



PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
VIRTUAL -WebEX
October 20, 2020

C. Howard Post, Chairman, opened the meeting at 7:28 p.m.

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

The draft minutes of the September 15, 2020 Planning Board Meeting and the September 22, 2020 Special Planning Board Meeting were reviewed. Tiano-one correction, the wide of the pathways mentioned on pg. 3 of the September 22, 2020 minutes should read “6’ or 8””. A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Furman, to approve the September 15, 2020 meeting minutes as written and approve the September 22, 2020 special meeting minutes with the correction of pathway width.. Board vote: Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Creen-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried.

One additional item to be addressed prior to the opening of the Public Hearing section of the meeting. Khattar Elmassalemah, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C., has requested re-approval for a lot line revision for Embassy Holdings, LLC that was approved on September 17, 2019. The applicant would like to move forward with submission of the final maps for signature at this time. A motion was made by Creen, seconded by Tiano, to re-approve the lot-line revision that was previously approved on September 17, 2019. Board vote: Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Site Plan, UCPB Safety Tower, 35 Quarry Road.** Opened at 7:32 pm. Presented by Dennis Doyle, UCPB. Also present were Steve Peterson (emergency management), Eric Kenna, Ed Wright and James Dickens (C&S Engineers). Ulster County is looking to install a Safety Tower on the parcel located at 35 Quarry Road and owned by Ulster County. The County purchased the land and have taken care of all environmental liens. A presentation was given for all present. A study was performed on the old analogue system which as a result the County is working on the simulcast system with ulit transmitter sites. There are gaps in the coverage area and the site presented for this safety tower would help to alleviate those gaps in this area. There will be two new towers installed to address those gaps, one in Saugerties and one in Big Indian. There will be 95% coverage with the addition of the new towers. There is still an area in the western part of Ulster County that is currently being looked at as well. Outbound services are nearly all covered with the additions. The towers located throughout the county communicate with each other and this helps to create the best overall coverage. The tower location will help to remediate the service gaps around the village and Route 32 corridor. Coverage will be significantly better with the new tower and will link back to the tower in Tonche and then back to Kingston. The tower will also have the ability to link to Dutchess County for future interconnect, which is something that we keep in mind. Geo technical analysis was done, looking at the number of the antennas that would be on site while looking at the structural needs of the tower. We are providing some additional strength within the tower for additional antennas for local emergency management services. Kenna-The Balloon Test was completed on July 18, 2020 and discussed with visuals of each location. The only visible locations were from Route 32/Harry Well Rd. intersection and the entrance

to the tower site. The County will follow the DEC guidelines regarding sensitive areas. The archeological and historical studies were completed, with no impact found. The tribal requirement notification was sent and there is a 30-45 day response period. No SWPPP is required as the area of disturbance is less than 1-acre. Doyle-there are 9 criteria that must be met within the "Balance of Public Interest Test". The proposed tower will create critical gap closure in coverage, this site provides continuity to other safety towers, required for public safety. The County will work with all the Boards in Saugerties to ensure that the correct requirements are made, the Zoning Board of Appeals will have to act on the "Balance of Public Interest Test". We've looked at other areas where we can put the towers, given this location and the distances away from other public safety towers, this is the best location for those reasons. This is an appropriate use for this particular piece of property.

Post asked for comments/questions from the public:

- Anthony Kordich, 66 Church Road - property borders the proposed parcel. When the balloon test was performed the balloon could be seen directly outside the picture window. Do not believe that the County is being transparent with their description of the project. Not all the accurate information is being given to the public. The tower is supposed to be located greater than 400 meters for safety reasons but the closest residence, mine, is 850 feet away and is approximately only 243 meters. So that puts me and my family and my property in danger. The value of residence will go down and health is a factor.
- Allen Bryan, 24 Church Road - Questions were sent to the PB earlier today and read by Ken Goldberg. Home is located at a slightly higher elevation and concerned about the visual impact of the tower. Why can't the county put a more powerful unit on the existing safety towers so that they can provide the desired coverage without installing a new tower on this parcel? Will the County lease space on the tower to commercial entities? Does the County plan to build a solar farm on this same parcel? Doyle-the county does not plan on leasing any space to commercial entities on the proposed tower at this time, the added area is to ensure that the tower has the capacity to provide what is needed for public safety. The county controls all of the safety towers with no commercial space. The county is still exploring the possibility of the installation of a solar facility on this parcel as well, it would be worked around the tower. To address the visuals as stated previously they are taken with Google just to give an idea of the ridges that are located around the site and to show the natural topography that will block the lower 1/3 of the tower. Goldberg-no commercial use? Doyle-no, not at this time, designed to deal with emergency communications.
- Darlene Pedrosa, 432 Old Route 32 - Concerned with the health issues, use of microwave frequency which is cancer causing, have three small children. Concerned with visual impact as well. What are the long-term and short-term effects on residents? Will this be 5G capable? Doyle-narrow banded waves are used to hit the other tower, Tonche Mountain. There will be no cellular facility located on this tower. The standards for safety can be collected regarding transmission. Pedrosa-what is the process/projected timeframe? Doyle-the process has to go before the Town of Saugerties ZBA before moving forward and then will come back to the Planning Board to discuss any further concerns. That will all determine the time frame, would like to complete before the end of next year. Beltrani-the Planning Board can review and comment on the site plan, the "Balance of Public Interest" test will be completed by the ZBA. The town has regulations for commercial towers but not this type of tower in the zoning law. We received a "Notice of Intent" from the County, that is how the Planning Board first got involved. The Planning Board wanted to ensure that the public had a sufficient amount of time to comment.

- William & Ellen Harrision, 15 Church Road - this will be a point to point transmission to other radio antennas on adjacent towers, correct? Not radiated into the community? Doyle-yes. Kenna-there are FCC (Federal Communications Commission) licensing thresholds that must be met, with public safety in mind. Harrison-does this set a precedent for future commercial entities to construct a separate tower? Doyle-there are no plans to allow a commercial/cellular entity to construct a tower on this parcel. If the county moves forward with a solar facility there will be no room for an additional tower. Harrison-the parcel is zoned residential, public safety towers are not permitted? Beltrani-the parcel is owned by the County and because of that is deferred to the public interest test. A commercial entity would not be able to disregard the zoning.

Post-comments and concerns can still be sent and received for a period of seven days to ensure that the public has an adequate amount of time to voice their concerns/comments. They may be received up until October 27, 2020 my mail to Becky Bertorelli, Planning Board Secretary, 4 High Street or email to chowardpost@gmail.com. Beltrani-the County will go before the ZBA at the next meeting on the first Monday of November.

A motion was made by Bouren, seconded by Tiano, to close the public hearing. Board vote: Creen-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Bourne-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye. Motion carried. Public hearing closed at 8:28 pm.

Post-does the Board have any questions? Beltrani-are you submitting the paperwork through CRIS or staring through SHPO? Kenna-we file it through an FCC online filing where they coordinate with both SHPO and the Tribal system. So, we've sent that to them and now we have to wait for them to respond. They have 30 to 45 days, and some of them just won't answer. So we'll just have to wait them out and close that loop. We have already received the "no significant impact" letter from SHPO. The FCC requires the NEPA checklist, because it involves the tribes it is a federal review, nation to nation consultation. A copy of the SHPO letter will be submitted to the board for the file.

Beltrani-a letter should be sent to the ZBA from the Planning Board with all supporting documents in preparation of their meeting. When they have completed their review the Planning board can perform our own site plan review. Goldberg-this public hearing gave everyone an opportunity to speak.

2. Site Plan/Major Subdivision, Brapas Land Development LLC, Route 9W/Off Tiger Maple.

Presented by Bruce Brady and Nick Pascaretti. The applicant would like to build one building with 4 townhouse units with 2 bedrooms each. The applicant would also like to subdivide the parcel into 5 lots, 4 of them to provide lot lines for each townhouse unit to be created.

The public hearing was opened by Post at 8:34pm. Comments:

- Aleda Stamboulian, 72 Tiger Maple Road - which section of Tiger Maple will this be built? How many more will be built in the future? What will the lighting be? Does the development meet the zoning/legal requirements? Beltrani-located on the eastern side of the parcel. The development does meet the bulk requirements for each of the four units to be owned with individual lots. Pascaretti-currently this is all that is planned. As far as lighting how does that have to be shown? Bletrani-street lighting is not required but lighting that is proposed on the building will need to be shown in detail. Stamboulian-lighting is necessary for safety. What about the holes in the land? Noise during construction? Traffic? Blasting damage? Beltrani-the land will be changed as it is developed and if there are unsafe features they will

have to be fixed. They will have to follow the Town's noise ordinance regarding construction. Traffic will not be increased significantly for a 4-unit townhouse building. Post-if blasting is required they will have to notify the Building Department as well as the neighbors. Insurance will need to be acquired by the developer of the blasting company, in case of damages.

Stambuolian-water/sewer? Was an economic feasibility study completed? What about the water run-off, currently an issue? What is the timeframe for construction? Post-the water will be provided via municipal hook up, the Water Department has already been notified of the project. Pascaretti-would like to start the 4th quarter of this year, as soon as possible.

Beltani-the project does not warrant an economic feasibility study. A SWPPP will be required, as it has been noted that more than 1-acre will be disturbed, and address stormwater issues such as run-off. The Town's engineer will review and must approve. Stambouljian-there are overgrown trees which block the stop sign, the stop sign itself is too tall, people drive too fast.

- Gary Prophett, 11 Rock Maple Road - concerned about similar issues: water run-off, blasting noise, heavy construction noise, etc. Will they be owner occupied units or rented? HOA rules regarding noise. Pascaretti-they will be owner occupied. We will keep noise in mind, we are local residents, and will abide by the noise regulations/restrictions. Post - Can the Planning Board get a copy of the HOA agreement on condos so that they can be taken into consideration? Ellsworth-look at deeds, the HOA regulations apply only the property it was deeded on and is part of the HOA, meaning the condos only.
- Sally Colclough, 48 Red Maple Road - will this be part of a larger development? Pascaretti-not at this time. Post-make note that no further subdivision can occur within 3-years of this one. Tiano-why is this a 5-lot subdivision and not a 4? Post-there will be four lots that go with the townhouse units and one large one remaining, creating 5 parcels total.
- Dinah Neals, 36 Red Maple Road - the traffic needs to be addressed throughout the development. The Town Board needs to get involved. Post-traffic is something that the Planning Board does take into consideration.

Post-any further questions? None. A motion was made by Ellsworth, seconded by Furman, to close the public hearing. Board vote: Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Bouren-Aye. Motion carried. Public hearing closed at 9:30 pm. Post-questions from the Board. Bouren-can't speed bumps be installed? Creen-they are Town roads. The stop signs should be clear and visible. Town issue.

Review of Planner comments:

- The site plan checklist needs to be addressed and completed.
- The area of disturbance needs to be updated to reflect the accurate area, if it is 1-acre or more a SWPPP will be required. As the current site plan states, 1-acre, a SWPPP is required and reviewed by the Town Engineer.
- Show current and new tree lines on site plan
- Landscaping plan is required with plantings provided.
- Will need a surveyor with the lots labeled.
- Elevations need to match up to the proposed site plan.
- EAF Part I required.
- SHPO addressed, no disturbance and identified a hazardous waste site located across the creek.
- Board will need to act on SEQR.
- Applicant should have a licensed engineer for the site plan, due to the scope of work, additional construction details need to be provided.

Goldberg-not comfortable completing SEQR with the amount of specifics that are still needed. Pascaretti-why do we need a surveyor at this point? Beltrani-you need a surveyor to draw and stamp maps for the subdivision lines. Pascaretti-at the last meeting we were told that we could do the 4-lots metes and bounds after the foundation is set. Post-yes but you will have to have a surveyor provide the stamped maps for at least the entire parcel and the 1-acre parcel that will be divided into the four townhouse lots. The metes and bounds on those lots can be done when the foundation is set but the general lot lines will have to be plotted. Pascaretti-thought a SWPPP was not necessary. Beltrani-on the EAF it states that the area of disturbance will be 1-acre, which requires a SWPPP and review by the Town Engineer. If that is not correct then the paperwork has to be amended and submitted. Charles Wesley (architect)-will do that. Beltrani-the Board will need the actual level and area of disturbance, pre & post construction, by a licensed engineer. Defer to the Planning Board on this requirement. Ellsworth-it will be done by the Town Engineer. Post-holding off on the four townhouse lot lines was the only thing that was discussed at the last meeting, not the entire 1-acre parcel. If the applicant proposes to disturb less than 1-acre a SWPPP will not be required. The site plan will go to the Town Engineer for review, at the applicant's expense, if they do not have it done. Pascaretti-we have increased the width of the driveway to 36' for side-by-side parking and provided a typical layout of the proposed townhouses. Submitted a 3 townhouse layout but it is the same layout for the fourth townhouse. Post-need an updated layout for the complete project, all 4 townhouses, including bedroom count, floor plan and area of disturbance. Pascaretti-would like a conditional approval. Post-it may be possible as long as all the information that has been requested is provided. Beltrani went through the site plan checklist, see **EXHIBIT A**:

- (a) required
- (b) required
- (c) waived
- (d) required
- (e) required
- (f) required for parking, trucks are waived
- (g) waived
- (h) required if proposed, if not proposed please note in next submission
- (i) required
- (j) required, already addressed to PB satisfaction
- (k) required, already addressed to PB satisfaction
- (l) required, provided already
- (m) waived
- (n) waived
- (o) required-please show existing and proposed tree line
- (p) required
- (q) required
- (r) required
- (s) not relevant, waived
- (t) required
- (u) required
- (v) waived
- (w) required where applicable
- (x) required where applicable
- (y) none identified
- (z) required

The applicant is required to review the subdivision checklist as well to ensure that all areas are completed, or a waiver is requested.

A motion was made by Ellsworth, seconded by Furman, to declare this an Unlisted Action under SEQR. Board vote: Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Bouren-Aye. Motion carried. A negative declaration will not be reviewed until additional information is submitted for review. Ellsworth-would the applicant mind if a site visit was performed? Brady-no issue. No further action can be taken.

3. Site Plan/SUP, Stillwater Getaway/De Gagne & Depalma, off Pond Lane. Presented by property owner Melanie De Gagne. Looking to create 4 small rustic cabins with no water in cabins and compostable toilets. It is a 5-acre parcel and the area in the middle is where the cabins will be placed. Post opened the public hearing at 10:11 pm for comments:

- Sarah Sawyer, 84 George Sickle Road - concerned with the traffic increase and the dust created on the private road (Pond Ln.) because of that. Does the Town require that to be paved? Will this be like an Airbnb and rented out every weekend? De Gagne-the intention is to primarily use it for our large family when they visit but we will be renting it out depending on that. We plan on starting with only 2 cabins at this time but would like to eventually have 4. When we do rent there will be a 2-night minimum requirement. We live here as well so we are very sensitive to the traffic and concerns to the neighbors as we will experience it as well. There is already renting going on as your home is also rented as an Airbnb so the traffic will not be much different. Beltrani-as far as paving of a private road, if there are any other projects that come before the board we will have to require/consider improvements to the road.

De Gagne-there was a comment regarding the area of disturbance, what do we need to provide?

Beltrani-need an outlined area of where the cabins will be placed, grading, tree removal (if required), any any area to be cleared in any way. Just show that area with a dotted line. De Gagne-we do not propose any tree removal and will be working around existing trees, there are areas that are naturally cleared to set the cabins. Beltrani-just ensure that you place a dotted line around the area that will have any type of disturbance. Ellsworth-is this considered a campground, there are regulations that have to be followed if that is the case. De Gagne-no, this is called Stillwater Getaway. No campground is proposed. Post-we will have to keep this public hearing open, notices have to be sent out again with "Return Receipt Requested", as required.

4. Site Plan/SUP, Sparling Road Solar/NY Solar 1000, LLC, Sparling Road. Presented by Andrew Varrow and Meg Thorton, Lightstar Renewable, LLC. Goldberg-we never made a SEQR determination on this project, we declared it a Type I but never approved a negative declaration. Post-we do have to do that. Beltrani-since it is not a subdivision it does not have to be completed before the public hearing is opened, the board is not ready for a SEQR determination at this time. Public hearing started at 10:24 pm. Thornton-Phase I Archaeological Study has been completed. Soil samples show that there was early pesticide use around 1952. There was not a long history. We are required to obtain an US Army Corps. approval. Varrow-the solar array area will be surrounded with a security fence. The panels do have a windshield and are built to withstand snow loads and rainwater.

Post asked for public comments/concerns:

- Michael & Debbie DePoala, 125 Sparling Road - primary concern is contamination, if a panel is damaged in some way from a storm or natural disaster how is it cleaned up or the effects on the environment dealt with? Water contamination? What is the life cycle of the system?

Decommissioning? Construction timeframe? Noise level of the inverters? Thornton-there is an emergency response plan and in the event of something like that the panel will be assessed immediately and any clean up will be done, soil removed and remediated. Any type of discharge that may occur from damage of the panel would typically not be anything that would be spread through water. Varrow- as far as decommissioning of the project, they will be removed, recycled and the land will be remediated to the conditions it is now. A seed mix will be used to bring back and re-vegetate the plant life, including pollinators. There is a bond held by the Town so that if we fail to do so it the Town will be able to do so. The life expectancy is 25-years and we have an agreement to add to that in 5-year increments up to 40-years, depending on the condition of the panels. Thornton-the inverter noise is equivalent to 35dba, which is the same level of a vacuum cleaner. That is for the full solar farm. Varrow-hope to begin construction by the end of this year. M. DePoala-we would like a copy of the emergency response plan. Have other sites been considered, considering the proximity to residential homes and the wetlands? Thornton-we have worked with similar sites, the actual footprint of the solar panels within the wetlands will be less than 1/10 of an acre. We will be trying to avoid that area as much as possible. Much of the disturbance will come from the road installation and upgrading of the existing culvert to a larger pipe to help with flow of water during rain. M. DePoala-installing a larger pipe would cause more water flow into our property wouldn't it? Varrow-working with the Army Corps. to try and alleviate the back up into the wetlands and give the water a natural course to flow. The larger culvert will keep the flow more steady and give the water a place to go instead of up over the roadway. D. DePoala-where in the process is the applicant with the Army Corps of Engineers? Board process? Thornton-currently we have an approved delineation of wetlands. They have received our application which includes endangered species documentation, cultural resource report, current plans for the project and the coordination with tribes. Which will meet the requirements for the "National Environmental Protection Act" (NEPA). We then await their comments and approval/disapproval. Beltrani-the Board is looking into the entire site plan in depth, with a focus on the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). We look at visuals, animals, noise, erosion and sediment control, stormwater management and all the requirements that help to shape a site plan. Typically it is a matter of due diligence and we can give a conditional approval with the requirement that the Army Corps approval be received. This is a permitted use in the MDR zoning district with the approval of a site plan and special use permit, which is what they are doing here.

Post-any further questions? none. A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Ellsworth, to close the public hearing since there were no further questions/concerns. Board vote: Furman-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Tiano-Ae, Creen-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Post-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried. The public hearing was closed at 10:45pm.

Board comments: Tiano-we have recently had other solar projects come back to the Planning Board for amendments to reduce the size of their solar project because Central Hudson required them to reduce the size. Varrow-there are two ways that a solar project can work with Central Hudson, one is that they come before the Town Planning Board first and then to Central Hudson (CH) once approved for their connections, that is when CH will determine how much energy can be supplied. Sometimes this ends up being less than what was approved by the Town Planning Board and an amendment is required. We have a signed commitment letter with CH for the size of the solar facility already so it will remain this size. Beltrani-request that you add my email to the CRIS system, in the future the Planning Board should handle the CRIS system for projects. Would like more robust seed mix added to the

decommissioning plan but defer that to the Board as it is discretionary. Varrow-we would be happy to add a more robust seed mix but if we change the decommissioning agreement at this point it would have to go through the entire process of being reviewed by the Town Attorney again. Also, regarding visual analysis, we have reached out to the NYS Thruway Authority, on September 25th, for comment on the site plan, but have not heard anything back. Have tried to follow up. Would request that we can get a conditional approval stating that if the NYSTA comes back with any requests that we make the required changes. Beltrani-does the Board feel that the view glare analysis that was provided by the applicant was appropriate. Post feel that it is appropriate, poll the Board to see if they have any comments/concerns: Ellsworth-no, Tiano-no, Creen-no, Goldberg-no, Furman-no, Bouren-no, Hlavaty-no. Varrow-do you need an exact caliper? Can we make an approximation? Post-yes. Goldberg-Phase II Archeology? When? Thornton-there was a handful found below the plow zone. SHPO and consultant will do a limited Phase II, 60 more shovel sets to verify that there is no deep burial of artifacts. It is planned to be completed 10/26-10/30. If it becomes eligible (smaller area) we will then look at the depth of the posts for the tables, and may have to limit or remove a table from the layout. The engineering components will be reviewed if eligible and depending on how big of an area. Beltrani-the Part II EAF was completed and there were some potential areas that will be affected but largely mitigated. Do any of the Planning Board members have any comments on the Part II that I have completed? No comments. The big component still pending is SHPO and a narrative front the applicant on the impact on agricultural resources. Post-poll the board on additional comments/questions: Tiano-none, Post-none, Furman-none, Creen-none, Goldberg-how do we handle the moderate to strong impact items? Beltrani-in writing. Goldberg-no further comments, Hlavaty-none, Ellsworth-none.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Site Plan Amendment, Wyldwyck LLC (Agawam), Liberty Street Ext. off Delaware Street).

Presented by Bruce Utter (Praetorius & Conrad, P.C.), Bruce Anderson (Cutler Anderson Architects), Fariah Choudhary (Architect), Adam Friedman (Applicant) and Mike Moriello (Attorney). Anderson-filled in the details as requested from the meeting last month. There will be no changes in materials, just included more detail. Friedman-working on civil drawings at this point and hope to have them ready and submitted for the November meeting. The UCPB referral submission will be completed before the next meeting. Looking for a conditional approval/resolution pending the UCPB comments. Tiano-can I get a full set of plans? Utter-yes, I will get you a set. Post-pole the board to see if they have any questions/comments: Furman-no, Creen-no, Goldberg-no, Bouren-no, Ellsworth-no, Post-no. Beltrani-I think that at this point we are good, we will get comments from the UCPB but do not expect them to be much different from what has been discussed and evaluated by the planning board. A draft resolution would be appropriate at this time, is this something that the planning board would like NVP to do or the applicant's lawyer? Post-would prefer that be us. Beltrani-will get started on that for the next meeting and forward to the applicant's attorney, Mike Moriello, for review and comments.

PRE-HEARING CONFERENCES

1. Major Subdivision, Tim & Kimberly Keefe, 255 High Falls Road.

Presented by the owners. Would like to take a 6.1-acre lot and divide into three 2-acre lots, leaving the existing house on the proposed middle lot. North Engineering is the engineer on record and is currently working on the setbacks and proposed septic locations. All three lots have frontage on High Falls Road, which will provide access. Post-this is a straightforward subdivision. Does anyone have questions on the Board? Tiano-no, Furman-access from High Falls Rd. with no sight line issues, Goldberg-no, Creen-no, Bouren-no, Hlavaty-no, Ellsworth-no. Beltrani-we can do the preliminary and the final public hearing

at the same time, just have to make sure the notice states that. A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Bouren, to set the public for next month. Board vote: Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Furman, to declare this an Unlisted Action under SEQR. Board vote: Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Furman, to approve a Negative Declaration under SEQR. Board vote: Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye. Motion carried.

Site Plan/SUP, Hacienda de Leyenda/Gary Hardwick, 33 Blue Mountain Church Road. Presented by the owners and Rich Rothe (Rothe Engineering). Beltrani-looking for some clarification regarding the actual intended use. Will the existing house be used, how is it currently being used? Hardwick-yes, that is the intention. The house is 6,850 square feet with 5 suites, each containing an ensuite. Currently it can accommodate up to 16 guests. We are looking to install summer teepees, which would not be rented out unless it was in coordination with the rental of the main house. Beltrani-would this be multiple individuals renting or groups? Hardwick-the proposed purpose would be for one group to rent the entire property at a time, all individuals being known to each other. Proposing to install 4 prefabricated cabins to extend the amount of individuals that can be accommodated. Would only be interested in hosting small events, weddings up to 100 guests, mostly retreats. Beltrani-need a narrative to include the usage, staff, parking, type of events, etc. Existing tree lines need to be shown. Answer these questions and submit to the board for the next meeting. Rothe-the lot is divided by zoning boundary and we have ensured that we meet the Sensitive Area Overlay requirements. The main house will be part of the Inn operations, the teepees will only be available with the rental of the main house. There will be a limited area of disturbance, using the open field areas mostly and the impervious areas will be pathways, no additional paving is proposed. Open to using parking off site and shuttling guests on-site. Limited in size of wedding that can be hosted. Hardwick-would look to do events from May-August, 6-7 events throughout the summer. Rothe-cabins will have bathrooms, working with the Health Department regarding a holding tank. A hauler will be used to remove as needed, bi-weekly, possibly. Barn will have a kitchen that will be used to assist in heating food, most events will be catered by an outside caterer and the food will be heated up on-site. Hardwick-we will provide a list of preferred caterers that we will be using in the area to the potential clients. Beltrani-would the kitchen be used to provide food for overnight guests? Hardwick-there will be no kitchen in the cabins but the house is self contained and since the guests that will be using the cabins will be part of the larger group that will be staying in the house they can all utilize that kitchen for meals. The barn kitchen will be used for events. A brochure was provided of the proposed cabins, each accommodating 4 guests. Rothe-waste disposal, dumpster next to the garage, there is room for a larger container and can be screened. Will go through the site plan checklist. Any lighting that is installed will be night sky friendly/downward facing. Tiano-the fire department needs to be notified for comments on the site plan. Ellsworth-comment on narrative with actual numbers to reflect what you would like to do, ensure the accurate amount of intended events. Post-once a special use permit is approved it will be reviewed after a year to ensure that all conditions are being met. Hardwick-we impose a curfew on guests and we collect a significant deposit to ensure that all rules are followed. Ellsworth-what about bathrooms for events? Hardwick-there are bathrooms in each of the proposed cabins and the main house, so that should be sufficient for the size of events that are proposed.

A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Furman, to set the public hearing for next month. Board vote: Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye. Motion carried.

Beltrani-SEQR will still need to be determined. Need confirm the amount of additional square footage, if it is over 4,000 square feet the DEC EAF mapper will have to be completed. Post-would also like to look into whether off property parking is allowed in zoning. Beltrani-will do.

3. Site Plan, GHBA, LLC, 626 Route 212. Presented by Josh Lemaine. The applicant would like to change the use of the existing restaurant area of the building into two additional apartments. Will be removing siding, replacing roof and upgrading the window. No excavation will take place. Will be adding bumpers for parking spots in the rear, landscaping and adding a bike rack. There will be no parking permitted in the front of the building. Beltrani-Section 245.41 regulates existing undersized lots, which this is but it predates zoning as it was built in 1950. This parcel seems to fit the requirements as stated in that section and is a pre-existing undersized lot. The applicant would be required to fulfill the bulk requirements to the best of their ability given the size of the lot. The density of the area is increasing due to the change of use, but there is nothing in the zoning that states that this is not allowed with a preexisting undersized lot. It seems to be a good use of the land. Would like an updated site plan that is to scale. Does the Planning Board require the site to be surveyed? Ellsworth-there really is nothing being changed as far as the footprint and no more land is being used, than what is already used. Just a more accurate description and detailed site plan is necessary. Post-agreed. Complete the checklist and provide boundaries of property to scale. The Board will need verification from the Water Department, Mark Resso, that there will be no issues with the increase in use with the additional apartments. Beltrani-this is basically just a change of use so it is the Board's discretion to move forward. A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Hlavaty, to declare this a Type II Action under SEQR. Board vote: Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Ellsworth, seconded by Tiano, to approve the application with the conditions that the Board receive a more accurate site plan drawing, to scale, and approval from the Town of Saugerties Water Department for the increase in demand. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Since there was no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Creen, seconded by Furman, to adjourn the meeting. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye, . Motion carried. The meeting was closed at 12:08am.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Becky Bertorelli
Planning Board Secretary

EXHIBIT A

SITE PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST

The following checklist reflects the planning process and information required for subdivision applications to the Planning Board.

Workshop

- 1) ___ Payment of Workshop Fee
- 2) ___ Workshop Application
- 3) ___ There are no particular plan requirements for the workshop. But the applicant should bring any material that will assist discussion of the project. These might include site photos, existing surveys, and conceptual drawings.

Sketch Plan and Pre-Hearing Conference

- 1) ___ Completed General Site Plan Application (pg. 5)
- 2) ___ Payment of Universal Application, Site Plan Review, and Escrow fees
- 3) ___ Completed and signed Short Environmental Assessment Form
- 4) ___ A sketch or map of the area which clearly shows the location of the site with respect to nearby streets, rights-of way, properties, easements, other pertinent features within 200 feet, and a topographic or contour map of adequate scale and detail to show site topography and existing natural conditions. (See 7.2.2.3 b in Town of Saugerties Zoning Law)
- 5) ___ A brief narrative and preliminary concept showing the locations and dimensions of principal and accessory structures, parking areas, and other planned features and any anticipated changes in existing topography and natural features. (See 7.2.2.3 a)

Preliminary Plat and Public Hearing

- 1) ___ Receipts from certified mailings to property owners within 500 feet of the project.
- 2) ___ Payment of fees on New Structures and Paved Areas, and Recreation Fees as they apply
- 2) ___ Preliminary Plat. Information may be supplied on more than one drawing. The following minimum requirements should be included.
 - ___ A. Title of drawing, including name and address of applicant and person responsible for preparation of such drawing.
 - ___ B. Boundaries of the property, plotted to scale, and including north arrow, scale, and date.
 - ___ C. Existing watercourses and wetlands in, and within 200 feet of, property lines
 - ___ D. Grading and drainage plan showing existing and proposed contours.
 - ___ E. Location, design, and type of construction, proposed use and exterior dimensions of all buildings
 - ___ F. Location, design, and type of construction of all parking and truck loading areas, showing access and egress
 - ___ G. Provisions for pedestrian access

- ___ H. Location, type and screening details of waste disposal containers and outdoor storage areas
- ___ I. Location, design, and construction materials of all existing or proposed site improvements, including drains, culverts, retaining walls, and fences
- ___ J. Description and method of sewage disposal and location
- ___ K. Location of fire and other emergency zones, including location of fire hydrants
- ___ L. Location, design and construction materials of all energy distribution facilities, including electrical, gas, and solar energy
- ___ M. Location, height, size, materials and design of all proposed signage
- ___ N. Location and proposed development of all buffer areas, including existing vegetation cover
- ___ O. Location and design of outdoor lighting facilities
- ___ P. Location, height, intensity and bulb type of all external lighting fixtures
- ___ Q. Direction of illumination and methods to eliminate glare onto adjoining properties
- ___ R. Location and amount of building area proposed for retail sales or similar commercial activity
- ___ S. Proposed limit of clearing showing existing vegetation, including trees with a DBH of 6" or greater within the clearing line
- ___ T. Landscape plan and planting schedule
- ___ U. Estimated project construction schedule
- ___ V. Record of application for and approval status for all necessary permits from state and county agencies
- ___ W. Identification of any state or county permits required for the project's execution
- ___ X. Other elements integral to the proposed development as considered necessary by the Planning Board
- ___ Z. Existing buildings on the site, and within 100 feet of property line
- ___ Y. Stormwater management and erosion control plans

Waivers

If the proposed project can not meet the complete site plan checklist, then waivers may be requested. To request that the Planning Board grant a waiver list the line item letter from above and explain the reasons for the request. If more space is needed, then please attach another sheet.

ITEM	EXPLANATION
_____	_____

_____	_____

_____	_____

_____	_____

