

TOWN OF PINE PLAINS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MAY 10, 2006

IN ATTENDANCE: Don Bartles, Chair
Jon DePreter
Bruce Pecorella
Vikki Soracco
Ken Mecciarello
Kate Osofsky

ABSENT: Brian Coons

ALSO PRESENT: Ray Jurkowski
Nan Stolzenburg
Register Herald
Millerton News
Matt Rudikoff
Dan Stone
Lauren Kingman
Ross Williams
Five members of the public

CARVEL: Bartles opened the meeting with continued discussion of the DEIS. Rudikoff handed out some additional materials to the Board. Stolzenburg was asked to go over the details of the meeting on Chapter 6. She stated that there was a meeting on May 5th with Christopher Lindner, representatives from Rudikoff's office and a representative from an archaeology firm that they worked with to develop Chapter 6. The purpose of the meeting was similar to that with Chapter 8 where there were some differences of opinion and to try to find a way forward with the next version of that chapter. Several issues were discussed. One of the main issues was whether or not appropriate sites were field tested for archaeological resources. If they weren't tested, there needed to be more documentation as to why. Lindner felt very strongly that there were locations that should have been tested that were not included in the original list of sensitive areas. The meeting lasted for two hours. A protocol for field testing was submitted by the archaeological firm to describe how they came up with the sites that were tested. Lindner will review the protocol to make sure it is consistent with the NYAC standards that the scoping document asked them to follow. They asked the criteria to be mapped. If other potentially sensitive sites are found, they should be field tested according to the same standards that were used. The locations already identified but not field tested, were asked to be reviewed with the criteria information to see if they should have been field tested. If it is decided they should have been tested, they were asked to do so. In other areas where they had valid reasons why field testing was not done, they are going to add in a fuller description of their reasoning for not field testing. Discussion was held on whether locations that are found to be potentially sensitive but not in areas that are scheduled to be disturbed in any way would need field testing. Stolzenburg stated that the applicant would need to have some sort of protocol in place so that if the plan changes through the review process and the above mentioned areas are disturbed, they would be field tested as necessary. Lindner felt that the golf course should be looked at as well. The

applicant agreed to do an inventory of an additional twenty-one structures that were identified as fifty years or older within a half mile radius of the project site. Stolzenburg stated that, while the issues weren't all solved, there are steps in place to move forward and an understanding of what needed to be done. Rudikoff stated that Stolzenburg reported the details of the meeting very well. Bartles stated that one of the biggest issues discussed was a protocol not only in the testing sites but also what happens if, during construction, something is discovered. Discussion followed. Stolzenburg stated that the applicant is going to do a couple of sites and submit an updated version on those sites to Lindner to see what he thinks before moving forward. Stolzenburg stated she had no problem with moving forward on the formalization of the completeness issue. Stolzenburg shared with the Board the copy of the letter of incompleteness to the applicant. The letter along with the matrix and copies of all the consultant comments will be forwarded to the applicant. Bartles asked the Board for comments. None stated. DePreter made a motion to authorize the Chairman to sign the letter of incompleteness; second by Soracco. All in favor. Bartles stated that the applicant has indicated that they will have all the chapters back to the Board by July or early August. Rudikoff stated that a schedule of the submissions will be provided. Jurkowski stated that the applicant has requested that it be a rolling submission which is much in line with what was done previously. Jurkowski asked that the submissions be sent directly to the Board and then copies will be forwarded on to Jurkowski and Stolzenburg. They would review the document and provide comments to the Board with a copy of the comments going to the applicant. Jurkowski stated that once the document is deemed complete, the applicant will be providing the Board with copies of the entire set. He stated that the Board would advise the applicant by letter that it is complete for the purpose of public comment. He stated the Board needs to consider how to make the document available to the public. He also stated that there is a new requirement stating that it must be posted on the internet. Discussion followed. Bartles stated that he hoped that this could go to the public in the early fall. Bartles also stated that there will have to be a definitive resolution by the Board of the items still in question. Stone stated that everyone will be getting electronic copies of the submissions and the Board and consultants will get a hard copy. Stolzenburg asked if there would be any agenda items from Carvel before late summer. Bartles stated that he would like submissions and then if there are any items for discussion, making it an agenda item.

EQUINOX FARMS: Ralph Simmons represented the applicant. Simmons presented the engineer's proposal for the common drive. Bartles asked what happens to Lot 1. Simmons stated that it will be extinguished. Bartles stated that there will be three lots on one road. Pecorella asked if there is a potential for another parcel. Simmons explained that there are four parcels altogether but only three will have residences. Lot 1 will never have a residence on it. Simmons explained that there is an old railroad bed between the parcels and it is owned by someone else otherwise it would be listed as one parcel. Jurkowski stated he would like Replansky to comment on how to deal with Lot 1. Jurkowski stated it should be written on the map and on the deed. Pecorella voiced his concerns about four lots versus three lots and making sure that Lot 1 is dealt with so that there will be no building on it. Bartles stated that he felt a note on the plat is sufficient. Pecorella asked what the future of Lot 1 would be. Simmons stated it would remain with the farm. Pecorella asked why they couldn't put it all on one deed. Bartles stated that typically you don't get deeds until you sell the property. Bartles stated that it should be on the final map. Bartles stated that he felt they have to establish the criteria with Replansky.

Jurkowski will check with Replansky on how to deal with Lot 1. A public hearing will be held at the June 14th meeting. A site inspection was scheduled for June 10th at 9 am.

ARNOLD AND ELISE GOODMAN: Steve Patterson represented the applicant. The applicant has 153 acres on Skunks Misery Road. He provided the Board with a map. This is previously approved as an open development area by the Town Board and allowing them to subdivide off one parcel of approximately 11 acres. Bartles stated that now the applicant wants to take another lot out. Bartles read a letter from the applicant's attorney to the Town Board requesting one more lot to be subdivided out. The Town Board sent a memo to the Planning Board which was also read by Bartles. The Town Board asked for the Planning Board's recommendations with regard to this request.

Discussion followed. Bartles stated he would like to see no further subdivision without addressing alternate access. The consensus of the Board is to recommend to the Town Board that they amend the original open development one time only. Bartles asked Proper to do a memo to the Town Board for his signature. Bartles stated that once the Town Board approves this, the applicant would have to return to the Planning Board for the subdivision. The Board also will recommend that the Town Board ask the Highway Superintendent for his recommendations with regard to the driveway access.

JAMES MURPHY: Murphy returned to the Board with the subdivision on Lake Road with regard to the driveway issue. Doug McNeill has refused to allow right of way through his driveway. Murphy gave the Board the options for driveway access. He stated he would like to have a common driveway onto Beach Road or a single driveway on Beach Road and a single driveway on Lake Road. The Board would prefer to have a common shared driveway onto Beach Road. Discussion followed. Bartles asked Murphy to get the driveway issue resolved before the next meeting. A public hearing was scheduled for June 14th. He was advised to have the revised maps to the Board ten days before the public hearing.

STISSING FARMS: John Reilly, attorney, and Keith Scofield, architect, represented the applicant. Reilly showed the Board conceptual sketch plans for the commercial areas. Bartles stated that under the current moratorium, the Board can not address another site plan. He stated that the Board could listen to a presentation. Reilly stated that he thought the Board could accept sketch plans or look at conceptals for comments and review. Bartles stated that, as far as he knows, the Board cannot do that. Reilly asked if they could comment. Bartles stated that there is no review of site plans unless they meet certain criteria and this doesn't meet them. Bartles stated that they could give informational comment but he wasn't sure to what extent. Jurkowski stated that the Board cannot accept the sketch plan. Reilly stated they would like to get some input on their vision so that by the time the moratorium is finished, they have a concept that is in tune with what people are thinking. Jurkowski stated that they could have a discussion but any comments would be non-binding. Reilly stated that the Stissing Farms project is now known as Town Centre of Pine Plains. Reilly stated he would like to update the Board and seek approval of a small sign for the information office next to the site. He would also like to get input on a revision of the landscaping plan that was accepted for the project that they would like to update and expand. Reilly explained the reasoning for the change in landscape plans. Many of the pine trees were diseased and had to be removed completely and they also found mountain of rock. Reilly showed the Board where these items were located on a map of the project. Reilly stated

that they have purchased an existing tree farm in Stanfordville and a tree spade. Reilly stated that they would like to update their plan to include 250-300 trees as opposed to the 70 that were approved in the original plan. The trees would be in 15-35 foot range as opposed to the 7-8 foot range. They would like to add trees around the retention area, back all around the outcropping of the large plateau, through the VA center and the auto body center and smaller trees around the entrances. They would like to increase the number of fruit trees from 17 to about 40 and beef up the park area. They would like to add another gazebo and a children's playground. Pecorella asked why they needed a children's playground if it is a senior citizen's condo. Reilly stated it would be for visitors and grandchildren. They would like to extend a stockade fence from where the dumpster is on the VA building and bring it through to 2847 Church which is also owned by the owner of the site. Soracco asked if they couldn't just put trees there instead of a fence. Reilly stated that there are junk cars and box trailers that the trees wouldn't block. Soracco voiced her displeasure with placing a fence there. Discussion followed with regard to the pine trees. He stated they would like to give it the feel of an Adirondack Park. They would like to bring in boulders as a way to break up the difference between the rock face and the flat area. They would also like to put boulders along the entrance ways. Jurkowski asked if they were using them as a retaining wall. Reilly stated they don't need a retaining wall in that area but it would look better with the boulders. Bartles stated that he feels they are using the boulders as landscape items not structural items but he doesn't know the site well enough to see how they fit in. Reilly stated they are not changing the grading plan at all. Discussion followed. Reilly stated that all the utilities are in. Reilly asked Jurkowski if the 6 foot chain linked fence around the retention area is required by code or is there something they can do that looks better than chain link. Jurkowski stated they could use the chain link and do landscaping on the exterior. Reilly asked if they could do stockade instead of chain link. Jurkowski reiterated to do the chain link with landscaping on the exterior. Jurkowski stated that it on the approved site plan so therefore it is enforceable. Soracco asked if the fence by the auto body would be on the property line. Reilly stated yes. Soracco asked how they would maintain the fence on the other side. Reilly stated he would ask the project manager to speak to the owner of the auto body. Soracco stated maybe they wouldn't want them on their side. Reilly stated they have been very cooperative with their neighbors. Reilly stated that most any work could be done from the one side. Soracco stated that she disagreed. Bartles asked Jurkowski for his comments on the landscaping. Jurkowski stated that the use of evergreens along the perimeter as screening is appropriate. Jurkowski stated that on the interior he feels it should be a combination of deciduous and evergreens. Jurkowski asked them to prepare a formal landscaping plan including the boulders. Bartles advised that this should be prepared and if it was ready in time, they could be on the June agenda. Reilly requested that the Board approve a small sign to be placed in front of 2847 Church St. This is a residence owned by the same owner as the project. They would like to pass out informational packets from this residence. Reilly stated that this is a residence used by the owner when he is in the area. Discussion followed on whether this is a change of use of the property. Reilly and Scofield then went over the sketch plan of the proposal for the adjoining parcel. The Board had several questions. Jurkowski again advised that the Board could not accept a sketch plan at this time.

Motion by DePreter to approve the minutes of April 12, 2006; second by Osofsky. All in favor.

Motion by DePreter to adjourn; second by Pecorella. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted by:

Nancy E. Proper
Secretary

Donald Bartles, Jr.
Chairman