

MINUTES of the Village of Montgomery Planning Board meeting held in the Meeting Room of the Village Hall, 133 Clinton Street, on Wednesday, September 22, at 7:30 pm.

ATTENDANCE: Chrm. Conero, Mbr. Romano, Mbr. Crowley, Mbr. Steed, Mbr. Meyer, Atty. Kevin Dowd, Scott Sicina of Lanc & Tully, Ross Winglovitz, Jane Samuelson & Nick Osenni of Engineering Properties, Tom Olley of Olley Architects, Kyle Bardwell of Chazen Companies, Walt & Mary Ann Lindner, Todd Zwigard, Don Berger.

OPEN: Chrm. Conero opened the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

RE: OLD BUSINESS

RE: KSH ROUTE 211 DEVELOPMENT – 211-1-29.22

Chrm. Conero asked if all items from the 7/23/21 Lanc & Tully comment letter had been satisfied? Mr. Sicina said yes.

Mr. Winglovitz is representing the applicant, along with Nick Osenni and Jane Samuelson. This project was two buildings; a 200,000 sq ft building along the rear of the property line and a 100,000 sq ft (indicates location on site plan). The Village declared a moratorium and new zoning came into place. They revised the plan based on their client's direction to two 80,000 sq ft and two 60,000 sq ft. Last month they presented that these would be both be 45 ft high. They haven't spoken with their client. They are still going to seek a variance but they think it will be the front two, away from Pleasant Avenue. They have discussed the potential for a conservation easement, which has been discussed previously, as part of mitigation for potential height variance for the two front buildings. They also added the secondary access. It cannot be waived. It will solely for emergency access. They will do it as a gravel drive with pavers at the entrance, with a gate, accessible to the fire department should the main entrance be closed. The DOT has been a problem just to get them to review the project because of COVID, lost paperwork, lost checks and echecks because that's how his client likes to pay. So, they finally got it straightened out and it's been assigned and is under review now for 300,000 sq ft, this is 280,000. Their traffic study was more conservative because of the previously proposed square footage. They prepared the Part 3 EAF, identified updated stormwater, updated visuals. If the Board has any input on that, in addition to Mr. Sicina's comments, they will incorporate it. Archaeological doesn't change, some things do; obviously, grading, drainage, visual impact will change. They are in conformance with the rezoning, they've provided the access and now they will do the work necessary to submit to this Board what Scott's been asking for and what would be required for the Environmental Review Act, SEQRA, for the project. They'll come back with that big binder, all updated for the new layout.

Atty. Dowd asked, then the Board will refer you to Zoning for the height variance? Mr. Winglovitz replied, yes.

Chrm. Conero asked, the two 80,000 sq ft buildings would require the variances? Mr. Winglovitz replied, yes.

Atty. Dowd asked, the crossing of the wetlands for emergency access, how big is that? Mr. Winglovitz asked, the square footage of the disturbance? .048. Atty. Dowd said the previous owner had disturbed wetlands down in the front. Are they combined? Are they still in the requirement of the...Mr. Winglovitz said he may be just over the 1/10 of an acre? As they design it, they will see once they get the grading in if they can stay under 1/10, they will, if they can't they will have to provide mitigation. They have to go for a permit either way. Over 1/10, they have to provide mitigation in a form of compensation 2:1.

Chrm. Conero asked if the DOT submittal was for the emergency access. Mr. Winglovitz replied, it was for both accesses, at that time. Once it's been assigned, they'll get their comments and address the project changes to them, which are less impactful than the previous plan.

Chrm. Conero asked if the entrance by Chandler had been straightened out yet? Mr. Winglovitz said no. There were discussions with the neighbor but so far, they have not been able to come to an agreement to do that. Mbr. Meyer asked, the access road is not directly across from Chandler? There's still an issue with that? Mr. Winglovitz replied, yes.

Chrm. Conero asked about the traffic study...it was done when there was more square footage. You're saying you don't have to update it because the square footage is reduced; less traffic? Does anyone have any questions? Mr. Sicina replied, yes, as long as the usage remains that same and you're not increasing the size of the buildings. Chrm. Conero asked about development around the project? Mr. Winglovitz said Medline was considered part of it, City Winery was part of it. Chrm. Conero said he is just confirming. Mr. Winglovitz said they have no problem updating it, it's to their benefit based on what's been done in the area and as far as downsizing the project, getting rid of the office space...Mr. Sicina again said, the proposed uses remain the same.

Chrm. Conero said they mentioned phasing of this project. As you go forward with a full set of plans, phase in these buildings. Mr. Winglovitz explained what order the buildings would be built. It will be discussed in the SEQRA process.

Mbr Steed asked what the footprint of the 80,000 sq ft building would be. Mr. Winglovitz said the 80,000 sq ft building is 320 ft X 240 ft and the 60,000 sq ft building would be approximately 300 ft X 200 ft.

Chrm. Conero said the next step is a full set of site plans and SEQRA documents, design guidelines for the warehouses (New Local Law guidelines). Mr. Winglovitz will include visuals in the EAF and discuss compliance with the guidelines.

Chrm. Conero said the impacts on transportation, we'll keep the way it is...Mr. Winglovitz said they can provide correspondence discussing synopsis from the traffic consultants. Mbr. Meyer said he feels that a new traffic study couldn't hurt, that the reduction in size of the buildings is not that much. Mr. Winglovitz said he will have the consultant provide a comparison and you will have that information.

Atty. Dowd asked the Board if they found the conceptual plan satisfactory at this point?

All Board member agree that they do.

A MOTION was made to ACCEPT THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR KSH ROUTE 211 DEVELOPMENT, 211-1-29.22, AND DIRECT THE APPLICANT TO CONTINUE WITH A FULL SET OF SITE PLANS, by Chrm. Conero, seconded by Mbr. Crowley and carried 5 Ayes 0 Nays.

RE: LOOSESTRIFE FIELDS PHASE II 204-1-2.22

Kyle Bardwell is representing the applicant. He distributes copies of a power point packet. He was before the Board last month and went over Lanc & Tully's comment letter and also spoke with Scott after the meeting to address comments to the satisfaction of the Board. In addition to the letter, there were concerns raised at the previous Planning Board meeting; one of those concerns was the traffic onsite. They completed a traffic report for Loosestrife but the Board was concerned that City Winery had been completed and there was further traffic there; they wanted us to take a look at that and how it affected Loosestrife traffic. They foiled and got the City Winery traffic report and were able to find those traffic counts at the intersection and they added what Loosestrife would cause. (on page 5 of the power point). City Winery solely looked at a pm traffic study on Factory Street and 17K. They estimated that they would be additionally adding 25 peak pm trips. This was a very negligible addition to the City Winery traffic study, only hindering delay by 1 second at the intersection and the level of traffic stayed the same. There was very negligible impact from Loosestrife on that traffic and they felt that was a comfortable way to show that even with City Winery in effect, that traffic shouldn't be an issue with Loosestrife.

Mbr. Crowley asked, with the new traffic lights on 17k, would that impact the traffic study that was done? Mr. Bardwell said his understanding is that the traffic improvements to 17k were accounted for in the original traffic study. They can follow back up on that but he thinks it was all accounted for, specifically with the City Winery numbers, as well.

Chrm, Conero said they submitted a traffic study based on this project prior to City Winery coming in. They've updated their total trips and found it would be negligible. (To Atty. Dowd) Does that need to be verified by Lanc & Tully? Mr. Sicina said they didn't have any issue with it. Mbr. Crowley said even though it was only a pm study and not an am study? Mr. Sicina said City Winery wouldn't be open in the am. Mbr. Crowley said but the traffic coming out of Loosestrife would be. Inaudible, everyone speaking at once.

Mr. Bardwell said another concern raised by the Board was having a fire truck sitting on the bridge during a fire. They found exactly what fire truck the Village of Montgomery uses, they had to do it for the vehicle maneuvering plan and they were able to turn a 75,000 lb. truck, and they reached out to Contech who is the bridge designer on this, and they were assured that this bridge would be HL93 loading. All the bridges in the United States are all held to this same factor of safety and they can basically cover any vehicle that would travel on a public road. That would cover all emergency access vehicles and we specifically gave them the weight of that vehicle and they said that even two would be fine on that bridge. In addition to that, they added details to the plans; adding topo, grade elevations, catch basins, drilling pits, utility profiles. He is looking to see if the Board would circulate for Lead Agency, as well as to County Planning and scheduling a public hearing?

Chrm. Conero said, in the past they had issues with the construction of the bridge and the makeup of the bridge. He would like to go forward with Lead Agency under SEQRA and going for the Public Hearing, contingent upon the design of bridge meeting the specifications according to what Lanc & Tully determine are appropriate. Atty. Dowd said that can also be a condition of approval. It's part of the construction plans. This application is new in the sense that it was denied the first time around for other reasons. You've already had two public hearings on this project, I don't know if you want to have another one? And we did refer to County Planning originally and we should probably refer it to them again because technically, it's a new application. Chrm. Conero said we should send it to the County and he's not sure how everyone feels about having the Public Hearing on this. Mbr. Romano said she could go either way. Mbr. Crowley said she, too, could go either way. It's been a while since the last public hearing. And no one came to either one. Mbr. Meyer asked when the last public hearing was? Atty. Dowd said there was a public hearing on March 18, 2018 and February 27, 2019 and they were adjourned for several months and ultimately, the public hearing was closed on June 26, 2019. Mbr. Romano said we were waiting on information. Atty. Dowd said there was a lack of failure to show up. Chrm. Conero said we didn't have any comments on it. He feels the public has a right to speak. Mbr. Meyer said a lot has changed in that specific area.

A MOTION was made to DECLARE INTENT TO BE LEAD AGENCY UNDER SEQRA, TYPE 1 ACTION, FOR LOOSESTRIFE FIELDS PHASE II, 204-1-2.22, by Chrm. Conero, seconded by Mbr. Steed and carried 5 Ayes 0 Nays.

Atty. Dowd said referral to County Planning is an automatic; have Tina send that out. Chrm. Conero said the next meeting is October 27th.

A MOTION was made to SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING FOR LOOSESTRIFE FIELDS PHASE II, 204-1-2.22 ON OCTOBER, 27, 2021, AT 7:30pm by Chrm. Conero, seconded by Mbr. Steed and carried 5 Ayes 0 Nays.

RE: CITY WINERY – SITE PLAN AMENDMENT – 204-1-1

Atty. Dowd asked if Mr. Zwigard had received the comment letter from the Building Inspector (dated September 22, 2021). Ms. Murphy said no and gave him a copy.

Todd Zwigard is representing the applicant. Mr. Zwigard sent his comment letter earlier that day; it was forwarded to the Planning Board.

Chrm. Conero asked, these comments are in response to Lanc & Tully's letter dated August 17, 2021. Mr. Zwigard replied, yes. Chrm. Conero said there was another letter you sent dated September 7, 2021 that was in response to Lanc & Tully's letter. He is trying to determine what has been satisfied from this letter vs. the 17th letter. There are still issues that have not been addressed and asks Mr. Sicina to address them. Chrm. Conero wants to review the comments from the 17th and asks Mr. Zwigard about the bulk table. Mr. Zwigard responds with, they're using the format of the approved site plan and only modifying it as necessary by the proposed work. A number of the items listed in that bulk table are listed as N/A. The reason is because the PDD is not bound by the restrictions of the Village zoning code. It creates its own standard. And since there wasn't anything set in the PDD like lot width, maximum building height, setback, there's nothing to show compliance with. There are no requirements. He just continued using N/A and updated the one thing that is affected, which is lot coverage and there is no maximum lot coverage. To him, it's a non-issue. He discussed it with Scott and feels it's okay as it is. Mr. Sicina said it was just for clarification so that if someone picks up the site plan, they can see that we looked at the setbacks; just clarification on why there were no distances given. It's not applicable because it's a PDD but at least its listed. Chrm. Conero asked, isn't there minimum lot widths and setbacks, building heights in the law? Atty. Dowd said it's separate zoning. He doesn't believe that there were any such...Chrm. Conero said there wasn't any of those things. So, #1, they don't have to worry about.

Mr. Zwigard said #2, the proposed grading should be shown on the plan. After his discussion with Mr. Sicina, he understands and agrees that the two earth formed ramps that are used to access the tent platform and viewing platform would be considered grading work. It's not; they aren't modifying the existing grade, they're bringing material in, forming these ramps but they are made out of earth so he's going to be showing them, listing the square footage, calling them out as grading. Scott will be satisfied with that. Mr. Sicina said he is also looking for spot elevations.

Mr. Zwigard said #3, clearing limits are have been shown in the vicinity of the proposed platform; the clearing limits for the two platforms are combined. He believes that is acceptable for that proposed work; it is the only proposed work. What was missing was since the change to the deer fence location is a new issue as far as a change to the plan, they are going to add the clearing limits for the fence. Chrm. Conero said the clearing limits show in the vicinity of the proposed platform. The platform looks to be pretty close to the Wallkill River. We have an 80ft setback in our code. I don't know if this is an appropriate time to bring it up, but the platform is about 10ft from the edge of the river,

where it's supposed to be 80ft. Mr. Sicina said, based upon plan location if he goes from the nearest corner in the picture and he scales it to the edge of the river, it's approximately 80 ft on the site plans. Chrm. Conero said, in reality it's not. Mr. Zwigard doesn't know why. Mr. Sicina said Lanc & Tully's inspector was there after the comment letter was sent to the Village office. He didn't think the platform was surveyed correctly, that it was an approximate location. Mr. Zwigard said it was based on the flags that were placed by Army Corp. It was contained within the flags. Chrm. Conero said it was not set back far enough from the river. Mr. Zwigard said his understanding was that there was no required setback from the river in the PDD. You're saying that it's smaller in reality than what was drawn. So that they have to resolve it. Chrm. Conero said the recent zoning, steep slopes and building within the (inaudible) is new, it's 100 ft and not 80ft. Atty. Dowd said it should comply. Atty. Dowd said the PDD needs to be amended. Mr. Sicina said if this is not where the tent platform is located then there is a very real potential for wetland disturbance. Mbr. Romano said and a river that overflows often. Mr. Zwigard said, it's all a flood plan. The whole project is. Chrm. Conero said the tent platform, #4, is the section we are talking about. You're going to have to have it surveyed to tell us exactly where that platform is on the plans and make sure there is no wetland disturbance. Mr. Zwigard asked what the process is for doing that. Hire a surveyor and have it located? Chrm. Conero said preferably an engineer, at this point. Mr. Zwigard asked, a survey, Lanc & Tully or Village rep. Mbr. Crowley asked why we would pay to do that? Chrm. Conero said you would hire someone to do it. Based on what we haven't gotten to the Building Inspector's report yet, but you really have to get an engineer. You have structural problems from Bruce. Let's get through the comments. Mr. Zwigard doesn't want to get into it. Chrm. Conero said they will read through it so that Mr. Zwigard is in receipt of it. Mr. Zwigard said he is in receipt and they will get a survey done of the platform so they know exactly where it is. Chrm. Conero said the deer fence does cross the wetlands, these areas will be shown on the next plans. You did tell us about that; it's on the northern side of that property.

#5; Mr. Sicina said the question was raised about what type of material was used for the deer fence and whether or not it was the correct material and he had their inspector take a look at it; the poles themselves are pressure treated material and the fencing is deer fence. Chrm. Conero said he saw Mr. Zwigard had noted there were poles but didn't indicate what type. He said there are rules about putting pressure treated poles in the wetlands. Mbr. Crowley agreed. We discussed that when they put the poles in, to make sure they were not pressure treated posts; that was an issue. That was a conflict. Chrm. Conero said this is still an ongoing issue and should be addressed and based on what Lanc & Tully's site visit showed, it does confirm that that is true. That's part of #4. You have the disturbance for the grading to be calculated on the fence and also have to figure out what you're going to do with these pressure-treated poles in the wetlands. Mr. Zwigard imagines they can be replaced with powder coated steel. Probably, the process of changing them out is more disturbing. Mbr. Crowley said you're disturbing it but the pressure treated is poison to the wetlands. You can't leave poison in the wetlands. Chrm. Conero believes that is a building code issue and an environmental issue. Atty. Dowd said it's more the issue that the wetlands are not supposed to have pressure treated lumber

in it. Mbr. Romano said if you came to us looking for a building permit, you wouldn't have to be dealing with these problems right now.

Chrm. Conero said #6, confirms the bridal suite be connected to the sewer forced main as originally approved. Mr. Zwigard said they are ready to go they are waiting for Bruce to issue the permit. The tank has been cast and is being delivered; the labor is all lined up and will be completed within two weeks of when we start. It does still say that we're not allowed to do that until October. If Bruce gives us a permit on Monday, we're ready to start. Chrm. Conero reiterates that they can start the work on October 1st and not before. Mr. Zwigard said okay.

Chrm. Conero continues with #7; project requires review by OC Dept of Planning. That would have to be the full EAF provided with updated plans. At that point, when you update the plans with all of the changes, we need to submit it to the County. Mr. Zwigard said that Scott asked for the project description to include revisions to the parking. The only revision to the parking is putting lines on the barn parking (bridal suite). Chrm. Conero asked if they moved the planter out of the way? Mr. Zwigard said no, they reduced the number of parking spaces. Chrm. Conero asked if they had an issue with the planter being moved and the turning radius, if you can't make it...Mr. Sicina has an issue, he doesn't think the cars will be able to traverse these areas with other cars parked in the stalls. Mainly, the parallel parked stalls and the planter is in the way. He's showing computer generated areas, showing how they will turn out, how it will pull forward, you can put cars in other parking spaces and show that there will be no conflicts. Chrm. Conero said that hasn't happened there. Does it help if the planter is removed? Mbr. Crowley said no, not really. It's very tight. Chrm. Conero said show it on the next set of plans. Amend the turning radius that can be provided, work with our engineer on that. Mr. Zwigard said yes.

Chrm. Conero continued with #8, clarifying existing proposed plan elements. Mr. Sicina said it's been revised. Chrm. Conero said the plans show that your striping of 88 spaces is close to the main parking lot, striping details, handicapped stalls, details and handicapped signs should be provided. That's #9. Mr. Zwigard said that will be added into the revised set. Mbr. Romano asked if the second parking lot would be paved. Chrm. Conero said no. Mr. Zwigard said it was approved gravel. The first lot is paved. There is discussion as to whether or not the overflow lot should be paved since it is no longer overflow and will be used year-round. Atty. Dowd said you cannot stripe gravel, no one will know where to park, it's a safety issue and a drainage issue; mud, snow. There's no guidance. If you're going to use it, it's going to need to be paved. Mr. Zwigard said he would let City Winery know. Mbr. Crowley asked for confirmation of how many coats of asphalt? Is it just one? Is it finished? Atty. Dowd said, its finished. Mr. Zwigard said it's already striped. Mbr. Crowley said we should know if it's finished because if its not, it will have to be restriped. Mr. Zwigard said, you're right.

Chrm. Conero said #10, the applicant has provided parking analysis to demonstrate the proposed outdoor stage and event area. The analysis demonstrates that the site does not have enough parking for the stage and the tent areas to operate at full capacity while the

restaurant is open. That's part of your engineering that you have to do for the parking calculations. You basically know that you can't have a stage and a tent event with the everyday business of the winery. Mr. Zwigard said yes. His understanding is that that would be a Board of Trustees issue. It's their role to create a new resolution about that. Atty. Dowd said the Board of Trustees would control the amount of usage that the property can have both for the restaurant and the different event venues. You would still need (inaudible) for parking. That's what we're trying to get done. Having parking attendants would help. Depending what the Village Board does, the amended site plan should have that they have parking attendants when they have these kinds of events to make sure they use all the spaces in the parking lot and you don't have enough.

Chrm. Conero said that's all the items that the engineer has had. He continues with the Building Inspector's letter: this letter is from the Building Inspector/Fire Inspector, it details a lot about the platform and how its constructed on unstable soil. The footings were dug up and there's water filled almost to grade surface within a few hours. He feels that a structural engineer should be brought in to the situation to determine what footing type was installed. Also, all load calculations that are required for the expected 500 people and the weight distribution on the tent. If you want us to move forward for an approval on this, you're going to have to address these things. Mr. Zwigard said ok. Mbr. Romano said there is something about the ramp that you said is all natural and earthy, it has to meet ADA guidelines. Mr. Zwigard said it can be earth form; it will meet all the codes. Chrm. Conero said the next time you come here you're going to have a lot of these things on the plans and we'll go from there. Mr. Zwigard was advised by Chrm. Conero to look at the Local Law #3. Atty. Dowd said it was passed in May of this year. Mr. Zwigard asked if this site was subject to that. Chrm. Conero said it's a new structure and it's on the property and its not on the PDD, so it would be. Mr. Zwigard said the whole property has been rezoned as per the PDD? Atty. Dowd said this protects steep slopes and avoid construction too close to the river. So that would apply to you.

RE: NEW BUSINESS

RE: ZAFIR, LLC 213-3-4.22

Tom Olley is representing the applicant. Zafir LLC was before the Board a few years ago to get approval for an 8,400 sq ft building that has been erected and is in operation. The application before you is to construct a 170ft x 80ft building at the rear of the property that would be called a warehouse. It will be a warehouse for their operation, not a distribution or fulfillment type of facility. At the time the plan was approved and the building was constructed, the occupant of the building, MBZ Industries received a patent for the container that they manufacture there; the plastic bag for shipping food grade liquids. They received a patent and their business is growing and they need to expand their storage facility for their finished product and raw materials. They are proposing a 13,024 sq. ft to comply with the zoning code standards. Instead of a putting the doors directly in the front, they put an appendage on so they could have side entry to those loading docks. There will be one loading dock, one ramp, to allow which will allow them

by forklift to get material from one building to another. It's not connected to this building because it couldn't work between the setbacks and location of the building/site geometry, a wetland in the front, so ideally it would be connected but, in this case, they can't do that. He received Lanc & Tully's letter. They will address of the concerns; there is nothing that warrants any back-and-forth discussion with the Board. The only thing he would point out is #2; they are a limited non-nuisance industry because their equipment is under 5 hp, they meet that requirement, so he thinks that makes them a site plan and not a special exception use. They will provide a narrative.

Chrm. Conero said all I1 zone warehouses had to have a special exception use. Atty. Dowd said this is an accessory to the main building. Mbr. Romano asked how high it would be? Mr. Olley said 32ft. It will be scaled architectural. This building will be a steel frame building and look like the current building. Atty. Dowd asked about the FAA. Mr. Olley said they will take care of that beforehand; they will have a paper trail. This building (indicates where they were in the flight plan on the previous building), they will send to the FAA accurate coordinates. Atty. Dowd suggested Mr. Olley speak with the director at the airport and that this Board will circulate it as part of SEQRA, including DPW. Mr. Olley said they will make sure they do things accurately. Chrm. Conero asked if the building would be subject to the new design guidelines that they worked on with the Master Plan? Atty. Dowd said yes. Mr. Olley said he feels they are below the threshold of some of the guidelines but like the location of the doors not facing Dunn. Chrm. Conero said the Planning Board will be taking a hard look at the aesthetics of the building's appearance. Atty. Dowd asked if this property abuts the Aiello Property that is subject to the annexation? Mr. Olley said yes, and indicates where on the site plan. They will have a separate septic system that will tie into the original building. They show an office on the site plan but it's part of the operation, it's not a separate office use. It's a place for the shipping and receiving clerk; it's not a separate use.

Mr. Sicina asked how many employees work at the existing building. Mr. Olley replied, five. Mbr. Romano asked if they park in the back? Mr. Olley said they park on the side. He believes they carpool.

Atty. Dowd asked if there would be more deliveries? Box trucks? Tractor trailers? Mr. Olley said one a day and both size trucks. They made sure there is maneuverability for the big trucks. Chrm. Conero said it's definitely a non-nuisance use.

Mr. Olley said the FAA is not a permit or required approval. When they revise the plans, he will ask them to declare lead agency. Mbr. Romano asked if there would be a public hearing. Atty. Dowd said it can be waived. Chrm. Conero believes the public has a chance to speak at these things. Mr. Olley said there are very few adjoining properties.

RE: HANOVER STREET DEVELOPMENT 202-3-4.2

Ross Winglovitz is representing the applicant, him and Jay Samuelson own the property. They purchased the property from Marc Devitt about 3-4 years ago. They had looked at

PDD's for the property. Under the new zoning, the PDD is not something they need to do. They want to put in one building to the right of their building. It would be similar to John Wood's building. It will be three stories; eight apartments above with commercial on the first floor. They may divide the building in half; have two spaces. They are looking at an entry with a pedestrian alley (indicated on site plan), landscaped between Clinton Street and the parking lot with an entry in the alleyway for access to the apartments. There will be two commercial entrances in the front and back of the building. They would reconfigure the parking lot to maximize parking. They can add some islands. This layout has 56 parking spaces but can add green space per Mr. Sicina. They will have renderings prepared for the building; get some basic floor plans. Water and sewer, they worked with Buddy to install water/sewer connections before Clinton Street was paved. Drainage for the site goes to the rear; they'll pick up catch basins. There's drainage on the south west side of Charles so they'll tie into the existing drainage system. With an easement that Marc retained; he owns 77 Clinton, so that will be reconfigured. It allows for it to be relocated to the aisles that will be created with the new parking lot to they can get access to that property in the future if they decide to do something with the property.

Atty. Dowd asked if anything was being done with the current building. Mr. Winglovitz said no. Their office is upstairs with the restaurant downstairs. Their goal is to maintain that. If for some reason, they will relocate downstairs and turn the upstairs into apartments if they had to.

Chrm. Conero asked how many bedrooms? Mr. Winglovitz said two-bedroom units. Maybe a few bedroom/dens. Eight total in the new building, four potentially if they rent the upstairs of their existing building, if they decide to rent it. This is a maximum footprint. They spoke with the architect; the western side of the property may be needed for egress for the building code.

Mbr. Romano asked, they will have access to the upstairs from the alley? Mr. Winglovitz said yes, the idea is to make it a nicely landscaped pedestrian alley. 12ft walkway, staircase with an awning.

Chrm. Conero asked if this is a private parking lot. Mr. Winglovitz said yes. Chrm. Conero asked how spots they need? Mr. Winglovitz said there are 56 proposed. They didn't calculate the total. They are within 500ft of the municipal lot.

Chrm. Conero thinks it will look good. He asks where the green space is? Mr. Sicina said it would be in the center of it; see more landscaping. Mbr. Romano suggested landscaping around the lot. Mbr. Crowley asked about snow removal. Mr. Winglovitz said they will move it from the site or use the green space.

Mr. Sicina asked about the dumpster enclosure; he said it looks a little tight in there. Mr. Winglovitz said he will see what they can do. They will return with more info on the building, address Scott's comments, and more landscaping.

Chrm. Conero said this is Kevin's (Atty. Dowd) last day at the Planning Board for the Village of Montgomery. He doesn't know what they would've done without him and his guidance. He has been on the Zoning Board and Planning Board when he was here. He thanked him for his service and for his dedication to the Village and speaking up when he had to speak up. You did a great job! We were only sued twice and both times we were vindicated! (laughter) He appreciated his help. Thank you. Enjoy your retirement.

Atty. Dowd said it's been privilege and honor to serve the Village and it's been a privilege to work with all of you, some longer than others. He appreciates the kind words and he wishes everyone the best; keep remaining as civic minded as you are and doing a service to your Village and community.

RE: MINUTES:

The minutes of August 25, 2021, were not completed at the time of the meeting, to be approved.

RE: ADJOURNMENT:

A MOTION was made to ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:52pm by Mbr. Romano, seconded by Mbr. Crowley and carried 5 Ayes 0 Nays.

Tina Murphy, Deputy Village Clerk