



PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
VIRTUAL -WebEX
January 19, 2021

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

Present: C. Howard Post, Carole Furman, Ken Goldberg, Kevin Brady, Mike Tiano, Len Bouren, William Creen, Adriana Beltrani (Town Planner, NPV).

Absent: Robert Hlavaty

The draft minutes of the December 15, 2020 and December 29, 2021 Planning Board meetings were reviewed. A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Tiano, to approve both as written. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Creen-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried.

Post took a moment to introduce our new Planning Board member that will be serving out the remainder of Dan Ellsworth's term, Kevin Brady. Also, Carole Furman has accepted the position of Vice-Chairperson, Robert Hlavaty has moved to full time member and William Creen has moved to the alternate position. Thank you each of you for your dedication and volunteering your time.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

NONE

OLD BUSINESS

1. Site Plan, Jeffrey Court Properties, LLC, Jeffrey Court. Presented by Khattar Elmassalmah, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C., for the owners. This application was previously presented to the Board in December 2019 but the project was put on hold due to the pandemic. The owners would now like to move forward. The lot is an 8-acre parcel located in the High Density Residential zoning district, with access from Jeffrey Court. The applicant is looking to construct two 3-story buildings with 12 units in each building, for a total of 24 apartments. The applicant has proposed 41 parking spaces, which is over the requirement of 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit. There is a refuse area, small maintenance building, and a hammerhead designed according to fire code for movement. The wetland delineation was completed in 2018 and a copy provided. Beltrani-what is the actual height of the building? Concern regarding adequate parking, even though the requirement is 1.5 spaces per unit the Planning Board may want to propose 2 per unit, as it is more realistic. The proposed 41 spaces does not leave room for visitor parking. Elmassalmah-the building height, peak to grade, is 35' and the proposed buildings are 32' wide. A note will be added to the site plan. Some grading has been shown but the area of disturbance will be less than 1 acre. There will be no further development on the parcel than what is shown. The landscaping can definitely be changed to ensure that invasive plantings are not being used. Beltrani-a traffic analysis should be performed. Elmassalmah-we only foresee an increase of maybe 20 to 30 trips, so it is way under the 100 trip threshold to require a traffic study. Beltrani-did the fire department get to review, any comments? The land in the back of the proposed development, will it be used, future development? A note may be warranted to state that no further development is proposed, if that is the case. How is the dumpster area screened? Dimensions? This is an Unlisted Action under SEQR. Archeology is warranted. This will have to be referred to the Ulster County Planning Board (UCPB) for their review and recommendation. The Town Engineer will review the

grading and utility plan. Need a more completed plan for the next submission for the Planning Board to act. Elmassalmah-it was sent to them but have not received comment yet. There is a fence proposed around the dumpster location, 42" high galvanized mesh. Did try to submit to the CRIS system today but was having issues, it finally went through and a case was created. We will tie into municipal water and sewer, no disturbance will be needed to do so. Would like to have a further discussion regarding parking. The proposed parking spots now include 36 full size (9'x36') and 5 compact car spaces (8' wide) Post-maybe the refuse can be moved to allow for more parking. Furman-any EV ready spaces proposed? Elmassalmah-will look how we can reconfigure to try and get closer to the 48 spaces, 2 per unit. We have the ability to possibly add an EV space by the maintenance building. Goldberg-a traffic study may be a good idea, there have been several projects added to this area within the last few years. Post-we could do a review of the approved projects in the area, the good thing is that access is via Village Drive which does have a traffic light at the intersection with 9W. Furman-this is a private dead road, will the applicant propose anything to help with the added traffic to the neighborhood? Post-a public hearing is not required but it would be in the best interest of the Planning Board and the applicant to host one. Tiano-the Glasco Fire Department has concerns regarding the accessibility for emergency vehicles. Information was received but not in time for the Commissioner's meeting, it will be reviewed at the next one. Glasco does not have a ladder truck to accommodate a 3-story building and will have to receive mutual aid from another department in the case of an emergency. The Fire Chief will be putting together a memo regarding concerns. A big issue is the width of the parking lot, there is not enough room for the emergency vehicles that will be required, 3 automatically respond from Glasco (protocol) and an additional ladder truck from the department that they receive mutual aid from. Another concern is regarding emergency access to the third floor, is there an elevator? It will be difficult for EMS to carry a gurney down three levels of stairs. Siamese connections in the front of the building? Can the buildings be lowered to 2-stories? Would request a traffic study be done. Furman-a sprinkler system will be required, correct? Elmassalmah-we can lower the pitch of the building so that the height goes down to 32'. There is currently a building in the Glasco Fire District that is 34' high and we can go lower, with the three floors. There is a sprinkler system required.

Post-pollled the Board to see if there were any additional questions/concerns at this time:
Furman-no, Goldberg-no, Tiano-good for now, Post-no, Bouren-no, Brady-no, Creen-no.

Post-no further action can be taken by the Board at this time.

2. Minor Subdivision, 71Goathill3, LLC, 71 Goat Hill Road. Presented by Charles Holts, PLS, for the applicant/owner. There was a lengthy discussion regarding if private rural road standards are required for the access drive to the two lots. There is a 50' ROW marked on the sketch map. The applicant would like to try and avoid private rural road standards if possible. The surveyor is wondering if the remaining parcel, when Lot 1 is subdivided, will meet flag lot requirements? The two parcels will share a common drive with access off Goat Hill Road, the shared length of the drive will be approximately 382'. According to the Town Zoning Law any access drive over 300' in length will be required to meet private rural road standards. Beltrani-it is my suggestion that the applicant design the access road to meet the private rural road standards in the event that future development is anticipated for the remaining land, Lot 2. That lot is not considered a flag lot. Holtz-both lots meet the requirements for frontage on Goat Hill Road. Not much of an issue with grading. Beltrani-the Town Engineer or the Highway Superintendent will need to review for a private rural road. The limits of disturbance must be shown to determine if a SWPPP is required. If it is less than an acre of disturbance the Planning Board can schedule a Public Hearing, or can wait on feedback regarding the roadway. Post-we can schedule a public hearing and move forward.

A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Goldberg, to declare this an Unlisted Action under SEQR. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion Carried. A motion was made by Furman, seconded Goldberg, to approve a negative declaration. Board Vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Furman, to set the public hearing for the February 16, 2021 meeting. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion Carried.

PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE

1. Site Plan/SUP, Family of Woodstock/Solar Generation, 454 Washington Avenue Extension.

Beltrani-there was an oversight at the workshop regarding whether this type of action is even permitted in the zoning district. As per legal advice, we will be tabling this review until a meeting can be had with the Planning Board attorney, Building Inspector and Town Planner to discuss if this is an allowable use, with SUP, in the zoning district. Paul McMenemy, Solar Generation, was present. McMenemy-just to be clear the proposed solar project will only be for the benefit of Family of Woodstock. They will be the sole offtaker of the energy that is produced. Just let us know what we can do to help.

No further action can be taken by the Board.

2. Lot Line Revisions, John Mullen/Greenspace Realty, LLC, Broadway Road. Presented by Bruce Utter, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. Utter-the applicant is looking to do nine lot line changes to lands located in the Glasco Ponds Subdivision on Broadway Road. The owner has acquired an adjacent parcel, previously owned by Central Hudson, and would like to distribute some of that parcel to existing lots #31-37 in the Glasco Ponds subdivision. The acquired parcel is landlocked, there is an old wood road on the westerly side but that is the only access. Beltrani-this parcel has been landlocked for some time, are there further plans for development? Utter-there may be but none is proposed at this time.

Post polled the Board to see if there were any further questions/concerns: Goldberg-no, Furman-no, Bouren-no, Brady-no, Post-no, Creen-no. A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Furman, to declare this a Type II Action under SEQR. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Furman, to waive the Public Hearing and Sketch Plan Review. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Bouren, to approve the lot line revisions, pending maps with owner's signatures and payment of outstanding fees. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried.

3. Major Subdivision, Catskill Terraces/HV Contemporary Homes, LLC, Ralph Vedder Road/Manorville Road. Presented by Jeff Hogan, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant is requesting to develop a 10-lot subdivision which will be created using the total acreage of three existing lots combined. Proposed Lot 1 and Lot 2 will have access off Manorville Road via a proposed private rural road and ROW. Proposed Lot 3 through 6 will have access off Manorville Road via proposed private rural road with 50' ROWs. Proposed Lot 7 through 10 will have access off Ralph Vedder Road via a proposed private rural road, which is under 1,200 square feet. Due to the steep ledge to the east of lots 1-6 access is not feasible from one common entrance. Due to additional steep ledges and wetlands

two private roads are proposed for lots 1-6 as described previously. All lots are well over the required bulk area in the zoning district. Beltrani-the applicant may have to go through a “Conservation Subdivision”, §245-23(B) in the zoning code actually requires a subdivision of this nature and located in this zoning district actually go through the process. Hogan-the applicant would like to keep the subdivision private. Beltrani-a conservation analysis may be required, it looks at the density and environmental factors. However, in §245-23(B)(g) of the zoning law does state that if there is no reasonable basis for requiring a conservation subdivision the Board may approve a conventional development. The applicant would have to demonstrate through a series of criteria and outlined with a conservation analysis. This is the first meeting that the applicant is before the Board so I want to make it known that this is a possible requirement, conservation subdivision/cluster subdivision. This project is an Unlisted Action under SEQR, the Board may require a Full EAF because of the number of lots, which will help with the conservation analysis. A SWPPP will be required, 15 acres of disturbance is being proposed. No further action can be taken by the Board until a conservation and density analysis have been performed. County referral, Fire Department comment and Engineer review will be required. Hogan-as far as the Conservation Subdivision, did some review and in regards to the lower area of the subdivision. If I calculate the constrained area it comes out to be 11.8 acres of the total 44 acres, of the proposed lower subdivision. This means the applicant would be able to develop approximately 32 acres and in the sensitive area overlay would allow them to create 8 lots where they are only looking to create 6. When doing the calculation for the proposed upper subdivision I get the same type of outcome, the applicant could do 8 lots, but are only proposing 4. Not sure that the proposed upper subdivision, with access off Ralph Vedder Road, meets the requirements for a Conservation Subdivision, if we are considering each existing parcel separately for the subdivision purposes. I know the applicant would like to move forward with a conventional subdivision and is willing to do what is necessary to try and make that happen. Beltrani-request a conservation analysis be submitted to move forward. Provide a sketch of what a conservation subdivision will look like compared to the conventional subdivision layout. The Planning Board will have to consider all aspects of a conservation easement on the balance of the property. Lot configuration is unique. Fuman-my understanding of conservation subdivisions is that it would cluster, meantin that you would bring houses closer together and not using a ton of acreage for each proposed house. Leaving the rest of the land unused. Beltrani-the point is to conserve sensitive areas. It would be at the Planning Board’s discretion if they would like to involve the Conservation Advisory Committee. Hogan-the owners of the property want to offer larger lots to prospective buyers, giving them privacy. Post-I think it would be defeating the purpose of a “Sensitive Area Overlay” to have them do a cluster subdivision, the proposed is more fitting in the area. No further action can be taken by the Planning Board at this time.

4. Lot Line Revision, Charlie Nemiroff/Robert & Linda Gippert, 227 Hommelville Road/Hommelville Road. Tom Conard, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C., presented. The applicant is proposing to move 1.150 acres from Parcel B to Parcel A. Both parcels have frontage on Hommelville Road and meet bulk area requirements.

A motion was made by Godlberg, seconded by Tiano, to declare this a Type II Action under SEQR. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Brady, to approve the lot line revision. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried with supermajority vote.

5. Major Subdivision, Joseph Gambino, 3524 Route 32. Bill Stade, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C., presented. The applicant's parcel is located in three zoning districts, MDR/LDR/HB. The LDR section

of the parcel is a triangular section located in the middle. The applicant would like to have the LDR zoning changed to MDR, HB remaining the same as it currently is. Beltrani-the applicant will need to receive Town Board approval to do so, scheduled to go before the Town Board January 20, 2021. A memo to the Town Board regarding the petition for rezoning from the Planning Board was drafted and distributed to the Planning Board for their review. It seems a little strange that a small section of LDR is located in the middle of a parcel where all the surrounding area to the north and east is MDR. The rezoning would be consistent with the zoning purposes. Post-this would be correcting what seems to be an error made previously when the area was zoned. Goldberg-reasonable this to do, based on what is located around that specific parcel. The Board agrees with Beltrani's comments and the correction of the error. A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Creen, to accept the memo and have it sent to the Town Board as recommendation. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Since there was no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Furman, to adjourn the meeting. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried The meeting was closed at 9:21 pm.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Becky Bertorelli
Planning Board Secretary