

TOWN OF WARWICK PLANNING BOARD

August 20, 2025

Members present: Chairman, Benjamin Astorino
Dennis McConnell, Bo Kennedy,
Rich Purcell,
Laura Barca, HDR Engineering
Danielle Dreyer, NPV Planner
Bob Krahulik, Planning Board Attorney
Connie Sardo, Planning Board Secretary

The regular meeting of the Town of Warwick Planning Board was held Wednesday, April 16, 2025 at the Town Hall, 132 Kings Highway, Warwick, New York. Chairman, Benjamin Astorino called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Astorino: I would like to recognize one of our professionals on the board who will no longer be with us, Danielle Dreyer. You've been a great asset to this board and I wish you and this board wishes you all the best in your future endeavors. I'm sure Max is going to miss you. I'm sure he's missing you right now in Hawaii. But thank you so much for all you've done for us and we really wish you the best. Thank you. Enjoy yourself. You are a very talented person, so whatever you do, keep doing what you do.

PUBLIC HEARING OF Jennifer and Allan Mante, Trustee

Application for Site Plan Approval for the use and construction of a new single-family residence located within "A Designated Protection Area" of Greenwood Lake, situated on tax parcel S 73 B 9 L 15; project located on the eastern side of State Highway 210 0.0 feet south of Greenwood Lake Terrace (390 Jersey Ave.), in the SM zone, of the Town of Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York.

Representing the Applicant: James Ramos from Rother Engineering Firm.

Connie Sardo: Mr. Chairman, we received the certified mailings for the Mante public hearing.

Chairman Astorino: Thank you.

The following review comments submitted by HDR:

Comment #1: Planning Board to discuss SEQR.

Danielle Dreyer: This is a Type 2 Action. No further SEQR view is required.

Comment #2: Applicant to discuss project.

James Ramos: Yeah, so we're here for the Public Hearing and what we're looking to do is build a single-family house on an existing vacant lot. It's a permitted use in that zone. The reason we're here is because the building is going to be within a hundred feet of the lake.

Chairman Astorino: How far is the house situated from the lake?

James Ramos: So, the closest corner to the approximate shoreline is 49.7 feet.

Comment #3: Conservation Board – no comments received

Comment #4: Architectural Review Board – no comments received

Comment #5: OC Planning Department – 9/4/24 no advisory comments

Comment #6: TW Building Department – 9/6/24 Covered structure on shoreline of lake with deck, trailer storage for many boats, 3 accessory storage buildings near property lines not permitted.

Chairman Astorino: They were taken care of with the building department regarding those issues? Is that correct?

Samantha Mante: Were we supposed to move those?

Chairman Astorino: Yes. It could be a condition, but they have to be moved.

Samantha Mante: Ok. They are not going to stay there.

Comment #7: NYSDOT: 08/08/25 driveway entrance design accepted; provide office with SEQR documentation (Connie provided 08/12/25).

Chairman Astorino: We have that.

Comment #8: Septic testing was witnessed on June 10, 2025. Engineer to provide a signed/sealed letter confirming that the soil test results for the original design are similar to the soil test results witnessed on June 10, 2025 – and thus, the design has not changed.

James Ramos: No.

Comment #9: Survey to be incorporated into the plan set. Also the existing features shown on the survey should be shown on the site plan.

James Ramos: Ok.

Comment #10: Provide a map note stating that “No construction or proposed use shall begin until the maps are signed by the Planning Board Chairman and Building Department permits are obtained.” Sheet 01, General Notes, Note 11

James Ramos: Ok. It is on there.

Comment #11: The surveyor must sign and seal the plan because metes and bounds are included on the drawings.

James Ramos: Yes.

Comment #12: Surveyor to certify that iron rods have been set at all property corners.

James Ramos: Ok.

Comment #13: Payment of all fees.

James Ramos: Ok.

Chairman Astorino: Do any Board members or Professionals have any comments or concerns? This is a public hearing. If there is anyone in the audience wishing to address the Mante Site Plan application, please rise and state your name for the record.

Ron Kahn: I'm a neighbor. I'm a neighbor of the property. What is the zoning limits on the front yard or the water side? You said 49 feet and change, but what does the Code say?

James Ramos: There's a 100-foot buffer line here.

Ron Kahn: So you're exceeding the setback by 50 feet. Is that what you're saying?

Laura Barca: That's not a setback. That's a buffer.

Ron Kahn: Okay.

James Ramos: So the setback is 30 feet, I believe? The rear yard setback?

Laura Barca: It's a rear yard setback.

James Ramos: And that's where the corner of the building will be placed?

Ron Kahn: I just asked what the Code is. The code is only a 30-foot setback?

Chairman Astorino: The rear yard.

Ron Kahn: That's the rear is the water side. Ok. What does the buffer mean?

Laura Barca: The buffer is just because Greenwood Lake is a protected water body, anybody that does anything in the town of Warwick that's within 100 feet of Greenwood Lake, typically it comes to the planning board, but it gets an additional

level of review to make sure that what you're doing is not adding erosion or pollutants or anything into the lake.

Ron Kahn: So it's 100-foot back. That's where the septic system and everything else has to be minimum, am I correct?

Laura Barca: It doesn't have to be 100 feet away. If it's not 100 feet away from the lake, that's why the applicant comes here.

Ron Kahn: It could be more, of course. Is that correct?

Laura Barca: It could be more, sure. But if it's less, which they're less, that's why they're in front of the board.

Ron Kahn: The house also is in that 100 foot?

Laura Barca: Yes, the house is 50 feet from the water.

Chairman Astorino: The 100-foot buffer triggers them to come to the planning board.

So pretty much any property on the lake in Greenwood Lake is coming to the planning board. It's pretty cut and dry. That's what the engineer was just explaining. Once they're before us, it's a different level of scrutiny to make sure that the septic and everything else that's done doesn't adversely affect the lake.

Ron Kahn: I'm still a little concerned. I didn't totally understand the buffer 100-foot.

Chairman Astorino: The 100-foot buffer is a trigger to come to the planning board.

Ron Kahn: It has nothing to do with the actual setbacks or anything?

Chairman Astorino: No, then there's setbacks they have to meet.

Laura Barca: The required zoning setback is 30 feet from the lake.

Chairman Astorino: If you came to us, if you wanted to build something on your property with two houses down, you'd be here.

Ron Kahn: I was here.

Chairman Astorino: Ok.

Ron Kahn: Thank you.

Chairman Astorino: Any further comments from the public? Let the record indicate there's no further public comment. We'll make a motion.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to close the public hearing.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 4-Ayes and 0-Nays and 1-Absent.

Mr. Kennedy makes a motion on the Jennifer and Allan Mante, Trustee application, granting Site Plan Approval for the use and construction of a new single-family residence located within "A Designated Protection Area" of Greenwood Lake, situated on tax parcel S 73 B 9 L 15; project located on the eastern side of State Highway 210 0.0 feet south of Greenwood Lake Terrace (390 Jersey Ave.), in the SM zone, of the Town of Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York. A SEQRA Type 2 Action was adopted on September 18, 2024. Approval is granted subject to the following conditions:

1. TW Building Department – 9/6/24 Covered structure on shoreline of lake with deck, trailer storage for many boats, 3 accessory storage buildings near property line not permitted.
2. NYSDOT: 08/08/25 driveway entrance design accepted.
3. Septic testing was witnessed on June 10, 2025. Engineer to provide a signed/sealed letter confirming that the soil test results for the original design are similar to the soil test results witnessed on June 10, 2025- and thus, the design has not changed.
4. Survey to be incorporated into the plan set. Also the existing features shown on the survey should be shown on the site plan.
5. Provide a map note stating that “No construction or proposed use shall begin until the maps are signed by the Planning Board Chairman and Building Department permits are obtained.” Sheet 01, General Notes, Note 11.
6. The surveyor must sign and seal the plan because metes and bounds are included on the drawings.
7. Surveyor to certify that iron rods have been set at all property corners.
8. Payment of all fees.

Seconded by Mr. McConnell. Motion carried; 4-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

James Ramos: Thank you.

Review of Submitted Maps:***Blain Town Square/NTBS Management Group***

Application for Site Plan Approval and Special Use Permit for the use and construction of mixed-use commercial, residential, recreational development, situated on tax parcel SBL #51-1-41.2; project located on the southern side of NYS Route 94, 1100 feet east of Warwick Tpke., (137 State Route 94S), in the CB zone, of the Town of Warwick.

Representing the Applicant: James Ramos from Rother Engineering.

The following review comments submitted by HDR:

Comment #1: Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.

Danielle Dreyer: This is a Type 1 Action, as the project will involve a physical alteration of over 10 acres. The Planning Board can't indicate its intent to be Lead Agency. A full EIS Part 1 has been submitted, and we've prepared a Lead Agency Notice of Intent and Resolution for the Board to commence coordinated review. We have also prepared a Full Environmental Assessment Form Part 2, identifying the following large or moderate impacts. This Part 2 cannot be adopted until 30 days have passed from the distribution of the Lead Agency. We recommend that the Planning Board have the applicant prepare a draft Part 3 Environmental Assessment Form addressing these potential impacts.

Alternatively, due to the size and location of the project and the wide range of potential impacts associated with it, the Planning Board may be, and the project sponsor may wish to proceed to, directly to a Positive Declaration of environmental significance as the adverse impacts are unlikely to be avoided. And these impacts identified are impacts to land, impacts on surface water, impacts on groundwater, impacts on plants and animals, impact on agricultural resources, aesthetic resources, impact on noise and light, impact on traffic, impact on energy, and impact on community character. Additionally, I understand that these plans are fairly preliminary at this point, but we would like to see lighting plans, preferably in the form of photometrics, landscaping plans, and any kind of signage and renderings of the project. We saw renderings at the workshop, but if you could provide all and any materials to the Planning Board for review, that would be great.

Chairman Astorino: Chairman Astorino: Thank you. I know we discussed the Positive Declaration at the Work Session. I think, in my personal opinion, it's a very wise move to do it early and get started with that. So Danielle, we could do the Type 1 to get started, and then I would, in the consensus of the Board, I think that's where we're headed, correct? It sounds like, I mean it sort of makes sense to me.

Mr. McConnell: Does that mean we have to do something tonight? I would like to get some information.

Chairman Astorino: We could do the Lead Agency to get started and then we'll proceed, and I think we have to prepare the POS DEC, correct?

Danielle Dreyer: Yes, correct. Yeah, we'll go forward with the Lead Agency. Once 30 days has commenced then we can move forward with the POS DEC.

Chairman Astorino: Okay, so I think we have a consensus at the Board. Jim, that's the way we are going to go.

James Ramos: Okay.

Chairman Astorino: So, we'll deal with that. Connie will circulate for Lead Agency.

Connie Sardo: Yes.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion for Establishing Lead Agency.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. The following Resolution was carried 4- Ayes and 0-Nays and 1-Absent.

617.6

State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR)

Resolution Establishing Lead Agency

Type I Action

Name of Action: Blain Town Square

Whereas, the Town of Warwick Planning Board is in receipt of an application for site plan approval on Town of Warwick tax lot SBL 51-1-41.2 on NYS Route 94 North. The project site is within the Community Business (CB) zoning district, and the Ridgeline Overlay, Aquifer Protection Overlay, and Agricultural Protection Overlay districts. The applicant is proposing a mixed-use commercial/residential/recreational development on approximately 38 acres of land fronting on the northbound side of NYS Route 94, across from the Price Chopper entrance. The project includes eight proposed structures having a total footprint of 145,200 square feet and will be a mix of office, retail, food service, and other uses. Four of the structures will each have 18 one-bedroom accessory apartments on the second story. A ninth building and associated athletic field is also proposed to be used for indoor and outdoor sports and recreation. Additional

improvements proposed include access roads, parking, utilities, and stormwater management facilities; and

Whereas, a Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) was submitted by the project sponsor, dated June 24, 2025; and

Whereas, after comparing the application to the thresholds contained in 6 NYCRR 617.4 and 5, the Planning Board has determined that the proposed project is a Type I Action, as the project will involve the physical alteration of over 10 acres; and

Whereas, the Planning Board has identified the following potential involved agencies for this Proposed Action:

NYS Department of Environmental Conservation

NYS Department of Transportation

Orange County Department of Health

Orange County Department of Planning

NYS Office of Parks, Recreation & Historic Preservation

Village of Warwick Planning Department

Town of Warwick Town Board

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Planning Board hereby classifies the proposed action as Type I pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.4(6)(i) and hereby declares itself Lead Agency for the coordinated SEQR review of this action; and

Be It Further Resolved, that the Planning Board Secretary is hereby directed to mail copies of the attached lead agency notice along with a signed and dated copy of the Full Part 1 EAF to be provided by the project sponsor along with a copy of the application to all identified involved agencies; and

Be It Further Resolved, that a Determination of Significance will be made at such time as all information has been received by the Planning Board to enable it to determine whether the action will or will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Comment #2: Applicant to discuss project.

Chairman Astorino: James, on this one, I know it's the beginning. If you want to do a quick synopsis of what it is, because it sounds like after the 30 days of circulating for SEQR, we will probably do a Positive Declaration and we will then break it down into

everything. If you want to do a quick synopsis of what is proposed, that's fine. But these other comments I'm going to put for the record at this point.

James Ramos: Ok. The Applicant and the Owners are very excited for this project. There's some group of lawyers. Once this gets built, they want to have their offices here as well. So, what we're definitely looking to do is coordinate with the DOT. I spoke with Kirk about that entrance and changing the light or whatever the DOT needs us to do on that. Basically, you know, it has the ability to get the water and the sewer from the Town. I believe that is correct?

Chairman Astorino: That's yet to be determined. That's something, again, I think we're going to have to work through that because whether there's capacity or not across the street, we don't know that.

James Ramos: So, our calculations are approximately 30,000 gallons.

Chairman Astorino: Yeah, we heard that 30 a day. And again, like I said, this is initial. It's a big project and we'll go through it step by step.

James Ramos: And then we're going to have to work with some of the marginal access connections. I heard some of those there was some controversy. We are going to make some changes on that. Whatever we have to do.

Chairman Astorino: Okay. And we could discuss with neighboring property owners when we get there if they're interested or not. We would go from there. Do any Board members or Professionals have any comments or concerns?

Mr. McConnell: Mr. McConnell: The barn is directly across from Price Chopper, which is where the light is. Is that why you're saying that maybe DOT will have to look at moving that light? I am trying to think how do you do that without taking down that barn? Is that on the plans?

James Ramos: Well, maybe once we've discussed with the DOT just like on the Price Chopper side, they have a turn lane so we may have to put a different turn lane right into the project there. And we want to keep it directly across from that light itself.

Mr. McConnell: Yeah, but you would also need them to come out.

James Ramos: Right.

Mr. McConnell: There are no plans at this point to necessarily take down the barn.

Bob Krahulik: Yes. There is.

James Ramos: It appears on the plan

Mr. McConnell: I'm not holding you to it.

James Ramos: It appears on the plan. If you look at it, the barn is superimposed right where that entrance boulevard is coming in and out.

Mr. McConnell: Okay, I got you. Thank you.

Chairman Astorino: Okay, so we'll get you started on SEQR. Do any other Board members or Professionals have any comments or concerns? We will list Comment #3 through Comment #54 for the record. We will go from there. Thank you, Jim.

James Ramos: Thank you.

Comment #3: Conservation Board – no comments received

Comment #4: Architectural Review Board – no comments received

Comment #5: TW Building Department – pending comments.

Comment #6: OC Planning Department – pending comments

Comment #7: OCDOH – pending submittal/review

Comment #8: NYSDOT – pending submittal/review

Comment #9: Planning Board to determine if a site inspection is necessary.

Comment #10: Service capacity letters are required to be submitted.

Comment #11: All applicable Town of Warwick Standard Map Notes must be added to the site plans.

Comment #12: §164-46J(53): Town of Warwick Design Standards is mandatory; please show on the drawing and/or provide a narrative to demonstrate how this project complies to the extent possible for an existing building/property.

Comment #13: All planned Tier 1 and Tier 2 uses and square footage of buildings should be included on the site plans.

Comment #14: §164-46J(139)(e)[1] For retail uses, a minimum floor area of 2,000 square feet and a maximum floor area of 60,000 square feet per lot is permitted. For nonretail uses, a minimum floor area of 1,000 square feet and a maximum floor area of 60,000 square feet per lot is permitted. Individual business establishments that exceed 8,000 square feet of floor area shall be designed to exhibit the physical design characteristics of pedestrian-oriented, shopfront-style shopping streets.

Comment #15: §164-46J(139)(e)[3] The maximum lot coverage shall be 30% for Tier 2 uses and 40% for Tier 1 uses. The area reserved for the marginal access road right-of-way shall not be penalized for reserving such acreage when calculating maximum lot coverage.

Comment #16: §164-46J(139)(e)[4] The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) shall be 0.2 for Tier 2 uses and 0.25 for Tier 1 uses. The area reserved for the marginal access road right-of-way shall not be penalized for reserving such acreage when calculating the maximum FAR.

Comment #17: §164-46J(139)(e)[5] Buildings that have a minimum of two stories and a maximum of three stories or 38 feet, not including the height exceptions allowed by § 164-41C(3) of the Zoning Law, will earn a bonus FAR of 0.05 for Tier 1 uses for a maximum allowable FAR of 0.30. The area reserved for the marginal access road right-of-way shall not be penalized for reserving such acreage when calculating the maximum FAR.

Comment #18: §164-46J(139)(e)[6] Requirements for Tier 2 retail store uses must be followed.

Comment #19: The number of employees, maximum seating capacity, hours of operation should be shown for each use.

Comment #20: Town of Warwick Table of Bulk Requirements with all applicable setback distances should be included on site plans. §164-42F(3)(b) Area and bulk requirements must be followed.

Comment #21: The project boundaries should be added to the ERM and NWI maps

Comment #22: NYSDEC ERM should be re-run. A check of ERM indicated potential rare species habitat on the site. The EAF identifies bog turtles as a potential rare species; the Applicant should cite whether potential habitat is present.

Comment #23: The CRIS map indicates potential archeologically sensitive areas on portions of the site. The Applicant should coordinate with the NYSOPRHP to verify if further studies are required.

Comment #24: The Applicant proposes to culvert a portion of the unnamed tributary to Wawayanda Creek. The Applicant should verify with USACE the regulatory status of the stream, permitting feasibility and requirements, and any compensatory mitigation requirements.

Comment #25: The proposed wastewater system should be shown on the plans.

Comment #26: The proposed water supply system should be shown on the plans.

Comment #27: Applicant to prepare a traffic study. The scope of the traffic study should be approved prior to the vehicle traffic counts being collected.

Comment #28: §164-42F(3)(c) Marginal access road development requirements must be followed.

Comment #29: Parking calculations must be shown on the site plans for all Tier 1 and Tier 2 uses.

Comment #30: §164-46J(139)(e)[8] Opportunities for shared parking shall be integrated into the plan for parking. Off-street parking spaces shall be located to the rear of the principal building or otherwise screened to not be visible from the street(s) or residential zoning districts.

Comment #31: §164-46J(139)(e)[9] Buildings shall have a primary entrance door facing a public sidewalk. Entrances at building corners may be used to satisfy this requirement.

Comment #32: §164-46J(139)(e)[10] Building entrances may include doors to individual shops or businesses, lobby entrances, entrances to pedestrian-oriented plazas, or courtyard entrances to a cluster of shops or businesses.

Comment #33: §164-46J(139)(e)[11] A minimum of 60% of the street-facing building facade between two feet and eight feet in height shall be comprised of clear windows that allow views of indoor space or product display areas. The bottom of any window or product display window used to satisfy this requirement may not be more than 4.5 feet above the adjacent sidewalk.

Comment #34: §164-46J(139)(e)[8] Opportunities for shared parking shall be integrated into the plan for parking. Off-street parking spaces shall be located to the rear of the principal building or otherwise screened to not be visible from the street(s) or residential zoning districts.

Comment #35: Detail for proposed parking spaces should be included.

Comment #36: All parking lot spaces must be striped; please provide a detail for all spaces that are not currently striped.

Comment #37: The plan should show the location and related signage for handicapped accessible parking spaces.

Comment #38: Town of Warwick Standard Notes must be included on the plans

Comment #39: The 911 addresses must be shown on the plan.

Comment #40: A full Stormwater Management Plan, in compliance with §164-47.10 Stormwater Management, must be submitted.

Comment #41: Limits of disturbance, and total amount in acres, should be included on the plans.

Comment #42: A Landscaping Plan, including a planting schedule, should be included on the plans.

Comment #43: The location, height, size, materials of construction, design, and illumination of existing and proposed signs, in accordance with §164-43.1

Comment #44: The proposed location, height, orientation, type of illuminating device, shielding, bulb type and wattage, and photometric data of all outdoor lighting fixtures, should be included.

Comment #45: Road sign locations should be included on the site plans.

Comment #46: Plans for the disposal of construction and demolition waste, whether on-site storage and/or use, should be provided.

Comment #47: The location of fire and emergency access ways and zones, including the location of fire hydrants or of the nearest alternative water supply for fire emergencies should be included on the site plans.

Comment #48: The location, type, and screening details for solid waste disposal facilities and containers should be shown on the plans.

Comment #49: Adequate pedestrian access should be provided, demonstrate this on the plans.

Comment #50: Provide a map note stating that “No construction or proposed use shall begin until the maps are signed by the Planning Board Chairman and Building Department permits are obtained.”

Comment #51: Surveyor to certify that iron rods have been set at all property corners.

Comment #52: Any required declarations must be added to the plan.

Comment #53: Any required Performance and Landscape Bonds must be submitted, as well as site inspection fees.

Comment #54: Payment of all fees.

Black Walnut Creek, LLC

Application Site Plan Approval and Special Use Permit for the use and construction for commercial agriculture farm market over 4,000 s.f., museum village, and eating and drinking establishment, situated on tax parcel S 4 B 1 L 2.46; project located on the northern side of Van Sickle Road 375± feet north of intersection at Pulaski Hwy., (13 Van Sickle Road a/k/a 6 Sodrick Lane), in the AI zone, of the Town of Warwick. Previously discussed at the Planning Board Meeting of 5/21/25.

Representing the Applicant: Keith Woodruff from Engineering Survey & Properties

The following review comments submitted by HDR:

Comment #1: Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.

Danielle Dreyer: We recommend that this action is classified as a Type 1. The Applicant has prepared a full Environmental Assessment Form Part 1 and we have prepared a Resolution for the board to declare the agency to commence coordinated review.

Mr. Kennedy makes a motion for Establishing for Lead Agency.

Seconded by Mr. McConnell. The following Resolution was carried 4-Ayes and 0-Nays and 1-Absent.

617.6

State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR)

Resolution Establishing Lead Agency

Type I Action

Name of Action: Black Walnut Creek

Whereas, the Town of Warwick Planning Board is in receipt of an application for site plan and special use permit approval on Town of Warwick tax lot SBL 4-1-2.46 at 13 Van Sickle Road. The project site is within the AI (Agricultural Industry) zoning district, and the Biodiversity, Agricultural Protection, and Aquifer Protection Overlay Districts. The applicant is proposing to add a multi-faceted Museum component to include a formal, dedicated museum space within the lower level of the barn. The museum will be complemented with a food truck area and a dedicated eating and drinking space; and

Whereas, a Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) was submitted by the project sponsor, dated May 28, 2025; and

Whereas, after comparing the application to the thresholds contained in 6 NYCRR 617.4 and 5, and 10 NYCRR 97.14, the Planning Board has determined that the proposed project is a Type I Action; and

Whereas, the Planning Board has identified the following potential involved agencies for this Proposed Action:

**NYS Department of Environmental Conservation
Orange County Department of Health
Orange County DPW
Orange County Department of Planning
NYS Office of Parks, Recreation & Historic Preservation
Town of Warwick Town Board**

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Planning Board hereby classifies the proposed action as Type I pursuant to 10 NYCRR 97.14(b)(2)(i), and hereby declares itself Lead Agency for the coordinated SEQR review of this action; and.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Planning Board Secretary is hereby directed to mail copies of the attached lead agency notice along with a signed and dated copy of the Full Part 1 EAF to be provided by the project sponsor along with a copy of the application to all identified involved agencies; and

Be It Further Resolved, that a Determination of Significance will be made at such time as all information has been received by the Planning Board to enable it to determine whether the action will or will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Comment #2: Applicant to discuss project.

Keith Woodruff: As briefly described in the Lead Agency determination, it's a 54-acre parcel located between Sodrick and Van Sickle Lane off of Pulaski Highway. The applicant is looking to convert the commercial agricultural current with a small farm stand into a larger farm market area over 4,000 square feet subject to or in conjunction with an eating and drinking establishment museum village as well as some other ancillary uses. Currently they have a food truck which did receive or requires an Orange County Health Department permit. We will be exceeding a public water supply and a sewage so those will also be applications and approvals by the health department. The plans were recently changed and submitted to the board in June for which we've modified the parking layout, increased the number of parking spaces. We've calculated a required count of 29 spaces. We provide 54 spaces on a gravel surface in front of the existing barn with an additional 96 spaces of overflow parking located along Van Sickle Lane, the farm road on the way out. So, for the farm festivals and any additional temporary overflow parking, that's where those spaces will be utilized. We also modified the hours of operation. So previously I think it was 12 a.m. We have it now listed on the plans as a 9 a.m. to 10 p.m. hours of operation. And we understand that there's some additional work that needs to be added to the plans. We have a copy of the comments and I don't think

there's anything specific that we need to go through unless there's something that the board wanted to kind of discuss.

Chairman Astorino: I think we discussed the parking layout at the work session, the wood chips, stuff like that, that that wasn't going to fly. The main reason tonight was to get SEQR going. So, we did that. I think we'll wait another submittal to see where we're at unless the board is comfortable setting this for a public hearing next available agenda. It's up to the board if you want to see the different layout?

Mr. McConnell: I would rather see the better layout.

Chairman Astorino: Ok. I will put Comment #3 through Comment #49 for the record. Keith, you have no questions on these at this point?

Keith Woodruff: No. These are comments that we can work through with the engineer.

Chairman Astorino: Okay, so let's get that going. Make another submittal and we'll get you guys going on that.

Keith Woodruff: Ok. Thank you.

Comment #3: Conservation Board – no comments received

Comment #4: Architectural Review Board – no comments received

Comment #5: OC Planning Department – pending comments

Comment #6: OPRHP: March 4, 2022 no significant archeologic materials found in proposed project area.

Comment #7: TW Building Department: 06/09/25 - 2 additions on barn require a permit, accessory structure requires a permit, maintain clear exterior walkways, fire inspection required, pending septic from 2022.

Comment #8: OCDOH for water & septic – pending submittal

Comment #9: Town Law §280(a) for access from a non-public road; Applicant requesting approval from the planning board.

Comment #10: Sheet O-100, Note 5 indicates the uses at this property. Applicant should separate the existing uses from the proposed uses and describe how each proposed use is an allowed use.

Comment #11: This property has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places since August 12, 2024. An application to the Town Board is required to update Town Code §164-43. B(2).

Comment #12: Applicant to include the following note on the plans: The (name of historic property/structure) is a Class I historic resource per the Town of Warwick Doe §164-43.3.F(1)(b). The historic character will be maintained and preserved. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired, not replaced. New features shall match the old in

design, color, texture, materials, and other visual qualities. A museum of site artifacts will be created (provide location of museum) for the public to view.

Comment #13: Applicant to submit copies of the private road agreements.

Comment #14: Applicant to demonstrate that the private road agreement for Sodrick Lane allows this type of use.

Comment #15: Applicant to confirm that more than one opportunity can be selected from §164-43.3.C(1).

Comment #16: Sheet C-100 shows parking requirements for 29 spaces with 35 spaces proposed. The septic system shown on Sheet C-302 indicates a bar/lounge for 152 seats. Applicant should clarify and can provide parking as needed.

Comment #17: Applicant to include width of Van Sickle Road on site plan.

Comment #18: Applicant to show an alternative for overflow parking so that the vehicle does not have to back out onto the private road.

Comment #19: Applicant to clarify how the 152 seat bar/lounge is an allowed use in the Table of Use Requirements.

Comment #20: Applicant to update plans to include the square footage of farm market, seating (both indoor and outdoor), and overflow and regular parking.

Comment #21: Applicant to add location of food truck to the plans.

Comment #22: Applicant to clarify/provide calculations for §164-46.J(152) (a), (b), (f), and (g).

Comment #23: Applicant to submit traffic scope of work.

Comment #24: Applicant to clarify status of two trailers on the property, located in side yard.

Comment #25: Applicant to clarify if amplified music will be part of their proposed operations of it all music will be indoors with doors closed, A noise study may be required.

Comment #26: Applicant to prepare and submit a lighting plan.

Comment #27: Applicant to submit architectural renderings of exterior of buildings.

Comment #28: Lots 6 and 7 should be outlined in bold to show distinction between it and other parcels.

Comment #29: Applicant to consider fencing between the adjacent farm and this property.

Comment #30: Parking areas cannot have a wood chip surface; applicant to update pavement type to a minimum of Item 4.

Comment #31: The plan is showing parking spaces along the private road that require backing into the private road. Applicant to confirm compliance with the code for location and for backing out.

Comment #32: Applicant to demonstrate compliance with ADA requirements, including accessible access routes from parking areas to building entrances, ramp locations, cross slopes for parking areas, spot elevations, and appropriate signage for ADA parking spaces.

Comment #33: Town of Warwick Standard Notes must be added to the plans, for Biodiversity and SWPPP Note for Projects in the AP-O.

Comment #34: All existing and proposed signage must be shown on the plan per §164-43.1. This includes depicting the location and related signage for any handicapped accessible parking spaces. Indicate locations of all proposed signs (stop, no parking, fire lane, etc.) and stop bar on the plans that correspond to the sign schedule and details.

Comment #35: Applicant to confirm whether any signage is proposed.

Comment #36: Applicant to include signage to clearly indicate entrances and exits for the property.

Comment #37: Applicant to include sign schedule showing parking signs to be included to help with traffic management on the property.

Comment #38: Parking requirements for each use must be shown (please include food truck, museum, and any others).

Comment #39: The soil testing for the septic system design must be witnessed by the office of the Planning Board Engineer or Orange County Department of Health.

Comment #40: Landscaping to be provided in accordance with §164-43.2(10), at a minimum.

Comment #41: Exterior Lighting Plan should be provided and be in accordance with §164-43.4(E)1.

Comment #42: Please add a note to the plan stating that a farm stand does not allow visitors to pick their own fruit.

Comment #43: The 911 addresses must be shown on the plan. Please confirm the address with the Town.

Comment #44: Provide a map note stating that “No construction or proposed use shall begin until the maps are signed by the Planning Board Chairman and Building Department permits are obtained.” Sheet 1, Note 13.

Comment #45: Surveyor to certify that iron rods have been set at all property corners.

Comment #46: The liber and page for Town of Warwick Standard Notes must be added to the plans.

Comment #47: A performance bond may be required to improve the road to the satisfaction of the town board or planning board.

Comment #48: Applicant to post any required Performance Bond or Landscaping Bond.

Comment #49: Payment of all fees.

UrbanXtracts Phase 2

Application for Site Plan Approval and Special Use Permit for the use and construction of Cannabis Manufacturing & Distribution, situated on tax parcel SBL #46-1-51.2; project located on the southern side of John Hicks Drive 100 feet west of State School Road (41 & 43 John Hicks Drive), in the OI zone, of the Town of Warwick.

Representing the Applicant: Jerry Casesa from H.V. Realty Service. Aaron Scherin, CEO of UrbanXtracts. Eric Rogge, Hudson Land Design.

The following review comments submitted by HDR:

Comment #1: Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.

Danielle Dreyer: This is an Unlisted Action under SEQR. We have prepared a Resolution for the Board to declare Lead Agency. I will preface that there is an error in the third whereas clause aside from the repeated dated error that we state the action will involve fiscal alteration of over 10 acres. That is not accurate so we will redact that and revise and send to Connie. However, we've also prepared a Short Environmental Assessment Form Part 2. If the Planning Board agrees with our identified actions and commenced review, they may wish to adopt the Part 2. And the impacts we identified were potential impact on land, traffic, existing water supplies, historic and archaeological resources, and other as we identified the potential impact of the increase of odors.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion for Establishing Lead Agency.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. The following Resolution was carried; 4-Ayes and 0-Nays and 1-Absent.

617.6

State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR)

Resolution Establishing Lead Agency

Unlisted Action

Name of Action: UrbanXtracts Phase 2

Whereas, the Town of Warwick Planning Board is in receipt of an application for site plan and special permit approval on Town of Warwick tax lot SBL 46-1-51.2 on John Hicks Drive. The project site is within the Office Industrial (OI) zoning district. The applicant is proposing the adaptive reuse of the existing honor housing unit (building 10) as a cannabis manufacturing and distribution facility and the reuse of honor housing unit (building 11) for staff accommodations (housing). Building 11 will be expanded with a 6,314 sf, 3-story addition. The project also

includes the three outdoor cannabis growing areas totaling approximately 118,400 sf, construction of four additional greenhouses, and reuse of the existing piggery building (building 15) as a training building with greenhouses; and

Whereas, a Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) dated was submitted by the project sponsor, dated June 23, 2025; and

Whereas, after comparing the application to the thresholds contained in 6 NYCRR 617.4 and 5, the Planning Board has determined that the proposed project is an Unlisted Action, as the project will involve the physical alteration of over 10 acres; and

Whereas, the Planning Board has not identified any potential involved agencies for this Proposed Action; and

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Planning Board hereby classifies the proposed action as an Unlisted Action and hereby declares itself Lead Agency for the uncoordinated SEQR review of this action; and

Be It Further Resolved, that the Planning Board Secretary is hereby directed to mail copies of the attached lead agency notice along with a signed and dated copy of the Short Part 1 EAF to be provided by the project sponsor along with a copy of the application to all identified involved agencies; and

Be It Further Resolved, that a Determination of Significance will be made at such time as all information has been received by the Planning Board to enable it to determine whether the action will or will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Comment #2: Applicant to discuss project.

Jerry Casesa: We are here tonight for the site plan approval and a special use permit for the expansion of UrbanXtracts growing, processing and distribution operations of cannabis products. It's located as we said in the Warwick Valley Office Technology Park. It's part of the old, the former Mid-Hudson, Mid-Orange Correctional Facility. It's located at the intersection of State School Road and John Hicks Drive. The site is approximately 22 acres and has six existing buildings. We are proposing expansion of the main building which is H-Block, known as H-Block. It's the main building as you first come in. That building is about 34,000 square feet over three stories, a footprint of about 11,400 square feet. There is a courtyard area in the middle of the building that we're proposing to put a three-story addition in there, which will add about 18,000 square feet to that facility. This building will be the primary cannabis manufacturing and distribution facility for UrbanXtracts. They're currently operating and will continue to operate out of the improved barn that we have here and the extraction facility. So that will remain. But this building is going to be used for more automation of the product and the processing. The rear building, which is a smaller building back here, is about 5,600 square, 5,490 square feet. Its footprint will remain unchanged. That'll be used for staff accommodations, but it's really farmworker housing. We've already applied to the Orange

County Board of Health which regulates that to make sure that they'll accept this operation in support of having farmworker housing on premise. We have that application. There's a little bit of a catch 22 because the board here wants approval from them that they'll approve that part of the project. They give us a letter indicating that it's acceptable, but we need to have a final site plan approval from the town for them to issue the actual permit. The permit, it won't be issued until we have the final site plan approval, and then they'll do a pre-permit inspection of the facility, give us our list, we'll have to modify the building, renovate it, get it ready for C of O, and then the permit is issued. It would be renewed every year.

Chairman Astorino: They will provide this board with an official letter from the Health Department saying, yes. I get the whole physical permit in your hand, but we need to have confirmation from them that they are going to allow this.

Laura Barca: I contacted the Health Department, and the Health Department said they have an application, and that's it. There's been no further issuance of anything from them except for receivable of your permit application.

Jerry Casesa: And you spoke to the board?

Laura Barca: Yes. I spoke with two people at the Health Department. I'm waiting to hear back from them.

Jerry Casesa: Ok. I called today to try to get an answer as well.

Mr. McConnell: Do you have a contingency plan if for whatever reason they say no?

Jerry Casesa: Actually, I don't believe it's required because I did meet with Brian Foote who is the person in charge of that area from The Department of Health. We went over it. He gave us a very specific list of criteria for that housing, size of rooms, amount of square footage for storage, personal effects, area of kitchen. So, this building, we took that building and designed it so we met all those criteria, and that's the application he has in hand which is the full architectural plans for that building.

Mr. McConnell: We know that government never changes their mind.

Jerry Casesa: Well, we hope not.

Mr. McConnell: So, I'm just asking do you have a backup plan, or let's say that they don't reject it but they impose further requirements.

Jerry Casesa: We will comply. That's all we can say. We'll comply with whatever they come up with. Because we do need that.

Mr. McConnell: But you see why we're not going to give you final approval, because we could give you final approval for something that you then can't do. And then you come back to us and go, why'd you give us final approval? Or instead, you make an argument in court, we got final approval from the Planning Board.

Jerry Casesa: I understand what you're saying, but I don't believe we'll go that far, but we'll work with that.

Chairman Astorino: We've got to work through it regardless.

Jerry Casesa: And we will comply.

Laura Barca: This Planning Board has worked with the Health Department before on farm worker housing, so I don't expect there to be, like the catch 22, I don't expect there to be a problem with that.

Jerry Casesa: So, we'll work through that. Thank you.

Chairman Astorino: So Jerry, I know we got SEQR started this evening. I mean there's numerous comments that are on here. If there's any questions for you on them you can ask them tonight or ask our engineer. We're getting started with SEQR. You have a lot of outstanding agencies we're working with. This board will set a site visit probably at the next meeting if you don't want to do it tonight. To go down there and take a look at it. And then we'll go from there. What's the board's feeling on setting a site visit?

Mr. McConnell: I don't see why we need to wait. We could set a site visit this evening.

The Planning Board discussed scheduling at site visit for the UrbanXtracts Phase 2 application. The Planning Board site visit has been scheduled for September 8, 2025 @ 5:00 p.m.

Chairman Astorino: We will list Comment #3 through Comment #45 for the record. Eric, do you have any questions?

Eric Rogge: Did you get the full plan set for the civil drawings?

Laura Barca: We got one version, but after this was written I realized that there was a second one that does have some of this information on it.

Eric Rogge: Ok.

Chairman Astorino: And like I said, we're very early in the process. So as this rolls through, obviously if there's any questions, by all means, reach out. So we have a site visit. We'll see you there on September 8th. Can we get in the buildings at all?

Eric Rogge: Yes.

Chairman Astorino: Perfect. Great. We'll see you then. Thank you.

Mr. McConnell: I think I brought this up at the work session. When you say extraction, to me that, you know, I think of like extracting olive oil from olives. Are you pressing things? You are? Okay. And do you have in the plans how that is treated in terms of the waste that comes from that kind of process?

Eric Rogge: That whole process is not being proposed in this expansion.

Mr. McConnell: So, what's the extraction that's being proposed?

Eric Rogge: Nothing, because what's already commented is what's being extracted.

Mr. McConnell: Okay, so this doesn't include extraction?

Eric Rogge: No.

Jerry Casesa: We are calling it processing.

Eric Rogge: It is called processing. So that's now taking it and putting it into products, packaging, the manufacturing of making the product after it's been extracted. The extraction is done at our existing facility.

Mr. McConnell: You've already got permitted for that. So, we can remove that language from this application?

Eric Rogge: On the extraction?

Jerry Casesea: If it is on there.

Chairman Astorino: I agree with you. But I wouldn't remove anything yet.

Mr. McConnell: I'm just saying that it confused me.

Chairman Astorino: No, I totally agree with you. But this process is early. Let's make sure first.

Mr. McConnell: Ok.

Eric Rogge: Maybe after the site visit, we would get a better understanding. Chairman Astorino: Let me ask you this question. Is there a way of seeing your process in the other building?

Jerry Casesa: Absolutely.

Chairman Astorino: Perfect.

Eric Rogge: That's what I thought we'll do first. We'll show you how we cultivate, how we extract, how we manufacture. And everything that we're doing now, all we're doing is expanding it here in an automated way. You're going to see us doing it manually in these new rooms, in these new places. We're going to put automated machines and that's why really the footprint as far as personnel pretty much stays the same. We're expanding.

Mr. McConnell: A site visit is worth a thousand words.

Chairman Astorino: Absolutely. Thank you.

Mr. McConnell: Can we make a note of that so that we don't lose sight of that?

Chairman Astorino: Yes. Laura, please make a note of that.

Laura Barca: Yes.

Jerry Casesa: Thank you.

Eric Rogge: Thank you.

Comment #3: Conservation Board – no comments received

Comment #4: Architectural Review Board – no comments received

Comment #5: TW Building Department – pending comments

Comment #6: OC Planning Department – pending comments

Comment #7: OCDOH – pending review for Migrant Labor Camp

Comment #8: NYS OPRHP – pending review

Comment #9: Office of Cannabis Management – pending comments

Comment #10: Planning Board to determine if a site inspection is necessary.

Comment #11: Applicant to submit a wetlands delineation survey.

Comment #12: Service capacity letters are required to be submitted.

Comment #13: All existing and proposed signage must be shown on the plan. The location and detail for any proposed signage should be added to the plans.

Comment #14: Town of Warwick Table of Bulk Requirements with applicable distances should be included on site plans.

Comment #15: Applicant to clarify existing and/or proposed water and sewer usage, and show any existing and proposed connections on the plans.

Comment #16: Applicant to clarify how products will be stored and how ventilation process will work for products.

Comment #17: Applicant to clarify if existing fencing surrounding the facility will remain, and how the facility will be secured.

Comment #18: Detail for proposed parking spaces should be included.

Comment #19: All parking lot spaces must be striped; please provide a detail for all spaces that are not currently striped.

Comment #20: The plan should show the location and related signage for handicapped accessible parking spaces.

Comment #21: Town of Warwick Standard Notes for utilities, limits of disturbance, and access onto a state highway note should be added to the plans.

Comment #22: The 911 addresses must be shown on the plan.

Comment #23: SWPPP Section 2.3.1 states that NYSDEC and USACE wetlands are present on and adjacent to the project site. Please clarify within the SWPPP if any soil disturbance is expected to occur within the regulated wetland areas or protected 100-foot buffers (a question in the NOI), or if any wetland permits are required.

Comment #24: SWPPP section 6.1.2 states that “Four design points were selected”, but then the table immediately following in the same section only gives two design points. Two design points appears to be correct based on information in other areas, so please clarify.

Comment #25: SWPPP Section 7.9 states that a Long-Term O&M plan will be provided prior to the closeout of the permit. Note that this should be included in this SWPPP package once available.

Comment #26: SWPPP Appendices:

- a. Appendix A – Notice of Intent and MS4 Acceptance is currently empty. Please include the eNOI here, even if only a draft at this stage before receiving all approvals.
- b. Appendix H – Stormwater Construction Inspection Checklists is also empty. Please include relevant checklists, or remove this Appendix if not necessary since there is also Appendix M – Construction Inspection Report.
- c. Please include design plans as an Appendix in the SWPPP package. This does not necessarily need to be an entire drawing set but should at least include relevant sheets to discussions in the narrative such as Erosion & Sediment Control Plans and a plan showing the location of post-construction stormwater management practices.

Comment #27: §164-46.J(53): Town of Warwick Design Standards is mandatory; please show on the drawing and/or provide a narrative to demonstrate how this project complies to the extent possible for an existing building/property.

Comment #28: §164-48 Performance Standards: No land or building shall be used or occupied in any manner so as to create any dangerous, injurious, noxious or otherwise objectionable fire, explosive or other hazard, noise or vibration, smoke, dust, electromagnetic or other disturbance, glare, liquid or solid refuse or wastes or other substance, condition or element in such a manner or in such amount as to adversely affect the reasonable use of the surrounding area or adjoining premises (referred to herein as "dangerous or objectionable elements"), provided that any use permitted or not expressly prohibited by this chapter may be undertaken and maintained if it conforms to the regulation of this section limiting dangerous and objectionable elements at the point of the determination of their existence.

Comment #29: §164-46 J(84): Accessory storage in an orderly manner is permitted in any area other than the required front, rear or side yards, provided that such outdoor storage does not exceed 15 feet in height or occupy more than 10% of the area of the lot, and such storage area is effectively screened from view from all sides. Screening shall consist of an eight-foot high solid wall or fence uniform in finish and appearance, or an effective living screen of evergreen type. In no case shall materials be stored so as to be visible from the public right-of-way or boundaries of the lot.

Comment #30: §164-46 J(86): A manufacturing use must not create any dangerous, injurious, noxious or otherwise objectionable fire, explosion, radioactive or other hazard, noise or vibration, smoke, dust, odor, disturbance to radio and television reception, glare, harmful discharge or storage or dispersal of liquid or solid waste, or other forms of nuisance in a manner or amount as to adversely affect the surrounding area. Applicant to demonstrate compliance.

Comment #31: §164-46 J(97): In addition to the landscaping required as a screen against adjacent residential districts, and in addition to that required in parking areas, a minimum area equal to 1/3 of the first 50,000 square feet of building coverage, plus 20% of the square footage in excess of 50,000 square feet, shall be devoted to aesthetic landscaping enhancing such areas as outer courtyards, building perimeters and major vehicular entrances and exits. Such landscaping and planting plan shall be consistent with the Town's Design Standards.

Comment #32: §164-46 J(124): In Office and Industrial Park Districts, no side or rear yard shall be required where such yard abuts an operating railroad right-of-way.

Comment #33: All applicable setback distances noted in §164-46 J(127) should be included on the site plans.

Comment #34: §164-46 J(131): The minimum floor area for uses in the Office and Industrial Park District shall be 2,000 square feet for the first floor of each principal building.

Comment #35: §164-46 J(132): The minimum distance between buildings in the Office/Research/Industrial Park District is 30 feet or equal to the height of the tallest building, whichever is greater.

Comment #36: Applicant to include manufacturing note for raw materials, §164-46 J(133), on site plans.

Comment #37: Applicant to include manufacturing note for prohibited processes, §164-46 J(134), on site plans.

Comment #38: §164-46 J(135): Operations involving slag piles, stockyards and slaughterhouses are prohibited in the Office and Industrial Park District.

Comment #39: §164-46 J(136): Solid waste management facilities, except those owned and operated by the Town, are prohibited.

Comment #40: §164-46 J(141): The use of mobile homes on farms to house tenant and migrant farm laborers shall be subject to the approval of the Orange County Department of Health. Town permits shall be granted by the Building Inspector for one year; annual renewals shall require an inspection report by the Building Inspector prior to issuance.

Comment #41: Applicant to specify the total number of workers that will be housed in the dormitory.

Comment #42: Provide a map note stating that “No construction or proposed use shall begin until the maps are signed by the Planning Board Chairman and Building Department permits are obtained.”

Comment #43: Surveyor to certify that iron rods have been set at all property corners.

Comment #44: Any required declarations must be added to the plan.

Comment #45: Payment of all fees.

Other Considerations:

1. Planning Board Minutes of 7/16/25 for PB approval.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to approve the Planning Board Minutes of 7/16/25.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 4-Ayes and 0-Nays and 1-Absent.

2. Planning Board to discuss canceling the 8/25/25-W.S. & 9/3/25-PB Meeting.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to cancel the 8/25/25-W.S. & 9/3/25-PB Meeting.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 4-Ayes and 0-Nays and 1-Absent.

Correspondences:

Chairman Astorino: Connie, do we have any correspondences this evening?

Connie Sardo: No.

Privilege Of The Floor For Agenda Items!!

Chairman Astorino: If there is anyone in the audience wishing to address any of the agenda items, please rise and state your name for the record.

Joe Dans: I am with the Conservation Board. Is everybody here familiar with the destruction of the trout habitat on Brady Road?

Chairman Astorino: Joe, it has nothing to do with this Board.

Joe Dans: It has nothing to do with the Board?

Chairman Astorino: If you want to have a conversation about that, I'll talk to you about it after. That has nothing to do with this Board. I was just going to call you because I received an email from you about it this afternoon. It has nothing to do with the Planning Board.

Joe Dans: Ok. Good enough. I have one question, though, just regarding the last people who were here regarding the UrbanXtracts. Is that for farm workers for packing plants and things like that?

Chairman Astorino: Growing, packing, everything.

Joe Dans: Ok. Is it for manufacturing as well, right?

Chairman Astorino: Cultivating, growing. And like I said, it's very early. That's why we're discussing a site visit. We want to understand it more, too.

Joe Dans: And then the other part, too, is....

Bob Krahulik: Joe, they are growing it and packing it on site.

Joe Dans: Oh, they're growing it there as well?

Chairman Astorino: Yes. I've got a question for you.

Joe Dans: Sure.

Chairman Astorino: Where has the Conservation Board been?

Joe Dans: I've always been here.

Chairman Astorino: No. I don't mean that. I mean, I could go back two years on every comment, and I think every Board member here will say the same.

Joe Dans: No, I'm here today, gentlemen.

Chairman Astorino: Great.

Joe Dans: I don't have a problem coming back for different meetings that are appropriate.

Mr. McConnell: Are you still an active Conservation Board?

Joe Dans: I'm active as part of the Conservation Board.

Chairman Astorino: Is there any other members? You need at least three members, I'm sure.

Joe Dans: I can go back and talk to the other folks that are there.

Chairman Astorino: I want to talk to you after about the other issue, but if we can, I think it would be quite nice with all of these projects that are here, quite frankly, some pretty good projects that are in front of us right now, that we get some feedback.

Joe Dans: Yeah. I mean, we had some ideas that we were hatching that I was actually prepared to present for the Conservation Board regarding the topic that I was talking about before, Brady Road.

Connie Sardo: But that's not a Planning Board matter.

Chairman Astorino: It's not a Planning Board matter.

Joe Dans: No, I understand that. You're asking me about the Conservation Board. No, no, no.

Chairman Astorino: I'm asking you as a member of the Town and Warwick Conservation Board, as an active member. Every meeting we have comments on; our secretary provides documentation maps on Planning Board projects. We get nothing in return. My question as a Planning Board Chairman, is why not? If the Conservation Board is active, we would like feedback. That's what I'm asking.

Joe Dans: I agree.

Chairman Astorino: Perfect.

Joe Dans: I'll work on it.

Chairman Astorino: Is there anyone else in the audience wishing to address any of the agenda items?

Hi. My name is Kim Accola. I'm on 79 Ryerson Road. And I had a violation; a stop work order.

Chairman Astorino: I'm telling you this too now. That is a Building Department issue. We are the Planning Board. I'm sorry you came out. That's the Building Department.

Kim Accola: We thought we had to go in front of the Planning Board.

Chairman Astorino: You may very well might have to, but you'd have to get on an agenda. We don't know. We know nothing about that. Let me ask you a question while you're here. What was the violation for?

Kim Accola: Trees. I took down some trees, but I thought I was allowed to take down up to a quarter of an acre of trees.

Chairman Astorino: Alright, let's address this with the Building Department first. Then the determination will be made if you have to come to the Planning Board. We will walk you through the process. I'm sorry you came out here. It's really not necessary.

Kim Accola: I live so far. It is no problem.

Chairman Astorino: Well, you've got a good attitude. We apologize. Connie, do we have Ms. McCullough's information?

Connie Sardo: The Building Department has it.

Mr. McConnell: The violation didn't come from the Planning Board. It came from the Building Department.

Kim Accola: And then I went to the Building Department and it's been back and forth, so I'm just trying to figure out what to do next.

Chairman Astorino: We will look into it tomorrow. We will get back to you.

Kim McCullough: Thank you.

Chairman Astorino: Is there anyone else in the audience wishing to address any of the agenda items? Let the record show no further public comment.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to adjourn the August 20, 2025 Planning Board Meeting.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 4-Ayes and 0-Nays and 1-Absent.