questions regarding the Fire Department; he knows it is  
26 volunteer and is wondering if their budget would increase. There is the population increase also  
27 and he asked about the Police Department, and if their budget would increase with the increase in

1 population. He is questioning if this is something that has also been looked into. Mr. Eickman  
2 responded to the unknown gentleman, saying Yes, no doubt there will be some increases. They  
3 will want to have a few more firefighters if they can, which has always been a problem for them.  
4 He said he knows they will continue to work to bring in more volunteers. He added that the Police  
5 Department will probably see some increases as well. He said he thinks, in general, because there  
6 is a cap of what can be done, the positive effects will probably outweigh any negatives. The  
7 unknown gentleman said that is his concern; it is the tax increase on everyone that will be  
8 occurring. He said there is also the increase in staff, pensions, things like that occurring and he just  
9 wants to understand what the actual budgets for would be each; the Education Department, Fire  
10 Department, and the Police Department. He said there are things that will impact their budgets.  
11 Mr. Miyoshi advised him, for his information, that the Town has nothing to do with the School  
12 District; they are totally different entities and not related at all. He said the Town has no control  
13 over what the School District does, how many classrooms they build, and how many schools they  
14 build; that is on them. He told him that the Wappingers School District spans over multiple towns;  
15 it is not just the Town of East Fishkill. The unknown gentleman said he is wondering, with all the  
16 new children coming in, where will they be funneled. He said there is also the question, just in  
17 case, there may be Special Ed children and questioned if there is adequate staffing to meet the  
18 needs of the children who may have special needs, things like that. He commented that it would  
19 have been helpful if someone from the Board of Ed was present to address those issues for some  
20 of the parents. He said his kids have all graduated college, so his concerns are for the other people  
21 who live here and will be affected. Another aspect, he said, is what the Fire Department and the  
22 Police Department will receive; he would like to know what the budget increase would be with the  
23 additional increase to the community. Mr. Papae told the unknown gentleman that the new people  
24 moving in will be paying taxes as well, and the burden is not just on everyone now. He said it is  
25 not that the people coming in are not paying anything in taxes. The unknown gentleman replied  
26 that it will increase everyone's taxes as well; that is undoubtable.

27

1 Ms. Bledsoe advised that the estimates are in the document that is on the website; she thinks all of  
2 those numbers are on there. She said they might have changed slightly since the last time they  
3 were updated, but all of the information is on the website. The unknown gentleman said his  
4 understanding is that, at one time, the average house price was \$550,000 and now it is \$750,000.  
5 It was increased higher and the taxes will be higher with the property valuation. Mr. Eickman  
6 advised him that he would find the information regarding taxes and that sort of thing on the website  
7 and told him that he appreciated his comments.

8

9 Mr. Bryant said a gentleman (from the public) had a question about the well testing, the time of  
10 year. He noted that the applicant team hydrogeologist could speak to, in particular, the 72-hour  
11 test, and how it gets permitted. Accordingly, Stacy Stieber, hydrogeologist came to the podium,  
12 stating that the well testing that was conducted was a series of 3 well tests. There was an individual  
13 test on each of the 3 wells conducted for 72 hours of continuous pumping over a 4-day period.  
14 They were done in May, in 3 consecutive weeks with rain received during the testing, which she  
15 said was not unusual when beginning the background period, the 3 consecutive weeks of testing,  
16 and a week of recovery afterwards. With a 5-week period, she said rain would be received during  
17 that time. She said the wells were pumped at more than twice the maximum day demand of both  
18 the combined Montage and Summit Woods projects. She said each well was pumped at that  
19 volume that exceeded twice the demand. The way the test protocols are designed, she said are to  
20 demonstrate stress on an aquifer A public supply well is not typically pumped at its maximum  
21 capacity for 72 hours continuously. She said the testing is done to simulate an extreme stress and  
22 what effects that may have on the well itself, as well as other nearby wells and that is how the test  
23 was conducted. Prior testing had been done on these wells in 2023, and some preliminary 48-hour  
24 tests were done. In 2003, Ms. Stieber believes, testing was done, so there is plenty of support data  
25 indicating these wells have strong yield capacities. She said this data has been submitted to the  
26 DEC as part of the water withdrawal, permit approval process. The pumping test data will be  
27 reviewed by the staff geologist there, who will also review the data and will comment, if necessary,

1 on what occurred. Mr. Bryant stated it is the DEC that issues the permit; it is not the Town who  
2 will issue; Ms. Stieber said Yes, the water withdrawal permit.

3  
4 Mr. Mills returned to the podium, stating his question was not how it was done, but when it was  
5 done. He said, again, if the plan for development is going to go ahead, maybe the Town of East  
6 Fishkill, from now on, if there is any water testing done, that it be in the driest months, not the  
7 wettest months. If strain keeps being put on the aquifers, he said it should not be done in the wettest  
8 time of the year.

9  
10 Ms. Bryant asked Ms. Stieber if there was any regulation by the DEC in terms of when this test  
11 can be done. Ms. Stieber returned to the podium, replying that the only regulation that applies is  
12 to unconsolidated stratified drift wells. She said the precipitation conditions are evaluated at the  
13 time of testing. Theoretical projections and assessments of longer-term pumping conditions called  
14 180-day or 6-month projections of what will happen, with extended use of the well, are done. She  
15 said the precipitation conditions are assessed and, leading up to those tests was a very dry period.  
16 She reiterated that rain was received during the test. However, ultimately, she said the results of  
17 the test support the yields, which are quite exceptional for the wells.

18  
19 Ms. Bledsoe stated that, when this was last in a Public Hearing, there were people who wanted  
20 their wells tested, but couldn't be accessed, and asked if there was an update on how that went.  
21 Ms. Steiber responded and referred to the displayed exhibit, saying that the figure shown in the  
22 circles are all of the properties contacted with a request to measure their wells and they are color-  
23 coded: Those shown in purple are properties where there was no response received from them.  
24 Those shown in green are the people who said Yes, and they were able to measure. Those shown  
25 in orange are the ones where they did speak to the property owners, and those are wells that they  
26 were not able to access. In most instances, she said they were equipped with suction lift pumps, in  
27 which the wells cannot be opened. She explained that it breaks suction and the well needs to be

1 reprimed before it can be used again. She said they need to measure relatively continually during  
2 the test period, to gather any data in order to make an assessment on that. When these wells were  
3 encountered, those shown in orange, she said they ultimately decided to install 3 additional shallow  
4 drive point wells on the Montage property. She pointed out the location of wells shown in orange,  
5 2,3 & 4, and said an additional 3 wells points were installed between the pumping wells and those  
6 wells, to assess whether there would be draw-down. There was no draw-down seen in those wells  
7 during the test period.

8

9 Mr. Tamulonis returned to the podium, stating that he did not know if it was this Board or forum,  
10 but asked what is developed for recreation for big developments like this. He asked if, in the  
11 building process, there are fees associated with these kinds of developments that goes back to the  
12 Town for creating or developing green space, parks, and expansion of parks. Attorney  
13 Cunningham responded that there is a recreation fee for every subdivision. Mr. Cannuli returned  
14 to the podium, stating that this is a cluster subdivision, with over 260 acres being preserved as  
15 passive open space. He believes it is \$6,000 per unit but said he was not absolutely certain about  
16 that figure. He said some additional things have been done, like connecting to the Rail Trail, and  
17 there are sidewalks throughout the development. Mr. Tamulonis said then, easy math, if there are  
18 100 houses, 500 to half a million in this development, that would be a rec. fee. Mr. Cannuli  
19 explained that, for each house, there is a rec fee, i.e. \$\$6,000. Ms. Robbins stated it is \$6,500. Mr.  
20 Tamulonis asked if those funds would be dedicated just for this project, or how would they be  
21 utilized. Attorney Cuningham said those are just rec fees for any sort of recreational project in the  
22 Town. Mr. Tamulonis questioned within the rec fees and spending, whose discretion is this.  
23 Attorney Cunningham said it is the Town Board's discretion when they are creating the budget  
24 and something that they would vote on for a project. Mr. Tamulonis asked if there was any criteria  
25 that earmark the fees for any kind of development that has been voted for, i.e, playgrounds or  
26 things of that nature, Or, he asked, are there mechanisms in place. Attorney Cunningham replied  
27 it is just something recreational, so it could be playgrounds, it could be fields, could be walking

1 trails, a pool, anything. Mr. Bryant said it is part of this process, it is separate and they have no  
2 control over what it goes to. Attorney Cunningham told Mr. Tamulonis that basically the money  
3 is given to the Town, the Town takes it and then where it goes is a separate forum. Mr. Tamulonis  
4 thanked the Board.

5  
6 Rob Miccarelli came to the podium, stating he is a proud resident of East Fishkill. He is also a  
7 volunteer Fireman and a volunteer EMT for the Town. He asked how this would impact the Fire  
8 Department, the Rescue Squad Department. He said he also volunteers at the Stormville Fire house  
9 and said this will be a big impact on them He asked if there had been studies done on how it will  
10 impact them; it seems there are studies for just about everything. He looked to Fire Commissioner  
11 Jodlowski, telling him he is great, he knows they all do a lot and it is tough to get volunteers now  
12 and then. He said it is definitely going to impact them. Mr. Jodlowski responded, saying there are  
13 no studies. It is known how often they go out for calls, and he mentioned at the last meeting that  
14 they went out on 3,338 calls last year which is a call every 2 ½ hours, 24 hours a day, 365 days a  
15 year, and, the truth is, any development of this size is never a good thing for them. He said the  
16 people who move into this, more than likely are not going to volunteer. He said the worry is more  
17 than just the fire, it is about things like every time people burn their popcorn, they have to go out  
18 for it. It could be any time there is steam from the shower that hits the smoke detector, they have  
19 to go out for it, as well if a basement pipe breaks. He said it is a lot of stress on the Fire Department,  
20 and they cannot just go out and get other members; they rely on them coming to the Department.  
21 He said that is the worry for them. Mr. Miccarelli said that last evening there were 3 calls just in  
22 the Four Corners development. He said when he looks at the development, there are only maybe  
23 2 people who volunteer there. He said he did not know if there had been specific conversations  
24 with the Stormville Fire Department; he knows their president, “George” was present this evening.  
25 He would like this taken into consideration, and said it is pressing the 911 system and being a  
26 volunteer.

27

1 Ms. Gray returned to the podium, stating that she appreciates the emergency services and  
2 addressed that this is something that was absolutely studied in the SEQR review regarding impacts  
3 on police and fire, ambulances; all of that was studied. The Findings that the Board made was that  
4 the tax revenue generated by the project would offset the increased demand from the population.  
5 She said she is hoping that, with the increased population from this project, there is another pool  
6 of volunteers. She said she is hoping, despite the sentiment, that the folks moving to this  
7 development will volunteer. Mr. Jodlowski said the tax revenue is not what helps them, the people  
8 do. Ms. Gray stated, with increased population, hopefully there is an increase of volunteerism as  
9 well.

10

11 Mr. Eickman announced that he wanted to thank everyone, the public, applicants, consultants and  
12 also Ms. Gray as counsel for the applicant. He again said he would accept a Motion to close the  
13 Public Hearing.

14

15 Someone called out from the public, stating he had another public hearing question. Mr. Eickman  
16 responded that he'd been given the opportunity to speak and would need to now stop. He advised  
17 the gentleman that, if he had more questions, he was sure the applicant would speak with him.

18

19

20 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Ed Miyoshi, to close the Public**  
21 **Hearing for Montage Subdivision. Voted and carried unanimously.]**

22

23 Attorney Gray thanked the Board for their time this evening and all the other prior meetings on  
24 this project and expressed that it was really appreciated.

25

26

27

28 ***DISCUSSION:***

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

**4. #2025 – 107- Irish Fields, 664-670 Leetown Rd. (6655-01-381969)**

Applicant is applying for an amended site plan.

**AND**

***DISCUSSION:***

**5. #2025 – 108- Package Pavement, 3530 Route 52, (6655-00-334069)**

Applicant is applying for an amended site plan.

John Latini and Eileen Doherty were the parties present and associated with both matters, which have separate entity names.

John Latini came to the podium, stating he was present for both Irish Fields and Package Pavement matters, together with Eileen Doherty, an officer of the company (Package Pavement).

He said they were present to go through and update site plans as well as answer any questions that the Board or any other Town members may have.

The site plan for Irish Fields, 644-670 Leetown Road was displayed. He said they have gone back and forth for quite a few months on a lot of things He knows there was concern with a wetland area and the gravel parking space to the right. The concern was there is a wetland marker, and they did not have a full delineation report completed, with comments, which was also supplied to the Town. He said this property was purchased back in September 2012, from William Baker. He said in all those back spaces back then as well.

1 Mr. Eickman suggested to Mr. Latini that he describe the relationship of this parcel to the larger  
2 parcel, as it would help some of the other Board members.

3

4 Ms. Robbins wanted to first give a little background to the Planning Board saying that since this  
5 is the first time they are seeing this. She said this came to the Planning Board in a different way  
6 than what typically comes in. She said in this particular case, there was a complaint against the  
7 property; they came in through the Building Department. Upon review of the property, she said it  
8 was discovered that there had been some expansion of the use over many, many years. This use  
9 has been around for a very long time, but upon review of the file, the last approved site plan was  
10 from the late 1980s. Over time there was some expansion of the use and some changes on the site.  
11 The applicant was asked to prepare an “As-Built” of the site to show exactly what was there, so it  
12 could be compared to the original approved site plan. She said the applicant has now prepared an  
13 “As-Built” of the actual site. She noted that across the street there was a model home and parking  
14 that were also associated with the applicant The model home originally had office space and,  
15 looking to Mr. Latini, she said she did not know if that still exists. He replied that 2 employees  
16 currently work in that office, the old Stormville Oil office, which has been sold. Ms. Robbins said  
17 there is also a lot of parking there, not an improved lot, but a dirt, gravel lot. She said she thinks  
18 employees from Package Pavement actually park over there and cross over the road. Mr. Latini  
19 said that is correct. Ms. Robbins said these are 2 site plans. Although they are not connected in the  
20 Town’s files, she said they are connected in the fact that some of the parking for Package Pavement  
21 is on the opposite side of the road, at the site plan that is called Irish Fields. She said that is the  
22 connection between the 2 site plans.

23

24 Attorney Cunningham questioned if the 2 properties are owned by the same owner and Mr. Latini  
25 answered Correct, Yes. He referred to the displayed site plan showing where the deli and pizzeria  
26 are located, as well as the 2-story building. He reiterated that there are 2 employees working in

1 that building still, and the parking. He said he could show the bigger site plan across the street if  
2 the Board wanted him to move onto that.

3

4 Mr. Eickman asked the number of parking places available there.

5

6 Irish Fields is referring to across the street from Package Pavement and they are 2 separate. Ms.  
7 Robbins said right now they are 2 separate site plans. Ms. Bledsoe questioned if they were going  
8 to remain 2 separate site plans. Ms. Robbins responded that they are trying to figure that out now  
9 and how to proceed with the site plan.

10

11 Mr. Latini said they are all under one ownership, with employees that park both in front of the  
12 main office; at 675 Leetown Road there is parking and at 670 Leetown Road there is parking.

13 He added that there is also parking at Package Pavement, at 3530 Route 52, with parking on all  
14 sides. He said all their drivers that park at package Pavement come in, pull their trucks out and  
15 park their vehicle where their commercial vehicle is. All the office employees and a lot of their  
16 plant workers either park in front of the main office, at 675, or at 670 Leetown Road. He said the  
17 parking has been there a long time. In response to the question about how many parking spaces  
18 over there, he said there is a total of 65, which also includes the pizzeria and deli, which he said is  
19 under the same ownership. That building is leased out to the owner of the pizzeria and deli, which  
20 he said are the same. He said between the 2, they probably have 6 employees working in the  
21 pizzeria and deli in any given day; they fluctuate a little.

22

23 Attorney Cunningham asked if it is the exact same owner, even if it is the same beneficial owner;  
24 is one owned by one LLC and one owned by another LLC or are both owned by the same exact  
25 entity or person. Mr. Latini said it is all owned by the same person. Ms. Doherty spoke from the  
26 public but she was indecipherable. Attorney Cuningham said then it sounds like there are different  
27 owners, which is not unsurmountable, but it is part of any sort of approval; it is important to know.

1 Attorney Cunningham said there may have to be some sort of lease agreement, from one entity to  
2 another. He said he understands if it is beneficial ownership, but if it is 2 separate entities, they are  
3 2 separate ownerships. He told Mr. Latini if they want to have an agreement where one parks on  
4 the other where it is not exactly the same owner, there are corp formalities that each property would  
5 have to follow. Ms. Robbins added that, from the Planning Board's perspective, they wouldn't  
6 want to be in a situation where one parcel was sold and then there is parking for the other parcels  
7 on it; it has to be made certain.

8  
9 Mr. Campbell questioned, for the parcel being looked at for an amendment to the site plan, if it  
10 met the requirements of the Town's regulations. Ms. Robbins replied that it is a tricky question,  
11 and it is obvious that this use has been there for a long time. In some cases, it pre-exists zoning  
12 Typically, she said, the Town does not allow an entity to park offsite, parking for their use, offsite.  
13 In this case, she said they had offices across the street that they were using for the building, but it  
14 does appear that they are using some of the Irish Fields site plan parking for the Package Pavement  
15 facility. Her concerns would be, as far as planning, is for the folks who are parking; do they have  
16 safe access across the street to get to their job. She said those are the types of things for the Planning  
17 Board to consider when looking at the site plan. They are looking at the site plan to see how they  
18 are accessing it, what they are doing to get there. As far as the ownership, she said this is something  
19 to discuss with counsel, as she is not a lawyer. She does not know exactly what that would entail,  
20 but there would need to be some sort of agreement.

21  
22 Mr. Campbell said that part of his thought process, which has been somewhat mentioned here, if  
23 there is approval given for this amended site plan, should this piece of property transact hands  
24 away from its existing use He said there could be issues because the Boad is allowing this to take  
25 place. He said he is not saying that they will, or not. But he is just saying that he sees an issue if it  
26 were to change hands. Then, he asked, what are they left with., having given this approval, asking  
27 if this is correct. Mr. Bryant said that is where a parking easement could potentially come into

1 play, but by the same token, it is also allowing offsite parking. Ms. Robbins said that is the reason  
2 why people are asked to come back to the Planning Board when they do expansions. When all  
3 those things are looked at, she said it is all part of a cohesive site plan amendment. She said they  
4 do not have that opportunity here, so it is being looked at in a different way. It is being discussed  
5 this evening because it is the first time most of the Board have seen it, and trying to understand  
6 exactly how it functions. It is what needs the business has and what needs the Planning Board has.  
7 Mr. Campbell said it is the functionality of it too, just from a safety standpoint. It's not wanting to  
8 disrupt what being used and he doesn't assume anything, but it doesn't seem like there have been  
9 significant issues because it has been used that way. But, at the same token, he said he guesses  
10 there must be some type of constraints that are placed on it. If the property were to change hands  
11 again, he said that they would have to come back, in a different iteration. Attorney Cunningham  
12 said Yes, and there are pre-existing, non-conforming uses in the Town's Code, and these are not  
13 totally unheard-of situations. For this project, he said it is their first time back to the Board. They  
14 are giving an overview and he said there's going to be a planning memo, an engineering memo.  
15 He said there are things that can be done to clean up the entire operation, from a land-use  
16 perspective. Mr. Campbell said Yes, but it also won't impede them from their operation because  
17 they have been doing this. He said he does not think they would want to impede that type of  
18 operation. Attorney Cuningham said he thinks he looked that up and it was since the 1950s, to  
19 some extent. Mr. Eickman said it is 75 years for Package Pavement.

20

21 Mr. Fitzgerald asked if the parking that is occurring at Irish Fields, for Package Pavement, was for  
22 convenience or necessity. Mr. Latini responded it was for necessity. He said it was many years  
23 ago, he was not exactly sure when the DEC came in and they had to put in a retention pond, and  
24 other things for DEC that restricted parking on the Package Pavement side.

25

1 Ms. Bledsoe asked Mr. Latini if the Board could look at Package Pavement first, which could help  
2 answer some of the questions about this. He proceeded to display the plan, saying that is the 4  
3 parcels.

4  
5 Ms. Doherty spoke from the audience, saying that Package Pavement itself started in 1951, but  
6 they purchased the property and built the plant there in 1953.

7  
8 Ms. Robbins said there is a lot going on on-site as can be seen on the plan. Mr. Latini said there is  
9 a lot highlighted on the plan that has changed since 1989, which was the last site plan. Ms. Robbins  
10 said she believes what has changed was put in red. Mr. Latini said a lot of the parking was always  
11 there, but it is shown in red anyway. He pointed out where all tractor and tractor trailers park. He  
12 said, when drivers come in, they pull their truck tractors out and park there and showed another  
13 location where it is the same thing. He showed where there is all flatbed parking, which is all along  
14 Route 52.

15  
16 Mr. Eickman asked Mr. Latini if he would be available to entertain this as a site visit for the Board.  
17 He said it would be great if they could actually go out and look at it, and give the members a quick  
18 tour, to see what is going on here. The rest of the Board agreed it would be helpful, and Mr. Latini  
19 stated it was no problem. He said that Matt Rickett and others came out for a full site tour. Mr.  
20 Eickman asked him to get in touch with Ms. Keenan in the Planning Department to give her a  
21 couple dates and times that would work well for him. Then, he said she could reach out to poll the  
22 members of the Board to see how many could get to the site at a given time.

23  
24 Ms. Bledsoe asked what the issues are that need to be addressed on both of these site plans. Ms.  
25 Robbins responded that the main complaint was that the existing site plan did not reflect what was  
26 out there. They were concerned about some of the things found and wanted to make sure they had  
27 the proper permits from the DEC, which she thinks was addressed. They were also making sure

1 the site was operating in a safe manner. Mr. Bryant noted the expansion over Leetown Road over  
2 the years. Mr. Latini asked if it was from his code compliance. Mr. Eickman said, as a result of the  
3 neighbor coming before the Town Board, the Town did send a letter to the DEC, and determined  
4 that they are in compliance with DEC regulations; everything was fine there. He said the concern  
5 is that it appears to be somewhat dangerous for people to be crossing Leetown Road, because  
6 people do fly down Leetown Road. Mr. Latini responded that he would not mind having a  
7 crosswalk. Mr. Eickman advised him that could be the solution to this particular issue Ms.  
8 Bledsoe said the biggest thing is the parking. Mr. Latini said Yes, that is the biggest thing that has  
9 changed. Mr. Campbell said a site visit would be clarification for someone like himself; he would  
10 like to understand the flow and how the traffic works, and maybe to be there when it is at its peak  
11 to see the ebbs and flows of it. He said it is obvious that the operation is safe, it is in compliance  
12 and there are a lot of things that are right and a few minor corrections. He told Mr. Latini it does  
13 not sound like he is not interested in doing the right thing if there are some small corrections. He  
14 replied that it is whatever needs to be done.

15  
16 Mr. Fitzgerald asked if all the truck traffic is restricted to route 52. Mr. Latini said Yes, there is no  
17 truck traffic on Leetown.and 80% of it takes a right out of the plant, onto Route 52. They go down  
18 there and get onto Route 84. There is an occasional that goes left, but most of the trucks that go  
19 out of there are taking a right out. Mr. Fitzgerald asked if there is any vehicle access from the  
20 Package plant to Leetown Road, or is it only to Route 52. Mr. Latini replied No, it is only to Route  
21 52.

22  
23 Mr. Fitzgerald asked if there was any employee parking on the Package plant Mr. Latini replied it  
24 is mostly drivers and mechanics; a couple plant personnel who park there as well.

25  
26 Ms. Robbins questioned what building the employees that park across the street go into mostly to  
27 work; is it all over the place, or mainly one of the buildings. Mr. Latini said it is all over. They go

1 over to the main office, as well as to the plant and at what they call the “white house”, which is  
2 670 Leetown Road; it is the white building there, with only 2 employees now.in that building. Mr.  
3 Fitzgerald requested him to point out the white building on the plan, asking if it had a garage and  
4 office. He pointed out the main office, and showed the locations where they are parking and  
5 walking. He showed where a lot of the office personnel park, saying there is only a certain amount  
6 of parking in front of the main office. He said they are walking to the main office or walking on  
7 the path to get to the plant.

8  
9 Ms. Bledsoe asked the number of staff and Mr. Latini replied that, with Package Pavement,  
10 between the 2, there is about 111. Ms. Bledsoe asked if that included drivers and Mr. Latini replied  
11 it does not include the drivers.

12  
13 Mr. Eickman asked how many trucks went in and out there on a given day and Mr.. Latini replied  
14 that it is hard to say; there are a lot of customer pick-ups and towns coming in to pick up cold  
15 patch, and stuff for the roads. He said there are over 100 when they are busy. A lot of material  
16 goes to the City, Connecticut, Long Island and he said the drivers are doing a lot. The drivers are  
17 doing 2 loads a day, per driver, and they are home every night.

18  
19 Mr. Eickman told Mr. Latini, to move this forward, he reiterated that it would be helpful to take a  
20 look with him at the site and understand what some of the issues are and go from there. Mr. Latini  
21 responded that he is good with that. Mr. Eickman said he thinks any other action can be put off  
22 until after this is done. Ms. Robbins noted that a Public Hearing would be held for the amended  
23 site plan. Attorney Cunningham suggested that circulation be done for Lead Agency under SEQR.  
24 Ms. Robbins agreed, declaring the Board’s intent.

25  
26 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, for the**  
27 **Planning Board’s intent to be Lead Agency for Irish Fields and Package Pavement**  
28 **for the Amended Site Plans. Voted and carried.**

1                    *Mr. Miyoshi stated that he abstained.*  
2

3                    *Mr. Miyoshi stated that his wife works at Package Pavement. Attorney Cunningham advised him*  
4                    *it is beyond an abstention; it is a recusal and whenever this is on, he should step off..*  
5

6                    Mr. Eickman asked if this was in a position to schedule a Public Hearing. Ms. Robbins replied that  
7                    it is not known if the Planning Board will request any changes to the Site Plan. She said right now  
8                    there is an “As Built” and the Planning Board will have to determine whether or not they want a  
9                    crosswalk, or where that crosswalk would be and those kinds of things. Attorney Cunningham  
10                    reiterated it needs review memos. Mr. Eickman said to Mr. Latini that he is in no particular hurry  
11                    to do things and basically the operation is going to operate, regardless of what the Board does. He  
12                    said this will be held off and Ms. Robbins added that it would be nice to have the site visit also.  
13

14                    Mr. Fitzgerald had a couple operational questions. He asked about the operation on a typical day,  
15                    was it just Monday through Friday and what is the approximate time that employees get there. Mr.  
16                    Latini replied that it depends on the time of the year and in wintertime they are a lot slower. When  
17                    they are busy, he said a lot of the plant workers are working 5:00 to 4:00 and they are working half  
18                    days on Saturdays, so 5 to 5 ½ hours on Saturdays. Mr. Fitzgerald said then they are there early,  
19                    before the road peak hours and Mr. Latini said that is Correct. He said that, even now, they come  
20                    in from 9:00 to 5:00 or, if they are not real busy, they leave at 1:30. Ms. Bledsoe asked if that was  
21                    also the office and he replied No, the office is typically more like 7:00 to 4:00 or 8:00 to 4:30,  
22                    depending on one’s start time. He said most office personnel start between 7:00 and 8:00 AM. Ms.  
23                    Bledsoe asked of all 100 are in at the same time and Mr. Latini replied No, it is a lot of office  
24                    personnel and includes the plant employees. If the office employees are added up, he said it is  
25                    maybe a quarter of the total employees that they have. Mr. Fitzgerald questioned if 20-25 of the  
26                    total are office employees and Mr. Latini said it may be more, he would have to break it down, but  
27                    it was probably 30-35. He said a lot of the plant workers carpool together. Mr. Fitzgerald asked if

1 there was driveway access onto Leetown Road for the main office parking, and Mr. Latini replied  
2 that it was Correct. He said there is no access from the plant, but they can walk; there is no drive  
3 access over. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that a field trip would make sense, in terms of the crosswalk and  
4 determining where a crosswalk would go, to be safe. He said at some point the traffic needs to be  
5 put together, even on the site with the pizzeria and deli and there is something in the Code where  
6 there is a certain amount of parking required. He said there is a certain amount of traffic that's  
7 associated with that development, which is separate from his, and that they need to get an  
8 understanding of all this. Mr. Latini said he would break it all down; it is no problem.

9

10 Mr. Rennia said there are 111 employees without the drivers, and he asked if they are independent  
11 contractors, independent drivers, who come in with their own trucks. Mr. Latini replied that they  
12 have both, some are with their own trucks and between this site and another site. At this site, he  
13 said there are 5 of their own trucks. If there is an outside company, they do a pile, they have to  
14 contract with them. He said they have 15 drivers and their trucks are based on his site. He said  
15 most of the other drivers that work for him are independent and they take their trucks home every  
16 night. Mr. Rennia asked him for this to be broken out when the parking calculations were done  
17 and Mr. Latini responded that he would do so.

18

19 Mr. Eickman told Mr. Latini, if there is nothing else this evening, then the Board looks forward to  
20 going to see him at the site in the very near future and they will go from there. Mr. Latini also said  
21 he was looking forward to it.

22

23

24

25 ***DISCUSSION:***

26

27 **6. #2024 – 094 – Stormville Square, 194-198 Route 216. (6657-03-064313, 066295)**

28

1 Applicant is applying to amend the approved site plan and replace the approved storage facility  
2 with a 21,000 sf building comprised of 3,500 sf of restaurant space, 8,750 sf of retail space and  
3 8,750 sf of office space with a retaining wall at the rear of the parcel.  
4

5  
6 *Member Sarah Bledsoe recused herself from participating in the Stormville Square matter and left*  
7 *the room.*  
8

9 Pat Gigliotti, Applicant and Amy Bombardieri, P.E., Day & Stokosa Engineering, P.C., were  
10 present.  
11

12 Ms. Bombardieri came to the podium, saying that this was before the Board again for an Amended  
13 Site Plan. The DEC and Department of Health applications have been put in for the Water and  
14 Wastewater and a SPEDES Permit will be needed for Stormwater. She said the Board has seen  
15 this before. The building is being changed out and they are changing out the use of the proposed  
16 building, going from storage to a mixture of uses; restaurant, etc.  
17

18 Ms. Robbins wanted to give a little background, stating that the site plan was approved for a storage  
19 facility, then got switched to more of a plaza type facility. The original application had that they  
20 were going to connect to sewer & water. She said they are now proposing their own septic and  
21 well. She thinks everything else is staying the same on the application. Ms. Bombardieri responded  
22 that the entrance and parking was shifted for the Stormwater but, other than that everything else is  
23 the same. Mr. Eickman asked if the size of the building is the same and asked if the uses were  
24 intended to be the same as what the Board looked at, i.e.. office, retail and restaurant. Ms.  
25 Bombardieri said Yes, that is the same. Ms. Robbins questioned if the pump station in the corner  
26 would no longer be on the site plan and Ms. Bombardieri replied Yes; they are no longer tying into  
27 the sewer. Mr. Eickman asked her how the rest of the site, in the front of the building had changed,  
28 exactly from what was last proposed. She asked him if he meant between the existing building and  
29 the proposed building area. Mr. Eickman replied Yes, saying the parking flipped, or the  
30 Stormwater and the septic system flipped. She said the parking was on the northern side and now

1 it is on the southern side. Other than that, Ms. Bombardieri said she thinks the traffic movement  
2 through there is the same as what the Board saw previously.

3  
4 Mr. Eickman asked if there are the same number of parking spaces as what was seen before. Pat  
5 Gigliotti spoke from his seat, responding that he thought there were a couple more added when the  
6 parking was moved from the left side of the building to the right side, because the septic has to go  
7 on the left side; there were 5, 6 more because of the way it was laid out. He said his well has been  
8 drilled, tested and everything is under the Board of Health.

9  
10 Mr. Bryant noted there is only one unloading zone in the rear and asked if it is adequate; while  
11 questioning if they know how it is going to be laid out. He asked if it is known who the tenants  
12 will be and if there is potential that an unloading zone will be needed. He asked if this would be in  
13 the front, or were they going to be able to ensure that that's the only spot utilized, regardless of  
14 where the tenant may be located in the structure. Ms. Bombardieri replied that she is basing it off  
15 the building they have now.

16  
17 Mr. Eickman asked Mr. Gigliotti to come to the microphone, which he did. He explained that they  
18 based this on their building at Hopewell Square. He said the one loading zone seems to be ample  
19 and that its about the same square footage, maybe 1,000 sf – 2,000sf. He said there is a lot of room  
20 back there for the loading, unloading and would be completely out of the way. Mr. Bryant told  
21 him basically they will enforce it as it moves along, to make sure that is the spot. Mr. Gigliotti said  
22 there is hatching, signs and everything. Mr. Eickman asked if there were still plans for something  
23 in the corner for the future. Mr. Gigliotti replied that they have it as a pad site, so Yes, but what  
24 the future is, he does not know.

25  
26 Mr. Eickman asked Mr. Gigliotti if he would be able to do it with the current septic and well. He  
27 replied it has been done for that and, if it happens, it happens. He said they did a little more than

1 they had to. Ms. Robbins asked Mr. Gigliotti if he knew the size of the building they were looking  
2 for on the pad site. He replied no, they have not even analyzed it yet. Ms. Robbins said she is  
3 making sure she understood what was said. She told him he assumed then that the pad site would  
4 use the septic that is being constructed now for his project. He replied Yes, Definitely, and that  
5 right now a 6,800-gallon septic system is proposed and he does not think they will ever come close  
6 to that. He said he is basing it on their Hopewell Square, which has 21,000 sf and that 2,400 gallons  
7 a day are used there on their busiest day. He said he is building a big septic system; he has to for  
8 the Board of Health, but he thinks anything anyone wants could be built there. It would not be the  
9 septic, but how the parking lays out for that pad site. He said he does not see anything big there,  
10 and if he can get a building that mimics the left side of what is already there, he does not see much  
11 more than that.

12  
13 Mr. Bryant referred to the wall, saying they came before the Board and got approval to put up the  
14 wall and that was completed. He asked where they are now with the earth-work. Mr. Gigliotti  
15 responded that, basically, it is just the wall there; this site is semi-graded. Mr. Bryant asked if there  
16 was much to bring in take off. Mr. Gigliotti replied, No, he thinks it is actually going to balance  
17 pretty close right now. He said if had to bring a little bit in, probably he would bring in a little bank  
18 run in. He has to actually work the septic system, but he is waiting for the comments. He said they  
19 have had discussions with the Board of Health and designing this the way they want it, but they  
20 have to wait for their comments. He thinks there will not be much on or off and the site is going  
21 to balance.

22  
23 Mr. Eickman recalled that there was just one neighbor that had some concerns about screening,  
24 light and stuff like that. He asked if there had been any other neighbors or had anything else come  
25 up. Mr. Gigliotti replied, saying anything that was approved for the landscaping with the neighbors  
26 has stayed in place and will be taken care of. He said he just has not done it yet.

27

1 Mr. Eickman asked if there was any landscaping that was along the Old Route 52 side that is going  
2 to change at all because the location of the parking is changing. Pointing to the displayed plan, Mr.  
3 Gigliotti said there is landscaping going down the entire side, from the back corner, all the way  
4 past the building and ending at the end of the parking lot. Mr. Eickman questioned if that had  
5 changed at all from the last plan and the gentleman responded that a couple of things might have  
6 been added; he was not sure. Ms. Bombardieri said it is going all the way down the property line,  
7 on the South side, then it is going North, along. Mr. Gigliotti said they added.

8  
9 Mr. Bryant said, as a refresher, he was asking if DOT was closed out, all done and the entrance  
10 closed out. Mr. Gigliotti responded that is basically closed out, the drainage stays the same, the  
11 well has been drilled, tested and they are actually just waiting on the Board of Health now for their  
12 comments and the septic system, then they are all set.

13 Mr. Eickman stated this could be relatively minor, in terms of overall impact, and he thought a  
14 public hearing may not be needed. Ms. Robbins commented that a Resolution is definitely needed,  
15 because they have modified the site plan; there is a newer site plan. Mr. Gigliotti said to draft the  
16 Resolution; the public hearing was already closed out and nothing changed except they are not  
17 doing the sewer, but a septic underground. Ms. Robbins told the Board it is up to them if they are  
18 comfortable with the public comment received. Then, at the next meeting she said the Board would  
19 prepare a Resolution that addresses the latest plans, depending on their decision, and pending the  
20 decision on the Public Hearing.

21  
22 Mr. Eickman looked to the Members asking if they wanted to speak to any concerns and there  
23 were none. He said he would accept a Motion to waive the Public Hearing.

24

25 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Ed Miyoshi, for the Planning**  
26 **Board to waive a Public Hearing for Stormville Square Amended Site Plan.**  
27 **Voted and carried.**  
28

1 Mr. Eickman told Ms. Bombardieri and Mr. Gigliotti that the Board would work on the Final  
2 Approval Resolution and everything for the next meeting, if that worked for them. They replied  
3 that it does work.

4 -----  
5 Mr. Eickman confirmed that this concluded business for the Planning Board this evening.

6  
7  
8 *ADJOURNMENT*

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

12  
13  
14 **Respectfully submitted:**

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