

VILLAGE OF POMONA
VILLAGE BOARD MEETING

May 18, 2026

7:30 P.M.

PRESENT

Mayor Ilan Fuchs

Deputy Mayor Mendy Lasker

Trustee Marc Greenberg

Trustee Raanan Zidile

Village Attorney Brian Nugent

ALSO PRESENT

Moshe Orange Village Clerk

ABSENT

Trustee Joel Grunwald

At 7:30 pm Mayor Ilan Fuchs called the meeting to order and led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance. We have a quorum, so the meeting can start now.

As no residents signed up in advance to address the Board, there was no motion to open the public comment period.

Pomona Cultural Center

Meeting Minutes - Approval of Minutes from the Village Board meeting on 4/27/2026: Trustee Lasker made a motion to approve the above meeting minutes and was seconded by Trustee Greenberg. Upon vote, the motion was carried 4-0-1.

Treasury Report

Trustee Zidile moved the resolution that the payment of General Funds Claims totaling \$208,799.85 set forth on page 4 in the Monthly Abstract Listing dated April 23 through May 13, 2026 as submitted is hereby approved subject to individual audits by the Board of Trustees. The Payroll(s) of May 1, 2026 as set forth in the payroll in the amount(s) \$10,980.00 is hereby submitted for approval, subject to the individual audits by the Board of Trustees. Seconded by Trustee Lasker, upon vote, the motion was carried by all present.
4-0-1

New Business:

34 North Ridge HOW application. Shimmy Glendower, representing the applicant, stated that the proposal complies with the Village's bulk and zoning requirements. He noted that the property contains approximately 45,000 square feet, exceeding the minimum lot area requirement. The property also provides approximately 400 feet of frontage along North Ridge Road and Overlook Road, significantly greater than the required 100 feet. Mr. Glendower further stated that the maximum permitted floor area for a house of worship is 10,000 square feet, while the proposed building contains approximately 8,839 square feet and therefore complies with the code requirements. Regarding parking, he noted that 15 spaces are required and the applicant is proposing 20 parking spaces, exceeding the minimum requirement. He went on to state that the proposed off-street parking would help alleviate vehicles parking on nearby roadways. He acknowledged that the applicant had received review comments from both the Village Engineer and Village Planner and indicated that all comments would be addressed. He further noted that the comments primarily related to site design, drainage, and other technical matters, and that the applicant anticipated responding to and resolving all outstanding comments within approximately one week.

Deputy Mayor Lasker stated that he wanted to hear from the public before the Board proceeded further. He also sought clarification from the applicant, asking whether the engineering review comments had been received and reviewed.

The applicant confirmed.

Deputy Mayor Lasker went on to ask whether the proposed lighting plan would satisfy the Village Engineer's comments regarding both the hours of operation and the intensity of the lighting fixtures.

The applicant responded that the hours of operation for the lighting would be determined in accordance with the Village's direction. The applicant stated that the lighting system could be programmed to shut off at whatever time the Village deems appropriate and expressed a willingness to comply with any lighting schedule established by the Board.

Deputy Mayor Lasker asked for clarification regarding the proposed curb cuts and whether they would be improved as part of the project.

The applicant responded that the curb cuts and related site improvements would be addressed in response to the engineering review comments. The applicant explained that several of the remaining comments involve standard engineering details, including sight distance information, drainage system specifications, and the selection and detailing of catch basins. The applicant characterized these as routine engineering items that would be incorporated into the revised plans.

Mayor Fuchs asked the applicant to elaborate on the Village Engineer's comments regarding the proposed buffer and what revisions would be made in response.

The applicant explained that the plans would be revised to clarify which existing trees and vegetation are to remain and be preserved. The applicant stated that the intention is to retain the existing buffer wherever possible and clearly identify it on the plans.

Mayor Fuchs then asked whether many of the existing trees had been lost as a result of the fire and whether they were dead. The applicant responded that, based on the survey, the majority of the existing trees remain on the property, particularly along the rear and side property lines. While acknowledging that some individual trees may have been damaged by the fire, the applicant stated that most of the vegetation remains in place.

The applicant further noted that the Village Engineer had requested the installation of a continuous landscaped buffer, including a line of trees along the property boundary. Deputy Mayor Lasker asked whether the applicant would be agreeable to that requirement, and the applicant responded affirmatively.

Deputy Mayor Lasker made a motion to open the public hearing, seconded by Trustee Zidile. The motion carried 4-0-1.

Andrew Gerson introduced himself as a resident of 28 North Ridge Road and stated that his property is located approximately 502 feet from the subject site. He noted that he did not receive notice of the application.

Deputy Mayor Lasker responded that the resident was still welcome to provide comments on the application. He clarified, however, that because the property is located beyond the Village's notification radius, the resident would not automatically receive mailed notices regarding future hearings or proceedings.

The resident stated that he understood the notice requirements and appreciated that the required postings had been made. He reiterated comments previously made before the Planning Board, explaining that his primary concern, as well as that of his family and neighbors, is public safety. He emphasized the importance of ensuring that the proposed building serves the community in a safe manner for congregants, nearby residents, and all others who may be affected by the use. The resident further stated that he has observed numerous issues at the property over the past several years, including the fire that occurred on the site. He noted that he was personally present at the scene early that morning and witnessed the incident. The resident also referenced rumors regarding the

cause of the fire but acknowledged that he did not have definitive information and indicated that such matters could be addressed separately at a later time.

The resident stated concerns regarding safety, parking, and traffic circulation related to the proposed project. He argued that the configuration of parking and the building layout could create congestion and potential hazards, particularly during religious observances when vehicles may not be moved. He referenced prior conditions imposed by the committee on earlier site work and alleged that some requirements may not have been followed, including concerns about temporary structures and building systems.

Deputy Mayor Lasker responded that, to his understanding, any prior work on the site had been completed with the necessary permits, and he was not aware of the issues being referenced. He advised that if the resident has specific concerns, they should be reported to the appropriate code enforcement or police authorities.

Regarding current safety and circulation concerns, Deputy Mayor Lasker explained that the proposed site design includes both an entrance and an exit (from Overlook Road and North Ridge Road) to improve traffic flow and reduce congestion on a single street. He also noted that fire safety considerations had been reviewed with the Village Fire Inspector and Village Planner, and that the proposal was found to be acceptable from a fire access standpoint.

The Deputy Mayor further stated that emergency access was considered adequate, including access routes for fire apparatus throughout the site. He added that a sprinkler system is also included as part of the building's fire protection measures.

The resident continued to raise concerns about fire truck turning radius and site access. Deputy Mayor Lasker responded that fire trucks are not required to make tight turning movements in all cases, noting that they can also back into the site if necessary, as is common in fire operations, and reiterated that multiple access points and fire protection systems are part of the overall safety design.

The resident questioned the nature of the house of worship use, stating that it is intended to serve the community and asking why there are so many vehicles traveling to the site. He suggested that attendees should be walking rather than driving, and raised concerns that vehicle usage results in overflow parking on surrounding streets.

Deputy Mayor Lasker responded that the Village does not regulate whether individuals choose to walk or drive to the site, as that is up to each user.

The resident then questioned the adequacy of the proposed parking supply, noting that with approximately 226 seats and only 28 parking spaces, he believed the parking was insufficient and would contribute to increased street parking. He expressed concern that the proposed parking ratio would not adequately support weekday or larger service attendance.

Deputy Mayor Lasker responded that he did not believe the proposal would create a road hazard. He stated that if any issues were to arise, they would be addressed at that time. He added that if a situation occurred one week, it would likely continue, and the Village would deal with it as needed. He further noted that, under the Village Code, the applicant has the right to construct a house of worship up to 10,000 square feet, and that the Board cannot prevent the project if it complies with the applicable code requirements.

The resident raised a concern regarding a potential blasting permit to remove a large rock ledge on the parcel, noting that there is a significant ledge on the property.

Deputy Mayor Lasker responded that the Village does not issue blasting permits and therefore did not anticipate blasting to be part of the project. He stated that, to his understanding, blasting would not be permitted and that the Village is not authorizing such activity. He also added that the meeting would not continue as a question-and-answer exchange with individual members of the public.

Trustee Greenberg stated that the reference to approximately 220 seats should be clarified as seats and not individual families. He noted that, in many cases, households in the community consist of larger families, often including seven or more individuals, and that seating capacity does not directly translate to the number of vehicles. He further questioned the expected number of members or attendees, suggesting that the actual membership may be significantly lower than the total seat count, possibly around 50 members, and asked for clarification on anticipated usage and attendance.

The resident, Silvia Watford of 6 North Ridge Rd., stated that she lives directly behind the proposed facility and raised multiple concerns regarding the impact of the project on her property and quality of life. She described experiencing significant noise from a temporary structure in the past, including late-night disturbances, and stated that the conditions were unacceptable, particularly with young children in the home.

She also raised concerns about traffic congestion and access issues during events, questioning how residents would be able to access their homes if nearby roads were congested. In addition, she expressed concerns about lighting impacts on her property, noting that the proposed lighting could affect bedrooms due to proximity. She further raised concerns about potential pollution, including garbage, traffic circulation from the proposed driveway connection to Overlook Road, and overall compatibility of the proposed building size with the surrounding residential neighborhood. She emphasized that while she was not opposed to a house of worship, she believed the scale and intensity of the proposed development was not appropriate for the area and raised concerns about lack of advance notification for large events.

Deputy Mayor Lasker responded that the proposed plans include a significant landscaped buffer consisting of approximately 19 green giant trees along the driveway, which he stated would help screen views of vehicles from the neighboring property. He also noted that the lighting plan includes restrictions on intensity and hours of operation, and that lighting is intended for safety and not to impact neighboring homes.

Regarding noise concerns, he stated that the prior situation involved a temporary structure, which is different from the proposed permanent building. He explained that the new structure would be enclosed, which should reduce noise impacts compared to the prior temporary setup. He also noted that the Board had previously approved a house of worship on the site in 2023.

Deputy Mayor Lasker noted that the current proposal is smaller than what was originally submitted, and also smaller than a nearby comparable house of worship referenced during the discussion. He stated that the applicant had made revisions in response to Board and community comments and had attempted to better fit the project within the surrounding neighborhood. He acknowledged that it would not be possible to satisfy every concern but emphasized that efforts were made to include buffering and landscaping measures, including additional trees and screening, to reduce potential impacts such as noise, lighting, and other disturbances to neighboring properties. Regarding roadway access and temporary closures, Deputy Mayor Lasker explained that block party permits require Village approval and are typically posted publicly. He noted that such permits generally include provisions to maintain access for local residents, or to provide alternate access routes, except for brief safety-related closures when necessary. He further stated that the special permit would limit use of the facility to the congregation and its members only, and would not allow outside parties or unrelated third-party events. He added that any violations or complaints would be addressed by the Village as they arise. With respect to traffic concerns, he reiterated his view that the revised site plan represents an improvement and stated that many of the raised concerns had been addressed through the current design revisions.

Silvia Watford questioned how the project would improve traffic conditions, noting that the development could generate a significant number of vehicles and expressing concern that even 100 cars would create an issue for surrounding roads and neighborhood access.

Deputy Mayor Lasker responded that he did not believe there would be 228 vehicles associated with the site and expressed doubt that such a volume of daily traffic would occur. He stated that, in his view, the number of cars would likely be significantly lower and noted that even during prior use of the property as a house of worship; he did not believe that level of parking demand was present. He added that many congregants are local and would likely be considerate of neighbors and work to minimize traffic, noise, and other impacts.

The resident then raised concerns regarding blasting and whether rock removal would be required to construct access roads. Deputy Mayor Lasker responded that, to his knowledge, the Village does not issue blasting permits and he was not aware of any approved blasting in recent years. He referenced past blasting activity in the Village that had reportedly caused issues for nearby residents and stated that no blasting permits are expected to be issued.

The resident questioned how site access would be constructed if blasting is not permitted. Deputy Mayor Lasker stated that the specifics of construction methods would need to be confirmed with the applicant.

Trustee Zidile added that while blasting may not be used; other methods such as jackhammering could be employed to remove rock, which can also generate vibration and disturbance.

Silvia Watford asked for clarification on the proposed access road, specifically questioning where the road would be located on Overlook Road and expressing concern about its proximity to nearby homes, including her own property located two doors from the site.

Deputy Mayor Lasker responded that the details of the roadway alignment are shown on the submitted plans.

Debra DeFour-Pierce from 77 Overlook Rd. stated that she had not received notice of the meeting and therefore did not receive the plans. Deputy Mayor Lasker responded that notice had been posted on the Village website and that plans were available online. He also stated that all properties within 500 feet of the site were mailed notice of the application.

Debra DeFour-Pierce further raised safety concerns, referencing a prior fire at the property and stating that embers had previously impacted her yard and caused damage. She reiterated concerns regarding emergency access, questioned the exact location of the proposed road, and asked whether adequate fire protection measures, including hydrant access, would be available near the proposed development.

The resident stated that they did not receive direct notice of the meeting or application and only became aware of it after seeing posted signage while walking in the area. The resident further expressed concern about pedestrian safety on Saturdays, stating that there are individuals walking in the roadway and not always moving out of the way for vehicles. The resident explained that they sometimes drive below the speed limit in consideration of pedestrians but will use their horn to alert people when approaching. The resident added that in a prior incident on Haley, they were allegedly spat on and verbally insulted after honking their horn to alert pedestrians in the roadway. They emphasized that their use of the horn is intended as a safety measure to prevent accidents and ensure pedestrians are aware of approaching vehicles, but noted that it has led to tension and conflict in the neighborhood.

Deputy Lasker responded that is really shocking.

The resident reiterated that they had previously raised these concerns and would continue to do so. They emphasized that their primary issue is public safety. They further stated that they had provided the Trustees and Mayor with information regarding pedestrian walking regulations and noted that, despite this, individuals continue to walk against traffic rather than facing oncoming vehicles. The resident described this as a significant safety concern for both pedestrians and drivers and stressed that it remains a major ongoing issue.

Deputy Mayor Lasker asked the resident to explain how the safety concerns being raised were specifically connected to the proposed house of worship application and its impacts.

The resident noted that during events, vehicles often become congested and traffic backs up onto surrounding roads, including Overlook Road. They stated that during these times, cars are frequently parked along their side of the street, contributing to crowding and safety concerns. The resident further explained that these conditions, combined with event-related activity and increased pedestrian presence, create ongoing traffic and safety issues in the neighborhood.

Deputy Mayor Lasker explained that the property is classified as a commercial use, and therefore it does not receive residential-style garbage pickup on Mondays and Thursdays. He stated that instead, the property is required to use larger commercial garbage containers and arrange for private hauling services, which he noted are already in place. He further stated that, under this arrangement, the site's regular waste disposal should not negatively impact surrounding neighbors.

The resident responded that their concern was not only routine garbage pickup, but also litter and trash generated during events when attendees leave waste behind in the surrounding area.

Deputy Mayor Lasker responded that the Village cannot legally control where individuals park or how they behave in public spaces, but stated that the Village would request that the congregation take appropriate measures to address such issues. He also advised that if residents experience issues with garbage left on or near their property, they should report it directly to him by email, and he would follow up with the applicant to ensure it is cleaned up.

The resident asked whether the existing trees along Overlook would need to be removed in order to construct the proposed road, expressing concern that the buffer currently providing screening would be eliminated.

Deputy Mayor Lasker responded that, according to the plans, additional trees are proposed to be planted along the parking areas and property boundaries. He stated that these new plantings are intended to enhance screening so that cars and activity on the site would be less visible to neighboring properties during events and gatherings. He added that the landscaping plan includes buffering on multiple sides of the property and indicated that the details could be reviewed further on the submitted plans.

The applicant stated that he has been constructing homes in the Village of Pomona since approximately 2015 and explained that rock excavation is commonly performed through hammering rather than blasting. He noted that the same method is routinely used when excavating foundations for residential construction and stated that the proposed project would utilize hammering techniques for any necessary rock removal. The applicant emphasized that no blasting is proposed as part of the project.

Deputy Mayor Lasker asked the applicant how long any noise associated with rock excavation or hammering operations was expected to last.

The applicant responded that he did not anticipate a significant amount of hammering would be required. He explained that the proposed building would largely occupy the footprint of an existing structure, and therefore he expected that any necessary rock excavation would be limited. The applicant indicated that, as a result, the duration of any noise-related construction activity should be relatively short. The applicant explained that the driveways were not originally proposed to be connected. However, at the Village's request, the plans were revised to provide a connection between the driveways in order to improve site circulation and traffic flow. The applicant noted that the requested connection resulted in the need for the additional site work being discussed.

Deputy Mayor Lasker asked whether the applicant could limit any hammering operations to reasonable daytime hours in order to minimize impacts on neighboring residents. He suggested that such work begin no earlier than approximately 9:00 a.m. and conclude by around 6:00 p.m., noting that while construction activities often begin earlier, hammering can be particularly noisy and efforts should be made to reduce disturbances to the surrounding neighborhood.

The applicant responded that they would be done before 8pm.

Mayor Fuchs asked the applicant to clarify the location of the commercial garbage collection area and from which side of the property refuse pickup would occur.

The applicant responded that commercial garbage pickup would take place from the North Ridge Road parking area.

Deputy Mayor Lasker expressed concern about minimizing impacts on neighboring residents from commercial garbage collection activities. He noted that other houses of worship have generated complaints when garbage trucks arrived very early in the morning and stated that the Village would prefer that pickups not occur at times such as 5:30 a.m. or 6:00 a.m. He suggested that a condition be added requiring the garbage collection company not to service the property before approximately 7:00 a.m. in order to reduce noise impacts on nearby homes.

The applicant indicated that he would agree to put it as a condition of approval.

Deputy Mayor Lasker emphasized the importance of ensuring that the proposed site lighting does not spill onto neighboring properties or negatively impact adjacent residents.

The applicant responded that the lighting plan would be submitted to the Village Engineer for review and evaluation. The applicant stated that the final lighting design would be subject to the Village Engineer's approval to ensure that it satisfies the Village's requirements and adequately minimizes impacts on neighboring properties.

Mayor Fuchs asked whether the applicant could coordinate event traffic management so that, during larger events, cones or other traffic control measures would direct parking to one side of the street only rather than both sides, in order to improve traffic flow and maintain safer roadway access for residents and emergency vehicles.

Applicant responded yes.

Deputy Mayor Lasker stated that he would not support making street parking management a formal condition of approval, noting that the Village cannot fully regulate on-street parking in that manner. However, he stated that the Village would encourage the applicant and congregation to be considerate of neighboring residents and attempt to accommodate concerns where possible. He also raised questions regarding the visual appearance of the property from Overlook Road, specifically asking whether existing trees would remain and whether adequate screening would continue to be provided along the roadway. Deputy Mayor Lasker noted that he observed several existing trees remaining near the road as well as substantial additional landscaping proposed throughout the parking areas.

In response, the applicant explained that the plans retain existing trees located along the roadway while also incorporating additional landscaping and screening improvements throughout the site.

Mayor Fuchs asked about the landscaping on the eastern side of the property, specifically regarding the proposed Green Giant arborvitae screening. He inquired whether the applicant could ensure that these trees would be installed early in the construction process, ideally before the remainder of the project is completed, in order to provide visual buffering for neighboring properties as soon as possible.

The applicant responded that it is difficult to guarantee the timing of the landscaping installation. He explained, based on past experience that newly planted trees often do not survive when installed too early in the construction process, particularly during ongoing site work and disturbance. He suggested that premature planting during active construction may not be successful and therefore cannot be assured before project completion. The applicant added that landscaping would likely be installed once the site is stabilized, since ongoing construction activity and heavy machinery could negatively impact newly planted trees. He noted that planting too early, while active site work is still underway, could result in damage or failure of the landscaping. He stated that once conditions allow, the remaining trees and greenery would be installed to provide privacy and screening. He also mentioned that temporary or supplemental measures, such as fencing, could be used in the interim to help reduce visual impact during construction.

A resident requested that the Board and its counsel conduct a site visit, stating that it is important for decision-makers to fully understand the property and its existing conditions before approving the application. The resident expressed concern that some Board members may not have sufficiently reviewed the site in person and encouraged a more detailed evaluation.

Deputy Mayor Lasker responded that the Board has already visited the property multiple times, not only recently but on prior occasions as well. He noted that they had been on-site approximately two to three times to review the conditions firsthand. He further stated that the Board also visited the property following the fire incident and acknowledged that it was a serious event, expressing relief that no individuals were injured and no surrounding properties were damaged.

A resident asked for clarification on whether a driveway would be constructed around the property.

Deputy Mayor Lasker responded that the proposed driveway configuration is part of the applicant's plan, not the Village's construction responsibility. He noted that the design includes a loop/through-drive arrangement that has been reviewed by the Village Engineer and is intended to improve circulation, drainage, and overall site safety. He added that the applicant will be required to post escrow to ensure that the approved improvements are properly completed. He further explained that the Village's role is to ensure that any approved house of worship is built in a safe and compliant manner while also considering neighborhood impacts. He stated that additional conditions had been incorporated into the special permit, including limits on early-morning garbage collection to reduce disturbance to nearby residents, and that no blasting is anticipated as part of the project. Deputy Mayor Lasker also emphasized that the applicant had originally proposed a larger project, but revisions were made in response to Village feedback, including requiring the driveway connections to improve traffic safety and reduce confusion about ingress and egress points. He stated that separating entry and exit points was intended to enhance safety for both drivers and pedestrians in the surrounding neighborhood and provide clearer traffic flow overall.

A resident raised concerns about electric scooters and bicycles being operated in the neighborhood, stating that the activity has become a safety issue, particularly for children waiting for school buses. The resident expressed concern that someone could eventually get hurt and requested that the issue be addressed with the community.

Mayor Fuchs responded that the Village has maintained a strong working relationship with the Haverstraw Police Department and noted that the department has been very responsive to complaints involving unsafe operation of electric bicycles and scooters. He encouraged residents to contact the police department directly when such incidents occur, explaining that officers have previously responded promptly to similar complaints and addressed the issue. The Mayor then stated that the discussion had drifted beyond the scope of the application hearing and requested that the meeting return to the agenda item under consideration before asking for the next procedural step in the application process.

After hearing comments from the public, the Village Attorney advised the Board to close the public hearing. Deputy Mayor Lasker made a motion to close the public hearing, which was seconded by Trustee Zidile. The motion carried by a vote of 4-0-1.

The Mayor proposed a motion to approve the Special Permit application for a Neighborhood House of Worship at 34 North Ridge Road, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. All “Whereas” clauses contained in the resolution are incorporated herein as if fully set forth.**
- 2. The Special Permit application is approved subject to the following conditions:**
 - o The applicant must obtain site plan approval from the Village of Pomona Planning Board prior to commencement of construction.**
 - o Street parking shall be permitted on only one side of the street, with the specific side to be determined by the Village Board, for a distance of 750 feet from the proposed main entrance to the house of worship.**
 - o The applicant shall comply with all applicable provisions of the Village Code concerning houses of worship and building construction, all applicable provisions of the New York State Building Code, and all other duly enacted laws and regulations relating to the health, safety, and welfare of occupants and visitors.**
 - o The Special Permit is limited to the principal use of regularly scheduled religious services. Accessory uses, including classrooms, social halls, administrative offices, gymnasiums, and indoor recreational facilities, may be permitted provided that such uses remain subordinate to the principal use of the neighborhood house of worship. No other uses or operations are authorized.**
 - o The applicant shall comply with and address all comments issued by the Village professionals, including:**
 - 1. The May 17, 2026 memorandum of the Village Planner, Nelson Pope & Voorhis, LLC; and**
 - 2. The May 14, 2026 memorandum of the Village Engineer, Spence Engineering.**
 - o Unless additional approvals are obtained from the Village of Pomona, the project must proceed strictly in accordance with the approvals issued by the Village Board, Planning Board, Zoning Board of Appeals, Building Inspector, and any other Village authority. Any unapproved deviation shall render the Special Permit null and void.**
 - o The approval is granted in reliance upon the truth and accuracy of the applicant’s submissions and representations. Any material misrepresentation shall render the Special Permit void.**
 - o The applicant shall report to the Village Board, through the Village Clerk, within fourteen (14) days of the occurrence of any of the following:**
 - a. Approval or denial of site plan approval by the Planning Board;**
 - b. Withdrawal of the Special Permit application or site plan application;**
 - c. Any change in ownership of the property while applications related to the Special Permit remain pending before the Village; or**
 - d. Any material change in circumstances that a reasonable person would understand could affect the approvals if disclosed to the Village.**

- Any refuse or recycling pickup at the property shall not occur before 7:00 a.m.

The Board additionally discussed limiting construction hammering activities to reasonable daytime hours. The Village Board further determined that the proposed action would not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts and therefore issued a Negative Declaration pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), based upon the findings set forth in Part III of the Full Environmental Assessment Form.

The resolution further authorized the Mayor, or in the Mayor's absence or inability to act, the Deputy Mayor, along with Village employees, officials, and consultants, to take any and all actions necessary to implement the provisions of the resolution.

The motion was seconded by deputy Lasker and carried 4-0-1.

Deputy Mayor Lasker clarified for the record that the resolution also included a Negative Declaration under SEQRA. He noted that the Board had reviewed Parts II and III of the SEQRA analysis as prepared by the Village Planner and determined that the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts. He further noted that, despite the approval of the Special Permit, the applicant would still be required to return to the Planning Board to continue the site plan review process and address all outstanding comments from the Village professionals.

Mayor Fuchs then asked whether the application review process was substantially complete or whether there were still additional issues to be addressed.

The applicant responded that there were still engineering comments that needed to be addressed and reviewed as part of the ongoing Planning Board process.

Old Business: not at this time.

Trustee period: not at this time.

Clerk period: Clerk Orange stated that the Deputy Mayor had approached him regarding assisting the Village with the collection of outstanding escrow balances. He requested that the Board authorize an increase in the escrow deposit amount to \$2,500, explaining that many applications are currently underfunded and that professional review bills frequently exceed the existing escrow amounts by approximately \$700 to \$1,000. Clerk Orange further

recommended that the Village consider increasing the initial escrow deposits for Planning Board, Zoning Board, and engineering reviews to \$2,500 in order to ensure adequate funds are available to cover professional review costs and reduce the need for repeated replenishment requests.

The Mayor responded that he recalled Building Inspector Lou Zummo having suggested a similar increase in escrow amounts several years earlier to ensure that applicants before the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals maintain sufficient funds to cover professional review costs. Deputy Mayor Lasker added that, for engineering reviews, Village Engineer Martin Spence typically establishes the escrow amount based on the scope of the application. He noted that most standard applications do not exceed the current \$1,500 escrow amount. However, issues generally arise when applicants fail to follow approved plans or when applications remain active for extended periods, resulting in additional professional review expenses. The Mayor suggested placing the matter on a future agenda for a more detailed discussion regarding potential fee schedule amendments for Planning and Zoning applications.

Village Attorney Nugent explained that one of the challenges with escrow accounts is that professional review bills are often incurred before the Village receives and processes the invoices. As a result, escrow balances can be depleted quickly, sometimes with the first billing. He stated that while a higher initial escrow amount may be necessary, it is equally important to require applicants to replenish escrow accounts before the balance reaches zero in order to keep accounts current.

Deputy Mayor Lasker noted that Planning Board and Zoning Board applications generally involve predictable professional review costs and that the issue primarily relates to planning-related expenses.

During the discussion, Clerk Orange noted that based on recent experience, applications requiring more than one or two meetings often generate professional review costs of approximately \$2,000 or more.

Following discussion, Deputy Mayor Lasker offered a resolution, stating:

Based on the request of the Village Clerk, who manages the Planning and Zoning application process, Deputy Lasker moved a resolution that the Village will increase the required PB and ZBA escrow deposit from \$1,500 to \$2,500 and update the Village fee schedule accordingly. Any unused escrow funds shall be returned to the applicant upon completion of the review process. The motion was seconded by Trustee Zidile.

The clerk then mentioned that the residence reached out to get a power wash for the tennis court. The mayor stated that the village has done that recently.

Legal period: Not at this time.

Mayor Fuchs made a motion to adjourn the meeting Second by Deputy Mayor Lasker motion passes 4-0-1.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Moshe Orange, acted as Village Clerk for the meeting