



PLANNING BOARD MINUTES June 18, 2024

C. Howard Post, Chair, opened the meeting at 7:32 p.m. Pledge

Present: C. Howard Post (Chair), Carole Furman (Vice Chair), Mike Tiano, Bob Hlavaty and Al Riozzi

Also Present: Max Stach (Town Planner, NPV)

Absent: Kevin Brady and Gina Kiniry

The draft minutes of the May 21, 2024 Planning Board meeting were reviewed. A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Tiano, to approve as written. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Abstained, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Riozzi-Aye. Motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Minor Subdivision (2-lot), Mark & Lori Mendelis, 85 Band Camp Road. Presented by Bruce Utter, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant is looking to subdivide a 14-acre parcel into two lots. The first lot will contain an existing single family residence and 5 acres. The second lot will contain 9 acres for future development.

Post opened the public hearing at 7:33pm. Public comments;

- Helyn Ulfik, 1601 Route 212 - just looking for clarification, was a little late and missed the beginning of the presentation of this project. Utter-just a minor subdivision, we have to show that the new proposed lot is buildable, so a septic and well location are shown. If the owner decides to sell and the new owner would like to develop, they will be required to submit the proper permits to the Health Department and Building Department to do so.

Utter-the requested corrections as noted in the Town Planner's memo have been made. The Road Maintenance Agreement was submitted, reviewed and approved by the Town Attorney. NYS SHPO has responded with "no impact". A note added to the subdivision map that if the total area of disturbance exceeds one acre a SWPPP (Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan) will be required before proceeding with any development. The area of disturbance has been noted on the subdivision map.

Post-do any of the Board members have additional questions. None. A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Riozzi, to approve a negative declaration under SEQR. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye Riozzi-Aye. Motion carried.

Post-this public hearing will have to remain open, adjourned until the July monthly meeting, due to the late notice of location change because of early voting at the Senior Center. The Planning Board secretary was not able to notice in Hudson Valley One as required, the deadline date had passed prior to being notified that the Senior Center was not available. The Planning Board will be responsible for sending out additional notices for the July 16, 2024 meeting and re-notice in Hudson Valley One. A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Tiano, to adjourn the public hearing until the July 16, 2024 monthly meeting located at the Greco Senior Center

on the corner of Market Street and Robinson Street in the Village of Saugerties. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Riozzi-Aye. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Site Plan (Senior Housing & Townhomes), The Villa Residences, 49 Spaulding Lane. Presented by Rachel Ehrlich, Dattner Architects and Aaron Werner, AKRF. Ehrlich-there are no changes proposed to the northern building, it will remain Senior Housing. The southern building has been reconfigured from senior apartments to affordable housing townhomes. They will be two-story dwellings consisting of 2 or 3 bedrooms each. The parking has been revised to single aisle parking with parking spots for each townhome directly in front of the entrance to each. Each townhouse will have two parking spaces. There are 3 clusters of townhouses proposed that are stepped to distinguish each unit. Each will have a small deck/patio overlooking the woods. The two bedroom units will be 18' wide and the 3 bedroom units will be 22' wide. Each unit will have a basement for storage, mechanicals and laundry. The layout will be open circulation. The main floor will have a powder or full bathroom and the second floor will have the bedrooms. There will be a deck/patio but no private backyard space is proposed. The proposed grading plan will be ready for next month's review. There will be a flat townhouse on each end of the building for handicapped accessibility. Each of the units will have a peaked roof, the overall height of the buildings is approximately 32' from grade at the rear. This is a reduction in height from the previous proposal. Each unit will have vertical siding, the color palette to be shown in the future. There is space in the attic for distribution and ventilation for air passage. Some duct work will also be installed in the attic. The townhouses will be all electric with the EV charging stations, number required by the Town Zoning Code.

Werner-we were able to put together a response to the traffic concerns that Member Tiano listed in his letter that was submitted to the Board. The memo was also reviewed by the Town's Traffic Engineer as well. The question from last month's meeting regarding school children was addressed by the Town Planner.

Stach-would like to just give a brief review of where this project is. Currently the applicant is before the Town Board for a revised zoning petition, the Planning Board is reviewing conceptual plans at this time, no engineered plans. This facility has been revised from strictly senior housing consisting of residential rentals to dual use of senior housing consisting of residential rentals and affordable townhomes/flats for families to purchase. The Planning Board has to review the changes as they affect SEQR and the previously adopted negative declaration. Looking at the project as a whole, the number of units is decreasing which would lead to believe that development impacts would be less. The population estimate provided by the applicant was based on a NJ study, Member Tiano questioned if that was accurate for NY. The previous project, known as Glasco Apartments, used the same series of multipliers created by Rutgers University but based on a NY study not NJ. Using that NY multiplier the differences are as follows: AKRF proposed that the increase in school children using the NJ multiplier would be 8.76 children, when using the NY multiplier the number would be 8.97, both being approximately 9 school aged children. Glasco Apartments estimated that there would be 18 public school children in their development, currently there are 11 (9 public, 1 private, 1 Pre-K). This may fluctuate over time but not to an extent that this would not be an accurate depiction. The Saugerties School District has confirmed that there are 15 seats open in each grade at Riccardi Elementary School, the proposed addition of approximately 9 children does not seem to be a negative impact. The traffic study was updated and showed very similar results. Volume did not seem to be impacted.

Werner-there were 7 additional accidents identified in Member Tiano's memo over a two year period. The NYSDOT did not have these accidents at the time of the traffic study. AKRF went back 5 years to 2017, the traffic study was initially completed in 2022. NYSDOT will address all accident concerns, as this is a State Highway. The projects identified are pretty far from this site. Glasco Apartments and Brapas Development are the only projects that were given to us by the Planning Board at the time of the Traffic Study. We have anticipated development and included a 2% growth rate per year until the proposed build out year of 2027.

Overall a 12% growth increase was shown, increasing by 47 trips overall. It is unlikely that any of the projects mentioned in Mr. Tiano's memo will produce 88+ trips through that intersection. The density has been reduced with the updated proposal and Colliers has agreed with our findings.

Stach-concur that the report was prepared correctly. The applicant, as suggested by Colliers, can look into the additional accidents if the Board fees it is necessary. They applicant has included the assumed growth that may not come through the Board. Once the projects get further away from the site it is harder to know how to take account of the traffic impact they may have. That is why there are traffic standards set for such studies, the applicant did follow those standards. If there is something that changes the previous impacts that were considered for the previous negative declaration the Board will consider those impacts when reevaluating the negative declaration. There are two additional issues to be considered during this evaluation. First the Town of Saugerties Historic Preservation Committee will be submitting a nomination of the Spaulding House as a landmark. At this point SHPO does not consider this an historic landmark to the State. The Board can proceed as it stands, without the nomination by the Town. Once the nomination is submitted it will have to be reconsidered. This process needs to proceed in a timely manner. Scenic Hudson concerns from across the river to be addressed. A second view rendering from behind the trees was submitted. It seems as though the updated proposal for the southern portion of the property will create less of a visual impact than the original proposed structure. At this point the Board will have the opportunity to rescind the negative declaration and vote for the adoption of a positive declaration or move forward with adopting the amendmed negative declaration as prepared by our office.

Post polled the Board to see who would be in favor of adopting the amendment negative declaration at this time: Riozzi-in favor, Hlavaty-in favor, Tiano-not in favor would like more details on traffic, Furman-in favor, Post-in favor. A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Post, to adopt the amendment negative resolution with one minor change, updating the number units to 42. Board vote: Riozzi-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Tiano-Nay, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried.

Tiano-why not put fire access all the way around the southern building? Erhlich-the applicant is trying to reduce the impervious surface, there is a walking path proposed. The buildings will be fully sprinklered. Also, the applicant would like to keep the visual impact, mostly to the red trail on the Scenic Hudson land. There is no vehicular access proposed to the backyard area. The updated site plan is a reduction of 15 bedrooms. There is a reduction of impact from the retaining wall, lessen with natural slope when not having that driving surface in the backyard area. This will provide improvement of views withi and outside the site.

2. Minor Subdivision, Doug & Sue Myer, 18 Warren Myer Road. The applicant has requested that this application be put on hold until further notice.

3. Site Plan Amendment, Route 32 Supply LLC/John Hommel, 3736 Route 32. Presented by the owner, John Hommel. Stach-has the applicant received any correspondence from the Building Department or Town Board? Hommel-no. Stach-at this point the Planning Board can not approve for this site plan amendment for a storage building on a use that has not been approved previously by the Planning Board. The site plan from 2012 was not for a landscaping supply business. The Special Use Permit that was issued for this site was for a Home Construction Business with an accessory repair shop for the construction business vehicles only, not outside patrons. The Town Board will be reaching out to the applicant to see how the site can be classified and how it will best fit into zoning. The Town Board will work within the Town's Comprehensive Plan to ensure that the site fits into that. There are multiple uses, some of which are not necessarily permitted on their own but can be classified as accessory uses to the primary use of the Home Construction Business, which is what the initial site plan seemed to assume.

The applicant will be withdrawing their application before the Planning Board until they can get the details of how to proceed straightened out with the Town Board. No further action can be taken by the Planning Board.

PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE

1. Site Plan, Planet Fiber NY LLC, 3099 Route 9W. Presented by Richard Boyle and Robert Boyle, CEO Planet Networks. The applicant is looking to install a prefabricated steel building (hub) to house fiber network equipment with two points of access, one from Route 9W and the other from Arthur Lane. The applicant proposes to match the color and trim color of Sue's Restaurant so that it will blend in. The building is 16' square feet and will be placed on a concrete slab with gravel base. The hub will be insulated with foam and R15. There will be air conditioning and heat pump to ensure that the equipment is not affected by the outside elements. There will be a generator installed for back up. Post-noise? Boyle-the generator will be inside the hub, with the appropriate venting, and will be less than 50 decibels at 50'. Furman-moisture? Boyle-the air conditioning will help with this. The generator will have a double wall Rothe diesel tank to ensure there are no leaks. Stach-are batteries used? Boyle-not long term. Stach-the bushes that are proposed on the corners of the hub, what will they be? I would recommend Viginiana Rose or Highbush Blueberry. A note will need to be added to the site plan regarding all landscaping being continuously maintained. An access easement over the car wash parcel will need to be created and submitted to the Planning Board attorney for review and approval. The fire department should visit the site to make sure that they will not have any issues with access in case of an emergency. A note should be added to the site plan referencing the sample photo of how the structure will look. This is a Type II Action under SEQR. It does front on Route 9W but UCPB referral is not required because the additional structure does not require an increase in the required amount of parking. Hlavaty-will there be an exhaust stack on the roof? Boyle-it will be a 2" stainless steel pipe that will go out the side of the building not the roof. Stach-will the board require an architectural drawing of the hub? Post-no, because of the small size and impact. Tiano-can you meet with the fire department on Thursday at the site? Boyle-please get in touch and will set something up.

A motion was made by Furman, Seconded by Tiano, to grant conditional approval pending comments from the Fire Department, landscaping notes added to the final site plan and easements submitted to the Planning Board attorney for review and approval. Board vote: Riozzi-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Since there was no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Furman, to adjourn the meeting. Board vote: Riozzi-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried.

The meeting was closed at 8:50 pm.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Becky Bertorelli
Planning Board Secretary