

TOWN OF WARWICK PLANNING BOARD

April 15, 2026

Members present: Chairman, Benjamin Astorino
Roger Showalter, Vice-Chairman
Dennis McConnell, Bo Kennedy,
Vickki Garby, Alternate
Laura Barca, HDR Engineering
Temi Alao, HDR Engineering
Max Stach, NPV Planner
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 15, 2026 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.

PUBLIC HEARING OF

Review of Submitted Maps:

FS Holding LLC

Application for Site Plan Approval & Special Use Permit for the use and construction of the continuation of existing uses and a proposed 16,000 s.f. addition to the existing 13,580 s.f. agricultural processing warehouse processing facility and legalizing one mobile home for farm-labor housing, situated on tax parcels SBL #2-2-30 and SBL # 2-2-11; project located at 18 Greenview Lane, in the AI/SL zones, of the Town of Warwick.

Representing the Applicant: Pat Brady, Engineer.

The following review comments submitted by HDR:

Comment #1: Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.

Max Stach: This action is classified as a Type 2 Action pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.5C4 agricultural farm management practices, including construction, maintenance, and repair of farm building structures. The Planning Board may determine the application Type 2 Action whereas no further SEQRA action will be required. The project is located in Agricultural District and subject to GML-239 network review. With regard to lighting, if any outdoor lighting is proposed, it should be provided on the plans. A landscaping plan has not been provided. It is not clear if the process and loading area are subject to Town of Warwick Design Guidelines for commercial buildings. If it is, landscape buffers and

natural stone walls will be required. Signs, if any new signage is proposed, details should be provided. And if it is subject to Design Guidelines, the applicant will need to provide renderings of the proposed building with addition.

Comment #2: Applicant to discuss project.

Pat Brady: We're here tonight seeking a site plan and a special use permit. Currently on the property is stated there's two existing mobile homes, existing, a single-family dwelling and a warehouse processing facility. One of the mobile homes doesn't have a CO, so we're here to legitimize that mobile home and put an addition on the existing facility processing facility.

Comment #3: Conservation Board – no comments received

Comment #4: Architectural Review Board – no comments received

Comment #5: OC Planning Department – 03/06/26 no advisory comments

Comment #6: TW Building Department – 03/13/26 violation for 1 mobile home with unknown number of bedrooms

Chairman Astorino: That is why they are before the Planning Board.

Comment #7: The following incomplete forms must be submitted: signed escrow form, signed EAF, signed Ag Data Statement, and signed Site Plan Checklist.

Comment #8: Applicant to consider combining lots 2-2-11 and 2-2-30 together; separately, 2-2-11 is not buildable.

Comment #9: There appears to be an encroachment of the driveway onto the adjacent property of Now or formerly Labanowski (no SBL shown for property, 2-2-9.3?).

Comment #10: OCDOH – Water supply and septic system for tenant farmers to be reviewed and accepted by OCDOH.

Comment #11: § 164-46J(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. There will be a fee for the original permit to cover each mobile home.

Comment #12: Planning Board to schedule a site inspection. (Applicant is proposing a reduced landscaping buffer.)

Chairman Astorino: So, unless our engineer, Laura, or the Applicant has any comments on any of these comments this evening, I'll put them for the record. I think the board should go out there and take a look at it before we proceed too much further.

Pat Brady: That would be fine. I am ok with all of the comments.

Chairman Astorino: We will list Comment #7 through Comment #37 for the record. We will be in touch with you regarding scheduling a site visit.

Pat Brady: Ok.

Chairman Astorino: Do any Board members or Professionals have any other comments or concerns?

Bob Krahulik: Mr. Chairman? Yes. There is an outstanding question about the nexus between the mobile homes, which are for migrant farm housing, and a farm in operation. You can't have a mobile home with accessories to the warehouse.

Pat Brady: Yes. I did reach out to the client, and they use Minkus Farm, is who they get their onions from. One of the mobile homes is currently vacant, and the other one is in the process of being vacated, and we will go to the Health Department, Legitimize the migrant housing.

Chairman Astorino: So, Bob, do you need an agreement of this such that they are working for this farmer?

Bob Krahulik: I don't know if just buying onions from another farmer makes this a farming operation.

Chairman Astorino: Okay. We would need to research that.

Bob Krahulik: We'll have to research it a little bit, unless there has been an interpretation by this board. Otherwise, the owner of the warehouse should be operating a farm somewhere.

Chairman Astorino: Okay. Let's do some research and see where we're at. We would have to set a site visit regardless.

Bob Krahulik: Yes. The original mobile home is grandfathered because there are permits issued by the building department for mobile home number one. I don't know whether you have Health Department approval for that?

Pat Brady: I don't believe so.

Bob Krahulik: But there is a permit for that. Mobile home number two is in question.

Pat Brady: Correct.

Mr. Showalter: Bob, I believe that use is viable because there are other farmers that process and do packaging. The Cavallaro's and Gurdas do it as well as others.

Bob Krahulik: Some have done it forever and they are grandfathered. But today the Code says if you have a mobile home on site, it has to be part of the same farming operation that exists on the property. I think it's a stretch to identify another lot that the owner is farming. But to say I'm buying onions from another farm, I don't think that turns into a farming operation.

Chairman Astorino: Let's do some research before we make that claim. You will be back. We will set a site. We will let you know when that will be.

Pat Brady: Ok. Thank you.

Comment #13: Applicant to clarify the existing/proposed use at the property (agricultural vs packaging) and whether these operations are associated with a larger farming operation.

Comment #14: The section-block-lot for each adjacent property should be added to the plan.

Comment #15: All applicable Town of Warwick Standard Notes should be added to the plans.

Comment #16: Applicant to clarify if each building/feature shown on the plans is existing or proposed.

Comment #17: Number of tenant farmers / bedrooms must be shown for each mobile home.

Comment #18: Applicant to clarify when temporary storage structure will be removed. Please add a note to the plans.

Comment #19: The connections for all existing septic systems must be shown. The number of employees/tenant farmers served by each system must be shown. Each system must be signed by a NYS PE to confirm proper function.

Comment #20: Hours of operation and number of employees for the business should be included on the plans.

Comment #21: Applicant must update the plan with 911 addresses.

Comment #22: § 164-46J(20) Accessory tenant housing and mobile homes to house tenant and migrant farm laborers shall be located no closer than 100 feet from any public road, shall be suitably landscaped in accordance with § 164-46H(8), shall be operated in conformance with Orange County Health Department regulations, and shall be located only on land that is considered a part of the same farming operation in which the tenant/migrant labor is employed. Employment documentation shall be provided annually to Town Code Enforcement Officer.

Comment #23: § 164-46J(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. Solar panels shall be adequately screened from adjacent properties to minimize views, taking into consideration the need for southern exposure

Comment #24: § 164-46J(3) A buffer strip of 200 feet is required separating a building used for warehousing and wholesaling of farm products, and for retail sale or production of farm and food processing supplies from any residence on an adjoining lot.

Comment #25: Please add a planting schedule to the plan (botanical name, common name, and size) and a planting detail for all proposed landscaping and grass onsite.

Comment #26: Clarify on the plans if the oil tanks are above or below ground and if the tanks are still in use.

Comment #27: §164-43.2(A) Off-street parking and loading requirements must be met. Square-footage of all buildings must be shown on the plan. Dwelling unit to be clarified by Town of Warwick. Applicant to clarify why the number of parking spaces for the warehouse square-footage is divided by two. Details for parking spaces should be shown on the plans.

Comment #28: Sediment and erosion control measures must be implemented onsite. Limits of disturbance should be outlined on site plans and shown in acres.

Comment #29: Applicant to show any proposed sign in accordance with §164-43.1.

Comment #30: The driveway entrance from Mission Land Road appears to have an encroachment onto N/F Labanowski; Applicant to clarify.

Comment #31: Applicant to explain the 20-ft wide right-of-way for a driveway.

Applicant to clarify if there is a filed documents in the Orange County Clerk's office.

Comment #32: Sight distances and profiles for all proposed driveways should be shown on the plans.

Comment #33: 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 #34: The declaration information for applicable Town of Warwick Standard Notes must be added to the plans.

Comment #35: The surveyor must sign and seal the plan.

Comment #36: Surveyor to certify that iron rods have been set at all property corners.

Comment #37: Payment of all fees.

Blain Town Square

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. Previously discussed at the PB Meeting of 8/20/25.

Representing the Applicant: Kirk Rother from Rother Engineering.

The following review comments submitted by HDR

Comment #1: Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.

Chairman Astorino: And just for the public that's here, I'm sure a lot of you are here for this. I'll have our Planner explain the SEQRA process. Right now, we are on step one of probably 964. We are just in the initial stages and I want everyone here that's for this project to understand that. No action will be taken tonight. No action will be taken, quite frankly, for a while. You can follow this project on our website and the Planning Board's portal. Our secretary is more than happy to take calls if you have any questions. So just getting that out of the way up front. And I'll turn it over to our planner to explain the process that we'll be taking tonight and how we arrived at this decision.

Max Stach: Okay, so the SEQRA process began for this project on August 20, 2025, when the Planning Board adopted a resolution Noticing Intent to Declare the Lead Agency and commence coordinated SEQRA review. It identified the health department, the New York State DOP, and the New York State DEC as involved agencies. Notifications were sent out to those agencies. No objection to this board, assuming lead agency status were received. Tonight, normally, we would be adopting just the part two, which would start a process, the first phase of SEQRA, which is to determine whether or not the project will have any environmental, significant adverse environmental impact. This applicant has said from the outset it is likely to have a significant adverse environmental impact. There's no contestation of that. What we're really doing tonight is getting to the meat of the SEQRA process, which is the second phase. The second phase of the SEQRA process is once one or more significant adverse impacts have been identified by the Lead Agency; you start the preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. This is a document that will look at the various areas of potential environmental concern. We have identified several of them tonight. It will look at alternatives to the proposed action that would meet the applicant's objectives. It will look at the potential to mitigate any impacts that are identified. And then this document will be used to weigh and balance any environmental impacts against social and economic considerations. Tonight, I have prepared for the board's consideration a Part 2, Part 3, and Positive Declaration of environmental significance. A Positive Declaration in SEQRA parlance means that it is positively going to have a significant adverse impact. It is not a statement that this is something good or bad. It is the step that starts the SEQRA process. The applicant has already provided what's called a Draft Environmental Impact Statement Scoping Document. This document

proposes by the applicant the areas that need to be studied through this process, the type of impacts that need to be considered as this project moves forward. This document is going to be subject to review by the interested public and by any involved agencies or interested agencies. There will also be an opportunity for the public to come here and speak and provide input on what this scoping document should contain. Now, the scoping document is not the EIS. It is the prescription for what needs to be studied in the EIS. So, it will sort of take the shape of an initial outline or table of contents for that future document in the EIS. That will be the first opportunity for public input. We are proposing that that happen on June 3rd of this year and that public and written comment be extended through the following Friday, which is June 5th. You don't have to wait for June 3rd to come to provide comment. You can start providing comment tomorrow, by writing. If you wish to speak and provide oral comment, that opportunity will come on June 3rd. But my point was you don't have to wait to write with your concerns. It's noted that because the planning board is starting the process tonight, we are told by the state statute that we have to adopt the final scope in 60 days. 60 days from today is June 14th. Having a scoping hearing on June 3rd, which we believe is going to be the first available meeting following tonight, would make it very difficult to finish up by June 14th. So I'm recommending that the board ask the applicant to extend the period to get to a final scope from 60 days to 91 days, which would allow through July 15th. If for some reason the planning board was unable to hold their regular scheduling meeting on July 1st, it would also have July 15th as a fall date. So that's what I'm recommending the board request. Other than that, we do have a resolution. Once that final scope is adopted, the applicant will then prepare the draft environmental impact statement. This will be a very large document with a lot of information that will address every and all identified potential environmental impact. It will be prepared in the applicant's perspective. This board will review it against that scope to make sure that everything we ask them to put in there is in there. And then this will be provided to the public for public review. Typically, that process takes about 60 days. There will be another hearing scheduled. You would get to comment at the scoping meeting about what should be in the EIS, and then at the second meeting you comment on what is in the EIS. Similarly, the agencies, DEC, DOT, any other interested agencies will provide this comment, and they will ask suggestions on how the project can be improved, areas that need to be studied further, etc. After that's done, this board will begin the preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Often the first draft is provided to the applicant to prepare, but ultimately this board is responsible for that document. What you will review is the applicant's opinion of the impacts, and then this board will prepare its own take. And that document, considering all the public input, considering all the technical analysis provided by the applicant, the board will ask its own professionals to provide technical analysis. It may need to hire additional professionals if we cannot provide those services to provide all the information, they need to reach a decision on whether to approve the application as proposed, approve one of the alternatives that is identified in the EIS, or to not approve the application. So that process, again, we're looking to close the final scope in early July. It will likely take at least a couple months for the applicant to put their draft together. Typically, it takes this board 45 days to review that.

So really what we're talking about coming together to talk about this EIS, we're probably looking at the fall. As the Chairman said, all of this information will be available on the Town's website as soon as they are ready for review by the public. I think that's really it.

I did prepare the Resolution to do those Parts 2, 3, and Positive Declaration, and I just see if Bob wants to add anything?

Bob Krahulik: No, Max, you did a good job. Thank you.

Chairman Astorino: Laura, do you have anything?

Laura Barca: No, Max, you did a great job.

Chairman Astorino: Thank you. We do have the SEQRA documents on hand. Dennis, would you make a motion on the SEQRA documents, please?

Mr. McConnell: Certainly.

Chairman Astorino: And we will go from here. And then, like I said to the members of the public, please don't hesitate to reach out to us. This is a very open process, as you just heard. There is one thing I would like to caution the public on, I've seen it in the past. I've been here for 25 years, and I gave up my age. Social media is a great thing. Don't think it's the end all of what's written on social media. If you want facts, contact us. We have no problem giving you the facts. That's what we do. That's what we're here for. This young lady has been here for 25 years also. If there's a question, ask her. If she doesn't have the answer, we will get you the answer. It's that simple. Other than that, I can't be any clearer than that.

Connie Sardo: Keep a lookout on the Planning Board's portal on the Town's website.

Chairman Astorino: We will provide any information as all possible as this process moves along. That is what we're here for.

Connie Sardo: If you go to townforward.org, click on Planning Department, and you'll see where it says you can review. Everything for the project is or will be on Planning Board's portal.

Mr. Showalter: The information is placed on the portal.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion adopting the Part 2 and Par 3 of the Full EIS and Declaring a Positive Declaration.

Seconded by Mr. Showalter: The following Resolution was carried 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW (SEQR)

Resolution Adopting Parts 2 and 3 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form and Declaring a Positive Declaration

Name of Action: Blain Town Square

WHEREAS, the Town of Warwick Planning Board is in receipt of an application for site plan and special use permit approval for the use and construction of a mixed-use commercial, residential, and recreational development situated on tax parcel Section 51, Block 1, Lot 41.2, located at 137 State Route 94 in the Town of Warwick; and

WHEREAS, a Full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) Part 1 was submitted by the project sponsor, dated June 24, 2025; and

WHEREAS, on August 20, 2025, the Planning Board noticed its intent to declare lead agency status to the Orange County Health Department, the New York State Department of Transportation, and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, and has since received no objections; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has reviewed the Full EAF Part 2 prepared by its planning consultant, identifying the following impacts as likely to result from the proposed action:

- Impact on land;
- Impact on surface water;
- Impact on groundwater;
- Impacts related to flooding;
- Impact on plants and animals;
- Impact on agricultural resources;
- Impact on aesthetic resources;
- Impact on historic and archaeological resources;
- Impact on open space and recreation;
- Impact on transportation;
- Impact on energy;
- Impact on noise, odor, and light;
- Consistency with community plans;
- Consistency with community character; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has reviewed the Full EAF Part 3 prepared by its planning consultant, which indicates that several of the above-referenced impacts are likely to be severe, extensive, large, and important; and

WHEREAS, the project sponsor has indicated that a Positive Declaration of Environmental Significance is appropriate and has submitted a Draft Scoping Document dated March 4, 2026.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby assumes lead agency status for this action and classifies the action as a Type I action pursuant to SEQR (physical disturbance of greater than 10 acres); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board adopts the Full EAF Parts 2 and 3 as prepared by its consulting planner; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board adopts a Positive Declaration of Environmental Significance, determining that the proposed action may result in one or more significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) shall be prepared; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that, having previously received the project sponsor's Draft Scoping Document, the 60-day timeframe for adopting a final scope commenced with the Planning Board's assumption of lead agency on April 15, 2026, and is scheduled to conclude on June 14, 2026; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby directs the Planning Board Secretary to file and distribute this resolution, together with EAF Parts 1, 2, and 3, the Draft Scoping Document, and a copy of the application, to all identified involved agencies and to post the same on the Town of Warwick website; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board shall conduct a public scoping session on June 3, 2026, at 7:00 PM at Warwick Town Hall, 132 Kings Highway, Warwick, New York 10990, and shall accept written comments on the Draft Scoping Document submitted to the following email or physical address and received no later than Friday, June 5, 2026, at 4:00 PM:

Connie Sardo, Planning Board Secretary
132 Kings Highway
Warwick, New York 10990
planning@townofwarwickny.gov

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board directs the Planning Board Secretary to publish notice of the scoping session in the newspaper of record no later than May 19, 2026, and to publish notice of the Positive Declaration and scoping session in the Environmental Notice Bulletin at the earliest opportunity; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board shall adopt a final scope for the project no later than July 15, 2026, as extended by mutual consent of the lead agency and project sponsor at the April 15, 2026, meeting of the Planning Board.

Kirk Rother: We are fine with the extension.

Comment #2: Applicant to discuss project.

Kirk Rother: : I don't really have much to add as far as SEQRA. Max did a fantastic job.

Chairman Astorino: Do you want to explain what you hope to do out there? If not, this process is going to morph into as we move forward.

Kirk Rother: Yes. We have a long road to go. Things may change a little bit. But for now, it's a 38-acre parcel of land. There are nine structures proposed. There are 140,000 square feet, using round numbers, of mixed-use commercial retail space, office space. There are four structures that are two stories, which would have accessory

apartments on the second floor. It's allowed in this Community Business zone (CB zone). They're limited to one-bedroom apartments. There's also a proposed outdoor athletic field with an indoor structure, modeled somewhat after Frozen Ropes, something similar to that effect. A couple of retail pads. The four mixed-use buildings I had mentioned, the Frozen Ropes building would be five, and then there's two larger potential retail buildings and two buildings that would be drive-through, like a bank or a restaurant or some type of use like that. Water and sewer are being worked out. The way it's looking now, we'll have our own sewer. There was a water district created when Price Chopper was built. And there was a sewer district, too, but there's not enough capacity in that sewer district for this project. We may connect with their water. We'll have to see how that goes, if there's enough water available, which most likely is. And sewer, I think we'll have our own wastewater treatment system. We've identified traffic, obviously. Most likely the traffic light at Price Chopper is going to have a signal for our project. Our entrance is proposed directly across from Price Chopper. If the public wants to see what this project could look like, there's some very nice renderings that were done by the architect. They're on the MuniCollab website. I'm not really familiar with that site. I don't know how you get to them, but I know they're there because we uploaded them. That's it.

Chairman Astorino: Thank you. Okay. One other comment I'll make to the Board in regards to the positive declaration. That is the hard look. It is the most significant way to look at an application, rightfully so. I think the applicant could even admit that. There is a lot of impacts that are potentially present here. That is why this Board is going that route, and we will continue on that way.

Mr. McConnell: Mr. Chairman, would you maybe just touch briefly on the fact that the Board is made up of laypeople, but that we have three professionals that go through this with us and answer our questions? Those professionals are the ones that we rely upon for expertise when assessing any project, not just projects of this size.

Chairman Astorino: Good point Dennis. Well, as you heard this evening, and I'll introduce them. Down to my left is Bob Krahulik, the Planning Board's attorney, Max Stach & Danielle Dreyer, Town's Planners, Laura Barca, Planning Board's Engineer. These are the four best, and I'm not slighting anyone else in this county, but I've worked with these people for many years. If there is a question, a concern, whether they can't get the answer, they will have people that will get the answer. This Board takes nothing from a lot line change to a project something like this lightly. If there's a question, concern, we will get that answered, and we will make sure it follows our Code to the T. To the public, please, if you have any questions, concerns, reach out to us. As of right now, June 3rd will be the scoping session. We will be in this room, and as Max said, if you want to write in stuff from now, email, we'll have it. If you want to wait, that's fine also. And the documents that were read tonight by our board member will be uploaded on the Planning Board's portal in a day or two.

Mr. McConnell: Mr. Chairman, could I also make one more point?

Mr. Chairman: Yes,

Mr. McConnell: You have an opportunity for written or oral comments, and we don't take any of them lightly. Just because in past projects maybe the decision wasn't the

way you would have gone, it's not because we took your concerns and just threw them out. We have our professionals actually address anything that's raised, and that's what we're doing here at the same time is that we listen to your concerns, and maybe we state it differently or a different angle on what it is you've expressed, but we all live in this town also. So, we're concerned about what happens in town. So don't think that us versus them. It's not that way at all. So, any question that you may end up having, don't dismiss it because, oh, nobody wants to hear that. We want to hear all questions, all concerns, and our professionals will advise us as well as our experience on these matters.

Chairman Astorino: In the Code. Thanks, Dennis. Do any other Board members or Professionals have any comments?

Max Stach: On the Town's website, because the town did start a new platform, the MuniCollab platform. When you go to the Planning Board's website, you will see some projects listed there, but there's a little red button on the right side that says Planning Board's portal. That is the entrance to MuniCollab where this project's information will be held. So don't get discouraged if you don't see it listed right there when you land on the Planning Department. You've got to press that little red button that says Planning Board portal.

Mr. Showalter: And for everybody in the audience here, as Ben said before, we read, if anyone wants to submit comments via email, snail mail, whatever, we read every comment. I spent a lot of hours over the years.

Connie Sardo: Email way is the best. Because I forward that straight to the Board members and Professionals.

Kirk Rother: Mr. Chairman, a quick question that I'm guessing the public would be interested in also. The scoping session is going to happen on June 3rd as a public hearing on this scoping document. And you had said in your resolution that that has to be noticed in the newspaper by May 19th. My understanding, unlike the application, the actual application where the public hearing notice is also sent certified mail to adjoining from 300 feet, that does not occur with the scoping document. So there will be no certified mail.

Chairman Astorino: Correct.

Kirk Rother: It's just the newspaper. And hearing it here tonight.

Chairman Astorino: And the website and everything else.

Connie Sardo: It will be in the Newspaper, website and in the Planning Board's portal. It will be posted at town hall.

Chairman Astorino: Okay. Thank you. We will list Comment #3 through Comment #36 for the record. I'm sure they're going to change as this project moves along. Thank you all for coming this evening. And again, any questions, please reach out.

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

Comment #13: §164-46.J(53) and §164-46J(139) (e)[7]: 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 #14: The requirements of §164-46J(139)(a) to (j) are applicable and must be addressed on the plans.

Comment #15: The requirements of §164-42F (Marginal Access Road) are applicable and must be addressed on the plans.

Comment #16: The 911 addresses must be shown on the plan.

Comment #17: The number of employees, maximum seating capacity, and hours of operation should be shown for each use.

Comment #18: The proposed wastewater system should be shown on the plans.

Comment #19: The proposed water supply system should be shown on the plans.

Comment #20: Parking calculations must be shown on the site plans for all Tier 1 and Tier 2 uses, including the required number of handicapped parking spaces.

Comment #21: Applicant to prepare a traffic study. The scope of the traffic study should be approved prior to the vehicle traffic counts being collected.

Comment #22: Adequate pedestrian access should be provided, demonstrate this on the plans.

Comment #23: 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 #24: §164-43.1 Applicant to include a sign schedule with details for all proposed signs, including code requirements, such as location, height, size, materials of construction, and illumination. Any required internal roadway signs (e.g., stop sign, etc.) must also be included.

Comment #25: Limits of disturbance and area of disturbance (in acres) should be added to the plans.

Comment #26: A Stormwater Management Plan, in compliance with NYSDEC requirements and §164-47.10 Stormwater Management, must be submitted.

Comment #27: The Applicant proposes to culvert a portion of the unnamed tributary to Wawayanda Creek. The Applicant should clarify so that environmental permitting can be determined.

Comment #28: A Landscaping Plan, including a planting schedule, should be included on the plans.

Comment #29: §164-43.4 Lighting: The proposed location, height, orientation, type of illuminating device, shielding, bulb type and wattage, and photometric data of all outdoor lighting fixtures, should be added to the plan.

Comment #30: The location, type, and screening details for solid waste disposal facilities and containers should be shown on the plans.

Comment #31: Plans for the disposal of construction and demolition waste, whether on-site storage and/or use, should be provided.

Comment #32: 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 #33: Surveyor to certify that iron rods have been set at all property corners.

Comment #34: Any required declarations must be added to the plan.

Comment #35: Any required Performance and Landscape Bonds must be submitted, as well as site inspection fees.

Comment #36: Payment of all fees.

Black Dirt Sports Club

Application for Site Plan Approval & Special Use Permit for the use and construction of an indoor rec-building with accessory outdoor sports fields, situated at tax parcels S12 B2 L 16, 17.2, 18, 19, and 20; project located at the northern side of County Route 1, 1,100 feet west of Firehouse Lane, (734 County Route 1), in the LB & AI zones, of the Town of Warwick.

Representing the Applicant: Kirk Rother from Rother Engineering.

The following review comments submitted by HDR:

Comment #1: Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.

Max Stach: This application is a little up in the air. I did get the email you sent regarding the size. The application, the EAF Part 1, identified that the applicant is proposing 14 acres of disturbance. Since the SEQRA regulations were updated, a new Type 2 use was established, which is basically reuse of an existing building. Reuse of an existing building is Type 2, as long as it doesn't trip a Type 1 threshold. Ten acres of disturbance is a Type 1 threshold, so because of that, this would be a Type 1 action. However, I don't think you're disturbing 14 acres.

Kirk Rother: Right.

Max Stach: And really what I need is a calculation of how much dirt you're moving around and any areas of dirt that you're not moving around that are going to be part of this proposed use. So, if it's not being moved around, but it's going to be mowed and people are going to play soccer on it, that counts, right? So that's what I need the calculation to include. Once we get that number, we'll either say Type 2, no SEQRA, or we'll say Type 1, give me a full EAF.

Kirk Rother: Does the mowed area count in the calculation? The whole site will be mowed.

Max Stach: It's what you're proposing for this use. It's a recreational use. If you're using it toward that recreational use, if it's going to be farmed, I think you mentioned that somebody already planted soybeans and it's going to continue to be part farmed, that doesn't count. But if it's ultimately going to be used for rental to sport teams that are kind of at commercial activity, we want to know that that would be considered part of the disturbance area.

Kirk Rother: It would be all of the 14 acres.

Max Stach: It would then be a Type 1 Action. If that's the case, please submit a full EAF.

Kirk Rother: Ok.

Comment #2: Applicant to discuss project.

Kirk Rother: This is an application for an indoor and outdoor sports facility at an existing roughly 8,000 square foot structure on County Route 1 west of Firehouse Lane. Currently existing agricultural fields right now, they're fallow. I think we're going to plant soil in the spring if this gets approved. We' would plant sod on it. We will use it for the ball fields.

Chairman Astorino: Okay. I believe this evening we're going to set a site visit for that. Is that correct? We are going to discuss scheduling that. Before we get on any further, Kirk is there any of these comments you want to discuss?

Kirk Rother: No. Okay.

Chairman Astorino: We need to schedule a site visit. We could discuss that at our next work session. It doesn't pay to go too much further until we see what is out there.

Kirk Rother: Yes. So, Max, how do you want to handle SEQRA? Do you want me to come back to another Planning Board with a long EAF?

Max Stach: We do it here by resolution.

Kirk Rother: Yes.

Max Stach: I would suggest that we do it that way.

Kirk Rother: All right.

Chairman Astorino: Let's do that. We will then set a site visit. We will list Comment #3 through Comment #39 for the records. We will see you when we get more information back to us.

Kirk Rother: 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: TW Building Department – pending comments

Comment #7: OCDPW – pending review

Comment #8: Planning Board to schedule a site inspection.

Comment #9: Applicant to confirm if any existing water and sewer service is sufficient for the proposed occupancy.

Comment #10: Applicant must update the plan with 911 address.

Comment #11: Applicant must place the parcel limits on the NWI, NYSDEC ERM, and FEMA firmette so potential impacts on federal and state water resources and floodplain can be assessed.

Comment #12: Applicant to clarify if propose to combine the lots associated with this proposed use.

Comment #13: The applicant shall provide a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for the site.

Comment #14: Town of Warwick Bulk Standards for each zone should be followed and included on the plans.

Comment #15: Applicant to demonstrate compliance with §164-46J(53) Town of Warwick Design Standards.

Comment #16: All applicable Town of Warwick Standard Notes should be added to the plans.

Comment #17: Applicant to clarify if additional protective netting will be placed around the field.

Comment #18: The applicant should include a detail showing the cross section of the infield areas (if sand and/or clay will be used).

Comment #19: A note shall be added to the plan stating the proposed permanent features and the proposed temporary structures. Construction details and locations of all features shall be shown on the plans.

Comment #20: The applicant should conduct soil testing to confirm the proposed depth of the proposed concrete foundations for the fencing, backstops, etc. Details must be added to the plans.

Comment #21: Any outdoor equipment storage should be shown on the plans, if applicable.

Comment #22: The applicant shall provide any proposed seating capacity for any spectator areas.

Comment #23: Hours of operation and number of employees for the business should be included on the plans.

Comment #24: Sediment and erosion control measures must be implemented onsite. Limits of disturbance should be outlined on site plans and shown in square feet.

Comment #25: §164-46J (43) Any outdoor amusement establishment use, or drive-in theater located within 100 feet of a lot line shall be effectively screened along the lot lines. Screening shall consist of a type of fencing or a hedge of such type and spacing as may be required by the Planning Board, of an initial height of not less than six feet at the time of planting and pruned to a height of not less than 6 1/2 feet to adequately screen all operations on the lot from the view of neighboring properties.

Comment #26: Applicant to provide a landscaping plan showing any required buffers between recreational use and adjacent residential or commercial zones.

Comment #27: If evening operations are proposed, confirm that lighting levels comply with Town standards. A lighting plan must be submitted.

Comment #28: Applicant to show any proposed sign in accordance with §164-43.1.

Comment #29: Parking calculations must be shown on the plan and the parking spaces must be added to the plan.

Comment #30: ADA-compliant parking spaces, accessible routes, and building access should be shown on the plans.

Comment #31: Applicant to clarify what potential noises will be produced on the property. The planning board will determine if an assessment of noise impacts associated with outdoor sports activities, including mitigation if needed.

Comment #32: §A168-19 Driveways Notes should be included on the plans.

Comment #33: Sight distances and profiles for all proposed driveways should be shown on the plans.

Comment #34: § 164-46J (83) Traffic generated by bowling alleys, dance halls, physical fitness studios and similar commercial recreation facilities and background traffic shall be no greater than 1.25 peak hour trips per 1,000 gross square feet. Applicant to submit a scope of work for a traffic study.

Comment #35: 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 #36: Any required notes and filed declarations must be added to the plan. The declaration information for all applicable Town of Warwick Overly Notes must be added to the plans.

Comment #37: The surveyor must sign and seal the plan.

Comment #38: Surveyor to certify that iron rods have been set at all property corners.

Comment #39: Payment of all fees.

7 West Cove Road, LLC

Application for Site Plan Approval for the use and construction of removal of an existing 3-bedroom, single-story dwelling, deck and the construction of a new 3-bedroom, two-story dwelling within "A Designated Protection Area" of Greenwood Lake, situated on tax parcel SBL # 76-1-37; project located at 7 West Cove Road, in the SM zone, of the Town of Warwick.

Representing the Applicant: Brian Friedler from Friedler Engineering. Chris Collins, Architect. Neil Shah, Applicant.

The following review comments submitted by HDR:

Comment #1: Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.

Max Stach: This action is a Type 2 Action pursuant to SEQRA, construction and expansion of a single-family, two-family, and three-family residence. Planning board may enter the determination for the record by motion and vote.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion for the Type 2 Action.

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

Comment #2: Applicant to discuss project.

Chris Collins; There's an existing residence on the lot. We're actually going to take that down. We're going to put up a new residence. It will meet all the zoning requirements. It will be from a single-story to a two-story residence. We also want to lift the first floor slightly out of the ground a little farther. Just to make sure we're not going to deal with any water issues.

Chairman Astorino: Do you have any questions, concerns on these comments this evening?

Brian Friedler: No. The applicant just wants to speak quickly about the septic system.

Chairman Astorino: Ok.

Neil Shah: The current septic system in the house is considerably older and is not working to its full functionality. We have allocated funds already, and when we purchased the house, the actual seller had left money in escrow due to the septic system situation. Our intent is to replace the system in its totality. But that does require another board approval or Orange County to approve it. What I'm asking this board to do is, in conjunction with that approval process, I would like to go ahead and start the construction process, once it's approved by the

Department of Buildings, to move forward the construction timeline, so my wife and my family can actually use the house ideally by next summer.

Chairman Astorino: This board will give an approval without an outside agency's approval. I don't think we can. I don't like doing that. Because if the County comes back and you have an approval to build your home, and you do not get that approval from the County, you would have no septic. We can't do that. I wouldn't do it. I haven't done it here. I don't think we want to start that.

Neil Shah: If I was still willing to take on the liability, in the event that Town said, no septic for you whatsoever, hell over high water, I would lose my money on the house that I built that has no septic. It's completely pointless. I'll even take an approval, partial approval, which says I can't put in plumbing until that process is done. I would like to be able to lay down my foundation, build my envelope, prior to winter, possibly.

Chairman Astorino: The best I can do for you tonight is I will speak to the board's attorney. I'm not going to make that decision tonight.

Neil Shah: I appreciate it.

Chairman Astorino: I will tell you what I'm leaning to know. That's my opinion. I don't know what the rest of the board will. I'm going to get an opinion from our attorney. Like I said, we've never done that in the past. I personally don't think it's a very good practice to do. But some people can say, now we've got a lot that's got a foundation, a home that's not completed. I'll walk it, because I can't get a septic. And there's another issue that, you know, our bonds, I just think it gets too convoluted. That's my opinion, but I will speak to our attorney.

Neil Shah: I appreciate that.

Mr. Showalter: Mr. Chairman, being that the lake is in a protected area, doesn't the septic system have to comply with our engineer.?

Chairman Astorino: It will be the health department.

Mr. Showalter: There is a requirement for the septic system to be constructed a certain way.

Chairman Astorino: That would be through the health department. I get your point. There is going to be a delay through the health department. But I personally think this board, but again, I will.

Neil Shah: Honestly, I really appreciate it. And it's worth a shot. I just was under the impression if there is already a septic system there, that one would...

Chairman Astorino: But if the septic system there is failing, because if that's, if you didn't come and say what you said this evening, we would have done a dye test out there. And then it would have failed, and we would have been like,

okay, now you go to the health department. So honestly, I applaud your honesty. Brian is a great engineer. Personally, I don't like doing that. I don't think it will happen. But again, I will have a conversation with our attorney.

Neil Shah: I appreciate it. Thank you.

Chairman Astorino: You are welcome. We will list Comment #3 through Comment #25 for the record. We do have a site visit scheduled. We'll do it as we move to Other Considerations for this project.

Brian Friedler: Okay. Are we at the point to be set for a public hearing?

Chairman Astorino: You absolutely could be set for a public hearing for the next available agenda. So we'll do that.

Mr. Showalter makes a motion to Set the 7 West Cove Road, LLC Site Plan application for a Public Hearing at the next available agenda.

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

Brian Friedler: Thank You.

Comment #3: Conservation Board – no comments received

Comment #4: Architectural Review Board – no comments received

Comment #5: OC Planning Department – pending

Comment #6: TW Building Department – pending

Comment #7: OCDOH – approval needed for septic system.

Comment #8: Planning Board to determine if a site inspection is necessary.

Comment #9: §280(a) is required because the access is to a private road; planning board can grant this as approval.

Comment #10: Applicant to confirm if §164-45.1 Existing Small Residential Lots apply.

Comment #11: Applicant to confirm if §164-41.A(1)(b) Supplemental Regulations for Residence Districts applies.

Comment #12: Applicant should be aware that any shoreline additions/improvements within 50 feet of Greenwood Lake (Class B) may be subject to NYSDEC Article 15.

Comment #13: The limits of disturbance (LOD) must be shown on the plan, as well as the area of distance (in sf and acres). LOD is shown in feet but not shown in acres.

Comment #14: Proper erosion control measures, details, and notes must be added to the plan. Please show the stabilized construction entrance and detail and other necessary controls to protect the lake.

Comment #15: Sheet 1, Soil Erosion Control Note #3 must be updated to say that disturbed areas shall be seeded with temporary seeding if there is no additional disturbance within 7 days (not one month).

Comment #16: Proposed site grading and contours should be added to the plan.

Comment #17: Speed limit and driveway sight distance must be shown on the plan.

Comment #18: Detail for proposed driveway should be added to the plan with note stating driveways designed in compliance with A168-19 of the Town Code and that the grade for the first 25 feet shall not exceed 8%.

Comment #19: Applicant to confirm surface covering for the proposed driveway and parking area.

Comment #20: 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 #21: Surveyor to certify that iron rods have been set at all property corners.

Comment #22: The surveyor must sign and seal the plan because metes and bounds are included on the drawings.

Comment #23: Applicant to provide a private road use and maintenance agreement.

Comment #24: Any applicable performance bond and/or landscape bond and associated site inspection fees shall be provided.

Comment #25: Payment of all fees.

US Lumber (Former Mid-State Lumber Co.)

Application for "Amended" Site Plan Approval and Special Use Permit for the use of an existing building material distribution center. The Applicant requests to extend hours of operation, situated on tax parcel S 33 B 1 L 11.1; project located on the southern side of Kings Highway, at Four Corners Rod and State School Road (270 Kings Hwy.), in the OI zone, of the Town of Warwick. Previously discussed at the PB Meeting of 11/15/23.

Representing the Applicant: Keith Woodruff from Engineering Properties and Surveying.

The following review comments submitted by HDR:

Comment #1: Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.

Max Stach: The board started SEQRA on this project back on November 15, 2023, by classifying the action as Unlisted and declaring Lead Agency. The applicant has, in the meantime, I think been working on some noise studies, but really, I think the next step in the process is for this board to adopt a Part 2 EAF. We have prepared one for this purpose. It's a very long, full EAF, but it's really only identifying one impact, and that is noise impacts. We didn't think that this would have any impact. The Planning Board could adopt that tonight. Then the applicant would be able to submit all of the noise studies that they've been working on officially as their draft Part 3 EAF. I think that puts everything nicely in the record for SEQRA.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to adopt the Full EAF Part 2.

Seconded by Mr. McConnell. The following Resolution was carried 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

Seconded by Mr. Showalter. The following Resolution was carried 5-Ayes and 0-Nays and 0-Absent.

617.6

State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR)

Resolution Adopting a Full Environmental Assessment Form, Part II

Name of Action: **U.S. Lumber**

WHEREAS, the Town of Warwick Planning Board is in receipt of an application to amend the site plan and special use permit approvals for an existing building material distribution center, in order to extend the hours of operation from 6:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m., seven (7) days per week to

twenty-four (24) hour operations, on a site located on tax parcel Section 33, Block 1, Lot 11.1, also known as 200 Kings Hwy, within the OI Zoning District of the Town of Warwick; and

WHEREAS, on November 15, 2023, the Planning Board noticed its intent to declare lead agency status to the following involved agencies and has received no objections thereto:

- Orange County Department of Planning;
- Orange County Department of Public Works;
- Town of Warwick Town Board; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has reviewed a draft Full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) prepared by its planning consultant which identifies the following areas of moderate to large environmental impact:

- The proposed action may produce sound above noise levels established by local regulation; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby assumes lead agency status and adopts the Full Environmental Assessment Form, Part II, as prepared by Nelson Pope Voorhis, dated April 15, 2026.

Comment #2: Applicant to discuss project.

Keith Woodruff: As discussed, it's an existing facility in the Mid-State Lumber, which has now been reclassified as U.S. Lumber. They are currently a wholesale lumber and building materials supplier. They had previously obtained a site plan approval from 2006, which extended their hours of operation from, or extended the early hours from 5 a.m. to 6.30 a.m., as well as the late hours from 7.30 to 9 p.m. And the amended site plan application before the board is to, as discussed, have overnight 24 hours a day for five trucks a week for pickup and drop-offs for those deliveries. We are limiting it to five trucks per week. We haven't limited it to the number of days, if it's one day, two days, three days, or five days. But we did limit it to at least the five trips. We did the noise study, which did show there is no off-site adverse impacts, which we'll incorporate as part of the Part 3 EAF that'll be submitted to the board for their review. We also reached out to the neighbors to run a supplemental noise study, putting receptors inside their homes, and none of the 10 submissions we sent out got favorable responses.

Chairman Astorino: I did not think they would.

Keith Woodruff: So, we are before the board to proceed with the SEQRA process. We also request from the board to be set for a public hearing.

Chairman Astorino: Ok. Are there any of these comments you'd like to discuss this evening? I think they're straightforward.

Keith Woodruff: No, I think it's enough.

Chairman Astorino: Ok. We will list Comment #3 through Comment #21 for the record. Does the applicant requests to be set for a public hearing at the next available agenda?

Keith Woodruff: Yes.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to Set the US Lumber Company “Amended” Site Plan Approval and Special Use Permit application for a Public Hearing at the next available agenda.

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

Keith Woodruff: Thank you.

Comment #3: Conservation Board – no comments received

Comment #4: Architectural Review Board – no comments received

Comment #5: OC Planning Department – 11/01/23 advisory for noise

Comment #6: TW Building Department – 12/19/25 needs fire inspection

Comment #7: OCDPW – pending submittal

Comment #8: OC planning – 01/05/26 no advisory comments

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

Comment #10: Provide the Town of Warwick standard notes to the plan, including the standard lighting note.

Comment #11: Please add the language from Town of Warwick Code §100A-3 Prohibited Noises and §164.48 Performance Standards-

Comment #12: Applicant to add the following note to the plans: “Trailers will be preloaded with forklifts during daytime hours. Trucks arriving during the evening or nighttime will only need to disconnect an empty trailer and/or connect to a preloaded trailer. Disconnection and connection will take place at the designated location shown on the site plan”

Comment #13: Please add the following notes to the plan:

- a. Normal Hours of Operations are 6:30am to 7:30pm, 7 days a week. Working outside these hours will be considered “nighttime hours.”
- b. During nighttime hours, employees and trucks (including tractor trailers) may enter or leave the site but only through the State School Road entrance and detach or attach empty or fully loaded trailers to tractors.
- c. Loading and unloaded of any truck during nighttime hours must be completed from behind a building to less sounds emitted toward Kings Highway
- d. During nighttime hours, all employees who enter or leave the premises must use the State School Road entrance and shall use the time clock installed within the southeast corner of the storage barn nearest the structure designated as “Existing Storage Shed.”
- e. All lights must be fully shielded.
- f. No Parking Signs to be maintained along the southeasterly side of County Route 13 at locations approved by Orange County DPW and Town of Warwick DPW. These sign locations must be added to the site plan.
- g. Annual review is required by the Town of Warwick Building Department for compliance with the Town Code and all Site Plan requirements.
- h. All notes on the site plan should be consolidated and/or ordered.

Comment #14: Sheet C-100 General Notes 13 to 24 contain some notes that are nearly the same; for clarify, please condense notes.

Comment #15: Applicant to add a note to the plans stating that the engine cannot run for more than 5 minutes at a time.

Comment #16: Applicant to clarify the hours of operation. Hours provided to not include 7:30-9pm and 5am-6:30am. Applicant to update the plans with this information.

Comment #17: Applicant to confirm the following and/or make the following revisions regarding the Truck Turning Movement Diagram:

- a. A second Truck Turning Movement Diagram needs to be added to the site plan showing a WB-55 truck backing out of the Designated Overnight Loading and Unloading Zone and egressing from the State School Road Entrance.
- b. Confirm that the area between Existing Storage Building A/B, the Designated Overnight Loading and Unloading Zone, and all other areas to be utilized by turning trucks will remain clear of objects to provide sufficient space for truck loading and unloading operations.
- c. Confirm if signage and/or pavement markings will be provided to convey to drivers the proposed truck routing to and from the Designated Overnight Loading and Unloading Zone.
- d. Confirm if signage and/or pavement markings will be placed at the State School Road Entrance warning that the truck turning movement encroaches into the oncoming lane for egressing vehicles.
- e. Display on the plans a 1-ft shy distance around the truck turning movement to demonstrate that trucks will maintain a minimum 1-ft clearance from objects onsite.
- f. Display on the plans the approximate curb cut width and entrance gate width at the State School Road Entrance to confirm that truck turning movements do not conflict with the gate or exceed the curb cut width.
- g. The Truck Turning Movement conflicts with the footprint of the Existing Gas Pump shown onsite. Revise the Truck Turning Movement diagram so as to not conflict with the Existing Gas Pump.
- h. Indicate on the plans the design speed used for the truck turning movement.

Comment #18: Surveyor to certify that iron rods have been set at all property corners.

Comment #19: The liber and page for required declarations (Agricultural and Biodiversity Notes) must be added to the plan.

Comment #20: If required, provide a Performance Bond and three-year landscaping bond and associated site inspection fees.

Comment #21: Payment of all fees.

Other Considerations:

1. Sibilla 7 Skysail Lane Subdivision – Planning Board to discuss scheduling a site visit for 4/27/26 @ 5:00 p.m.
2. Alexander 11 Walts Way Site Plan for rebuild of single-family dwelling located within “A Designated Protection Area” of Greenwood Lake. Planning Board to discuss scheduling a site visit for 5/6/26 @ 5:00 p.m.
3. 7 West Cove Road, LLC Site Plan for removal and construction of a two-story single-family dwelling located within “A Designated Protection Area” of Greenwood Lake. Planning Board to discuss scheduling a site visit for 5/6/26 @ 5:45 p.m.

Chairman Astorino: The site visits mentioned above are set. Regarding the Blain Town Square Homestead project, Laura just brought to my attention about scheduling it for a site visit before the public scoping section. I think it would be wise to get out there before the scoping session.

Mr. McConnell: Yes.

Mr. Kennedy: Yes.

The board discussed scheduling a site visit for the Blain Town Square project. The site visit is set for 6/3/26 @ 5:00 p.m.

Connie Sardo: The board should also discuss scheduling a site visit for the Black Dirt Sports Club that is located in Pine Island.

Chairman Astorino: We should schedule that one as well.

The board discussed scheduling at site visit for the Black Dirt Sports Club. The site visit is set for 5/26/26 @ 5:00p.m.

Chairman Astorino: Connie will send us reminders about all of the site visits that we set.

Connie Sardo: Yes.

4. Planning Board Minutes of 3/18/26 for PB approval. (Approved).

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to approve the PB Minutes of 3/18/26.

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

Correspondences:

1. Email correspondence from a Resident, William Maier addressed to the Planning Board in regards to the Blain Town Square project.

Chairman Astorino: We have that correspondence.

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. Let the record show no public comment.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to adjourn the Planning Board Meeting of April 15, 2026.

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