Revised 9/16/14

The Philipstown Planning Board held its regular monthly meeting on Thursday, June 19, 2014 at the Butterfield Library in Cold Spring, New York. The meeting was opened at 7:30 p.m. by the

Chairman. Present: Anthony Merante, Chairman

Kim Conner

Mary Ellen Finger (arrived at 8:35 p.m.)

Joseph Giachinta David Hardy Neal Zuckerman Steve Gaba, Counsel Ron Gainer, Engineer

Absent: Pat Sexton

Auth (Steve and Sandra) – Site plan application – 279 Route 9, Cold Spring: New Submission

Mr. John Delano introduced himself and the applicants. He presented the plan and said that there are some steep slopes on the property. Mr. Delano said that the ordinance regulates slopes over twenty percent and there are some additional restrictions on slopes which then exceed thirtyfive percent. He pointed out the twenty to thirty-five percent slopes and the slopes thirty-five percent or greater. Mr. Delano said that their frontage along Route 9 is about 816 feet and along Route 301 is about 566 feet. Total area of the property that's encumbered by the SPO (Scenic Protection Overlay) is about 6.8 acres of the ten acres. He said that they have not submitted an application to the DOT although this location was agreed upon for being best for the proposed use. Mr. Delano explained that the applicant's preference for choosing the location was that the average annual daily traffic volume on Route 9 is tremendously greater than it is on Route 301. He said that the problem that they run in to coming in off of Route 301, is that they have to traverse some of the steep slopes. Mr. Delano said that they are proposing a driveway that meets the vertical alignment at maximum percent of grade within the Town's fourteen percent regulation. He said that he thought the driveway is 786 feet long and because it's in excess of 500 feet, they're required to provide a turnoff/pullout for the fire people, which they provided (pointed out on plan). Mr. Delano said that the home is going to be approximately 3800 hundred square feet in footprint. The septic system was previously approved for six bedrooms only because that was the maximum amount they could get in there at the time. Mr. Delano said that they spoke with the Health Department and they see no reason why the septic permit would not be renewed, as it meets all the current regulations. He apologized for the typographical error on the drawing with regard to the height of the building. Mr. Delano said that the maximum permitted in the zone is forty feet. They intended to represent that the structure would be less than forty feet high. Mr. Delano said that it will be less than forty feet high – it's a one-level ranch house. He said that they anticipate they'll run into rock when they do the driveway, so



l

clearly they won't have an opportunity to do much in the way of infiltration. Mr. Delano said that there was some concern there might be some additional steep slopes on the Route 9 side. He pointed out the only steep slopes on the Route 9 side that meet the current definition of steep slopes – between 20 and 35 percent. Mr. Delano said that they haven't really talked about lighting and with regard to that and color, nothing is set yet. He said that they prepared a basic landscape plan. Mr. Delano said that they did not believe the house would be seen from anywhere at all because of the steep slopes, heavy vegetation and the building would be set behind the ridgeline.

Mr. Gainer said that the there is an obligation of the Board to take a hard look as to potential environmental impacts - to understand the specifics more than generalities, as to just how much cutting is involved, and whether it's just going to be graded or require rock removal. Mr. Gainer said that there's going to be an effort that has to be done to better illustrate that.

There was a brief discussion with regard to the Board making a site visit. Mr. Merante asked what they could do to facilitate the process. Mr. Delano said that it would probably be physically easier to walk in from Route 9, as the grades are gentler.

Mr. Gainer said that the Board obviously understands that just due to the size of the residence and the impacts, a second approval is required. He said that it's also doing disturbances on greater than twenty percent slopes, which elevates it to a special permit under the new zoning.

Mr. Delano stated that they were not there because of the size of the house. He said that it was the amount of the disturbance in the SPO zone.

Mr. Zuckerman addressed the applicant and stated that he would like to know what he would or would not see from Route 301 or Route 9.

Mr. Delano said that the house is not in the SPO, so he did not believe it would bear the consideration Mr. Zuckerman was asking for. He said that the house is outside of the SPO. Mr. Delano said that he would not see anything from Route 9 – it's heavily vegetated. They have a limited disturbance on the plan, which they don't tend to go beyond. He referred to the plan and said that certainly from this portion (pointed out) of Route 301, they believe the same is true because the house is set so far back.

Mr. Gainer asked if the (inaudible) would be great enough where it might be seen from the 9 corridor.

Mr. Delano said that there is no fill required for the septic system, and even if they keep the same bedroom count, the septic system and expansion area will be smaller than what's delineated because of the recent change in the design (inaudible) for the Health Department.

Mr. Gainer asked if it was wooded at all now.

Mr. Delano referred to the map and pointed out what he said was all part of the forested area.

Mr. Gainer said that it was going to be removed.

Mr. Delano said that a portion of it will be removed to install the primary septic field. He said that the expansion area will not need to be cleared – the vegetation can remain because there's no fill requirement for the sanitary system.

Ms. Conner asked what you could see if you're further down Route 301. She said that presumably the neighbors down below would see a good (did not finish sentence).

Mr. Delano said that they haven't pulled any site line profiles from that direction. He said that while there may be some visibility, they don't anticipate it would be severe.

Ms. Conner said that she knew in the winter, you can see the ridge.

The applicant said that the area is not vegetated now — there are no trees there. He said that the reserved area does have trees and they won't be disturbed. The applicant stated that the tree line along Route 9 will stay. He said that as far as the access to the site, that is the only feasible way to access that piece of property. He said that it is a real difficult lot. The applicant said that his intention is to build the house on the ledge. He said that he does not have to do any blasting, hammering, etc. The applicant said that for the driveway, there will be some impact, but most of the rock that he sees in his experience is loose rock, and it's been affected by the elements, so there is really not going to be a lot to take it down.

Ms. Conner made a motion to schedule the site visit for Sunday July 13, 2014 at 9:30 a.m. Mr. Giachinta seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

Anthony Merante - In favor
Kim Conner - In favor
Mary Ellen Finger - In favor
Joseph Giachinta - In favor
David Hardy - In favor
Pat Sexton - Absent
Neal Zuckerman - In favor

Mr. Gainer said that it would be an Unlisted Action and the Board could do a Coordinated Review if the Board wished. A county referral (239M) is required. CAB is involved because of the steep slope disturbance. He suggested they make a referral to the Fire Department. Mr. Gainer said that he had one concern about where they had the proposed widened driveway because of the severe turns and said that they may want something near an area where you can see toward the bottom of the access. He said that it could be better evaluated at the site walk.

Mr. Zuckerman made a motion that the Board conduct a Coordinated Review. Mr. Giachinta seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

Anthony Merante - In favor
Kim Conner - In favor
Mary Ellen Finger - In favor
Joseph Giachinta - In favor
David Hardy - In favor
Pat Sexton - Absent
Neal Zuckerman - In favor

C.F. Diversified Corp. - Subdivision approval: Return of escrow funds

Ms. Finger made a motion that the Planning Board recommend to the Town Board to return the escrow funds. Ms. Conner seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

Anthony Merante - In favor
Kim Conner - In favor
Mary Ellen Finger - In favor
Joseph Giachinta - In favor
David Hardy - In favor
Pat Sexton - Absent
Neal Zuckerman - In favor

Cold Spring Farm (Marian Rockwell) – Alternative access – Old Albany Post Road, Garrison: Discussion of updated plan

Mr. George Schmidt of Morris Associates, introduced himself and stated that he was representing Nick and Mariam Rockwell. He said that they were back in front of the Board trying to utilize access off of Old Albany Post Road. Mr. Schmidt said that there is kind of a little woods road cut in there already and they wanted to get some feedback from the Planning Board with regard to what it felt about that before they go too far with the steep slopes, landscape plans, disturbances, etc. He said that it is going to be steep — he was thinking about thirteen and a half percent for most of the road. Mr. Schmidt said that it would have a finished

driveway coming in off of the thirteen and a half and coming through the scenic protection. He said that there's going to be some wetlands. Mr. Schmidt said that they would not impact the wetlands themselves, but it is looking like they will be in the buffer for short period of time. He said that they would get the wetlands delineated and they will provide that on the drawings.

- Mr. Gainer asked if Mr. Schmidt if he had generated any preliminary profiles.
- Mr. Schmidt said that he had a preliminary profile, but didn't have it with him tonight.
- Mr. Gainer asked if it was entirely along an existing wood road or there was some significant clearing, cutting and filling to do.
- Mr. Schmidt said that there will be cutting and areas of filling. He said that he was using the wood road as much as he could for horizontal alignment and trying to do his disturbance where the woods road is into the property cutting into the hill.
- Mr. Gainer distributed the regulations for the steep slopes section of the zoning ordinance. He said that the applicant should visit that pretty early on to make sure they could satisfy those concerns. Mr. Gainer said other than that, it's going to be the significant issues are interests of the Conservation Board, which they would also have to appear before.
- Mr. Schmidt asked if the Board had any objection to them testing to see if there was rock or anything that would influence where the alignment would be.
- Mr. Gainer said not if they were just driving into the site and not doing any disturbance.
- Mr. Merante said that he thought the Board needed more information and a plan and more detail from the applicant. He suggested that the applicant talk with the Building Inspector and said that he would then notify the Planning Board.
- Ms. Rockwell asked the Board asked if the anyone may foresee as a major obstacle that the original proposed area would be an open area, well off of any ridge line and totally not visible from anywhere. She asked if it would be worth pursuing.
- Mr. Gainer said that he remembered raising that as a major concern in the very beginning and he did not know if the CAB or Wetlands Inspector ever weighed in on that issue, but he would certainly be responding to that concern.
- Ms. Rockwell asked if she could approach him prior.

Mr. Gainer said that he would give the contact information so that Ms. Rockwell could find out if he's willing to write any informal assistance now

201 Old Stone Road – Site plan application 201 Old Stone Road, Garrison: Memo via email dated June 2, 2014 from Ron Gainer regarding site visit comments/observations

Mr. Watson said that the plan has not changed. He said that it's a little easier to see in plan view, the driveway is being re-routed from the light yellow/greenish route it's on now, low around the hill to approach the building – the same parking area from a different angle. The existing building – part of it, is being retained. The rest of the building is going to wrap around the edge of the hill and roughly the same roof level as exists now, and it's going to fall off the hill and have a walk-out basement on the downhill side. Mr. Watson said that they are working with the Health Department still. He said that they have to convince them that this is a better solution.

Mr. Gainer said that the issue is where it sits and visibility from public places recognizing its sitting right on the ridge. He said that it's clearly identified in the significant areas, and the view sheds that the Board wanted to see were identified.

Mr. Watson said that he did take a look at a couple of places within Mr. Gainer's memo. He said that there is some visibility from the North Redoubt. Mr. Watson said that in the wooded situation, he thought it probably was minimal. He said he could look at it very easily – it's a clear line of sight. Mr. Watson said that it must be a mile and a half – the distance that's mitigating that, and then the wooded stuff. He said that they'd go up and take pictures and demonstrate that. Mr. Watson said that as far as the other place, he looked at Fort Defiance. Fort Defiance is not visible. He said that he hasn't found a place in the Appalachian Trail that's visible, but his gut tells him it will not be visible. Mr. Watson said that they'd like to hone in on any steep slopes issues the Board has. He said that the septic system is on a steep slope. Mr. Watson said that they have a GOTech company to see if they can get some of the rock out and lower the building a little more, or at least identify what they can do by way of altering the elevation a little bit to reduce visibility. He said that they would be maintaining a wooded buffer around the property.

Mr. Gainer asked if there were any other possible sanitary disposal areas on the site.

Mr. Watson said that they have an existing sanitary sewer and are technically allowed to use that, as they have a four-bedroom count settled on with the Health Department. He said that they are still working with them. Mr. Watson said that their fallback position is to use the existing septic system. He said that they can make the primary area pretty much meet code.

Mr. Gainer said that the Board wants to be sure it correctly understands the potential impacts.

Mr. Merante asked if there had ever been a problem where the applicant expected to change some of the turns and curves of the driveway approaching immediately off of 403.

Mr. Buck said that it was something they had talked about. He said that one of the solutions was rather than using small dump trucks, to use large pickup trucks. The applicant said that he doesn't have ownership and does not have any contact with the owner of the road. He said that they're pretty comfortable that the road is in good enough shape to take the loads up and down.

Mr. Gaba said that he thought they were ready for a public hearing.

Mr. Giachinta made a motion to schedule a public hearing at the next Planning Board meeting. Ms. Conner seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

Anthony Merante - In favor
Kim Conner - In favor
Mary Ellen Finger - In favor
Joseph Giachinta - In favor
David Hardy - In favor
Pat Sexton - Absent
Neal Zuckerman - In favor

Tuana – 3-lot subdivision – 992-996 Old Albany Post Road, Garrison: Further discussion from May15, 2014 meeting (submission made last month)/comments via email from Steve Gaba to follow

Mr. Watson said that there is really a processing issue in question that's come up. He said that he had explained it last month – submitted a letter giving the Board a chronology of the Tuana situation and different events that lead up to the current situation, which is the three pieces of property that Mr. Tuana and his former wife own, being flagged as illegal lots. Mr. Watson said that there's been an attempt in the past to get them legalized by going through a subdivision process. That subdivision process was never closed. So they submitted the paper work and asked if the Board would have its attorney look at it and in the meantime, they've done some additional work and Mr. Tuana has engaged Ms.VanTuyl. Mr. Watson said that they were there tonight in the hope that they could continue and bring the process to a positive ending for his client, but mostly to receive comments from the Board.

Mr. Gaba said that he had looked into it. He said the applicants came in for subdivision approval in 2008, started the public hearing, held it open and the Board had not seen them since. Mr. Gaba said that the public hearing had never actually been closed. He said that the Town has established a policy regarding abandonment of applications, however a letter did not go out,

there was no notification given to the applicant, so that policy would not apply in this instance. Mr. Gaba said also, because the application was processed to public hearing prior to the zoning change, they're considered under the old code. He said that he thought the appropriate thing to do was to re-notice the public hearing and send to County Planning again.

Mr. Gainer said that he did not know who on the Board would have the original plans that were submitted by the applicant.

Mr. Watson said that he would supply them as well as a new list of adjoining owners as they undoubtedly changed.

Ms. Conner made a motion that the Board schedule a site visit on July 13, 2014 (following the Auth site visit). Mr. Hardy seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

Anthony Merante - In favor
Kim Conner - In favor
Mary Ellen Finger - In favor
Joseph Giachinta - In favor
David Hardy - In favor
Pat Sexton - Absent
Neal Zuckerman - In favor

Mr. Giachinta made a motion to make the referrals to the County and check to see if the application should also be referred to the CAB. Ms. Conner seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

Anthony Merante

In favor

Kim Conner - In favor
Mary Ellen Finger - In favor
Joseph Giachinta - In favor
David Hardy - In favor
Par Sexton - Absent
Neal Zuckerman - In favor

ESP (Bruce and Donna Kehr) - Site plan application - Route 9, Cold Spring: New submission

Mr. Giachinta recused himself from the application and left the table.

Mr. Watson explained the history of the application to the Board. He introduced Donna Kehr, principal and one of the owners of the property. Mr. Watson went over the history of the property with the Board. He said that the applicants have expanded and were cited and have been trying for many years to bring the property into conformity so they can stay in town and continue their successful business. Mr. Watson said that their property is still in a zone where

this is a permitted use, but their coverage far exceeds the 60% allowable. He said that the only possible solution from their point of view is to seek a zoning change in the rear piece of the property to bring it into the same zone as the front piece, and basically enlarge the parcel so that the coverage percentage goes down. Mr. Watson said that they developed a site plan and there are a couple of things that are not very evident. He said that they have a parallel petition to the Town Board to change the zoning. Mr. Watson said that the most significant change in the site plan will be the addition of the lighter colored building and a small addition to the front of the existing building. The residential structure that's going to remain will be changed from a residence to a warehouse structure. Mr. Watson said that this will allow the applicants to bring a lot of their material inside and protect it. He said that they are making several changes to the yard – removing an encroachment toward the northeast corner of the original property, moving one of the buildings out of the setback area back into the setback area, cleaning up the front of the yard, moving the sign back to its original approved position, adding screening in the front, and formalizing the parking spaces. Mr. Watson said that they are leaving the open area where they have drives and alleys shown. He said that the border of the rear of the property is the center line of Clove Creek. It borders conserved lands and has two residential borders on the other side of the creek. Mr. Watson said that there are associated wetlands and there is a flood plain. He said that they offered to put all of that into a conservation easement to further assure that it won't be violated. Mr. Watson explained that the way the further assurance is concerned is that the holder of the conservation easement has the right to come in and enforce it in addition to any enforcement power that the Town has. He said that they proposed the setback from a residence (pointed out) be increased from its required fifteen feet and they'd provide plantings as necessary. Mr. Watson said that they also said that they will not expand beyond what is seen on the plan for a period of at least ten years and they provided a physical barrier in way of a fence along the back rear of the property. He said that they are working on the architecturals and will be submitting them later. Mr. Watson said that they discussed that it would be much better if they did something like the Stanco building – they basically put a brick front on the building. He said that they are working on that now, and that's why the Board didn't get the plans. Mr. Watson said that instead of display of product out there, there will be landscaping, the sign will be there, it will be a visible site, but it will be dressed up considerably and much less obvious to passersby. He said that they are reaching out to the neighbors in order to see what their specific concerns are and how they might be able to modify the plans as they move along to lessen their concerns, if not eliminate them.

Mr. Gaba asked Mr. Watson how have these forego the processing the application without the zoning change first being granted.

Mr. Watson said that he thought it was more a question for Mr. Gaba to answer because he really didn't know the answer, but he did know that both boards are aware of it. He said that it was discussed at the pre-application meeting and he discussed it with the Supervisor that it would run

in parallel, much the way some Boards run a site plan and variance applications in parallel and whoever gets to the finish line first conditions their answer on the second happening.

- Mr. Gainer asked if the Town Board petition had been filed.
- Mr. Watson said that it has been filed for over a year.
- Mr. Merante asked if there had been any movement on it.
- Mr. Watson said no. He said that he was planning to present at the July Town Board meeting to report what they've done here and ask that they start taking a look and thought they had to be included as involved.
- Mr. Gaba said that he thought to get the zoning change, there are a couple of different ways to proceed before the Town Board on an application like this. He said that the most common would be that they submit a petition to the Town Board along with their own separate (inaudible) and they'd need another one to go to the Town Board and then the Town decides if it would take action or not. Mr. Gaba said that he thought once they had that in front of them formally, the Planning Board would be in a better position.
- Mr. Watson said that all the paperwork is available they did give them an EAF. He said that it's not the same EAF because they changed forms, but they can submit that for the next July meeting of the Town Board. Mr. Watson said that it's a little bit that the Town Board wants to see what the Planning Board does because they're going to be enabling that change and are going to want to be assured that what's going to happen is going to be satisfactory.
- Mr. Gaba said that they can ask the Planning Board for a report.
- Mr. Watson said that they have to.
- Ms. Conner referred to a memo from Susan Jainchill with regard to the pre-application meeting on the 9th, and said that it says on the second page that the potential for amending the zoning in regards to this application have been a topic of Town Board discussion over the past ten months and a zoning change is being considered. She asked if that was incorrect and whether it had been discussed at the Town Board meetings.
- Mr. Watson said that he went to two Town Board meetings one for certain, where he presented the concept and a conceptual plan. He said that he knew a petition was presented. Mr. Watson said he did know, if talking to Mr. Shea, that they did have discussions concerning it.

Mr. Hardy asked if they needed to get a setback variance for the new proposed building.

Mr. Watson said no. He said that he would have had to on the old zoning and explained the specifics.

Ms. Finger made a motion that the Board schedule a site visit for Sunday, June 29th at 9:30 a.m. Mr. Zuckman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

Anthony Merante - In favor
Kim Conner - In favor
Mary Ellen Finger - In favor
Joseph Giachinta - Recused
David Hardy - In favor
Par Sexton - Absent
Neal Zuckerman - In favor

Mr. Giachinta joined the table again.

Obert R. Wood III – Site plan application – 316 Old West Point Road, Garrison: New submission

Mr. Watson introduced Mr. Wood to the Board. He said that the piece of property is a total of twenty acres and a significant portion of the property is under conservation easement. In fact, other than for driveway and septic systems, and other minor things, the building is restricted to a small area in the middle of the property. Mr. Watson said that a couple of years ago, Mr. Wood applied for a wetlands permit to allow the construction of a driveway and was granted that wetlands permit and constructed the driveway from Old West Point Road through the property through the wetlands, through the wetlands buffer to roughly the middle of the property. He also obtained a permit to construct a septic system and that system is in the southern portion of the property in the ground. Mr. Watson presented the plan to the Board and showed the location of the driveway. He said that they are applying for another wetlands permit to bury the electric service lines underneath the driveway. Mr. Watson said that that's the only activity that's happening in any of the wetlands. Once they get out of the wetlands buffer, they're going to make the driveway a little wider to allow for the units to be brought up safely. Mr. Watson said that there is not a lot of grading involved.

The applicant said that the enlargement of the turn is a temporary thing. He said that it's that they realize they're going to have to cut the corner with heavier equipment but they're not intending to keep that there. The applicant said that it is within the building envelope that the conservation trust...they stopped the driveway when they hit the building envelope originally, because the intention was until they designed the house, they didn't want to take down any trees or do any unnecessary work until they knew what they were building.

Ms. Conner said that through the building envelope it says there is a trail.

The applicant said that there are trails all over the place. He said that he had a copy of the Land Trust Conservation Easement and it requires that (inaudible) the trail comes down and goes up to Blueberry Swamp (pointed out). The applicant said that they are not required to keep the trail. He said that their intention is to keep the trail and use that as a hiking area, but their intention is to eventually re-route the trail just past the ridge line so it's not coming right through the building envelope.

Mr. Hardy asked if the existing trail was the access get up to the upper part.

The applicant said that there were a number of entrances and said one was not frequently used because of the steepness. He said that there are trail markers, but there not much of a trail there. The applicant said that he would like to reinstate the trail because he likes the trail.

Mr. Gainer said that it would be good to show that intended relocation even if he doesn't proceed with it immediately.

Mr. Watson said that they can do that.

Ms. Conner said that she remembered reading in the zoning something about modular construction and limits on that, but that she may have been mistaking that for mobile homes.

Mr. Gainer said that he did not recall, but would look into it.

Mr. Watson said that he was hoping the Board would schedule a site visit and tell them that because it's a minor subdivision, it didn't feel it necessary to have a public hearing.

Mr. Gaba said that the Board would have to start its SEQRA review. He said that he thought there was a CAB referral required also.

Mr. Gainer agreed.

Mr. Gaba said that this is a kind of unusual application off of West Point Road, as opposed to off of Route 9. He said that unless the Board feels there is some visual impact here that the neighbors might be interested in...did not finish sentence.

Mr. Gainer said that most of the property is conserved already and there's public access through the property. He said that may generate public interest.

A brief discussion followed.

The applicant said that the Conservation Trust is interested in protecting the scenery and have put restrictions on the house. He said that he house can't be more than twenty-five feet tall – they are actually at seventeen feet. They require muted tones in color, so they're using a kind of a slate, dark grey. He said that there are rules about not being allowed to clear outside of the building envelope.

Mr. Gainer suggested referring this application to the Fire Department.

Mr. Giachinta made a motion that the Board schedule a site visit for Sunday, June 29, 2014 at 10:30 a.m. Mr. Zuckerman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

Anthony Merante - In favor
Kim Conner - In favor
Mary Ellen Finger - In favor
Joseph Giachinta - In favor
David Hardy - In favor
Par Sexton - Absent
Neal Zuckerman - In favor

Ms. Conner made a motion the schedule a public hearing for the next Planning Board meeting. Mr. Zuckerman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

Anthony Merante - In favor
Kim Conner - In favor
Mary Ellen Finger - In favor
Joseph Giachinta - In favor
David Hardy - In favor
Par Sexton - Absent
Neal Zuckerman - In favor

Adjourn

Mr. Zuckerman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Giachinta seconded the motion. The meeting ended at 9:30 p.m. The vote was as follows:

Anthony Merante - In favor
Kim Conner - In favor
Mary Ellen Finger - In favor
Joseph Giachinta - In favor
David Hardy - In favor
Pat Sexton - Absent

Neal Zuckerman - In favor

Respectfully submitted,

Ann M. Gallagher

Note: These minutes were prepared for the Philipstown Planning Board and are subject to review, comment, emendation and approval thereupon.

Date approved: _________