

**WORKSHOP MEETING AGENDA**  
**TOWN OF LLOYD PLANNING BOARD**

**Thursday, August 21, 2025**

**CALL TO ORDER TIME: 5:30pm**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ANNOUNCEMENTS: GENERAL, NO SMOKING, LOCATION OF FIRE EXITS, ROOM CAPACITY IS 49, PURSUANT TO NYS FIRE SAFETY REGULATIONS. PLEASE TURN OFF ALL CELL PHONES.**

**OFFICIALLY OPEN THE MEETING**

**Attendance:** Board Members: Scott McCarthy, Charly Long, Franco Zani (left at 7:30), Gerry Marion, Bill Meltzer, Lambros Violaris, John Dispensa, Fred Pizzuto (via Zoom, non-voting), Lenny Auchmoody (Town Board); Board Staff: Dave Barton, Paul Van Cott (via Zoom), Christian Moore, Sarah Van Nostrand

**Minutes to Approve at the August 28, 2025, meeting**  
July 17, 2025 & July 24, 2025

**Continued Public Hearings:**

**Highland 3555 LLC: Site Plan: 3555 Route 9W: SBL #88.17-9-55.111**

Applicant is seeking site plan approval for 4 mixed use buildings.

Review Status: Public hearing opened July 24, 2025  
SEQRA Status: Lead Agency Circulated on 6-10-2025.  
Potential Action: SEQRA Determination

Brooks (A part of the Applicant's team) said that last month they listened to public comment and some changes we made based on the comments. They do have a revised landscaping plan and the plantings have been revised. The applicant met with the owner of Shamrock. They moved the barbecue area and pergola farther away from Roberto Ave. They have reduced the height of the plantings along the retaining wall with the adjoining land owner, Shamrock is looking to have nothing exceed the height of the retaining wall, so that nothing will block the view of their building. They have reduced the height of the plantings in the pocket parks.

McCarthy asked if they have already met with Sham (Owner of Shamrock) and he is good with the way things are.

Brooks said that they didn't have anything else to add. They applicants are looking to see if there is a possibility to take a portion of the front building and instead of having it enclosed, having it an open-air outdoor seating area, so that it would cut off the building and increase visibility. She

mentioned that there will be trash compactors inside the buildings, so there is no loose trash in the containers and they are emptied regularly. They are also working on making an enclosure that is more pleasant to look at.

McCarthy asked if there was going to be a separate trash bin for recycling.

Galorenzo (Applicant's Agent) said that there were going to be two separate enclosures one for recycling and one for garbage.

Meltzer asked are the compactors just for the residential side of the buildings or is it for the commercial as well.

Galorenzo said it would be for both; there will be a shoot on each floor that you would just throw your trash down and then they gather in the compactor.

Meltzer asked is this below the retail space.

Galorenzo said yes.

Brooks said a cross easement would probably not be needed between properties as each owner would build their access up to the property line. When someone goes to utilize the back building on the Shamrock property the Planning Board at that time could decide if that applicant should build up to the property line. There would be no cross easement needed as both property owners would be building up to the property line. Right now, the applicants are conveying an easement to the town for the drainage structures. She mentioned that she reached back out to the school district and expressed the Planning Board concern about the students waiting at the end of Roberto Ave, they said that 9W is 4 lanes at that spot with no divider between lanes and that is a safety issue. If the parents are not there to receive their kids they would have to stay on the bus. She said this is typical of the school district on dead end roads as it saves time, saves money, saves milage and it is consistent with what is done in the rest of the community. Most of the time when you have a property like this typically you are going to have people who are married and don't have children yet, empty nesters, so basically in one of their other complexes they have 50 units and how many had kids.

Galorenzo said there were 12 out of 50, but these are the townhome style. In Poughkeepsie out of 368 units there are 5 school children.

McCarthy said it is great that you gave the board those numbers, but knowing how many bedrooms and not knowing what might happen in the future. You have enough bedrooms there and you can say that you are only going to have 2 school kids, but you have room for more.

Brooks said that they are going with the best information that they have today because they cannot predict what is going to happen tomorrow.

McCarthy said that the board is going to take the worst-case scenario and think about that to what minimal amount may be there in reality.

Brooks said that they reached out to DOT about getting a signal put in. They also discussed with them possibly reducing the speed limit in that area as that would help calm the traffic a little bit. That is the whole point of the Gateway zoning is to make it more pedestrian friendly. DOT's response was to determine if a light was required they would need a signal warrant analyst provided by the traffic engineer. He would recommend that if there was a concern about left-hand-turning vehicles that the emergency driveway on Roberto Ave, should be use as a full movement access to have vehicles use the signal at 9W and Milton Ave. Regarding a speed reduction they need a resolution from the Town Board requesting a study for a speed reduction. This this location has had it speed raised by 5mph after the road improvements that called for the change some years back. Sometime between 2009 and 2012 after they did the improvements along 9W they actually raised the speed limit from 40mph to 45mph. They will need a resolution from the Town of Lloyd as an applicant is not allowed to do that on their own. If that is something that the board thinks is a good idea, they can petition the Town Board to petition the DOT.

Barton said that it would be keeping with the intent of the zone as it would be more pedestrian friendly, it's designed to be pedestrian friendly, it's designed to have retail spaces and it would be keeping with what the town envisioned that zone to be.

Zani said that would ask to reduce the speed from Milton Ave to Tillson Ave.

Marion said it's a start.

Barton said their argument would be it would make the left hand turn out safer and even make the right-hand turn into sites safer.

Brooks said in regards to Roberto Ave the community sentiment is to not open it up. One of the options is that they want to leave as emergency right now they do not want to take that recommendation of DOT and it was not a requirement. As part of the board's consideration one of the things they could do and make part of the record is due to community sentiment they are going to leave it as emergency access only, if down the road if it came to pass that they didn't reduce the speed limit and there did appear to be a problem they could come back to the board at that point in time for reconsideration, they would like to leave it emergency at this point.

McCarthy said he agrees with that point right now.

Board agrees.

Moore asked if they plan on making a revised submission.

Brooks said they did submit the revised landscaping plan, she believes that was the only real change that was made.

Moore said at a previous meeting the board was discussing moving the location of the entrance into the site to further away from the light, was that ever further explored.

Brooks said no, as that would have required an entire redesign of the project.

Cuciti (37 Brescia Blvd) said that he doesn't think the board is ready to vote on a neg. dec., is his first comment. This project is 235,000 square feet which is 5X times the size of Hannaford and it is 25 feet from the road. It is about a quarter of the size of the Poughkeepsie Galleria which has signalized roads feeding into it and it has its own internal roads, so it says it is huge is not an exaggeration. He went through the meeting minutes to look for any work the board did on community character, he didn't find anything in the minutes. He doesn't think the board has quarter scale elevations with neighboring buildings, so the board can get a sense of the scale. The rendering from 9W is a bit misleading as it shows a dense forest in the back that doesn't exist in the site plan. He thinks the traffic issue is a huge impact, when the board did the Villages there was a light that was built into SEQRA as a mitigation and at that time it was 175 cottages. He thinks that the board should take a second look at what this traffic situation is going to be with another traffic engineer.

Petty (9 Brescia Blvd) said that he has concerns about the size and scope of the project as far as traffic and the impacts it's going to have on 9W in that corridor from Milton Ave to Tillson Ave. He feels that 144 units is going to add a lot of traffic to that environment. In the SEQRA it says that the commercial property that is located underneath the building is only open from 8am to 5pm and that is done so they reduce the amount of parking spaces that they require. He doesn't see how that would be viable, so he feels that is something that needs to be looked at. He also thinks that dismissing what the school district says about the safety concerns about picking up on 9W, he doesn't think that it is fair to dismiss those concerns.

McCarthy said he doesn't know where the board is dismissing the recommendation of the school regarding the safety of the kids.

Zani said there is no pick up on 9W.

Brooks said there is no pick up on 9W.

Zani said the pick is on Roberto Ave.

Brooks said to be clear the pickup is going to be at the intersection of Roberto and Van Wagner, so they cannot put any kind of protection where the children will wait, so they will need to have appropriate attire or protections during inclement weather as there is no enclosure they can construct on the applicants property on Roberto because they cannot wait on the property, they have to wait at the intersection.

McCarthy said that was based on the Planning Board's request of building a shelter for students waiting for a school bus.

Petty said thanks for the clarification he appreciates it.

McCarthy said the board would take into consideration anything that the school board suggests for the safety of the kids.

Petty said he knows that there are no parks or play areas for kids proposed but knows that there are town parks nearby and what is the safety of the kids that walk to those parks as he knows not all those roads have sidewalks.

Maffei (3 Tillson Ave) said that her main concern is how people are going to go north on 9W. She lives on Tillson Ave and is familiar with that intersection and has tried to do a U-turn there, you are not really able to do that especially since most people have SUVs and things like that. She spoke with the Highway Supervisor and he didn't think that was a place that people could continuously make U-turns. Her question is what is the plan here and can a plan be in place before moving forward with the project as this is a big deal, two lanes of oncoming traffic, uncontrolled turning lane. If it is not a light maybe they have to do something different, there needs to be some kind of traffic calming or there needs to be islands so people cannot drive in the turning lane. She is concerned for pedestrians that will have to cross the singular entrance into the place especially during rush hours when people are trying to get in and out of the site. She doesn't know if there was a revised traffic study as the one on the website was conducted during December and concluded that there are no pedestrians that cross 9W. Most of the year there are a lot of pedestrians and people riding bikes and the village is planning on constructing that sidewalk on the west side to connect at Tillson, Haviland and 9W.

McCarthy asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

Motion made by Zani, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Violaris.

All ayes, motion passed to close the public hearing.

McCarthy asked what is the board's next steps.

Van Cott said if the board is ready that they need to make a SEQRA determination and whether or not they want to approve the project.

McCarthy asked all tonight.

Van Cott said that there is no approval resolution for tonight. They did prepare a draft FEAF for the board to consider and a draft resolution if the board was inclined to go that direction to issue a negative declaration.

McCarthy asked the board if they were inclined to go through the FEAF.

Board agrees to go through the FEAF.

Van Cott went through the FEAF part II with the board. He will put in front of the board staff recommendations and if there are disagreements than a discussion should take place.

Impact on Land-yes impacts.

Board discussion:

Marion said that it is an impact.

McCarthy said that they might be small impacts.

Marion said that it is a large project it is 4-acres, with 140 units there is nothing small about that.

Vote: 6-small impact (Dispensa, Meltzer, Zani, McCarthy, Long, Violaris), 1-large impact (Marion).

Impact on Geological Features-no impact.  
Board agrees.

Impacts on Surface Water-yes impacts.

Marion asked if the impact on wastewater was for the water & sewer district or was it for onsite wastewater.

McCarthy said it would be septic.

Zani said in this case it would be town sewer.

Marion said in that case it would be a large impact.

Moore said that this section is impact on surface water so the answer to the wastewater question would be no.

Board agrees that they are all small impacts.

Impact on Groundwater-yes impacts.  
Board agrees all small impacts.

Impact on Flooding-no impacts.  
Board agrees no impacts.

Impacts on Air-no impacts.  
Board agrees no impacts.

Impacts on Plants and Animals-yes impacts.

Van Cott said on the FEAF part I the system generated that this site has the potential for Bald Eagle habitat. He doesn't know if the applicants consultants may want to comment on that because he doesn't recall seeing anything in the documentation.

Brooks said that the applicant states that they have a letter from the DEC.

Galorenzo said that he has a letter from their environmental engineer that there will be no impact on Bald Eagle habitat.

Van Cott said that is sufficient and that the board should have that for the record.

Marion asked if they got a response from DEC.

Brooks said that the letter was never sent to the DEC. There is about a mile radius from a known nesting site and you have to look at each individual site and determine if there are possible nesting sites.

Marion asked if the environmentalist was picked by DEC or the state?

Brooks said that the environmental biologist specialist they are the ones who review the sites according to DEC regulations and determine whether or not there is any potential habitat on this site.

McCarthy asked if that letter was submitted to the board.

Galorenzo said not yet, but he will make sure it is.

Van Cott said that the eagle's habitat is typically associated with open water and they normally don't have any reason to go near any commercial area. He feels that the letter from the environmentalist is fairly safe and fits everything he has read and other projects that he has been involved with.

Board agrees all small impacts.

Impact on Agricultural Resources-no impacts.  
Board agrees no impacts.

Impact on Aesthetic Resources-yes impacts.  
Board discussion:

Marion said it is a large project and close to the road.

McCarthy said that is why yes was selected. It is close to the road and it is going to be large.

Board Vote: 6-small impact (Dispensa, Meltzer, Zani, McCarthy, Long, Violaris), 1-large impact (Marion).

Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources-no impact.  
Board agrees no impact.

Impact on Open Space and Recreation-no impact.  
Board agrees no impact.

Impact on Critical Environmental Areas-no impact.

Board agrees no impact.

Impact on Transportation-yes impacts.

Board discussion: 6-small impact (Dispensa, Meltzer, Zani, McCarthy, Long, Violaris), 1-Moderate impact (Marion).

Impact on Energy-yes impacts.

Board agrees small impacts.

Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light-yes impacts.

Meltzer asked if there is a restaurant use in there can those odors be all day.

Van Cott said at this point that would be speculative you really don't have that information, you have no idea what the tenants are going to be but that is a potential.

Board agrees small impacts.

Impact on Human Health-yes impacts.

Board agrees small impacts.

Consistency with Community Plans-yes impacts.

Board discussion: 6-small impact (Dispensa, Meltzer, Zani, McCarthy, Long, Violaris), 1-Moderate impact (Marion).

Consistency with Community Character-yes impacts.

Board discussion: 6-small impact (Dispensa, Meltzer, Zani, McCarthy, Long, Violaris), 1-Moderate impact (Marion).

Van Cott said one of the changes in SEQRA occurred recently is that when you are doing the part II you need to take into account whether the project will have any impacts on a disadvantaged community. As you may know, a large part of Lloyd is a designated disadvantaged community in New York State.

McCarthy asked if he could define disadvantaged community, so everyone can understand what it is.

Van Cott said what New York has done is that they have looked at all the census tracts around New York State and used a set of criteria to evaluate if there were disproportionate burdens or vulnerabilities in the community both in terms of pollution and it also looks at social-economic for example what portion of the community is below the poverty line. They take all this information and go through this methodology to determine whether or not compared to other communities in New York State if this community is disproportionately burdened or has a vulnerability that effects it's population. What New York State now requires as part of the SEQRA review to look at basically if any of the SEQRA impacts that have been talked about may have a disproportionate impact on a disadvantaged community. The question is will this

project impact a disadvantaged community. The answer is yes there will be some impacts, but for all of the reasons that the board has already discussed that those would only be no to small impacts.

Board agrees.

Van Cott read SEQRA Determination resolution.

McCarthy asked for a motion to approve the SEQRA resolution.

Motion made by Meltzer, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Zani.

6-ayes, 1-nay (Marion), motion passed to approve the SEQRA resolution.

### **New Business:**

#### **Community Land 2002: Subdivision/Lot Line revision: Hurds Rd/S. Ohioville Rd.**

Applicants are seeking to subdivide a large parcel into 3 parcels and add the remaining lands to their properties.

Review Status: Application and plans circulated to board.

Koehler (Applicants Agent) said it is the southeast corner of Hurds Rd and South Ohioville Rd, the owners that live along South Ohioville also all own the large parcel behind their properties. The 45-acre parcel is the subject of what they are looking to do. It is in the agricultural zoning district. They are proposing the creation of three new building lots out of the 45-acres and then the remainder land will be added to some of those lots along South Ohioville Rd and they will have long skinny lots. Then they have the two flag lots off of South Ohioville Rd, identified as lots 1 and 3 on the plans. Lot 2 on the plans would gain access off of Hurds Rd. They went to the building department for a pre-meeting and were advised to get Health Department approval for the water supply and sewage disposal which they did and they were able to secure permits for all three proposed building lots. There is a section of the Town's code that does talk about flag lots with offsets from the rear houses to the houses that are in front and based on the geometry of what they are trying to accomplish, trying equally to give land owners the same amount of land because they are all owners of this large lot. That does create a situation where they will have to go to the Zoning Board for an area variance to deal with that non-conforming offset.

Moore said that the wetlands are flagged and flagged in 2022. A letter of jurisdictional determination will be needed from the DEC. None of the wetlands appear to be DEC they all appear to be army corp. of engineers, but they will need an updated JD to close that loop. He noticed that two flags are being proposed, and the code only allows one flag lot unless you are doing a subdivision of 4 or more lots.

Koehler said that he spoke with Barton regarding that, the situation of the lot line revisions means that there are actually 7 lots in the subdivision.

Barton said that was his interpretation as well because the rear is being subdivided and individual subdivided lots are being attached to smaller lots along South Ohioville.

Moore said if that is the determination of zoning then that comment would not apply. He asked how DOH approval was gotten on the three lots since the lots themselves don't exist yet.

Koehler said that was his question when he was sent towards the Health Department, but they were able to show proposed lot lines, he can send the stamped plans to the office.

Barton said that is common practice because the Planning Board would not do a subdivision without knowing if there is septic capacity for installation.

McCarthy asked staff if there is anything else.

Barton said this is pretty straight forward. He agrees with Moore that a JD would be required.

McCarthy asked where does the board go from here.

Barton said he would recommend a letter to the ZBA and then Koehler would submit an application to the ZBA.

Pizzuto said he thought anything over 5 lots has to go to the county.

Barton said they can send it to the county for comments. He asked the board if it has to go to the county, do they authorize him to refer it to the county.

Board agrees.

### **Dakota Field Properties LLC: Lot Line Revision: 258 Martin Ave: SBL # 79.2-1-6.110**

Applicant is seeking a lot line revision to correct accessory structure being on another parcel.

Review Status: Application and plans circulated to board.

Storyk (Owner) said that the property is at the end of Martin Ave and that he owns both lots. He needs to jiggle the lot line a little bit because there is a structure that is over the current lot line. He decided to sell the house and rather than moving the tent structure they decided to shift the lot line, the lots are going to keep their current amount of acreage.

Moore asked if the building is served by well and septic.

Storyk said no.

Moore said he just wanted to make sure that the new lot line wouldn't be crossing over a water or septic line.

Storyk said there are no wetlands here either.

Van Cott said this would be a Type II SEQRA action and if the board wants to go ahead and schedule a public hearing they can.

McCarthy asked what about the other shed that is on the other lot line.

Storyk said the other shed is on the lot line, but he owns both parcels.

Public hearing scheduled for next month.

Storyk asked if at the end of the public hearing would he be done with the process.

### **Fjord Vineyards LLC: Site Plan: Route 9W: SBL # 96.3-2-19.100**

Applicant is seeking site plan approval for a wine tasting room.

Review Status: Application and plans circulated to board.

Erdmann (Owner) said that they have a new tasting room that they would like to put up on their property. The project didn't previously need site plan approval and now they do. They would like to know what they need to move forward with the site plan approval; they are working on a septic design.

Violaris asked if it was going to be a separate building or if it was going to be added onto an existing building.

Erdmann said it is going to be a new building. They just planted 6-acres of grapes. They have done a traffic study and have submitted that to the DOT.

McCarthy said he doesn't remember all these items on the plans last time.

Barton said that this is all new and it is a better layout than what they had last time. There is a current road cut now, if you want to go up a steep hill into the property. They are proposing a new entrance, the grade will be better, the line of sight will be better, he doesn't think DOT is going to have any issues with it. The applicants would like to know how deep in the weeds do you want the site plan to be for an agricultural use that will have the public attend. A part of the question is how detailed do you want the survey to be. In his opinion location of structures, boundary lines, he doesn't know if they need the woods. He feels if the board has a good sense of the layout, the steepness of the driveway, the layout of the tasting room, they have good parking. There is a pond on the property and later on they will discuss putting a fence around it.

Zani said he would like to know the width of the entrance, width of the driveway because you are going to have traffic in and out. If it is going to be right turn in and right turn out, you will need signage. The board will need to know where they are going to put the sign, the design of the sign and the width of the sign.

Erdmann said you are talking about where we are going to put the Fjord Vineyard sign. She mentioned where they were thinking of putting it.

McCarthy said show it on the plans. One of the board's concerns would be fire truck access and making sure they can get in and out of there. They need to know what the size of the building that is going in there. If any lighting is proposed the board will need to know that.

Barton said his anticipation is that they will have events there as well like weddings.

Erdmann said they are not planning on having weddings.

Barton said whatever you are proposing ask for as much from the board as possible in terms of events.

Erdmann said that they are applying for a grant and if they get it they will get it by November, but they need a negative declaration.

Barton said that he doesn't see anything in SEQRA that would be more than no to small impact.

Van Cott said that the board may not even get there it might be a type II.

Moore said when this was here last year he remembers a high number of parking spaces; you may want to have your professional determine if you need as many parking spaces as that for events. You may need to have a general stormwater permit that would just be for erosion control.

Barton said maybe you could look at doing banked parking for larger events on grass.

Moore said that there will need to be ADA access as well. He suggested that they might need to look at bus parking.

Erdmann said that they were working with Milton Harvest to maybe do an event with them.

Dispensa asked if there is power on the site now.

Erdmann said no.

### **New Public Hearings:**

#### **Buddhist Culture Center: Site Plan: 86 New Paltz Rd: SBL #87.4-3-21.211**

Applicant is seeking site approval to convert existing duplex into a place of worship.

Review Status: Public hearing set for August 28, 2025

## **Short-term Rentals**

### **Santoro, Sandra: 62 Mackey Rd**

Review Status: Application and supporting documents circulated to board.

Gray (Property Manager) said that it is a basic Airbnb. The guests are vetted through the system and then he vets them before allowing them to rent.

McCarthy asked how many bedrooms?

Gray said 3 bedroom.

McCarthy asked how many guests?

Gray said 5 guests.

McCarthy asked if there was sufficient parking for these guests.

Gray said yes.

Meltzer asked if the units were labeled, so the renters know which unit is which.

Gray said yes they went through the fire safety inspection.

Meltzer asked if the property was set up in a way that the guests would know where the property lines are.

Gray said they get a map of the property.

Meltzer asked if the other part is owner occupied or rented.

Gray said it is rented.

Pizzuto asked if there is a site plan.

Gray said that the owner submitted everything that is required.

McCarthy said he is not sure a site plan is necessary. The board did get a full package on this.

Meltzer asked if on the street if there is something identifying the property address.

Gray said there is.

Meltzer asked if they started renting it through Airbnb.

Gray said they did and that was how they got notified by the town.

Meltzer asked if there have been any complaints in the time that you were renting.

Gray said he has had no complaints so far.

Barton said that there have been no complaints about any short-term rental since they have implemented the law.

Meltzer said they have 2-1,000-gallon septic tanks, both were pumped.

McCarthy asked for a motion to open the public hearing.

Motion made by Zani, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Violaris.

All ayes, motion passed to open the public hearing.

Jones (58 Mackey Rd) said there is no sign for 62 Mackey Rd., she put 58 up because people kept going to her house. She had to put boulders to keep people from parking on her property. Sometimes the people park and block her in.

Barton said that in the house rules it should state that parking is only allowed on the property for guests. Make sure that the number of the property is very visible at the front of the property.

Gray said that they had to make all that very clear in the rules, which are posted inside the house and online for when you book the unit. He was not aware of the issue and that there is plenty of parking.

Barton asked if there was a number 62 in front of the house so people know where they need to go.

Gray said if you come off Mackey Rd, there is a post on a pole and then there is also a rock that is white and has 62 painted in black on it.

McCarthy said if you could put a sign at the end of the driveway on a wooden post that says 62, it would clarify where they have to go.

Gray said the signs are there, but he will make them bigger.

Jones said that the sign needs to be where the guests will pull into the property.

Dunham (Fire Department) said that it needs to be marked for safety, so if something does happen emergency vehicles can find the property.

## **Informal Discussion**

## **50 Toc Dr**

Phelps (Applicant) said he is trying to purchase 50 Toc Dr and would like to use it for fine art storage. It is a quiet operation it will be about 6-8 box trucks a week to start out and once the building is full it will be about 1-3 box trucks a week. It would be a deep storage facility where people can store their large art pieces that they don't need on a high demand.

Marion asked is it just art.

Phelps said paintings, sculptures, etc., they keep it clean, keep it quiet.

Meltzer asked if their concern was if it was good use for that property.

Barton said it was the building department's determination that they needed site plan. This is a warehouse use and the building used to be an industrial use they were making products.

Meltzer said they had a warehouse use.

Barton said they did, but the warehouse use was accessory to the main use because it was a processing facility. The two items are listed as separate uses in the use table. They have to be looked at when the use changes because this is a warehouse use not light industrial, so it needs to have site plan. He thinks this will be an easy site plan because they are not changing anything on the site.

Meltzer asked if when it was built did he have to have site plan.

Barton said he doesn't know because the building has been there a long time.

Phelps said their biggest change would be to put a new roof on it, strip it back to an empty box, put pallet racks in and then fill it with items.

Meltzer asked if he was looking for something from the board to move forward with the purchase.

Phelps said the closing is contingent upon the approval.

Barton said that this use is much better and less intensive than the previous use. He mentioned that the old plan could be used in this case as he is not changing anything.

Phelps said that the only change they may have to do is add a lift dock as the door is much higher than the dock.

Dispensa asked if the building had a sprinkler system currently.

Phelps said yes it has a sprinkler system. It will have full video surveillance; it will have full monitoring.

Dispensa said will someone be there.

Phelps said no it will be remote.

McCarthy said if you can get an old drawing or an old map, submit it to the board for review.

Auchmoody asked will the building be climate controlled.

Phelps said it currently has HVAC in it, but it may need to be repaired or replaced. About a 1/3 of the building will be non-climate controlled which will just be heated in the winter and left to its own devices in the summer.

### **Administrative Business:**

#### **Villages-site plan extension request**

DeJoy (Applicant's agent) said he is in place for First.

McCarthy said that someone should clean that site up, mowing, trimming make it look nice.

DeJoy said as everyone knows there was a list of conditions of approval, they are working on getting them done. For the traffic light they are waiting on electricity from Central Hudson, once they get that there is a whole process that the DOT requires to activate the light, it has to blink for 3 weeks. Once that is all done the light can be up and working.

McCarthy said that the light was supposed to be done by a certain time and why wasn't it.

DeJoy said some things are out of their control, longer than anticipated.

McCarthy said the light was supposed to be done by August 23<sup>rd</sup> and its not on. Is the pump done.

DeJoy said no.

Barton said that was not time restricted.

McCarthy said it is not clean and the light isn't up. He asked when does the resolution expire.

Van Cott said he doesn't have it in front of him, but if it can wait until next week the board might be able to get better answers.

DeJoy said he would like to request that as well this way he get the answers for the board.

Van Cott said that the board needs more information on the compliance of the conditions. What the time frame is for the light as that was a key condition. Along with plans for maintaining the property.

Meltzer said that they are asking for a year and that seems kinds of extensive for where they are right now.

Van Cott said that in the zoning code it allows for 2 extensions for 1 year each, but that doesn't mean that the board cannot put additional conditions on it.

McCarthy said this would be their second extension.

Van Cott said that it was just 1 year ago that the resolution was approved. He asked if it would be possible to get something in writing before next week's meeting, so the board can think about if they want to add any conditions.

DeJoy said a written status report with dates and a plan.

McCarthy said perfect.

**Motion to Adjourn.**