

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TOWN OF LLOYD PLANNING BOARD

Thursday, July 22, 2021

CALL TO ORDER TIME: 7:00pm

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

OFFICIALLY OPEN THE MEETING

Attendance: Board Members: Scott McCarthy, Gerry Marion, Lambros Violaris, Larry Hammond, Bill Meltzer, Franco Zani, Carl DiLorenzo, Sal Cuciti, Charly Long, Claire Winslow (town board); Board Staff: Dave Barton, Paul VanCott, Andy Learn, and Sarah Van Nostrand

Minutes to Approve

May 27, 2021

Old Business:

All Space Storage- Site Plan, 480 Route 299, SBL# 87.1-2-28, in DB zone.

Applicant is seeking site plan approval to add additional storage facilities to an existing site already containing storage facilities.

SEQRA status: Unlisted

Andy mentioned that he sent a review memo around, plans are in decent shape, there are a few changes that need to be made, he would like to see fencing or a guide rail around the stormwater, some changes need to be made around the stormwater infiltration basins in regard to the proposed grading, and there are a few tweaks that need to be made to the stormwater modeling. Kelly (applicant's agent) said that she did receive Andy's comments, she mentioned that the project did receive ZBA approval, and would like the board to set a public hearing for next month.

Dave said that he would also refer this project to the Ulster County Planning Board.

Public hearing set for August 26.

New Business

Public Hearings

Selux Corporation: Solar Array, Site Plan Review and Special Use Permit; 5 Lumen Lane, in GB zone.

Applicant is seeking commercial site plan and special use permit approval to construct and maintain a 750 KW solar array in an unused portion of the parcel.

SEQRA status: Unlisted

Review Status: Ulster County Planning Board comments received and circulated to board.

Scott asked for a motion to open the public hearing.

Franco made the motion, 2nd by Charly.

Zach (applicant's agent) mentioned that they did receive Andy's comment letter. He also mentioned that they are working on the decommissioning plan and will send it around when it is finalized.

Dave said that there has been some commentary between staff and board members about the decommissioning plan.

Andy asked if they had received comments from the Highland Fire Department about the turnaround area?

Zach said that they are working on it.

Paul went through the long EAF with the board.

1. Proposed action may involve construction on, or physical alteration of, the land surface of the proposed site?

Board agrees no to small impact.

2. The proposed action may result in the modification or destruction of, or inhibit access to, any unique or unusual land forms on the site?

Board agrees no to small impact.

3. The proposed action may affect one or more wetlands or other surface water bodies?

Board agrees no to small impact.

4. The proposed action may result in new or additional use of ground water, or may have the potential to introduce contaminants to ground water or an aquifer?

Board agrees no to small impact.

5. The proposed action may result in development on lands subject to flooding?

Board agrees no to small impact.

6. The proposed action may include a state regulated air emission source?

Board agrees no to small impact.

7. The proposed action may result in a loss of flora or fauna?

Board agrees no to small impact.

8. The proposed action may impact agricultural resources?

Board agrees no to small impact.

9. The land use of the proposed action are obviously different from, or are in sharp contrast to, current land use patterns between the proposed project and a scenic or aesthetic resource?

Board agrees no to small impact.

10. The proposed action may occur in or adjacent to a historic or archaeological resource?

Board agrees no to small impact.

11. The proposed action may result in a loss of recreational opportunities or a reduction of open space resource as designated in any adopted municipal open space plan.

Board agrees no to small impact.

12. The proposed action may be located within or adjacent to a critical environmental area?

Board agrees no to small impact.

13. The proposed action may result in a change to existing transportation systems?

Board agrees no to small impact.

14. The proposed action may cause an increase in the use of any form of energy?

Board agrees no to small impact.

15. The proposed action may result in an increase in noise, odors, or outdoor lighting?

Board agrees no to small impact.

16. The proposed action may have an impact on human health from exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants?

Board agrees no to small impacts.

17. The proposed action is not consistent with adopted land use plans?

Board agrees that the action is consistent with the land use plans.

18. The proposed action is inconsistent with the existing community character?

Board agrees that the proposed action is consistent with the existing community character.

Resolution for negative declaration was read.

Scott asked for a motion to accept resolution.

Franco made the motion, 2nd by Gerry.

Roll call vote was taken.

Sal-aye

Larry-aye

Franco-aye

Carl-aye

Gerry-aye

Charly-aye

Scott-aye

All in favor motion passed to accept negative declaration.

Site plan and special use permit resolution was read.

Scott asked for a motion to accept the resolution.

Sal made the motion, 2nd by Larry.

Sal asked if the comments being included, includes the decommission plan?

Andy replied yes.

Roll call vote was taken.

Gerry-aye

Carl-aye
Charly-aye
Scott-aye
Franco-aye
Larry-aye
Sal-aye

All in favor motion passed to accept the resolution.

Basciano, Stephanie- Lot line revision, 404 Pancake Hollow Rd., SBL #87.1-2-19.300 & 87.1-2-19.400

Applicant is seeking a lot line revision between 4 existing lots on Pancake Hollow Rd. located in the R-1 zone and A zone.

SEQRA status: Unlisted

Paul went through the SEAF with the board.

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

Board agrees no impact.

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

Board agrees no impact.

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

Board agrees no impact.

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

Board agrees no impact.

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?

Board agrees no impact.

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 agrees no impact.

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

Board agrees no impact.

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

Board agrees no impact.

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

Board agrees no impact.

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

Board agrees no impact.

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

Board agrees no impact.

Paul read the negative declaration resolution.

Motion made by Scott, 2nd by Sal.

Roll Call Vote:

Gerry-aye

Carl-aye

Charly-aye

Franco-aye

Scott-aye

Sal-aye

Larry-aye

All in favor motion passed to accept the negative declaration resolution.

Scott asked for a motion to open the public hearing.

Motion made by Larry, 2nd by Franco.

Patti (applicant's agent) mentioned that she had finalized the driveway maintenance agreement, which will be filed with the map.

Sal asked about Department of Health approval.

Patti replied that Andy W. (a part of the applicant's team) was working on it.

No public comments.

Scott asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

Franco made the motion, 2nd by Sal.

Dave asked if the board was going to approve the preliminary plat without board of health approval and without the meets and bounds?

Scott said there is an easement.

Carl asked if that would be a condition for final approval?

Dave said that the board wouldn't even entertain the final approval without it.

Paul said the board when it comes to the final plat can choose if they want another public hearing or waive it.

Scott asked for a motion to approve the preliminary plat resolution.

Sal made the motion, 2nd by Franco.

Roll Call vote:

Sal-aye

Franco-aye

Scott-aye

Carl-aye

Larry-aye

Gerry-aye

Charly-aye

All ayes motion passed to accept the preliminary plat resolution.

Rover Contracting (Riverside Corners): Site Plan Review: 251 N. Riverside Rd.: SBL: 87.8-1-10.3 in LI zone.

Applicant is seeking site plan approval to permit construction of a 9,800 square foot warehouse building for storage and maintenance of equipment for a construction company, with an attached two-story office and file storage annex totaling 3,000 square feet in size.

SEQRA status: Unlisted

Review Status: Ulster County Planning Board comments received and circulated to the board.

Scott asked for a motion to open the public hearing.

Larry made the motion, 2nd by Franco.

Patti (applicant's agent) mentioned that she had added notes to the site plan based on last week's comments. The notes added included that there is to be no outdoor storage if moved outside in the future the enclosure needs approval, clarification that no signage is proposed and if there is any in the future it has to go to the board for approval, the vegetation on the westerly side of the site is to remain and added to, and that the applicant will look into ways to meet the NYS Stretch Energy Code.

Andy said that he received an email earlier from Patti about the Health Department giving the project preliminary approval. He also mentioned similar to the other project he needs the description of the water line easement. He mentioned that a note should be added about lighting or it should be included in the plan set.

Patti said that she had added to the plan set.

No public comment.

Scott asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

Franco made the motion, 2nd by Sal.

All ayes, motion to close the public hearing passed.

Paul went through the SEAF with the board.

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

Board agrees no to small impact.

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

Board agrees no to small impact.

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

Board agrees no to small impact.

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

Board agrees no to small impact.

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?

Board agrees no to small impact.

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 agrees no to small impact.

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

Board agrees no to small impact.

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

Board agrees no to small impact.

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

Board agrees no to small impact.

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

Board agrees no to small impact

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

Board agrees no to small impact.

Scott asked for a motion to accept the negative declaration.

Franco made the motion, 2nd by Sal.

Roll Call vote was taken:

Gerry-aye

Larry-aye

Franco-aye

Carl-aye

Sal-aye

Charly-aye

Scott-aye

All ayes, motion passed to accept the negative declaration.

Paul read the site plan resolution.

Scott asked for a motion to accept the resolution.

Franco made the motion, 2nd by Sal.

Roll Call vote was taken:

Gerry-aye

Carl-aye

Larry-aye

Scott-aye

Charly-aye

Franco-aye

Sal-aye

All ayes, motion passed to accept the resolution.

The Village in the Hudson Valley: Site Plan Review and Special Use Permit Route 9W: Master parcel # 95.12-1-15.100

Applicant is seeking approvals for an Assisted Living Facility.

SEQRA status: Negative Declaration issued

Review status: Referred to UCPB

Kelly (a part of the applicant's team) mentioned that they had made some modifications based on comments at the Planning Board's last meeting and have provided responses to all comments received. She also mentioned that the project was referred to the County and that she thinks the comments were received back. She mentioned that the size of the building was reduced and pulled away from the residences.

Sal asked why they did that?

Kelly replied that it was in response to the public comments. She said a lot of the public was concerned about the close proximity of the project to the residences.

John (applicant's agent) mentioned that they were able to shave down the building, so that they could shift the road and add more landscaping.

Kelly said that the building was originally 93 feet to the property line, when they shifted the building, it will be 137 feet to the property line. She said that the road was 50 feet to the property on Mayer Dr, now it is 87 feet. She also mentioned that all their stormwater will be retained underground instead of in ponds. She said that the team removed the sales office as well.

Public hearing continued:

Anthony Pascale (Business Owner) said that he has concerns that his property will be impacted. He is concerned about drainage problems as there are blind ditches and French drains on the property; he would like the applicant to get a certified survey for the property. Also, he is worried about the dust that will contain chemicals (arsenic, DDT and other spray materials). He thinks this project is a great concept, he thinks that it is overdevelopment, and feels the location is wrong for it. He feels that there will be traffic issues as well.

Mark Reynolds (Newspaper reporter) asked when the building changed in length what is the length now? Also, he asked if standing on 9W looking up at the structure, what is the height of the building?

Don (a part of the applicant's team) replied that the rear wing was reduced by 57 linear feet long and the height of the building hasn't changed it is still less than 30 feet.

John mentioned that they have submitted very detailed elevation maps through various stages.

Dave mentioned that the trees along the drive appear to be close to the road and that Fire apparatus might hit them. He suggests that the applicant move them back farther off the road.

John mentioned that the County agreed with the way the board did the SEQRA process. One comment from the County was that the project should be reviewed by the DOT. The County also wants the applicant to provide a link for the sidewalks.

Andy said that he would clarification from the County on the sidewalks and what side of the road they are on.

John said the next comment was about transit, if there would be a pick up and drop off location for UCAT. The next comment was about stormwater, which the team is working on. Also, highlighting the hours of operation during construction and making sure the neighbors are screened, especially during construction and to avoid construction activities on weekends. The County also mentioned that some of the lighting on campus was a little high and that they would the applicant to reduce some of the lighting on campus as per the dark-sky association.

Sal said that according to the site plan and zoning code the board is supposed to have ¼ inch scale for the elevations. He feels that the steep slope of 15-20% that the project is gaining extra height due to building on the slope. He also, said that the road is at 10% slope which is too steep

for sidewalks. He would like to see the building moved back another 20 feet as it is a big building and very close to the property line.

Charly asked if in the future would the underground storage work?

Kelly mentioned that they are working on it, the team is preparing a SWPPP for the ALF, but they are also going to make sure that the underground storage will be sufficient in the future.

Andy mentioned that he had raised the question last week about the truck turning movements for the loading dock access, for the trucks coming from the south and entering the site from Mayer and going through the parking lot. It then shows them making a right as to turn out of the site and then going southbound and then backing up into the loading dock and he feels that it could potentially cause a problem, if that access is blocked.

Carl suggested that maybe they should have the trucks enter the site from 9W instead of Mayer Dr.

Andy said that one of the comments he has is about the trash compactor, has the team looked at that at all?

Kelly said that she talked with Ken (a part of the applicant's team) and Royal Carting to get some dimensions.

Dave said that he has a question about the lot line revision. He asked if the red line indicated the new lot line, so he doesn't under that a lot that is a 53-acre lot, he would like to know what the space in there is, as it is sort of a strange shape. Was there a reason why the new lot line was arranged that way?

Ken said that the lot line was adjusted for the future PRRD as well as meeting requirements for the site plan for coverage calculations.

Andy asked how does the lot depth fit with the bulk requirements at the pinch point near the storage facility lot?

Kelly said that she is willing to discuss between now and the next submission with Andy, Dave, Paul to work on fixing the lot line.

Scott asked if there were anymore questions. Hearing none he asked Paul where the board should go from here?

Paul replied that they could keep the public hearing open, or if the board is comfortable with the subdivision the board can close the public hearing for that. From the date that the board closes the public hearing they have 62 days to make a decision.

All members are in favor of continuing the public hearing.

Motion to Adjourn.