

June 11, 2026

PINE PLAINS PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, June 11th, 2026

7:30 PM

In Person and Zoom

IN PERSON ATTENDANCE: Michael Stabile, Chairman
Kate Osofsky, Co-chair
David Allan, Alternate
Scott Cavey
Rory Chase
Ethan DiMaria
Dick Hermans
Ari Kardasis, Alternate
Steve Patterson

ABSENT: Dick Hermans

ALSO PRESENT: Warren Replansky, Town Attorney
George Schmidt, Town Engineer
Ed Casazza, Town ZEO
Jeanine Sisco, Town Board Member
Steve Hobson, Applicant
Amy Argyrakis, KARC Planning
Kelly Liboit, KARC Planning
Members of the Public

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

Approval of the May Minutes: Stabile asked for a motion to accept the May meeting minutes, motion by Cavey, second by Patterson, all in favor, motion carried.

HTWO Properties, LLC (00:3:40-00:18:18): Stabile asked Hobson to review his new site plan with the board. Hobson went over the few new changes to his site plan with the board, such as the placement and coverage of shrubbery, outlines of setbacks from the westerly line, the southern line was addressed with the fence, the right-of-way for pedestrian traffic, as requested by the ZBA, lighting, and parking setbacks, etc. Stabile asked if the southern fence would be replaced and Hobson replied yes. Hobson then reviewed the different buildings on the site plan.

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

June 11, 2026

Stabile asked if there were any members of the public looking to speak. Brian Coons of 2837 Church Street spoke and expressed his support of the project.

There was a brief discussion regarding the sign for the project.

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

Stabile then went over the SFEAF for the project with the board (see attached)

Stabile took a roll call vote for a preliminary approval (a formal resolution will be prepared for next month's meeting, pending comments from Dutchess County Planning): Chase aye, Kardasis aye, Patterson aye, Cavey aye, Osofsky aye, DiMaria aye.

KARC Planning Consultants, Inc. (00:18:55-00:49:35): Stabile said he was confused as the plan shows three lots but if you refer to parcel access it is only two lots. Argyrakis explained why this was like that. Kardasis asked if the intention was to sell properties. Argyrakis said not that she is aware of. Coons also explained that the applicant was willed the property, so that is why parcel access is showing two lots. Stabile asked Replansky if the parcels have one owner does this still need to come to the planning board - Replansky replied yes. The board then discussed the commercial lot and the residential lot. Libolt said the commercial lot is currently being used as residential and there are no plans to use it commercially. DiMaria asked why not merge it into one lot. Libolt said the applicants were not interested in doing this. Libolt said this lot line adjustment will make it more conforming.

Replansky said the public hearing could be waived and is a Type II Action under SEQR.

Stabile asked for a motion to waive the public hearing - motion by Patterson, second by Chase, all in favor, motion carried.

The applicants will return next month for a formal resolution.

Other Business: Stabile asked Replansky the status of CEEN. Replansky said their attorney contacted him and he indicated that they were making progress on negotiating the shared driveway issue. Replansky said they will still need to appear before the planning board regarding the amended site plan

June 11, 2026

approval. Stabile asked about Stissing Farms. Replansky said he hasn't heard from them but he is concerned about the conversion regarding going from rentals to condominiums. Replansky said he would notify their attorney and ask them to attend the meeting and describe how this phasing will take place.

Replansky said he received a call from County Planning regarding the Lia's property and they were concerned about the way it was set up to expedite things could be subject to a use variance, instead of an area variance. Replansky suggested either rezoning the property to the less restrictive zone or change the language so that the permitted uses in the less restrictive zone would apply to the whole property as long as the planning board makes a finding that it's not a deference to any safety or welfare. Stabile said this would take away the need for a variance. Replansky said there is a town board public hearing for it next week and he will discuss it with the town board then. Replansky said he is still waiting for the official reply from the county regarding this. The board then discussed over properties where this bifurcation is an issue. Replansky asked that he be sent these properties.

Stabile asked about the farmstand law - Replansky said the county didn't mention this one but he hasn't heard officially back from them.

Stabile asked Casazza on the progress of Stissing Center. Casazza said they have made some progress, but they haven't been working and do not work every day. Sisco said they are waiting on shingles. After they arrive the scaffolding will be coming down.

Stabile asked about the solar facility - Casazza said they are supposed to be finished at the end of the month. Stabile asked if they were referring to the site plan and make sure they are adhering to it. Stabile said the board would like to do a site visit when the project is completed.

The July planning board meeting will be held on the third Wednesday, July 15th, due to a scheduling conflict. Stabile asked for a motion to move the meeting, all in favor, motion carried.

Stabile asked for a motion to adjourn at 8:14PM, all in favor, motion carried.

June 11, 2026

Respectfully submitted by:

Tricia Devine

Michael Stabile

DRAFT

HTWO

Agency Use Only [If applicable]

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?	☒	☐
2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?	☒	☐
3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?	☒	☐
4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?	☒	☐
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?	☒	☐
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?	☒	☐
7. Will the proposed action impact existing:	☒	☐
a. public / private water supplies?	☒	☐
b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities?	☒	☐
8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?	☒	☐
9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?	☒	☐
10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?	☒	☐
11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?	☒	☐

PRINT FORM

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.
<u>Pinellas Planning Board</u>	<u>6/10/26</u>
Name of Lead Agency	Date
<u>Michael Stabile</u>	<u>Chairman</u>
Print or Type Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency	Title of Responsible Officer
<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>
Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency	Signature of Preparer (if different from Responsible Officer)

PRINT FORM