

April 16, 2021

PINE PLAINS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
Wednesday April 14, 2021
7:30 PM
Via Zoom and Uploaded to YouTube

IN ATTENDANCE: Michael Stabile, Chairman
Ethan DiMaria, Alternate
Dick Hermans
Jayelle Hoffman, Alternate
Kate Osofsky
Steve Patterson
Peter Salerno
Vikki Soracco

ABSENT: Ken Meccariello

ALSO PRESENT: Sarah Jones, Town Liaison
Ray Jurkowski, Town Engineer
Warren Replansky, Town Attorney
Drew Weaver, Town ZEO
Lynden Chase, surveyor for Cedar Ridge Farms
The Chazen Companies, Durst Planners
BJF Planning, Pine Plains Planners
The Durst Corporation
Jennifer Van Tuyl, Durst Attorney
Town of Milan
Edward Bona, 5 Dogs Farm
Joyce Capuano
David Burke, Capuano's Architect
Steven Hobson, HTWO Properties, LLC
The Reynolds Asset, Stissing Farms
Mike McCormack, LMV Architects, Stissing Farms

Chairman Stabile opened the meeting at 7:30 pm with a quorum present.

Cedar Ridge Farm, LLC Public Hearing: Motion to open the public hearing by Hermans, second by Patterson, all in favor, motion carried.

Stabile asked if anyone was from the public and wanted to speak. There were none. Stabile then asked Chase if he would like to say anything. Chase then explained the application again, a 40 acre one-lot subdivision, the other 200+ acres remaining farmland.

April 16, 2021

Stabile asked if there was one other subdivision already made from that property and Chase replied yes, to the south.

Stabile asked again if any members of the public were looking to speak. There were none.

Stabile asked for a motion to close the public hearing, motion by Patterson, second by Hermans, all in favor, motion carried.

The board then went over the SEAF (see attached).

The board then went over the resolution (see attached).

The resolution passed unanimously by a six-person vote.

The Hudson Valley Project Sketch Plan Review: Lisa Baker of the Durst Organization introduced the members from her team at the meeting and then gave a brief introduction of the project. Baker said they would be presenting their residential sketch plan for their proposed conservation subdivision.

Monian and Mesinger of the Chazen Companies then went over a summary of the sketch plan and the next steps in the review process.

Mesinger gave a brief history of the property.

Mesinger then gave a brief history of the NND stature in the town's zoning and how the applicant eventually changed direction from their original NND application to a conservation subdivision.

Mesinger then reviewed the presketch meeting held with the town last year. He said the purpose of the presketch meeting was to establish a base residential yield and to establish at least 50% of the site as open space, as is required by an open space conservation subdivision.

Mesinger said they matched primary and secondary open space features in order to arrive at a 50% open space map. Mesinger then went over some of the open space features, such as wetlands, steep slopes, etc.

Mesinger said following the zoning ordinances for the base residential yield resulted in 223 units with just under 12 acres per unit. Mesinger then said the calculations were submitted to the town's planners who agreed with the calculations.

April 16, 2021

Mesinger said they also met with the Town of Milan recently to explain the process to them.

Mesinger said he hopes to present to the Town of Milan during their May 5th meeting with a conventional subdivision and then a cluster subdivision. Mesinger said the goal for Milan will be the same layout as Pine Plains.

Mesinger said they have met with the DOH regarding water and sewer and hope to meet with the DEC soon.

Mesinger then presented their sketch plan. Mesinger said the applicant is not seeking any additional density for the Sports City plats, instead this land will be added to the total acreage with the same constraints. Mesinger said because of this they revised the base residential yield to 237 plats of 11.2 acres.

Mesinger said the next step will be the commencement of the SEQR process. Mesinger hopes Pine Plains would declare themselves the Lead Agency at the next meeting and circulate this to the other agencies involved. Mesinger said they have submitted a draft scope for the environmental impact statement. Mesinger said the proposed resort will be in the second part of the environmental impact statement. Making the resort an alternative in the EIS is complying with the zoning ordinances and therefore will not require any variances.

This concluded Mesinger's presentation.

Stabile said Frank Fish of BFJ Planning would now be going over the process going forward.

Fish said this is preliminary discussion with the board and he does not expect any actions taken tonight.

Fish said the first step should be Pine Plains declaring themselves Lead Agency and sending this information to Town of Milan. After thirty days the scoping process may begin.

Sarah Yackel of BFJ Planning then went over the timeline memo sent by their office to the Planning Board - establishment of lead agency, positive declaration, scoping, preparation of draft EIS, completeness review, final EIS, and finally the adoption of SEQR findings, after which the board would be a position to comment on the conservation subdivision.

April 16, 2021

Yackel said the immediate next steps would be Pine Plains declaring themselves lead agency at the next meeting on May 12th, introducing the scoping document at the June 9th meeting, a special meeting on June 23rd to declare Pine Plains as lead agency after the 30 days, a virtual scoping meeting on, or around, July 21st, and an in-person meeting on July 31st.

Stabile asked BFJ to go over the alternatives, such as the resort.

Fish said the alternatives are an important element of the EIS. One is required by law, the No Action Alternative. Fish said they have provided an alternative, the resort. Fish said the applicant has included alternative to the resort in the scope. If no action were taken, the resort would be 12,000 sq feet.

Fish said the town board would be able to comment on the resort, since they oversee the zoning ordinances, as well as the public, since part of the draft EIS is a public hearing.

Fish said there would be ample time to study the resort size during the SEQR process.

Stabile then noted that members of the Town of Milan's planning and town board were present and would anyone like to comment.

Darby, the chairman of Milan's planning board, said he was just observing tonight.

Stabile then asked if any planning board members had anything to ask. Hermans asked if a formal liaison with the Town of Milan should be established or a connection to Milan's zoom meetings. Stabile replied that the Milan Planning Board meets in person. Hermans said he would attend the meetings and report back to the board. Milan's next planning board meeting will be on May 5th at 6:00pm.

Replanksy then explained further the alternative section in the DEIS. Replansky said the applicant decided to change their application of SEQR, they would then need to amend their application. Stabile then asked Replansky if that would mean that things would then need to be done over. Replansky replied it would need to be decided at that time, but he imagines there would be a new review of an amended application. Fish said after public comment, and going into the final EIS phase, if there are any resort comments, they could be made and the FEIS could carry a preferred alternative. Fish said the

April 16, 2021

full EIS process would probably take 7-8 months so there will be plenty of time to examine everything.

Replansky said he was under the impression that a coordinated SEQR would need to be done in conjunction with the Town of Milan. Replansky feels there will be much more coordination between the two municipalities besides a meeting liaison. Stabile asked for an example of what something like that usually looks like. Replansky said an example of a coordinated review would be when the Town of Milan, and their planners, attended Pine Plain's planning board meetings during the first round of this application. Replansky said there was a coordinated effort for the SEQR. Replansky said you do not want to go through the process and then Milan has a separate approval process, so something will need to be coordinated.

Darby then said Milan expects to coordinate with Pine Plains' consultants and the board. Darby said during their meeting with the applicant the resort plans were sort of put off. Darby said if the resort, and application for the lot structure, are going to be submitted together and it seems more of a Pine Plains issue, as it appears that the resort will be there. Mesinger replied yes, the resort would be in Pine Plains.

Stabile asked Mesinger if they are also in the presketch stage of the process with the Town of Milan. Mesinger replied yes, and that Milan has a similar process.

Replansky said at some point the applicant needs to tell Pine Plains how far they will be progressing with their application in Milan since it will probably need to be factored into the environmental review. Yackel agreed and Mesinger said he doesn't see why Pine Plains wouldn't be copied on anything going on in Milan.

Stabile asked Devine if the documents pertaining to tonight's discussion were available in the board's dropbox. Devine replied no, but she would add them. It was also suggested by Fish that a copy be available at the town's clerk office and at the town library. Replansky also asked for copies of anything submitted to the Town of Milan.

Capuano Site Plan Review: Joyce Capuano and her husband introduced themselves and explained about their application. They purchased the property at 3032 Church Street and said they are here to present their site plan for an accessory dwelling.

April 16, 2021

Capuano then introduced their architect, David Burke, to explain further. Osofsky asked if it was the Patchin's property and Capuano replied yes. Burke then went over the current state of the property and some of its features.

Burke said the proposed cottage would be 1250 sq feet. Burke said the applicant would like to continue the driveway to the cottage and they are considering relocating the garage forward, or south, and connecting it to the cottage.

Burke said the current septic tank would be corrected and a second one added for the cottage.

Stabile asked the square footage of the cottage and the main house. Burke replied the cottage is 1250 square feet and that they are not planning on any changes to the main house. Burke said the main house is roughly 2500 sq feet.

Stabile asked if any board members had any questions. Soracco asked about relocating the existing garage. Burke replied that is the intent, while saving as much as they could. Soracco asked where they were planning on relocating it. Burke replied straight down south. Burke said the current location is not convenient for parking a car.

Soracco asked if it would be right on the property line and Burke replied yes. Soracco said she thought a structure had to be a certain amount of feet from a property line. Weaver said it would have to a board decision as the current garage is also on the property line. Weaver said it could remain nonconforming or the board could require a variance.

Stabile asked for Replansky's comment and he replied that he believes there is a decisional law allowing the nonconforming, but he would need to check. Jurkowski said they would still need to go before the ZBA. Replansky said it is a rare instance and he would need to check if the ZBA would decide or the ZEO. Replansky said he thinks that decisional law refers to tearing down a structure and rebuilding it, but that moving one would probably require a variance.

Burke asked about leaving the garage in place and Replansky replied if they would like to move forward that was probably the best thing to do. Burke said as an alternative could they rebuild the garage within the setback and Replansky replied yes.

April 16, 2021

Soracco said if they leave the garage where it is, isn't it part of their driveway. Burke said yes, and it would be an accessibility issue that they would need to get over in other ways.

Stabile asked if there was a time factor and Capuano replied yes, they would like to get things under way since it will take some time to complete.

Replansky said an issue with leaving the garage where it is does not allow driveway access to the cottage. Burke replied that Replansky's point was well taken, and they will look for other options.

Stabile asked if they could leave the garage where it was and, in the meantime, start building the cottage. Replansky replied no, conditional approval could not be given tonight, there would need to be a hearing for a special use permit. Stabile replied that he wasn't saying that they could receive conditional approval tonight.

Stabile said they have been discussing issues like this on the zoning review committee and saving nonconforming structures within the hamlet. Stabile mentioned giving approval for the cottage while the applicant applies to the ZBA for an area variance. Stabile also mentioned the garage would be moved to a less onerous area than next to the inn.

Stabile asked where the applicants were with the board of health and the septic for the cottage. Burke replied that they are in the middle of going through that process and doing perc tests. Stabile asked if they had received a letter of approval from the BOH and Burke replied that they have not.

Jurkowski said the DOH process would probably take 3-4 months. Jurkowski said the board and the applicant should keep this in mind while deciding the process. Capuano replied that, that was helpful and thank you.

Salerno asked Burke what the rectangle immediately to the left of the cottage was in the plan. Burke replied that it was the entire footprint of the building. Salerno asked if it was half the square footage of the house. Burke said no, it is 1250 sq ft and that in the zoning code an accessory dwelling could be up to 75% of the main house or 1250 sq feet, whichever was smaller.

April 16, 2021

Burke said he understood there would be a public hearing next month and then would the planning board be ruling on it. Stabile asked Replansky if a public hearing could take place before the septic approval. Jurkowski answered that he feels it is important to have a design plan outlining the proposed septic as part of the application prior to the public hearing. Jurkowski feels that due to the age of the house a new design for the septic will need to be made for the cottage and the main house. Burke said they were expecting to do that. Jurkowski said the new design may change the overall layout so he feels it is important for the planning board to see it prior to a public hearing. Burke said the septic tanks are shown on the plan as to what they suspect will be required from the DOH. Jurkowski said the septic tank is only a minor item compared to the leach field. Replansky asked if there was an existing leach field. Burke said they believe so and that there is an existing septic tank. Replansky said unless it's a cesspool, the tank is usually connected to a leach field. Burke said there were doing the perc tests to verify that. Replansky said we should know where it is because it will eat up a lot of the common area.

Replansky asked are they committed to moving the garage instead of just rebuilding it. The applicant replied that they are not committed to moving the garage. Replansky said they could move the garage to somewhere else on the property until it is reestablished, creating driveway access. Replansky said the easiest thing to do may just be tearing down the garage and rebuilding it in the same architectural style. Burke said doing this would require them to rebuild it outside the setback. Replansky said a variance from the ZBA would be required. Burke asked if either way, rebuilding or moving it, would require a variance and Replansky replied yes.

Stabile said the DOH approval is the bottle neck, not the public hearing. Stabile suggested they speak with Jurkowski. Stabile asked Replansky if he had anything to add on the matter and Replansky said he assumed they had their own legal counsel to pursue the matter further. Burke said they could do so if needed. Stabile said they should gather what Jurkowski needed on the plans and the board would go forward from there. Stabile said they can give approval, but that the maps would not be signed until they received approval from the DOH. Jurkowski said the point is to see the proposed extent of the construction as it pertains to the septic system for both dwellings. Jurkowski said since it sounds like they have already consulted an engineer, the next submission to the planning board should be the design of the septic system at which point the planning

April 16, 2021

board can go and decide about scheduling a public hearing, pending the ZBA issue. Burke asked if they should submit another application once they receive this information and Jurkowski replied, not another application, but just another submission. Burke asked if then they could have the public hearing and just wait for DOH approval. Jurkowski said yes, the DOH approval would be one of the conditions.

Stabile said they could get Burke in touch with the ZBA who may be able to supply some general guidance. Burke said that would be helpful and he needs to confer with the applicants as well.

Burke asked to confirm if a variance would be required pertaining to the garage. Replansky replied that he thinks in the new location, yes, a variance would be required. The applicants asked in either location and Replansky replied yes.

Jurkowski said one other comment to note, while their engineer is putting together the design plans, as he noted on the site plan it proposes a new service line back to the cottage, so pursuant to the regulations of the water district, there's only one service line allowed for any singular parcel. Therefore since there is currently a water service that goes into the main house, it would need to extend from the main house to the cottage. Jurkowski said the question would be are you going to keep the current service or increase it. Burke asked if the electric would also need to be a single meter and Jurkowski replied correct.

Burke said he was clear and appreciates the recommendations and information.

Stabile apologize for having to slow down things a bit, but that it is the process, and everything needs to be correct before proceeding.

Stissing Storage, HTWO Properties, LLC: Stabile asked Replansky about the public hearing mentioned on the resolution, since a public hearing was not held and does one need to be held. Replansky replied that it is not a special use permit, so the public hearing was waived. Stabile said that change will need to be made in the resolution.

Stabile then asked about the easement and how it is placed on the west side, but the applicant had talked about it going up the middle of the property. Stabile asked Replansky if that was not possible. Replansky said when he reviewed it, he did not

April 16, 2021

have a set of plans showing the easement there, he saw it on the west side. Stabile asked if that change needs to be shown on the plans and Replansky replied absolutely.

Replansky then asked if the applicant was committed to doing the easement, as he read the minutes from the zoning board and didn't think they were requiring it. Hobson, the applicant, agreed that it was advisory. Replansky said if Hobson were going to the easement, he would need to show it on the plat and prepare a formal easement document and there would be some liability issues.

Hobson replied that he understands and was wondering if he could add some verbiage that if deemed necessary in the future to do the easement to link the trail system, etc. he would be willing to revisit it then. Replansky asked if that was the purpose of the public access, to link it to trails. Hobson replied yes. Replansky said Hobson could put something on the record that he would agree to do the easement when the trail system requires that linkage. Replansky said it was up to the applicant but doing so would require a lengthy legal document that would need to also be submitted to the county. Replansky said it would be a fair amount of legal work to get it approved.

Hobson asked how he should go about adding the verbiage saying he would add the easement in the future, if necessary. Replansky replied that it could be added to the resolution. The board agreed that this sounded reasonable.

Replansky said he would add another "where-as" clause that the applicant has volunteered and agreed that when a public trail system is created which requires the linkage of the trail from Nine Partners Drive to Church Street that the property owner will cooperate in creating a public easement. Stabile asked for it to say the trail or sidewalk system.

Stabile then read the resolution (see attached).

The board then went over the SEAF. Hermans asked Stabile since the board already went over the SEAF for a previous applicant, to just read the number and have the board answer yes or no. Stabile asked Replansky if that was acceptable. Replansky said yes if the board votes on it. Motion by Hermans, second by Patterson, all in favor, motion carried.

Stabile then did a roll call vote and the resolution passed unanimously.

April 16, 2021

5 Dog Farm Site Plan Review: Stabile checked with Replansky if he was recusing himself with this application - he is. Stabile said because of this Jurkowski completed the resolution. A letter was received from the DOH. Stabile asked if there was anything else needed and Jurkowski replied that was the only outstanding item.

Jurkowski said regarding SEQOR, the board determined it was a Type II Action at the last board meeting.

Stabile said the public hearing was waived.

Stabile then read the resolution (see attached).

Motion by Patterson to accept the resolution, second by Hermans, all in favor, motion carried.

Stissing Farms/Town Centre: Stabile wanted to check on the status of the project and make sure all parties involved are on the same page.

Louis Reynolds said that they have done a lot of research between this meeting and the previous one. Reynolds said the septic system has been approved and all the permits for it have been maintained and are up to date and current, as well as the rain logs. Jurkowski agreed that the septic system was up to date.

Jurkowski said he spoke to Reynold's contractor regarding three items. The first being the septic system since he was not sure if it had been constructed in its entirety for the full build out of the project. Jurkowski received documents with the original approval from the DOH and the original design by the engineer, indicating that it was installed. Jurkowski said it is installed and similarly the water system was installed as well.

Jurkowski said after speaking with the applicant's engineer he believes an as built is being prepared of the existing site.

Since so much time has transpired since the original design, the as built would be a base mat to do a coordinated review of the site to confirm the compliance with the structure and infrastructures that have been put up to date.

April 16, 2021

Jurkowski said the biggest item has to do with the storm water. Jurkowski said the original storm water permit is still intact and valid. Therefore the original stormwater design is still valid and does not need to be redesigned to the current standards.

Jurkowski said he received correspondence from the current design engineer and Gasper, from the department of environmental conservation, confirming that the permit was still valid.

Jurkowksi said other than reviewing and confirming that everything has been installed from the original plan, it does not appear that there will be any major modifications as far as the stormwater.

Reynolds said their contractor is currently working on the as built drawing, as well as an updated topographical drawing.

Jurkowksi said he also discussed an important item with the contractor that going forward a proposed construction phasing plan should be created. Jurkowski said the planning board would like this information as well, as he believes it was one of the items in the original resolution.

Stabile asked if Weaver was waiting on the planning board, i.e. Weaver did not have any issues with the project. Weaver agreed and was only waiting for planning board approval.

Replansky said there were a lot of items from a legal standpoint. Replansky said the property owner has changed the plans for this property several times, mostly regarding changing the condominium aspect and converting it to rentals. Replansky said the planning board issued a lengthy resolution dated September 10th, 2014 which goes through the entire history of this application and the changes. Replansky said this resolution, and one from 2011, state several things that need to be done by the applicant.

Replansky believes one of the major issues of the original developer was that one or two of the units had already been sold as condominium units and the property owner was supposed to buy back those units so that the project could be converted to rental units and it's never been done. This is an issue for not only the planning board, but the town's accessor as well. Replansky feels about 90% of the requirements have never been completed by the applicant and they need to be addressed.

April 16, 2021

Stabile asked Reynolds if he was going back to the condominium model and he replied yes. Reynolds said one unit is currently owned by a third party and that he is currently working with their attorney to clean up any outstanding issues. Reynolds said they would be removing the restriction of 55 and over and have it be a market rate condominium sale.

Replansky said he is glad to hear that because it eliminates a lot of the problems. Replansky also said at some point the assessor will need to be involved. Replansky said their legal counsel should contact him so that they may discuss the issues in the resolutions.

Replansky said the age restrictions would have to be further looked at by the planning board since originally the board required to retain some age restrictions after the original applicant wanted to change it to make sure that some of the negative declaration purposes were completed. Replansky said the age restrictions might not be required at this time, but that is something that the planning board will need to approve.

Stabile asked about only part of the 55 and over being changed. Replansky replied that there have been different iterations over the years. Replansky said it was up to the planning board whether they would like to abandon that requirement.

Replansky told Jurkowski while a new construction phasing is being created, the issue of the bonding will need to be revisited. Replansky said the bonding was a bit unusual and that at Salisbury Bank there is an account with a balance of \$187,000 which cannot be touched without Replansky's approval. This was the security put up by the developer in lieu of a letter of credit or an actual bond. Replansky said Jurkowski will need to determine if this amount will be sufficient.

Replansky asked if the internal road system would be private. Reynolds replied yes. Replansky said the original easements have the other developer's name on it, but he doesn't think this needs to be changed.

Replansky said an escrow account will need to be funded for legal and engineering purposes.

Stabile asked Replansky and Jurkowski to enumerate the items that are looking for in a memo. Replansky doesn't feel this can be done until Jurkowski receives the as built plans. Jurkowski said he could provide a guide.

April 16, 2021

Replansky said Reynolds would need to update his plans with the attorney general's office and Reynolds replied that it was already in the process of being done.

Willow Roots, Inc.: Stabile wanted to let everyone know that Willow Roots, Inc. has withdrawn their application for a special use permit.

Approval of March, Special, and Workshop Meeting Minutes: Motion by Hermans to approve the March, minutes, second by Patterson, all in favor, motion carried. Motion by Patterson to accept the special meeting minutes, second by Salerno, all in favor, motion carried. Motion by Patterson to approve the workshop minutes, second by Salerno, all in favor, motion carried.

Other Business: Stabile said to keep an eye out for sexual harassment training and regular training.

Stabile thanked everyone for working hard. Stabile also said there may need to be two meetings a month if this load of work keeps up.

Motion by Patterson at 10:05 pm to adjourn, second by Salerno, all in favor, meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by:

Tricia Devine

Michael Stabile

TOWN OF PINE PLAINS PLANNING BOARD

RESOLUTION GRANTING SUBDIVISION APPROVAL TO CEDAR RIDGE FARM LLC

WHEREAS, Cedar Ridge Farm LLC has submitted an application for a minor subdivision for the property located at 8032 NYS Route 82, Pine Plains, New York, Tax Parcel No. 12-6972-00-163395; and

WHEREAS, the plat provides for a one lot subdivision of 42.88 acres out of a 222 acre farm; and

WHEREAS, the application was reviewed at the March 10, 2021 Planning Board meeting and continued review of the application at a special meeting of the Planning Board on March 24, 2021, at which time the Planning Board noticed this application for a public hearing to be held on April 14 2021 and declared this to be an Unlisted Action under SEQRA; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board opened the public hearing on April 14, 2021 and closed the public hearing on said date; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board reviewed the Short Form Environmental Assessment Form and determined that this action did not have the potential for any significant environmental impacts and that, as a result, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”) need not be prepared; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board Engineer has reviewed the said subdivision plat and has determined that the same in acceptable form for approval.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it


RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby grants final approval to said subdivision and authorizes the Planning Board Chairperson to sign the subdivision plat, subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. That all escrow fees for the review of the application by the Town Engineer and Attorney to the Town and filing and recreation fees be paid in full prior to the signing of the subdivision map by the Planning Board Chair.

The Planning Board members voted as follows:

Michael Stabile, Chairman	Aye
Ethan DiMaria, Alternate	Did Not Vote
Dick Hermans	Aye
Jayelle Hoffman, Alternate	Did Not Vote
Ken Meccariello	Absent
Kate Osofsky	Aye
Steve Patterson	Aye
Peter Salerno	Aye
Vikki Soracco	Aye

The Resolution was carried by a six person vote of the Planning Board members on April 14, 2021.



**TRICIA DEVINE, PLANNING BOARD
CLERK, TOWN OF PINE PLAINS**

Project:

Date:

**Short Environmental Assessment Form
Part 2 - Impact Assessment**

Part 2 is to be completed by the Lead Agency.

Answer all of the following questions in Part 2 using the information contained in Part 1 and other materials submitted by the project sponsor or otherwise available to the reviewer. When answering the questions the reviewer should be guided by the concept "Have my responses been reasonable considering the scale and context of the proposed action?"

	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Will the proposed action impact existing:		
a. public / private water supplies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Agency Use Only [If applicable]

Project:

Date:

Short Environmental Assessment Form Part 3 Determination of Significance

For every question in Part 2 that was answered "moderate to large impact may occur", or if there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action may or will not result in a significant adverse environmental impact, please complete Part 3. Part 3 should, in sufficient detail, identify the impact, including any measures or design elements that have been included by the project sponsor to avoid or reduce impacts. Part 3 should also explain how the lead agency determined that the impact may or will not be significant. Each potential impact should be assessed considering its setting, probability of occurring, duration, irreversibility, geographic scope and magnitude. Also consider the potential for short-term, long-term and cumulative impacts.

Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above, and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action may result in one or more potentially large or significant adverse impacts and an environmental impact statement is required.

Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above, and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

Pine Plains Planning Board
Name of Lead Agency

4/14/2021
Date

Michael D. Stabile
Print or Type Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency

Chairperson
Title of Responsible Officer

[Signature]
Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency

[Signature]
Signature of Preparer (if different from Responsible Officer)

PRINT FORM

TOWN OF PINE PLAINS PLANNING BOARD

**RESOLUTION APPROVING SITE PLAN SUBMISSION OF HTWO PROPERTIES, LLC
FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 2818 CHURCH ROAD (ROUTE 199) (TAXID No.
134200-6872-17-185241-0000) PINE PLAINS, NEW YORK**

WHEREAS, HTWO Properties, LLC has submitted a site plan application to the Pine Plains Planning Board which provides for an expansion of the existing self-storage facility on the property located at 2818 Church Street (Route 199), Pine Plains, New York (Parcel ID No. 134200-6872-17-185241-0000); and

WHEREAS, the plans for expansion have been determined by the Town's Zoning Enforcement Officer to exceed the maximum impervious coverage as prescribed by the Zoning Code from 50% to 62%; and

WHEREAS, prior approvals by the Town of Pine Plains have permitted the maximum lot coverage for this parcel to be 56%; and

WHEREAS, the application was referred to the Pine Plains Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for an area variance from the maximum lot coverage requirement and after the conduct of a public hearing, the ZBA granted the area variance by Resolution dated February 9, 2021; and

WHEREAS, as part of the application to the ZBA and its presentation to the Planning Board, the applicant voluntarily committed itself to provide in the future a pedestrian access easement through its property, which would allow pedestrian access over the parcel from Nine Partners Drive to Church Street for sidewalk and/or trail purposes; and

WHEREAS, the site plan submissions have been by the Town Engineer and found to be acceptable; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board waived the requirement of a public hearing at its March 10, 2021 meeting and continued review of the application at its April 14, 2021; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board has determined, upon review of the short form Environmental Assessment Form that this action does not have the potential for any significant environmental impacts and, that as result, no Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be required.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby approves the site plan application of HTWO Properties, LLC dated February 23, 2021, submitted, and reviewed, by the Planning Board and the Town’s Engineer; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this site plan approval is contingent upon the payment of all escrow and filing fees for review of the application by the Town Engineer and the Attorney to the Town prior to signing of the site plan plat by the Planning Board Chairman.

The Planning Board members voted as follows:

Michael Stabile, Chairman	Aye
Ethan DiMaria, Alternate	Did Not Vote
Richard Hermans	Aye
Jayelle Hoffman, Alternate	Did Not Vote
Ken Meccariello	Absent
Kate Osofsky	Aye
Steve Patterson	Aye
Peter Salerno	Aye
Vikki Soracco	Aye

The Resolution was carried by a six person vote of the Planning Board members on April 14, 2021.

Tricia Devine

**TRICIA DEVINE, PLANNING BOARD
CLERK, TOWN OF PINE PLAINS**

Project:

Date:

Short Environmental Assessment Form
Part 2 - Impact Assessment

Part 2 is to be completed by the Lead Agency.

Answer all of the following questions in Part 2 using the information contained in Part 1 and other materials submitted by the project sponsor or otherwise available to the reviewer. When answering the questions the reviewer should be guided by the concept "Have my responses been reasonable considering the scale and context of the proposed action?"

	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Will the proposed action impact existing:		
a. public / private water supplies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Agency Use Only [If applicable]

Project:

Date:

Short Environmental Assessment Form Part 3 Determination of Significance

For every question in Part 2 that was answered "moderate to large impact may occur", or if there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action may or will not result in a significant adverse environmental impact, please complete Part 3. Part 3 should, in sufficient detail, identify the impact, including any measures or design elements that have been included by the project sponsor to avoid or reduce impacts. Part 3 should also explain how the lead agency determined that the impact may or will not be significant. Each potential impact should be assessed considering its setting, probability of occurring, duration, irreversibility, geographic scope and magnitude. Also consider the potential for short-term, long-term and cumulative impacts.

Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above, and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action may result in one or more potentially large or significant adverse impacts and an environmental impact statement is required.

Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above, and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

Pine Plains Planning Board
Name of Lead Agency

4/14/2021
Date

Michael D. Stabile
Print or Type Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency

Chairperson
Title of Responsible Officer

[Signature]
Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency

[Signature]
Signature of Preparer (if different from Responsible Officer)

PRINT FORM