

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

June 16, 2026

Planning Board Chairperson John Eickman called the meeting to order.

CHAIRPERSON COMMENTS:

Members present were John Giovagnoli, Donald Papae, John Eickman, Richard Campbell and Sarah Bledsoe. Member Ed Myoshi was absent.

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

:

**b. Mr. Eickman announced the *Upcoming Meeting Dates* are:
July 21 & August 18, 2026**

c. *Approval of Minutes of Meeting Held: May 19, 2026*

**MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Donald Papae, to
approve the Minutes of Meeting Held May 19, 2026.
Voted and carried. Sarah Bledsoe abstained.**

Town Professionals and Consultants present: Sinead McLoughlin-Parisi, Esq, Town Attorney; Michelle Robbins, AICP-Town Planner and Scott Bryant, Town Engineer.

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

ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING:

1. **#2026 – 112 – TEG Federal Credit Union**, 839 Route 376 (6358-02-939516)

Applicant is applying for site plan approval for a 6,512 sf. 2-story bank in the B3 district.

MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to reopen the Adjourned Public Hearing for TEG Federal Credit Union. Voted and carried unanimously.

Brian Stokosa, Day & Stokosa Engineering, P.C. was present.

Mr. Eickman stated that an email had been received from a resident who lives on Jennifer Drive and indicates opposition to the project because of traffic issues.

Mr. Stokosa proceeded with presenting the updates since this was last before the Board. He said redesigning the stormwater had been discussed, based on the soil tests that they had. This has been resubmitted to the Town Engineer, and it is his understanding that it is under review. He is working with the Board of Health, specific to water supply and septic. There has been review by the Board of Health and a couple of comments remain, which he said are technical in nature. Specific to the (NYS)DOT, he said they have spoken with the applicant, and Colliers Engineering has been engaged to submit for the Highway Work Permit. As talked about at the last meeting, there was going to be a sidewalk installed and a dedication of the sidewalk area in an easement form to the DOT. He said the applicant has signed the paperwork to begin that process, which can take some time, but it was initiated and is going into title now.

There were no questions or comments from the Board Members and Mr. Eickman looked to the Town Professionals for theirs.

1
2 Ms. Robbins noted the easement being dedicated and asked Mr. Stokosa if the sidewalk was
3 being constructed as part of the project. He replied Yes and said that the process takes about 9
4 months with the dedication and all. He said it could be part of the C.O. and that it would not
5 hamper the building construction if they wanted to start early next year but reiterated that they
6 have started the process. Ms. Robbins confirmed with Mr. Stokosa that the sidewalk is 5-Ft wide.
7

8 Mr. Eickman asked if the applicant had completed the design for the monument sign and Mr.
9 Stokosa replied that he did not know. He inquired of a gentleman in the audience who replied
10 No, not yet.
11

12 Mr. Eickman asked if there were any comments or questions from the public and there were no
13 responses. He told the Members he would accept a Motion to close the Public Hearing.
14
15

16 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to close the**
17 **Public Hearing for TEG Federal Credit Union. Voted and carried unanimously.**
18
19

20 Mr. Eickman said he would proceed with the Negative Declaration and he summarized the
21 reading of the document, as follows:
22

23 **Name of Action: TEG Federal Credit Union, dated June 16, 2026**
24

25 **REASONS SUPPORTING THIS DETERMINATION:**
26

27 (It will not result in any significant fiscal impacts.

- 28 1. It will not generate a significant amount of noise or emission levels.
29 2. It will not affect rare or endangered species of animal or plant, or habitat of such species.
30 3. It will not result in any impacts to historic or archeological resources.
31 4. It will not result in any impacts related to hazardous materials.

5. It will not result in a significant effect on air, water quality or ambient noise levels for adjoining areas.
6. It will not be subjected to unacceptable risk of flooding or major geological hazards.
7. It will not have a substantial aesthetic affect.
8. It will not involve adversely affect any surface water or groundwater.
9. It will not allow for improper uses within specified zoning districts.
10. It will not result in adverse cumulative impacts.
11. It will not result in adverse growth-inducing impacts.
12. It will not conflict with the Town's Comprehensive Plan.

In conclusion, no significant potential impacts were identified as a result of the Proposed Action.

MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Donald Papae to adopt the Negative Declaration for TEG Federal Credit Union. Voted and carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION OF SITE PLAN APPROVAL

NAME OF SITE PLAN: TEG Federal Credit Union
NAME OF APPLICANT: TEG Federal Credit Union
LOCATION: 839 Route 376
GRID NO: 6358-02-939516

Resolution Offered by Planning Board Member: John Eickman

WHEREAS, the applicant submitted an application for site plan approval for a TEG Bank at 839 Route 376; and

WHEREAS, the proposed 6,512 sf bank and associated improvements including a 2-lane drive-up ATM, 23 parking spaces, drainage and utility infrastructure, lighting, sidewalk and landscaping would be located on a 1.05-acre parcel in the B-3 zoning district; and

WHEREAS, the applicant is providing a 10-foot-wide sidewalk easement with a five-foot wide concrete sidewalk across the site's Route 376 frontage; and

WHEREAS, the proposed commercial building was reviewed and approved by the ARC on May 7th, 2026; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to SEQRA:

The proposed project is an Unlisted action under SEQRA; and

On February 27th, 2026, the Applicant submitted an Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) to the Town of East Fishkill; and

On March 17th, 2026, the Town of East Fishkill declared its Intent to be Lead Agency; and

On March 18th, 2026, the Town of East Fishkill Planning Board circulated the EAF and Notice of Intent to be Lead Agency to all Involved Agencies and a coordinated review was undertaken; and

On May 19th, 2026, the Town of East Fishkill Planning Board declared itself Lead Agency; and

On June 16th, 2026, the Planning Board adopted a Negative Declaration on the application; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was opened on May 19th, 2026, and closed on June 16th, 2026; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby grants site plan approval for the above project as represented on a map entitled "TEG Federal Credit Union" prepared by Day & Stokosa Engineering, P.C., dated 1/20/26 and last revised 5/29/26 subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval from the Dutchess County Board of Health.
2. Obtaining a water connection permit from the Town Water Department.
3. The applicant shall obtain a temporary highway work permit from NYSDOT for the entrance and sidewalk. To provide mitigation for the potential queuing on Route 376, a retiming of the traffic signal at Route 376 and Hillside Lake Road shall be included as part of the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) Highway Work Permit. The Highway Work Permit must be closed out prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy.
4. To mitigate the intersection sight distance limitation, an intersection ahead warning sign (MUTCD Sign No. W2-1) is proposed to be installed in advance of the intersection to warn drivers approaching from the north via the right turn channelized movement of the approaching intersection. The approximate location of this sign is identified on sightline diagram contained in Appendix A of the project Traffic Impact Study (TIS). This has been reviewed and approved by NYSDOT and will be part of the Highway Work Permit for the Project.
5. Revise the concrete sidewalk label arrow on the site plan to point to the sidewalk along the Route 376 frontage.

6. Satisfactory resolution of any outstanding comments from the Rennia Engineering Design, PLLC review letter dated 6/12/26.
7. Satisfactory resolution of any outstanding comments from Hudson Valley Engineering Associates (HVEA) review letter dated 6/15/26.
8. Satisfactory resolution of any NYSDEC/NYSDOT conditions/contingent upon NYSDOT approval.
9. No tree removal between March 31st and November 1st to avoid impacts to Indiana bats.
10. An escrow payment in the amount of \$5,000 for an environmental monitor during construction.
11. The applicant is advised that the conditions of this approval must be satisfied and the site plan drawing signed by the Planning Board Chairman and any required State, County and Town permits obtained prior to beginning any related work on the subject property.
12. All required easements shall be filed with the County Clerk prior to issuance of building permits. Easements shall be prepared and properly executed between the owner of the subject property, future purchasers and adjacent property owners, where applicable. These easements and agreements shall be submitted to the Town Attorney and Town Engineer for review prior to being recorded to ensure consistency with the purpose and intent of the approval. In addition, notes shall be added to the site plan listing these and all other easements on the property.

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

Resolution Seconded by Planning Board Member: Rich Campbell

The votes were as follows:

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

Discussion held before the Members voted.

Mr. Campbell questioned if the sidewalk needed to be included in this Resolution and Ms. Robbins replied that it is included; it is shown on the site plan. She explained that she had asked it be made a little clearer with the arrow, as shown in condition #5 of the Resolution.

Mr. Stokosa stated that the signing of the site plan is contingent upon the issuance of a Highway Work Permit. He asked if the timing of the issuance of the Highway Work Permit could be adjusted, because the dedication needs to happen first. He again said that it can take from 9 months to a year to actually formally dedicate the sidewalk easement area to the (NYS)DOT. Ms. Robbins told him that Brendan Fitzgerald wanted her to reiterate to him that, as part of the Highway, to get timing of the signal, which could also be part of the Highway Work Permit; there are a lot of things going in. Mr. Stokosa agreed it is a lot of things going in and said that is why he submitted for the Highway Work Permit, to show the intent that they are going through the process. But, he said, just not holding the site plan signing to the issuance of that Permit. Mr. Bryant asked Mr. Stokosa if he was suggesting to start the work before getting any Highway Work Permit. He replied that a temporary entrance Permit would be given. He asked if the signing of the site plan could be tied to the Temporary Permit. Mr. Bryant told him they have to have access. Ms. Robbins questioned the Temporary Permit. Mr. Bryant said it is the entrance. Mr. Stokosa said they would not be able to touch the sidewalk, or the entrance, formally with concrete, until the Highway Permit is issued.

Accordingly, the Resolution condition #3 was amended to reflect that the applicant would obtain a Temporary Highway Work Permit from the state entrance, with another condition added.

Mr. Bryant advised that the specs for the sidewalk would need to be submitted. Mr. Stokosa replied that they are okay with the specs; it is the dedication which they want first, and then they will issue the Highway Work Permit. He said there had been a discussion this day and they will

1 only issues the Temporary. He said the dedication is cleaner; it is the chain of command at the
2 (NYS)DOT. Mr. Bryant questioned there would be the building on their right and Mr. Stokosa
3 said it would be dedicated with the easement.

4
5
6 ***ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING:***
7

8
9 2. #2026 – 114 – **225 Robinson**, 225 Robinson Ln. (6358-02-887660)
10

11 Applicant is applying for site plan approval and Special Permit for a contractor & commercial
12 vehicle storage yard in a R-1 B-3 zone.

13
14 Brian Stokosa, Day & Stokosa Engineering, P.C. was present.
15

16 **MOTION made by John Giavignolli, seconded by Donald Papae, to reopen the**
17 **Adjourned Public Hearing for 225 ROBINSON. Voted and carried.**

18 **Richard Campbell did not vote. He recused himself and, as he left the meeting,**
19 **Mr. Eickman thanked him, saying Mr. Campbell would continue to recuse**
20 **himself for this particular item.**
21

22 Mr. Stokosa displayed the plan and stated that this proposal was for a Special Permit for a
23 contractor's yard, on an existing farm located along Robinson Lane, at Route 376. This project
24 was before the Planning Board last month, with a lot of public input regarding the proposal. In
25 listening to what the public had to say, and working with the Town Consultants, he said they are
26 being sensitive that this is in a residential zone, close to a business zone. He said they tried to
27 push the development of the storage area to the lower southern corner of the property. Originally
28 it was just behind the existing barn in the center of the property. He wanted to give an update this
29 evening and said he was trying to work with the Consultants and Planning Board to provide some
30 more buffer between the residential properties and locate the area more toward the business zone.

1 In doing this, he said some documentation was submitted by the applicant with regard to traffic
2 trip-counts into and out of the site, which was reviewed by HVEA. Based upon their output and
3 the analysis given to them, he said they did not feel a traffic impact statement was required for
4 what is being proposed on this property. Additionally, he said there was an advocate present to
5 speak after he was done, on behalf of the applicant. He said if the Board had any additional
6 questions, they could ask. He explained that they were trying to move the center area closer to the
7 business zone to give more of a buffer, for more green space between this and the residences.
8 Another thing that was touched on in the submission is that, in the DEC's eyes, this is going to
9 be considered a contractor's yard. As part of that, he said the bio retention, dry swales, runoff
10 mitigation is going to be the treatment for this area. Hydrodynamic separators are also being
11 looked into for cleaning of the runoff associated with the millings area, where the storage yard is.
12 He said it is in the process; a concept has been submitted to the Town, but it will be further
13 refined as they go through the process. They are trying to work with the property, the landowners,
14 and move this use closer to the business area. There will be a further submission he said, and this
15 is in an Adjourned Public Hearing, but he wanted to give the Board an update on where this is
16 going.

17
18 Mr. Eickman asked the public, in case there was anyone present for the matter, if they understood
19 where the proposal is now with regard the parking of vehicles and everything.

20
21 Someone spoke from the public stating that she thought it was on the back portion of the
22 property. She said she was confused looking at the plan and asked if the proposal was now for
23 the wash station to be moved to the back portion, closer to the business, or is it going to be kept
24 where it is. Mr. Stokosa responded that the existing barn, where the wash station is, has a water
25 service to it. He said it will be kept in the same general area; the area that is moving is the 2.7-
26 acre enclosed area.

1
2 John Nemeth came to the podium, stating he was speaking for the Metzgers, whom he has known
3 for 20+ years in his capacity as a developer and he has become a friend. Mr. Nemeth said he
4 worked for AVR for 17 years in this area and that they have built a lot of things. He said he was
5 sure a lot of people don't know much about Glenn Metzger, but he wanted to share with the
6 Board. He said he went for a ride with him this weekend to the farm and he saw Mr. Metzger as a
7 farmer first; not a construction guy. He said he has a view and a vision for this farm, to farm it. It
8 just happens that he is going to store his equipment there, because that is the only way he can pay
9 for it. He explained the way Mr. Metzger has it in his mind to build the berms, plant trees, take
10 the trees that are on the site and transplant them out to the front. He said he did not have any idea
11 how big the beautiful piece of property was. Mr. Nemeth hopes the Board takes that into
12 consideration, as well as the people present who live next to it. Pointing to the displayed plan, he
13 said the new proposal is great that they came up with, with the Town, from the conversations and
14 watching videos from the last meeting, listening to everybody's comments. He noted that the
15 driveway lights will go out straight ahead, which should not impact anyone. He said it would be
16 amazing to clean the farm up and bring it back to its normal glory. If one goes up to the
17 Metzger's farm now, he said it is history there; it is spotless, the fences are mended after anyone
18 drives through them and they are usually fixed within a week. In order to do this, he said it costs
19 a lot of money. He is hoping Mr. Metzger is able to get this property and farm it and said it is Mr.
20 Metzger who has been planting the corn there for the past 5 years, which people probably do not
21 know, and with the permission of the owner. He said the owners, who live in Massapequa, came
22 to Mr. Metzger saying they wanted to get out; they have nothing to do with this area. He said Mr.
23 Metzger and his family are pillars in the community. Looking to the Board, he asked that the
24 Metzgers be given the consideration, saying they are standup people. He said they listen and hear
25 what people say and when it rains one gets the wash for 15 minutes; the rainwater, clean up; the
26 engineer knows how everything works, he does his job and makes sure it is done. He said the

1 DEC has oversight on all of it. He said any comments that anyone has, let them know and they
2 will address them; the Metzgers are great people. He concluded, saying thank you.

3
4 Mr. Eickman asked Mr. Stokosa if he had additional information to be given, such as the number
5 of pieces of equipment that would be allowed, number of vehicles that will be part of the traffic
6 patterns, and hours of operation. Mr. Stokosa replied that, when the update was submitted to the
7 Board, the idea was to have just center access coming into the area. He said this is when it was
8 rectangular and obviously the concept is going to be the same here. There will be a double gated
9 entrance and, as with any storage area, the vehicles will be backed in, with a center road section
10 where one can drive around and access each of the sides of the storage area. With regard to the
11 hours of operation, he said it is a contractors' yard. Employees would come in, in the morning,
12 park their car there, take a piece of equipment and go out. He believes that the vehicle trips were
13 submitted and, on a max day, worst case was 189 trips per day combined, coming in and out, AM
14 and PM, but they do not anticipate this. He said that is with every truck moving, and they had to
15 give a worst case, He has averaged that there is probably going to be 33% less than that. The
16 information from that was submitted to HVEA, it was reviewed and they agreed with the traffic
17 numbers. It does not cause a traffic impact statement to be developed. As far as the equipment is
18 concerned, he said it would be a combination of equipment and maybe storage material. This is if
19 they may have pieces of pipe, catch basins, traffic cones, or anything that would normally be
20 associated with construction. In talking with John and Glenn Metzger, he said they are maybe
21 looking at 50 vehicles possible in that area. The construction equipment will be delineated in a
22 row, backed in and with a center access point.

23
24 Mr. Bryant said one thing missed was 189 trips a day, but the Town's traffic data says 4,000. Mr.
25 Stokosa said this is a fraction of that at peak, with every piece of equipment moving, employees
26 coming in and out He thinks this is in a threshold that does not warrant additional analysis. He

1 said these are trucks that travel these existing roadways and are located in East Fishkill already.
2 They are on the roads, using this intersection and corridor.

3
4 There were no further comments from the Board Members. Mr. Bryant noted that he is working
5 with them through the stormwater and infrastructure compliance, with the DEC regulations and
6 that it will take a little time to do that engineering. Mr. Stokosa said there is a whole chapter in
7 the DEC stormwater manual that they have to follow. It gives them certain design criteria that
8 they have to follow, there are certain groundwater conditions, elevations and soil tests that they
9 have to do. He said it is all part of the SEQRA SWPPP that is done for all of their projects. He
10 said it is a little enhanced because it is vehicle storage based, so there is an additional layer of
11 treatment and protection that they follow. Typically, it is done with a separation device where,
12 when the water comes in, it comes into a Hydrodynamic separator where it spins around and
13 separates out any kind of water or dirt. There are certain maintenance procedures to keep it
14 cleaned out. He said those will be sized and there are formulas that allow for them to come up
15 with that math. For protection of the groundwater and aquifer, these treatment areas have aligners
16 in them, to give an extra layer of protection. There are certain types of techniques that he said can
17 be used and a combination of all 3 will probably be used, which will be incorporated into a future
18 submission. Since they are tinkering with the site and the layout of it, he said the practices will be
19 modified accordingly.

20
21 Mr. Eickman asked if they had a chance to redesign the screening, now that it was moved. Mr.
22 Stokosa replied that he thinks, because they are moving closer to Route 376, there will be a
23 buffer row there, as it is kind of moving it away from Robinson Lane, and more into the corner
24 and they are probably more focused on the 376 side, and possibly behind the school, where they
25 originally talked about a couple of trees and some of the later brush areas between this property
26 and the school.

1

2 Before opening up comments to the public, Mr. Eickman wanted to acknowledge an email
3 received from Theresa Cordero of 254 Robinson Lane, which he said was similar to a former one
4 she had sent, but that it was a little briefer. He summarized reading the email, as follows:

5 “Given the significant concerns surrounding traffic, noise, pollution, water quality and
6 community impact, she respectively asked that the Planning Board carefully consider whether
7 this proposal is appropriate for this location.”

8 She asked that this be entered into the public records and Mr. Eickman said a complete copy of
9 her email would be in the Planning Department for review by anyone who wants to see it.

10

11 Mr. Eickman then opened up the meeting to anyone from the public who wished to speak for or
12 against the project.

13

14 Linda Hassett, 205 Robinson Lane, came to the podium stating that she had lived in the Town for
15 about 25 years. She said she walks from her home on Robinson Lane almost every day, past the
16 farm and Metzger’s farm where the cows are by the firehouse, and all the way back. She said she
17 has been thinking about this and all the conversations going on and appreciates that some of the
18 concerns have been addressed or being worked on. However, she had not heard anything that
19 assured her that her property values won’t be impacted, that there will not be an issue with noise,
20 quality of life, the dirt, traffic and she said she is not feeling comfortable with this. In her yard,
21 which she said is about ½ mile away from the school, she can hear when the kids at the school
22 are outside playing sports. She voiced concern about the number of vehicles early in the morning
23 and throughout the day, maybe 189 trips on a busy day, but 33% less on other days and said it
24 will be noticeable. She said she is not hearing enough and that this does not seem like a good
25 idea to her and feels that there are so many issues not addressed. There are the moving things

1 back a bit, but she said she would appreciate this being thoroughly looked at, ask the hard
2 questions, and why this should be supported, as citizens, and she would like more information.

3
4 Doug Welch, 9 Summerlin Court, spoke from the public, asking Mr. Stokosa to explain the
5 separator process for purification, and in what scenario this would be used. Mr. Stokosa replied
6 that separators are used typically in dense commercial projects and, at any time there is a gas
7 station or commercial site. He explained that the water is collected, enters into a catch basin. Mr.
8 Welch asked if it was collected from groundwater and Mr. Stokosa replied that it is surface water
9 and this is millings based. The water will travel to a low spot, which is a catch basin, probably a
10 series of catch basins, where they are connected via pipe. That pipe leads to a circular
11 Hydrodynamic separator, which is all done by gravity. He said it basically filters the water down,
12 contaminants go to one side of the chamber, clean water exits the chamber and would probably
13 go into dry soil, which is then vegetated with different grasses, plantings. He said this is all
14 specified by the DEC and there is a certain type of organic material like topsoil that this goes
15 into. This is part of a stormwater manual that he said the applicant will be putting together for
16 this. He said this will go through the sizing, the design criteria, the soil testing, A pre-post
17 drainage analysis will be done, and it is made sure that there is no excess runoff leaving the
18 property boundary. Within that, he said there is a table for maintenance of these structures. There
19 is a yearly, bi-yearly maintenance that is all spelled out within the document. He said the
20 document gets reviewed by the Town fully, and it has to comply with DEC standards. Mr. Welch
21 said they gave a permanent one and he would have to find out the scenario used. He asked if this
22 was taking into consideration any vehicle that might be contaminated, have leaky fuel, or
23 whatever is in this particular basin already. Mr. Stokosa replied that it is a commercial site. Mr.
24 Welch questioned if the whole area was a wash basin and Mr. Stokosa replied that it is not a
25 wash basin, but the whole area runoff will be conveyed to a catch basin and to a treatment
26 device; it is similar to a parking lot. Mr. Welch questioned if the whole area would be impervious

1 to leaks into the soil. Mr. Stokosa replied No, millings are being put down, it is recycled asphalt
2 and, as soon as there is a 90-92 degree day, the ground turns hard, water hits that, it goes to a low
3 point, then it goes into the catch basin.

4
5 Mr. Welch said he would like to speak and Mr. Eickman requested that Mr. Welch have a
6 microphone. He came to the podium, saying he lived directly across from the proposed site. He
7 said he is gun-shy with all of this as far as contamination, because he used to live on Shenandoah
8 Road. He said most people who had lived in the Town for quite a while would be familiar with
9 the well contamination at IBM, which affected more than 60 wells. There were procedures in
10 place for safeguards, and they had a lot of money to back it up. He said that they didn't do
11 anything until the leaks were determined and carcinogens and toxins were in the wells, with
12 people already suffering. He said this is his driving cause and he is even closer, being across the
13 street from this project. He said accidents happen and questioned if this property was ever perc
14 tested for development. He thinks there were several times when they tried to build developments
15 there. He said he does not know and would not venture to say why they were denied, but now
16 they are stuck with the equipment depot, and things happen with the fuel, the toxins and
17 whatever they are carrying. He said he is afraid; he lives there and can get all the assurance that
18 the EPA is on top of it, but that is a flood zone. He said he has watched that whole area go
19 underwater and his neighbor pumps out water with every major storm. He sees a 4-inch hose
20 gushing out thousands of gallons of water from their basement. His next-door neighbor has
21 flooding problems and cannot put anything in his basement. He is saying that the whole area is a
22 flood area and they can have whatever they want on top of the soil, but once the water is on top
23 of the soil and it is a flood, he is questioning where the water is going. He said it is not going into
24 the catch basin; it is going into the drinking water, and it will find its easiest way in there.

1 Otto Mark, 274 Robinson Lane came to the podium stating that he lives across from where the
2 storage building is proposed to be built. He said, like Mr. Welch, this is the only water that he
3 has been using to drink and is not only concerned about the water, but the spill of oil and the
4 value of his property. He said if he was going to be buying property there and sees the storage,
5 the traffic and noise that is happening, he would walk away and probably go to another place,
6 which bothers him. He is bothered that every morning between 4:00 and 5:00 he has to hear the
7 noise of the pickup truck getting the garbage, but he understands that someone is needed to pick
8 up the garbage, which he has gotten used to. He stated that hearing about this new proposal has
9 actually brought a lot of concern to him.

10
11 The next one to speak at the podium was Kristen Melendez, 29 Summerlin Court. She said she
12 was responsible for the very long letter at the last meeting and had a few things to say this
13 evening. She said she appreciated the time and consideration as she did so. Ms. Melendez wanted
14 to share a little of her background, saying she was trained in geosciences, environmental science
15 and policy. She has done environmental compliance for over 20 years in the private and public
16 sector and stated everything she has submitted is, of course, her own opinion, and not
17 representation of any company that she may – or may not work for. She wanted to state for the
18 record that she did not receive any response to the comments she submitted; she had requested a
19 written response but did not receive anything. At the last meeting it was said that the contractor
20 would come back and answer all of the questions and the contractor did come back, but with new
21 design plans and all the questions were Not answered. She wanted to review some of the
22 questions that she still had. She thinks someone else brought it up this evening, that this is the
23 crux in that this particular proposal is not compatible for this local area. She said Yes, it is a
24 farm, yes, it has businesses, school land residential, but it is a construction storage yard, for
25 construction vehicles. That is not part of the picture in her mind, not part of it for her kids or any
26 part of it for a residential setting where schools and businesses interact with a construction yard

1 depot. She reiterated that it is not compatible with the area. She has a huge concern with the
2 vehicle washing area and she understands that the contractor is proposing the storage yard.
3 However, she is questioning why a vehicle washing area is needed in addition to the contractor
4 storage facility. If a facility is needed in order to generate money to build up the farm, she is
5 asking why a washing station would have to be part of that. She asked if it could not be included,
6 She thinks a lot of people's concerns would be remedied if there was no washing station on site.
7 She said this is a huge way to spread invasive species, it causes further potential contamination
8 when the vehicles are being sprayed down, whether it is mud, oil, hydraulic oil, grease, whatever
9 is being put in, and said she is not sure the oil separator was really separating it. She is
10 questioning why these things are being proposed and should they be approved with the
11 compatibility of the area. She added that what was proposed originally was the storage yard.
12

13 Ms. Melendez had some additional questions about more protection against flooding and did not
14 see any in the plans. She reviewed the updated plans briefly and did not see anything about a
15 Floodplain Development Permit being applied for. Her understanding is that a Development
16 Permit is required before beginning any construction or development within a FEMA designated
17 special flood hazard area. She said that the oil separator(s), if put in, she is thinking there are 2 on
18 the plan now, need to be anchored to prevent flotation, or any kind of lateral movement. She did
19 not see any notes about this on the plan. She also wanted to bring to the people's attention that
20 there are now 2 oil separators on the plan, whether that is intentional or not.
21

22 Ms. Melendez wanted to talk about the wetlands, stating there is a recent law, 6 NYS Code of
23 Rules and Regulations 664, which was annulled in April, due to an administrative error. She said
24 the intent of that law is that any wetland, no matter what the size, would be a Class 1 Wetland if
25 it had the following characteristics: one of the characteristics that is relevant to this is if the
26 wetland is an area designated as a floodway on the digital flood insurance rate map. With that in

1 mind, she said all of the land on this property would be a Class 1 Wetland if that rule was still in
2 effect today, but it was annulled. Mr. Bryant advised while there are wetlands on the property, it
3 is not the entire property. Ms. Melendez said she looked at the map. Mr. Bryant said there are
4 waterbodies outside. Ms. Melendez brought her map notes to Mr. Bryant to review this together.
5 Ms. Melendez returned to the podium, stating she apologized for the error. She said a wetland
6 would require a 100 Ft buffer under that law, which is not currently in effect. She added that the
7 state of New York is saying they are moving forward and want to protect the freshwater
8 wetlands. With that in mind, she asked that the Town take this into consideration with this
9 project, if it moves forward, and to require a 100-Ft buffer in the areas that are within that
10 floodplain around the wetlands. She said the chances are that the law will be seen again soon.

11
12 Ms. Melendez also has a concern with the proposed oil separators and said she brought up this
13 concern at the last meeting, in her last letter. She said it looks like the OWS-5 and the OWS-10
14 and 20 are also appearing on the design plans and the systems do not appear to be equipped with
15 alarm systems. From what she could tell, she said the “5” and “10” were made of concrete, which
16 she said is a huge concern, due to the breakdown that happens with a concrete system in that it
17 deteriorates so quickly. She highly recommends that the Town take a look at a fiberglass, or other
18 plastic options, and that be required, as well as an alarm system. She said she had noted in her
19 last letter that many oil separators are constructed complete with an alarm system, and she
20 provided a link for a Highland oil separator that does meet those specifications. She added that it
21 did not appear that this had been taken into consideration. Mr. Bryant advised her that there are
22 discussions that are being had and she replied that was great and thanked him. She said she did
23 see there was a schedule for the design flow for the capacity of the oil separators. However, she
24 did not see a design flow for total water usage planned at the wash station, which she said is what
25 she requested, but it may have been unclear in the last memo. She is trying to figure out how
26 many gallons per day is expected for us at the facility from this 1 well. She said she is still a huge

1 opponent of the wash station, if there has to be one, to be connected to the public water supply
2 for less impact on the local community, with the draw-down. She said Summerlin Plaza has a
3 public water system. She questioned why this could not be hooked up to Summerlin Plaza and
4 why this could not be required as part of this process.

5
6 Ms. Melendez referred to the Hydrological study, saying someone else talked about that as well,
7 so she would not go into too much detail regarding this. She suggested finding out where the
8 water is going, how fast it is going and said if that is seen, maybe it could be hooked up in
9 another way, other than using that water supply.

10
11 Ms. Melendez continued, saying that she did not see anything regarding landmark status
12 consideration for the property, or any updated design plans regarding impacts to the 2 sections of
13 the parcel that were reserved for recreational use in the front of the property (Robinson Lane).

14
15 She had other comments regarding the new plans. She requested that the Town place restrictions
16 on the size and number of vehicles allowed. She saw that the driveway is being built to withstand
17 80,000-pound vehicles, which she said is consistent with a semi-truck, tractor trailer with a full
18 payload. She asked if this is what they can expect being driven in and out of Robinson Lane and
19 if there is even enough space for a turn radius for that type of equipment on the site. She did not
20 see anything in the plans regarding idling. Her understanding is that New York State requires no
21 more than 5 minutes of idling for vehicles greater than 8,500 pounds and she is asking how this
22 would be enforced on the site; what is the accountability. She is requesting that the Town
23 specifically restrict future stockpiling of stone, aggregate, salt and any other commodity material
24 in the storage area. If it is a vehicle storage area, she suggested requesting that it be a vehicle
25 storage area. She is requesting that the Town specifically restrict and disallow fuel storage in this
26 area. She also had a question on whether or not the Town was certain that the proposed activity

1 qualifies for 6 CRR NY 617.5 State Environmental Quality, SEQR Type II action quality review.
2 She asked which action, specifically, was the contractor claiming under this rule. She is
3 requesting use of wildlife friendly erosion control measures and that, currently, hay bales and
4 plastic controls are being proposed. She recommends referring to US Fish and Wildlife services,
5 for example, coir logs and stakes and said the Town should limit and restrict the use of plastic
6 fencing, as it prevents movement of local wildlife She noted that, at the last meeting, several
7 folks had mentioned that there is so much wildlife in this area. She loves where she has lived on
8 Summerlin Court for the past 10 years. She said she had lived in the boonies in New Hampshire
9 and there is more wildlife where she now lives; there is so much richness here. She said hay bales
10 are known to rot quickly and do not hold up in heavy rainfall, and they also contain seeds from
11 invasives and allow them to infiltrate on the site and locally, to the neighbors.

12
13 Ms. Melendez voiced her concern about the local bus routes and would like to limit impacts to
14 the students, the children, and said Summerlin Court is full of kids. She is asking for
15 reconsideration of the timing. She understands it is a contractor vehicle yard but is questioning if
16 vehicles really need to be moving out before 8:30; that is when the kids get on the bus and
17 everyone is going up and down the streets, when all the traffic is. She requested if it was at all
18 possible, to move that timing.

19
20 Ms. Melendez questioned why an Environmental Assessment had not been conducted, and why
21 an Environmental Baseline Survey had not been proposed. She said this would protect both the
22 contractor, as well as give the residents some peace of mind and a sense of saying “this is where
23 we were before Metzger got here, and Metzger can prove after that they didn’t do anything; it is
24 how it was beforehand.” She thinks this makes sense as part of a real estate transaction and is
25 something fairly commonly accomplished.

1 Ms. Melendez apologized that her comments were all over the place, but she had not had a
2 chance to consolidate them.

3
4 She continued, saying there was a note on the design plans about inspections of the oil
5 separators, which is actually saying “every 3 to 6 months” on the design plans currently. Her
6 understanding per the industry standards is “weekly to monthly, with increased inspections after
7 significant rainfall. She would like the design plans to reflect that or reflect a more frequent
8 inspection rate. She has questions about why the effluent sampling from the oil separators is not
9 included in the notes, nor the specs for construction. She reiterated that there are now 2 oil-water
10 separators on the site and she is questioning why the additional separator has been proposed at
11 the storage yard location. She said she had it in her last letter and still feels strongly about the oil-
12 water separator discharge and vehicles being washed, which she does not believe should be
13 getting done. She said they should be connected to an MS4, or other wastewater treatment system
14 – to protect their drinking water, soil, and those around them. She referred to the stormwater
15 inspections and site logbook and the SWPPP, and she requests that the contractor identify the
16 location of all of these on the design plans, where they will be accessible to the public. She said
17 they do say they will be accessible to the public, but she would like to know, on the design plans,
18 where that would be, so they can be easily accessed.

19
20 Ms. Melendez is requesting that the applicant provide how the snow removal will be handled for
21 the driveway and the oil-water separator areas, as well as requesting that salt usage is specifically
22 excluded in this area. She said she had a question regarding erosion control measures and
23 whether or not they will be implemented all along the proposed roadway, perimeter and
24 disturbance area. She said it did not appear that way on the design plans. In regard to the
25 construction waste management plan, she said she had a question as to whether it was tailored
26 specifically to the proposed project. It appears as boiler plate language and, for example, she said

1 #4 talks about concrete wash out facilities, chemicals, paints, solvents and fertilizers, whereas
2 previously, on page 1 states “no hazmat usage. She said, therefore, the design plans conflict
3 within. She said #3 prohibits the use of largescale detergents only and there should be a provision
4 that prohibits all detergents of any kind. She said if they go to surface water, it directly
5 contaminates the groundwater. If it goes through the oil-water separator, she said it will render it
6 useless, essentially, by letting everything pass through.

7
8 Ms. Melendez stated that she wanted the Town to consider, as part o this process, a “No-Action”
9 alternative, in addition to the proposed construction area and all of the other possibilities,
10 whether there is – or is not a wash station. She said a No-Action Alternative is also very much
11 worth consideration, as well as asking the contractor for other alternatives. She said the
12 constituents, the people have concerns and asked, “what else can be done”. She said “let’s
13 brainstorm” and figure out what can be done that will help improve the property, but not be such
14 a large risk to everyone.

15
16 Ms. Melendez wanted to end with an excerpt from the East Fishkill Stormwater Management
17 page, which she feels is really relevant, and read as follows:

18 “Water is one of our most valuable resources, not only our drinking water, but also our
19 natural resources such as water bodies, watersheds, floodplains and wetlands. It is very important
20 that various pollutants are prevented and protected from discharging into our water resources
21 through stormwater runoff. Clean water is essential to the entire community and for the
22 protection of our environment and wildlife.”

23
24 She said this is our Town and this is what they are saying they are going to do and she wants
25 help, so they are able to do that. She thanked the Board and professionals for their time and
26 patience and consideration, and looked to Mr. Bryant, saying she appreciated his correction.

1
2 The next speaker from the public to come to the podium was Steve Hoffman, a resident of 23
3 Summerlin Court and he said he had lived there for about 13 years. He said his wife runs a
4 licensed daycare out of their property. He stated that he appreciated his fellow neighbors and
5 residents, who he said were much smarter than him, and with much more detailed concerns than
6 him. He said he wanted to take a bird's eye view, step back. When he first got the letter stating
7 that the meeting was going to happen, he said he was under the assumption that the property was
8 going to be repurposed. He said he came to the meeting, which started with the problem of being
9 this property was an eyesore. He said there is a fence that has not been repaired, and there is a
10 trailer on the property in disrepair. The solution was, in order to beautify the property again, there
11 would be a contractor yard storage of commercial vehicles. He said this is how he heard it, he
12 was not saying those were the exact words spoken, but as a resident hearing what the potential is
13 to fix a potential problem. He is not saying it is that simple, but, if this is the solution to beautify
14 the property, he thinks the solution has a lot more concerns than a dilapidated fence and trailer.
15 He said it is a farm and initially he heard it was a storage facility. Now it is 189 trips per day, for
16 50 vehicles and 189 trips might be excessive, but that is the request. He said if it is granted, they
17 have every right to use it for 189 trips per day. The request from 6:00 AM to 8:00 AM, Monday
18 through Saturday might be diminished, saying it won't happen, but if that is the request and that
19 is what is granted, he said he could be waking up at 6:00 AM on a Saturday, hearing contractor
20 vehicles going to the property. His concern and question is, is the solution of making this a
21 storage yard, with a wash facility and trucks coming in and out of the property, 14 hours a day, 6
22 days a week, and up to 189 times a day, and all the environmental concerns, which he
23 acknowledged everyone did a great job, and was not going to go over. His concern and questions
24 are, is this the best solution if the problem initially was that there was a fence in disrepair, a
25 trailer, so therefore, the property is an eyesore. He said he thought Ms. Melendez alluded to this
26 at the end, the problem is there are a lot of other different solutions that don't cause as many

1 concerns, environmentally and otherwise, He said he lives there and there may have been traffic
2 studies done, but just to leave Summerlin Court to get out onto Robinson Lane, at a certain time
3 o day, with the school traffic, and the bus stop, which is right on the corner. He said some buses
4 come down Summerlin Court because there are a few bus stops there on Summerlin Court. He
5 said the parents that come to his wife's daycare, drop off in the morning and afternoon, and now
6 potentially 50 vehicles are entering and exiting that exit on Robinson Lane at the same time.
7 Pollution is also a concern for him. He said his main goal is to step back; he is a big picture kind
8 of person and does not get into as many details because he does not have the education in this
9 area to do that. If the problem is that the property is in disrepair, he said he would like it to be a
10 nice, working farm again and this is the solution. He thinks his neighbors have expressed a
11 number of concerns to say maybe the solution will cause more problems or are they better off
12 with just the need to fix the property, then this is the solution, which might create additional
13 problems. He said he thinks he has made his point, which is for everyone to just step back and
14 take a look at this, asking if this is really the best thing for the community. He noted that there are
15 2 schools within 7/10 of a mile; there are residences, businesses, and he is questioning if this
16 really is the place for a commercial property. He asked this to be considered; to reject the
17 proposal and he thanked everyone for their time and consideration.

18
19 There were no further comments from the public and Mr. Eickman asked Mr. Stokosa if he
20 wanted to make any comments. Mr. Stokosa responded he would adjust the comments, and
21 update the plan based on information received this evening, and the new design concept that they
22 put forward. He said they would work with the Town Consultants too, to add additional
23 information. Mr. Eickman said there is still quite a bit of work to be done and told Mr. Stokosa
24 he would see him next month.

1 **MOTION made by Sarah Bledsoe, seconded by Donald Papae, to further adjourn**
2 **the Public Hearing for 225 ROBINSON to July 21, 2026. Voted and carried**
3 **unanimously.**

4
5 Ms. Robbins wanted to clarify the SEQR matter and advised the Board that that this had been
6 circulated for Lead Agency. She said the matter is not a Type II Action, but an Unlisted Action
7 She said this means they are going through the SEQR review and, prior to any site plan approval,
8 they would need to receive a Negative Declaration from the Planning Board. Ms. Robbins
9 advised the Members that the Planning Board had not declared itself as Lead Agency.

10
11 **MOTION made by Donald Papae, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, for the Planning**
12 **Board to declare itself Lead Agency for 225 ROBINSON. Voted and carried**
13 **unanimously.**

14
15
16 **The matter having concluded and Richard Campbell returned to his place, seated to act**
17 **with the other Board Members.**

18
19
20 ***DISCUSSION:***

21
22 **3 #2026 – 116 – Alpine Industries, 1343 Route 82 (6558-01-029784)**

23
24 Applicant is applying for amended site plan and a special permit to construct a 1040 sf. building
25 for storage, retail and office space in a the B3 mixed use district.

26
27 Brian Stokosa, Day & Stokosa Engineering, P.C. was present.

28
29 Mr. Stokosa displayed the amended site plan, stating that this was before the Board last month to
30 introduce the project. They had the round of review with the Board of Health; it is under review,
31 they have comments back and are in the process of modifying that. He said this is an existing
32 landscaping business, along Route 82 and a detached second building is proposed along the front.

1 Some additional parking has been added and delineation of some of the material storage spaces.
2 Comments were received from the Fire Department, and he said they will make it loop around,
3 instead of doing the “crazy T”.; he thinks there is enough room to do that. Other than that, he
4 said submission to the ARC is needed and, between scheduling and the applicant, they did not
5 have a chance to make this month’s meeting. There is a meeting tomorrow and he said they will
6 be submitting the updated architectural plan. They are going to try and look at lighting and
7 landscaping. Ms. Robbins said, at the last meeting, it was discussed that the Planning Board
8 would go out to look at the site. Mr. Stokosa asked if the Board had a chance to do so or if they
9 had any input. Mr. Eickman stated he had looked at it, and asked Mr. Stokosa what changes he
10 had planned, in terms of lighting and landscaping. He replied that, at this stage, it is not open to
11 the public during the day, and even at night; it is just the employees. There is a possibility that he
12 could have retail in the future. He said this site used to be “Alpine” landscape supply, so it has
13 some existing pines that were planted 20 years ago. He said some of those pines are either dead,
14 or in rough shape, so the applicant wanted to just fill in those voids, going around the site. An
15 existing chain link fence already borders the property, and the owner would like just to remove
16 the deceased trees and replant in kind, with the same species that are in front of the property. He
17 said there is a pretty heavy landscape in the front of the property that shields a lot of the area in
18 the back. With the same concept, he said if there is a tree in disrepair, it will just be taken out and
19 another one put in. He did not think anything beyond this would be required above and beyond,
20 but they wanted to defer to the Board and, if they have a chance to get out to the site, they will
21 amend as required.

22
23 Mr. Eickman asked if anything was being done to beautify the front of the property and would
24 the old tractor sit in the front. He said it is an interesting artifact that needs prettying up and Mr.
25 Stokosa told him he would pass that along. Ms. Robbins questioned where the tractor is and Mr.

1 Stokosa replied that it is on the right side of the entrance. Mr. Eickman said it can't be missed; it
2 is nice, and not painted John Deere green, but it is rusted.

3
4 There were no comments or questions from the Board members, and Mr. Eickman looked to the
5 Town Professionals. Ms. Robbins said that at the last meeting the Board had declared its intent to
6 be Lead Agency and she believed the Board needed to declare Lead Agency for the outline. If the
7 Board feels this is ready, she said it would also, potentially, schedule a Public Hearing. Mr.
8 Eickman noted to Mr. Stokosa that he was going to the ARC tomorrow and he replied that this
9 would be submitted.

10
11 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Donald Papae, for the Board to**
12 **declare itself Lead Agency for Alpine Industries. Voted and carried unanimously.**
13

14 Mr. Eickman asked Mr. Stokosa if he would be ready for a Public Hearing July 21st and he
15 replied Yes.

16
17 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Donald Papae, for a Public**
18 **Hearing to be held on July 21, 2026 for Alpine Industries. Voted and carried**
19 **unanimously.**
20

21 Mr. Stokosa thanked the Board.
22
23
24
25
26
27

DISCUSSION:

4 #2026 – 117 – Hudson Properties, 1557-1559 Route 82 (6559-03-211252)

Applicant is applying for a subdivision and amended site plan of an existing commercial lot.

Brian Stokosa, Day & Stokosa Engineering, P.C. was present.

Mr. Stokosa said he was present for the same thing as the last project. This property has existing lighting and landscaping. He suggested that the Board make a trip to the site to see where it needed to be filled in. He said it has some pretty good screening along the Taconic, from when the Florys went in there and re-did the building in the back. It has matured now, and he said there is some matured landscaping around the front of the building.

Ms. Robbins said she could maybe go to the site this coming Thursday and Mr. Stokosa offered to be there. Ms. Robbins said this is a subdivision and site plan; it is a very minor site plan because they are not really modifying anything on the site, per se. They are showing some land bank parking and potentially some landscaping, and it is a subdivision subject to SEQR. She said the Board needed to declare its intent to be Lead Agency and to circulate.

MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by John Giovagnoli, for the Board to declare its intent to be Lead Agency for Hudson Properties. Voted and carried unanimously.

Looking to Ms. Robbins, Mr. Eickman asked if this was something that would require a Public Hearing or was that something that could be decided. Ms. Robbins responded Yes, it will require a Public Hearing because of the subdivision. She advised Mr. Stokosa that he would need to

1 circulate prior to the next meeting and the Board can declare Lead Agency next week. Ms.
2 Robbins said there is time to circulate, if within 4 days, and Mr. Eickman asked Mr. Stokosa if he
3 would be ready for the Public Hearing, to which he responded Yes.

4
5
6 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Donald Papae, for a Public**
7 **Hearing to be held on July 21, 2026 for Hudson Properties. Voted and carried**
8 **unanimously.**
9

10
11
12 ***DISCUSSION:***
13

14 **THIS MATTER WAS ON THE AGENDA, BUT WAS NOT HEARD AT THE**
15 **MEETING.**
16

17 5 #2026 – 118 – **Orlando Electric**, 1055 Route 82 (6458-04-636046)
18 Applicant is applying for a site plan approval for a 120'X60' (7200sf) warehouse/shop space and
19 two offices.
20

21
22
23
24 ***DISCUSSION:***

25 6. #2026 – 119 – **1486 Route 82**, 1486 Route 82 (6559-03-136067)
26
27 Applicant is applying for a special permit and site plan approval to convert a pre- existing non-
28 conforming 2 story building into town house apartments and commercial use.
29

30 Peter Scott, PW Scott Engineering and Architecture P.C, 3871 Route 6, Brewster, was present
31 for the matter. He did not have a flash drive but displayed the plan on the easel.
32

1 Mr. Scott said this was being applied under the MURSP Special Permit requirements 19441 and
2 basically, outline the permits as commercial, multi-family and an R-1 Zone, of which this is in.
3 He said the building coverage could be up to 50%, lot coverage 75% and the yards are reduced to
4 25 front, 25 rear 25 side, and 50 rear. He said the proposal for the project is an 1800 SF multi-use
5 building in the front and behind it, (5) 25 x 25 units, integrated into the existing fish market
6 building, which is a 2-stoy concrete building, with a stepped foundation. He said a complete site
7 plan was provided to the Board. Stormwater Management initials were septic, architecturals, and
8 he would talk about what is on the plan. Something that is permitted in the MURSP Special
9 Permit Plan. In addition, a site plan which depicted no commercial and 100% multi-family was
10 put together, maintained within the existing fish market building, which he said he would talk
11 about as well. The access point is established on the site plan, and he said there is the entrance
12 way off of the property, on the south side of the building. On the north side of the building, he
13 said pavement is being eliminated to reduce the impervious count on the site and to help with the
14 stormwater management. A new septic system is being put in that location and there is an
15 existing septic system, partially in the rear of the property, but he said it consists of 1 or 2 septic
16 fields, which do not meet Code. The proposal is for the whole northern section of the property all
17 lawn, extending up to the building itself. Some plantings are proposed in the front and on the
18 side, in terms of buffer plants and he said there is some buffering on the south side as well, next
19 to an adjacent, existing driveway, which extends to the property located behind this parcel. The
20 parcel is 1.04 acres in size and to mitigate parking in the view shed of the rear property owner, he
21 said they are adding an array of trees, arborvitaes, to form a buffer on the rear of the property
22 itself. He said they are conforming with everything on the property, and, in fact, the particular
23 site plan shows 2 extra parking spaces. He wanted to talk about the comments received, one of
24 which was about relocating the dumpster so it is not in front of the parking space and he said that
25 a parking space will probably be eliminated. For fire trucks access, he said a center core aisle is
26 proposed, 24 Ft wide, to service the proposed parking spaces. Access is being provided through a

1 reinforced soil area, so trucks and fire trucks can access the driveway if they have to provide
2 access to the building. Parking was eliminated on the north side. Since the driveway is located on
3 their property, he said the proposal is for an emergency access loop, having the driveway as
4 center core, as access to the property itself. He said there are some comments on that, and they
5 can easily be adjusted, because there is excess parking.

6
7 Mr. Scott continued, saying that the building itself is an enhancement of what is there, and the
8 enhancement consists of a new front façade, which is 1,800 Sf of commercial use; the tenant is to
9 be evaluated at a later date as this moves towards completion. He said the 2-story high units
10 themselves all have separate entrances. He pointed to the lower level, open floor plan, with a
11 staircase to the second floor, and entrance to the bedroom and closet, which he said is all very
12 open and generous in size. The common theme of the development of the building with multiple
13 units continues to the north side of the building and there are multiple little areas where they have
14 outdoor decks and a sliding door. He said all the units have access to the large rear area, which is
15 described as the septic area and will be a big, long grassy area to serve the needs of the occupants
16 of the building. He said about 50% of the coverage is the building and about 50% coverage is the
17 development, so this is way under development criteria for the particular box, within the MURSP
18 zone. On the front sheet of the drawing, he said it depicts the respective drawings, and again said
19 this is far below the threshold. While this project was being designed, he said it was decided to
20 look at the input from the Town's planner, with the potential option was to develop residential
21 units within the building itself. He said that would mean eliminating the 1,800 Sf use in front of
22 the property, and replacing that with 6 units, in a linear fashion, which is the shape of the existing
23 building. He said a plan was prepared, and submitted, which shows this type of development.

24
25 Mr. Scott described the advantages of this type of development. One is that they are further back
26 from the road with this option. Significantly less parking is needed, because it is 1 ½ parking

1 spaces per unit. He said they would propose 3 spaces for parking for each unit, it would go with
2 the theme, and there is still extra parking with this proposal. He said it makes emergency access
3 much easier, because not that much parking is needed in the field and, with regard to the
4 dumpster, there is plenty of room. They are basically only developing the side of the parking that
5 faces the building, and the side that is away from the building, on the other side of the aisle. He
6 said it is really overflow parking, extra parking, for potential users of the site. In the commercial
7 concept, he said there is extra space on that one as well, because the commercial use is not being
8 used on weekends, so there is a lot of overflow and phase parking with that option. He said this
9 one is all one use, and significantly more or less development, more open space, and more
10 plantings can be added if so required, with this particular concept. This concept also maintains
11 the same storm management, the same concept of collection treatment on the property for
12 infiltration. He showed the area where it is all gravel, saying the site is basically a gravel bank,
13 extending all the way up to the rear of the property. He said the soils are fantastic for infiltration
14 and there is no problem with this at all on the property, very easy to work with as well.

15
16 Mr. Scott continued, saying there are 2 options to look at with the Planning Board, and they are
17 proposing it because the residential would work for them as well; it is less development, and they
18 also have the commercial plan working – both site plans were made to work for this property.
19 The only difference is the architectural that would not have a commercial building in the front.
20 The last unit would be decorated appropriately for a residential building, but there would be no
21 windows facing Route 82 He said they would still have the same front and rear design of the
22 units architectural, because they do not think there is any significant improvement if they allow
23 people to look at the street out of their unit; it would still be a front and rear access sort of design.

24
25 Mr. Scott continued, saying that a SWPPP, stormwater management, had been submitted with
26 the test data, and there were some minor comments from the Town consultants, dealing mostly

1 with the Fire Marshall concern of where the dumpster was being put, and where the emergency
2 access is. He said this is very easy to achieve because they have extra capacity for parking on
3 both plans.

4
5 Mr. Scott offered to answer any questions and get direction from the Board as to what they would
6 like to look at, in terms of residential – or residential and commercial.

7
8 Ms. Robbins wanted to give a bit of background, for those who may not have figured out that this
9 is the former fish market building. She said the Special Permit was put in place specifically to
10 help property owners with underutilized commercial buildings that are located historically in a
11 residential district. She said it can put one in a difficult situation if the commercial use goes out
12 and the commercial use hasn't been used for years. It sits there, gets dilapidated and affects the
13 residential properties around it because of the fact that the building isn't being used, or it is
14 underutilized. She said the Special Permit does give some discretion, like the Planning Board.
15 One of the things it allows one to do, is consider mixed use buildings, but also consider a
16 building, if it is so decided, to allow it to be completely residential. She advised Mr. Scott that
17 this was something he may consider, if wanting to wave the commercial requirement. She also
18 told him he needed to consider the context of the neighborhood, the look of the building, and all
19 those types of things. She said it sounded like there is not a tenant yet for the potential space, but
20 it could be medical and there are some limitations in the Special Permit with regard to how many
21 employees there can be in the building. Ms. Robbins thinks it limits it to 2 if it is a doctor's or
22 medical; 2 doctors and 4 staff. It is limited because the idea of the Special Permit was not to
23 allow an expansive commercial use, because it is a residential district. She said it would be a very
24 limited amount of commercial activity that could be considered at the site and she thinks this
25 should be contemplated. It is the location, neighbors, distance between the neighbors on the site.
26 Ms. Robbins asked Mr. Scott about the commercial application and the driveway going in; was it

1 different than the existing driveway, or was he using the existing curb cut. Mr. Scott replied that
2 the driveway has a continuous asphalt apron curb cut and he said they are restricting it
3 significantly with this proposal. He said it is reduced by 100 Ft with the width of the driveway.
4

5 Ms. Robbins advised Mr. Scott that this is also a tight site, and, obviously, will need Board of
6 Health approval for the septic. She noted that the locations of the wells and septic will need to be
7 considered, and there are the properties around them too. She said she did not know if he had
8 already looked into that but said there are constraints on the site as to where things can be
9 located, when trying to design within those parameters. She said the Planning Board may want to
10 consider this when thinking about how they want this site to be used.
11

12 Mr. Campbell stated this site has not been used for anything and the building is dilapidated; he
13 asked Mr. Scott if his intention was to eradicate it. He asked if any engineering had been done on
14 the existing structure, the foundation, because it seems to be, at this point, that the building is
15 dilapidated to the point where there is infiltration of weather. Mr. Scott replied that they had done
16 a couple of things. First, the site plan was fixed, because there was a pipeline which had basically
17 eroded significantly, and it was discharging water on the street. They had prepared everything
18 already and the stormwater is functioning now as it is supposed to and that was Step 1. He said
19 Step 2 was a complete analysis of the building and prepared plans to the Building Department, to
20 stabilize the building, the structure was looked at, the foundation. They are proposing to
21 eliminate the front 25 Ft of the building and replacing that. He said a plan has been submitted for
22 this. At this point in time, he said there was no point in moving forward until it was discovered
23 what they are doing with this Board. Drawings have been filed, stamped and sealed by structural
24 engineers to stabilize it and make it work. In terms of depending which way they go with the
25 project, he said if this goes with the residential, they would be working with the footprint of the
26 existing building, which is the least amount of impact to the site. It would be very easy at that

1 point to solve the building size because the building was designed to the footprint. The units are
2 front to back footprints, and he said he said the only thing they probably would be doing is
3 rebuilding the structure. The sloped roof would be replaced because they would like to make it a
4 gable roof, if they can, pitched front to back with a ridge in the middle. The first 25 to 28 Ft of
5 the foundation has to be repaired, because it is a block wall that has a failure in 2 locations.

6
7 Mr. Campbell asked if the engineers' report was part of the plans the Board is looking at. Ms.
8 Robins wanted to take this a step back, stating that the intent of the Special Permit was to allow
9 buildings to be used, because of the concerns that there were existing buildings that were non-
10 conforming in use. They wanted to have people reuse them and not necessarily take them down
11 all the way and re-construct something that would not be allowed by zoning. She said this was
12 the idea and intent behind the Special Permit and told the Members that this is something to keep
13 in the back of their minds. With regards to the foundation, she referred this to Mr. Bryant and he
14 stated that would be under the Building Department and the application for the actual Permi; it is
15 little premature to get into, and whether or not what was submitted is sufficient or not; they are
16 there yet, and the premise is that they have to use the existing building. Mr. Campbell said, for
17 the record, that this building is pe-existing, non-conforming and Ms. Robbins added that was
18 correct.

19
20 Mr. Eickman asked Mr. Scott if he was using a portion of the existing building and he replied
21 Yes. Mr. Eickman asked if he was using the foundation that sits there for the apartments. Mr.
22 Scott replied that it is a step foundation that was designed around everything Anything to do with
23 the foundation, he said, has met the criteria. The same steps exist; everything is the same in that
24 regard. In terms of structure, he said, to be very candid, they designed a way to solve all the
25 structural problems on the building. However, he said, it might be more cost-effective to just

1 rebuild the building, but keep the same footprint and foundation, as much as possible, which
2 would be ideal for them.

3
4 Mr. Eickman referred to the 6 Townhouse apartment plan, asking if this exists on the same
5 footprint as the 5 apartments on the commercial and apartments plan, and therefore they are
6 smaller, he assumes. Mr. Scott replied that the only difference n the 2 site plans is that there is a
7 little stub that is extended to the north; this all fits in the footprint, but it added to the north, while
8 this building is exactly in the footprints of the existing building. Mr. Campbell said then Plan A
9 exceeds the footprint, and Plan B stays inside of it. Mr. Scott said the ordinance states the
10 residential has to be an existing building, but the commercial does not. That is how the ordinance
11 reads. He said they could take an existing building and put all the residential they want but can
12 add commercial to it. He said, with the Special Permit, they utilized that option for Plan “A “,
13 which is fully compliant with the setbacks and coverage. Then, he said they are showing all the
14 advantages if they just do the residential, there would be less development on the site. If a
15 commercial component is being added to the building, he said it cannot be 25 x 25; they would
16 never get a tent. He said they picked 1,800 Sf, which is the minimum that can be had, for some
17 sort of commercial use. What they prefer at this point in time is that they probably want to go
18 with the residential; it is a lot less impact, more open space, and has a lot of advantages to it. He
19 said they would not have to be concerned with commercial people, their working hours, etc. on
20 the site. He said both options were shown here to show what the optional scopes could be and, of
21 course, let the Board select which is more preferred. He said, again, that this is in an R-1 Zone.

22
23 Mr. Bryant questioned if there was room to turn around a firetruck; he heard this was doing away
24 with blacktop on the one side, so there're won't be a loop. He asked if there was a turnaround for
25 fire trucks and garbage trucks. Mr. Scott responded that a firetruck would try and utilize the
26 adjacent driveway since there is frontage; he said there is no easement. Mr. Bryant asked him

1 when he says “adjacent”, does he mean it is not on this site. Mr. Scott replied it is not his
2 property, but there is a regulation, a State Code, that allows firetrucks access to all streets and
3 driveways in a Town. Mr. Bryant asked if the trucks would have to go on the neighbor’s property
4 in response to a 911 call or something. While showing it on the plan, Mr. Scott replied it is just
5 direct access, but to leave goes right back to the neighbor. Instead of backing around the street,
6 there is a loop cross. Mr. Bryant asked about the garbage truck and Mr. Scott replied only if there
7 is a turn; they have a pull-off. He said that is feasible without a plan. Mr. Bryant deferred to the
8 Fire Department.

9
10 Mr. Palin told Mr. Scott, once they see the plans, from what he is saying, his concern is the
11 emergency exit being safe. He said he could show him a plan with unobstructed access off the
12 property. The second part is in the ground; the driveway has to support a 75,000 lb. vehicle. Mr.
13 Scott told him he can give the rating on it; it is used all the time. Mr. Palin has concerns about the
14 maintenance in the wintertime and not only the emergency exit, but the driveway. He said those
15 are some thoughts he has and there will be more official comments when he sees it. Mr. Scott
16 said there never was a loop around the building in the past. Mr. Bryant stated that there were also
17 never 6 apartments either and Mr. Scott agreed. He said they were working on an option because,
18 basically, if there is a road around the building, then there is no building left; it would be a
19 parking lot, with a building in the middle of it. He said they are trying to work out a compromise,
20 to make this work. In other municipalities that he has worked with, the firetrucks are allowed to
21 back up onto the road because there is enough security that, after the fire is over, they are allowed
22 in other cities to back the trucks off the property onto the highway. Mr. Palin expressed his
23 concern is not after the incident, but during the incident when the apparatus is able to get in and
24 out of there. He said there is no public water there and seeing a business has a water supply
25 across the street. If they are able to run the tankers across the street, and switch the motions, in
26 and out easily in the parking lot, and around is better. If there is a fire and recues have to be made

1 off the back of the building, he said doing it with the ladder is much quicker than carrying 25, 24,
2 35 Ft ladder all around the building to reach the upper floors. Mr. Scott told Mr. Palin that the
3 DOT doesn't like it, but he could give a stub off the highway, on the other side of the building,
4 and drive in there, a pull-off on the north side of the building. Mr. Palin said they would have to
5 look at that. Mr. Scott told him they are flexible, and he is not sure they would ever get water
6 from across the street; that is a long shot. He said he could do an ISO count on this and determine
7 the fire tank size, and an underground fire tank could be done, if they have to.

8
9 Mr. Campbell asked the square feet for either plan, starting with the one that is all residential,
10 and Mr. Scott replied that it is a 3,800 Sf footprint, times 2 stories.

11
12 Ms. Robbins asked Mr. Scott to describe the size of the apartments and asked if the units were 2
13 floors. Mr. Scott replied, Yes, the Town Houses, stacked, because there has to be a separate
14 entrance and exit for each unit and that is what will be shown on the plan. Ms. Robbins asked if
15 there would be a mix of 1 and 2 bedrooms or all 2 bedrooms. She also asked the general size of
16 the apartments. Mr. Scott replied first that that they are 1,000 Sf, then said 500. He said they are
17 1 or 2 bedrooms, depending on how they go with the selection of what type of project the Board
18 wants, going forward. He said, if they get rid of the commercial, they are saving 4,400 gallons
19 per day, which is the minimum for a doctor's office. He said they can take the 400 gallons and, at
20 110 gallons per bedroom, per day, and make some of those units potentially 2 or 3 of them, could
21 be 3 bedrooms. He said there is enough square footage and that is why he is bringing up the
22 options early, because everything is tied into that as this moves forward. It was designed both
23 ways with the site plans, with both septic, drainage, for the Board to see the ramifications of
24 making that selection, he said.

1 Mr. Campbell confirmed each unit is 2 stories Mr. Scott said they could never get the Fire
2 Code to work with a Type 5 building, having them stacked; the building would be taken down in
3 a heartbeat.

4
5 Ms. Bledsoe asked if the Special Permit procedure applied the same if there was not the
6 commercial space. Ms. Robbins said the Board would have to leave the requirement or
7 commercial. She said the reason for that is because it is residential, single-family zoning. The
8 deteriorated properties were commercial at one point, and the Town tried to create a method for
9 people who were stuck with properties that were just deteriorating and not being redeveloped
10 because they couldn't redevelop in any way. It was to give them somewhat of a re-use
11 opportunity. She encouraged the Board Members to read through the mixed-use Special Permit
12 and the intent of it, to give an idea of where the Town is going with it.

13
14 Mr. Campbell stated, then the best use for the applicant and the Town would be the residential,
15 complete residential? Ms. Robbins replied, telling the Board that she thinks that is something
16 they need to consider. She said it is pretty residential there, it is surrounded by residential, and
17 she does not know how the neighbors may feel about another commercial use there. She thinks
18 parking could become an issue with any sort of commercial use that happens. Mr. Campbell told
19 Mr. Scott his comment before was that the applicant would prefer the residential use. Mr. Scott
20 said it would solve a lot of problems with the Fire Department, and it basically seems to function
21 better. One thing about planning wise, which he said is important to realize, is he pointed out
22 where, in the north there's a house, but there is an open field in the south, and houses behind the
23 driveway. He said they could push all the parking the to the south side and he showed where
24 there could be a 100% green buffer between the existing building and the property line. They did
25 basically improve the life of the existing house to the north, which he also pointed out, Mr.
26 Campbell asked him about the space between the actual back of the building to the property line,

1 not to the house; he knows it is very narrow. Mr. Scott looked at his dimensions and said it was
2 about 60 Ft. Mr. Campbell asked if there was any existing buffer there now or was it just
3 overgrowth. Mr. Scott pointed out where there is a pine tree that he said was falling apart. The
4 back of the property he said is basically brush and various components of past work. Mr.
5 Eickman asked if it was possible to do some screening though, to screen that house. Mr. Scott
6 showed where a boxwood buffer was put, along the area where the house is to buffer that. He
7 said trees cannot be put in the septic area; they have to be 10 Ft away from a septic area with
8 trees. He said they do terrible things when they go into the septic field itself. A solid, 10 Ft
9 buffer, in compliance with the regs, is planned along the property line to sort of buffer that. Mr.
10 Campbell asked what about a fence and Mr. Scott replied there would not be any problem with a
11 fence, but he hates putting fences in, saying they are pretty ugly. He pointed out the area where
12 little porches, 10 Ft wide are seen, ungraded, with no railing around them. The porches are being
13 set so they are less than 24 inches above grade. He said a railing is not needed and it is sort of a
14 step down, onto a lawn area. He is trying to make this as simple and as innocuous as possible, in
15 terms of development and is focusing on a grass buffer area. Mr. Campbell told him he is not just
16 referring to the site, but it would also be a bit of a buffer to people who will be back there, and
17 they will enjoy the apartment, which they rightfully can do. He said there are all those people
18 who would be out in the back, whatever it would be, a party. Mr. Scott said he does not want to
19 do a chain link fence. Mr. Campbell said he is talking about something that would be more
20 conducive, to protect the neighbors' same enjoyment of their property. Mr. Scott asked about 5
21 Ft, maybe 4 Ft., he said he would show a fence, and the options but said, as an architect, he does
22 not like fences. He added that he is open to any suggestions the Board may have and said the goal
23 of this whole process was to try to "bring this back from the dead". He said they started by fixing
24 the site work, then the structural work; now they have a site plan and whatever improvements
25 anyone can think of here, he said they are more than happy to entertain that.

26

1 Mr. Scott continued, saying that they had tried to contact the people across the street, the private
2 water service, but he is not sure how they will make out with fire flows; this wasn't really
3 designed for fire flows. He said that is why they may do a tank on this property, because it is the
4 only way to make it work really.

5
6 Mr. Eickman asked Mr. Scott if he wanted to know this evening if the Board is amendable to one
7 plan or the other. He replied that he did not want to put anyone on the spot, decision-wise, but if
8 they wanted to make a decision, he would love to hear it. Or, he said, it is something that could
9 be done through the mail, email, or whatever. Mr. Eickman told him he thinks he will see the
10 Board is willing to work with him to get this redeveloped, because it has been such an eyesore
11 for so long. He added he thinks both of the plans are interesting and he, as one, would be
12 amendable to the All-Residential plan, for all the reasons Mr. Scott has stated. He told him, it
13 looks attractive to him, as the architect, and the applicant, and he thinks it is something that
14 would be a little more attractive, as well, to the surrounding, residential neighborhood. Mr.
15 Eickman turned to the other Board Members for any opinions they may want to voice. Mr. Papae
16 stated that he agrees; he thinks this should be residential. Mr. Campbell said he goes with the
17 residential, with the protections of the neighbors, as he had lightly discussed. He said he would,
18 obviously, like to see how the façade plays out against Route 82 and that right now it faces it, as
19 opposed to having to look at the side of the building. He said he does not know of plans for the
20 entrance that looks more inviting from the front. Personally, he feels that the residential use
21 would be best suited for that area, and he thinks everyone would love to see the building
22 resurrected, based on what the Boad is being shown. Mr. Scott said they would like to take ethe
23 roof off the building and make it more decorative; right now, it is a flat plate, and they are
24 looking to pitch it further toward the north. He would like to make it more of a satisfying
25 architectural façade. He said the new roof was shown in the architectural plans and he will

1 provide new plans. He pointed out the new roof, shown with the dormers, that break it up. He
2 said the whole front has been redone in some manner, like a house.

3
4 Ms. Robbins asked what the changes do to the square footage; does it increase that. Mr. Scott
5 replied No, the gable roof is not tall enough to constitute that and the ridge is under 7 ft. 6 high; it
6 doesn't meet the building Code. It was questioned if the building would be the same height, or
7 the same height as the existing structure. Mr. Scott replied the building is smaller than the
8 existing structure; it has to be a little taller. He said this is because the roof flat, at a 1% slope.
9 They are going to increase the height by about under 6 Ft

10
11 Ms. Robbins told the Board that this is a proposal for 6 units, and she thinks the density needs to
12 be considered, to consider the use and the potential changes that may have to occur with the
13 building when determining this; there is time to think about it. Also, considering the
14 neighborhood compatibility with the use of the site, she said this is a tight site. She told the
15 Board they are all the things that should be weighed and considered if they have not seen the site
16 yet.

17
18 Mr. Campbell asked if the ARC would weigh in on this and Ms. Robbins replied that they would
19 have to look at the architectural, Yes. She said the original intent was that the building would be
20 reused and there is a little bit of a conundrum here because it is not certain how much of the
21 original building can be reused at this point. She said this would have to be factored into
22 consideration. Mr. Eickman asked when that would be determined and Ms. Robbins replied that
23 it is supposed to be reused completely. The idea was not to allow a building to be taken down
24 and build a whole family building, rather than reuse in a way that someone gets an economic
25 benefit from the property without having to modify it really.

1 Mr. Bryant said if the architect puts his stamp on it and it gets submitted, it either gets comments
2 or is approved, comments are on the structures, and he is going to respond to those comments.
3 He said ultimately, he is going to put a stamp on the structure, and he thinks that is definitely
4 represented. Mr. Scott stated that he is an architect for both and right now the building is built
5 with lumber sizes, especially on the roof, which doesn't meet the Building Code; they are 2 x 6
6 and can't be used anyway. He said a plan was provided to the Building Department and he tried
7 to sister it up with a lot of lumber, but it is easier to just replace it and do it the right way.

8
9 Mr. Eickman told the Board, even though they all know this area, he thinks it would be useful to
10 do a site visit with Mr. Scott. He told hm maybe he could describe this in real time, within the
11 front of property how everything lays out. He said they can take a look at the neighborhood and
12 the adjacent properties, and so forth. Mr. Scott said they had cleaned out the entire inside of the
13 building and there is no debris in it. The concern was about fire problems; it is cleaned, gutted
14 and rooms cleaned throughout.

15
16 Mr. Campbell asked how this exists with the Building Department today. He asked if it was
17 condemned, does it have Building Code violations. Mr. Bryant said they need an engineer's
18 letter, they need to come forward, which they are, and it would be in some kind of holding,
19 waiting to see how this goes. Mr. Campbell asked if there were any open Building Code
20 violations right now and Mr. Bryant said he thinks the only thing that shows with the technicality
21 is that the demo expired and was not renewed.

22
23 Mr. Scott said the owners of the property could not attend this evening and they want to move
24 this along. He said his firm was retained to make it happen. He was present to see whatever is
25 needed and will take care of it. He can remodel for the next meeting, put the fence on the site

1 plan, have it all in 3D, and get all the bells and whistles. The front will be done as well and he
2 said they would move it along.

3
4 Ms. Bledsoe asked if there was a list of potential permitted commercial uses of what could
5 possibly go in there – or could not go in there., that most professionals use. Ms. Robbins replied
6 “Yes, there is a list” and she proceeded to read the list it: employees professional office and
7 limited to 4 employees. Ms. Bledsoe said then there would be no daycare and Ms.. Robbins
8 replied Yes and continued reading the list: Low Density, Low traffic generator. Home office,
9 general offices limited to 4 employees, private practice medical or dental office, is limited to no
10 more than 2 medical practitioners and 2 staff members. Mr. Campbell said this is limited by the
11 square footage and they could add on for commercial. Ms. Bledsoe asked the alternative if the
12 Special Permit is not granted and Ms. Robbins replied it is 1 home. Ms. Bledsoe said then it is 1
13 single family house; they would need to tear down, rip out foundations, not using anything
14 existing. Ms. Robbins said that would be; it is an acre and Ms. Bledsoe said it would not meet the
15 setbacks. She said the house would be microscopic because it wouldn’t meet the setbacks; its is
16 so narrow Mr. Scott said it would be pretty small and it is in an R-1 Zone. He thinks the setbacks
17 are 30. Ms. Bledsoe said it is the narrowest part of the lot. Mr. Scott said the lot parallels the
18 building shape; it is a little wide in the front, but it narrows out in the back. Ms. Bledsoe asked
19 the approximate width and Mr. Scott replied that it is about 140 Ft frontage and a little over 110
20 Ft in the rear. Ms. Bledsoe said there is 50 Ft to build something. Mr. Scott thinks the best use
21 for all is trying. The concept of this Special Permit kind of makes sense, and this is like the
22 poster child for it. He thinks if everyone could work together, which they would love to do, this
23 could be brought back to make a nice element in the Town. He reiterated that he is open to any
24 comments, suggestions, to make this a better place, because they want it to be a showcase, and
25 not an empty building on the side of the road.

1 Mr. Eickman advised Mr. Scott to work with Jackie Keenan in the Planning Office, and she
2 would try to herd everyone together on a date that might work for him, for a site visit.

3
4 Mr. Scott thanked the Board.

5
6 Ms. Robbins asked if the Board wanted to declare its intent for Lead Agency and Mr. Eickman
7 replied he thought that could be done. She said they would need to circulate.

8
9 Ms. Bledsoe asked about the next step and where do they go from here. Ms. Robbins replied that
10 it is a Special Permit and there would need to be a Public Hearing on the Site Plan. At this point,
11 she said, they need to be given some feedback about where they are going to take the project.
12 Some of the parameters need to be understood. She asked Mr. Scott if he had gone through some
13 of it with the health department and he replied that all the testing had been done for it and they
14 have one more. He said the testing toward the front of the property was for commercial-
15 residential and no holes were punched in the existing pavement. The next step with the health
16 department would be to add some additional holes where the pavement needs to be removed.

17
18 Mr. Campbell asked about the entrance onto Route 82 and Ms. Robbins said this would need to
19 be circulated to the DOT, and the DOT will have to determine if they are going to have any
20 requirements or require any changes. She said the curb cut will potentially be changed, so they
21 will weigh in on something.

22
23 Ms. Bledsoe questioned if this Board needed to decide which plan it supports, informally. Ms.
24 Robbins replied that the only way this can be done as All Residential is if the Planning Board
25 makes it a requirement for the commercial, which she said is in the Special Permit, that the
26 Board has the discretion to do that.

1

2 Ms. Bledsoe asked if there was a Public Hearing before that and Ms. Robbins replied No, this
3 would just be directed to them, which way the Board wants them to do it. She added that there is
4 also some ability for the Board to waive some of the setbacks and other dimensional
5 requirements, if it makes the project a better project. She said that is why she is encouraging the
6 Board to do the intent for Lead Agency, to make sure they are following the intent and for when
7 considering and waiving anything.

8

9 Mr. Campbell asked if tonight the Board would be voting and Ms. Robbins suggested they may
10 want some additional information. Mr. Eickman thinks the site visit would be appropriate. Mr.
11 Eickman told Mr. Scott that he had heard some comments that would give him an idea of how
12 the Board is leaning.

13

14 Ms. Robbins said the mixed-use redevelopment permit for the first plan is 194-46.12. Mr.
15 Eickman asked Ms. Robbins to email that information to the Members. Mr. Campbell stated it
16 would be helpful when they do the site visit.

17

18

19

20 Ms. Bledsoe asked if the next step is to do the site visit, then at the next meeting they could vote
21 on which path it would be going forward. Ms. Robbins said it is also deciding waiver of the
22 commercial requirements or any of the other things that may be waived.

23

24 Mr. Campbell asked if they were going to declare intent for Lead Agency. Ms. Robbins replied
25 that it can be done now; this can't be circulated until Mr. Scott knows which plan. Mr. Eickman
26 said there is no reason not to and to get it out of the way now.

1
2
3 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Donald Papae, for the Board**
4 **to declare its intent to be Lead Agency for 1486 Route 82. Voted and carried**
5 **unanimously.**
6

7
8 Mr. Eickman told Mr. Scott the Board would look forward to the site visit and Ms. Robbins said
9 an email would be sent around to see what dates work.

10
11 Mr. Scott asked how the site visit would work; would there be a quorum for the site visit and if
12 the public would come with them. Mr. Eickman told him there was a way they could figure this
13 out; they may have to split it up, but that they can talk about it separately, offline. Mr. Scott said
14 there are certain time periods, and he did not want to get into trouble.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 -----
25 Mr. Eickman confirmed that there was no further formal business to be conducted this evening.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

ADJOURNMENT

1
2
3 **MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by John Giovagnoli, to**
4 **Adjourn the Planning Board meeting.**

5
6 **Voted and carried unanimously.**
7

8
9
10 **Respectfully submitted:**

11 **Kathleen Mahodil, Meeting Secretary**
12 **East Fishkill Planning Board**
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25