

Old Business

Scott Saso recused.
Brad Scott took the chair.

Dias, Joao, 565 Riverside Rd, Site plan SBL#88.1-1-4.200, in DB and R1 zone.

The applicant would like site plan approval for his existing concrete storage business.
The Board reviewed this application at the Planning Board Workshop last week and had no further questions.
The Board reviewed the environmental form.

MOTION TO ISSUE NYS SEQR determination of non-significance pursuant to NYS SEQR Regulations under 6NYCRR Part 617 pursuant to review of short EAF on this unlisted action which is determined to be complete for the application as submitted by Joao Dias, for the site located at 565 N. Riverside Rd., identified as Tax Map SBL88.1-1-4.200 for a site plan, should have a negative declaration on the environment, on motion by Carl DiLorenzo, seconded by Dave Plavchak. Vote 7 Ayes, 0 Nay, 0 Abstained, 0 Absent.

The resolution was read by Brad Scott.
A **Motion** was made to set the public hearing for May 22, 2014. (See Resolution on file)

Administrative Business

Scott Saso returned to the meeting.

Sign Approval

Sign - Sawyer Savings (Sawco) 3515 Rt. 9W

The applicant anticipates sign approval.
(This sign was previously approved on the site plan for the new building), The one that was originally presented with the light over the top, we had done some photos simulations and found out that on this particular siding it would not do good. The Bank decided to put a background on it so it is smooth so that when you downlight it, you can see it better. This makes it 6 sq. ft. larger. The monument sign was also slightly off on the square footage.

A **Motion** was made to accept the updated sign by Fred Pizzuto, seconded by Dave Plavchak. All ayes.

Minutes to Approve

A **Motion** was made to accept the Planning Board Workshop minutes from the March 20, 2014 meeting by Lawrence Hammond, seconded by Dave Plavchak. All ayes. Brad Scott abstained.

A **Motion** was made to accept the Planning Board Meeting Minutes from the March 27, 2014 meeting by Carl DiLorenzo, seconded by Dave Plavchak. All ayes.

Accessory Apartments

The Planning Board has been working on the language for accessory apartments and it has been discussed at previous meetings. Dave B. asked the Board to vote on the accessory apartment language so that he can bring it to the Town Board. Dave asked the Board "Do you want to have an accessory apartment in an accessory structure?" He asked Mike H. if he would like to weigh in on the question.

Mike H: When I was here we did the accessory apartment and the whole principle behind the accessory apartment was to allow people to rent a spot in their house to help pay their taxes by renting. I understand the issue was the detached garage, you make an apartment above a detached garage that is not technically the principal dwelling structure, and therefore would this cause that not to be allowed?

Dave B: Yes, the language now would cause that not to be allowed. The way the Board has been leaning, in my opinion, as of the last time, is that it would only occur in the principle dwelling unit.

Brad: I thought we had come to a secondary use in a secondary structure, again I think it relates to the kind of quality of life. I know I would rather it be above my garage, than in or attached to my house. I do not think that it would be bringing the quality of the neighborhood down; I think that it could be a very nice thing. I do not think it does anything to detract from the quality of the neighborhood, the impact on the neighbor. Again it relates to what are we doing in Town and how we are growing and who is living here. I see it as a positive I am not sure that those settings should be denied this as long as it is in the requirements. I think that rather than cutting up your house or putting people in your basement this is a better option.

Mike H: From the Board's perspective what would be the risk of the detached garage being the accessory apartment?

Larry: Then it becomes a second residential structure on a common lot, it cannot be subdivided.

Dave P: But if it is in a garage it is also in my mind part of the primary residence.

Mike: I can understand the second residential structure concern but it is only 650sf.

Larry: Do you want ¼ acre lots then, or do you want to go to 1 acre or larger?

Bill: In the wording it says accessory apartments shall not be counted as a residential unit.

Larry: Which is okay if it is in the house but now you are adding (did not finish).

Bill: No it says that flat out.

The Board continued discussion on secondary use in secondary structure.

Peter: I have been sitting on the fence with all of this but I think I have been persuaded by Brads discussion that properly done in a secondary structure it is a good idea.

Dave P: Yes, I agree.

Carl: My fear is that what we are going to get is more secondary uses than somebody putting some one in their house. We are opening the door, in my opinion, to mostly what we are going to see. People are going to want help with their taxes and this is what they are going to do. I go back to the original purpose I think when the old Board did it, we did it with the intention of pretty much having it in the primary structure.

Fred P: I agree with Carl.

Mike H: As I remember this was purely to help mom and dad, or help pay their taxes. I don't think we spoke necessarily to detached garage or this and that. From the TB perspective I think we will take the Planning Board's lead.

The Board took a final official vote on whether or not an accessory is acceptable as a secondary use in a secondary structure:

Larry-No, Carl-No, Brad-Yes, Scott-Yes, Fred P.-No, Dave P.-Yes, Bill-Yes. Peter and Fred R. abstained.

Fred R. asked how the accessory structure would be recognized during 911 emergencies. The assessor will be contacted for follow up.

The Board reviewed a memo, titled Level Setting for a Public Hearing, which was put together by Bill Ogden. Terresa Bakner, Attorney, had offered some ideas to include and remove from the memo. The Board finalized the memo that they will use for public hearings.

The Board briefly discussed the Hudson Valley Wine Village DGEIS; the process and the number of proposed residences.

A **Motion** was made to adjourn by Fred Pizzuto, seconded by Lawrence Hammond. All ayes.