

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
TOWN OF LLOYD PLANNING BOARD

Thursday, April 22, 2021

CALL TO ORDER TIME: 7:00pm

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ANNOUNCEMENTS: Please allow sometime between speakers, so no one is talking over each other. For the two public hearings to please not repeat what someone else says. Please keep chats private, so the board doesn't get distracted.

OFFICIALLY OPEN THE MEETING

VIA Webex

Attendance: Board members: Scott McCarthy, Sal Cuciti, Larry Hammond, Carl DiLorenzo, Gerry Marion, Franco Zani, Lambros Violaris, Bill Meltzer, Charly Long (came in late); Board staff Dave Barton, Sarah Van Nostrand, Andrew Learn, and Paul Van Cott.

Minutes to Approve

January 28, 2021, February 18, 2021 and February 25, 2021, March 18, 2021, March 22, 2021, and March 25, 2021.

Scott asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Franco made the motion, 2nd by Larry. Scott asked for a vote all ayes, minutes approved.

Old Business:

Villages ALF: Site plan and SUP. Route 9W: master parcel # 95.12-1-15.100

Applicant is seeking a SUP and site plan approval for an ALF.

Review draft SEQRA Negative Declaration

Scott mentioned that The Villages applied for a SUP for an ALF and have also indicated that they would also like to seek a PRRD approval from the town at a future date. The Planning Board is the SEQRA lead agency and has review the SEQRA and FEAF part 1 and all the other application materials provided by the applicant. The Planning Board has also reviewed all comments from staff and consultants. The Planning Board has also reviewed and discussed SEQRA and FEAF parts 2 and 3. At last week's Planning Board meeting the board directed staff to prepare a draft resolution and a negative declaration for the board to review and consider for tonight.

Scott asked for a motion to be made to accept the draft resolution and attach the negative declaration to it.

Franco made the motion, 2nd by Carl.

Sal asked if they were going to review the EAF before taking a vote?

Scott replied that he thought they did that last week when they asked staff to draft a resolution.

Sal said that he didn't receive a copy of the EAF part 2 or 3 and would like to know if anyone else did.

Paul responded that the board has been through part 2, so he thought they were set on it. Part 3 would be the negative declaration, it's the explanation of all the areas where the board has identified moderate to large impacts.

Sal asked for it to put up so they can review it?

Scott asked if everyone got a copy of it through the emails this week?

Bill replied yes and then there was a revised version sent around before the meeting.

Sal said it was just the negative declaration, not the EAF.

Paul replied that was not recirculated, but that was work the board had been through and done, so he thought it was completed.

Scott said it was finalized during the 2nd special meeting.

Sal said so in the special meetings, the board had impacts on land, and impacts on traffic. Is that how it remains?

Paul responded that traffic fell out as there was a consensus that there wasn't going to be a significant impact on traffic. The land impacts remain. Also, there were concerns on the aesthetic impacts related to the overall development.

Sal said that he likes that Paul worked a lot of the impacts into the negative declaration which he appreciates. He guesses that he expected a copy of the EAF beforehand, it only shows that one impact, right?

Paul replies yes, the impacts on land those are the ones that really stand out. One of the aesthetic impacts did remain at moderate to large.

Sal asked so, we're not going to do those charts or anything like that. Any mitigations that are in the negative declaration text are the ones that the board came up with.

Paul said yes, you have what is offered for mitigation conceptually and then you also have the realization that if and when you have an actual PRRD application you will have another round of opportunity to review that proposal and to come up with additional mitigation as the board sees fit.

Sal said thank you Paul. He also, said that its fair to say that he is not in favor of this, basically because the drawings don't match any of our discussions or have sort of acknowledgement of them and he doesn't think that the text did enough.

Scott asked if anyone else had anything to add.

Scott asked Paul to read the resolution.

Paul read the resolution.

Roll call vote was taken: Larry-aye, Carl-aye, Sal-nay, Gerry-nay, Lambros-aye, Scott-aye, Franco-aye.

5-ayes, 2-nays

Motion to accept negative declaration passed.

John (applicant's agent) said thank you to the Planning Board for all their work and time spent on the project and they look forward to completing the project with them.

New Business

Garcia/Trainor: Lot line Revision: Pancake Hollow Rd. SBL: 87.3-2-10 and 87.3-2-11

Applicant proposes to convey a 0.15-acre parcel of land from her unimproved 6.84-acre parcel to adjoining lands of co-applicant. The approximately fifteen-foot-wide fee parcel of land will supplement an existing twelve-foot-wide right-of-way over an existing driveway leading from Sundial Lane.

Board to set public hearing.

Scott asked for a motion to set the public hearing for next month.

Franco made the motion, 2nd by Larry.

Scott asked for a vote, all ayes.

Motion passed to set public hearing May 27th at 7:00.

Public Hearings

Denis Brathwaite and MSW: Lot line revision 13 Alex and 30 Alex Ct. SBL: 87.22-1-2 and 87.22-1-3

Applicant is proposing a lot line revision for 13 and 30 Alex Court to allow setback compliance.

SEQRA status: Unlisted action, SEQRA SEAF Part 2/3 review required.

Scott said because the project includes a subdivision, SEQRA needs to be completed 1st before opening the public hearing. He then asked Dave to take the board through SEQRA.

Dave read through the short form of SEQRA.

1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?

Scott said no to small impact.

Sal said no to small impact.

2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?

Scott, Sal and Franco all said no.

3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?

Franco and Sal said no.

4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area?

Sal and Scott said no.

5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for transit, biking or walkway?

Board said no.

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?

Board said no.

7. Will the proposed action impact existing: a. public/private water supplies? b. public/private wastewater treatment utilities?

Board said no.

8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?

Board said no.

9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?

Board said no.

10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?

Board said no.

11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?

Board said no.

Board determined that there would be no adverse environmental impacts.

Scott asked Paul to read the negative declaration that the board received.

Paul read the negative declaration.

Scott asked for a motion to accept the resolution.

Franco made the motion, 2nd by Larry.

Scott asked for a vote, all ayes.

Motion passed to accept the negative declaration.

Scott asked for a motion to open the public hearing.

Carl made the motion, 2nd by Larry.

Public hearing open.

Scott asked if the applicant had any comments?

David W. (applicant) said that it was a minor lot line revision to make the lots straighter.

Scott asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to comment?

There were no public comments, so Scott asked for a motion to close the hearing.

Franco made the motion, 2nd by Carl.

Scott asked for a vote, all ayes.

Motion passed to close public hearing.

Scott asked Paul to read the resolution on the preliminary plat.

Paul read the resolution.

Scott asked for a motion to accept the resolution.

Franco made the motion, 2nd by Larry.

Scott asked for a roll call vote to be taken.

Larry-aye, Carl-aye, Sal-aye, Charly-aye, Gerry-aye, Franco-aye, Scott-aye.

7-ayes, 0-nays

Motion passed to accept the preliminary plat.

Silver Gardens (was Goldenview II): site plan. Argent Drive. #96.29-3-3.11 in PUD

Applicant proposes to construct a three story, 55,000 square foot (total, all floors) affordable, rental housing complex for senior citizens. The complex will include 57, one-bedroom units, outdoor parking areas, a new roadway configuration from Argent Drive to access the complex and pedestrian connections to Argent

SEQRA status: Type I Action based on Part 1 of SEAF. Planning Board is lead agency. SEQRA SEAF Part 2/3 review required.

Hearing status: Site plan review hearing opened, continued; Subdivision hearing cannot be opened until a SEQRA determination.

Scott asked Paul for guidance on the public hearing.

Paul mentioned that the Planning Board role is to conduct site plan and subdivision review and the standards that they review projects against are set forth in the town of Lloyd code, specifically section 100-53 (for site plan) and so the things under that section that the Planning Board is looking at are things like traffic, pedestrian safety, how it fits in with land and buildings in the surrounding area, the capability of the project, things that development of the site will not conflict with adjacent buildings, that there is enough parking, and then typical environmental issues like adequate drainage, water supply, sewage disposal, road alignment, engineering, proposed use complies with the town's comprehensive plan. The Planning Board also, deals with SEQRA issues, like aesthetics whether it's near a state park. Those are all appropriate areas of comment in terms of what the Planning Board can do something about. He knows that they have heard a lot of those comments and the applicant has heard them and responded to them as well. What the Planning Board does not get into is things like the track record of the developer, they cannot deny someone a permit because they did not do a good job on another project. The Planning Board also doesn't look at taxable value property, they don't do balancing tests. They are trying to figure out if it meets the environmental review standards that are provided by zoning code and under SEQRA. He mentioned that if the public could refrain from asking questions that the Planning Board doesn't deal with. If they could think about how, it fits in with the environmental review that would be helpful. The other thing that Scott wanted mentioned is they have received a lot of public comment and feels that they touched on a lot those issues. He also, said that if people hear someone else saying the same thing that they were going to say, consider whether your comment adds value.

Scott asked for a motion to reopen the public hearing.

Franco made the motion, 2nd by Charly.

Sal recused himself as he works for the park. Lambros will be filling in.

Public Hearing:

Maureen Flaherty (Bridgeview resident)- Mentioned that she had read the original PUD document for Bridgeview and saw that 10 acres of land are needed for a phase. This project is only on 5 acres and sees it as an issue because if he doesn't have the required acreage. She doesn't see how the project can move on based on this. Also mentioned that the minutes were only received 2 weeks ago because of the town's negligence and out of respect of the community they would like more time, so they can gather information. She said that the public hearing should be open for another month. Has concerns about a 3-story building being built. She also, mentioned that there is some confusion on whether it is a 2-story or 3-story and how does it fit in with the height limit.

Carmen (Bridgeview resident)- Is concerned about stagnant water and would like to know if a modification was requested to rectify it.

Suzanne Garcia (Bridgeview resident)- Mentioned that the 5 acres is a big issue. She is also concerned about the water as it won't be a loop, but a dead-end water main which means stagnant water. She feels that their drinking water will benefit from stagnant water. Would like more time to read through the planning board minutes and to understand the project better. Also, feels that they are not receiving answers to their questions.

Tricia Chapman (town resident)- Is concerned about the impact of the project to Franny Resee park. She also hears and echoes the concerns of the residents in Bridgeview. She urges the developer and the board to consider the impacts to the entire town not just the community. She is also concerned about the subdivision of the lots and that there could be future development.

Christopher (Bridgeview resident)- Mentioned that he didn't receive a certified letter about this new public hearing. He is also concerned about blasting and wants to know if a vibration study has been done. As he has cracks in his foundation from the blasting when Goldenview was built. Would like to know which way the water line is coming from. Also, would like to know if there is an access road from Domenica or just from Argent.

Carmen (Bridgeview)- Wants to know how long Argent Dr. will be closed if the access road is to be built off of it?

Suzanne (Bridgeview)- Wants clarity on if this project will be 2-stories or 3-stories?

Nicole Rios (Bridgeview)- She agrees with all the other speakers. She would like to know how long construction will be and if there will be blasting. She also agrees that the park which is a national park and should be protected.

Justin (applicant's agent)- He mentioned that they have provided memos to the Planning Board answering the questions that the public has raised. He mentioned that the parcel is located off Argent Dr. and is 13.7 acres which will be subdivided into 2 lots. He said that it is a part of the Bridgeview PUD back in 1984. Originally this lot was going to have a high rise built on it. He also, said that this project fits the PUD zoning, the minimum lot size for residential building has to be 5 acres and they have 5.3 acres. They meet all set-backs, and coverage of the zoning. Lot 2 is 8.2 acres and there is no proposed development at this time. It will be a 57-unit development for people aged 62 and higher. The building will be 3-stories and doesn't have a basement. They will connect to town water and sewer; there is capacity for the town to service this project, the water service will be coming off of Argent Drive. There were adjustments made on the water line, they have moved the main to closer to the building as to prevent having stagnant water. He also, said that the town will require an easement.

Mr. Gerentine (applicant) asked Justin to show the water maps.

Justin- Pulled up the updated map and explained the changes to the water line. He said that the fire trucks can circulate through the parking area without the need for reversing or making a k-turn. He mentioned that the 3-way stop they are proposing is safer than the way the road is now. During their traffic study they found that there would 18 trips during the peak pm and 19 during peak am, which is less than a 1% increase in the Argent Dr./9W corridor.

Mr. Gerentine (applicant) said that the highway superintendent mentioned that the 3-way stop they are proposing is safer than the existing conditions. He also, said that there would be no closure of Argent Dr. during construction.

Justin then continued on saying that there is no action proposed from Domenica into the site. He also mentioned that they met with Scenic Hudson and Palisades Park Commission in March to hear their concerns. One concern was they wanted an increase in landscaping. They wanted more buffer landscaping along the parking area. They added 10 more land banked parking spots. They also added in a buffer along the trail. They swapped some of their plantings to more native species per Scenic Hudson suggestions. Scenic Hudson also asked if they could use more earth-tone colors for the buildings. He mentioned that they have submitted a SWPP which includes a sediment and erosion plan. Which has to be completed if you remove more than 1 acre of land. As for the lighting they have submitted a full plan with LED lighting, that is dark sky compliant. He mentioned that right now there is a trail across the site. The applicant has agreed to provide an easement to the public to utilize the sidewalk up into the site and to the trail to maintain the trail connection. They had the ecologists back on the site to check about concerns to plant and animal species that could be on the site. They provided that report to the board and the report says that this project is highly unlikely to adversely impact any threatened or endangered species. Christopher asked about the crosswalk, will the applicant be maintaining it as far as the paint markings? He also wanted to know if the stop signs would be the solar panel ones that flash as no one obeys the stops signs in Bridgeview.

Justin replied right now the stop signs are regular, but could talk to the applicant about the ones that flash. Maintenance of the crosswalk should be on the town, but will talk to town to discuss that.

Gerry asked if Justin could re-explain the phases on the acreage.

Justin said that the minimum area for a PUD is 10 acres for a phase and their lot is 13.7 acres, so they meet the minimum 10-acre threshold. In the PUD the minimum lot for residential has to be at least 5 acres, and lot 1 is at 5.3 acres which is for Silver Gardens.

Gerry asked is it 10 acres of development, correct?

Justin said no overall parcel area has to be 10 acres minimum.

Gerry asked if they could show the other lot?

Scott said that can be answered after Justin is done with his presentation as this is part of public hearing still.

Justin said that he went through everything he has and asked if Mr. Gerentine has anything to add?

Mr. Gerentine said that he has all the memos on the questions that have been received and has answered them all. As for the process he has followed all the procedures of the Planning Board. The letters are not on him, that's the town's job, but they pay all the bills for the legal notices to go out and they even held it up a month because Palisades didn't receive one. He also said that there is no construction going through Goldenview, there are markings there for other reasons. He also asked if Mike could explain the 5 acres of the PUD?

Mike (applicant's lawyer) said that Justin did a good job of explaining it.

Mr. Gerentine asked if Paul would like to add to that?

Paul said that its great that the Bridgeview residents did look through the original PUD document, but said that they looked at the same 10-acre question early on. They found that the 13-acre parcel for this phase fits. He said that each site plan only needs 5 acres for residential use. He thinks its 3 acres for commercial.

Scott asks anyone from the board have any other comments. He also told Gerry he was sorry for cutting him off before.

Gerry said that he is concerned about lot 2 that it could be developed in the future. Which leaves a lot of unanswered questions. He is concerned that once this project is approved, they will submit a new application for lot 2.

Scott asked if Paul or the applicant's team could answer that.

Mike Moriello (applicant's lawyer) said that at present there is no proposal on lot 2. If in the future there is a plan, the applicant would have to comply with SEQRA if required and any site plan or SUP if needed.

Gerry asked what the total acreage was?

Justin replied 13.7 acres.

Gerry asked about the other parcels that the applicant owns that is adjacent to this project.

Justin replied that the 13.7 is only one tax parcel. He said there is a small piece in the northwest corner that is not part of the project and is 0.8 acres. There are also, 2 small parcels along Domenica Lane that are not a part of this project.

Gerry said, so they could all be lumped together to make another 10-acre parcel, which is another project.

Paul asked are the 2 parcels on Domenica adjoining to the lot that is being retained?

Justin said they are adjacent to the proposed lot 2.

Paul asked how many acres total will those 2 parcels plus lot 2 be if they are merged in the future?

Justin said he thinks its just under 10-acres. He said that he would get an exact number for the board.

Andy mentioned that the upgrades needed for the Bridgeview pump station will be borne by the developers that have projects in the area not by tax payers. He also mentioned that by moving the hydrant closer to the building reduces the stagnant water issue significantly. The easement to the town is for future use to loop to Domenica.

Claire asked if they can clarify how, it can be 3-stories high and still under the height limit of 35'?

Paul mentioned that in a PUD the max height is 35'. He asked Justin to explain how they could have a 3-story building under the max height of 35'.

Justin replied that the project architect did measurements per building code around the perimeter of the building to measure the average height of the finished grade to the medium height of the roof lines and have done that calculation around the building and it is under 35'.

Claire asked then you have a right under the 10 acres to build this project out?

Justin replied yes.

Claire asked it's not 5 acres, right?

Justin said no, as was described they have proven their compliance to those acreage.

Claire asked if Pat Ryan the Ulster County Executive sent a letter speaking to this project, am I correct?

Justin replied that is correct.

Claire asked about the town comp. plan, she mentioned that the Ulster County one is in favor of more development in the town that they have tried to keep tailored, correct?

Paul replied that is correct. The goals speak of a need for more housing options that are affordable for local people.

Claire asked Mr. Gerentine if he does pay taxes on his properties?

Mr. Gerentine replied yes you are correct.

Claire asked Mr. Gerentine if he takes any exemptions on his projects?

Mr. Gerentine replied he doesn't take any IDA exemptions.

Claire asked what about a 485B?

Mr. Gerentine said that he doesn't do a bonified 485B as they don't go thorough the classifications of it. He said the assessments are based on the market rents and the assessor bases that as total rent and evaluates it backwards to see what the value of the property is.

Claire asked the Planning Board if any of them take kickbacks? As she has seen that comment and resents it about them taking kickbacks. She wants to make it very clear to the public that the Planning Board members don't get paid. Their position on the Planning Board is to work as volunteers, which she recommends anybody to try to work in one of the positions in the town as a volunteer because you really do get an education. She wants it to be made clear that those accusations are upsetting as the board works really hard, there is a lot of reading, a lot of work on their end, a lot of learning there are classes. She even spoke to Dave about the comment made about him being "loosey, goosey" which is a comment she has heard a lot from a certain Counselman and then it was repeated by Maureen at the town board meeting and it made her think of Mr. Mazzetti because she has heard him say it before.

Maureen said that she never said "loosey, goosey."

Claire said that her point is that Maureen was implying that Dave doesn't do his job and she would disagree. She is on her last term here, and she's probably sure that Bridgeview is happy about that and she doesn't really care. Here's the deal she has worked with these guys and the town Planning Board. The Planning Board is her team and she really resents all the negative comments about them taking kickbacks and as far as it goes with Dave as well. She said that Dave works hard, he has a lot of projects and she knows because she is an apartment owner that they do inspections there and she is held to task, so she knows Mr. Gerentine will be as well because she has seen the book that he has to do every year to make sure he is compliant with the seniors. She feels disappointed, she thinks that this project will be great for the town. She said that as long as Mr. Gerentine follows the law he should be allowed to build on his property. As long as the Planning Board, Dave and Paul who she has faith in do their due diligence to make sure that the law of the land is followed. She believes that they are following the law of the land because she has been at the town hall asking questions, about the assessments and all the other things to make sure that he is compliant. She also, had conversions with Mr. Gerentine about the water as that was one of her concerns. She feels he is being compliant.

Scott said thank you for addressing the comments, Claire.

Carmen said legal rights should not be the only thing that's being considered here, that's what the comprehensive plan is for. She hopes that other than legal rights, other voices will be heard and not just the developers and 57 seniors who will potentially benefit from it. She is all for affordable housing, but feels that this is not the location for it, as it being so close to Franny Resee Park which is a treasure.

Maureen said she did speak to Fred Pizzuto and said to him, from what she has observed from going to these meetings and also reading up on certain things, she has observed that things were

a bit loose. She did not say “loosey, goosey” as it is not one of her expressions. She asked him as the supervisor of the building director was, he concerned about the loose approach because when she sees him saying that “sometimes I take notes and sometimes I don’t,” and the issue of the meeting minutes no where to be found for the public viewing for 2 years. That does concern tax payers and that is what she asked. She said there could be many reasons why the minutes were not done correctly, she cannot speculate. She just wants to correct for the record that she did not say “loosey, goosey,” she said he has a bit of a loose approach.

Claire said she doesn’t think he has a loose approach at all.

Maureen said, so we disagree Claire.

Suzanne said that she has known Claire forever, but has to call her out on this. This is not a parent child relationship you cannot be disappointed with us; we are a group of people that feel blindsided and whenever someone is speaking from a place of frustration, you’re going to have what we have which is mistrust. It might be misplaced mistrust, but its mistrust because we didn’t have the meeting minutes. She found out about this project when it was very far along, she should have known about it way earlier than this and she thinks sometimes when you slow walk people through something you’re more likely to win them over. When you’re ambushing people, you are not going to get a lot of fans.

Claire said she is disappointed in reading the comments on the side that were saying “how much do they get paid and how much does Scenic Hudson get paid for this project.” It just doesn’t work that way and those comments are no good for anybody.

Suzanne said this is the world of politics and getting it done. It might not be pretty at times and she is just telling them that it’s the voice of frustration that people didn’t get the information and she doesn’t think it was transparent as it should have been. Finally, she wants to reiterate something and support Carmen when she goes to the parking lot for Franny Reese there are license plates from all corners, from all states, we must recognize the gem that, that is and if we play our cards right, we’ve got a great source of income which should be protected for generations to come for this area if we really care about our area, we got to handle this properly right next to the park.

Maureen agrees that Bridgeview residents are frustrated. She just wants to say that she wasn’t commenting in the side about money being exchanged that was one person and it wasn’t her. She feels that she has been extremely professional as she tries to voice her concerns and to be honest at last night’s meeting, she couldn’t even finish her sentences as she was being talked over and it felt like she was being bullied. She feels as a tax payer that she was being very respectful and would like to see at least that level of professionalism from the people who are on these boards.

Scott said that he appreciates all the comments being made, but a lot of them don’t pertain to the Planning Board decision and that they need to stay on track.

Scott asked for a motion to continue the public hearing next month.

Mike asked if the applicant could speak for a second?

Scott replied yes Mr. Moriello.

Mike said he doesn’t see why there is a continuation of the public hearing, he has not heard any relevant conversion on matter of the environment that haven’t been examined. They have been comprehensively examined of all of those issues that have been brought up. He said that everyone should be mindful of the fact that SEQRA doesn’t even require a public hearing unless you have a positive declaration of environmental significance. He mentioned that the Planning Board can only interpret the law as it is written and don’t have a chance to change the law to fit the popular opinion may be of nearby owners of land or residents. They can apply the

administrative law if they want to do something different, they have to run for town board, then they can change the zoning law.

Paul said this is not SEQRA hearing this is a site plan review hearing that the board opened and has continued and the board has not yet opened the subdivision hearing, so it's entirely appropriate that the board to continue the public hearing on the site plan. One of the things Scott had flagged for this meeting was to see if the board is ready to go through the part 2 of SEQRA and possibly give a direction to staff to draft a declaration for next meeting.

Scott said let's go back to my question is there a motion to leave the public hearing open until next month?

Gerry made the motion, 2nd by Carl. Vote was taken all ayes.

Motion passed to continue public hearing next month.

Scott asked the board to consider if it was ready to make a SEQRA determination? At last weeks meeting the board indicated that there was no more information needed to make a determination and the board was provided with a EAF to look over. He said he will let the applicant give their point of view for SEQRA and then Dave will take the board through it.

Gerry said that his only question is the overall lot size of the small parcels it seems that they don't quite know, he would like to have a firm number of what those parcels are.

Franco said that he looked those parcels up, one is 0.08 acres and the other is 0.09 acres and the part to the east is 2.0 acres. Is that right Justin?

Justin replied that is correct. The parcels along Domenica are correct, but the triangular piece the survey shows as 0.81 acres. When he adds those 4 parcels up it would be 9.22 acres (includes 3 parcels not a part of the project and one being created by this project).

Gerry asked can that be verified as if it is another 10 acres that's another phase, right?

Franco mentioned that he could look it up on Parcel Access.

Scott asked the applicant to provide their prospective on part 2?

Mike mentioned that the applicant submitted a draft EAF part 2 on the 14th of April. He said that the part 2 is the document that the board has to come up with its own answers, but the applicant can suggest what the answers could be. He went though the applicant's suggested answers:

Impact on Land-yes, no to small in subsections.

Impact on geological features- no

Impact on surface water- yes, no to small in subsections

Impact on groundwater- yes, no to small in subsections

Impact on flooding-no

Impact on air-no

Impact on plants and animals-yes, no to small in subsections

Impact on agricultural resources-no

Impact on aesthetic resources-yes, no to small in subsections

Impact on historical and archeological resources-yes, no to small in subsections also provided a letter of no adverse impact from New York State Parks.

Impact on open space and recreation-no

Impact on critical environmental areas-no

Impact on transportation-yes, no to small in subsections

Impact on energy-yes, no to small in subsections

Impact on noise, odor and light-yes, no to small in subsections

Impact on human health-no

Consistency with community plans-no

Consistency with community character-no

Scott asked Dave if he would take the board through part 2 of the EAF? He also mentioned that he wants to hear from the whole not just one or two voices.

Dave went through part 2 of the EAF. (see attached for answers)

Scott asked for a motion to have staff draft a negative declaration and resolution.

Franco made the motion, 2nd by Charly. Vote was taken all ayes.

Scott asked for a motion to set the public hearing for the subdivision for May 27th and refer the project to the Ulster County Planning Board.

Larry made the motion, 2nd by Franco. Vote was taken, all ayes. Motion passed to set public hearing on the subdivision for next month.

Other comments from the board

Carl said that he heard from someone in Bridgeview about the meeting minutes. He wants to speak on Dave's behalf because he knows that Dave went through a lot of turn over in the building department and also, we've been through a pandemic last year. Which in his opinion is remarkable that they are even able to do this between doing it virtual with computers and noise breaking up and be able to hear anybody. He really feels for the building department, he just wanted to say that on Dave behalf that he went through hell this past year and is doing the best he can.

Scott said he will say on behalf of Dave and all the staff, that he keeps in close contact with these guys, he talks to them probably 3 times a week. He will say that Dave and the entire staff in the planning department really do go above and beyond to meet the obligations that they have to and on top of a pandemic they actually created a way from an idea that we can move this town forward in any direction, whether it's for development or against development whatever it is, but we are doing is we're able to see the presentation, are able to act on them, and are able to do what is necessary for the town to conduct normal daily business. He has to say thanks to the entire building department for everything that they have done up there as they make his life very simple trying to get everything together and on top of Andy and Paul doing their part, advising the board legally and from an engineer stand point. He has to say for anyone who says that they are intangible is wrong. Over the last few months, it has taken them a little while to get everything together in these requests for everybody to have that open transparency, but he will say that this video has been open ever since the pandemic started and anybody that wanted to partake in any part of understanding, there has been public comment sections every time they could view everyone of our meetings, they have been invited, so he would say its kind of on their own negligence of not doing so. He sees that his board members are here 95% of the time, so he wants to thank everybody.

Motion to Adjourn.