



PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
VIRTUAL -WebEX
April 20, 2021

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

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

Absent: Ken Goldberg

The draft minutes of the March 16, 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. Motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Minor Subdivision, Edward Kovac & Judith Bentley. Presented by Tom Conrad, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. Public Hearing was opened at 7:36pm. The applicant is looking to subdivide an 11.41 acre parcel to fulfil a will requirement. Each of the family members, brother and sister, are to get half of the existing lot. Proposed Lot 2 will consist of approx. 8.5 acres with an existing house and proposed Lot 1 will remain vacant with approx. 5.6 acres. The potential access to Lot 1 and the back part of Lot 2 will be from a 50' ROW from Route 32, shown on the map. There are no plans to develop Lot 1 but the division of land is just to satisfy a stipulation of their mother's will.

Post-is there anyone from the public here with questions/comments?

- Darrin Moret, 94 Joseph's Drive-reason for subdivision. Conrad-just to satisfy a stipulation of a will.

Post-Any further questions/comments? None. A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Hlavaty, to close the public hearing. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried. The public hearing was closed at 7:42pm.

Beltrani-just ensure that the note on the map is clear that any future development of Lot 1 or the back portion of Lot 2, which is cut off from the front portion because of the proposed ROW, will require that the 50' proposed ROW is brought up to the Town of Saugerties Private Rural Road Standards as it is longer than 300' in length. A road maintenance agreement will also be required and reviewed by the Town Attorney for such ROW. NYSDOT curb cut will also be required. Note on the Subdivision map must be clear as to that description. Conrad-will add Engineer approval required. Post-Board questions/comments: Bouren-no, Creen-no, Brady-no, Post-no, Furman-no, Tiano-no, Hlavaty-no. Conrad-will update Note #8 will be updated and submitted for wording approval prior to submission of final maps, once approved.

A motion was made by Brady, seconded by Furman, to approve the minor subdivision with the added wording to the map as requested regarding the engineer approval of ROW, executed Maintenance

Agreement and NYSDOT curb cut acquired if future development is to occur on Lot 1 or the back part of Lot 2. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Brady-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried.

2. Site Plan, Jeffrey Court Properties, LLC, Jeffrey Court. Presented by Khattar Elmassalmah, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. A description of the proposed apartment buildings was given to the public. The applicant is looking to develop 1 acre of an 8.5 acre parcel located off Jeffrey Court. There will be two buildings with 12 two-bedroom units each. Entrance and exit will be via Jeffrey Court. They will be 3-stories, 35' to the peak. A hammerhead was proposed for fire apparatus turn around and accessibility. Landscaping proposed and lighting will be contained within the site.

Post opened the public hearing at 7:49 p.m. Question/comments from the public:

- Karen Deruyter, 2 Steven's Court - How is this parcel classification, is this use allowed? Will there be any recreation for the children that will live in this apartment complex? How will snow removal be addressed? What school will the children attend? Elmassalmah-the parcel is located in High Density Residential and this is an allowed use in that zoning district with a height up to 41'. A recreation fee will be paid to the Town to help with upkeep of Town run playgrounds for the children to access. Do not have an answer about school. The snow removal will be the responsibility of the Town for the roadways leading up to the entrance and then on-site it will be pushed to areas outside of the wetlands.

Beltrani-suggested that all questions be asked and then answered by the engineer when the public is done.

- Ray Mendock, 27 Canterbury Drive - how far from the Canterbury Drive residents' property lines will the apartment buildings be located? There is a brook located on-site. How will this affect the fish and wildlife? How will the construction debris be handled? The brook that runs through the parcel feeds into the Hudson River, concerned regarding contamination from run-off. What will be the exact height and will the Glasco Fire Department be able to service in case of emergency with current equipment? Concerns regarding traffic.
- Bob Milsom, 5 Jeffrey Court - how will the privacy of the neighbors be handled, we live directly adjacent to this parcel. Would like to see the site plan modified to include privacy and transitional space between the proposed apartment building and our single family residence. Leaving a 100' of transitional space between the structures with 75' of wooded space would be more appropriate but would put the project over the 1-acre of disturbance that they are trying to adhere to. Determine the impact to the wetlands. Would like to see the proposal re-submitted with an accurate area of disturbance and an access road included.
- Michelle Wright, 16 Village Drive - Jeffrey Court is a narrow road. How will the snow removal be dealt with after the cul-de-sac is taken away and used as an access to the proposed apartment complex? That is where the Town pushes the snow now. How will the storm drains and water run off be dealt with?
- Mike Allen, 11 Village Drive - There should be an additional emergency access road.
- Cherly Wright, 16 Village Drive - Traffic light proposed on Village Drive? Wright-will the road be widened to deal with increased traffic and snow removal? Will the buildings be set on foundations? Elmassalmah-none proposed. Will not be touching the width of the road. The buildings will have no basements, and be set on concrete slabs.
- Tom Francello, 2179 Route 32 - the residences of Canterbury Drive will be able to see the apartments and the apartments, due to the height, will be able to look into their backyards. What kind of screening and landscaping will be proposed to eliminate that and keep their

privacy? Compact parking spots vs. normal parking spots. Is the grading and utility plan included in the area of disturbance? On the landscaping plan that was proposed it shows the grass areas go out further than the area of disturbance lines, does that need to be included? What is the pump station for, with the generator? Elmassalmah-the pump station is for the difference in elevations only and there is a small generator that will be located next to it. Francello-everything proposed is deciduous and nothing is evergreen which will provide year around screening, the other will allow the neighbors from Canterbury Drive, Village Court and Jeffrey Drive to see the lights 6-7 months of the year. Grading also has to be addressed to the southeast, bio retention area. Elmassalmah-grading and stormwater will be reviewed by the Town Engineer.

- Agnes Laquidara, 12 Village Drive - how will big trucks be able to access the site for construction purposes? The roads are not wide enough to accommodate a schoolbus to turn around now. They have to go to the end of the cul-de-sac and turn around now to pick-up the existing apartments located on Village Drive. T
- Dean Palen, representing 4 Stevens Court - will the apartments be accessing the municipal water/sewer or keeping it private? How will this affect the demand it attached to the Town. How does zoning come into effect? Elmassalmah - have sent to the water/sewer department with no comment received yet.
- Justine Levigne, 35 Village Drive - the drainage is currently awful, how will this impact and the roads are very narrow to facilitate this type of increase in traffic.
- Darrin Moret, 94 Joseph's Drive - opposed to the proposed 3-story building, curious to see Environmental Impact Statement. Fire trucks will require mutual aid, and can not handle with equipment that Glasco currently has. The road can not handle the increase in traffic.

Post-we will be keeping this public hearing open until next month's meeting, May 18, 2021. The Planning Board will not give comment until answers to the public's questions are submitted. Tiano-would prefer if the applicant would submit a final version before making comments. Elmassalmah-next month's submission will include a better plan with engineer comments. Beltrani-work with the Town Engineer and the applicant's engineer. Post-need more coordinated review, coordinated by the Town Planner. Should have the Town Engineer do a preliminary review of the drawings with comments. A memo to George Redder regarding rights of the Board to require widening of access road was sent. Elmassalmah-according to Subsection I of the same section that Redder referenced it states that the road requirement is 26' width. Beltrani-this is part of the subdivision review, which you are referencing, this is not a subdivision but a site plan review and therefore the Planning Board is allowed to go over what they would like to see in terms of safety. Elmassalmah-that does not allow the Planning Board to override the NYS Code/Fire Code. Beltrani-we will be looking into this with the attorney.

Post-does the Board have any further comments/questions at this time. We will be keeping the public hearing open. Bouren-will have additional questions, not at this time, Creen-no questions, Brady-no questions at this time, Furman-no questions at this time, Hlavaty-no questions, Tiano-would like the traffic study copy. Fire apparatus turnaround? Snow removal addressed. The Glasco FD does not have capability to address a 3-story building. Once a 3-story building is permitted they will be coming all over town. The fire and ambulance have access and ability restrictions when it comes to this size building.

A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Furman, to keep the public hearing open and send the current proposed site plan to the Town Engineer for preliminary review. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Brady-Aye, Creen-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Post-Aye, Furman-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. The applicant is requesting to develop a 10-lot subdivision which will be created using the total acreage of three existing lots combined for a total of approx. 89-acres located off Ralph Vedder and Manorville Road. A convention subdivision was approved by the Planning Board. The "Notice of Intent" to serve as Lead Agency was prepared by the applicant's lawyer, Mike Moriello, and distributed. No response was received, the 30-day time limit ended on Sunday. There are 3 private roads proposed, one off Manorville Road and two off Ralph Vedder Road, all under 1,200 linear feet. There will be frontage for each parcel on one of the private rural roads proposed, some driveways will be lengthy, 12' wide with pull offs. Increase the size of the T-turnarounds for fire access. Create some areas to remain wooded, with large buffer areas between parcels (green belt areas). Stormwater will hopefully be prepared for the next submission.

Post-green belt areas are what the Board was looking for. Any questions from the Board: Bouren-no, Creen-no, Brady-no, Furman-no, Tiano-no, Hlavaty-no, Post-no. Beltrani-lots along Ralph Vedder Road are shown to the center line of Town Road, the dimensions of ROW should be shown and RMA, as required. Hogan-base mapping was done 15-years ago showing that a user road with a 50' descriptive ROW, will be labeled. ROW will be added to all lots affected.. Is it the intent that they will share maintenance, an RMA must be created. Ridge View Drive, is existing access, is there an RMA on file for the section that runs through Lot #1 & Lot #2? Hogan-the land was not purchased but that section of the ROW was and a note will be put in the deeds for Lot #1 & Lot #2 as part of the legal description. Beltrani-is blasting proposed? Hogan-would prefer not to but do not put that restriction on the applicant in the case that it is necessary, will do a local permit through the Building Department if that does become necessary. Moriello-do not want to prohibit unless necessary. In NYS blasting is considered a ministerial act and therefore is a Type II action under SEQRA as described in 6NYCRR Part 617.5(c)(25) and does not require further review. However, NYS is very strict with their requirements regarding blasting and ensures that the blaster will take all responsibility for the action, the Building Department also has local law requirements that must be followed. McKeel (owner)-would prefer not to blast, prefer hammer but just do not want to be restricted in the case that it is necessary. Beltrani-there is an overlap shown on Lot #3 with an existing home, how will this be rectified if it is actually correct? It is noted by DEC that there are chestnut, oak, northern hardwood, hemlock and trees on-site. Does the Planning Board want the trees 8" and wider marked on the map? Hogan-that would be a major undertaking considering the scale of the project. Beltrani-there is a regulated Class A trout stream located on the parcel to the north used for drinking water, shown on map, add label. More information needs to be provided on the road and stormwater before going to the Town Engineer for review. Hogan-that stream runs through wetlands and will not be disturbed. The house will look down on it. Can change the green belt to include. Will the applicant be required to mark out the 8" diameter trees? Post-take a board vote: Bouren-waive requirement, Post-we performed the the conservation review and added the buffer are (greenbelt area), waive, Creen-no comment, Brady-waive, Hlavaty-waive, Tiano-waive, Furman-developer sensitive to tree groups, shift of green belt area. McKeel-preservation of trees is important, willing to walk properties and mark trees to keep for preservation. Moriello-the Board can walk with developer to mark heritage trees to preserve, survey and show on map after walk through.

A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Brady, to declare the Town of Saugerties Planning Board Lead Agency. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried. The board will work with the applicant and their engineer to schedule a walk thru.

2. Major Subdivision, Joseph Gambino, 3524 Route 32. Presented by Bill Stade, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. This is a proposed 5-lot subdivision on land located off Route 32. Recently received re-zoning approval from the Town Board to change the section of the parcel that was zoned low density residential to medium density residential so that the parcel is consistent with the area around it. The parcel is now zoned MDR/HB/SA/GO. Beltrani-review of the preliminary plat list, no significant habits were identified by DEC. Trees 8" in width or greater are to be marked on the map. Maintenance and ownership need to be clarified. Private rural road standards have to be adhered to. A Road Maintenance agreement must be created for Lots 1, 3, 4 & 5. Stade-this property was clear cut not that long ago as it was a quarry. There will not be too many trees that will meet that requirement to be marked. The area of disturbance is under the 5-acre threshold so a basic SWPPP will be completed for the next meeting. Beltrani-the fire department should review the proposed roads for comment as well. Need a topographic map with 5' contours for buildability. Grading and area of disturbance have to be shown, sight and stopping distance at the entrance/exit to Route 32 to be shown. Stade-permit from State for that entrance. Add the Town Highway Department to the EAF for the required permit needed for curb cut on High Falls Road, if received we need a copy. Drainage swales to be shown on plans and a maintenance agreement will be discussed. UCPB referral is required. Agency comments needed will be from Saxton FD and UCHD. A public hearing is required. Post-will need a copy of the NYSDOT letter received regarding entrance/exit onto Route 32. Any further questions from the Board: Bouren-no, Creen-no, Brady-no, Furman-no, Hlavaty-no, Tiano-wells done already, effect on aquifer? Stade-no, will not affect other wells located in the aquifer. Post-that section is not heavily developed.

A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Tiano, to declare this an Unlisted Action unders SEQR. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Brady-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried. Post-would like to schedule a walk thru for the 8" trees, a meeting was scheduled. Furman-will there screening of existing trees between lots? Stade-yes. Post-further comments: Bouren-no, Creen-no, Brady-no, Furman-no, Hlavaty-no, Post-no, Tiano-no. A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Tiano, to schedule the public hearing for the May 18, 2021 meeting. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Brady, to submit the referral to the UCPB. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried.

PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE

1. Lot Line Revision, Jill & Richard Rothe/Rolf Olsen Sr. Presented by Richard Rothe. The lot line is being requested to add a buffer to the adjacent property by adding .95 acres to the parcel that is currently 9.5 acres, making it 10.5 acres. Post-pretty straight forward, any questions from the Board: Bouren-no, Creen-no, Brady-no, Furman-no, Tiano-no, Hlavaty-no, Post-no.

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

2. Lot Line Revision, Chestnut Hill Holding Group, LLC/Almonte/Botarel. Presented by Richard Rothe. Part of this was before the Board a couple of months ago and received an approval for a major subdivision. The applicant is now looking to give land to two adjacent landowners to extend their lot lines to the center of the existing stream. Adding .3 acres to one lot and .4 acres to the other. Lot 3 and Lot 4 to maintain a 1-acre minimum, as required. Post-any questions from the board: Bouren-no issues, Creen-no, Brady-no, Furman-no, Hlavaty-no, Tiano-no, Post-no.

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

3. Site Plan Amendment, Holmes Memorials LLC, 3185 Route 9W. Presented by Bob Schuman, owner/applicant. The business would like to add a storage building in the back of the building for storage of trucks. Received approval for a 13' setback variance, that was necessary from the back lot line, from the Zoning Board of Appeals in May of 2020. The proposed storage building will be 60' x 28' and will be set on a poured foundation with frost walls. Would like to use douglas fir wood frame or concrete, depending on cost. there will be two access garage doors, 16' to 18' tall. Would like to make it the same color as the existing building. The storage building will be located behind the existing building and therefore will not be that visible from Route 9W. To the west of the proposed building it is screened with an existing tree line. Beltrani-the site plan will have to include a zoning table with the required setbacks and the variance received from the ZBA, for the zoning district. It will need to have all elements plotted to scale, would prefer architectural signed drawings. How do trucks access the storage building, show existing paving vs. proposed. Will blacktop be used? Emergency access? Show existing treeline. The Board will have the right to waive any site plan requirements that they feel are not applicable. This will need to be referred to the Ulster County Planning Board. Schuman-there will be no plumbing, lighting and the exterior of the existing building has lighting that will be used. Post-building finishes the same? What is the height of the building in front. Schuman-the building will be light gray with a blue roof like the existing building. The proposed storage building will be about the same height as the existing building. Post-questions from the Board: Bouren-need work on the site plan to include those items addressed, Brady- no, Furman-use of buildings? Schuman-trucks and equipment storage, Tiano-elevations shown for building, existing and proposed. Hlavaty-no questions. Post-no further action can be taken by the Board until a more detailed site plan is submitted.

4. Site Plan/SUP, Forest Run Campground, Churchland Road. No one was present for this application.

5. Site Plan/SUP Amendment, Canos Recycling LLC, 1083 Kings Highway. Presented by Charles Wesley. The applicants would like to add the intake of motor vehicles to their recycling business. There will be a new area added to locate the motor vehicles when they come in to empty the fluids and then they will be stored as a whole until they are removed from the site. Landscaping shown for screening includes Niagra trees that will be 4' to 5' when planted and 18' to 25' when mature. Some parking will be moved to allow enough space for installation of a new scale. There is a proposed 40' x 80' concrete slab for storage, not covered because the equipment to pick-up the motor vehicles will not be able to lift the car onto the trailer with a cover. Beltrani-the OIL/I districts do not allow for outdoor storage, may need a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals. Furman-the cars will be piled on top of each other? Wesley-maybe 2 to 3 high. Bouren-is the proposed new scale drive-on? Would it be just the addition of cars? The trailers that are currently parked along the NYS Thruway side of the site

need to be removed. Wesley-it is a drive-on scale, there will be a mobile trailer to be used as the office for the scale. Everything fenced and new screening will be added. Beltrani-the existing trailers are not on the site plan, they should not be on-site. The drained fluid, how will it be disposed? Will need to contact DEC. Wesley-the proposed storage trailers will be on site for about one month until they are picked up and removed by a professional removal company. Will need approval from the DEC. Brady-a containment curb should be added to the slab where the draining of the vehicles will be done to ensure there is no run off. Wesley-will do. Beltrani-storage of materials, §245.28 of zoning code, will require a use variance from ZBA. Anything that is on the premises for over 180 days is considered permanent. Double layer of screening along NYS Thruway, give fence detail, check section of zoning law regarding signage along NYS Thruway. The Special Use Permit will require an exact number of vehicles expected to be stored at one time. Wesley- expecting 8 vehicles. The buffer areas will be met. The north and south side of the parcel are already screened. A dotted line will show the area of disturbance. Beltrani-how high will the storage go, how many cars, hours of operation, calculation of difference, no grading proposed, no removal of existing vegetation shown, will defer to the Board. Ulster County Planning Board referral is not required.

Post-board questions/comments: Bouren-remove the trailers along the Thruway, double tree lines on that side, Creen-should go to ZBA for use variance, Brady-signage along Thruway may be an issue for the Thruway Authority, Furman-agree with Bouren, Hlavaty-concerns with outdoor storage, secondary containment required-there are DEC regulations regarding that, no discharge of contaminated stormwater. Tiano-no comments but do not think more screening is necessary. Post-not too much more the Board can do until they go to the ZBA for a use variance and then come back to us. A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Bouren to refer to the ZBA for a use variance regarding the outdoor storage of vehicles. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried.

6. Major Subdivision, Greenspace Realty LLC/Mullen, Harrison Court/Glasco Tpke. Presented by Bruce Utter, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant has acquired additional land and would like to extend Harrison Court and create 6 new lots to add to the previously approved Glasco Ponds Subdivision. Applicant does not like the restriction of no further subdivision. Just a note that the minimum requirement for HDR is 10,000 square feet. Will be tied into public water/sewer. The setbacks are shown on the Preliminary. Harrison Court is proposed to go to the Town, under the 1,200' requirement. The Federal Wetlands are delineated in the West. Will be providing a basic SWPPP for the Town Engineer's review. There was an archeological study done for the previous subdivision. Will be sent to the Ulster County Planning Board as required.

Post-Board questions/comments: Bouren-no, Creen-no, Brady-no, Tiano-no, Furman-no, Hlavaty-no, Post-no. A motion was made by Post, seconded by Furman, to declare this an Unlisted Action under SEQR. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried. No further action can be taken by the Board at this time.

7. Lot Line Revision, Gersbeck Estate/Thomas Gorman, 148 & 154 Route 32A. Presented by Bill Stade, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant would like to fix an existing problem, the existing residence does not line up on Lot #2. The lot line proposed will make the non-conforming lot conforming. Beltrani-there is an error on the parcel acreage, must be updated. Setbacks must be shown on the map to ensure all setback requirements are met. The area of the proposed land exchange does exceed the minimum requirement of 1-acre. The Board can vote to waive the sketch plan requirements.

A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Brady, to waive the sketch plan requirements, waive a public hearing and approve the lot line revision with the condition that setbacks be shown. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried.

8. 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 provision in the zoning law that if a lot is less than 5-acres the overlay provisions do not apply, which means the SA overlay does not affect this subdivision application and the 1-acre requirement for MDR is met for both proposed lots. The user road runs through the parcel connecting Kings Highway to Railroad Avenue, 50’ ROW and the Town does maintain that section. Public water and sewer will be used. Doug Myer, Highway Superintendent, did approve the proposed driveway of Lot #1. The Town Planner’s comments will be addressed for next submission. Beltrani-this in an Unlisted Action and a public hearing can be scheduled.

A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Tiano, to declare this an Unlisted Action under SEQR and approve a Negative Declaration. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Furman, to schedule the public hearing for the May 18, 2021 meeting. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried.

9. Lot Line Revision, Mark & Beth Woodard, 1279 & 1287 Glasco Tpke. Presented by Dan McCarthy, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The application is selling a section of Lot #2 to Lot #1 to eliminate a setback issue for the garage on Lot #1. Both parcels will meet all build requirements and the setbacks shown. Beltrani-straight forward.

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

ADDITIONAL ITEMS

EV Charging Stations-Apartments/Developments. Just an update was provided regarding the process and to let the Board know that a public hearing is being set up by the Town Board regarding the implementation of this to site plan requirements.

ADJOURNMENT

Since there was no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Brady, to adjourn the meeting. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Creen-Aye, Brady-Aye, Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried. The meeting was closed at 11:23 pm.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Becky Bertorelli
Planning Board Secretary