



PLANNING BOARD MINUTES January 21, 2025

C. Howard Post, Chair, opened the meeting at 7:33 p.m. Pledge

Present: C. Howard Post (Chair), Carole Furman (Vice Chair), Mike Tiano, Bob Hlavaty, Kevin Brady and Gina Kiniry.

Also Present: Adriana Beltrani (Town Planner, NPV).

Absent: Al Riozzi

The draft minutes of the December 17, 2024 Planning Board meeting were reviewed. A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Brady, to approve with the date change. Board vote: Post-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Kiniry-Aye, Furman-abstained. Motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Site Plan, Stone Creek Commons, 3190 Route 9W. Presented by Patrick Mitchell, Passero Associates. Also present, Robert Cain (CSD Housing), Christine Nealon (Rehabilitation Support Services) and Paul Freeman, Esq. The applicant gave a brief description of the proposed apartment complex and commercial space. Rehabilitation Support Services (RSS) currently rent space in the Twin Maples Plaza for administrative offices and the hope is to move those working out of that office to the proposed commercial space while providing apartments for the community. The apartments will be for the general public. There are 25 studio apartments and 22 1-bedroom apartments proposed. There will be 45 parking spaces with EV parking. Will tie into the municipal water and sewer. Lighting and landscaping proposed per Town requirements. The SWPPP is currently being reviewed by the Town Engineer, adjustments are being made as required.

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

- Scott Buley, 18 Garden Circle - what is the height of the structure, lighting and landscaping? Concerns with light pollution spilling over on adjacent properties and storm water drainage. What is the exact location of the proposed building on the parcel? Seems like a lot being squeezed onto a parcel that is not large enough. There is a stream that runs through the parcel that this development is proposed on. The parcel is adjacent to neighborhoods and there are small children in those neighborhoods, safety is a big concern. The applicant should consider fencing in the entire parcel. Mitchell-the lighting will not spill over the property boundaries. Photometrics have been provided. Working with a planner regarding the landscaping plan to ensure that it fulfills requirements. The SWPPP will be reviewed by the Town Engineer to address any issues regarding storm water run-off/drainage. The proposed development meets all bulk and setback requirements and is an allowed use within this district as per the zoning code. There is an intermittent stream that is non-jurisdictional according to NYSDEC. The building is proposed on the north side of the parcel and parking is proposed on the credit union side of the parcel. Parking is proposed 57' from the side property line and any development is proposed 212' from the rear property line. Buley-this is proposed to be a two story facility, concerned with being able to look into the surrounding backyards.
- Brett & Regina Melchin, 16 Sherwood Place - will the applicant be removing the existing building? What is the exact definition of a residential treatment facility? When visiting the Rehabilitation Support

Services (RSS) website and reading the many services that the agency provides, for a multitude of populations, the public would like to know which this location would serve. There are several drug and alcohol recovery residential facilities in the area, one that is owned by this agency, and we own a dance studio where they drift on and off our property. It is not a safe environment when there are young children attending lessons and someone from one of those facilities walks into our building uninvited. The additional traffic will put a strain on our community and the safety of the roads. Kain-The applicant is proposing 40,000 square feet of commercial space and a multi-family rental building. Parking studies have been done to include multi-use properties across the state. The proposal includes 45 parking spaces which is more than adequate for each use. This is not proposed to be a treatment facility. Mitchell-the existing building will be removed. The proposed use will create a light/minimal traffic increase. Proposing about 12-14 employees in the commercial space and about 21 cars a day entering and exiting the site. Due to that proposed increase a traffic study is not warranted. Melchin-what about the strain on emergency services, which are already overloaded? Concerns with the foot traffic and impact on the dance studio. Mitchell-the development should not increase the foot traffic in the vicinity of the dance studio. Proposing a sidewalk extension and a bus shelter. Most will utilize those. Post-the Planning Board has notified the ambulance, police and Glasco Fire Department of the proposed development. Melchin-is this a non-profit facility? Nealon-it does not mean that it is government supported.

- Soni Andrews, 16 Garden Court - when visiting the website it states that the agency provided drug recovery and mental health services, will treatment for both be on this site? Kain-the applicant is the owner and sponsor of the proposed development. Nealon-RSS does provide a lot of those things that the public is addressing but this is a newer area that the agency is exploring aimed towards housing. The agency is proposing to bring more housing to a community that needs it and trying to fill those gaps in the housing market. The purpose is to help meet that gap in affordable housing.
- Danny & Loretta Myer, 60 Carol Anns Way - does not seem that 45 total parking spaces would be adequate. What recourse would the community have if the applicant does not follow through with what is proposed? Nealon-will be relocating 14 staff members from our current offices in Twin Maples Plaza. They have outgrown the space and need a larger office space with a conference room. That is the only use of the commercial space. No clients would be coming to the site for treatment. There is a 24-hour staffing pattern for the residential rental part of the proposed development. Standard of management with a front desk staff member 24-hours a day. Myer-the community is full of non-profit facilities, how many can we have before it is saturated. Currently there are 4 treatment facilities in the vicinity of the proposed development.
- Gina Ferraro Wayman, Rehabilitation Support Services - no services were provided at the 11 Twin Maples office and none will be provided at the new site. The office space is for the employees currently working there. The agency does own Abel House located on Overbaugh Street. We were not aware that individuals from that facility were trespassing and if we had been made aware we would have addressed it. If it happens again we ask that we be notified. The proposed use of the new facility would be half office space for us to move to and half apartment rentals for the community.

Post-there seems to be a lot of questions that need to be addressed, an informational meeting was suggested by the Planning Board previously but the applicant did not want to do that. It may be beneficial to do so before the next meeting. We will keep this public hearing open until the February 18th meeting and additional information can be provided to the neighbors. The Board requested that certified mail with notification of the public hearing be sent to all neighbors within 500' of the proposed parcel to be developed.

Beltrani-UCPB comments were received. Jurisdictional Determination requested to be submitted to the NYSDEC. As of January 1, 2025 wetland regulations have changed. The Planning Board has previously requested this and now the UCPB is as well.

A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Kiniry, to keep the public hearing open until the February 18, 2025 monthly Planning Board meeting. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Site Plan, Derek Winnie/Saugerties Self Storage, 3058 Route 9W & 2037 Route 32. Presented by Derek Winnie. UCPB comments received. Beltrani-UCPB has recommended the Planning Board disapprove the project as shown. There are design standards that have not been met for the Gateway Overlay district. This was previously discussed with the applicant at the previous meeting but has not been addressed on an updated site plan. NYSDOT comments required regarding sidewalks and access. The Planning Board was advised by Town Counsel that area variances in this case are not required. The Board will forward UCPB comments to Town Counsel for comment. The Planning Board has the right to override the County's comment by supermajority vote, if they feel necessary and appropriate. Documentation will be provided to the County to support that vote. Lighting information is still needed from the applicant and correspondence from NYSDOT. Post-the recommendations from the County will be forwarded to Town Counsel before the Board can move forward with that part of the review.

2. Site Plan, Pond View Apartments, 14 Stevens Court. Presented by Bruce Utter, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant is before the Planning Board this month for an update only. There were some comments that have previously been addressed but at a meeting where the current Town Planner may have not been present. The applicant is the owner of both parcels, the one being developed and the one that is providing access to Route 9W. Easements have been addressed in the deeds of both properties. There is a 65' ROW for ingress and egress. A utility easement, 10' drainage easement and a 20' sewer easement. Deeds are subject to whatever rights the Town may have. There are 3 EV charging stations proposed on-site. One is proposed behind the existing building on the parcel located on Route 9W. The applicant is proposing to submit signage later in the process while still working on it. Operation and Maintenance agreements to be created. NYSDOT is pushing towards all egress through Steven's Court to the traffic light on Route 9W. Traffic study was done using that circulation route to access Route 9W. Beltrani-the Planning Board reserves the right to have an opinion on circulation. Utter-the rentals are proposed to be market rate. A stockade fence was originally proposed when the original site plan was approved many years ago and the applicant will still do that. Landscaping along that area is not proposed due to the existing sewer easement. Can discuss adding more landscaping in the islands with applicants to help meet the zoning requirements but there are light poles in those areas, limiting the space. Beltrani-there is a 20% requirement of landscaping as per the zoning code. Utter-detail for the dumpster enclosure includes a chainlink with slats (vinyl). The sidewalk is concrete and the dumpster is on a concrete slab. There is a 5% grade on the sidewalk to meet the dumpster pad. The applicant proposing landscaping in the sloped area between the curb and sidewalk to eliminate any safety concerns. Will the Board want the connection of Steven's Court and Route 9W to be a Town Road as mentioned in the Planner's memo. Beltrani-up to the Board's recommendation. Additional directional signs are recommended. Utter-can add and will provide details. There is an existing school bus stop at the Village Apartments. No bus shelter is proposed as there is an existing public transportation bus stop at the plaza and crosswalk across Route 9W at the traffic light to get to that location. Asked NYSDOT for their comments regarding this. Outdoor amenities include an outdoor picnic area and a mowed path for walking. Beltrani-would recommend landscaping in the buffer areas and setbacks. Meadow plantings can be in the easements, they would also benefit pollinators. Foundation plantings would be nice. Bioretention plantings as per NYSDEC requirements. Utter-there is an aquatic bench in the pond. Additional landscaping to be addressed. Lighting plans provided. Including some trees in those areas may help reduce the light intensity. Beltrani-full cut off lights are required. Utter-they are fully shielded-front door lights proposed are dark sky compliant. Can change to frosted to cut down light intensity slightly. Proposing a, 18" lantern style for the front doors. Parking lights are down shielded, bat light shield. Can get the updated catalogue sheet. It has been determined that the proposed project has no effect on SHPO. Beltrani-Part II of the EAF was

prepared by our office. There are a couple of areas that need to be addressed by the applicant before the Planning Board can take action on Part III. Referral to UCPB is required.

A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Brady, to approve Part II of the EAF. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Furman, to refer the application to the UCPB. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Brady, seconded by Hlavaty, to set the public hearing for the February 18th monthly meeting. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE

1. Major Subdivision (3-Lot), Western Sullivan Properties/Jan Marazita, 236 Dutchtown Road. A representative from Bethlehem Surveying was present but did not know a presentation was required. The applicant is requesting a minor subdivision on a parcel they recently purchased. However, since this parcel has previously been involved in a minor subdivision within the last three years the applicant will be required to proceed with a major subdivision to include the entire original parcel. Beltrani-the applicant will be required to identify possible home sites to confirm that the Planning Board is looking at buildable lots. That is required on the sketch map. This is an Unlisted Action under SEQRA. No other involved agencies identified and the Planning Board can assume Lead Agency.

A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Furman, to declare this an Unlisted Action under SEQR. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried. No further action can be taken until a proper presentation of the proposed project is made by the applicant.

2. Minor Subdivision (2-Lot), Timothy Unich/440 Fishcreek LLC, 440 Fishcreek Road. Presented by the owner, Tim Unich. The applicant is proposing to subdivide the parcel into two lots, one 2.33 acres and the other 29.47 acres. Beltrani-there is a section of the parcel located across George Sickel Road and it goes north; it is recommended that this be added to the proposed smaller parcel. Unich-can do whatever the Board thinks is best. That is really unusable land. Beltrani-the 25' access from Goerge Sickle does not show improvements, can only be used for a driveway. The front yard setback to be shown. It is an Unlisted Action under SEQR and the Board can approve a negative declaration. A public hearing will be required. Any proposed disturbance is well beyond the 100-year floodplain. UCPB referral is not required as the proposed subdivision is less than 5 lots.

A motion was made by Brady, seconded by Kiniry, to approve a Negative Declaration under SEQR and set the public hearing for the February 18th monthly meeting. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

3. Minor Subdivision (2-Lot), Timothy Unich/30HW Realty LLC, 30 Highwoods Road. Presented by the owner, Tim Unich. The applicant is looking to subdivide the parcel into two lots, one at 2.86 acres that contains an existing house and the other at 5 acres that is currently vacant. Beltrani-same comments regarding front yard setbacks to be shown on map. NYSDEC Article 24 requires that the federal wetlands and the pond need to be screened, approx. 14 acres. A Jurisdictional Determination will have to be submitted to the NYSDEC. May require wetland delineation. There is a 100' buffer outside of any flagged wetlands. Unich-submitted the application this morning to NYSDEC. Beltrani-anything that is within the 100' bugger will require permits from NYSDEC before land disturbance. The NYSDEC will offer to have someone come to the site and make a determination but that can take up to 90-days. If a wetland delineation is completed by the applicant the Planning Board can feel confident enough to move forward with that information. Our firm also has an in-house wetland specialist if the applicant would like to connect with them. Unich-any proposed work is outside of the 100' buffer, would propose a site visit by the Planning Board. Have already reached out to NYSDEC. There is a comment regarding installation of a monument at the property boundary. There is already one present. Beltrani-

denoted on map with monument. This is an Unlisted Action under SEQR. The NOI (Notice of Intent to Serve as Lead Agency) was prepared and can be circulated with the Board's approval.

A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Hlavaty, to declare this an Unlisted Action under SEQR and distribute the NOI. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Kiniry, to set the public hearing for the February 18th monthly meeting.

4. Lot Line Revision, Gregory & Thomasine Helsmoortel/John Rzewski & Fatemeh Nowshad, 27 Barbaras Court & Barbaras Court. Presented by Gregor Helsmoortel. The applicant is looking to eliminate an encroachment created by an existing shed they thought was on their property but in fact was on the adjacent neighbor's parcel. The land is being transferred from Rzewski/Nowshad to Helsmoortel. Beltrani-meets all requirements.

A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Kiniry, to waive sketch plan approval, waive a public hearing, declare a TYPE II Action under SEQR and approve. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS

1. Lot Line Revision, James King & Lara Eurdolian, 383 West Saugerties Road. The applicant, James King, has sent in a request for a 1-year extension on submission of the final maps. This is the first request from the applicant.

A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Hlavaty, to approve the one year extension. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was closed at 9:42 pm.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Becky Bertorelli
Planning Board Secretary