



## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

*Virtual*

**May 17, 2022**

C. Howard Post, Chairperson, opened the meeting at 7:31 p.m.

Present: C. Howard Post (Chair), Carole Furman (Vice-Chair) - part of the meeting, Mike Tiano, Robert Hlavaty, Ken Goldberg, Len Bouren and William Creen (alternate who joined as full member)

Absent: Kevin Brady

Also Present: Adriana Beltrani (Town Planner, NPV)

The draft minutes of the April 19, 2022 Planning Board meetings were reviewed. A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Tiano, to approve. Board vote: Furman-Aye, Goldberg-Abstain, Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried.

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**1. Site Plan, Ryley's Auto Repair, High Falls Road.** Presented by Rich Rothe, Rothe Engineering, P.C. The applicant is proposing to build an auto repair shop on one of the parcels that was created as a result of the Gambino subdivision. The building will be 60' x 125' with a 20' x 30' wood frame portion on the front for office space. The applicant has an existing business but currently rents the space and would like to purchase this parcel to move his business to permanently. The applicant has grown his business over the years with hard work and is a good businessman.

Post opened the public hearing at 7:36 pm. Public Comments:

- Pat Melville, 31 High Falls Road-highly against the position and location of this proposed business. The lights currently on the Gambino building are intrusive enough and this will add to the light pollution. Rothe-the Gambino building is not part of this project and therefore should not be considered for this public hearing. This building will have all downward facing, shielded lights and it is an allowed use in the zoning district, Highway Business. Melville-how is this parcel located in the Highway Business district when it is in the middle of residential properties? Not against the business, just this location.
- Toni Berzal, 97 High Falls Road-concerned with the look of the applicant's current business location and how that will affect our properties when it moves to this location. It is dangerous to add the commercial traffic to High Falls Road. Want the applicant to be able to continue his business just not in this location.
- Joe Puma, 2602 Route 32-neighbor of Ryley's current business location. Ryley is a third generation resident of this Town. He has built his successful business in this Town and has provided for the neighborhood. Would like to voice support for the business.
- Bob Melville, 26 High Falls Road-this business does not belong in a residential area/neighborhood. We are also third generation residents of this Town. The noise of the tools and the potential disarray that a business like this would bring to the neighborhood is not good.
- Ryley O'Conner (applicant)-understand the concern of the neighbors but plan on making the parcel look top notch. At the present time it does not look that way because the area needs to be prepared for a building, it is a process to make things look better. This parcel is the third one in on the left of High

Falls Road from Route 32 and the potential traffic is very minimal. Just a customer dropping off their vehicle for repairs and picking it up. Would be respectful of the neighbors.

Post-there has been some back and forth, the purpose of a public hearing is for the Planning Board to take comments and allow the applicant to address them. This is not a forum for arguments.

- Joe Cimorelli, 12 Cobble Creek Road-how is this business and location different from other local repair shops in the area, Steyer's for example.

Beltrani-will require a full site plan within the next two months. Rothe-do not see any problems with doing that within the next month. A SWPPP requirement will be determined by the Town Engineer. Beltrani-there are operational questions to be addressed. Post-should we keep the public hearing open until June? Hlavaty, Goldberg, Furman, Tiano, Bouren-yes keep open. Creen-abstain. A motion was made by Post, Seconded by Goldberg, to keep the public hearing open until the June meeting (location to be determined). Board vote: Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried.

**2. Minor Subdivision/Lot Line Revision, Martec/Demitri Kolokotronis, 44 Pine Tree Lane.** Presented by Tom Conrad, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant has changed their previously proposed 5-lot subdivision to a 2-lot subdivision with a lot line revision. Lot #1 will be a new building parcel and Lot #2 will contain an existing house with wetlands. Parcel A, containing 4.5 acres, is being combined with the adjoining parcel owned by Hicks.

Post opened the public hearing at 8:03 pm. Public Comments:

- Donna Vulpis, 47 Pine Tree Lane-concerned with the applicant performing additional subdividing in the future. Conrad-the applicant has no plans to future subdivide because of the amount of wetlands located on the larger parcel. Vulpis-how were the lots adverzized for sale without it being an approved subdivision?
- Scott Budik, 67 John Yeager Road-concerns about the wetlands located on the parcel and how they will be affected. The proposed Lot #1, the buildable lot, has a spring located on that property which branches off to the lot line that is to go to Hicks. Wildlife concerns, there are DEC protected creatures that inhabit that property. There is a watercourse missing on the map, it does not have the spring fed course indicated. Lot #1 does not show the proposed sewer location, not on the map that I viewed. Across the road there is a stream that comes in. There are lots of water concerns. Conrad-an updated map was provided with submission to show the proposed sewer location, no test holes have been done to date. Before a building permit can be issued Health Department approval would need to be received. Budik-would ask the board to keep the public comment session open. Tom Horowitz, 56 John Yeager Road-concerns with water, there are many of us in the area that are concerned with the water.
- Melanie Rock, 48 John Yeager Road-there is a boardwalk on the property across the road, the Bischoff's, and the area is very swampy at best. The structures located on that property have no plumbing or well. Concerned with the impact on the wells of the neighbor's and the habitat of the wildlife.
- Jackie Haught, 60 John Yeager Road-water issues and the structures located in the area are of concern and the impact on the wetlands. Rock-septic does not flow but there is a pond on top of the septic. John Yeager is located at the base of the mountain and when it rains the water flows down for days after. A NYC realtor was marketing the lots for many months.
- Wendy Saxon, 341 West Saugerties Road-what is the purpose of the subdivision, it was a larger subdivision at the last meeting it was before the board. Conrad-looking to create 1 building lot and convey 4.5 acres to Hicks. Only one additional building site is proposed on John Yeager Road. Saxon-his lot and one other lot with one house. Water is the biggest concern. How will they get a septic on the proposed lot? The septic for the Bischoff's property is on my parcel, they could not put one on their parcel.

- Jacqueline Haught, 60 John Yeager Road-will there be further subdividing of the property? Conrad-no the plan but can not confirm that they will not propose that in the future. The wetlands onsite will limit that. You can put a septic, will just depend on what design needs to be used.
- Bob Leddy, 341 West Saugerties Road-the area off John Yeager Road where the new lot is proposed concerned about water issues. Post-the new proposed lot is the driest spot on John Yeager Road.
- Ben Gailey, attorney for Joe Forlenza, 43 Pine Tree Lane-the parcel is very wet with vernal pools throughout. Not possible to construct a septic system on that lot. To comment regarding advertising lots for sale before the subdivision is approved, it is illegal. Violation of State law. The water that is located and runs off from the Bischoff site will flow towards the proposed septic site.
- Alicia Goldsberg, 21 Pine Tree Lane-were any water tests performed? Interested in seeing the results of the tests that have to do with water quality.

Post-were test holes for the septic done? Conrad-no, it was never a concern. A septic can be designed to fit the area. Beltrani-the Planning Board is required to determine whether a parcel is buildable prior to approving a subdivision. The Board has required perk tests be performed prior to approval in the past. Hicks parcel has not been built out yet, including the prior approved plat with buildable elements. Ensure the Hicks parcel development goes where it was proposed by expanding the parcel. The map to include a note as such. Jeff Hogan (engineer for the Hick's property)-the Hick's property is currently under construction and everything is located as planned. Beltrani-a reference note at minimum to show where the house is located. Post-what kind of septic was installed on that parcel? Hogan-shallow trench for the 3-bedroom house.

Board Comments: Hlavaty-need more information for the septic on the proposed new lot. Post-need perk holes. Conrad-get Kolokotronis to do them. The Board agrees to keep the public hearing open until more information is received. Post-the public hearing will be carried over to the June 21, 2022 meeting. Test holes should be dug prior. Conrad-what should the note regarding the Hick's property state? Beltrani-titled map to state the lands of Hicks to be improved to the map filed with the Ulster County Clerk's office (with reference number and SBL number). Post-trees to stay as stated from the site visit.

A motion was made by Post, seconded by Goldberg, to keep the public hearing open until the June 21, 2022 Planning Board meeting.

**3. Site Plan/SUP, Denier Car Wash/Duncan Properties LLC, 2891 & 2897 Route 32.** Presented by Scott Ouimet (Kaaterskill Associates), John Denier (owner) and Mike Moriello (attorney). Ouimet-the applicant is looking to include zero discharge car washes and those that are connected to municipal water/sewer in the Aquifer Overlay district. Remove them from the prohibited list. Consistent with the NYSDEC requirements. Washing a car at home is more harmful to the Aquifer than what is proposed. The safety features were explained and all wastewater will be professionally removed and transported to a licensed waste facility. The applicant is proposing to add lawns, creating less impervious surfaces. Stormwater will be added as well.

Post-asked the public to not repeat concerns that have already been addressed so that everyone can be heard. The public comment session opened at 8:57pm. Public comments/concerns:

- Joe Hudson, 154 Hommelville Road-concerned about water shortage, from the reservoir. At peak use 1.6 million gallons of water per hour, and the aquifer produces up to 1 million gallons a day, a necessary source for the Town. The area of the proposed car wash should be treated the same as the area of the reservoir as it provides water to our Town. There is a reason that car washes are forbidden in the Aquifer Overlay district. The applicant is asking to look over the interest of many to benefit the few with the installation of the car wash in this zoning district. Seems like a very small advantage for a few. Do not support this.
- Marjory Greenberg-Vaughn, 109 Hommelville Road-this should not even be considered in this district. No ability to guarantee that nothing will be polluted, once it is polluted the damage is done. If

something happens to the aquifer, what happens to our property values? People would not want to drink or bath. Once you change this overlay zoning area anyone can open this type of business. Remediation would be the taxpayers responsibility if there was an issue. Inappropriate project for this area. Mr. Moriello stated that a public hearing would be a negative comment session. People should have the right to speak. There are other locations for a car wash. Changing the zoning law will only open up requests for other changes. You may own the property but if you contaminate the aquifer everyone around here will be affected. Put this somewhere that you do not have to change the zoning that has been implemented in this community.

- Bari Koral, 127 Hommelville Road-this is an upsetting subject for many. The effects on the vital resources. Another location should be considered.
- Andy Cowan, 122 Lodge Road-would like to remind everyone of the gas leak at the Howard Johnson, nothing can be guaranteed. This location does not make sense, there are other areas on Route 212 and Route 32 that can be used, outside of the aquifer. Against this project location, why is the applicant focused on this location? Zoning is to protect and car washes were removed for a reason. Denier-Randy Richers is a partner of the car wash and we are not hiding anything. This project has nothing to do with Winston Farms. This has been our lifelong dream. Not trying to do anything underhanded. We believe in taxes that generate revenue for the town. Randy owns the property there and this would be a great service for the area. We have been best friends since 4th grade. Ouimet-designed the facility and proposed language for rezoning. Suffolk County has several zero discharge facilities. There is a protection water shut off which would allow the applicant to repair before any leaks occur. NYSDEC guidelines will be met with this proposed use.
- Gene O'Donovan, 159 Hommelville Road-when the applicant purchased the property they knew the zoning. They knew what was allowed, why ask to put something so potentially dangerous in that area? Not a good idea.

Post asked if there were any additional comments/concerns that have not already been voiced. There were none. A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Tiano, to close the public comment session. Board vote: Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried. The Public Comment Session was closed at 9:29 pm.

Beltrani-a SEQR determination needs to be made by the Planning Board on the entire action before the Town Board can make a decision on the zoning. Part II of the EAF-mention impacts in the April 2022 memo, may have been addressed by the applicant and the Planning Board will review and discuss them. Would like to know the Board's thoughts on the zoning amendment and if it can be recommended to the Town Board. Ouimet-the applicant has provided thorough evaluations to respond to those concerns in the memo response that was submitted today. Are there any changes to the draft language? Hlavaty-proposal regarding emergency storage capacity from 2 days to 3 days. Remind us how many existing facilities there are in NYS? Ouimet-there are 55 car washes in Suffolk County, not in the municipal sewer district. Hlavaty-any information on the failures from those locations. Ouimet-no but this is why we have the secondary containment unit with leak detection.

Goldberg-the zoning law was implemented in 1989 and amended in 2008. 14 years later there have been several recommended changes submitted by the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Planning Board. Recommend that the Planning Board not review this request by itself and it be added to the full review of the zoning law. Pg. 16 Section 4.6 of the Comprehensive Plan states that "The Town/Village are dedicated to protecting all freshwater resources." Pg. 42, Goal #8, Items 8.3 and 8.7 states "Promote a land use pattern that protects air quality plus surface and groundwater resources, while working to eliminate (or minimize) all sources of pollution, but not limited to road salt and leaching dump sites." "Enforce and improve policies to protect and enhance water supply systems." NYS has developed the "Drinking Water Source Protection Program" overseen by the NYSDEC. The NY Rural Water Association developed the "Ground Water protection plan fo the Town of Saugerties". Two major changes were made to the Zoning Law as a result of this document. There were

originally 10 businesses that were prohibited in the Aquifer Overlay and it was increased to 21 businesses, car washes were explicitly included. The applicant's engineer and hydrologist assure us that there will be no contamination, there is no way to guarantee that and the consequences outweigh the advantages of having a car wash in this area. Let me remind the Board that we were all assured that the supertanker was the safest way to transport oil by water until the Exxon Valdez disaster. We were all assured that the Alaska Pipeline was the safest way to transport oil underground until there were 19 pipeline breaks. We were all assured that trains carrying cars containing oil, bullet trains, were the safest way to transport oil overland until they weren't. Applied to the ZBA to allow use, they would not get approval, this is not an allowed use for that site. Asking the entire zoning law to be changed for one site. Recommend not approve but add to recommendation list when and only when the entire zoning law is reviewed.

Furman-do appreciate the engineering, but there is nothing perfect and we need to protect our aquifers. Agree with Ken's statements. Tiano-the applicant proposes to draw water from the aquifer, how do they propose to shut off pumps? Ouimet-that is included in the proposal and zoning language. Shut off from the well and the system in the case of a malfunction. Bouren-mirror what Ken and Carole say. If a breakdown does happen the outcome is devastating. What if someone is in the middle of washing their vehicle and everything shuts off? Ouimet-the well water will be shut off but there will still be water in the reclamation system to finish rinsing off the vehicle. Bouren-I think that the applicant should look for another location where car washes are allowed. Creen-abstain. Post-trying to follow the science. Looked into this system in California and other states and it is commonly used.

Moriello-there does not have to be a recommendation made tonight. The applicant can come up with more information and answers to the questions that were raised tonight.

A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Furman, to recommend that the Town Board not review this zoning petition but add it to the list of other items that will be reviewed when a complete review of the current Zoning Law is undertaken. Board Vote: Hlavaty-Nay, Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Nay, Post-Nay, Creen-Nay. Motion Not Carried.

Furman-what more needs to be known? Ouimet-would like to be able to address Goldberg's comments and show where these systems have been used. Moriello-will include Adriana and Dennis Larios for their review. Hlavaty-one additional concern, give the worst case scenario if there is a breach/leak what is the maximum quantity of wastewater that will be emptied into the groundwater and how toxic it would be.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

**1. Site Plan Amendment, ELNA Magnetics, 203 Malden Turnpike.** Presented by Bruce Utter, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant is looking for an amendment to their existing site plan to add a 15,000 square foot addition to the existing building and construct an additional detached 18,750 square foot cold storage building, adding an additional 13 parking spaces and an emergency access drive in the rear of the building. The application was referred to the Ulster County Planning Board (UCPB) and submitted last month. There were two comments in response to the referral. One was regarding the lighting plan, still working on getting that completed by the lighting expert. Will be replacing the existing light fixtures with LED lights and adding one additional light pole. Revising the wall pack lights to LED as well. The second was in regards to the NYS Energy Code. Will address that with the Building Department when the time comes. One EV charging station is already on the site plan. The SWPPP has been approved by the Town Engineer. Requesting a conditional approval with the condition of photometrics. There were no further questions from the Board.

A motion was made by Post, seconded by Hlavaty, to conditionally approve pending the receipt of photometrics. Board vote: Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried.

## **2. Site Plan/Major Subdivision, Brapas Land Development LLC, Off Tiger Maple Lane/Route 9W.**

Presented by Michael Lockwood, engineer and Bruce Brady, owner. The applicant has not been before the Board in several months. Additional lighting information and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan were provided with this submission. The Planner's comments state that the height of the building exceeds height requirements. However, zoning takes the average which is below the 42' requirement in this zoning district. The living room will not be counted as a bedroom, it will open up so it does not include a door and closet to eliminate any confusion. Beltrani-no grading has been shown, it needs to match with the architectural plans. Refer to the Town Engineer if the Planning Board deems necessary. The Building Inspector should determine if a variance for the building height is necessary. Will need the revision dates added to the subdivision plans done by Vetere Surveying. Lighting and garage grade to be shown. Erosion and Sediment Control Plan to reflect grading. SEQR remains open. Ulster County Planning Board referral is not required. Highway Department curb cuts are required. Post-the average height is what is generally used. Refer to the Town Engineer with the next submission. There were no additional Board comments.

A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Bouren, to set the public hearing for next month. Board vote: Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Creen-aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried.

### **PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE**

**1. Site Plan, Jill McIntyre, 142 Esopus Creek Road.** Presented by the owner. The applicant is looking to install a shed/studio on her vacant lot located in the Waterfront Overlay district. The abandoned house has been removed and new trees planted. Did acquire a building permit in 2016 to build a new home but never started it so that has since expired. Currently there is a vintage camper on-site that is used when visiting the area. Would like to clean up the parcel and add a shed/workshop, it will not be a residence. Well and septic will not be used. No sales/commerce. It would be no bigger than 200 square feet. Provided building examples to the Board. There will be no electricity installed in the structure. Always bring in potable water and operate on solar power. No utilities. There will be no removal of vegetation. The shed that was questioned in the Planner's memo is not on this parcel. Beltrani-there is no principal structure on site, curious how an accessory structure can be installed without that. Will need a determination from the Building Inspector before the Board can move forward. The future development should be included on the site plan, if a house is something that the applicant would like to do at any time. The parcel should be looked at as a whole so that the applicant does not need to come back in the future for an amendment. Will work with the Building Inspector and the applicant on the next steps.

No further action can be taken by the Board at this time.

**2. Lot Line Revision, Jason Moriber/LeGeoff/Ostrander.** Presented by Dan McCarthy, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant is proposing to buy a section of the neighbor's parcel to act as a buffer between the adjoining parcels. Beltrani-Parcel C has frontage on Glasco Turnpike, is there a ROW? Tax maps do not show that. McCarthy-there are 3 entrances to Parcel C, a ROW is not necessary. Simple transfer of land. No Board comments.

A motion was made by Post, seconded by Furman, to waive sketch plan requirements, waive a public hearing, declare a TYPE II action under SEQR and approve the lot line revision. Board vote: Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried.

**3. Lot Line Revision, Michael E. Catalinotto, 3154 & 3144 Route 9W.** Presented by Tom Conrad, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant is proposing to combine three lots into one. The two smaller lots of 1.4 acres and .9 acres are currently vacant. Beltrani-the area to be conveyed to Parcel C (the largest of the three parcels) exceeds the minimum lot size for the zoning districts. The Board can vote, by supermajority, to waive the sketch plan requirements and public hearing if they choose to. No objections from the Board.

A motion was made by Post, seconded by Tiano, to waive the sketch plan requirements and a public hearing. Board vote: Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried by supermajority vote. A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Furman, to approve the lot line revision. Board vote: Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried.

*\*Carole Furmen left the meeting at this time.*

**4. Lot Line Revision, Lynn & Morris Almeleh, 921 & 925 Glasco Turnpike.** Presented by Dan McCarthy, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant was denied by the ZBA years ago. With this proposed lot line revision the applicant would go back to the ZBA for a side yard variance of 2' to make an existing cottage conforming. Parcel 1 has enough acreage/area to meet setbacks. Looking for a referral at this time. Beltrani-the Planning Board can classify this as a TYPE II action under SEQR and refer to the ZBA.

A motion was made by Bouren, seconded by Tiano, to waive sketch plan requirements, waive the public hearing, declare a TYPE II action and approve with the condition that the note be amended. Board vote: Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion Carried.

**5. Lot Line Revision, Avalanche Falls, LLC/Jessica Fisher, 124 Wilhelm Road.** Presented by Dan McCarthy, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant proposed to adjust the lot lines on two parcels that they own, to lighten the flood insurance costs. Beltrani-the Board can approve with the condition that the note be updated with Parcel 2. No Board comments.

A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Bouren, to waive sketch plan requirements, waive a public hearing and declare a TYPE II action under SEQR. Board Vote: Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion Carried. A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Tiano, to refer the application to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the side yard variance. Board vote: Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried.

**6. Site Plan/SUP, Ravensbeard Wildlife Center, LLC, 131 Van Buskirk Road.** Presented by Ellen Kalish, Director/Owner and Jordan Kallish (son). The applicant is proposing to move their existing bird rehabilitation center to this parcel. A review of the Town Planner's comments. The applicant does not plan on having any more than 14 cars on site at one time. Not trying to have a lot of people stopping, by appointment. Office will be located inside the house. There will be an entrance from the house and an entrance from the clinic. All veterinary pharmaceuticals will be provided by a vet. Will follow all laws regarding storage. Ventilation is tested and monitored. The existing pool on site will be used for personal use only and be locked during business hours. The applicant would like to purchase this home but needs to make sure that she can run this business at this location prior to that.

Beltrani-the Planning Board can review the information received and decide to waive certain criteria as they see fit. A scaled site plan should be submitted. The residential use of the property will have to be referred to the Building Department to ensure that that will be considered an accessory use to the animal specialty business. It would be a change from residential to commercial use. Hlavaty-would like to have a site plan completed with minimal requirements including the comments the Planner has made in her comment #3. Goldberg-need a site plan of some sort that is to scale to review. Tiano-want to see the schematic. What kind of birds are on site? How many events would the center host per year? Bouren-need site plan and more information. Creen-agree. Kallish-not a lot of events, they would be small in scale. The birds that are kept long term are educational birds that are unable to be returned to the wild. When doing educational events there will not be birds flying free they will be secured to the presenter. We do events for small groups such as Seniors or Boy Scout/Girl Scout Troops.

The business is 100% non-profit. Beltrani-a narrative description of all the details presented tonight should be supplied with the next submission.

A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Post, to schedule the public hearing for the June meeting. Board Vote: Hlavaty-Aye, GoldbergAye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried.

**7. Site Plan Amendment, The Middle Way School, 268 W. Saugerties Road.** Presented by Jeff Hogan, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. Also present were Cecile Hohenlohe and Davide Boylan from The Middle Way School. The applicant is looking to add assembly space to an existing site. The space will create a place for the children to eat lunch and get out of the weather when required. The existing septic is approved for up to 111 students and staff, and will be under that threshold with the proposed additions. The applicant is looking to build a 45' diameter Geodesic Dome consisting of 1,200 square feet. It will be an open plan on the inside. The applicant is also proposing to add a 2-story multipurpose building with office space and assembly space, next year. The limits of disturbance are relatively small. The proposed new building will be similar to the one that was built a few years ago onsite. Not adding to the population, no additional parking will be required or needed. Referral to the Ulster County Planning Board is required. There is quite a bit of screening between the proposed location of the new structure and the neighbor. There will be a 90 student range for each building at separate times. Post-the last time the applicant was before the Board they met with the Fire Chief of Centerville to ensure that access was not an issue, suggesting doing that again just to confirm the new structures provide adequate access. Hogan-will reach out to the Chief of Centerville. Hohenlohe-will not be growing beyond the 6th grade. Currently there are 76 students and projecting to be 90 by September. The 111 includes students, employees/staff.

A motion was made by Post, seconded by Tiano, to refer to the Ulster County Planning Board and set the public hearing for the June meeting. Board Vote: Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Creen-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried.

**8. Minor Subdivision, Catherine Berzal, Route 32.** Presented by the owner's representative, Tasha Berzal. Beltrani-the ownership of the parcel is not clear. The owner on record is Ulster County. The parcel was listed on the Ulster County auction list. Berzal-was pulled from that list. Beltrani-the application has to be updated with the accurate information. It has a different parcel listed on the application than the one in the sketch map that is being presented for the subdivision. Proposed Lot #1 is landlocked with no access. The Planning Board can only approve a lot that is buildable. Access needs to be provided and demonstrated to the Lot #1. Need more information on the subdivision plan, topography, easements, flag area. The flag area is not shown on the County maps and serves as the only access to the rest of the lot. How is it maintained? Is it part of the parcel or is there an easement? Private rural road standards will have to be addressed. Well and septic feasibility will have to be shown. This would be considered an Unlisted Action under SEQR. The question of ownership is still open. A public hearing will be required. Referral to the Ulster County Planning Board does not seem to be required. Hlavaty-there are lots of comments to be addressed from the Planner's memo. Post-septic system can be set on that parcel. Easement/access needs to be addressed along with questions of ownership. Beltrani-would like a site visit for topography. Post and Tiano will do that. No further action can be taken by the Board at this time.

## **ADDITIONAL ITEMS**

**1. Site Plan Resolution Amendment, Glasco Apartments, 260 Glasco Tpke.** The applicant has requested that the resolution be revised to allow for permits to begin the foundations be applied for prior to completion of the conditions of the original resolution, at the applicant's own risk. The only condition that is outstanding at this time is the NYSDOT approval for the entrance onto Route 9W. The revised resolution has been reviewed by the Town Engineer, Town Attorney and the Town Planner. A motion was made by Post, seconded by Hlavaty, to amend the resolution to allow the applicant to apply for building permit and begin the foundation work onsite at



their own risk. Board Vote: Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Post-Aye.  
Motion carried.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Since there was no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Bouren, to adjourn the meeting. Board vote: Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried. The meeting was closed at 11:59 pm.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Becky Bertorelli  
Planning Board Secretary