

RED HOOK TOWN BOARD MEETING

September 23, 2015

A meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Red Hook, Dutchess County, New York was convened in public session at the Town Hall, 7340 South Broadway, Red Hook at 7:30 p.m.

Present: Supervisor Sue Crane
Councilman James Ross
Councilman Harry Colgan
Councilman William O'Neill
Town Clerk Sue McCann
Absent: Councilwoman Brenda Cagle
Also Present: Attorney for the Town Christine Chale
Michele Greig, Greenplan

Supervisor Crane welcomed everyone to the meeting and opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

SUPERVISORS REPORT

Supervisor Crane presented the following budget adjustment:

General A Fund: Increase revenue - \$4,910, Reduce appropriations - \$53,000; Total increase appropriations - \$57,910

Highway DB Fund: Total reduce appropriations - \$5,896; Total increase appropriations - \$18,000

On a motion of Councilman O'Neill seconded by Councilman Colgan moved to approve the budget adjustments as read.

Adopted	Ayes	4	Crane, Ross, Colgan, O'Neill
	Nays	0	
	Absent	1	Cagle

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councilman Colgan announced the Tivoli Street Painting Day on October 3, 2015.

Supervisor Crane reminded voters that the election will be held on November 3, 2015.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Supervisor Crane opened for comments.

Fulvia Masi, Linden Avenue, expressed concerns regarding the delay for replacement of the Linden Avenue Bridge.

Councilman O'Neill addressed those concerns by explaining that there will be a pedestrian walkway before the bridge is demolished. There is nothing conflicting in what happened, the bridge deteriorated before they thought it would. There is no impact on the charm of Red Hook because the new bridge is not going to be a lot bigger than the original bridge was, and is no relation to the deed and value of the property, the assessed value. That is a separate matter. Lastly, he suggested that she speak to her lawyer about his retainer. There is nothing we can do about it. What happened to the bridge was thoroughly presented to the Town. It is out of our hands since the County is the principal agency dealing with it.

Ms. Masi was concerned with the deterioration.

Councilman O'Neill said we have nothing to do with that. It was discovered after an inspection. He stressed that the County has to be contacted about the bridge.

Highway Superintendent Theresa Burke explained that NY State does the inspection of bridges on a two year cycle. She explained the inspections on the Linden Ave. Bridge. After the state reports, it is up to the County and we have no control over that.

Supervisor Crane spoke to Ms. Masi for a length of time today and she appreciates their frustration; there are other people in Town frustrated as well. The issue is with Dutchess County DPW, not the Town. We did have a presentation about the bridge project from the County. She suggested Ms. Masi contact Bob Balkind, Director of DC DPW.

CDBG APPLICATION 2016 – DISCUSSION/PUBLIC INPUT

Supervisor Crane asked if there were comments about the Community Development Block Grant for 2016. There were none.

PROPOSED UPDATE TO TOWN ZONING LAW – TOWN OF RED HOOK CODE CHAPTER 143 DISCUSSION – MICHELE GREIG

Supervisor Crane asked Michele Greig, Greenplan Inc. to lead the discussion.

Michele Greig explained that the Intermunicipal Task Force has been working on this for the last four years. She explained that the Town Board adopted a new comprehensive plan in 1990. That plan recommended design review for new development within or adjacent to Town recognized historic sites and districts. Michele reviewed and explained the requirements for three districts, the Hamlet District, the Overlay Historic Landmark District and the Environmental Overlay District. Paula Schoonmaker prepared the map that Michele used for reference for the Town Board. When zoning was adopted the survey the map was never actually filed. In the late 90's the Town Board created a map so that zoning could be implemented by the Planning Board. This is what the Task Force decided for their approach to this issue: First of all they believe the Town should focus on the most important critical historic resources in the community, secondly they believe that any property on the State or National register should require some review by the Planning Board. She pointed out multiple historic properties. They also recommended that those resources proposed for protection are adequately protected by the Planning Board. At this time there is no protection for those properties on the National Historic Registry. They recommend that the review process that we have now for the hamlet districts be extended to include the HLO district and any other properties on the State and National Register. That review process works extremely well. She explained the historic landmark district features and the ease of the process about the structures. They are proposing ways to simplify the process.

In 2004 there were three large community meetings to solicit ideas about what residents thought were the most important issues. Historic preservation came up, as well as adopting the EPO map along with other recommendations that evolved into the Centers and Greenspaces Plan. The problem of addressing historic preservation in the Town has been what the Task Force has been meeting about over the last four years. In a nutshell, this is what the Task Force has decided as their approach to this issue: the Town should focus on the most critical historic resources in the community; based on that the Hamlets should continue their review; any property on the State or National register should require some review by the planning Board; recommending this apply only to the historic registry, the hamlets, and the four properties listed outside of that district. Those properties should be looked at carefully and be adequately protected. The review process for the hamlet district should be extended to include the HLO district and any other properties on the State and National registers. When the Historic Landmark district was created in 1990 it identified 345 contributing structures within that district and 32 non-contributing. She explained how the Task Force came to their decisions and made the process simpler. Michele gave an in depth description of ways to streamline processes. Focus will be on the most critical historic resources to ensure that they have adequate review and that the review is streamlined. She pointed out the recommended changes to help that streamlined process.

Councilman Colgan commented that having development or building in the larger area of the Town within 500 feet radius of historic district essentially says everything you do has to go through the Planning Board. That alone seems to preclude streamlining the process.

Michele pointed out the number of properties under the new proposal.

Councilman Colgan saying having read this law, it is very awkward because many sections are deletions of the existing law and reading it is out of context.

Michele pointed out the changes to be sent to General Code. She will provide a red-lined version to the Town Board members. In an answer to Supervisor Crane she told her that Charlie Laing from the Planning Board is also a member of the ITF. He thinks that sending this to the Planning Board and the Design Review Committee at the same time will help simplify the process. She showed a graph and fact sheet of the affected area, and suggested sending information to the landowners telling them about informational meetings. Michele acknowledged Sarah Imboden who went through the Excel tables on parcel access to determine the landowners in the affected area. It might be a good idea to send it to County Planning now for their initial review and comment, and then a final review can be sent.

The Board discussed some of the items among themselves. Michele will clarify where the changes will be in the Town. The dates for the informational meetings will be October 21 and October 29, at 7:00 p.m.

RESOLUTIONS

Acknowledge required audit of Justice Court was conducted

Supervisor Crane explained that the Board should have previously passed this resolution for the Justice Court audit. She read the resolution.

Lee Goff explained the situation as she knew it. The burden was GE's to clean up the river. A number of river advocacy groups question the actual amount of PCB's levels still in the river. Councilman Colgan clarified, that what they are asking is for the Board to support that GE maintain the infrastructure they have and continue to operate it. He thought they might want to keep the equipment there and let someone else take over the operation. Supervisor Crane wonders why not ask the EPA to save the river. Surely the federal government has more money than GE does. Ross explained the superfund law that the 'damager' is the one responsible. Supervisor Crane commented that we could say it's our fault for being uninformed and allowing that to happen. At this point she feels we are going after the wrong entity. Councilman Ross would like to see the EPA to continue to oversee that the cleanup continues. He suggested passing a resolution asking the State to look at it closely and come up with a plan to maintain the infrastructure. Ross explained that this proposed resolution had been adopted by multiple local municipalities. Councilman Colgan tends to want to go along with the resolution, knowing how corporate America operates; it might become some kind of cooperative venture. Councilman O'Neill would offer to pass the resolution. This is a sense of spirit of communities along the Hudson River asking to back the idea to continue the effort to get rid of the PCB's.

RESOLUTION 2015 #45

RE: REGARDING THE REMOVAL OF PCB'S FROM THE HUDSON RIVER

On a motion of Councilman William O'Neill seconded by Councilman James Ross moved to approve the resolution.

Adopted	Ayes 4	Crane, Ross, Colgan, O'Neill
	Nays 0	
	Absent 1	Cagle
		Copy attached

Councilman Ross said the sentiment of this tells big corporations that things do matter to the local citizens.

Highway Superintendent Theresa Burke acknowledged the NY State Troopers and the Red Hook Village Police for their Route 9G safety assessment. Their representatives contributed some important information at the sites they were concerned about. She thanked them for their valuable contribution to the study.

On a motion of Supervisor Crane seconded by Councilman Colgan moved to go into Attorney/Client session at 9:43 p.m.

Adopted	Ayes 4	Crane, Ross, Colgan, O'Neill
	Nays 0	
	Absent 1	Cagle

On a motion of Councilman Colgan seconded by Councilman Ross moved to adjourn the Attorney/Client session at 9:57 p.m.

Adopted	Ayes 4	Crane, Ross, Colgan, O'Neill
	Nays 0	
	Absent 1	Cagle

On a motion of Supervisor Crane seconded by Councilman Colgan moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:58 p.m.

Adopted	Ayes 4	Crane, Ross, Colgan, O'Neill
	Nays 0	
	Absent 1	Cagle

Respectfully submitted,

Sue McCann, Town Clerk