

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ULSTER  
TOWN OF MARLBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

----- X

In the Matter of

SMITH SUBDIVISION

Project No. 17-1017  
First Street, Milton  
Section 103.1; Block 4; Lot 47.130

----- X

EXTENSION - SUBDIVISION

Date: December 16, 2019  
Time: 7:30 p.m.  
Place: Town of Marlborough  
Town Hall  
21 Milton Turnpike  
Milton, NY 12547

BOARD MEMBERS: CHRIS BRAND, Chairman  
JOEL TRUNCALI  
BEN TRAPANI  
CINDY LANZETTA  
JOSEPH LOFARO  
MANNY CAUCHI

ALSO PRESENT: JEFFREY S. BATTISTONI, ESQ.  
PATRICK HINES  
VIRGINIA FLYNN

APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE: DOUG SMITH

----- X

MICHELLE L. CONERO  
PMB #276  
56 North Plank Road, Suite 1  
Newburgh, New York 12550  
(845) 541-4163

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

SMITH SUBDIVISION

2

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I'd like to call the meeting to order with the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our country.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

MR. TRUNCALI: Agenda, Town of Marlborough Planning Board, December 16, 2019. Regular meeting 7:30 p.m. Approval of stenographic minutes for 11/4 and 11/18. Smith Subdivision, extension, subdivision; Greiner BSD Realty NY, sketch, subdivision/lot line. Next deadline: Friday, December 20th. Next scheduled meeting: Monday, January 6th.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Excellent. I would like to have the approval for the stenographic minutes for November the 4th and November the 18th.

MS. LANZETTA: I'll make that motion, to approve those minutes.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Is there a second?

MR. LOFARO: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BRAND: All those in favor?

MR. CLARKE: Aye.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

SMITH SUBDIVISION

MR. TRAPANI: Aye.

MS. LANZETTA: Aye.

MR. TRUNCALI: Aye.

MR. CAUCHI: Aye.

MR. LOFARO: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Aye.

Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BRAND: So moved.

Before we begin I would just like to submit for the record that I have completed two online training courses, one for the New York State Historic -- New York State Department of Local Government Services Historic Preservation and also the New York State Department of State Public Meetings and Hearings. Those have been forwarded to the secretary as well.

First up, Smith Subdivision, extension, First Street, Milton.

So we received a letter from Mr. Ross Winglovitz regarding the Smith Subdivision. Their subdivision was expired on November 20, 2019 and they are requesting a 90-day extension to the conditional final approval as that the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

improvements are nearly complete and the owner expects to file by the end of the year.

Jeff, did you have any comments on that?

MR. BATTISTONI: I will say that I prepared an approval resolution for the Board. A subdivision approval under State law is valid for 180 days. You are allowed to grant extensions of 90 days. So this is something you can do. I recommend you do it. And all of the conditions are in the resolution.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay. Any comments or questions from the Board regarding the 90-day extension?

MR. SMITH: I've done the blacktop and all the improvements are done. Just, you know, I've got the metes and bounds near the dedication parcel that were given to the Town and everything. It's just a matter of, you know, waiting for Pat to approve the performance bond amount and basically filing the maps and, you know, getting checks and stuff for the rec fees and stuff like that. So it's right there. I don't know if we'll be done by the end of the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

year the way things are going but shortly.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Excellent.

All those in favor of the resolution to grant the 90-day extension for the conditional final approval for the Smith Subdivision?

MS. LANZETTA: Doesn't she have to poll the Board?

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Jen, poll the Board.

MS. FLYNN: Chairman Brand?

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Lanzetta?

MS. LANZETTA: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Truncali?

MR. TRUNCALI: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Trapani?

MR. TRAPANI: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Lofaro?

MR. LOFARO: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Clarke?

MR. CLARKE: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Cauchi?

MR. CAUCHI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: And just a housekeeping question, Jeff. The November 20 --

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

SMITH SUBDIVISION

6

what's the date?

MR. BATTISTONI: It actually expired on November 17th. Some people think it's a 6-month extension. It's really 180 days. The approval would have expired November 17th. This is retroactive to that date.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SMITH: All right. Thank you very much.

(Time noted: 7:35 p.m.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, MICHELLE CONERO, a Notary Public  
for and within the State of New York, do hereby  
certify:

That hereinbefore set forth was  
prepared from a recording and is a true record of  
the proceedings to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am not  
related to any of the parties to this proceeding by  
blood or by marriage and that I am in no way  
interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto  
set my hand this 2nd day of January 2020.

*Michelle Conero*

---

MICHELLE CONERO

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ULSTER  
TOWN OF MARLBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

----- X

In the Matter of

GREINER BSD REALTY NY

Project No. 19-3013  
96 Idlewild Road, Marlboro  
Section 108.3; Block 1; Lots 21.113 & 18.12

----- X

SKETCH - SUBDIVISION/LOT LINE

Date: December 16, 2019  
Time: 7:35 p.m.  
Place: Town of Marlborough  
Town Hall  
21 Milton Turnpike  
Milton, NY 12547

BOARD MEMBERS: CHRIS BRAND, Chairman  
JOEL TRUNCALI  
BEN TRAPANI  
CINDY LANZETTA  
JOSEPH LOFARO  
MANNY CAUCHI

ALSO PRESENT: JEFFREY S. BATTISTONI, ESQ.  
PATRICK HINES  
VIRGINIA FLYNN

APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE: DARRIN SCALZO

----- X

MICHELLE L. CONERO  
PMB #276  
56 North Plank Road, Suite 1  
Newburgh, New York 12550  
(845) 541-4163



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Next on the agenda, Greiner BSD Realty, sketch, subdivision/lot line, 96 Idlewild Road, Marlboro.

MR. SCALZO: Good evening.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: How are you this evening?

MR. SCALZO: I made it to this point.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Good. So were you given a copy of Pat's comments?

MR. SCALZO: I was not.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay. They will be on the board shortly. I can give them to you. I can read through them.

It says the lot geometry under the revised plan eliminates the small (inaudible) of property which were previously proposed. The project results in making two lots into four lots under the current proposal.

A note has been added to the plans regarding cross access for the general notes and should be modified to include proposed lot 2 which also share an access road. An easement should be prepared and filed with the subdivision granting rights of access wherever they are

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

proposed.

Comment 3, the current water taking use which was previously approved on the resulting lot 1 will no longer have 10 acres and will no longer be permitted as a use for that site plan.

No amended site plan application has been received as part of the subdivision application and therefore the approval for that site plan will be invalid based on the filing of the subdivision map.

Number 4, a deed plot map has been provided depicting the entire parcel.

Number 5, roadway dedication parcels should be proposed along all frontage, which all frontage existing along Town roadways.

Number 6, no new construction is proposed.

A public hearing for the subdivision is required.

I believe that is it. I can give you a copy of those as well.

MR. SCALZO: Okay. The last time we were here was September, so if you don't -- I can roll through the narrative again if you guys want

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

to be refreshed.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Sure.

MR. SCALZO: We're proposing now a lot line change. It's now a three-lot subdivision of approximately 88 acres. There's a 30 plus acre parcel on tax parcel 21.113 and approximately 58 acres on tax parcel 18.12. Both parcels are located on the southerly side of Idlewild Road. The 30-acre parcel has road frontage in multiple locations on Idlewild Road.

They propose to put a storage building in the corner of Idlewild and Burma.

The 58-acre parcel has road frontage on Burma, and it also has the Pioneer Water warehouse. The applicant is seeking to create a standalone lot for the warehouse. To accomplish this we will need to combine the lot line change and subdivision to affect lot 21.113. The lot line change portion will allow for the sliding around the warehouse into tax lot 18.12, and then a three-lot subdivision of tax lot 21.113.

There is a 22 plus acre lot on the west which includes the preservation area and the wells and nearly 5-acre parcel for the old water

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

bottling warehouse. There's over an 8-acre lot which includes the cold storage building at the corner of Idlewild and Burma.

I just saw Pat's comments. This is the first I've heard of them here today. The second sheet of the plan actually really spells it out much easier than the initial plan that I submitted in September. It's much easier to follow.

One question that I have is the roadway dedication parcel should be proposed all along the existing Town roadways. Pat, did you also intend for that to be road dedication areas? For example, say on lot number 4 which is the one that's at the corner of Burma and Idlewild.

MR. HINES: Yeah.

MR. SCALZO: The tough part about that -- and listen, anything can be done. That was a general description. There were no metes and bounds. I actually had physically located the road and, you know, that's how it came with the acreage for that lot number 4. As I say, it can be done. Was that your intent with your note, Pat?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. HINES: Yes. All the lots involved. Any of the frontage. It's a typical requirement. You do have metes and bounds there, though. Just on the deeds, is that --

MR. SCALZO: I included dimensions on there.

MR. HINES: So then you can do it with that map with a note saying 25 feet from the center line.

MR. SCALZO: Okay.

MR. HINES: That will clean that up and that will give the Town the dedication that it needs.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: This proposed lot number 2, that has access on Idlewild Road?

MR. SCALZO: It does. Up in the -- there's actually a 50-foot strip. It's an access. I call it an access. There's actually a 50-foot strip that does have -- it's on sheet number 1. It does have a 30-foot wide access road. It appears on filed map number 7904. So it actually does not -- the right-of-way corner -- the right-of-way does touch the corner of the lot, however there's a 30-foot wide access from

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Idlewild to that 50-foot wide strip.

MS. LANZETTA: Now, is this access --  
is this piece that goes out to the road that's  
also adjoined by Schlagler and Kalfa, do they  
have a right-of-way on that access also over to  
the --

MR. SCALZO: They do. That's for the  
driveway. Or the driveway, at least Schlagler  
does.

MS. LANZETTA: That should be depicted  
on the maps as well so we're sure we're not  
landlocking any of these pieces.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: So lot 2, Schlagler,  
and Kalfa, or whoever that is, they're all  
accessing the same right-of-way off of Idlewild?

MR. HINES: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay.

MS. LANZETTA: So one, two, three.  
Okay.

MR. CLARKE: And that's in their deeds?  
That's in Schlagler's and Kalfa's deeds?

MR. HINES: I don't know the answer to  
that.

MR. SCALZO: I'd have to review those.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Offhand I don't know. I'll have that information for the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: What's the other little cutout there on Burma Road? That little small -- it's kind of like in the middle of lot 4.

MR. SCALZO: (Inaudible.)

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I got you. This is just another property.

MR. SCALZO: In revising sheet 2 I'll throw the (inaudible) for that parcel there to eliminate (inaudible).

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I think that will be good, too.

MS. LANZETTA: Yeah. They're all supposed to be depicted anyway in a subdivision.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: And the applicant is well aware that there will be no bottling of water or anything on that warehouse site?

MR. SCALZO: I also read that note that Pat had about the water taking use which was previously approved will no longer have 10 acres and will no longer be permitted as a use for the site plan. Pat and I agreed we're not having a

1  
2 meeting of the minds on this, which is fine. But  
3 if you read the local law which was added to the  
4 code, it states that you can not draw water  
5 unless you have a 10-acre parcel. It doesn't  
6 address bottling water at all. So my  
7 interpretation of the code, which perhaps could  
8 be clarified by the Zoning Board of Appeals for  
9 interpretations, is that that use may still be  
10 available to them to bottle, however they can not  
11 draw from that lot.

12 MS. LANZETTA: So they would truck in  
13 water to bottle at that facility?

14 MR. SCALZO: Or they could just throw a  
15 big hose right across, 30 feet from the facility.  
16 I don't know how they actually did the operation  
17 before.

18 MS. LANZETTA: Well this was part of an  
19 agricultural operation. Now if these other folks  
20 come in, then it becomes a light industrial use  
21 which is permitted as special use. So you would  
22 have to come back and everything would have to be  
23 reviewed again as part of a site plan.

24 MR. SCALZO: Certainly. I certainly  
25 understand that.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. CLARKE: Why was this an agricultural use?

MS. LANZETTA: Well that's how it was approved. The original site plan was approved as an agricultural use because it was -- that particular water taking business was reviewed and came under the Ag provisions, the State Agricultural --

MR. CLARKE: Part of the farm?

MS. LANZETTA: Yeah.

MR. HINES: I don't think they had approval for water taking. It was Pioneer Springs, right, that came for a site plan?

MS. LANZETTA: Yeah. Yeah. When it was approved, though, remember when Doc Pascale was representing them and he explained how it was done under the State Agricultural -- Ag & Markets.

MR. HINES: And that's just my comment. You're reducing the size of the lot that previously had 10 acres that allowed for the water taking under your code. So step one would be you take it to the code enforcement officer to discuss this comment, and then, as you said, the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

next step would be the ZBA. I know you're familiar with that process.

MR. SCALZO: I certainly am. As I said, it just doesn't address it. The code stops short of saying it, so --

MR. CLARKE: I see what you're saying.

MR. SCALZO: It's not like a tie goes to the runner here, but it's not --

MR. HINES: You certainly wouldn't want a bunch of 5-acre lots claiming they're going to become water taking businesses by running a hose over to their neighbor's lot. That's not the intent of having 10 acres in the zone.

MR. SCALZO: I understand that.

MS. LANZETTA: It still has to go through the site plan review.

MR. HINES: Yes.

MR. SCALZO: Yes.

MS. LANZETTA: And then the proper SEQRA would have to be done.

MR. SCALZO: Currently they are not -- it is not a water bottling operation. Currently they are leasing to Amy Hepworth. She's storing vegetables and other agricultural items in the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

warehouse. So it's actually -- it's in character with the neighborhood.

MS. LANZETTA: Well that's an agricultural use.

MR. HINES: After a year of not doing the water bottling it loses that previous approval.

MR. SCALZO: I'm not sure how that all -- the water bottling operation has ceased. I've been involved in this since May, seven months, but it didn't appear as though there was much going on there before that.

MR. HINES: It's been awhile.

MR. TRUNCALI: So is the spring that was feeding the water operation, is that on lot 2 there where it says spring house?

MR. SCALZO: That is correct. And again, I'm unfamiliar with how the operation had worked previously. I don't know how they actually got the water from the spring house into the facility. I can't imagine they would have put it in a truck --

MR. TRUNCALI: No.

MR. SCALZO: -- and just drove the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

truck over. It makes sense they had hoses for it. I can find that out if you're interested to know.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Is there a reason that the applicant isn't going through the site plan process as well to indicate his usage of this property?

MR. SCALZO: Well as I indicated, their usage right now is just for storage --

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Right, right.

MR. SCALZO: -- agricultural storage. Anything that they do beyond that would be subject to site plan review --

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Correct.

MR. SCALZO: -- and approval.

MR. TRUNCALI: What about that overhead utility line that's on lot 2. Is that feeding the existing metal warehouse there?

MR. SCALZO: If it is it's underground. I can verify that as well.

MR. TRUNCALI: They may need an easement for that.

MR. SCALZO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: It does say overhead

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

on that.

MR. TRUNCALI: It dead ends there.

MR. SCALZO: It drops at that utility pole.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Jeff, did you have something?

MR. BATTISTONI: Yeah. I had a question. If there's currently a site plan approval for a water taking, water bottling business and you needed these 10 acres for that, why doesn't the applicant create a 10-acre parcel? It seems like there's plenty of acreage there. This proposed lot 1 be expanded to include the water tanks, the spring house, have 10 acres of land. Is there a reason why that's not occurring?

MR. SCALZO: It's exactly that. The reason why it took me so long to get back here, the two parties are trying to work something out and they are maintaining the 5 acres. It's all filed documents in the County of what it is.

MR. BATTISTONI: So the owner of the property has a contract of sale that defines what has to happen for the subdivision to occur?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. SCALZO: You are correct, sir. They would not have had this.

MR. BATTISTONI: Okay. That's not the Planning Board's problem.

MR. SCALZO: No, no. It's not.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Right.

MR. HINES: So that leads us into the same -- Jeff and I were talking. The access to lot 2 and having this large scale map now with the easement, that doesn't have legal -- and when I say legal I mean New York State Town Law 280-A -- access to Idlewild Road. 15 feet or greater access. It would have access only by easement which would have a Town Law 280-A issue.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: What is that law, Pat?

MR. HINES: The lot width we discussed earlier with Schlagler and Kalfa. That lot -- now that we have a larger detailed map -- has a point where it touches the Town right-of-way. New York State Town Law 280-A, I'll defer to Jeff on this if he wants to correct me, but assumes that 15-foot access to a Town road or a road shown on a subdivision map is legal access. The building inspector most likely could not issue a

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

building permit on lot 2 because it does not have access to a Town road or a road shown on a filed subdivision map because it only has that --

MR. SCALZO: 30-foot wide access road by prescription.

MR. CLARKE: Who owns the prescription? Who owns that little 30-foot piece there?

MR. SCALZO: I can dig further into that. That's how it appears on filed map 7904 which I have with me.

MR. HINES: If that's a road shown on a subdivision map it may resolve that issue. I don't have those documents.

MS. LANZETTA: I'm trying to figure out how these guys got their subdivisions. It's just an easement.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I wish they listed the date on the maps. That would be helpful.

MS. LANZETTA: That's what I was thinking, too.

MR. BATTISTONI: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to look into the issue as to whether a planning board can create a lot that does not have road frontage. It may have access to an easement but

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

it doesn't have frontage.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Yeah. I think we certainly would need clarification on it.

MR. SCALZO: I did submit this to Gael Appler and his comments -- the entrance is existing and has been -- has suitable safe sight distance and has created no problems in the past.

MS. LANZETTA: He's only looking at this particular entrance, though.

MR. SCALZO: That's correct.

MS. LANZETTA: He's not looking at the rest of the subdivision.

MR. SCALZO: That's also correct. So now if you recall from our last meeting, I attempted initially to come in to design a jug handle they call it, which -- well, for everything that Mr. Hines is describing here, if I were to go back to my jug handle, as aesthetically unpleasing as it may be, that would eliminate the 280-A because at that point -- and I would have to provide the proper fee. That was one of the conditions that we discussed at the last meeting. However, I would prefer if we could dig a little deeper into the 30-foot



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

access.

MR. BATTISTONI: I will look into that condition.

MR. SCALZO: Yeah. The jug handle, as I said, my initial attempt at that was to just maintain one less lot. I would prefer the course that you have in front of you right now.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I think my biggest concern is for the warehouse lot, that it seems as though down the road it may become an issue for them by not seeking the site plan application in connection with the subdivision and seeking to do things which may not be allowable. I mean I'd prefer to have -- possibly not allowable. I think I'd like to have everything done correctly the first time as far as the 10 acres with the water. If they're ever thinking about bottling water on there --

MR. SCALZO: Well it's not a permitted use. Should this be approved, that's no longer a permitted use.

MS. LANZETTA: Right. Right.

MR. HINES: It's losing that use.

MR. SCALZO: They're losing that use.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

The other issue is they have not defined, other than storage of agricultural items at this point, what they are intending to do. Anything, as I say, would be subject to site plan approval at a later date.

MS. LANZETTA: Right. I think Chris is just expressing our concern that they not come back later, that we're raising it now that this is a real concern.

MR. CLARKE: The applicant is BSD Realty. They own 56.3 acres of proposed lot 3. I mean they could literally come back here and do a lot line revision and combine those two and have the 10 acres.

MS. LANZETTA: Okay.

MR. HINES: In the future if they wanted to. That was the point of my comment 3, was kind of putting everyone on notice that you have that use here but it's going away under the code.

MR. BATTISTONI: There probably should be a note on the plat to that effect.

MS. LANZETTA: Yeah. I just don't want them to come back later, you know, and claim that

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

there's a -- that this wasn't a self-inflicted problem that they were setting up.

MR. SCALZO: It's all self-inflicted. It's true.

Member Clarke, you had mentioned perhaps combining the warehouse lot with proposed lot number 3 of 56.3 acres, which is a great idea, however they put the cart before the horse with this with the agreements that are filed with the County now. Once this action is complete, that 56 acres goes back to the Greiners. So now you're talking about real property here. That's why we couldn't come to an agreement which permitted them --

MR. CLARKE: This sounds about right. Okay.

MR. HINES: So I think a note on the map that says this subdivision supercedes the previous approvals granted, whenever they were.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Yeah.

MS. LANZETTA: Okay.

MR. SCALZO: I would be happy to put a note indicating exactly that. I can work with you, Pat, and get the language exactly right.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Just for my own clarification, how are they able to file all of this with the County?

MR. HINES: It's just private agreements they filed, not anything to do with this Board. They apparently filed some kind of agreement to do a transaction with each other.

MR. SCALZO: Oh, yeah. I actually have a copy with me if you would like me to leave it with you.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I just don't understand how that --

MR. SCALZO: It's very unusual. I've never seen anything like it.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay. Neither have I. That's why I asked.

MR. CLARKE: Maybe they're going to turn it into a hemp processing center. That would be agricultural. That would be, you know, conforming.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any other questions?

MS. LANZETTA: Don't you have -- you have to be the grower of the hemp. You can't have a third party come in and process it and have it

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

be --

MR. CLARKE: You have a partner.

MS. LANZETTA: Yeah, if you're a partner.

MR. CLARKE: They're all related so, you know, why not.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any other questions or comments from the Board?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BRAND: No. It looks like you have some homework to do.

MR. SCALZO: Yeah. Perhaps I'll come back the next time (inaudible) and take care of everything and perhaps we can move forward.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Scheduling a public hearing.

MR. SCALZO: In February.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Yeah. Okay.

MR. SCALZO: Thank you very much for listening. Like I said, this is a very unusual project for me.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Good luck. All right. Thank you.

Anything else from the Board before I

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

proceed to close?

MR. LOFARO: Just one quick thing.  
It's my understanding today is Joel's last meeting. Joel has been a member for ten years plus from what I understand. I just figured everybody should know that and say thank you. I sat here next to him for two years and I learned just by paying attention to Joel. I just figured everybody should know he did his time and thank you for what you've done.

(Applause.)

MS. LANZETTA: Thank you, Joel. You did your time.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: On to greener pastures.

I'd like to have a motion to close.

MR. LOFARO: I'll make the motion.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Is there a second?

MS. LANZETTA: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: All those in favor?

MR. CLARKE: Aye.

MR. TRAPANI: Aye.

MS. LANZETTA: Aye.

MR. TRUNCALI: Aye.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. CAUCHI: Aye.  
MR. LOFARO: Aye.  
CHAIRMAN BRAND: Aye.  
So carried. Thanks, guys.  
(Time noted: 8:00 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, MICHELLE CONERO, a Notary Public  
for and within the State of New York, do hereby  
certify:

That hereinbefore set forth was  
prepared from a recording and is a true record of  
the proceedings to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am not  
related to any of the parties to this proceeding by  
blood or by marriage and that I am in no way  
interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto  
set my hand this 2nd day of January 2020.

*Michelle Conero*

---

MICHELLE CONERO