



PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
VIRTUAL -WebEX
May 18, 2021

C. Howard Post, Chairperson, opened the meeting at 7:47 p.m. with apologies as there were technical difficulties.

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

The draft minutes of the April 20, 2021 Planning Board meetings were reviewed. A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Hlavaty, to approve. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Furman-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-abstained. Motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Site Plan, Jeffrey Court Properties, LLC, Jeffrey Court. Presented by Khattar Elmassalmah, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. This is an open public hearing continued from the March 16, 2021 meeting. Elmassalmah-have met with the Town Planner and Town Engineer at the site to review the requirements. May require a full SWPPP for the proposed apartment complex. Reviewed the suggestions of a picnic and playground area with the developer. There was a 2006 site plan presented to the Planning Board for a regrading project. There is currently Town drainage that empties into this site and would like to somehow go back and look into incorporating what was previously presented, in 2006, into whatever the applicant wishes to move forward with. Received a letter from Tom Francello regarding landscaping suggestions, it was appreciated. Received a letter from Mike Tiano regarding the fire access and the most recent fire that occurred in a similar complex. Reviewed the many comments received from the public with the applicant and are looking at what direction to go with the design/project.

Post-since the applicant is proposing that the scope of the project is probably going to change would suggest that the Planning Board close this public hearing and require that another one when the updated site plan is submitted. Beltrani-once an updated site plan/scope of work are submitted then the Planning Board would have the opportunity to open another public hearing for public comments regarding that updated site plan. Post-poll the Board regarding closing the public hearing at this time: Goldberg-fine with requiring a new public hearing, as long as nothing major changes. Furman-deferring it as long as it will be reviewed again, with public hearing. Bouren-agree that another public hearing is necessary. Tiano-no problem closing this one. Hlavaty-agree. Creen-agree. A motion was made by Post, seconded by Furman, to close this public hearing but require that another one be scheduled when a new site plan is submitted. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furamn-Aye Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried.

Board comments:

Goldberg-3-stories seems to be the major issue, is there any way that the applicant can get the same number of apartments with 2-stories? Elmassalmah-the applicant was trying to minimize the footprint of the project on the land. It can be looked at, there are many considerations at this point including stormwater, 3-story height and access. Looking at different directions for development of this particular parcel. Goldberg-more than 8-acres are available on this parcel. Elmassalmah-there is only about 4-acres that are usable. Furman-access issue is important, school busses, traffic, would prefer 2-access points. Elmassalmah-Jeffrey Court is only 22' wide which is 2' shy of the actual road requirements for the Town, not sure how that has happened. Going through Bishop's Gate is impossible with the topography of the parcel. Bouren-agree with access and would like to see recreation on-site for the residents' use. Like a playground and trails. Elmassalmah-will discuss with the applicant. Tiano-when a traffic study is completed would like to see it. If the applicant reduces the height of the apartment buildings to 2-stories there will be no issue for the Glasco Fire Department. The pictures that were supplied from the recent apartment complex fire in Kingston were for reference to see how many vehicles and trucks responded and the area that was needed for the ladder trucks with their outriggers down. I believe that Jeffrey Court is only fed with a 6" line and that can be an issue for pressure. If an access loop was provided or secondary access it would be beneficial. Hlavaty-no issues at this time. Brady-echo Furman, access is a significant issue that must be addressed. The character of the neighborhood has to be considered and fire management as well. Beltrani-no additional comments at this time, would be happy to hear the different options that the applicant is looking at. Keep in mind there may be trees on site that are required to be preserved and can be addressed when a new site plan is submitted. Post- no further action by the Board at this time.

2. Major Subdivision, Joseph Gambino, 3524 Route 32. Presented by Bill Stade, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. This is a proposed 5-lot subdivision of a 32-acre parcel of land located off Route 32. Currently operating a business on the parcel. The Town Board recently approved the rezoning of the LDR section of the parcel to MDR to fit the surrounding zoning districts. Sediment and erosion control plan was submitted to the Town Engineer for review.

Post opened the public hearing at 8:11pm. Public comments:

- Marilyn Freeburg, 3574 Route 32-main concern is water supply being affected by the additional wells that will be installed for the proposed lots. Is the applicant responsible for any issues that may occur? Stade-studies for the water have not been done yet. Beltrani-perk tests are done and they will tell the applicant if the water supply is up to standards and ensure that surrounding well water is not affected. There are requirements for setbacks for septic tanks that must be followed. Freeburg-worried more about the financial responsibility if our well is affected and we have to drill a new one. Gambino-will be required to receive permits and approvals for well and sewer from the Ulster County Health Department (UCHD) and the company that performs the work to install the wells/sewers will have insurance that would cover any issues, that would be their fault. Stade-all wells meet code and are located to ensure that they meet setback requirements. Beltrani-will go through the Ulster County Health Department for the required permits and approvals.
- Toni Berzal, 97 High Falls Road-work has already been done on the High Falls Road side of the parcel that is proposed to be subdivided. What is being proposed on that side? Beltrani-showing a lot line for proposed Lot 2. There should be no clearing done on any of the parcels once the project is before the Planning Board. They are not allowed to do any work until the process is completed and/or approved. Berzal-currently dumping concrete and blacktop in a hole and there is a road already installed. Gambino-that was all performed several

months ago, already spoke to the Building and he had told me that as long as it did not go over 1-acre the potential buyer could start clearing the land. Beltrani-the potential buyer does not have any rights to that property until it is sold. Suggest that the neighbors alert the Building Department to that issue.

- Doug Brandt & Cherly Premod representing mother, June Brandt who lives at 63 High Falls Road-work is still going on that should not be going on. Concerned with the drainage issues. Lot 1 what is being proposed, will have additional concerns/comments. Post-can be submitted to the Planning Board in writing. Premod-the clearing started last fall, there are 4' tall mounds of shale, trees removed as late as April 2021. There are big holes being filled with various materials being dumped.
- Roger Stinemire, 3550 Route 32-concern is with Lot 3, there is natural run-off due to topography and the rocky terrain. There is a ditch between us and the neighbor's property that fills quickly already, worried about the additional runoff. Hoping the Stormwater plan will ensure that there is no additional runoff to our property. What is put into the SWPPP to ensure that it is maintained? Concern with the privacy from Lot 3, the southern border mostly, there is only a 20' section shown as a buffer between our property and that lot. Would request a larger privacy buffer. Also have concerns with the impact on existing wells. Gambino-looking to put each house as far away from existing lots for privacy. The well for my shop was drilled and there were no issues to anyone in the surrounding area. The engineers will acquire permits and approvals for setbacks from the UCHD. Stade-will keep as much natural screening as possible to preserve privacy. A note to that effect can be added to the map. Stinemire-increasing the buffer along Lot 3 would be appreciated. Gambino-there is over 200' to the lot line and will not go more than 100' into that buffer.
- Mike Melville, High Falls Road-there is a quarry that has been filled with concrete and blacktop, part of it is on the parcel involved with the proposed subdivision but the whole quarry is not owned by the applicant. Do not want to see it filled. Gambino-I put the blacktop from my old driveway in my section of the quarry. Contacted the DEC prior to doing so to see what could be put in there. They said anything rock or rubble. There will be additional dumping into that area. Want to ensure that roads being installed are built to Town specifications. There are rumors that they plan to put the mechanics shop up on High Falls Road; there is no commercial zoning in that area. Post-that is not part of this application so we can not speak about that until a plan is presented.
- Joanne Melville, 31 High Falls Road-no decisions will be made tonight? Post-no the Planning Board plans to keep this public hearing open at this time.

Beltrani-roads will be required to be installed to Town specifications and reviewed by the Town Engineer. The Planning Board did not know about the work that was currently being done so thank you to the public for getting us that information. Goldberg-will be open until next month so any comments can be submitted in writing. Post-carried over and awaiting the SWPPP for the Town Engineer's review. No further action can be taken by the Board at this time.

3. Minor Subdivision, Bernice O'Conner, 122 Railroad Avenue. Presented by Jeff Hogan, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The parcel is 2.4 acres and the applicant is proposing to subdivide, Lot #1 for a new house and Lot #2 with an existing house. There is a Town maintained section of road that goes through the parcel connecting Kings Highway to Railroad Avenue. Would like to subdivide a little over an acre to give to daughter. There is public water and sewer. No proposed construction on the existing house lot.

Post opened the public hearing at 8:51pm. Public comments:

- Jodi Judson, 117 Railroad Avenue-there is an existing historical marker will it stay?
Hogan-there is no proposed construction along the Kings Highway side, so do not see that it will be affected. Just connecting the public water and sewer in that area. Can show it on the map to ensure that it is not affected. Judson-is the proposed house 1-story or 2-story? There are electric lines shown and they seem to be within my view. Hogan-yes, there are existing utility poles along the westerly property line that would probably tie into one of them and run underground to the house. Zoning setbacks will be adhered to and discussed with the applicant the house being more to the north below the ledge. No control over the adjacent property views, unfortunately. Can only make suggestions. There is no house design proposed yet so not sure if it will be 1 or 2 stories.

Post-any additional public comments? None. A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Tiano, to declare this an Unlisted Action under SEQR and re-approve a negative declaration. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furamn-Aye, Post-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Brady-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Post, seconded by Furman, to close the public hearing. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furamn-Aye, Post-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Brady-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried and the public hearing was closed at 8:58pm.

Board comments: Goldberg-no. Furman-the pass through road cuts off as a section of the parcel that is left across from the proposed lots would like a note added that it is not a buildable lot. Hogan-will do and that section of roadway has a Town 50' ROW and public access with Town maintenance. Bouren-no. Tiano-the historical marker is located in the NE section of the parcel near where the driveway is being proposed, look at not moving it. Hlavaty-no. Brady-no. Creen-no. Post-no. Beltrani-all comments have been addressed.

A motion was made by Post, seconded by Brady, to approve the subdivision with the usual conditions. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Brady-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Major Subdivision, Catskill Terraces/HV Contemporary Homes, LLC, Ralph Vedder Road/Manorville Road. Presented by Jeff Hogan, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. Just wanted to get on the agenda this month to see if we can get the Board's ok to submit the SWPPP, when completed, to the Town Engineer to begin the review process. Post-yes, there is no need for a motion to approve, just go ahead and forward it when ready.

2. Site Plan, Embassy Holdings LLC, 334 Route 212. Presented by Khattar Elmassalmah, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. At the last meeting there were concerns with parking and traffic circulation/stacking. Changed the site plan layout to assist with stacking and traffic, moving the handicapped parking and creating a one-way traffic. No effects on the parking area now. The landscaping and lighting plans still need to be discussed with Starbucks and the Town. Post-like this proposed site plan much better. Poll the Board on layout: Goldberg-is there a total size change? Will it remain a Type II action under SEQR? Elmassalmah-yes, because of the change in pattern. Beltrani-it will remain a Type II action. Furman-good. Bouren-good. Tiano-good. Post-good. Hlavaty-good. Brady-good.

Elmassalmah-will have to confer with the Building Inspector to make a determination on what is the front of the building in order to see if an area variance is needed for the rear setback. If it is determined

that the front is considered the part of the parcel that runs along Route 212 a rear yard setback for the building will be required. The applicant would be able to share parking with the larger parking lot in the back, the same owner, provisions will be made. Beltrani-conventionally the front yard would be alongside Route 212 but will await the Building Inspector's determination. Post-make referral to Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) and confer with the Building Inspector in the interim. A motion was made by Furman, Seconded by Tiano, to refer to the ZBA for a rear yard setback area variance. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried.

Beltrani-will need correspondence from the DOT for the closing of the curb cut on Route 212. Will there be a loading dock? Signage needs to be shown, menu sign permit, will need a more complete site plan and will require UCPB referral. Elmassalmah-no deliveries, will get information regarding signage from Starbucks and their requirements.

3. Minor Subdivision/Site Plan, Brapas Land Development LLC, Route 9W/off Tiger Maple Lane. Michael Vetere, surveyor, presented. To be clear only here for the minor subdivision and have no information regarding the site plan that has previously been before the board. This is for a 2-lot subdivision, creating a 1-acre lot from the 38.5-acre parcel. The subdivision was required as part of the previously presented site plan, currently still being reviewed by the Planning Board. Sewer and water were corrected on the sketch plan as requested by the Town Planner, as well as adding the adjoining owners. Beltrani-this minor subdivision will need to be done in conjunction with the site plan that is currently before the board and not as a separate application. Vetere-not privy to that information and therefore can not move forward with the site plan aspect. Beltrani-the applicant should hire an engineer to facilitate the entire process as a whole, the site plan and the minor subdivision. Need to show buildability, need a completely new application to present both. Vetere-soto ensure that I have it correct, the minor subdivision needs to be forwarded to an engineer, of the applicant's choice, and done under the same application process with the Planning Board as the site plan. Post-this is considered an incomplete application at this time and they need to withdraw the site plan or just move forward with an engineer to do both together. Beltrani-there have been several lengthy memos completed for this project and sent to the applicant explaining the process, they can always attend another workshop or just hire an engineer to do move forward with the process for them. for the minor subdivision and the site plan together, as one. Vetere-will go back to the client and let them know that this will need to be included with the original site plan as one application. Beltrani-the most recent site plan that the applicant submitted was insufficient.

4. Site Plan Amendment, Canos Recycling LLC, 1083 Kings Highway. Presented by Charles Wesley, architect. Beltrani-the amendment was presented to the Board to include motor vehicle in-take and drainage. A Special Use Permit was issued previously for a dry metal recycling facility with conditions. The site plan showed outdoor storage and that is not permitted unless it is considered an accessory use to the main use. Thought they may need a use variance from the ZBA but do not if the new use is considered an accessory use to dry metal recycling by the Building Department. There are questions as to whether the applicant has been adhering to the 2019 SUP approval, including such items as: all processing of materials shall be done inside the building, stored and will only be on-site for a 120-days maximum before removed from the facility. Currently they are in violation of the SUP as these items are not being adhered to. Sediment and erosion need to be shown. Building heights need to be indicated. Parking calculations need to be put on the plans. NYS Thruway should be approached regarding the sign in the viewshed, if that is no longer proposed then it needs to be removed from the site plan. If not, it will need NYS Thruway approval. Landscaping species and size need to be

indicated. Level of detail of that will be up to the Board. Landscaping should include maintenance notes with replacement. Buffers between the site and neighboring properties should be addressed. Truck calculations should be noted, number entering and leaving the site. How will deliveries be accomplished? Removal of recycled materials? It is indicated that there will be 80-100 deliveries, will these be via pick-up trucks, are these outgoing and incoming? Where do the shipping containers come from? One day in and out? The existing trips exceed the approved 2019 SUP. §245 of the zoning code references the ability of the Planning Board to revoke a SUP if not being adhered to. The April 2021 site plan shows detail and location of storage, however, more details are necessary as indicated in the latest memo. Vehicle details need to be located on site plan, business hours, chemical storage and runoff provisions. Wesley-does the board have any erosion control measure suggestions? Beltrani-need to meet the requirements of NYS. Wesley-there is only one building on-site and it is existing, 12'-13- feet height. There will be two storage containers with a tarp totalling 16' in height. Parking will stay with the same 8 spots. NYS Thruway has not been contacted, but it will be done. As far as landscaping looking to plant white cedar, can add note to site plan, height at time of plantings will be 10'tall. Will be installing new gravel on hard firm ground. Deliveries are individuals with pick-up trucks/trailers with dry metals. Cars will be brought in on a flatbed or truck. One vehicle at a time and as the number of vehicles approaches 8 the professional removal company is called to pick up. The purchaser needs to pick up 8 at a time. There will be no more than 8 stored on the concrete pad that is proposed. Shipping containers are on-site and are taken away when they reach 45,000 pounds. As far as not adhering to the SUP, the business has grown tremendously and is trying to keep up with it. Beltrani-if that is the case you need to come back before the Planning Board when it starts to happen and amend the current SUP to ensure you are following zoning code. There are conditions that are added to SUP and those must be followed and if the applicant sees a trend that may require a change they are required to come back before the Planning Board to address those changes. Wesley-the vehicles will be drained onsite. Beltrani-will need a description/specifications of the storage containers, where they will be stored and how often they will be removed and by whom. All this will ensure the safety of hazardous materials and possibility of explosion. There needs to be a safety plan in place. The more information given the better in order for the Board to make an informed decision. Wesley-it was determined, as addressed in a letter from the Building Inspector dated April 2012, that the use being requested is an accessory use to the dry metal recycling business. Beltrani-that letter was not specific to this project but used for reference to what may be considered an accessory use. Not subject to this review. Wesley-the residential property that buffers the site is owned by the owner of the facility, all buffering will remain the same as it currently is. Would like to ask that a public hearing be waived. Beltrani-that is not an option as this is actually an amendment for a SUP permit along with the Site Plan Amendment.

Board comments:

Goldberg-made a visit to the site a couple of days ago and saw that most of the conditions of the 2019 SUP approval have been violated. Wesley-the business has grown quickly and the result is the excess amount of metal onsite. Goldberg-once the applicant felt that they were violating the SUP conditions they should have come back for an amendment. Concerned that if we amend the SUP at this point will those new updated conditions be adhered to. Furman-concerned with the number of containers onsite, would like the trailers that are onsite removed that are being used as visual buffers. Please explain the process when a vehicle is brought into the site. Wesley-the vehicle will come in on the flatbed/truck, be weighed on the new proposed scale while still on the flatbed/truck, brought to the rear of the property, drained, move to the concrete pad and piled with a forklift (3-cars high max.) and removed by a professional offtaker when 8 vehicles are onsite. The trailers by the Thruway will be removed. They were only used to cover the view from the Thruway. Landscaping will be in place. Bouren-no

comment. Tiano-the applicant should have come back sooner for an amendment of increased business. Hlavaty-reconciliation of existing vs. proposed conditions and include the items that were talked about in writing. Brady-responded to market conditions, need a check against the original application. Creen-will vary month to month but the applicant will need to get a handle on the use and amend the SUP accordingly. Post-violation of original USP from 2019. Violations taken care of and come up with a realistic figure to amend the conditions of the SUP. Adhere to the zoning code to ensure they are meeting the requirements. Concerned with the open storage, will need more fencing, screening so that the piles are not visible from the road and neighbors. Wesley-there is an arched cover proposed, 16' in height, color to be green or white. It is not removable. The vehicles will be placed on the concrete pad with a forklift. Post-a fence should be installed to conceal the storage on the Kings Highway side, like what is proposed on the Thruway side, with the screen mesh. Furman-landscaping along Kings Highway should be the primary screening. Wesley-proposing the additional landscaping on the Kings Highway side that will be 10' in height at the time of planings. Beltrani-dry metal storage is in violation by outside storage as the original SUP indicated that all storage would be inside the building. Post-the solution would be to ensure there is adequate screening along Kings Highway to decrease the visual impact of the recycled metal piles. Beltrani-is the concrete pad for dry metal storage and vehicles? Wesley-yes, we can keep the height down on the piles if we expand the footprint. We can also stagger landscaping. Beltrani-will need a revised site plan and narrative. Post-public comments will help.

A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Furman, to schedule the public hearing for June 15, 2021. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried.

PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE

1. Lot Line Revision, Jason & Leatrice Wallach, 7 Ebel Court/Ebel Court. Presented by Dan McCarthy, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant would like to take the existing three lots and eliminate the middle one by distributing it to the other two. Post-any board questions? Goldberg-seems simple, giving more space to the house and the existing structure. Furman-same. Bouren-good. Tiano-good. Post-no comment. Hlavaty-no comment. Brady-no comment. Creen-good. A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Hlavaty, to declare this a Type II Action under SEQR. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Furman, to waive sketch plan approval, waive public hearing and approve the lot line revision. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried.

2. Site Plan, Rust Free Motors LLC, 2 Simmons Drive. Presented by Stephen King and Brian Morris, owners. The applicant is proposing to use the back lot as a car sales lot. King-supplied a site plan showing the screening, fencing and parking of the cars in the back lot. There is a triangle point in the front part of the parcel. The front part of the building is existing, the previous business was a car repair shop. Bouren-you are already using the back lot for parking, correct? Beltrani-you will need to submit a scaled drawing to include metes and bounds. You will need configuration of the building, landscaping should be specified, location and size of lot, fence details and location. This is located in the Gateway Overlay district and will be subject to those restrictions. Where will customers park? Signage for entrance/exit, circulation pattern of traffic needs to be demonstrated. You will need to provide a parking space for every 200' square feet of sales area. The SUP does require a public hearing and UCPB referral is required. Post-will need more information for the public hearing. Goldberg-need

more information for the site plan, landscaping is important. Especially for the neighbors on Simmons Drive. King-will ensure that any lighting will be downward facing and any landscaping that is installed will be maintained. Furman-need more landscaping along 9W, low in height but to ensure that no one uses that side as an entrance. Need more information. Bouren-more landscaping. Tiano-there are currently about 40 cars on site and a camper. Concerned with where the camper is parked and the visual impact to safety on existing roads that meet there. Contact the State DOT, they may have an issue where that camper is parked. Have already heard complaints from the neighbors in the back regarding the vehicles. Post-the PB will be looking at the whole site from this point forward, not just the back, as the use will be different from what the previous business was. Morris-will not be a commercial auto repair shop but yet the repair side of the business will be secondary to the selling of cars. We will buy cars, bring them onsite to repair and then put them on the lot for sale. If a vehicle that is sold needs repairs we will take that vehicle back to repair for the owner. Hlavaty-nothing further. Brady-nothing further. Creen-need more information. Ost-a Special Use Permit will be needed for the cars sales in the front or back, will confer with the Town Attorney to see how they can operate in the meantime, vehicle under review of the Planning Board. Beltrani-the applicant is welcome to call with any questions or concerns about updating the site plan to include the items discussed.

No further action can be taken by the Board until an updated site plan has been submitted.

3. Site Plan Amendment/SUP, KMP Realty Holdings II, LLC, 1 Tomsons Road. Presented by Kevin Pitcock, owner, and Steve Levine, solar development. Looking to install a solar farm off Tomsons Road. The land is currently vacant. The ballast system will be used to reduce the footprint of the panels and pollinator friendly plantings will be used. Will be using a 14.6 acre portion of the 45.3 acre parcel. There will be minimal tree removal. Have already had detailed conversations with the NYS Thruway Authority. The ballast will be concrete and the panels bifacial with no glare. Phase I review with Central Hudson has been approved. Work with NYSERDA, this will be a community solar project. NY Sun participant to benefit the taxpayers. Will include a PILOT, plan to use local staff and contractors. Sustainability is the goal. Ron Leonard-all individuals involved with this project are locals and working to do something close to home, have done these projects in other areas in the past. Beltrani-the Town of Saugerties Planning Board will assume lead agency when a complete site plan is submitted and reviewed. At that point the action will be classified under SEQR and all referral to other agencies that are necessary will be done. Leonard-there are no drainage issues on the land that is proposed for the project, proposing to use an innovative road system to decrease the impact of conventional paving. It is a grid type surface in which clover will be planted to grow through, but will be tough enough to withstand the weight required for emergency vehicles. Post-we will need time to review the updated site plan that was submitted today. Leonard-when do we do the adjacent owner notification? Beltrani-this will not be a coordinated review, considered an Unlisted Action under SEQR, will need a public hearing at which time notification of neighbors will take place. Need additional sheets w/details, a site plan of this nature will not be on just one sheet for the site plan. Need clearing limits and details on the proposed roadway that will have to be reviewed by the Town Engineer. Leonard-will be in contact with the Fire Department to discuss access.

No further action can be taken by the Board until the updated site plan can be reviewed.

4. Lot Line Revision, Paul & Claudia Andreassen/Crispin Kott & Kandy Harris. Presented by Mike Vetere, Vetere Land Surveying, LLC. The applicant is proposing to add 2.796 acres to Lot 1, increasing the size from .0720 acres to 3.516 acres, from Lot 2, decreasing the size from 8.682 acres to

5.486 acres. Lot 1 has acquired conditional approval from the NYSDOT for access from Route 9W, Lot 2 has existing access. Post-any questions? none by the Board.

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

5. Lot Line Revision, Ann & Grey Morris, 437 John Joy Road/John Joy Road. Presented by Mike Vetere, Vetere Land Surveying, LLC. The applicant proposes to delete a lot line that creates a non-conforming parcel and join the two together into one parcel, meeting all zoning requirements.

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

6. Lot Line Revision, Tara Schatzel/Matthew Gardiner, 49 & 45 Fortune Valley Lane. Presented by Tom Conrad, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant proposes to revise lot lines to include the driveway that was not originally included with the Gardiner parcel and to allocate the same area back to the Schatzel parcel, making an even exchange of land. The final size of each parcel will remain the same as it was to begin with.

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

7. Major Subdivision, Demitri Kolokotronis/Martec, 44 Pine Tree Lane. Presented by Tom Conrad, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant would like to create 5 lots from the 15-acre parcel. There is an existing house on the proposed Lot 3. From the Planner's notes the following items are needed to move forward: well and septic, topography, name of adjoining property owners, etc. Beltrani-the applicant will need to provide proof of buildable which will require perk tests to be performed, confirmation of septic areas, stormwater, location of existing structures, water courses, swamps, disturbance areas and large trees mapped out. The Board has been doing site visits to look at trees and mark those that will be required to be untouched. Will require a full engineered subdivision map. The Board will require all the necessary paperwork and approvals for sewer and water/well. Conrad-will provide this information to the applicant and complete a full EAF when the complete application is submitted.

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

ADDITIONAL ITEMS

1. Matthies Extension. Cynthia Matthies has requested a 6-month extension on her site plan approval for 169 Esopus Creek. A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Hlavaty, to approve the 6-month extension. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried.

2. Sophiedrew Acres, LLC Extension. Bruce Utter, Praeotrius & Conrad, P.C. has requested a 1-year extension on the site plan/SUP for Sophiedrew Acres located on Glasco Tpke, due to delays caused by the pandemic. A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Hlavaty, to approve the 1-year extension. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried.

3. Solar Zoning Change Memo. The current zoning table needs to be amended to include large scale solar facilities in certain zoning districts; LDR, MDR, I, OLI, RB. Beltrani-any changes or comments on the draft memo for the Town Board? Hlavaty-the size restrictions may be an issue in determining what will be considered a large scale solar facility that is commercial vs. residential. Beltrani-something that can be discussed to clarify.

4. Moratorium Memo. A draft moratorium memo was distributed for review before going before the Town Board. The moratorium addresses accessory overnight accommodation type uses. Definitions for resorts, density requirements for campsites, ect. Once a moratorium has been established the Town Board will have 6 months to address the concerns and implement new zoning, extensions may be granted if necessary and can extend 3 to 6 months. Post-this is much needed. Goldberg-is there a grandfather clause, if something pertaining to the moratorium is already in the Planning Board review process? Beltrani-something that is being discussed, there are hardship waivers. Will bring before the Town Board and keep the Planning Board updated.

5. In-Person Meetings. Post-board vote to see if we should remain virtual or go in-person. Majority would like to stay virtual at this time.

ADJOURNMENT

Since there was no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Tiano, to adjourn the meeting. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried. The meeting was closed at 12:27 am.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Becky Bertorelli
Planning Board Secretary