

APPROVED:
MOTION BY:
AYES: **NAYS:** **ABSTENTIONS:** **ABSENT:**
DISTRIBUTION: OFFICIAL MINUTES BOOK – TOWN CLERK – BLDG DEPT.

Certification of Receipt
By: _____ Rosaria Peplow, Town Clerk
Date: _____

WORKSHOP MINUTES
TOWN OF LLOYD PLANNING BOARD

Thursday, April 20, 2017

CALL TO ORDER TIME: 5:30 pm

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ATTENDANCE **Present:** Dave Plavchak, Lawrence Hammond, Fred Pizzuto, William Ogden, Nicki Anzivina, Debra Dooley, Scott McCord, Peter Brooks, Carl DiLorenzo, Andrew Learn; Town Engineer, David Barton; Building Department Director
Absent: Jeff Paladino; Town Board Liaison

ANNOUNCEMENTS: GENERAL, NO SMOKING, LOCATION OF FIRE EXITS, ROOM CAPACITY IS 49, PURSUANT TO NYS FIRE SAFETY REGULATIONS. PLEASE TURN OFF ALL CELL PHONES.

New Business

Dakota Field Properties (Storyk), Martin Ave, Lot Line/Subdivision Martin Ave, SBL#79.2-2-10, in R1 zone.

The applicant has recently been approved by the Planning Board for a two lot subdivision of his 17.143 acre parcel of land. (This has not been filed yet) Lot 1 will consist of 6.257 acres for a proposed single family dwelling and Lot 2 will be the remaining land consisting of 10.886 acres. Board of Health approval has been granted for the proposed residence. He revised his maps to add a lot line revision which will decrease Lot 1 to 5.96. The .297 acre portion of Lot 1 was given by the applicant to his neighbor's (Casamento) abutting property.

There was discussion on whether it is required to have a new public hearing in lieu of the changes made to Lot 1. The Planning Board will consult with counsel at the next meeting and determine at that time.

Beer Universe, 1-3 Haviland Rd, 96.1-1-29.100, in GC zone.

The applicant would like site plan approval to construct a retail store for his Beer Universe business. The retail/service will be 5,750 sq. ft. and the warehouse-wholesale sales/storage portion will 1,000 sq. ft. The applicant is proposing 24 parking spaces, creating new sidewalks and site landscaping.

Khattar Ellmassalemah, Senior Project Engineer for Praetorius and Conrad, P.E. was present to represent the applicant.

Khattar E: The property is .9 acres and currently contains 2 buildings, 1 accessory building with a shed next to it.

Dave P: Will the applicant keep the project as two buildings?

Khattar E: They will have two buildings, but one of the existing buildings will be relocated and basically rebuilt. The use of the existing building will be partly a retail store and the other portion is not in use. The

proposed action basically is to square off the building, create about 6500 square feet and have it as one use being a beer and beverage store. The name of the store is Beer Universe and there are three stores currently in Kingston, Saugerties and Albany. All three stores are the same style with storage in the back and the remainder comprised of retail space.

Dave P: Do you have the elevations of the store and the style?

Khattar E: Not yet as this is our first approach.

Dave P: It is going to be important for the Planning Board to see the elevations and size of the proposed buildings in that district.

Khattar E: I understand there will be specific standards for the Gateway Commercial District. We had a meeting yesterday with Dave Barton and went over the guidelines for what is allowed in that district.

Dave P: The recycling containers need to be removed.

Khattar E: They are aware of that, they did not have the time to remove it from the plan. The idea is to have the beer store and the accessory building as a two story or one and half story with the first story containing the recyclables.

Dave P: So, the recyclables will be inside?

Khattar E: Yes and the second floor will have a two-unit apartment for most likely the employees of the beer store. The calculations will be done to accommodate both the residential and commercial aspects. As far as traffic, they are going to have two entrances to the site. They have to have a two way entrance due to the close proximity between the existing building and the property line.

Dave P: Both entrances will be on Haviland Road?

Khattar E: Yes. As far as the district is concerned, the plan is to match the addition to the larger building, which is mainly built of concrete block. The final product will possibly have the first three feet made up of brick veneer, a small cap and then stucco from that point up. There will be landscaping and the stand alone building in the back will probably be a light frame building with a hardy board finish to it.

Dave P: Does anyone recall if we specified what the finishes would be in the Gateway Commercial District or what the code is?

Khattar E: The reason I will use materials like brick and stucco is because it would be similar to the Dunkin Donuts that is there.

Dave P: The Dunkin Donuts precedes the Gateway code.

Peter B: Everything precedes the code.

Dave P: The way we structured it is that we wanted the area coming off the Walkway to have a "walking type of zone". That's why sidewalks in that zone are very important.

Khattar E: We do have those proposed. The sidewalks and the locations of the islands they do exist currently and they will be improved upon.

Dave P: We need to talk to Richie Klotz, Highway Superintendent, about the right of way and then go to the Town Board about it.

There was discussion about the existing right of way of Haviland Road and Roberts Road.

Peter B: We still need to go to the local highway department for approval.

Dave P: Even if the Town Highway Department supported of the idea, it still needs to go to the Town Board and a resolution made to approve it. We would condition the approval on getting the right of way.

Khattar E: As far as drainage, the site is now serviced by two major catch basins one on each side with a main 36" inch line going to each basin. Sewer is a service that leaves the site that goes right to the manhole across to Mile Hill Road as well as existing water at the site. In terms of utilities, the site is already serviced.

Carl D: Are you planning on making any changes on the service connections or will they remain as is?

Khattar E: If the conditions are acceptable then yes.

Dave P: We will definitely need to see the elevations right away and that the recyclables are housed inside the building and the sidewalk and parking details.

Bill O: We would like to see lighting details.

Khattar E: The final site plan will have the existing and the proposed detailed photometric plan and the elevations.

Bill O: It is not so much the photometric plan but more the direction of the lights.

Ellmassalemah: The photometric plan will give you values. I'm not sure what the maximum is by the property line. They will see what the maximum pole height is and comply with that.

Peter B: We are probably going to be very interested in your design standards because it should look like the way it is laid out in the design standards.

Khattar E: Seventy five percent of the building is going to look like the design standards. The reason why I angled the addition was to have more of a symmetrical uniformed look to it.

Bill O: What did we base the number of parking spaces on?

Khattar E: The preliminary calculations shown on the schedule allowed for four spaces for every one thousand square feet of retail space and 1 parking space for every 2000 sq ft of storage space. A 5750 sq ft retail space would allow 23 parking spaces and 1000sq ft of storage space would add an additional space for a total of 24 spaces.

Dave P: You will then need what are allowable spaces for each of the apartments.

Khattar E: Or I can increase the amount of storage.

Bill O: These are enormous formulas. Do you think you are going to need that much parking given the nature of the store?

Khattar E: That is just code.

Dave P: He is asking if you think you need that many spaces given the nature of the business because we do not want to have more parking than is needed in that zone.

Bill O: Ignoring the code, what do you think would be sufficient amount of parking spaces? It would be good to come back with more detail.

Dave P: We try to limit parking in that zone if we can, we don't want to have more parking than we need but we also like to have the right reasons to justify it. If there is history that shows need than we can justify it but that is something that we will have to discuss with you. It needs to be viewed as "here is what the code says here is what we need and why". Plus, you would have to add in parking spaces for the apartments.

Andrew W: No permanent practices necessarily. The Town code does require an erosion sediment control plan and a proposed contour plan to see if water is draining properly and a turning movement plan for fire trucks and refuse.

Fred P: The plan has to go to the fire department.

Khattar E: Currently the only location with visibility that would make sense for the sign is on the corner. The problem is there are at least eight street signs in that area. It is 50 square feet and six feet tall sign. Elevation wise I believe we are already down four feet in the hole. So by the time you're done you will only see the top of it. The intent is to put a digital sign. According to the sign company, given the existing elevations of the site a twelve foot sign would make more sense from a visibility point of you.

Bill O: We have some restrictions on digital signs.

Khattar E: We are aware of that. The sign company will go by the town's stipulations and will not be an issue. The good news is that we are all on the same page.

Dave P: everything is fine as long as the elevations are met, the right of way is taken care of, and the recyclables are moved inside.

Khattar E: I know the meeting is next week so I do not believe we will be able to be ready for that meeting.

Dave P: It depends on how much you can get done.

Peter B: Typically we would like Andy Learn to look over everything.

Khattar E: The reason we are asking is because of the contingent on the property. We would just like to know the time frame for the May meeting. We would like to provide as much detail as possible.

Dave P: The faster you can get more information to Dave Barton the better because he would be able to direct you on what needs to be done. At that point we will have to access at the next workshop meeting how much has been done and will need to be done. If everything is done in May then the public hearing could be set in June. This is all contingent on what has been completed.

Nicki A: Just remember that it also needs to go the Ulster County Planning Board.

Dave P: In that respect I think it would be pushing it to have the public hearing in June, it would probably be closer to July.

Khattar E: As far as the elevations for both buildings, you are not going to need the inside details, just how it would look from the outside?

Bill O: While you are being creative, just think about if the parking places could be reduced and what changes could be made in elevations because we are interested in having a walking area.

Khattar E: Probably the farthest row of parking away from the building could be reduced to keep more of a green space in that area. It would be just a continuation of trees.

Dave P: That would be fine.

The Board anticipates a public hearing could possibly happen in July.

Peter Brooks recused.

Watson, David, 10 Bellevue Rd, 88.17-2-36.120, in R2 zone.

The applicant would like to add a 24' x 24' 2 (576 sq ft) 2 car garage in a carriage house style on his property which is in the Waterfront Bluff Overlay District.

The applicant said he would stucco the building, keeping the dormers and after it is built he would make the building two feet above grade to match his existing house on the property. He applied for a zoning variance and the public disclosure will terminate on May 11, 2017. If the variance is in place after May 11th, he would like to start building immediately after.

David Watson: I assume your question might be because I live on the river side of the road, why impact the view over the bluff? The answer is that I won't because there is no view.

Bill O: Is the property in the water/sewer district?

Watson: No, I have my own well and septic. I can show you pictures of where the building will be in the northern portion of the property.

Mr. Watson shared a map/illustration plan of where the proposed building would be on his property and where it would be in relation to his neighbors' properties. He also presented where the building would and where the view, if any, is present at the site.

Dave P: Are you looking for approximately a 13 foot variance?

Mr. Watson: Yes, I was pleased to find out, if you read through my letter, I made a plea for an additional zoning variance.

Dave P: I don't think there needs to be a public hearing on this but perhaps a resolution is needed.

Peter Brooks returned to the meeting.

New Business

Savino, JoyAnn, 131 South St, 87.3-5-32, in A zone.

The applicant would like to add a 442 square foot accessory apartment above her existing garage. Her residence is in the Agricultural Zone. The A zone requires a minimum of 2 acres. Ms. Savino's lot is pre-existing non-conforming with .82 acres. She is requesting lot area relief of 1.18 acres from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Dave P: Ms. Savino, you are also going forward to the zoning board.

Ms. Savino: With a five foot variance.

Dave P: It's an area variance.

Ms. Savino: It's so old they are saying its multi-use among other things so at this point they're saying just do what you need to do.

Dave P: We would be interested in the accessory apartment.

Ms. Savino: It has been completed. This project has been eight years in the making and every time the inspector came there were more things I needed to complete.

Dave P: Did you ever come forward for a special use permit prior?

Ms. Savino: No one ever told me to do anything until a couple of weeks ago. Anthony Giangrasso said that he had been looking through my file and told me that I needed to go in front of the Town Board for several issue like heating etc...

Dave P: If you are going to call it an accessory apartment and people are going to live in it, then you will need to address those issues.

Ms. Savino: If it is just for me where I would be able to invite summer friends over I don't see the point. No one had ever told me what to do.

Dave P: You are looking for an accessory use permit for an apartment which needs to meet what requirements are currently in place for that.

Bill O: When the Town adopted the code one of the reasons was to get some of the older existing places that no one knows about up to code.

Peter B: The Zoning Board will consider whether it is okay to have two dwelling units on an undersized lot. The Planning Board will be looking at how it is laid out and the Building Department will be looking at whether everything is up to code. The Planning Board's role is to look at how the structure is laid out.

Patty R: The public hearing for this is set for May 11th with the ZBA.

Carl D: No one allowed accessory apartments with a special use permit in just about all zones?

Ms. Savino: Several of my neighbors have them.

Peter B: It's a non-conforming existing building so the question is whether she wants to amplify the use by putting in a second dwelling in what's already an undersized lot.

Dave P: The path forward is to go to the ZBA first and come back for your special use permit.

Peter B: The question I would raise is how good of a plan it is that we need to see because I think the plan we have now falls short. It needs more detail that you can understand the scale and everything clearly indicated.

Dave P: More detail with the dimensions as on the accessory apartment example.

The Board would like to see a more detailed and clearly indicated to scale plan.

Cusa, Sal Jr., Chapel Hill Rd, 95.2-6-9, in R1 zone.

The applicant seeks Special Use Permit to construct a 2-Family house in an R-1 zone on a 1.565 acre lot. The minimum acreage for a two family in the R-1 zone is 2 acres. He is requesting an area variance for relief of 0.435 acres from the Zoning Board.

* The applicant did not receive the Special Use Permit.

Old Business

Tremont Hall Corp., Vineyard Ave, 88.17-9-48, in R1/4 zone.

The applicant would like to convert an existing vacant 9600 square foot lumber storage building into a multi-family residential structure with 20 apartments, with associated parking and amenities.

Peter B: One of the things I could not tell from the small plans was the pedestrian walkway. I thought we discussed having a sidewalk in the area which connects to Vineyard Avenue?

Patti Brooks from Brooks and Brooks, PC: There is no way to put a sidewalk to Vineyard Avenue because we are already widening the driveway to 20 feet. I was under the impression that the Planning Board was satisfied with it when we were widening the roadway 20 feet and having them come all the way up the roadway. One of the building inspectors commented he thought about bringing it over to the northerly side of the building up the walking path that was already created. We looked at it on the site and thought it was a good idea because it gets the pedestrians off of the driveway very quickly. There is no room to put a sidewalk.

Dave P: The comment from the Ulster County Planning Board was “while the proposal ties in directly to the existing rail trail, a pedestrian connection is not provided to connect to the sidewalk system on Vineyard Avenue that helps tie the project and rail trail into the downtown area. The UCPB recommends the installation of a sidewalk along the site’s driveway to connect the building and rail trail to the sidewalk on Vineyard Avenue.”

Patti B: The way that we mitigated it is by widening the driveway and taking the gravel walking path and taking it off the driveway as quickly as possible. We are talking about a 20 foot driveway that will service 20 residential units. So the likelihood of two cars passing within that first 150 feet coming in off of Route 44-55 is highly unlikely.

Peter B: Beside the people that park there, there are people that get there mail there as well.

Patti B: The thought that people park at the lower level, get the mail and then get back in their car and drive up to the building. The lots will be used for overflow parking in the area where there is the school bus shelter.

Larry H: Could it be made any wider to accommodate a sidewalk?

Patti B: Topographically with the grading I don’t see where it could be made any wider. I had understood that the Board was satisfied with the proposed widening we had on the existing driveway. By coming only 150 feet off of Route 44-55 and routing everyone up the walking path, I thought that the Board had found that to be accessible that is why I did not explore anything more with the sidewalk issue.

Carl D: So it is pretty much a private road so it doesn’t have to meet specific DOT requirements.

Patti B: It is a private driveway.

Carl D: I know it’s a driveway but it still has to accommodate two-way traffic.

Patti B: the point is is that the applicant is granting an easement to allow pedestrian traffic for the Rail Trail on private property.

Peter B: There are other people who may want to walk there to get their mail or schoolchildren using it when school is in session.

Dave P: The question we really need to address is whether there is a safety issue with people walking there.

Carl D: I don’t think you could make it any narrower because it has to accommodate two-way traffic.

Peter B: You couldn’t put the sidewalk on part of the proposed road it would have to be an addition.

Fred P: I understand the reasoning with the easement, but how are you going to keep people from not using it?

Patti B: We are not trying to.

Peter B: For the Rail Trail I think you have done something good by what you have done here. What I’m concerned about are the children getting on and off the school bus and the people who will be going back and forth to the mailboxes or to the parking spaces.

Bill O: A private driveway on private land and how many children will there really be? The traffic may be averaging two cars an hour.

Patti B: I would ask if we are able to put a grassy strip along the edge of it. Looking at the contours on the westerly side I don't see where we could accommodate a pathway. On the easterly side of the driveway I could speak with Andy Willingham to see if we could place a grassy path in there. Part of not necessarily wanting a sidewalk you are talking about inviting people up into the Rail Trail that way. That is something we don't want to do. They want to work with the Town, as well as we do, as far as the easement to the Rail Trail but we also don't want to invite people to use it.

Peter B: Perhaps we could put some gravel in that area.

Bill O: Gravel in the winter time is tough to remove the snow off of it.

Carl D: There could be no trespassing signs put up.

Patti B: Yes, we could. There seems to be two issues; the people going to the Rail Trail and the residents walking to Town. Part of what this project is about though is making it a walkable property. The goal is to encourage people to live here and go to the downtown businesses.

Andrew Willingham, PE: There should be consideration made for ADA accessibility.

Patti B: This is private property.

Andrew W: If it is a public access, however, we should at least evaluate it.

Patti B: The applicant is not willing to extend that type of licensing agreement. We are looking to convert it to a permanent easement to possibly the Town. At that point, the Town could allow what they would want for that pathway. The applicant does not want to have to deal with the liability and the insurance of that but he is willing to assist with the easement.

Dave P: I don't believe grass or gravel would be beneficial as the grass could become slippery and it could become cumbersome to remove snow from the gravel etc...

Larry H: Would it be possible to extend it out a few more feet for walking?

Bill O: Stripe one edge of it as a walk.

Dave P: Like you would for a bike path which may be a good alternative. It would have to be clearly identified as a walk/bike path.

Andrew W: Two-way traffic could fit within an 18 ft by 5 ft walkway. As far as the review, one of the high points to consider is the truck turning plan. I am a little bit leery about the trucks turning where the parking spaces are.

Patti B: One of the things to consider is that it is a through road and it will be gated. The whole reason for the gating was so an emergency service vehicle wouldn't necessarily have to turn around. I know that given the preference it wouldn't turn around. In the event of an emergency they would have access to those gates.

Andrew W: That is something that we would need feedback from the fire department. It's questionable if they would even try and turn. We should also look at access to the dumpster and if the trucks will be able to turn after they pick up the garbage.

Patti B: The reason we went with the fire truck is if that type of truck could come in and turn around then certainly a garbage truck could. It may also be dependent on the type of dumpster that is there. The refuse company would have to accommodate the site.

Andrew W: That makes sense. Did we get the load rating on the bridge yet?

Patti B: No, but we did receive today the abutment repair details. I will have the load rating by Monday.

Andrew W: As far as landscaping and screening of the parking lot. I see some islands were added to comply with the Town's requirements. I want to look at the screen for the dumpster that would be right along the Rail Trail. I see the landscaping easement like we had discussed and a few trees along the dumpster enclosure with the details for it. It is at the Board's discretion if they feel that the three trees there are enough to make the dumpster less visible especially in the back of it.

Patti B: There will be very dense red cedar trees with a stockade fence but they can get a few more trees to make the enclosure less visible from the Rail Trail.

Andrew W: It also at the Board's discretion whether part of the parking area that abuts the land of Mr. Stopard is adequately less visible with the landscaping or if anything more is needed.

Patti B: They thought the fence would make for more privacy but they can certainly put more trees there.

Andrew W: I saw a lighting plan but I did not see a photometric plan.

Patti B: That is correct because we are still having difficulty with the Walkway bollard lighting. I spoke to Lightspec today and gave them the plan and height of where all the building lights would be and asked to have a photometric plan of those because they are the most impactful. The Walkway lights will be near the ground. The applicant would like to see about having bollard lights along the parking area instead of having street lights. I will have the photometric plan for next week's meeting.

Andrew W: Another big issue that I want the Board to be aware of is the water service connection which will have to be extended under the Rail Trail. We are talking about possibly looping it. After meeting with all interested parties, it was decided that the best thing to do is to extend the water line under the Rail Trail to serve the building and then they will provide a hydrant and a capped end.

Patti B: The hydrant will be in the area of the "V" on the site plan. They will be extending it further and in addition granting an easement to the Town so that a possible future extension could go out to Van Wagner Road.

Andrew W: It will be capped and if the Town would like to extend it they could in the future. The flow rate that the Town has for that area is good. We are convinced that the additional flow from the apartments would actually help with the water quality. There are no issues there now so it should be fine. The topic of how the waterline under the Rail trail will be installed has come up. They had discussed installing an open cut; they need to get a final determination about it.

Peter B: Is that because there could be a conflict with the fiber optic cable.

Andrew W: There is fiber optic cable there that prompted us to want to install an open cut but there was also concern about creating a bump in the pavement of the Rail Trail. We will need to make a final determination about that.

Patti B: Andy believes he will be able to design it to the point back from it how it was originally. There will be mutual easements in the case that over a period of time heaving occurred.

Dave P: There is more of a risk of hitting the fiber optic cables than the risk of a small bump in the pavement.

Andrew W: As it is now, the plans show an open cut.

Fred P: Why would you bore as opposed to an open cut?

Andrew W: It is much safer to carefully open cut where the fiber optic cables are located.

Patti B: I hope I have submitted enough information so the Board would consider setting a public hearing next week for the May meeting.

Bill O: I think we need the fire department's comments.

Patti B: Do you need their comments before you set a public hearing?

Dave P: I think the only reason I would be more comfortable with the comments being included is because many of the prior comments we had from the public were about fire safety. I think we all need to help you get that answered.

Carl D: I spoke to the deputy fire chief last week about the comments and he said he would look into it.

Patti B: I included Everett in it as well because I thought he would be able to assist in getting comments back from the fire department.

Deb D: Could we invite the fire chief to next week's meeting so we could get the information quickly?

Bill O: I don't think the absence of comments from the fire department will stop anything rather a discussion point.

Dave P: We will do what we can to obtain the comments as quickly as possible.

Patti B: At this point is the Board willing to schedule a public hearing for May?

Dave P: I think we would like to push to obtain the comments first and then we could decide at next week's meeting.

Patti B: Could you schedule the public hearing contingent upon receiving the fire chief's comments by a particular date?

Dave P: We will get everything ready to set it but see where we are at the next meeting.

Old Business

Highland Assisted Living at Village View (former New Village View), 1 Grove St, 88.69-1-10, in R1/4 zone.

This project consists of an 18,310 sq. ft. expansion to an existing assisted living facility. The expansion will allow a total of 80 beds and not more than 13 employees per shift. There will be a total of 24 parking spaces. The proposed expansion will continue to utilize existing central water and sewer facilities.

1 Grove, 7 Grove, and 9 Grove Street were rezoned from CB to R 1/4.

Feb. 17, 2016 - 1 Grove, 7 Grove, and 9 Grove Street were rezoned from CB to R 1/4.

July 2016 - New submittal with name change (formerly New Village View) Highland Assisted Living Center at Village View.

This application is for siteplan approval and lot line revision.

Revised plans have been submitted.

Andy L: I looked through the SEQRA related items and the drainage report and they are providing a pond. There are two drainage areas; the existing catch basin on the road collects a significant portion of the site and another one behind the building collects the rest. We're providing a pond that will mitigate the flows.

Dave P: The pond will control how quickly it releases?

Andy L: Yes, it will control the flow rate. This project does not exceed an acre so it does not need a SPDES permit. It drains completely after a storm and requires no water quality treatment at all; it's purely just a bathtub.

Carl D: Will the rate of flow be similar to what it is right now?

Andy Learn: Yes.

Carl D: Can we get a fence around it?

Andy L: Yes. The side slopes are two in one, but it is acceptable. There could be up to two feet of water in it during a storm so you want to fence it to keep people out of there. I feel they have addressed the drainage issue adequately for SEQRA purposes.

Dave P: We are very interested in seeing a fence be put around it.

Andy L. explained by the map how the proposed conditions would work with the drainage system showing how the pond would meter out the water. He explained how the pond could get to maximum of two feet as a result of a hundred year storm with an additional one foot cushion.

Stuart Mesinger, AICP-The Chazen Companies: We were in front of the Zoning Board for a good part of the winter and finished all the submissions there. They are waiting for the Planning Board action before they can act on the variance.

Dave P: They are waiting on our SEQRA action.

Anthony T: Yes.

Dave P: We can put that together for next week.

Stuart M: They will take the Planning Board's SEQRA determination because you are the lead agency and they will be able to make a determination.

Health Quest, 514-520 Route 299, Site Plan SBL#87.1-3-33.100, in R1\2 zone. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing building and driveway and construct a 15,000 square foot medical office building with parking, drainage, on site septic and water supply.

The site consists of two parcels that will be combined to a 5.6 acre lot. Revised maps have been submitted.

Present for Health Quest:

Richard Rang-Kirchhoff Companies - Developer

Caleb Carr – Mendenbach & Egger, PC

David Keith – Health Quest

Richard R: There was an error on the renderings so they will forward them to the Planning board tomorrow. The maps will also be much more detailed as far as landscaping and grading. There are still two parcels that we are looking to consolidate into a single lot. The general layout is the same, there minor site changes made to accommodate storm water management and a little more refined design of the wastewater disposal facilities.

Caleb C: The major change is increasing the size of the basin to accommodate large storms. We added the water quality basin in to these plans.

Andy L: It looks like with the water quality basin that the bottom will be hitting rock.

Caleb C: The water quality basin is purely for storage.

Andy L: are you planning on lining it to keep a water level in it?

Caleb C: We haven't actually proposed a liner yet. We did have some penetration tests done. There may be rock at the bottom but not several feet to remove.

Richard R: The rock seems to come up then drops off so we would do an excavation in one location and go twelve feet over and not hit any rock. They are over sizing the septic system for the flows we are anticipating to be on the safe side since we have fairly good soils.

Dave P: Have you approached the Health Department yet?

Caleb C: I believe Barry Mendenbach has and they are fine with our estimates with respect to the flows. The flow rates and the DEC design standards are 250 gallons a day per doctor, which is exceedingly high. Barry has negotiated with them with respect to an acceptable number. The whole system is about 900 and I think we have 10-12 fulltime practitioners on the site.

Andy L: There will be a well, correct?

Caleb C: Yes, there will be a well.

Andy L: Is there fire suppression for this building?

Caleb C: There is proposed right now a fire pump, storage tank and a sprinkler system. We're still struggling to make that work economically. There is no requirement to sprinkle the building, but we are trying to.

Bill O: There are four proposed handicapped parking spaces. Given the nature of the facility, shouldn't it be a higher number of handicapped spaces?

Caleb C: We don't see a significant need for them at our other facilities but we can discuss at the next meeting about possibly adding more.

Fred P: I believe they only have four spaces at Caremount Health Facility in Poughkeepsie.

Caleb C: Yes and they actually do a higher volume of clients than we will probably be doing here.

Dave P: I think they only require two handicapped spaces.

Caleb C: We wanted to try and be conservatively parked on the site because of the turnover. There will be about 25 full-time employees on site a day. There is a significant employee base as well as patient turnover at the facility.

Andy L: I would like to see the turning radius plan.

Caleb C: I do have a fire truck turning radius but it is not with the plans. We have not done one for a garbage truck yet.

Andy L: You might want to look at that too, based on where the dumpster is.

Caleb C: We based our dimensions on a New Paltz fire truck which I believe is 41 feet.

Andy L: It would be a good idea to confirm the truck's dimensions.

Richard R: We have already initiated dialogue with the DOT and they have provided us with very preliminary comments. Site distance is on the order of over 1000 feet in either direction so I believe we are pretty good.

Caleb C: With the grading plan, we have added a guide rail around a curb because of the slope immediately behind it. We are anticipating curbing around the building. The entrance road is at 26 feet, which is more than adequate.

Caleb C: It is 8% around the western boundaries and flattens out as you get to the top.

Richard R: Health Quest was adamant about not going over 8%. I believe your code allows up to 15%.

Andy L: The maximum is 15%, 10% is recommended but 8% is better. The existing driveway had spots of over 12.

Bill O: What is the fuel for the generator?

Richard R: that would be a diesel fired generator.

Andy L: Back to the storm water basin, is there maintenance access?

Caleb C: That's why we placed the four bay along the road because that would be the main thing that would have to be cleaned out. There would be access to come up on the other side as well but with a steeper slope.

Dave P: Andy, do you think there should be an access road there?

Andy L: It does look like they can reach a portion of it from the road so it would probably be fine. I would rather they not create more disturbance to get a road in there.

Richard R: In respect to SEQRA is the Planning Board going to assume to process as the lead agency and coordinator review? Would you be able to declare your intent to be lead agency so we can get that circulated?

Peter B: We can do that next week.

Caleb C: Is there any procedure we need to complete for combining the lots?

Richard R: Is it anything more than we are eliminating the property line at this point?

Dave P: It is a lot line revision.

Bill O: When are you looking to occupy?

David Keith: We are anticipating occupancy by August 2018.

Dave P: When are you looking to start building?

Richard R: We would like to close out the site plan approval process within three meetings, if possible.

Dave P: We will try to get close to that, possibly 3-4 months.

Richard R: The corrected renderings will be supplied tomorrow.

Administrative Business

Discussion on second residence/same parcel code

Larry H. initiated a discussion on continuing to have "a second residence on the same parcel" as part of the Planning Code. Carl D. is concerned and believes the Planning Board should re-examine and reassess the

issues concerning it. Dave P. suggests weighing the pros and cons and having the Town Board be part of the discussion as well. He recommends that they put together a proposal with a list of concerns.

A **Motion** to adjourn was made by Peter Brooks, seconded by Nicki Anzivina. All ayes. 8:38pm