

TOWN OF PLATTEKILL
PLANNING BOARD
P.O. BOX 45
MODENA, N.Y. 12548

October 22, 2013

THE MEETING OPENED WITH A SALUTE TO THE FLAG BY CHAIRPERSON CINDY HILBERT AT 7:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL: Chairperson Cindy Hilbert, Thomas Wilkin, Darryl Matthews, Nathaniel Baum,

Planning Board Engineer: David Clouser

ABSENT: Richard Gorres, Katherine Beinkafner, Judith Mayle

MINUTES

October 8, 2013

MOTION: Mr. Matthews made a motion to approve the minutes with Mr. Baum seconding the motion. All present voted aye.

OLD BUSINESS

Orchard Heights-Proposed 8 Lot Subdivision (Palazzo Lane) SBL#95.1-7-29.314

Mr. Kenneth Stenger, Attorney was present to represent the applicant. Ms. Hilbert stated that the board would be reviewing Part 2 of the Long Form EAF. Mr. Clouser passed out copies to the Planning Board members and went over the form as follows:

Impact on Land-yes

- Any construction on slopes of 15% or greater, (15 foot rise per 100 foot of length) or where the general slopes in the project area exceed 10%-Potential for large impact, which can be mitigated by project change.
- Other impacts on land: "*land disturbance typical of an 8 lot residential subdivision development*"-Small to moderate impact, which can be mitigated by project change.

Impact on Water-

3-Will proposed action affect any water body designated as protected?-No

4-Will proposed action affect any non-protected existing or new body of water-No

5-Will proposed action affect surface or groundwater quality or quantity-Yes

- Coverage under the Stormwater SPDES General Permit-Potential for a large impact which can be mitigated by project change
- Proposed action will allow residential uses in areas without water and/or sewer services-Potential large impact which can be mitigated by project change

6-Will proposed action alter drainage flow or patterns, or surface water runoff?-Yes

- Proposed action may cause substantial erosion-potential for a large impact which can be mitigated by stormwater erosion controls

- **Impact on Air**

7. Will proposed action affect air quality? No

Impact on Plants and animals

8. Will proposed action affect any threatened or endangered species? No

- Property is actively farmed as apple orchards

9. Will proposed action substantially affect non-threatened or non-endangered species? No

Impact on Agricultural Land Resources

10. Will the proposed action affect agricultural land resources? Yes

- The proposed action would irreversibly convert more than 10 acres of agricultural or, if located in an Agricultural District, more than 2.5 acres of agricultural land-potential large impact which cannot be mitigated

Impact on Aesthetic resources

11. Will proposed action affect aesthetic resources? No

Impact on historic and archaeological resources

12. Will proposed action impact any site or structure of historic, pre-historic or paleontological importance? No

Impact on open space and recreation

13. Will proposed action affect the quantity or quality of existing or future open spaces or recreational opportunities? Yes

under other impacts: *additional residents will generate additional demands on recreational facilities and the existing Town facilities can accommodate this additional demand-small to moderate impact which cannot be mitigated.*

Impact on critical environmental areas

14. Will proposed action impact the exceptional or unique characteristics of a critical environmental area (CEA) established pursuant to subdivision 6 NYCRR 617.14(g)? No

Impact on Transportation

15. Will there be an effect to existing transportation systems? Yes

Under other impacts: *The development may generate 8 additional peak hour trips which can be accommodated by the existing transportation network-small to moderate impact which cannot be mitigated*

Impacts on energy

16. Will proposed action affect the community's sources of fuel or energy supply? No

Noise and odor impacts

17. Will there be objectionable odors, noise or vibration as a result of the proposed action?

Yes

Under other impacts: *Temporary noise and odor impacts which will be managed during construction by restricted hours of operation and maintenance of construction equipment-small to moderate impact which would can be mitigated by project change.*

18. Will proposed action affect public health and safety? Yes

Under other impacts: *Pesticide contaminated soils will be remediated in compliance with Ulster County Health Department specified methods-(remediation plan is in the process) small to moderate impact which can be mitigated by project change.*

Development will create a demand for additional community services (e.g. schools, police and fire, etc.) which would create a potential large impact which cannot be mitigated

Will proposed action create or eliminate employment-beneficial impact with a potential large impact with cannot be mitigated.

20. Is there, or is there likely to be, public controversy related to potential adverse environmental impacts? No

Mr. Clouser will prepare Part 3 of the Long Form EAF.

Ms. Hilbert asked Mr. Stenger if he had any questions. Mr. Stenger stated this was pretty consistent with the analysis that Mr. James (Engineer for the project) had done with him prior to this evening. Ms. Hilbert asked Mr. Clouser a question regarding the development creating a demand for additional community services (e.g. schools, police and fire, etc.) and it being a large to moderate impact as it was only an eight lot subdivision. Mr. Clouser stated this hits a certain threshold, it would to be written up in Part 3.

The applicant is scheduled to appear on the November 12th. meeting to go over Part 3 of the Long Form EAF.

NEW BUSINESS

Hudson Valley Flyer's Club/DeMagistris III Lot Line Revision

Mr. Ben Grey, Vice-President of the Hudson Valley Flyers was present along with Fred Schindler, President of the Hornets. Other members of the Hudson Valley Flyers Club Inc. were present in the audience. Revised plans dated July 7, 2013 were passed out to the Planning Board members. Mr. Grey explained that they would like to move a lot line which would extend their property, for safety issues. Ms. Hilbert asked Mr. Grey if there were safety issues that the Hudson Valley Flyers Club was currently trying to mitigate? Mr. Grey stated their intension is to make the approach and departure to the south safer, because of the trees that are there now. Ms. Hilbert asked Mr. Grey if they would be removing the trees to extend? Mr. Grey stated they were

not going to extend their runway, but would be clear the trees the width of the runway back as far as they can, although they can't go too far back because of wetlands, so that the approaches and departures are safer. Mr. Wilkin stated the Hudson Valley Flyers Club Inc. was not changing their site plan, but doing a lot line and adding a parcel on to their land. Mr. Schindler stated that he was in touch with a representative at the D.E.C. and she gave him the directions for cutting around the trees. Ms. Hilbert asked Mr. Clouser if he had any questions. Mr. Clouser asked Mr. Grey about the width of the runway. Mr. Grey stated the runway was one hundred feet wide at its widest, and they were thinking of making it one hundred fifty feet wide. Mr. Wilkin asked if the Planning Board should be doing a site plan modification. Mr. Clouser stated that there is nothing in the Plattekill Code about clearing. Mr. Clouser asked Mr. Grey if the Hudson Valley Flyers Club would be doing any grading? Mr. Grey stated no, they are not even planning on taking the stumps out. Mr. Clouser added that there shouldn't be any grading done. Ms. Hilbert asked what the elevations were in the area. Mr. Schindler stated it runs back flat and right before the wetlands it pitches up, but they would not be going that far. Mr. Clouser asked Mr. Grey if there were any wells or septic on the property. Mr. Grey replied that up by the club house there is a well and septic. Mr. Matthews asked if the Hudson Valley Flyers would be extending their runway at all? Mr. Schindler stated the runway currently goes up to the rock wall and D.O.T. has given them a displaced runway because of the trees. Mr. Andrew Miller stated the end of the runway can be used for takeoff, but currently, you can't use the very end of the runway to land on, so by taking out the trees you are keeping the same glide slope and what you are gaining is about four hundred of useful feet on the present runway as it is presently built. There was a determination that this project would be considered a lot line revision and not a site plan modification. Mr. Wilkin stated that the application was stamped on October 4, 2013 so it would still fall within the old SEQRA form. The Planning Board members went over the Short Form SEQRA.

MOTION: Mr. Wilkin made a motion that the Plattekill Planning Board take lead agency with Mr. Matthews seconding the motion. All ayes on the vote.

MOTION: Mr. Wilkin made a motion to declare this an unlisted action with Mr. Matthews seconding the motion. All ayes on the vote.

MOTION: Mr. Wilkin made a motion to declare this a negative declaration with Mr. Matthews seconding the motion. All ayes on the vote.

There was a determination to set this application up for a public hearing for November 12th.

The applicant will pick up a packet from the Planning Department with the names and addresses of the neighboring property owners within 500 feet for certified mailing.

Pre-application: Rumsey proposed Phase III (Freetown Highway)SBL#101.2-4-30

Morty Gluck was present as a representative for Ken and Kathy Rumsey (letter of authorization is in file) to talk to the Planning Board about what needed to be done with the infrastructure and what would need to be done in order to subdivide the seven lots in Phase III. (the total lots in the subdivision is 20 lots). The Planning Board members reviewed the file and the signed original site plan map. Mr. Clouser stated the design for the road is there, although it needed to be checked to make sure it was built the way it was designed. Mr. Clouser stated a subdivision plat would be required, and a short form SEQRA would be sufficient. Mr. Clouser stated the lots would require board of health approval. Mr. Gluck stated they would need to get a septic design.

Mr. Gluck asked Mr. Clouser about the SWPPP. Mr. Clouser stated it was more than an acre disturbance so a SWPPP would be required.

DISCUSSION

Messina and Sons Site Plan/Special Use & Lot Line Revision (Orchard Drive) SBL# 101.1-6-4.311

Mr. Meluso, representative for Mr. Messina and Engineer Kevin Patton were present, although not scheduled to appear on the agenda. Mr. Meluso stated he just wanted to give a status report to the board. Ms. Hilbert asked Mr. Meluso if he brought maps to the board. Mr. Meluso submitted a copy of the wetland boundary validation map signed by Brian Drumm on 10/17/13. Mr. Wilkin stated that he couldn't say a word when the Ulster County Planning Board reviewed the application, but one of the required modifications from the Ulster county Planning Board would be to mitigate the need for a permit to place the proposed building within the buffer area. Mr. Patton stated there is room to put the building there and not be in the buffer. Mr. Wilkin stated that would be one of the comments from the Ulster County Planning Board. Mr. Wilkin stated they also thought there should be more of a lighting detail than what was submitted. Mr. Wilkin added that the Ulster County Planning Board also commented on SWPPP, fire safety and the building. Mr. Wilkin added that landscaping is always an issue with the Ulster County Planning Board. Mr. Meluso stated the D.E.C. doesn't want them to put trees in the buffer area. Ms. Hilbert stated they would have to wait until they get the official comments from the Ulster County Planning Board, and once they get the copy of that, they would be forwarded to Mr. Meluso and he would be scheduled for a meeting, probably in December. Mr. Meluso stated he needed to have a meeting before December because if the parties that are selling and buying the land don't come together soon, the whole deal will come apart, and they won't have a place to put a building. Ms. Hilbert stated the Planning Board only has one meeting in November and one meeting in December, and the board already has three applications and one public hearing for November. Ms. Hilbert indicated if one of the applicants drop out for the next meeting, Mr. Meluso would be contacted. Mr. Clouser stated he would need to look at the watershed maps. Ms. Hilbert added that the board had requested a sound reading be taken. Mr. Patton stated he followed the D.E.C.'s noise study guidelines. Ms. Hilbert asked Mr. Clouser if he had any other comments. Mr. Clouser stated he could review the Stormwater Prevention Plan when he receives the watershed maps, or would Mr. Meluso like to see where he gets with the D.E.C. first? Mr. Clouser stated he did not want to start the clock on the review which would cost Mr. Messina money, if the Stormwater Prevention Plan was going to change. Mr. Patton stated he would get the information to Mr. Clouser shortly.

The applicant will get the necessary information to the Planning Board Engineer for his review on the Stormwater Prevention Plan.

DISCUSSION

There was a brief discussion regarding requiring the applicant to construct driveways with significantly steep slopes versus requiring the homeowner to construct the driveway.

Memo from the Supervisor regarding Walden Playboy

Ms. Hilbert stated the Planning Board was presented a letter from the Supervisor regarding the status on Walden Playboy

Ulster County Planning Board

Ms. Hilbert stated that the Planning Board received a copy of the Ulster County Planning Board changes to the review process.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Ms. Hilbert made a motion to adjourn with Mr. Baum seconding the motion.
All ayes on the vote.

The meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by
Susan Bolde, Planning Board Clerk