



**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
SPECIAL MEETING  
VIRTUAL -WebEX  
September 22, 2020**

C. Howard Post, Chairman, opened the meeting at 7:06 p.m.

Present: C. Howard Post, William Creen, Ken Goldberg, Carole Furman, Daniel Ellsworth, Len Bouren, Mike Tiano, Robert Hlavaty (alternate), Adriana Beltrani (Town Planner, NPV).

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. **Site Plan Amendment, Agawam/Wyldwyck LLC, Route 32/Liberty Street Ext.** Present: Adam Friedman (applicant), Bruce Utter (Praetorius & Conrad, P.C.) and Mike Moriello (Attorney). Post-this is an open public hearing that has been left open since the August 18th meeting. Utter-the applicant is looking to develop a total of 82-acres, which consists of two parcels, located in Glasco. They are looking to amend a previously approved site plan and special use permit which included a residence house for staff, artist studio and several other items that they would like to remove to create a less impactful site plan. The parcels do have frontage on the Hudson River but the development is confined to the upper section of the land that is not along the river.

Post opened the public comment section of the public hearing at 7:08pm:

- Tom Francello, 2179 Route 32-the lumination plan was requested by the Town Planner and the one that was submitted does not have the same type of lights that were originally shown in the previous site plan. The Board needs to have details regarding the lights that are to be used. Have spoken with the Building Department and without giving a specific name or the details it is felt that the Planning Board is dropping the ball on these projects and not getting the adequate detail that is needed for the Building Department to follow through. Bertorelli-I will ask one of the Building Inspectors to join the meeting for their input. Post-yes, that is appropriate. Utter-it is not an uncommon practice that as the applicant goes through the process they have to change items as a result of the public hearing or to fulfill a need. Moriello-the final details will be done after the public hearing, that is what a public hearing is for to get those suggestions and address those concerns. Friedman-things, such as final details, will be changed if necessary, for instance we have put the locations that we would like to put the cabins but that may change depending on if the Health Department will need something shifted for better access. We have tried to work with Tom Francello regarding landscaping. We have a well thought out plan but it may have to change when permits are approved. These are things that we have to wait for. Our short-term vision is to move forward and get this amendment approved, this process has been over four years already. Our long-term vision is to have a viable hotel that is successful within the town.

Beltrani-would like to review my comments. The plans have evolved, a civil set was provided, which is valuable. The loading area-the grading plan and architectural plan did not match up. Request and update on the civil set. Essentially the layout of the site plan will not change but the details and architecturals are an important element of that site plan and must

be demonstrated. Once a site plan is approved the only changes that will be permitted are field changes and only to a certain extent. There is a specific percentage of change that is allowed. Example: the applicant can change the manufacturer of the light but not the type of light fixture permitted on the final site plan. The staircase shown is not consistent between the architectural plan and the site plan, clarification will need to be made. Further engineer details for the retaining walls will be needed. The lighting will need to be clarified around the cart/walking paths and path around the pond. Lighting details were provided last month but not this month, will need details of lights not just symbols marking their location. 2,700 kWh is the appropriate warmth for lighting, 3,000 kWh will have to be approved by the Board, not all of the warmth measurements were provided throughout. The engineer will need to be involved at this point as the project moves forward. Creen-should there be a coordinated set of plans/drawings? This would be helpful to see everything together and for the engineer to review and redline. Friedman-yes, apologize for that. Would like to have everything match, the architectural provided is to the best scale of availability and would not like to change the buildings. Beltrani-helpful if the applicant would go through the "Site Plan Checklist" that the Planning Board provides within the application to ensure that all required documents are provided for the review process. Architecturals and how they relate to the plan are necessary. At this point it would be beneficial to the applicant to get the engineer and building inspectors involved to provide comments and clarifications for the public. The Board will not be able to act until comments from the Engineer are received and reviewed. Moriello-Utter will coordinate with the engineer. Friedman-there has been a lot of news articles and publicity already on this project. Focus on the technical details.

- Dave Mauro, neighbor-the water lines that connect on Route 32 where the entrance and exit is, there is a water main there and it breaks about once a year, what will happen with the disturbance, when they make the tie in? There are probably 5 to 7 patches already in that water main. The problem with the pressure south of this project, will it be made worse? There currently is no problem at the Liberty Street water lines with pressure. Why are they proposing to connect an 8" main to a 6" main on Liberty Street instead of going out to Glasco Tpke/Delaware Street to the larger water lines? If there is a problem after connection where do we go? When the Fire Co. uses volume, the water pressure drops in Glasco, if it was tied into the larger main it would eliminate those pressure drops on Route 32. Utter-the calculations show that there will not be an issue with the connection that is proposed. If there is an issue then the applicant would have to address and correct it. Fire flows are used within the calculations and there are no future problems foreseen. Friedman-the hope is that what we propose to do will improve the pressure and help the flow south of the entrance on Route 32. Tiano-there is a 6" line that runs along Liberty Street to Glasco Tpke and a 10" line that runs east and west on Glasco Tpke. If connected to that 6" line the fireman training will collapse that line at the smallest part, they practice with draw vacuum. Would like to see a topographic map for elevations of water decreasing south of the project. If they connect to the larger, 10", line on Glasco Tpke. it would eliminate the issues. Utter-the Town Engineer accepted the hydraulic tests.
- Allen Carney, 2146 Route 32-landscaping that was provided with the public hearing notice mailing does not show much detail on the landscaping that runs behind our home on Route 32. Why is the applicant not using the Route 32 entrance/exit as the primary as using Liberty

Street as the primary will cause a significant increase in traffic through Glasco?  
Friedman-we wanted to use the Route 32 entrance/exit but the NYS DOT would not let us because of the sight distance. We propose to landscape as much as possible behind those houses that run along Route 32. The site plan that you received in the mailing was not the detailed landscaping plan (it was shared via WebEx for Mr. Carney to see by Mr. Anderson). A copy will be sent to Mr. Carney for his record.

- Victor Clearwater, 2150 Route 32-the power lines have been taken down and removed, is that for the larger size trucks for delivery? Friedman-deliveries will only be permitted from the Route 32 entrance/exit.
- Tammy Benton, 2184 Route 32-the pathways are rolled crushed granite, that is not handicapped accessible. Friedman-they are but they contain a hardening agent which will make them compliant. Anderson-it is a decomposed granite that is ADA compliant. Benton-wanted to see the handicapped suites and cabins. Friedman-we will be following all ADA regulations as required. We will not be able to get the proper approvals if we do not. We will have the proper total/mix for each type of room.

Kevin Brown, Assistant Code Enforcement Officer-joined the meeting to address the concern brought up by Mr. Francello. Francello-a conversation that was had with someone from the building department was that without specific details on the site plan it is hard for the code enforcement officer to go after the developer after the fact. It has happened with a dumpster and then another project with road details. Brown-design size is what becomes an issue with dumpster, that comes to our attention after the fact. Francello-Farmhouse Commons, no enclosures? Brown-had removable fencing panels around the dumpster for snow removal and then put back up after the winter season. Francello-have been asking for a dumpster detail on this project since 2016, Stormwater detail, etc., hope they are answered and included in the resolution. Friedman-many of the questions that you have had have been answered, unfair comment. The spraying was addressed, dumpster drawing has been provided...we care what this site looks like and the area around the dumpsters are important for aesthetics. Francello-the dumpster detail around the greenhouse dumpster has not been provided. Beltrani-would like to make a suggestion that the applicant pause submissions until there is a complete set of plans. Friedman-would like to avoid a 3-month delay, would rather be in front of the Board every month to address the comments and move forward continuously. Brown-with site plan approval the construction site will come before the Building Department. All ADA requirements, the dumpster area and all those items are in the Building Code and will be subject to the Building Inspector's review. Tiano-there is a concern on the second row of cabins being accessible to emergency personnel during snow/ice season. There is a 6' or 8' path, is it true that if the Fire Chief does not sign off on that configuration that it will not receive the Certificate of Occupancy? Brown-no, the Building Inspector can sit down with the Fire Chief and come to an agreement on how the issue can be resolved. Tiano-there news to be a walking path down for the Fire Department, have submitted a letter from the Glasco Fire Department with issues to be addressed. Brown-there are design standards that will be followed. Friedman-we are willing to compromise, if something is not working we can address it. We intend to be good neighbors.

Post-any further questions from the public? None. This will be sent to the Engineer. Should we keep the Public Hearing open? Beltrani-you can keep it open, it will have to be closed prior to any

decision being made, still need the Engineer's comments. There have not been many questions/comments addressing that this site plan amendment is not acceptable.

Post polled the Board:

Creen-moving in right direction, close public hearing

Hlavaty-do not believe we need to keep the hearing open

Goldberg-close, we know the concerns

Ellsworth-close

Furman-close

Tiano-until we get the full set of plans do not close the public hearing

Post-concur to close

A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Ellsworth, to close the public hearing. Board vote: Current-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Post-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Nay, Goldberg-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Furman-Aye. Motion carried. Public Hearing was closed at 8:24 p.m.

Post-coordination with the engineer and Town Planner are necessary and submission of a complete site plan. Friedman-will work to move forward. Utter-we know what has to be done and have heard the public's comments.

## **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

### **1. UCPB Safety Tower**

Beltrani-attended the public meeting that was hosted by the Ulster County Planning Board. Goldberg-attended as well. Presented by Dennis Doyle of Ulster County Planning Board (UCPB). The first that we heard of the public meeting was at the Planning Board meeting last Tuesday (9/15). The notice that was given to the general public was a short amount of time and not publicized in a timely manner. The only notice that was given was a small notice the morning of the public meeting in Hudson Valley One, some subscribers do not get their paper until Friday, the day after the meeting was held. It was mislabeled as a discussion about a balloon test. It was not a public hearing but a public meeting meaning that it did not require the notifications and time periods for notification that a public hearing is held to. There are no requirements for notification of a public meeting. Anyone that wished to attend needed to pre-register and UCPB will continue to receive public comments until 9/30/2020. Do not have any project issues, benefits to the local community and larger community outweigh the concerns to the community. My comments are: First, if we do the balance test and vote in favor of the project, then the project would be exempt from the Town's zoning law. Second, if we do the balance test and vote against the project, then the project cannot be placed anywhere in Saugerties since, as stated by the Town Planner, the project is not a private cell tower and non-private cell towers are not mentioned anywhere in the Town zoning law at all. Opportunity was not given to the community of the Town of Saugerties to ask questions, there was not proper notification. Can we do a public hearing, the Town of Saugerties Planning Board? Ask Dennis Doyle to come to do a presentation, individuals will be notified in a more timely manner and will have the ability to use the project website to get information so they are prepared with questions/concerns. This way the community can address concerns and understand the rationality of the project. Post-are we allowed to host a public hearing as a Board? Beltrani-we can host a special meeting as if it was a public

hearing. This may be a question for the Town Attorney, George Redder. We do have to perform a “Balance of Public Interest Test” and hosting a public hearing would be helpful. We can ask Mr. Redder if it is within the realm of the balance of public interest test to request more public input. Host community has to consider all the factors when completing the balance of public interest. Then approach Mr. Doyle to participate. Goldberg-went back to the recording of the last meeting and he stated that he can not stop us from having a public hearing. Will double check the recording again to ensure that is what was said. Post-will entertain a motion to host a public hearing on our own, once we receive the legal opinion of the Town Attorney. A motion was made by Post, seconded by Goldberg, to host a public hearing regarding the safety tower, date to be determined upon the advice of the Town Attorney, George Redder. Board vote: Creen-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Furman-Aye. Motion carried. Ellsworth-the applicant will have to pay for the notification mailing. The tower is needed for the fire department, just do not agree with the process that is being pushed upon this Board. Creen-do not think that we need a mailing. Beltrani-agree that we need more public comments to make an informed determination. Must contact Dennis Doyle before setting a date to ensure that he is available to participate in the public hearing. Post-will wait to hear back from Mr. Redder to set a date. Beltrani-we are the host community and should be able to host a public hearing.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Since there was no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Ellsworth, to adjourn the meeting. Board vote: Creen-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Post-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye. Motion carried. The meeting was closed at 8:51 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Becky Bertorelli  
Planning Board Secretary