

**Town of Wallkill
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 4, 2022**

**Members in Attendance: Gary Lake
Tom Hamilton,
Doug Dulgarian, Bill Capozella
Clark Najac and Jim Keegan
Andrew Guattery**

**Also in attendance: Mike Weeks, MH&E PC, Consulting Engineer
Tad Barone, PB Attorney**

7:00 PM – MEETING

G Lake: OK we have one Public Hearing tonight. If you want to speak at the Public Hearing, please fill out a blue card. We will take your comment. The Engineer for the project will step aside and take your comments. You may or may not get an answer. We are here to get your comments about the project. Then we will take it from there. Again if you want to speak please come up and fill out a blue card. First on the agenda is the proposed site plan and modification of Fair Oaks Religious Institution. It is how it appears on the map. Most of us probably know it as Fair Oaks Bungalow Colony. With that, Tom do you want to come up?

**Fair Oaks Religious Institute/Camp Dinov SP/SUP – PH
310 Shawangunk Rd (3-1-49.1) #2013-0035**

G Lake: give your name for the record please.

T DePuy: Do you want to read the public notice first?

G Lake: let her get caught up. Just give them your name. Write your name in there and then I will have her do that when she's done doing what she's doing.

T DePuy: I am Tom DePuy with Lanc & Tully Engineers. I will be representing Dinov.

G Lake: Ok we have been working on different variations of this for a few years now. We finally got to the point of holding a public hearing. Basically it's the same land use as it was. There is a couple additional recreation buildings on the outside. I will have Mr. DePuy go over his map and explain what is going on there. Probably the biggest and most improvement is.. Which I think he is working on is the leech field or septic system. So Tom give us a description of what you are doing there.

T DePuy: ok I will just give a little summary of what's there now. If you see all the units in green, they are what's occupied today. These are usually occupied in the months of July and August. They are only seasonal. That's how they are going to remain. So there's approximately 48 units that are occupied now. The ones you see in blue are there but are not occupied because they lack the sewer needed to

May 4th 2022

PB Minutes

occupy them. That's part of the project. We are in the process of installing a new large septic system. Which is located on the lower end, more towards the Tarbell Road area. There will be three large septic fields/absorption fields. They will be having an alternating system. We are going to be laying new sewer lines all up through the project. In order to collect the sewer and properly treat it. Under Phase one of the project, let me just go back here. Like I said, the green ones are now occupied. The blue ones we are going to occupy as soon as the sewer becomes available, which is part of Phase One. Besides occupying those buildings, we have several Shuls and Mikvahs proposed. There is going to be some additions in some of the other small dwelling units or bungalows. We are going to add a couple of bedrooms in several of areas. So if you see anything in tan, that's what's proposed in Phase One. There are learning center and lecture halls. One is a dormitory, they are going to have some of the children stay in one area. The rest of them are either learning centers, Shul, and there is one proposed Mikvah. That's on the Phase One. Phase Two is showing two larger buildings which are both learning centers. There is to be some additional bedrooms on some of the other units. These two out here are dining halls. That would be what's involved in Phase Two.

G Lake: OK Now your septic, I think is important for the people to realize that. The septic system that you are putting in is being guided by the O.C. Health Dept.

T DePuy: both the OC Health Dept and the NY DEC

G Lake: So that design is not only is kind of looked at by our people but basically the OC Health Dept is taking the lead on that and they given you permission to operate over the years with the one that you have there now.

T DePuy: yes

G Lake: but now they expect you to...

T DePuy: have the new one installed by the end of this... ready for next season. Use the existing ones, one more year and next season the new plant will be in place.

G Lake: The outside buildings that you described a minute ago. They are strictly for religious purposes or prayer, or dining hall, no bedrooms?!

T DePuy: there is a dormitory.

G Lake: Right. OK. We are still looking at basically the summer season as it has operated over the last whatever years it's been.

T DePuy: Yeah

G Lake: this has been. OK. Let me go through the Board before I go to the public. Doug

D Dulgarian: I will wait until after the public

J Keegan: After the public.

B Capozella: After

A Guattery: after

C Najac: after

T Hamilton: after the public

G Lake: OK again please fill out a blue card. Fill it out and you will be called at that time. OK before I go to the public, read the notice.

May 4th 2022
PB Minutes

R Charles: **NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that on Wednesday, the 4th day of May 2022, at 7:00 pm, or as soon thereafter as the matter can be heard, there will be a **Public Hearing** conducted by the Planning Board of the Town of Wallkill at the Town Hall at 99 Tower Dr, Building A, Middletown, NY on the application of Fair Oaks Blauvelt, LLC / Darkei Tshivo Dinov Camp for Site Plan and Special Use Permit approval under Sections 249-38, 249-39 & 249-40 of the Town Code to construct and/or operate a religious Institute on the premises located at 310 Shawangunk Road, which premises is located in the Town of Wallkill, Orange County and identified on the Town's Tax Maps as Tax Lot 49.1 of Block 1 Section 3. All parties of interest will be heard at such time and place.

G Lake: Thank you. OK let me **open the public hearing at 7:08PM**. Again, fill out a blue card. Come up and state your name. There is a piece of paper there. I hope there is a pen there. Please write your name so when we get everything on tape we can get it on paper eventually or on the website whatever she does with it. Rudy?

R Charles: Elizabeth Lubitz

G Lake: Good evening

E Lubitz: Hi. I am Elizabeth Lubitz. I lived across the street from this for 30 some years. My biggest concern is that they were in front of the town back in, I think, 2013 with the same plans. The septic was a huge issue. Water was also a huge issue. They were supposed to do something back then. The only thing that they have done in the last nine years is widen the roads towards the end and put some drainage in and then put a fire hydrant in. That was all they have done. In the time that they have been there, they have not kept up the area, at all. I have pictures. It's disgusting.

G Lake: I have been out there.

E Lubitz: OK. All of you have been out there. Doug you actually know where I am talking about. Like I said, if they are going to do this, they seriously need to start cleaning it up and do what they need to do. They were here nine years and they have done nothing in the nine years. How much longer are we going to have to look.... Shouldn't they have an amount of people that they are allowed? I can tell you, when I tell you that they bus load these kids in and stuff. It's really amazing how they just bring in so many people and so many kids and they are really not zoned for it. I don't think. I don't know. It's a camp. I don't know how many children you are allowed in a camp. Basically it needs to really really really be looked at. And really thought about. For the Town of Wallkill.

G Lake: OK, Thank you.

R Charles: Tammy Riggs

T Riggs: I have a couple of questions

G Lake: Name for the record please.

T Riggs: Tammy Riggs

G Lake: Please write your name down, thank you.

T Riggs: I live right on the road. They have the buses going up. There was a fire up there. Fire trucks could get up, nobody else could get up. It blocked the road totally. There was a house that went up, that's one. Is the Health Department going to be involved in their dining hall? They got a lot of fines the last time because all of their refrigerators weren't up and working. The sewer has to be pumped out once a week because it's overflowing and going down the road into people's yards. I would also like to

May 4th 2022

PB Minutes

know back in 2009 or it was 13. You people went and said that the cabins that are in blue had to be taken down to the ground. They are still sitting. Nothing's been done. Now they are going to redo them? We were also told on their trailers, they had to be removed in September. By the end of September, the end of October. In November all of them were supposed to be out. They didn't even have a plan. So why did they even come in? And you allow it. I kept calling, they are getting fined, they are getting fined. Then I talked to somebody her and they are like "Oh it's dismissed!" How can this happen?

G Lake: Thank you

T Riggs: Thank you.

R Charles: Tracy Pazdar

T Pazdar: no comment.

R Charles: Carol Gillen

C Gillen: My name is Carol Gillen. I live at 133 Gillen Road. I didn't hear any discussion about occupancy. Obviously there is going to be a huge change in occupancy with such a big expansion of the property. I think that is something that really needs to be spoken to. That's a lot of buildings being brought in. You are easily, I don't even know, square footage wise, are we doubling capacity, tripling capacity, quadrupling capacity? I don't know. The blue buildings, it is my understanding also, those blue buildings were condemned. Some of them have trees growing right through them and what not. They were supposed to be raised. It is also my understanding that code allows once the building has not been occupied for a certain amount of time, they are obligated to be raised. Those should likely come down, not be part of a site plan. There's no definition in our code for a religious institute. I think that the applicant is playing some games with us here. There's nothing in there for religious institute. Those words do not exist. There is mention of a place of worship. So that's allowed by special use permit in an RA Zone. But a religious institute is not mentioned anywhere. If you look at the definitions: place of worship, Section 249-3. Place of worship goes on to say where a religious institution operates as a school. The zoning provisions relating to a school apply as opposed to a zoning provisions relating to a church. Place of worship or a religious institution. Likewise for a religious institution operates as a bible camp. The zoning provisions relating to a camp apply as opposed to the zoning provisions relating to a church, place of worship or religious institution. So obviously our definitions make a distinction between a place of worship and a school. I would propose to you that an institute being synonymous with a school. This is really a school application. There is no provision in RA for a school, whether religious or otherwise. There are also special provisions for dead end properties in our zoning. This is definitely a dead end property. At minimum, this project has to be referred to zoning for interpretation. I am also concerned that if this a religious institution use!? Undefined, not knowing what it is. Nothing in there to tell us what it is. Is to apply and to be approved in a RA Zone when there's nothing there to say what it is or that it's allowed. That there is no reason to stop it from being in any other zone in our entire town. I just want to flow through some recent zoning and planning history, just in case. Sometimes the left and the right hand don't always know. So this project was just before zoning right?! So back in October of 2020, the attorney threatened RLUIPA*. At that particular public hearing in front of zoning. That application was there for use as a camp. It was presented with a need for multiple very large variances. Some as large as 80 and 70% relief. That zoning application was pulled by the applicant in December of 2020. But that didn't delay the double wide trailers that got pulled in in Spring of 2021. No site plan, no approval, no nothing. They just showed up one day and there they were. Multiple double wide trailers. Notably the zoning application cited the presence of the endangered Northern Long eared bat and stated that the wetlands mapping is known to be incomplete in the area. The septic

has been inadequate for many years now. I'm sorry, those were the words of the applicant so that's on the zoning application. That tells you that there is endangered species and unknown, questionable, incomplete mapping as to wetlands. The septic has been inadequate for many years now. The septic only approval was granted by the Planning Board. I am sure you are all familiar with that, in October of 2021. With an assurance that this was to correct the existing problems, not to facilitate expansion. The trees that have been cleared, habitat for the bat – mind you, are now have been cleared and then they are now looking for an expanded use in this proposal. So the newly proposed religious institute uses the same site plan as the camp. So it's still all the same new building all the same application. The same one that was pulled from Zoning in December of 2020. *(inaudible)* the planning and zoning this property it has been a terrible neighbor in recent years. This may be more important for you to hear than I think some of the ladies were trying to suggest too. I think we are all saying the same thing. This is not the same operation that it was. I have been there since 1989, not as long as Liz, or Lisa, but you know but I have been here for a while too. There was no nuisance in the presence of families. The moms walking the road for exercise. The daytime music that might come out, occasionally from that property. Now instead of that, there's garbage, there's noise. Even at three in the morning. There's school buses and other vehicular traffic up and down the road. And the failed septic. Complete with terrible smells that just waft through that neighborhood. All of those things have been brought to the town's attention previously. We did speak about them with the Zoning Board. We did speak about them with the Planning Board when they have been here in the past. Buildings that were previously condemned, I did mention those, are to be restored and brought back on-line rather than being raised. I do think that that is something the Town needs to make sure you understand because there are provisions in code for those the be taken down have they not been occupied for a year. It has been well more than a year. There are literally trees coming through some of them. Despite the public health concerns: the failed and inadequate septic, the sites continued to operate. This really is a health hazard. For God's sake, why are we allowing this to be? It just spills out. It's terrible. Honestly when have we conceded enough? That's really the question. When have we really conceded enough? There are so many red flags and things that are being done inappropriately and still it's allowed to continue. So do we really have to bend over and let this one happen too? Do we really have to say that this site can expand by, I don't know, three/four times, and that it can be a school in an RA Zone. Do we really have to go to that level as well? When is it ever enough? There must be some limit to what RLUIPA* can do to us!? I would hope. There has to be somebody looking out for us, the rest of us that live in the community. Thank you

G Lake: Thank you. Anybody else Rudy?

R Charles: no

G Lake: Doug do you want anything right now or do you want me to close the public hearing?

D Dulgarian: I have nothing. I want to see the comments.

G Lake: Come on back up to the mic Tom. OK we got a whole bunch of comments. Some of them I know are not easy answers and as the septic – I know you are working with the Health Department on that. That is their jurisdiction. I don't know if you want to talk about any of these other ones, right now? Or if you want to submit everything in writing back to us?!

T DePuy: Yeah we will probably submit everything in writing. I understand, I have been on the site over the last ten years also. We are trying to get the applicant to, you know, improve the overall project so... But yeah we can respond to the comments in writing.

May 4th 2022

PB Minutes

G Lake: OK I think that some of these things are not Planning Board issues. Which you know. But at the same token, I think, between now and the time that you answer to these comments, I do believe that we need some definite answers to go on the site plan. When and if it continues forward. I think there's a couple of things as far as.... What is the capacity? I think that is important to talk about a little bit. I have been up there several times during the summer, I see what was there. Somebody mentioned a bunch of buses coming in. I didn't realize that many buses came in, I will be honest with that. So if that is a case, I think we need to know that between now and the time that you come back. Is there daily bus trips into this? I still look at it as a bungalow colony and I know we are looking at a name change basically. Let me make a motion to close the public hearing. Then I will tell everybody what we are going to do after that. After I go through the Board.

Motion to close the public hearing

Bill/Jim 7 Ayes 0 Nays

Your public hearing is closed. Doug

D Dulgarian: I am interested in seeing all the comments in writing and his rebuttal. I am also interested in seeing our attorney give us some responses to some of the comments as well. I am going to leave it at that for now. I know we have plenty of time to hash what was just discussed.

J Keegan: I agree. I appreciate the public coming out and giving us all these comments. Some stuff I didn't know myself. Even though I obviously have been to the property. So I am going to wait to see what the rebuttal is and work from there. That's it for now.

B Capozella: I think that's the way to go. We have a list. We will supply to them. A list of all the questions that the public answered. We will get those in writing. Obviously nothing is happening we are just going to review that and look at the answers and responses and make decisions going forward. At this point nothing is happening.

A Guattery: I agree with Doug. I would like to see the comments or response to the comments and I would like to see what the attorney has to say. There are some things here that the public has brought up that need some clarity before we do anything. Nothing for now.

C Najac: I agree with Doug and Andy. I do have a question. How long do they have to answer all these questions?

G Lake: well I am going to come to that also before I move on about him waiving the 62 days.

C Najac: OK thank you.

T Hamilton: You said the operation is July and August?!

T DePuy: Yes

T Hamilton: That's all? Not that we find out that they come up on a different holidays and all of this stuff. You are telling us July and August, that's what it should be stuck to. If and when they go through our process.

T DePuy: the definite dates. That was agreed on with the applicant. We can put that on the approval.

T Hamilton: But there are a lot of comments that we have to add. So

D Dulgarian: that's not getting used right now?

T DePuy: No they don't usually occupy the grounds until fourth of July.

Dulgarian: OK

T Hamilton: they use it!?

May 4th 2022
PB Minutes

T DePuy: no. They come up just for the summer.

G Lake: during the summer they use it.

T DePuy: but all of the stuff that you stated that has to be done with the buildings and everything else.

T DePuy: they are only using the ones that are in green. None of the other ones.

T Hamilton: are they up to code?

T DePuy: there are some violations. I know that Building Department just went out there and went through all of them. Made a list of violations.

T Hamilton: they just did that? They have been before us a couple of times. Nothings been done?

T DePuy: No they have had previous violations and they have answered them. Now there is more violations. We got the list the other day from the Building Department.

T Hamilton: well I will look for that last myself.

G Lake: It should be on your phone. Anything else Tom?

T Hamilton: that's all.

G Lake: OK Mike's comments. Have you looked through them at all. We are going to bringing you back to a work session anyway but...

T DePuy: we really have no issues with them. The only thing is Phase One and Phase Two: Phase Two would require an expansion of the DEC permit. Which we agree with (*inaudible*).

G Lake: that's the SWPPP that you are talking about?! The expansion

T DePuy: No the SWPPP - the SPDES permit for the treatment plant has to be expanded, to go to Phase two.

G Lake: Do you agree to waive the 62 day time frame?

T DePuy: yes

G Lake: OK, now the next thing before I move on: I am going to leave the public comment period open if you want to e-mail or write something in. You have the next 10 business days to do so. After that we will forward anything new that we get to the applicant, to our engineer, to the attorneys. So we won't be going back to work in this at least for a couple/three weeks.

T DePuy: yeah a couple of weeks yeah

G Lake: OK!?

B Capozella: can I ask a question?

G Lake: Go ahead

B Capozella: how long does the applicant have to respond to whatever list that we come up with?

G Lake: Well right now he has 10 days that he can't do really... Well he can do what he wrote down tonight. I just gave the public 10 days to respond in writing to the Town Planning Board.

B Capozella: so if someone wasn't here..

G Lake: Right they could write in a comment they might have.

B Capozella; well we have a letter from somebody and we will submit into the file

May 4th 2022
PB Minutes

T DePuy: Yeah that should be put in the record.

B Capozella: OK

G Lake: right and he will be given that. OK and then after that 10 days, he will probably have to come back to a work session before we continue on. In the mean time, I am going to go down and talk to the Building Department a little bit and find out where they are at with it. That is their gig, not our gig. So we got to be a little careful but whatever is on this map, eventually, if it does continue forward. That gives the Building Department a lot more teeth to really go out and do some enforcing. So that's where we are at for that. You waived your 62 days. The public has 10 days to submit written comment. If nobody else on the board has anything else to say then I will make a motion
Table for further action

T Hamilton: One question. You are talking about July and August. A lot of this stuff, if you don't have any of this stuff that we are looking at tonight to have done. What can't you use now? You are saying July and August they are going to come up here and what?

T DePuy: Yeah they are going to utilize what's in green.

T Hamilton: has that been up there? The Building Department been up there to look at this?

T DePuy: Yeah they were up there. I think you were copied on it. Violations that have to be taken care of before they can occupy before July.

T Hamilton: you don't have that list? You don't have the list?

T DePuy: I got it on my phone

T Hamilton: alright. I'll get that tomorrow.

G Lake: It's my understanding from the Building Department, the only they will be allowed to use is what the present CO is on.

T DePuy: right

G Lake: that's it. So if the building does not have a CO on it, I believe they put a sign on the door. They are not allowed to use them. But I am going to check with the Building Department.

T DePuy: But there are other items then the ones that are in green that need

G Lake: Yeah I realize that. I am just saying that you are going to need a CO to use what the Building Department says is OK.

Motion to table for further action

Bill/Andy

7 Ayes 0 Nays

OK Thank you

(31:38)

*RLUIPA: Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act

Farrell Shopping Center SP 432 E Main St (73-1-1.232) #2021-0100

R Winglovitz: good evening for the record. Ross Winglovitz Engineering & Surveying Properties. I am here with Andre Lukianoff, a Project Engineer. This is a revision of a sketch that was presented to the Board, I believe in January. This is Lot #3 of the Distelburger Project. Lot #1 was a Dunkin Donuts site – here. Lot#2 is the apartments that Farrell is building currently. Then Lot#3 is what we had on the plan as a place holder for a medical office space. We didn't quite know what we were going to do with it. We proceeded with what was originally a shopping center. I think it was 24,000 sq.ft. In the interim as

May 4th 2022
PB Minutes

we started to get into the detail design at this point we were given concept/sketch approval. The owners were approached by a convenient store for location on the property. What we have done is we revised that sketch plan to reduce the size of the shopping center to 19,000sq.ft. Added the convenient store with pumps for gas. It's own dumpster. It would be located on it's own property. It would share access with the Shopping Center. So that it did have access to the light. The entrance that is currently there was constructed as a curb cut as part of the improvements along East Main Street. It allowed for left ins, not the way it is currently designed. It was configured so that that center island could be restriped to allow left ins. There would be rights in and rights out. No lefts out at that location. So anybody going towards the City of Middletown would have to go out to the main entrance. To the light to make a left out. We asked, understanding that that this is a higher traffic generator than what we had gotten sketch plan approval for. We have asked Creighton Manning, who did the original traffic study, for this site, to prepare an updated traffic study considering the development on Lot #1 and #2 and this revised development on Lot #3. That is underway and will be presented to this Board and the OC DPW when it is prepared. I think that is the major changes. Again, it would be on a separate lot because the convenient store owner wants to purchase the property and not have a land lease. I can answer any questions.

G Lake: Yup, let me go through the Board. Have you presented any of this to the County yet?

R Winglovitz: no we have not

G Lake: Now that you are going to a little bit of a higher volume?

R Winglovitz: Yeah that's why we asked for the Traffic Study to be prepared and then we would send the whole thing in to them.

G Lake: Let me go through the Board. I think you are going to find that maybe trying to shove that at that location could be a little excessive maybe for that particular site. Doug

D Dulgarian: I think that the intensity of the use is quite a bit different going to a convenient store with gas pumps. The amount of trips generated then obviously the original shopping center would have. The proximity with the school and the traffic volumes that we have already on East Main make it not conducive. Then the other intersection, I like obviously that there is a traffic control device at the one but the other one that is actually lined up much better with the property and actually lined with the lot, because you are going to subdivide. You can't make a left out. You shouldn't make a left in. Should be right out and right in only. I am just not sold on this one. A little further down they wanted to one and that got denied for the exact reason of – Too high intensity of a use. That was on a corner so it was a little bit more but.... I like it better with the original use you presented. That's all

J Keegan: I like it a little better also. I understand if the market is – market driven. With that right out and right in there is a property similar to this that we approved over here. It was called Gasland, or whatever it is, right off 17. They have a similar thing where all the cars are supposed to go back and around onto the road. Nobody uses it. Everybody uses the one way in and out at the front of the property. There it's not really that big of deal. There's nothing else really there. No other traffic comes in or out. In this area, if everybody were to kind of do that. I would really look at that, how we would limit that. People would all try to make lefts. Once it comes back we would like to see the rendering of what the building is going to look like and how we are going to make it fit into the corner and things like that. That's all the comments that I have. I would want to look at that and see how that's going to play out. That's it Gary.

D Dulgarian: Gary may I?

May 4th 2022

PB Minutes

G Lake: Yeah go ahead

D Dulgarian: can you tell us what the existing TOPO is from the road up where the traffic control device is to down where the tanks are going to go? You can't tell by your map. OK right where your finger is to where the fuel tanks are going to go all the way down to the right corner.

R Winglovitz: 504 here. It's about 10' from here to here.

(People talking)

D Dulgarian: that's about 30'. I have lived there for 60 years.

R Winglovitz: it goes back up where that house and barn. So that's higher than the road. So that's got to be

(people talking)

D Dulgarian: my point is that very very very low. You would have to raise that tremendously to put your sea of blacktop in there, up front.

R Winglovitz: yeah we would have to cut this (*inaudible*) out about 6' where the house was actually and the barn was back here. They would be cutting it down about 6'.

D Dulgarian: how deep do you put the tanks?

R Winglovitz: depends on what size tanks we use. Diameter is like 8' diameter and 2' a cover or so, so about 10' down.

D Dulgarian: OK Thank you. Thank you Gary

B Capozella: Yeah first pass, it's definitely more traffic intense than your original plan that we looked at. I got some concerns, going into the site. Especially with the tractor trailers now. With gas tanks, as before.... Before even with the shopping center there was some issue with 18 wheelers. This makes it even more difficult with the traffic flow as they come in. Now they have to deal with the pumps that are right there. How they are going to flow through that parking lot and so forth. That is to me, a big concern. I think that's good enough for now.

A Guattery: What happened with the Dunkin Donuts lot? Is that still.... Did they buy that? That lot that's across...?

R Winglovitz: Yeah Farrell does own and control that lot.

A Guattery: Farrell still owns and controls that. I understand the Topography drop that's over there. It's steep as it goes over and drops down. There's also low water retention that you are putting gas tanks next to, bad combination. I might be more amicable to the idea if they were switched. If the convenient store was on the entrance road to the apartments. Either where the Dunkin was going to go or on at least the entrance road side of the shopping center. So reverse the two. Something like that, so that the pumps and everything are up at the signal intersection. People are using that signaled intersection. That right in or the right out left in, that is... it's going to be a bad mix. It's going to be a very bad mix. The traffic on that road is already horrific. This is going to bring up a bunch more. Like Doug said, you might even get shot down just on the traffic flow. It's possible. But I think I have a real problem with it being in that whole back at that end. I have a problem with it being at that entrance that we are not going to be able to control. I don't necessarily have a problem with the idea of a convenient store and pumps but where they are.

R Winglovitz: not in love with the location

May 4th 2022
PB Minutes

A Guattery: No. It's got a lot of things that are asking for trouble. If you could do it on the other side of it. The subdivision might be really cooky. Or do it over where the Dunkin was going. Me personally, it would be a lot more amicable then seeing something like that work because this is just going to cause all kinds of havoc. That's it for now Gary

C Najac: All the comments already listed. But I want to expand on the traffic. Finally the school did something really good and got the traffic off the road. All those buses and all the people, it's great. Now you want to put this back in. And put it right back where we were. It doesn't make any sense. At least put it all at the light.

T Hamilton: Yeah the right in and right out, I think if we put a police officer at that point, catching these people not doing what it's supposed to be... Because they are going to come in and out of there the way they want to come in and out.

R Winglovitz: he has a point, yeah

T Hamilton: no good

R Winglovitz: they can't make a left but they will be looking to make the left.

T Hamilton: They won't if we close that and make them all come in that other road. Come in at that light and come down the other end.

G Lake: Anything else?

T Hamilton: that's all

G Lake: OK yeah a little ambitious, maybe. I think Andy hit on a little something. I am not for designing site plans. I don't like designing the parking because I am not the guy with the six figures behind my name, that does that. I think Andy might have hit on a little something that could work a little bit better. I know that might not be what the owners of the property want to do and stuff but I think it's worth looking at. I'd be curious about what your traffic guy did say. If you decide to stay with this before we went on too far. My only other question is electric car chargers. Are they going to have any on the property?

R Winglovitz: they do not

G Lake: Are they going to?

R Winglovitz: I can talk to them about adding, but it hasn't come up

G Lake: no no. We had another store... it really creates a problem for the stores. I understand they actually lease a chunk of the property for the electric car chargers. So they pay the bill not the store. Because it does something to the rate. It puts it at the maximum for all 24 hours, I guess. I am not quite sure that I want to call for a sketch plan approval on this yet. I think, if I am hearing the Board correctly, they would like you to take a second look at it..

R Winglovitz: We would just ask you to table for further action

G Lake: that's what I would say, I would table it for further action. Take a closer look at it. In the meantime, maybe the traffic guy comes back and we can send it to our traffic guy and maybe they say this ain't a big deal. Right now I think I just assume table you for further action and not go with the sketch plan just yet.

R Winglovitz: understood

G Lake: OK?! **Motion to table for further action**
Motion for adjournment

Doug/Andy 7 Ayes 0 Nays
Tom/Doug 7 Ayes 0 Nays

