

Extended Public Hearings

Hudson Summit LLC 2016 (3 lot subd), 52 Mayer Dr, SBL#95.12-2-7, in R ½ zone.

The applicant would like a three lot subdivision. Two of the lots are for single family homes and the third the applicant would like to be dedicated to the Town. Previous agreements, on file, were made that the Town would take the lot with the pond.

Updated maps have been submitted.

Andy: The information I was looking for is on the map. The applicant was able to determine that we would have vertical clearance for the pipe going in as well as horizontal clearance. I am satisfied, I will write up a memo on this.

Dave B: There is just the ongoing question if this is going to be a 2-lot or 3-lot subdivision. I do not know how you tell him 2-lots; if you took the pond out of the equation he could have two lots.

Dave P: I think we reviewed this with Terresa Bakner and were advised that the agreement that was made with the Town is what we need to follow. There were some neighbor concerns which may be a civil matter.

New Business

Cuciti, Salvatore, 37 Brescia Blvd, Special Use Permit SBL#87.20-6-7, in R ¼ zone.

The applicant would like to build a 1 bedroom accessory apartment in his home. The apartment will be created by converting an unused storage room and adding 270 sq. ft. on to the back of the house. The apartment will be approx. 670 sq. ft. and will include a bedroom, a living room, kitchen, full bath and sitting room.

Mr. Cuciti was present for the meeting.

The Board reviewed a survey and footprint plans of the proposed and discussed setbacks.

Mr. Cuciti: We will use our existing driveway for parking; we have four spots on the driveway and one garage bay.

The Board anticipates setting the public hearing next week for March 2017.

Tillson Realty and Management Inc. 23 New Paltz Rd., Site Plan, SBL#88.13-10-1 in R ¼ zone.

This is an Adaptive Re-Use building.

The applicant is requesting an Adaptive Re-Use of a former, 1240 sq. ft., gas station located in the R 1/4 acre zone. He is proposing a 920 sq. ft. addition to the first floor; for a total of 2160 sq. ft. of first floor office space. He is requesting two accessory apartments in the proposed 1240 sq. ft. 2nd story addition.

Patti Brooks of Brooks & Brooks Land Surveyors, the applicant's representative, was present for the meeting. Al Barone, the applicant, was present for the meeting.

The Board reviewed the submitted siteplan.

Patti: We understand this comes under the Adaptive Re-Use interpretation. The building that is there now is just over 1200 sq. ft. which is not adequately large enough to put anything in there. He is proposing a single story addition as well as a second story addition with the hope of putting two apartments up there. My understanding is that the Adaptive Re-Use Code is under review. We are here tonight to ask how we should go forward at this point and we would like to know what the Board thinks of the plan.

Alan: The second story will have a gable roof. We did not want it to be just a square box. We figured with the addition of the first level only it would give the building more character and fit nicely into the neighborhood.

The Board discussed the setbacks, leaving the existing building, square footage of apartments and green space. Patti: Using the current code we were thinking of one 1-bedroom and one efficiency apartment. The parking schedule is on the map.

Andy: A few things that stand out to me are the multiple driveway accesses it would be good if you could get it all on one side. The New Paltz Rd. side would look a lot better if you did not have the additional driveway there. My concern on Phillips Ave. is the parking arrangement; people backing out onto Phillips Ave.

Patti: They will not be backing out onto Phillips Ave. because Phillips Ave. is about 30 feet wide and we put the parking spaces back off of the road. The parking space itself is 18 ft. and then it is another 18 feet until you reach the blacktop of Phillips Ave. Right now the entire lot is open. We are channelizing it by proposing a post and rail, fence or something comparable barrier along New Paltz Rd. which would be about 2 or 3 feet in height.

The Board discussed the Adaptive Re-Use language as is and proposed. Because the new code proposal is not complete the Board would like this application to go forward with the current code.

This application will be sent to the Ulster County Planning Board.

The Board agrees that an upgrade to this site is a service to the Town. The Board anticipates elevations.

The Board anticipates setting the public hearing next week for the March meeting.

46-48 Front St. Owners, 96 North Rd. Subdivision & Lot Line Revision SBL#88.1-4-8.220 in R ½ and GB zone.

The applicant is requesting a 2 lot subdivision and lot line revision with his 39.15 acre parcel. He would like to create a one acre parcel for an existing dwelling and convey 2 acres of land to a neighbor to be made part of existing lot. Remaining 36.15 acres to remain undeveloped.

William (Bill) Eggers, LS of Medenbach & Eggers Civil Engineering & Land Surveying, the applicant's representative, was present for the meeting.

Dave P: This last was in front of the Town Board for rezoning request for PRD. That request is off the table for now.

Bill E: The applicant is not sure which direction he wants to go with things. In the meantime he has an immediate possibility to convey 2 acres to a neighboring parcel (SBL#88.13-2-6 with hotel and Bagels and Bites). This is a Lot Line adjustment with the Right of Way to Grand Street to be reserved.

The other part of this application is on North Rd. the applicant is requesting a subdivision to create a one acre parcel for an existing residence. There is an existing parcel next to what will be this new lot which has an existing driveway going over this proposed lot which has an existing right of way over the proposed new one acre lot.

Larry: You have a shared driveway with the Would Restaurant; you could be partially responsible if there were an accident or something. Why not give The Would your half of the driveway plus another 10 feet for snow storage? That would be a good neighbor. This is just a suggestion.

The Board also suggested changing the lot line adjustment so that the line proposing to create the 2 acre parcel on the corner is placed so that there is no need for a right of way and the remaining large lot has its own access.

The Board anticipates map updates and setting the public hearing, next week, for the March meeting.

Old Business

Tremont Hall Corp., Vineyard Ave, Site Plan, SBL#88.17-9-48 & 54.200, in R1/4 zone.

This is an Adaptive Re-Use building.

The applicant would like to convert an existing vacant 9600 square foot lumber storage building into a multi-family residential structure with 20 apartments, with associated parking and amenities.

Updated plans have been submitted.

Circulated for SEQRA Lead Agency on 2/2/17.

Patti Brooks the applicant's representative was present for the meeting.

The Board reviewed comment letter dated 2-9-17 from Brooks & Brooks which is in response to Morris' memo dated 1-25-17. (See attached)

The Board discussed proposed easements, blacktop surfaces, and the walking path from the building to proposed parking spaces 30 to 35.

Andy will review the revised submittal.

Andy: I worry about keeping people from parking within that easement with the Town at the end of the driveway. It may be good to take up the blacktop that is not serving any purpose.

Patti: The roadway itself would have to stay for emergency access.

Andy: I know you want to try to maintain the access to downtown, which is an important aspect, so I would be curious of what kind of gate you would be proposing.

Patti: That gate was probably going to block people as well but it is right up against the rail trail so people could walk right around. We could get rid of some of the blacktop and leave enough for a walking path.

Andy: The site does not disturb more than one acre so it does not require a full storm water analysis, the main thing we would be looking for is erosion control during construction. Other than that is just the sewer and water connections and how that is going to work.

Patti: I have not heard back from the fire department yet, I will follow up on that. Peak Engineering has looked at the bridge and a preliminary review memo with recommended reinforcements dated 2-16-17 was submitted. (See attached)

Andy: If they do need to do some work at the bottom of the abutment what permits will be needed?

Patti: None. DEC (Department of Environmental Conservation) sent a letter saying that it is not a classified stream and not regulated.

Patti submitted the deed and correspondence from 1993 regarding easements. (See attached)

She informed the Board that it was *agreed with the Town Board that the wooden bridge adjacent to Vineyard Avenue would be reconstructed and the back driveway paved up to the top of the hill to a point where it enters the old Conrail right of way. The Highland Sewer District will install a new lateral to the lumber yard office as recently located.*

Patti: The Bridge was not built that long ago it was in 1993.

Dave P: And who did the traffic study?

Patti: DOT (Department of Transportation) said that they did not need a traffic study. Because this is pre-existing and there is no other access to the site, and they determined that the traffic load that this would be demanding would be the same or less than when it was a commercial site.

Dave: One concern I know we did have was the sight distance, especially making a left out of there.

Andy: I think to have the sight distance would be a good idea but to show an area on the site plan that needs to be maintained with vegetation below a certain height would be a good idea.

Patti: One of the other things we had talked about which is still on the table is mitigating some of the concerns about sight distance by everybody exiting to the right so they do not have to cross the traffic.

The Board would like to see what the fire department has to say.
The Board will consider setting the public hearing next week for the March meeting.

Highland Assisted Living at Village View (former New Village View), Siteplan; 1, 7, & 9 Grove St, SBL#88.69-1-10, 11 & 12, in R1/4 zone.

This project consists of an 18,310 sq. ft. expansion to an existing assisted living facility. The expansion will allow a total of 80 beds and not more than 13 employees per shift. There will be a total of 15 parking spaces. The proposed expansion will continue to utilize existing central water and sewer facilities.

Feb. 17, 2016 - 1 Grove, 7 Grove, and 9 Grove Street were rezoned from CB to R 1/4.

July 2016 - New submittal with name change (formerly New Village View) Highland Assisted Living Center at Village View.

The Board anticipates updates. No new information at this time.

Administrative Business

Sign Approval

Sign - Walker Rt. 9W, 3945 Route 9W, SBL# 95.4-1-18, in HBD zone.

The applicant would like to install a double sided 40sq. ft. internally illuminated freestanding sign with an electronic reader board.

Wesley Walker was present for the meeting.

Dave B: This is the sign that was out in front of Wesley's shop on Route 299. This acts like a new sign because it is in a new location.

This is an electronic sign. Night time lamination was discussed. Wesley informed the Board that the sign dims during evening hours and everything meets regulations.

Dave B: There is no scrolling, instant messaging or animation permitted.

A **Motion** to approve this sign was made by Lawrence Hammond, seconded by Nicki Anzivina. All ayes.

Mountainside Woods, Toc Rd. RE: Deed Restrictions

Rules and Regulations

David Weinberg, the applicant, was present for the meeting.

This is their second proposal. His other amendment request was approved on Jan. 26, 2017.

Dave W. reviewed his request with the Board. (Request letter attached)

Dave W: In the original deed restrictions there were two types of restrictions; one was general provisions and one was very specific provisions. We would like to take the general provisions and make those Rules and Regulations which would be part of the subdivision plan and also be attached to the deed. The specific restrictions would still remain as deed restrictions. The reason for this change is to give the Planning Board the discretion down the line so that if something happened in terms of the Rules and Regulations you will have the ability to modify or change something. If they remain as deed restrictions you lose the power of this. So letters a thru h would all become Rules and Regulations and the other ones (fences and wetlands) would go into the deed. The one that we suggested a modification to, where we got into the vehicles, is letter a. I would like to add another general provision to the Rules and Regulations which would be letter i. I have had some customers ask me about fences. I would like to add that no fences will extend into the front yard beyond the front porch of the home.

The Board anticipates amendment approval next week.

Adaptive Re-Use Discussion

Dave P. asked the Board to review the revised draft keeping the 70% rule in mind and whether the efficiency apartment is needed.

A **Motion** to adjourn was made by William Ogden, seconded by Fred Pizzuto. All ayes. 7:05pm