

TOWN OF WARWICK PLANNING BOARD
June 5, 2024

Members present: Chairman, Benjamin Astorino
Dennis McConnell, Bo Kennedy,
Rich Purcell, Vikki Garby, Alternate
Laura Barca, HDR Engineering
Temi Alao, HDR Engineering
Max Stach & Danielle Dreyer, NPV Planners
Bob Krahulik, Planning Board Attorney
Connie Sardo, Planning Board Secretary

The regular meeting of the Town of Warwick Planning Board was held Wednesday, June 5, 2024 at the Town Hall, 132 Kings Highway, Warwick, New York. Chairman, Benjamin Astorino called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC HEARING OF Nuradin Giljic

Application for Site Plan Approval for the construction and use of the removal of an existing 1-bedroom dwelling and the construction of a new 1-bedroom dwelling, located within “A Designated Protection Area” of Greenwood Lake, situated on tax parcel S 72 B 3 L 19 project located on the eastern side of Jersey Ave., 920 feet north of Rocky Trail (536 Jersey Ave.), in the SM zone, of the Town of Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York.

Representing the Applicant: Brian Friedler from Friedler Engineering

Connie Sardo: Mr. Chairman, we mailed out the certified letters to the adjoining property owners on 5/28/24.

Mr. Astorino: Thank you. At the last public hearing and the approval, we had done at the May 1, 2024 Planning Board Meeting, there were some neighbors that were not notified and was missed. It happens. That is why we are here tonight to do another public hearing. We will rescind the May 1, 2024 approval and open the public hearing this evening.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to rescind the conditional approval granted for the Nuradin Giljic Site Plan on May 1, 2024 due to failure of the Applicant to notify all neighboring property owners within 300’ of the premises.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to open the Nuradin Giljic Site Plan Public Hearing.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

Mr. Astorino: Do any Board members or Professionals have any comments or concerns? Bob, there was a letter sent by a neighbor about an easement. I know that you had submitted a Title Search. Have you reviewed that?

Bob Kraulik: Yes. Let us wait and see if that author of that letter is here tonight during the public comment section.

Mr. Astorino: I don't think so. They said they were away.

Bob Kraulik: If they are not here, then I will address those issues. I would rather wait. If there is somebody here, I have some questions.

Mr. Astorino: Ok. This is a public hearing. If there is anyone in the audience wishing to address the Nuradin Giljic application, please rise and state your name for the record.

Russell Sirico: I live across the street.

Mr. Astorino: Are you the one that sent the letter?

Russell Sirico: No. His name is John Keck. I had spoken to him. He has the same concerns as I do. There is going to be a 2nd floor with a roof on this dwelling.

Mr. Astorino: Yes.

Russell Sirico: It would ruin my view. I checked with a Broker about this. I am directly across the street from it. It would ruin my neighbor's view that live on the right and on the left. I had spoken to both of the neighbors. They had said they would bring that up to the Board. I guess one of the neighbors had done that already. I guess the other neighbor has not. It is going to bring my property value down by \$50K. to \$100K. just for the view. I also have lake rights to the property. My neighbor John Keck also has lake rights to the property. I have papers showing that.

Mr. Astorino: Are you going to put those papers in for the record?

Russell Sirico: No. This is the first time that I am here.

Mr. Astorino: Could you give those papers for the record so that we could review them?

Russell Sirico: Only if I could copy it.

Mr. Astorino: If you could get a copy to us tomorrow, we could have our attorney review that.

Bob Kraulik: I could take a look at that right now.

Russell Sirico: Please note that these documents go back to the year 1961. There was no street address.

Mr. Astorino: If you could get us a copy of that, it would be good for us to have.

Russell Sirico: Yes.

Mr. Astorino: Laura, Max and Bob, correct me if I am wrong. Regarding the viewshed issue, the views are taken from public viewing spaces not from private spaces. They are allowed to go up if they stay within the boundaries of the Code. They are allowed to go up by Code. They are not exceeding the maximum height allowed.

Russell Sirico: I know it is not the height of it. It will bring down our property values.

Mr. Astorino: They have a right to do that.

Russell Sirico: We had spoken to a Lawyer about it. He said that we have a case. If we bring in a case, it would hold this up for about 2 to 3 years at best.

Mr. Astorino: That is your right to do that. This Planning Board is in charge of following the Code.

Russell Sirico: I was hoping it would not have to come to that.

Mr. Astorino: This Board follows the Code. We just don't arbitrarily say. We have to follow the Code either way. The Code says it is from public viewing areas. It is not from private areas.

Bob Krahulik: There is a maximum building height.

Mr. Astorino: 35 feet building height is the maximum.

Russell Sirico: I know. My house is 32 feet high.

Bob Krahulik: This project doesn't come close to the 35-foot maximum building height.

Russell Sirico: I bought my house 40 years ago with the condition that I had the view and the lake rights. It was checked. I can't find the title papers. I would have to pay extra for that.

Mr. Astorino: That is one thing we are reviewing. Do you have any other comments or concerns?

Russell Sirico: I had spoken to Brian Friedler regarding the septic system. He was very nice and helpful. If he puts in an anaerobic or an aerobic system, there is no land there.

Mr. Astorino: We understand that. That is why our Engineer will be reviewing it.

Russell Sirico: Does that system work while it is flooded under water? It floods there. It is on record with the Police Department. At least 5 to 7 times a year the house gets soaked. That property is under a foot of water on top of it. I don't know if that type of septic system could still function properly while under water. We are on a low spot. It floods.

Mr. Astorino: Laura, that could be something you could take a look at. Maybe a drain or something could be put in. Brian would have to address that.

Laura Barca: We are not the NYSDOT.

Mr. Astorino: I understand that. But where the septic is being placed. My issue is that if it is going to flood over a septic, maybe a curtain drain or something could be put in around. I don't know if that could be possible?

Brian Friedler: I don't think it is possible. When we were out there with the Health Department, we dug a bunch of locations in this patio area.

Mr. Astorino: This was approved by the O.C. Health Department. Is that correct?

Brian Friedler: Yes.

Laura Barca: Yes.

Mr. Astorino: Ok.

Russell Sirico: My question still has not been answered. Does it still work while it is under water?

Mr. Astorino: It would have to be proved that it is under water. If the Health Department gives its approval, then that is another level of review. It is more so than Brian and with our Engineer. It is another level on top of that. We will review it.

Russell Sirico: Regarding moving the footprint, I don't have an argument with that. The house was hit approximately 7 or 8 years ago by a car. Moving the house back won't prevent this kind of stuff from happening. There are many buildings that are located right up against the road.

Mr. Astorino: I understand that. I think he is at least trying to prevent that from happening.

Russell Sirico: I have no argument with that. It is a dangerous place to live. I had a car that hit that came half-way up my stairs on my property. Those are my complaints.

Mr. Astorino: Thank you. Bob, do you want a copy of the document Mr. Sirico handed to you?

Bob Krahulik: I don't need it tonight. You could submit copies of it.

Russell Sirico: I will bring in a copy of it.

Mr. Astorino: Thank you. Is there anyone else wishing to address the Giljic application? Let the record show no further public comment.

Bob Krahulik: I have a couple of questions and observations about the easements. The documents that Mr. Sirico handed to me tonight of some new easements that all basically says the same thing. It states that some of the neighboring property owners have the right to access to the lake over a 15-foot-wide Right-Of-Way along the northerly boundary line. I have seen 3 Agreements now. One of them requires the user of the easement to pay 1/6th of the annual real estate taxes. I don't know if that is being done. The two that were just handed to me that I reviewed have no financial obligation to use the easement.

Mr. Astorino: Ok.

Bob Krahulik: I think the Applicant and this application we have to make sure we don't infringe upon their ability to utilize that 15-foot-wide easement.

Mr. Astorino: Ok.

Russell Sirico: Those stairs that goes down into the lake is the easement for the 3 houses. I guess there is a fourth one? According to the plans, they are going to get filled in. That house will be put there. Then, there would be no access to the lake at all. I think that stairwell that is being filled in is needed for the septic system.

Brian Friedler: No. It is not.

Mr. McConnell: Mr. Chairman, did we do a site visit?

Mr. Astorino: Yes. We did.

Mr. McConnell: I don't recall the stairs that are being referred to. I am guessing the easement doesn't recite stairs. It just says a 15-foot corridor. Would it be inaccessible if the stairs are not there?

Russell Sirico: You did not see the stairs because it is overgrown with weeds.

Mr. Astorino: What Mr. McConnell is asking is it accessible? If the stairs were removed, is it still accessible?

Russell Sirico: No. It is not.

Mr. McConnell: Why is that?

Russell Sirico: There would be no way to down to the lake.

Mr. McConnell: I don't understand that. The easement is over a certain piece of land. It is not over a stairway. There happens to be a stairway there. I don't think that is part legally formally of the easement. If they were to remove the stairs and graded it, you would still have that 15-foot corridor. That is what I am asking.

Russell Sirico: I would have to jump over a wall to get to the lake.

Bob Krahulik: Dennis, part of the problem that was mentioned in the letter is that the Applicant is proposing a new parking area there. That is going to create a drop-off where the stairs would be. The people that sent us the letter had said that if they install that parking space, now it would be interfering with their ability to get to the lake.

Mr. McConnell: Ok. They short cut it because they didn't say that the parking space would create a drop-off.

Bob Krahulik: That is the issue.

Brian Friedler: We would agree to eliminate that and keep the 15-foot.

Mr. Astorino: That would be with the stairs. Is that correct?

Brian Friedler: Yes. We would keep it open.

Mr. Astorino: Does the public have any other comments on the Giljic application? Let the record show not further public comment. Do any Board members or Professionals have any comments? We would still have to review the changes. Laura and Bob would need to review the changes.

Bob Krahulik: Right. We do not need to review the easements anymore. That would no longer be an issue if they are going to remove the parking space.

Mr. Astorino: Ok.

Bob Krahulik: I think the Board should keep the public hearing open. Brian would update the maps and resubmit them. The public would have one more opportunity to comment on the revised Plan at the next meeting. Unless there would be any further comment, then we would be in the position to approve it.

Mr. Astorino: Ok. We will adjourn the public hearing to the next available Planning Board Meeting. There would not be any formal notice sent out to the residents. This is the formal notice.

Mr. Purcell makes a motion to adjourn the Nuradin Giljic Site Plan Application Public Hearing to the July 17, 2024 Planning Board Meeting.

Seconded by Mr. McConnell. Motion carried; 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

Nuradin Giljic: First, I would like to say Thank you for all your hard work. I have been the owner of the house at 536 Jersey Avenue for the past 4 years. This is the first time that I am hearing about an easement. Isn't this supposed to come up based on taxes and insurance?

Mr. Astorino: I don't know that. Bob, is that written in there?

Nuradin Giljic: Is there some sort of insurance if something were to happen going down the stairs or if someone falls down? Who would be responsible? Is it for free to have an easement on my property? He texted me about selling property. He had asked me if I would be willing to sell my property. With all of these issues, I don't know why he would want to buy my property.

Bob Krahulik: The easement was known at least to your attorney when you purchased the house. There was a title report and title search done. That easement existed in the closing documents which you had provided to us today.

Nuradin Giljic: Ok.

Bob Krahulik: Perhaps your attorney had not explained it to you at the time you bought the house. It was there. That agreement requires the person using the easement to contribute towards the taxes and provide proof of insurance. We just saw two more easements. It sounds like there are 3 people that have the right. The other two easements don't mention any obligation to pay taxes or to maintain insurance. That is an issue between you and them. The Planning

Board would not get involved. You would need to have your attorney do more of a thorough title search to see who has the rights and under what conditions they could exercise those rights.

Nuradin Giljic: Ok. Thank you.

Mr. Astorino: Do any Board members or Professionals have any comments or concerns?

Mr. McConnell: Bob, when were these easements created?

Bob Krahulik: They go back to the late 1960's and early 1970's.

Mr. McConnell: They are not recent creations. Is that correct?

Bob Krahulik: They are not.

Mr. McConnell: Ok.

Nuradin Giljic: Are there names on there that I could look for? The 1970's goes way back.

Bob Krahulik: I am not sure who sent the email out today with the title report. It came from Elizabeth Cassidy's office.

Nuradin Giljic: I provided that.

Bob Krahulik: Ok. So, you have that information. That is what you had sent me. The answers to your questions are right here.

Nuradin Giljic: Ok.

Mr. Astorino: If you want a copy of your neighbor's easement agreement, maybe he could provide you with a copy of that.

Nuradin Giljic: Ok.

Mr. Astorino: We will list Comment #1 through Comment #13 for the record. The public hearing has been adjourned to the Planning Board Meeting of July 17, 2024.

Brian Friedler: Thank you.

The following review comments submitted by HDR:

Comment #1: Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.

Comment #2: Applicant to discuss project.

Comment #3: Conservation Board – no comments received

Comment #4: Architectural Review Board – no comments received

Comment #5: OC Planning Department – 02/13/24 advisory comment for erosion control near Greenwood Lake

Comment #6: TW Building Department – 02/12/24 septic pump out receipt to be submitted (no further action because septic system will be replaced as part of the construction)

Comment #7: NYSDOT: a highway access permit must be obtained from NYSDOT before construction begins. A copy of this permit must be submitted with the building department application.

Comment #8: Soil Erosion Control Note #3 will be updated to say that disturbed areas shall be seeded with temporary seeding if there is no additional disturbance within 7 days.

Comment #9: Applicant to provide additional information for the backfill to be placed over existing stairs to create a parking area (e.g., specification for material, compaction for material placed, height of retaining wall, PE required for wall, etc.). Applicant to include easement on plans and specify any plan changes required to maintain accessibility as required by the easement.

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 1, Map Note

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

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

Comment #13: Payment of all fees.

PUBLIC HEARING OF Ruby Randig & Mateo Prendergast Suc, TTE.

Application for Site Plan Approval and Special Use Permit for the construction and use of a Class 2 Home Occupation of a 36'9"x 22'11" garage/office space. The office space will be approximately 325 s.f. for a massage therapy and skin care business, situated on tax parcel S 63 B 1 L 13.2; project located on the eastern side of Iron Mountain Road (103 Iron Mountain Rd.), in the MT zone, of the Town of Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York.

Representing the Applicant: Brian Friedler from Friedler Engineering.

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

Mr. Astorino: Ok. Thank you.

The following review comments submitted by HDR:

Comment #1: Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.

Max Stach: This application was deemed a Type 2 Action. No SEQRA review is necessary.

Mr. Astorino: Thank you.

Comment #2: Applicant to discuss project.

Brian Friedler: The Applicant is looking to move their Class 1 Home Occupation into a proposed garage office area that would be located in front of the house. We had received ZBA approval back in April. They received a variance for the structure being larger than 1200 s.f. We are here in front of the Planning Board to seek approval.

Comment #3: Conservation Board – no comments received

Comment #4: Architectural Review Board – no comments received

Comment #5: TW Building Department – 02/12/24 No violations.

Comment #6: OC Planning Department – letter dated 02/13/24 stating that OCDOH approval is required; updated letter dated 04/25/24 stating that there are no advisory comments.

Comment #7: Planning Board to determine if a site inspection is necessary. Site Visit conducted on 03/20/24.

Mr. Astorino: That has been done.

Comment #8: ZBA – area variance granted in letter dated 04/25/24.

Comment #9: §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.

Brian Friedler: 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 1, Map Note

Brian Friedler: Ok.

Comment #11: The declaration information for the Ridgeline Overlay Notes must be added to the plans.

Brian Friedler: Ok.

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

Brian Friedler: We would request from the Board a waiver of iron rods set at all property corners.

Comment #13: Surveyor to sign and seal drawing.

Brian Friedler: Ok.

Comment #14: Payment of all fees.

Brian Friedler: Ok.

Mr. 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 Randig Site Plan Application, please rise and state your name for the record. Let the record show no public comment.

Mr. McConnell: I believe we had received some comments from neighbors that wouldn't be able to attend the meeting tonight. Do we have those comments?

Mr. Astorino: Yes. We do have those comments. There were numerous letters over the course of this. I know the Applicant had stated they were going to have certain hours/days of operation. Is that correct?

Brian Friedler: Yes.

Mr. Astorino: Do we know what days they would be?

Brian Friedler: Could we add a map note stating that there would be no more than 4-days at any given time?

Mr. Astorino: Bob, we had talked about that.

Bob Krahulik: Yes. The note could be general. It could state something to the effect of the business operation would be limited to only 4 days in a consecutive 7-day period.

Brian Friedler: Ok.

Bob Krahulik: For anybody that is here this evening observing, the mechanism to enforce that would be to take some pictures and demonstrate that there are cars coming and going let's say they do those 5 days a week. You would then report that to the Building Department. The Building Inspector would issue a Notice to Remedy for a Code violation. They would have to stop doing that. If they don't, then they would be issued a summons to appear in Justice Court potentially facing a fine.

Mr. Astorino: Ok. You would put the hours of operation note on the plans.

Brian Friedler: Ok. Will do.

Mr. Astorino: Do any Board members or Professionals have any other comments or concerns? Let the record show no further comments from the Board and/or Professionals.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to close the Public Hearing.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

Mr. Kennedy makes a motion on Comment #12 to waive the certification of iron rods to be set at all property corners.

Seconded by Mr. Purcell. Motion carried; 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

Mr. Purcell makes a motion on the Ruby Randig & Mateo Prendergast Suc., TTE., application, granting conditional Site plan Approval and Special Use Permit for the construction and use of a Class 2 Home Occupation of a 36'9"x22'11" garage/office space. The office space will be approximately 325 s.f. for a massage therapy and skin care business, situated on tax parcel S 63 B 1 L 13.2; project located on the eastern side of Iron Mountain Road (103 Iron Mountain Rd.), in the MT zone, of the Town of Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York. A SEQRA Type 2 Action was adopted on February 21, 2024. Approval is granted subject to the following conditions:

1. §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.
2. 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, Map Note
3. The declaration information for the Ridgeline Overlay Notes must be added to the plans.
4. Surveyor to certify that iron rods have been set at all property corners. (WAIVED)
5. Surveyor to sign and seal drawing.
6. Applicant to add a note to the plan: This home occupation limited to four days of operation during any seven-day period.
7. Payment of all fees.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

PUBLIC HEARING OF Warwick HG, LLC.

Application for Site Plan Approval and Special Use Permit for the expanded construction and use, Use #75 of a previously approved campground's use and operation from 74 permitted campsites formally known as Black Bear Campground and now known as *Serenity Ridge At Warwick Campground* to 130 campsites, along with various other typical modern campground amenities. The amenities include, but are not limited to, roadway improvements, an entrance gate, pavilion, playground, recreation areas, and wading pool, situated on tax parcel S 8 B 2 L 27.14; project located on the eastern side of Wheeler Road 1400 feet south of Dussenbury Drive (197 Wheeler Rd.), in the RU zone, of the Town of Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York.

Representing the Applicant: Juan DeJesus from MJS Engineering. Thomas Vega and Rick Ferruggia, Applicants. Ron Kossar, Attorney.

Connie Sardo: Mr. Chairman, we received the certified mailings for the Serenity Ridge At Warwick Campground application.

Mr. Astorino: Thank you.

The following review comments submitted HDR:

Comment #1: Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.

Max Stach: Since our last meeting, we are in receipt of the Draft Environmental Assessment Form (EAF), Part III in response to the Part II full EAF. In that Part II, you had identified 6 areas of potential environmental impact on land, surface water, groundwater, plants and animals, Aesthetic Resources, and traffic. Regarding the EAF Part III, we do have some concerns with it. More information is required. We need more details on how these potential impacts would not occur. For example; Impact on Land, we would like more details on which specific best management practices you are going to employ to avoid impact from steep slope construction. We are going to want to make sure that the Town Engineer concur that standard practices are adequate. Similarly impacts on surface water and impact on ground water, I think are issues that we would want to discuss further. Impact on plants and animals. We are really going to want to look at the CV of the reviewing authority to be added to the Part 3 EAF. Impact on Aesthetic Resources. We had some concerns with homesites 84-105. Those are the ones up on the Ridge. We are going to want more information documenting how they would not be visible. We understand that a traffic study was received. That was reviewed by the Town Engineer. Is that correct?

Laura Barca: Yes.

Mr. Astorino: From the public viewing area. Is that correct?

Max Stach: Yes. It would be from the public viewing areas which is mainly from the road. Laura, did they not have any comments on that and were satisfied?

Laura Barca: Correct. We gave them a Scope of Work of what to do. They submitted a report. We did not have any additional comments.

Max Stach: Ok. Late yesterday or earlier today, we were copied on a letter received from Jody T. Cross, Esq., regarding some previous concerns from a previous application on this site. I am going to suggest that we look at those concerns that came up previously and make sure they are addressed by this application.

Mr. Astorino: Yes. Even if they are applicable?

Max Stach: Yes. In my very brief understanding, I know one of the issues they had was with the increasing ground water usage. The previous environmental review some merrily said just as your proposed EAF that since you have a permit that there would be no impact. That is not adequate. We need to make sure that you had documented that there is adequate supply and quality to serve the needs without impacting area wells. If you have that report and study that you used in order to get the Health Department permit, that should be submitted to this Board.

Mr. Astorino: Ok. Thank you.

Comment #2: Applicant to discuss project.

Juan DeJesus: We are here today with the Serenity Ridge At Warwick project. Here today are the Applicants Rick Ferruggia, Thomas Vega and the Attorney Ronald Kossar. We are seeking site plan approval and special use permit for this project. The parcel itself has 51.5-acre parcel in the RU zone. Looking at the map, we have outlined each and every numbered of the site for this project. There are 74 existing sites. We are proposing at this time 56 proposed sites. It would be a total of 130 sites. Previously in 2014, we had a similar project that went before the O.C. Department of Health. They actually received approval for 165 sites for both the wells, sewers, and septic systems on the site. The proposed 130 sites are actually a lot less. The OCDOH has been here to the site several times to do an evaluation on the site. They have not found any inadequacies in these systems that are presently on the site. Looking at the map, all of the proposed sites are not within the 100-foot setbacks around the property. We are showing some improvements minor road improvements for pedestrian safety and as well for circulation. We are proposing a new entrance gate. The gate is electronic. It is a better system than what is in place now. It would make who's coming in and going out a better way to log it. All of that information would be submitted to the Building Department on a regular basis. We are also proposing 2 pavilions on the eastern side of the site. The closest one to the property line is about 140 feet off the property line. We are also proposing to relocate the playground. It is going to be located by the proposed basketball and pickleball courts. Where the existing swimming pool is located, it will be abandoned and filled in. The proposed swimming pool would be located more to the east of the property off about 190 feet from this property line. There are 2 existing garbage locations that would remain. They are screened. They have a fence. There are shrubs around them. Each of these campsites would have water, sewer and electric hookups. They would also have the ability to connect to the internet. Each of these sites would have 2 parking spaces. They are 18'x12' parking spaces. There would also be additional parking scattered throughout the site for a total of 80 additional parking spaces on the site. There are a lot of trees on

the property. It is beautiful property. We feel it fits within the rural character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Astorino: Thank you. Before we get into the comments this evening, we will be adjourning this public hearing due to the fact that we have to review some more information. For the public that is here, we are going to adjourn this public hearing until July 17, 2024. We are going to open the public hearing tonight for any comments and concerns. Do any Board members or Professionals have any comments or concerns?

Max Stach: I thought that it has been a large topic of conversation over the course of this application so far about some of the programmatic and operational differences between what is proposed and what it was previously permitted at in terms of ownership and transient users, is there anything you could add with regard to that for the public benefit?

Rick Ferruggia: It is setup now as a transient RV campground. People could come in and stay for a night, a week, or a month. Under the Code, you can't stay for more than 210-days. Our plan is to transition to different style park models which would stay year-round but they can't be used for more than 210 days. That is the only difference.

Mr. McConnell: When you get through your transition, you should not have the 45-foot 5th wheels pulling in or the 37-foot Class A Motor Homes pulling in.

Rick Ferruggia: Correct. You won't have that in and out traffic. You would have regular vehicles. You would have all owners not people just randomly coming in for a few days.

Mr. McConnell: Is this something that has been done elsewhere?

Rick Ferruggia: Yes. This is what the marketing place is transitioning to this style. There would always be a market for transient campgrounds or RV parks. A lot of people would want to have their RV but not to drive it anywhere. They want to come and enjoy the weekend or a week in the summer, fall or winter knowing that it is sitting up there for that seasonal recreational use.

Mr. Astorino: Bob, have you reviewed the plan to monitor this?

Bob Kraulik: Yes. I have reviewed the Lease Agreements between the owner of the campground and the owner of the individual RV units to make sure that all of the promises that we are hearing tonight would be complied with going forward.

Mr. Astorino: Ok.

Bob Kraulik: Unrelated to that issue, in connection to the letter we received on behalf of the Neemans. There has been some substantial litigation involving this park. It would have to be investigated and reported back to the Board on how the history of the litigation might affect as to what is being proposed tonight.

Mr. Astorino: Regarding the Special Use Permit, they would have to comply to or it could be revoked. Is that correct?

Bob Krahulik: Right. Records would have to be filed with the Building Department illustrating how many days each unit has been occupied and permits renewed annually. If the Building Department doesn't believe that all conditions have been complied with, they would refer the violation to the Planning Board. The Planning Board would be in the position to review past problems. The Planning Board would decide whether or not the permit shall be revoked or whether the permit shall be renewed. It is an annual review. The permit could be revoked if they are not in compliance with all of these conditions.

Mr. Astorino: Ok. 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 Serenity Ridge Campground application, please rise and state your name for the record.

Rob Cronin: I am a resident of Florida, NY. I have lived there 20 years. I would like some clarity on the permitted structures. In my mind, I am thinking a trailer park.

Mr. Astorino: No. It is not. They are classified as RV's.

Rob Cronin: There are still going to be spaces for people to come in and hook up and then out.

Rick Ferruggia: Eventually not. They would all be park model RV's. The wheels and axles would stay on. They could be moved. There is more to move them than a conventional RV. It is designed to be there seasonally for seasonal use. You can't live in it year-round.

Mr. Astorino: We did review the specifications on those. They are not certified. You cannot live in them. They are RV's.

Rob Cronin: You cannot live in them for more than 210 days.

Mr. Astorino: No. You could stay in them. They are not rated to live in them. You could use them for seasonal use. Our Town Code states for 210 days.

Rob Cronin: Then would they be removed?

Mr. Astorino: No. It would stay there. We are monitoring them.

Rob Cronin: This is nuance.

Mr. Astorino: It is not a nuance. It has to meet the Code.

Rob Cronin: But in terms of the view of a trailer park to the public, the value of our properties would be affected. I have lived there 20 years. I have never seen the place at near capacity. Doubling it in size, what is the necessity for that?

Mr. Astorino: That is their business. They need to follow the Code. To be honest to you, there are no variances involved in here. They don't have to go to the ZBA for any variance. With that being said, we are not here to run their business. We are here to make sure they follow the Code. These park models and if that is their plan, it is allowed in the

Code. As you had heard this evening, they would have to meet the requirements. There has to be a monitoring procedure.

Mr. McConnell: Language is important. When you use the word trailer park, that denotes a certain type of facility with movable space to sleep in. I have worked in trailer parks. This is not and now and never has been encompassed by the words trailer park. This is an RV park. Trailer Parks are more like what you have down in Moonachie at the end of Teterboro Airport.

Rob Cronin: It sounds to me that we are moving in that direction with these permanent structures.

Mr. Astorino: They are not permanent structures. The wheels and axles are staying on there. If they don't comply, they could be moved.

Rick Ferruggia: These are very aesthetically pleasing to be set in the woods. They would all be earthtone colors. They are not like those white RV's that goes in and out. They blend right into the woods.

Rob Cronin: Ok.

Mr. Astorino: Which by the way, you would have to prove to us because our Planner had asked you to do a site visual analysis.

Rick Ferruggia: Yes.

Mr. Astorino: Is there anyone else wishing to address the Serenity Ridge Campground application? Let the record show no further public comment.

Laura Barca: One point of clarification is that the campground currently has the ability to use your permitted for 74 units. Is that correct?

Mr. Astorino: Yes.

Laura Barca: The Applicant is proposing to go to 130 units. Those campsites are actually already there. You are just not allowed to use them. The number of campsites physically to the neighbors are not increasing. You are just going to be allowed, if you get approval to use them.

Rick Ferruggia: To create these new campsites, we don't have to take down hardly any trees at all to achieve that. They are all existing.

Laura Barca: Ok.

Rick Ferruggia: The roadway servicing those proposed new ones are existing.

Mr. Astorino: Ok.

Laura Barca: Thank you.

Mr. Astorino: Ok. We will list Comment #3 through Comment #21 for the record. Are there any further public comment this evening? To anyone that is here this evening that did not speak, this public hearing will be adjourned to July 17, 2024. Does a Board member want to make that motion to adjourn the Public Hearing to July 17, 2024.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to adjourn the Serenity Ridge At Warwick Campground Application Public Hearing to July 17, 2024.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

Mr. Astorino: To the public, there would be no additional notices mailed out. This application will be on the July 17, 2024 Planning Board Meeting for a continued Public Hearing. This is your notice. Thank you.

Comment #3: Conservation Board comments: no comments received

Comment #4: Architectural Review Board comments: no comments received

Comment #5: OC Planning: advisory comments dated 01/02/24: recommends a traffic study, describes the minimum driveway requirements, and interior roads should be designated no parking areas.

Comment #6: OCDPW: letter received 03/27/24 no comments

Comment #7: OOCDOH: Applicant to provide most recent OCDOH annual permit to operate a campground. Permit 230259, expires 12/31/24

Comment #8: NYSDEC: Applicant should submit the most recent copy of 11/21/14 SPDES septic permit 3-3354-00662-00001, valid until 11/20/2024; Submitted SPDES permit and the permit transfer documentation.

Comment #9: Applicant to submit a sample of a lease agreement that will be used to confirm: no sub-leasing, short term rentals, number cars allowed per site, outside upkeep of park models, definition for “vertical” family members, etc.

Comment #10: Applicant to provide narrative to describe how the proposed gate mechanism will work to manage the use of each campsite (210-day maximum) and who is using each campsite (i.e. “vertical” family members).

Comment #11: A barrier protection design must be completed to determine the timber sizes for the post and barrier rail along with post spacing, rail configuration, and distance from edge of where the slope begins. This design shall also establish the depth of post and all connections. A submittal of drawings and calculations signed and sealed by the Structural Engineer must be submitted for review.

Comment #12: HDR has no additional comments on the Traffic Study dated April 2024.

Comment #13: The SWPPP Narrative states that there will be a permanent stormwater feature (sheet flow to filter strips) used. This same feature is then also included in the existing watershed information. Applicant to explain how it can be both a proposed and an existing feature.

Comment #14: Applicant to confirm that the site provides slopes within the ranges specified in Section 5.3.2 of the “Bluebook”. Please also confirm that the maximum contributing length is 150 feet for pervious surfaces and 75 feet for impervious.

Comment #15: Applicant to provide PDF copy of eNOI as a part of this application.

Comment #16: Add a detail for the proposed pavilion.

Comment #17: A copy of all declarations cited on the drawings and/or part of the previous Site Plan shall be submitted (e.g., Ridgeline, Ag, Sheet 1, Note 31).

Comment #18: Applicant to comply with obtaining an annual Building Department permit in compliance with the Town Code and Sheet 1, Note 24. Pending Town to clarify permit process.

Comment #19: Applicant to provide any Performance Bond or Landscaping Bond required by the planning board.

Comment #20: Applicant to clarify the status of the Site Inspection Fee for the Barrier Protection near campsites 51 through 59. The previous owner posted this bond; Applicant to clarify if this bond has been legally transferred to the new owner.

Comment #21: Payment of all fees.

PUBLIC HEARING OF Wheeler R.E. Dev., LLC

Application for Preliminary Approval of a proposed 6-Lot Cluster subdivision + Lot Line Change a/k/a *The Round Hill Subdivision*, situated on tax parcels S 7 B 2 L 51.12 and S 7 B 4 L 13; parcels located on the northern side of Wheeler Road 3000 feet west of Union Corners Road (490 Wheeler Rd.), in the RU zone, of the Town of Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York. The proposed subdivision was classified by the Town of Warwick Planning Board, acting as Lead Agency under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQR), as an Unlisted Action was adopted on 2/21/24. All interested parties will be given an opportunity to speak.

Representing the Applicant: Dan Getz from Engineering Properties & Surveying. James Mezzetti, Applicant.

Connie Sardo: Mr. Chairman, we have received the certified mailings for the Round Hill Subdivision public hearing.

Mr. Astorino: Thank you.

The following review comments submitted by HDR:

Comment #1: Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.

Max Stach: The Planning Board at a previous meeting adopted the Part II EAF identifying two potential areas of environmental impacts to natural resources with regards to the potential impacts to wetlands, DEC-regulated streams, and the Northern Harrier. Impacts to erosion, flooding and drainage with regard to onsite 100-year flood zones. The Applicant has submitted a short EAF Part III that was very well written and very well done. We only had to remove the draft date from it before we incorporated it into our proposed Part 3. We are recommending that this application that you had taken a hard look at all of the potential environmental impacts and that it would unlikely result in a significant adverse impact, we would recommend that the Board adopt a Negative Declaration.

Comment #2: Applicant to discuss project.

Dan Getz: This project is located on the northern side of Wheeler Road at 490-Wheeler Road. The property is situated on approximately 94 acres. Previously some years ago, it was approved for 19-Lot subdivision. Those homes were not built at the time. In the year 2020, we had gone before the Board to make one new buildable lot. Now, we are back before the Planning Board to undo that one buildable lot and make it 6 buildable lots. The previous plan for 19 lots was going to have a loop road. This plan would be 6 driveways off Wheeler Road. As a proposed Cluster subdivision approximately 52% of the property would be deed restricted as a Conservation area that would not be able to be built on.

Mr. Astorino: Thank you.

Comment #3: Conservation Board: no comments received

Comment #4: Architectural Review Board: no comments received

Comment #5: OC Planning: 03/04/24: northern harrier, wetland protection with possible deed restriction, project design-related comments, who will own/maintain open space area

Comment #6: OCDOH: Approval not required because previous letter approvals have expired and current plan does not meet the threshold where an approval would be required.

Mr. Astorino: Laura, did you confirm that with OC Department of Health?

Laura Barca: Yes.

Comment #7: TW Building Department: 02/12/24 no violations

Comment #8: Applicant to confirm that the Application Form has correctly identified the agricultural land as being part of Lot 2.

Dan Getz: The Application Form doesn't mention Agricultural land. It is part of Lot 2. We are good with that. The Application Form is for 6 Residential Lots. Should we mention that on the Application Form?

Laura Barca: We talked about it at the Workshop clarifying because when you first came in with the application, you weren't sure what you were going to do with that piece. We just talked about making sure that the Application Form was consistent with your current proposal.

Dan Getz: Right. We submitted an amended Application Form to Connie. I believe it is consistent.

Connie Sardo: The Application states 6 Residential Lots + Lot Line Change.

Dan Getz: Right.

Mr. Astorino: Are you good with that comment?

Connie Sardo: We are good.

Mr. Astorino: Ok.

Comment #9: 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 C-100, note 17

Dan Getz: Ok.

Comment #10: Declarations were filed for Agricultural Notes, Aquifer Notes, Northern Harrier Notes, Open Space Notes, and Lot 13 Driveway. The deed to Lot 13

noted a granting of a temporary 20-ft easement for the construction of Kaylei Way, that is no longer required.

Mr. Astorino: Regarding Lot 13 Driveway, that should be removed. Is that correct?

Dan Getz: Right. There is no more Lot 13. That Legal Declaration will be refiled. New wording for that has been submitted.

Mr. Astorino: We will strike the Lot 13 driveway portion of Comment #10. We will add to that comment to the Planning Board's specifications.

Bob Krahulik: Right.

Laura Barca: It is to make sure what was already filed would need to be unfiled.

Bob Krahulik: It would need to be corrected and addressed in the revised declaration.

Laura Barca: Correct.

Mr. Astorino: Bob, we will leave Comment #10 to your specifications.

Bob Krahulik: Ok.

Comment #11: Applicant to update language on drawings (and any associated documents) from Conservation Easement to Open Space.

Dan Getz: Ok.

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

Dan Getz: Ok.

Comment #13: Applicant to add the declaration information for the updated Aquifer, Agricultural, and Northern Harrier Protection notes to the plan.

Dan Getz: Ok.

Comment #14: Payment in lieu of parkland for five lots per Town of Warwick Town Code §75-3.A.(2)(a)[3].

Dan Getz: Ok.

James Mezzetti: Yes.

Comment #15: Payment of all fees.

James Mezzetti: Ok.

Mr. 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 Round Hill Subdivision application, please rise and state your name for the record.

Robert and Maureen Hogan come up to address the Planning Board.

Robert Hogan: We live at 254 Round Hill Road. This project is going to back up to the back of our property. We just received the notice last Saturday. We had no time to confer with any Realtors or Attorneys to discuss the in complication of our property taxes or anything else.

Mr. Astorino: It would not affect your property taxes.

Maureen Hogan: We are concerned that it would affect the value of our property.

Mr. Astorino: As a right, they have a right to do this. This application was previously approved for a 19-Cluster Lot subdivision.

Maureen Hogan: What year was that?

Mr. Astorino: It was approximately in the year 2004 or 2005.

Dan Getz: Looking at the map, Round Hill is located up here on the map. These proposed buildings are located closer down to Wheeler Road.

Maureen Hogan: We are on Round Hill Road. It is called a Round Hill project but it is located on Wheeler Road.

Mr. Astorino: Your property is not located near this. It borders it. It is not where the homes are going.

James Mezzetti: We are doing it this way because we did not want to impact the schools. The cost of infrastructure is ridiculous. We wanted to keep as much open space as possible.

Maureen Hogan: Ok. Would they be big lots?

James Mezzetti: Yes. They are big lots.

Dan Getz: Looking at the map, this whole area would be one lot for a house. That is the lot that would be backing up to you. It is a green area.

Maureen Hogan: Ok. That is perfect.

Mr. Astorino: There would be no more building on this property.

Maureen Hogan: Ok. Thank you.

Mr. Astorino: Is there anyone else wishing to address the Round Hill Subdivision application?

Russell and Teresa Cronin come up to address the Planning Board.

Russell Cronin: We are located right here on the property. It is abutting on our property where Lot 1 is located. This is a great design. I love it much more than the first design.

Teresa Cronin: We live on 24 Eden Hill Road. Would we see this house?

James Mezzetti: Yes. There is open field located there.

Teresa Cronin: Ok.

Russell Cronin: Thank you.

Mr. Astorino: Is there anyone else wishing to address the Round Hill Subdivision application.

Joe Pillmeier and Joey Pillmeier come up to address the Planning Board.

Joe Pillmeier: We live at 274 Round Hill Road. I have spoken to James about this a few times. He has been a great neighbor. I am sure with whatever he has planned, it would be done right. Could we get exclusive hunting rights to this property? Who oversees that? What does that mean?

Mr. Astorino: It is going to be open space.

Dan Getz: It is open space that would be owned by the property owner. They wouldn't be allowed to build on it.

Joe Pillmeier: It would still be owned by James. Is that correct?

Dan Getz: No. It would be owned by the same person who buys it to build a house.

Mr. Astorino: It is deed restricted.

Joe Pillmeier: The person that buys that property would own that. Is that correct?

Mr. Astorino: Yes. But it would be deed restricted. There would be no further subdivision.

Joe Pillmeier: What about the black dirt area? Is that all conservation?

James Mezzetti: It would be all part of it.

Joe Pillmeier: I had spoken to James a few times. I wish you nothing but success.

James Mezzetti: We appreciate that. Thank you.

Mr. Astorino: Is there anyone else wishing to address the Round Hill Subdivision application?

Russell Cornin: What would the square-footage of the homes?

James Mezzetti: They won't be the size of the large houses located on Kings Hwy.

Russell Cronin: Are they going to be 5,000 or 10,000 square-foot homes?

James Mezzetti: I don't believe they would be quite that big.

Russell Cronin: I am thinking of selling my house and buying one of these.

James Mezzetti: We could talk about that.

Mr. Astorino: Is there anyone else wishing to address the Round Hill Subdivision application?

Catherine Pomella: I live at 106 Hunt Drive. I am very happy with James' plan. I wanted to say that this plan was very old when it first started. I have a 10-year-old daughter and an 8-year-old. One is now 28 years old and the other is now 30 years old. I am now a grandmother. My grandson will be 7 years old. I also have a 2-year-old granddaughter. Let's get this done. James, you made me very happy because I could look out my kitchen window and still see the beautiful field. That means a lot to us. I have been in my home for 25 years.

James Mezzetti: I appreciate that. Thank you.

Catherine Pomella: I am here representing everyone that lives on Hunt Drive. Everyone is busy. Everyone is very happy. Let's get this done. Give it a stamp of approval.

James Mezzetti: Thank you.

Mr. Astorino: Is there anyone else wishing to address the Round Hill Subdivision application?

Diane Wesbecher: I recently purchased a home in Warwick. This is the first time that I have heard of this. When I received a letter, we panicked. We don't know how this would affect us.

Mr. Astorino: Where do you live?

Diane Wesbecher: I am located on Regelski Drive.

Mr. Astorino: Your property is not even near this proposed subdivision.

Diane Wesbecher: Ok.

Mr. Astorino: We do a circulation of letters. Your property is not near it.

Diane Wesbecher: Ok. Thank you.

Teresa Cronin: When would construction start?

Mr. Astorino: The Applicant would have to comply with the conditions set forth this evening. Once those conditions have been met, it gets reviewed by the Town's Professionals. The maps would get signed-off. Those maps would get filed in the O.C. Clerk's office. Then they would apply for building permits. It would take some time.

Teresa Cronin: Ok. Thank you.

Mr. Astorino: Is there anyone else wishing to address the Round Hill Subdivision application? Let the record show no further public comment.

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

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

Ms. Garby makes a motion to adopt the Part III EAF as prepared by the Town Planner.

Seconded by Mr. McConnell. Motion carried; 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

Mr. Kennedy makes motion on the Wheeler R.E. Dev., LLC application, granting Preliminary Approval of a proposed 6-Lot Cluster Subdivision + Lot Line Change a/k/a ***The Round Hill Subdivision***, situated on tax parcels S 7 B 2 L 51.12 and S 7 B 4 L 13; parcels located on the northern side of Wheeler Road 3000 feet west of Union Corners Road (490 Wheeler Rd.), in the RU zone, of the Town of Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York. The proposed subdivision was classified by the Town of Warwick Planning Board, acting as Lead Agency under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), as an Unlisted Action adopted on February 21, 2024. A SEQRA EAF Part 3 and Negative Declaration was adopted on June 5, 2024

Seconded by Mr. McConnell. Motion carried; 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

Dan Getz: We ask the Planning Board to waive the Final Public Hearing?

Mr. Astorino: I don't see a problem with that. How does the Board feel?

Mr. Kennedy makes a motion to waive the Final Public Hearing.

Seconded by Mr. McConnell. Motion carried; 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

Mr. Kennedy makes a motion on the Wheeler R.E. Dev., LLC application, granting conditional Final Approval of a proposed 6-Lot Cluster Subdivision + Lot Line Change a/k/a ***The Round Hill Subdivision***, situated on tax parcels S 7 B 2 L 51.12 and S 7 B 4 L 13; parcels located on the northern side of Wheeler Road 3000 feet west of Union Corners Road (490 Wheeler Rd.), in the RU zone, of the Town of Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York. A SEQRA Negative

Declaration was adopted on June 5, 2024. Approval is granted subject to the following conditions:

1. 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 C-100, note 17
2. There were declarations previously filed for Agricultural, Aquifer, Northern Harrier, and Open Spaces notes. In addition, the deed for Lot 13 noted a granting of a temporary 20-ft easement for the construction of Kaylei Way; Lot 13 and this 20-ft temporary easement are no longer required for this subdivision. These previously filed documents are subject to Planning Board Attorney’s review.
3. Applicant to update language on drawings (and any associated documents) from Conservation Easement to Open Space.
4. Surveyor to certify that iron rods have been set at all property corners.
5. Applicant to add the declaration information for the updated Aquifer, Agricultural, and Northern Harrier Protection, and Open Space notes to the plan.
6. Payment in lieu of parkland for five lots per Town of Warwick Town Code §75-3.A.(2)(a)[3].
7. Payment of all fees.

Seconded by Mr. McConnell. Motion carried; 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

Dan Getz: Thank you.

James Mezzetti: Thank you.

Other Considerations:

1. Planning Board Minutes of 5/1/24 for PB approval.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to approve the Planning Board Minutes of 5/1/24.

Seconded by Mr. Purcell. Motion carried; 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

2. PB to discuss Rescheduling 6/19/24-PB Meeting to 6/20/24. (Town Hall closed on June 19th)

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to Reschedule the Planning Board Meeting of 6/19/24 to 6/20/24 at 7:30 p.m.

Seconded by Mr. Purcell. Motion carried; 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

3. **St. Stanislaus R.C. Church** – Letter from Stephen Mandracchia, Applicant’s Attorney dated 5/22/24 addressed to the Planning Board requesting 6-Month Extension on conditional “Amended” Final Approval of a proposed 3-Lot, Lot Line Change; situated on tax parcels SBL # 13-1-17, SBL #13-1-1.4 and SBL #13-1-1.1; parcels located on the northern side of C.R. 1, 570 feet west of Pulaski Hwy., in the SL/LB zones, of the Town of Warwick. Amended Conditional Final Approval was granted on 6/7/23. *The Applicant is requesting the 6-Month Extension to ensure that the final maps are signed & sealed by the Surveyor, submit Affidavit for certification of iron rods, and maps to be signed by all property owners.* The 6-Month Extension becomes effective on 12/7/23.

Representing the Applicant: Stephen Mandracchia, Attorney.

Stephen Mandracchia: The maps have been finalized. We just need to get the mylars printed and signed by all of the owners of the property. That is why we are requesting the 6-Month Extension.

Connie Sardo: If the 6-Month Extension is granted tonight by the Board, you would have 2 days to get the maps signed.

Mr. Astorino: We are back dating it from when it was done.

Connie Sardo: You did not request a 6-Month Extension back in December when it was due.

Mr. Astorino: If we grant this 6-Month Extension this evening, you would need to come back to the Planning Board for Re-Approval of Conditional Final Approval. That would give you an additional 6 months’ time. The maps won’t be signed by Friday, June 7, 2024. Is that correct?

Stephen Mandracchia: They won’t be signed by then.

Mr. Astorino: You originally received conditional Final Approval on 6/7/23. Now, the 6-Month Extension on conditional Final Approval would expire on 6/7/24, which is two days from now. You should have requested the extension back in December of 2023. You would need to come back to the next Planning Board Meeting for Re-Approval of Conditional Final Approval.

Stephen Mandracchia: Ok. Understood. We will send in a Re-Approval request for the next available Planning Board Meeting.

Mr. Astorino: Ok.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion on the St. Stanislaus R.C. Church application, granting a 6-Month Extension on "*Amended*" conditional Final Approval of a proposed 3-Lot, Lot Line Change; situated on tax parcels S 13 B 1 L 17, S 13 B 1 L 1.4 and S 13 B 1 L 1.1; parcels located on the northern side of C.R. 1 570 feet west of Pulaski Hwy., in the SL/LB zones, of the Town of Warwick, County of Orange, state of New York. The Amended conditional Final Approval was granted on 6/7/23.

The 6-Month Extension becomes effective on 12/7/23.

Seconded Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

Correspondences:

1. Email correspondence from John & Iris Keck dated 6/3/24 addressed to the Planning Board in regards to Giljic Site Plan application.
2. Letter from Jody Cross from Zarin & Steinmetz, dated 6/4/24 addressed to the Planning Board in regards to the Serenity Ridge at Warwick Campground.
3. Email correspondence from JJ Van Cura & Janis Goldberg dated 6/5/24 addressed to PB in regards to Randig 103 Iron Mt. Rd. Site Plan application.
4. Email from Villag of Florida Mayor Harter dated 6/5/24 in regards to Serenity Ridge Campground.

Mr. Astorino: We have those correspondences #1 through #5 in our packets.

Privilege Of The Floor For Agenda Items!!

Mr. 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. Let the record show no public comment.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to adjourn the Planning Board Meeting of June 5, 2024.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.