



VILLAGE OF SAUGERTIES
43 PARTITION STREET
SAUGERTIES, N.Y. 12477
PHONE: 845-246-2321 FAX: 845-246-0887

Planning Board Meeting and Public Hearings

May 14, 2025

Minutes

Present: Planning Board – Dara Ellenbogen, Mike Karashay, Bill Barr, Sean Paige, Lisa Mayone, Anne Meiswinkel, Andrew Zink

Others: Ben Neidl, Eyal Saad, Mike Moriello, Larry Marshall

Absent:

PUBLIC HEARING

83 North Street Lot Line Changed

See attached sign in sheet for residents that spoke, See attached petitions that were submitted **by Kathryn Meyers**.

Chairperson Dara Ellenbogen welcomed the residence, so great to see a huge turnout and thank you for all coming to participate. Before the Public Hearing, we want to make sure that everyone here is educated as to why the Public Hearing is taking place, the scope and what it's limited to in terms what is currently before the Village Planning Board, as well as our board's role is as there are multiple parties involved. Introduced the Village Board council.

Ben Neidl, Village Attorney addressed the community he wants to comment briefly before the Village Planning Board tonight as opposed to what may come later. Tonight, there is an application for a lot line adjustment, property owned by the Village and property owned by the applicant. The applicant as we understand will at some point in the future file an application likely to develop a residential development in the North Street area. The application has not been filed yet, that is not deliberate yet as there is nothing before the board to deliberate yet. If that goes through sometime in the future it will subject to a

separate Public Hearing, a separate Public Approval process by this Village Planning board. The line between this Village Planning Board's role in this process and the role of the Village Board of Trustees in this process. One of the two parcels in the proposed lot line adjustment is owned by the Village. The Village Board of Trustees and the Village Planning Board have their respective roles. The Village Board of Trustees will decide if they want to make an adjustment to the lot line, that will happen at a Public Meeting at a Village Board Meeting. First step in the meantime, the Village Planning Board function to look at from a Planning and Zoning perspective if the application can even happen. There are certain criteria for lot line adjustments, the questions to be reviewed will the lot line adjustment result in an illegal undersize lot, create a setback problem. That is what before this Board tonight; then they would go to the Village Board of Trustees and that board would decide if the benefit is an adequate exchange for the land swap. At the end of the Public Hearing the meeting will go into the regular Meeting and in the regular meeting there is another application for a lot line which has already been vetted, and the Planning Board will be voting on it tonight, so I don't want that vote to be confused with the lot line for 83 North Street.

Mike Moriello, the attorney for the applicant. Larry Marshall is the consulting engineer for the applicant. Thank you for having us. I want to give a little background. We had meetings with the Mayor, Eyal, counsel and with the Town, to be transparent. We thought the best way to be transparent. The overall project the multifamily has to be disclosed upfront. Under SEQRA (State Environment Quality Review Act) The segmentation. The lawful segmentation of a portion can be done, which is the lot line revision. The applicant will have to go through the full SEQRA, full Public Hearing, Site Plan and Special Use permit. The best way to get the salt shed moved for the Village. The salt shed would be in on hold for two years but we agreed to do whatever the Planning Board wants to going forward whether it's segmentation, or to go back and resubmit the application. Thank you for your time.

Larry Marshall, applicants Engineer reviewing the map on the projector and discussing the land for the swap. The portion of land that is owned by the Village of Saugerties would be transferred to the lot. Discussion on the parcel of lands owned by the applicant and the parcel of land owned by the Village. The Salt shed is located in the Town of Saugerties.

Dara Ellenbogen – making clear that there is a 2 minutes time window to speak, and discussion is limited to the nuts and bolts of the lot line revision to each speaker.

Laura Phillips, 4 Prospect St. on the proposed lot line changed, there should be no action taken after the 1st Public Hearing without time to learn more about the transfers. It is unclear when negotiations started. Is there some reason for the lot transfer to be rushed through. The plot to subdivided allows Market Street allows applicant to develop a road,

the land on North Street would allow for buffer land and more apartments are critical to the plan's development and disregard impact for Village residents. They are doing this to create a good spot for the salt shed. The transfer would enable the developer to complete the land application which allow the 167 units development which will significantly alter the residential character of the Village of Saugerties. I request you table this for more study.

Micheal Meyer, 122 Elm St. – Thank you for the opportunity to speak, a group of my neighbors that are close to the lot line adjustment and we are concerned about this affects us collectively. I want to emphasis that breaking down the project smaller seemingly separate for environmental assessment under minds the process of SEQRA. SEQRA also exposes the Village to article 78 proceedings. SEQRA is in place to ensure for governmental agencies to look at all of the environmental consequences before a decision made, a demand comprehensive look at the entire action and not in isolated pieces. The Village attempt to divide the project into separate environmental reviews is in direct violation of SEQRA intent. Segmentation is problematic, prevents us from seeing the true scope / impact on proposed project and it would be to a more rigorous review require more larger projects with a larger impact would require more in depth such EIS. Meaningful consideration, alternatives become impossible. SEQRA requires that you look at different ways that a project can be done with less environmentally damaging projects. When a project is segmented you lose finding projects other alternatives and address the project as a whole. Segmentation allows the developers to downplay human impacts. Smaller impacts can be insignificant on their own, but collectively they can be large. In this case the segmentation for the lot line change from the North Street development would prevent consideration of how the 167-unit development does comply with zoning or the comprehensive plan, not complying with the character of the Village. Using 17 acres of forest, adding 5 acres of impervious surface. Doesn't include trash or storm water, higher taxes, over a million dollars to the school budget. Segmentation silences the voices of the Saugerties citizens. It fragments the possibility to understand the complete picture provide comments. Segmentation makes it harder for the community to see the overall project and effectively participate in the decision making. In this case the developer stated that segmentation is allowed, based on a Court decision in 1998 and more recent 2022, for appeals court found that and foreseeable developments cannot be segmented. It would be demonstrative court dates for this case. Based on these facts, the legal precedence and the regulatory intent of SEQRA and citizens comments presented we urge the Planning Board to reject the advancement of the developer over the existing residences that live here. Stand firm against the segmentation of the environmental review. Deny the lot line division and property transfer until a comprehensive and transparent assessment of the entire action is completed.

Chris VanBenschoten - 100 Elm Street I read the material that I got from the Village Clerk, the two notes that affect the lot line adjustment are putting in the adjustment for putting in a road. Page 12 at the top predominant species, including bears. The next box doesn't contain and species or plant that is listed by the Federal Government or New York State as endangered or threatened. One of the plants that are protected by New York State, 3 species of ferns that are not protected. I have ferns in my yard, they are protected, I did not plant them. They are more than likely protected ferns that the development will destroy, so I say no.

Brian O'Mally - Bennett Avenue, this has to do with the parcel in question is going to be swapped and has been accessed and valued before a transfer takes place. If the Village is willing to give it up then it should for auction with notice to residents who would have a chance to purchase the parcel.

Kathryn Meyer - Elm Street, I am representing members of the entire community, as members of Elm Street we quickly realized that Elm Street is a jewel to the entire community. Dear Members of the Village Planning Board on behalf of 293 residents of the Village and the Town of Saugerties, who will be greatly affected by the implications the lot line change. We request that you reject the proposed lot line change for 83 North Street. Please do not exchange Village land at the north end of Market Street against the lack of transparency and information. That would allow access to the landlock property. We value our green spaces and respectfully request that you vote no to the proposal of deportation and development between North and Elm Street, this project is not keeping with character of the Village. On behalf of 77 youths of Saugerties School District and our community that are counting on you to make decisions for the best interest of the future. They respectfully request you rejected the proposed lot line change, do not exchange the land at the north end of Market, which would allow access to developers property. We value our green spaces and respectfully request that you vote no for the proposal of the lot line change and the deforestation between Elm and North Street. This project is not in keeping with the character of the Village. I ask that you share the request and these signatures with Mayor Murphy and members of the Village Board. Respectfully submitted Kathryn Meyer.

Chris Allen – live in Barclay Heights, the impact of this project with the lot line change affects the entire community. I wanted to bring up if this lot line change happens there will be deforestation, drainage issues, water issues with such a large development built upon the infrastructure of the Village. There is another area this board should focus on, which may not be covered by SEQRA. I attended presentation at the Orpheum for Earth Day, expert on water and air from Environmental Department at Bard College. He brought up the spike in air pollution on July 4th fireworks every year from Cantine Field. Those trees are air filters to clean and protect our lung from gun powder, residue smoke in the air. That issue may not be covered during SEQRA review, environmental review. The single day

when air quality will be its worst, we will be removing nature's protector and air filter from the entire town, I just thought that should be brought up. Thank you.

Brian Donhue - I am limiting my comments to the lot line division. If you look at the assessment, it states that there two pieces of Village land. If they are not then the application has to be corrected. The form states that there is no necessary action taken by the Village Board, which again is incorrect. There are number of things that in the form that is rather sloppy. I would urge the Village Planning Board to reject the application as defective and have them resubmit. I can see an article 78 being filed some time down road.

Eliabeth Reece - 67 Elm Street, lived there over 20 years. I wanted to add to what one of the other speakers talked about the buffer zone where the woods are. We already hear the rails and the thruway. Any deforestation there will increase the noise factor. Any Village votes related to this issue put on hold, that Village Board and Village Planning Board both take action on the Town Board and Town Planning Board regarding why they failed to require procedure. The same issue, Saugerties Town Planning Board failed to have a required Public Hearing, or provide sketch plans related to this. Instead, they fast tracked and voted approval as if it was a minor admin decision, which it clearing is not. It's non-conforming lots, requiring variances, it results in a change to land use and zoning. Most importantly it has a huge public impact on traffic, environment and community character. Since it includes a lot of swaps, which is contingent on the Village arranged this swap which is clearly not in the interest of the Village taxpayers. Unless the Village Board and the Planning Board stop this and address the procedures by the Town Planning Board meeting and ask them not to approve of their meeting of April 15, 2025, Town Planning Board Meeting. Thank you.

Mike Snyder - Village has a salt shed, the tenants of the developers would see it as eyesore. It's a commercially zoned area. The Village should keep their property, not put a salt shed on town property. I lived on Elm Street, I was born and raised Elm Street and there's no way this is going to happen.

Mike Karashay made a motion to keep the Public Hearing open for 83 North Street, Bill Barr seconded the motion to keep the Public Hearing open for 83 North Street. All in favor. Motion carried.

Dara explained that the Public Hearing has been kept open until the next meeting. Further comments can be submitted, via email to pmelville@villageofsaugerties.org.

REGULAR MEETING

Dara Ellenbogen presented the minutes for April 9, 2025, for approval, Anne Meiswinkel made the motion to approve the minutes for April 9, 2025, meeting. Lisa Mayone seconded the motion to approve the minutes for April 9, 2025, meeting. All in favor, one abstention. The motion carried.

61 East Bridge Street (Arm of Sea)

Floating Dock

Nothing new to report

6 – 8 South Partition Street PB 25 001

Dara presents the adaptation of the Resolution # 4, Lot Line Deletion for 6-8 South Partition Street, Bill Barr makes the motion to adapt Resolution # 4, Lot Line Deletion for 6-8 South Partition Street. Sean Paige seconds the motion to adapt Resolution # 4, Lot Line Deletion for 6-8 South Partition Street. All in favor, motion carried.

ROLL CALL

Anne Meiswinkel Y

Lisa Mayone Y

Dara Ellenbogen Y

Mike Karashay Y

Sean Paige Y

Bill Barr Y

83 North Street (Canoe Hill Road LLC)

Lot Line Changed

Dara asked the Planning Board if they have any questions for the applicant.

Bill Barr had questions about the salt shed, I called the DPW Supervisor, asking why we needed another salt shed. The Village has received DEC violations concerning the salt shed. Eyal Saad pulled up the map to show where the salt shed is located. There is no mitigation for that salt shed. The proposed salt shed, is a bigger area, flat.

Bill Barr reasons for segmentation, I voted for segmentation. I am not sure I feel good about it. The letter of intent states the lot line change, it's a property swap not a lot line change states it would allow to be developed for multifamily development. Ben Neidl stated that the mechanism to swap is the lot line change. On the issue of segmentation, the Village Planning Board can pull back. Segmentation is allowed, if one piece if ready and

the rest is not, we document it. Ben used a Home Depot parking lot / Target example to explain the sensibility to use segmentation. When the applicant comes back and have to go through the entire SEQRA process. Bill Barr requested that Resolution 3 for Canoe Hill be read with the details of Paragraph 3 C:

- c. If and when the Applicant, its affiliates or its successors make any future applications to the Village in connection with the development of any parts of Parcels A, B, C or D, or other properties, in connection with the potential multi-family development project described in the Application, or any other development, those applications will be subject to a complete SEQRA review, with full consideration of any and all environmental impacts that may be posed by the development proposed in said future applications. The Applicant is on notice that the VPB's discrete SEQRA decision on the immediate application concerning the lot line adjustment and land exchange shall not constitute a SEQRA determination of significance or approval for anything other than the discrete acts of adjusting the lot line between Parcel A and Parcel B (in coordinated review of the discrete act of adjusting the lot line between Parcel C and Parcel D).

Mike Karashay asked about the MS4 violation of the salt shed, is there fines associated with that, Eyal responded yes. The Village is not supposed to be use the salt shed since last year. We are to get the salt from the Town off of Rt 212 and drive back. Mike Karashay stated it's dead for all intense and purpose. The Village DPW and salt shed is in the Town. The violation is \$35K a day. Eyal stated about putting the salt shed in another place, at the recycling on Steele Place, DEC stated that nothing can go their as it was previously a dump. Mike Karashay asked the gentleman stating the application errors, if it can be reviewed to ensure it's correct. Ben Neidl I could not catch was he was saying. There are two pieces of Village parcels, one is in the Village and the other is in the Town. The Village Board of Trustees still has to approve the parcel of the property swap. Ben will review the application for clarification.

Dara Ellenbogen presented a motion to adjourn the Planning Board meeting of May 14, 2025. The motion to adjourn the Planning Board meeting of May 14, 2025, was seconded by Anne Meiswinkel. All in Favor. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:15pm.

The date of the next Planning Board meeting is June 11,2025 at 6:30pm
Submitted by Peggy Melville May 21, 2025