

**TOWN OF RED HOOK PLANNING BOARD
DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
JULY 2, 2018**

Chairman Sam Phelan called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm. He announced that the Public Hearing for the Herrick subdivision was cancelled because the applicant has withdrawn the project.

Mr. Phelan introduced Kristina Dousharm, who was attending her first meeting as a new Planning Board member.

A quorum was determined present for the conduct of business. Members present: Sam Phelan, Bill Hamel, Kallie Robertson, Lisa Foscolo, Brian Kelly and Kristina Dousharm. Also present were engineering consultant Michelle Mormile and planning consultant Michele Greig.

Kallie Robertson made a motion to accept the draft minutes of June 18. Bill Hamel seconded and all members voted in favor.

OLD BUSINESS

LA Commons – 260 Rockefeller Lane – Special Use Permit, Site Plan

Continued discussion of application to construct a multi-family dwelling on a 5.845 acre parcel in the R 1.5 district.

Applicant's representatives Joe Palumbo and Matt Braydich were present.

Mr. Braydich discussed the lighting plan submitted with Michelle Mormile, and the revisions that need to be made.

Michele Greig said that a revised site plan must be submitted showing the footprint of the proposed three apartment multi-family dwelling (mfd).

Mr. Braydich reviewed the floor plans and elevations of the mfd, which shows a single common entrance door in the front, and two exit doors on the rear of the building, which faces Rockefeller Lane.

Mr. Phelan asked for comments from Board members. Mr. Hamel asked if there was a particular reason that front of the building faces away from Rockefeller Lane. Mr. Braydich replied it had been an engineering decision. Board members asked if the building could be turned so that the front faces Rockefeller Lane. Mr. Braydich agreed that could be done. The Board generally agreed that the front of the building should face Rockefeller Lane.

Kallie Robertson asked if the applicants could show at the Public hearing which trees would be removed from the existing tree lines at the front and sides of the property.

Ms. Foscolo asked how many parking spaces are required. Ms. Greig said she would have to review a revised site plan. The Board and applicants discussed the parking lot. Mr. Phelan recommended that the parking be changed so that cars are not so visible for the road. The Board agreed that the project should look like a single family home. They referred the applicants to the list of requirements that need to be shown of the site plan outlined of Michele Greig's memo dated 6-28-18.

Ms. Greig said the site plan must be submitted to County Planning for review. Michelle Mormile added that if the construction will disturb more than one acre, an Erosion and Sediment Control plan would need to be approved by the Department of Environmental Conservation.

A public hearing was tentatively scheduled for Aug. 6.

OTHER BUSINESS

Discussion – Monica Wieboldt Lot Line Adjustment

Monica Wieboldt was present. She said that she wants to transfer two acres from her 88 acre parcel to her neighbor. When she originally applied for a lot line adjustment, the Planning Board required a Farmland Protection Plan. She wanted to know if there was any way to simplify the process.

Since the project is a simple lot line adjustment that does not create a new lot, Michele Greig suggested sending it to the Town Agriculture and Open Space Committee to see if they had any concerns or comments, and whether they feel that this project warrants a Farmland Protection Plan. She said it would be helpful to show the soils on the property, since a key concern is the preservation of agricultural soils. She asked if there were any conservation easements on the property. Ms. Wieboldt said no.

Ms. Greig said a common use and maintenance agreement should be submitted for the existing shared driveway, which is approximately 50 feet long before it splits into separate driveways. Mr. Phelan asked if one had been drawn up for the original subdivision. Ms. Wieboldt said she was not sure. It was recommended that she check with the Dutchess County Clerk's Office. Ms. Mormile added that Ms. Wieboldt's engineer may be able to determine if an agreement existed. Mr. Phelan questioned whether producing or drawing up an agreement was necessary for an existing driveway.

Ms. Wieboldt agreed to return at a later date.

Extension request – Preserves at Lakeskill

Project engineer Mike Bodendorf was present. Bill Hamel recused himself.

Mr. Bodendorf reviewed the progress of the project since the last extension request was granted. He said one item holding the process up is that the project attorney is waiting for a response from the Planning Board's attorney. Mr. Phelan asked Mr. Bodendorf to have the project attorney specify exactly what was referred to the Planning Board attorney and update the status of the situation.

Mr. Phelan asked Ms. Mormile to circulate a copy of the letter received by the applicant from the Department of Transportation denying a reduction of the speed limit on Feller Newmark Road.

Ms. Mormile asked the Board if steel monuments could be used rather than concrete monuments to mark the corners of lots. Brian Kelly made a motion to waive the requirement for concrete monuments, and use steel rods instead. Kallie Robertson seconded and all members voted in favor.

Mr. Phelan said that a meeting of town officials will be held in July to discuss the site distance, driveway entrance and bond estimate for Feller Newmark Road. He said there were still many concerns about safety.

Lisa Foscolo made a motion to grant a 90 day extension. Kallie Robertson seconded and all members voted in favor.

Kristina Dousharm said that she has been getting feedback from community residents and businesses that the Planning Board has a reputation of being hard to work with. Discussion followed concerning the expectations of applicants, timewise and financially. Major themes that were identified during the discussion were:

- Applicants often don't understand the process and length of time required to process their project.
- Applicants generally don't appreciate the need to involve other agencies, review boards and public hearings when processing their applications.
- Applicants are often surprised by the cost of consultant services to review and process their application.
- The Planning Board sometimes investigates and resolves each issue raised regarding a project in a serial manner rather than identifying all the issues and then resolving only those deemed to be relevant and critical.

Ms. Dousharm asked if consultants could estimate the costs of reviewing the project. Ms. Greig and Ms. Mormile said that would be difficult, because it depends largely on the complexity of the project and the applicant's diligence.

Bill Hamel commented he thought that the fact that the Planning Board has a rigorous reputation actually speaks well of the Board and the Town.

Dealing with referring projects to attorneys, litigation, and defending Planning Board decisions was also discussed.

Ms. Dousharm suggested doing a study looking at what project costs are for each specific applicant category over the past two years, or conducting a survey. Mr. Phelan asked planning staff to provide a review of applications in 2016 and 2017 to see if specific problems can be identified.

Lisa Foscolo asked why the Rec Park West project is not being reviewed by the Planning Board. Kallie Robertson said that at a recent Town meeting when the question was asked Supervisor McKeon's response was that since the town makes its own regulations it is assumed that the town will follow its regulations and therefore the town board can act as the Planning Board.

Parking, lighting, traffic control, noise, and visual impact are things that would be applicable to the Planning Board, Mr. Phelan said, and he did not think the project was to that point currently. Mr. Phelan asked Ms. Foscolo draft a letter to the Town Board offering the services of the Planning Board to review their engineer's proposed drawing for such things as parking, lighting, and noise dampening for the Board to review prior to sending it to the Town.

The summer meeting schedule was discussed. The August 20 meeting will be cancelled due to lack of a quorum available.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Board, Brian Kelly make a motion to adjourn. Bill Hamel seconded and all members voted in favor.

Respectfully submitted

Kathleen Flood
Planning Board Clerk