



PLANNING BOARD MINUTES October 15, 2024

C. Howard Post, Chair, opened the meeting at 7:29 p.m. Pledge

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

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

Absent: Kevin Brady

The draft minutes of the September 17, 2024 Planning Board meeting were reviewed. A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Kiniry, to approve as written. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Abstain, Tiano-Abstain, Hlavaty-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

NONE

OLD BUSINESS

1. Site Plan, Stone Creek Commons, 3190 Route 9W. Presented by Chris LaPorta, Passero Associates. Also present, the RSS team. An information flier was distributed to the Board regarding the proposed use. The applicant has decreased the number of proposed rental units from 50 to 47, while still using the previously proposed footprint. This will allow for more office space to be incorporated into the plan. The project has already been submitted to SHPO and a response letter was received and attached with submission. SEQR impacts are small. Stach-the EAF Part I needs to reflect the changes to the plan proposed. The Planning Board can circulate the "Notice of Intent" to serve as Lead Agency once the updated EAF is received. The landscaping plan shows bio retention areas. A lighting plan was also submitted. The applicant should show how the project will look from Route 9W, at eye level into site. The applicant should take the time to answer questions that were presented in the review memo for next month. If the applicant is able to submit the updated EAF by the end of the week the Board can circulate the "NOI" and have enough time for the 30-day response period before the next scheduled Planning Board meeting. Tiano-at the Fire Commissioner's meeting several concerns were raised, will supply the applicant with a letter to address those concerns. What is the difference between a studio and a 1-bedroom? Robert Kane, CFD Housing-the difference is the one-bedroom has a separate defined bedroom area and a studio is one open space consisting of a sleeping area, living area and kitchen. Tiano-there are 8 trash areas depicted inside the structures, can the applicant lower the number of trash rooms within the structure to decrease the possibility of fire in those areas that are confined. The slope on the rear of the building is steep and makes it very difficult for the fire department to place a ladder in the case of a fire. Is there any way to allow some space that is flat to facilitate that? With the placement of the retention ponds it makes it difficult to access the side of the building in case of an emergency. Kane-an UTV will be used, on-site, to access those areas. There is a wetland in the north end and the applicant is trying not to introduce any impervious surface to that area. LaPorta-there is a bridge proposed to support the UTV and allow accessibility. The bio retention pond shown is shallow. The flat areas are pushed as far as the site allows. Tiano-are the apartments for handicapped individuals? Kane-there are 5 ADA accessible units, 3 hearing and visually impaired individuals and the remaining units are handicapped adaptable.

A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Hlavaty, to declare the Town of Saugerties Planning Board as lead agency and allow Becky Bertorelli to distribute the NOI to all involved agencies. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

2. Site Plan Amendment, Derek Winnie/Saugerties Self Storage, 998 Kings Highway. Presented by owner, Derek Winnie. The applicant has met with the fire department on-site to ensure that access is acceptable to all proposed and existing units. Post-the Planning Board had requested that the area of disturbance be identified on the site plan or confirmed, in writing, by an engineer that the total area is less than one acre and a SWPPP is not required. This has not been received to date. Winnie-a letter was submitted from the Building Department regarding the CSX easement, as the applicant did not hear back from CSX themselves. It was confirmed by the Building Inspector that the roadway and structure are outside of the 50' easement. Stach-was the applicant able to locate any deed restrictions regarding the CSX easement? Winnie-no, but from the best of my knowledge as the owner we can not build within the easement and if we do and if maintenance work for CSX is required the owner removes whatever is built at their own expense. Stach-the board will be able to add a condition to the resolution that no additional building can be done on the site until a SWPPP is completed and approved by the Town Engineer. What kind of lighting is proposed, for safety? Winnie-no electric on-site so will install small solar lights, like the ones on the Route 9W site. Found that less lighting deters theft. Will provide solar lights in between the buildings, on buildings. Post-agree that the solar lights are adequate, like the ones at the Route 9W site. They need to be added to the plan. Stach-model, name and indication of location required. Nothing on this current proposed site plan has been approved, as the buildings are not the same size as the previously approved site plan. All lighting must be 3,000 K color setting or less. Even though the Board has received the permit approval letter from the Ulster County Department of Public Works, the Board will still require a letter from UCDPW stating that the curb cut is appropriate and has been approved. The Planning Board is the only involved agency and can commence uncoordinated review. The Board can review SEQR based on the previously approved negative declaration and re-affirm if there have been no significant changes in those requirements. Post-does not look like there is anything that would affect the previous negative declaration approval. A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Kiniry, to re-affirm the previously approved negative declaration under SEQR. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried. Tiano-there is a ditch to the back catch basin? Winnie-will be filling that in. Stach-a note will be required on the site plan that no doors can be installed on the east of the rear building, closest to the railroad. This does have to be referred to the Ulster County Planning Board, as Kings Highway is a County road. A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Riozzi, to refer to UCPB. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE

1. Site Plan, Viacheslav Kiselev & Irina Kurdani, 315 Old Route 212. Presented by owner Viacheslav Kiselev. The applicant is proposing to install two additions to the existing single family residence. One addition for a living room and the second for a master bedroom. The addition on the southwest side of the house will require a setback area variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals to meet the zoning requirement. The applicant is currently before the ZBA to acquire that variance. The additions will be built on piers and fill will be brought into the site to raise the elevation. Beltrani-the applicant is before the Board because the parcel is located in the Waterfront Overlay district and site plan approval is required. The watercourse is on the opposite side of Old Route 212 from this site. No impacts to the waterfront have been found. If lighting is proposed, specifications of the fixtures and locations will need to be shown on the site plan. Kiselev-there are no houses on any adjoining parcels within sight distance. There are houses on the opposite side of Route 212. Will be installing a Ring motion sensor light facing the driveway (towards Old Route 212). Stach-the applicant should provide the Board with a list of lights and their specs. As the Board has done previously, conditional approval can be granted pending lighting information and approval of the side yard variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

A motion was made by Riozzi, seconded by Hlavaty, to conditionally approve the site plan pending lighting specifications submission and ZBA approval of required side yard area setbacks to meet zoning requirements. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

2. Minor Subdivision (2-Lot), Chestnut Hill Holdings Group LLC, Chestnut Hill Road. Presented by owner, Richard Rothe. The applicant is proposing a two lot subdivision on a 28.3 acre parcel. There is an existing 50' ROW through lots that follows the existing roadway. Creating the new +/- 3.5 acres lot for son to build a house, noted as Lot #2. Test holes have been completed and there is room for a septic system on both proposed parcels. The topography is not on the sketch plat. The access to remaining lands and adjacent parcel is via a 25' ROW. That Would not like that to be larger to deter additional subdivision of land. Beltrani-is the 25' ROW shown with the past lot line revisions? Post-yes. Beltrani-topography is required. Lot #2 needs to demonstrate buildability, even if that is not the present plan. There is a stream where a culvert is required for access to the back remaining lands. There are wetlands on the larger parcel but no wetlands have been noted on the new proposed parcel. Suggest a 50' ROW over Lot #2 to Lot #1 for future development. Leave 25' ROW to the neighbor. Stach- a note can be added to the map that the access road to Lot #1 will have to be improved to Private Rural Road Standards if additional development is proposed. Beltrani-wetland data on Lot #1 needs to be added, stream to be avoided with future development. This is an Unlisted Action under SEQR. No other involved agencies. The Planning Board can declare Lead Agency. The land disturbance is less than one acre. Will require submission to SHPO through the CRIS system. A public hearing is required. The applicant will be required to contact the Highway Superintendent to look at Chestnut Hill Road as it only has a single point of entry. The Fire Department should review as well, this is located within the Centerville Fire District.

A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Kiniry, to declare this an Unlisted Action under SEQR. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Kiniry, seconded by Tiano, to schedule the public hearing for the November 19, 2024 Planning Board meeting. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

3. & 4. Lot Line Revision & Site Plan, Derek Winnie/Saugerties Self Storage, Inc., 3058 Route 9W & 2307 Route 32. Presented by the owner, Derek Winnie. The applicant is proposing to do a lot line adjustment and remove the lot between the two adjoining parcels, creating one larger parcel. The applicant is proposing to extend the existing self storage facility, on 2307 Route 32, onto the acquired parcel. The rear building proposed on 3058 Route 9W will be 5' from the property line and follow a pre-existing setback of the current structure. Stach-the applicant should show division of the parcel being added to 2307 Route 32 and the parcel to the North (3064 Route 9W) with landscaping or a curb of some sort. The sidewalk along Route 9W is to be extended to follow the acquired parcel. The applicant does not show the 20' side yard setback and will either have to adjust the size or location of the building or apply for an area variance to meet that setback requirement. The front yard setback needs to be 40' from the property line, adjustments will have to be made or a variance is required. Located in the Gateway Overlay, so landscaping will need to be addressed and a plan submitted. Winnie-plan to match what is on 2307 Route 32 and continue. There is a NYS DOT curb cut that is 20' wide. Stach-define that with landscaping. Beltrani-something low for sight distance. Winnie-there are no dumpsters proposed on-site, do not currently provide and would like to keep it that way. Stach-the Board will require an updated SEAF using the DEC EAF Mapper. Once that is received the Planning Board will be able to circular the "Notice of Intent" to serve as lead agency. UCPB referral is required as it is located on a State Road. Lot Line Revisions are considered a Type II Action and no further SEQR review is required.

A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Furman, to waive sketch plan approval, waive a public hearing and approve the Lot Line Adjustment to remove the lot line between the two parcels and create one larger parcel. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Tiano, to refer the site plan application to the Ulster County Planning Board for review. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Kiniry, to circulate the “NOI” once the updated SEAF is received from the applicant. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

5. Lot Line Revision, Jason Moshos, 416, 418, 422 & 424 York Street. Presented by Khattar Elmassalemah, P.E. of Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant is proposing to adjust lot lines between adjoining parcels, all owned by him, to eliminate several encroachments, lot lines going through buildings and lessen some of the pre-existing non-conformities. Beltrani-the section of Lot C that does not pertain to this lot line revision should not be included. That section is not relevant to the lot line revisions themselves. There will be no expansions of non-conformities but correction of some. The applicant will have to update the plat to eliminate the street abandonment area adjacent to Lot C. This is a Type II Action under SEQR and does not require further review. Post-any questions. None.

A motion was made by Riozzi, seconded by Hlavaty, to waive sketch plan approval, waive a public hearing and approve the lot line revisions. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

6. Major Subdivision, Littleton Partners LLC, Goat Hill Road. Presented by the engineer, Darrin Elsom, Kaaterskill Associates. The applicant is proposing a 5-lot major subdivision on the 30.1 acre parcel. Wetland delineation has been completed. Awaiting the topography maps to submit Will require a private rural road and construct to standards set forth in the zoning, hoping that the Planning Board will give some relief regarding the 1,200’ requirement. A Road Maintenance Agreement will be drafted. Beltrani-a waiver can be requested from the Board but it will also need to be approved by the Fire Department and Town Engineer. There is dense forest located on site and the Board will most likely want to do a site visit to note trees that are larger than 6” in diameter. This is an Unlisted Action under SEQR, the DEC and DOH are the other involved agencies.

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

7. Site Plan, Edward Portnoy & Mira Blushtein, 117 Glenerie Lane. Presented by Matthew Towne, P.E., Willingham Engineering. The applicant is before the Board because the parcel is located in the Waterfront Overlay district and they are proposing to build a single family residence. Site plan approval is required. The applicant will be disturbing over 1-acre, a SWPPP has been completed and submitted to the Town Engineer for review and approval. Beltrani-the elements that the Planning Board are going to be most interested in lighting, elevations of the structure and non-reflective glass. These items can be shown as notes on plans. The Board can require full cutoff lighting or spec sheets, elevations and non reflective glass as conditions of approval.

A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Hlavaty, to approve the site plan with the conditions as stated. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

8. Lot Line Revision, John Staccion & Bipin Patel, 28 & 12 Railroad Avenue. Presented by Donald Brewer, Donald Brewer Surveying Inc. The applicant is proposing a lot line revision to move the existing lot line to follow the ridge; it makes more sense with the topography for Lot 2 to own the ledge. After the proposed revision Lot 2 will be 3.143 acres and Lot 1 will be 1.721 acres. They both have public water and sewer. All setback requirements are met. There is an easement over the lower portion of Lot 1 to Lot 2 but it is not required as Lot 2 has separate access directly to Railroad Avenue. Beltrani-the lot line revision as proposed meets requirement, creating a flag lot with appropriate frontage.

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

ADDITIONAL ITEMS

None

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was closed at 9:20 pm.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Becky Bertorelli
Planning Board Secretary