

WORKSHOP MEETING AGENDA
TOWN OF LLOYD PLANNING BOARD

Thursday, September 16, 2021

CALL TO ORDER TIME: 5:30pm

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

Via Webex

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

Minutes to Approve

July 22, 2021, August 19, 2021, and August 26, 2021

Old Business:

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: UCPB Comments received; CPL comments received; public hearing closed

Paul said that the board closed the public hearing and that they are now under a time deadline for making a decision on the project. He can draft resolutions for next week.

Andy mentioned that the team has submitted new plans and an updated SWPPP. The biggest outstanding comments are on the SWPPP. He feels that the new plans help with access to the loading area. The team is just about there with stormwater and has a few minor comments, but he feels that it be addressed by next week.

Scott mentioned that Carl brought to his attention, that the elevation of the building were 59 feet. He said that it is calculated over the average grade for the building, so when you have the rear part of the building and the front part of the building the average grade would be the rear part of the building and then you would have the average grade of the front part of the building, since they are pretty much 2 separate buildings, even though they are connected. He said that nothing here exceeds 32 feet, correct?

Dave replied that it is less than 35 feet.

Scott asked Dave to explain how the average grade comes about?

Dave explained that the applicant did the calculations and he reviewed them and applied the code to them and agreed with their calculations. What they do is they take the building as it sits on the ground; they take the grade at all points around the building and the average height above that needs to be under the maximum height allowed in the zone.

Scott mentioned that because the building is built into the land side of the property it gave that one elevation the appearance of being high as it is up on top of the other building in grade.

Andy mentioned that he has questions on the sewer district expansion will be a condition as they are still working on a developer's agreement, health department approval, traffic improvement plans especially for sidewalk work, the easements for sewer and drainage lines that cross the property. He also, mentioned that there is now a fence proposed across the loading dock area, he suggests that the board take a look at the fence and make sure they are okay with the style of it. Scott asked Andy if he thinks they could have them addressed by next meeting?

Andy replied it is possible.

Paul said that if the board is ready, he can draft resolutions as the board only has 62 days to make a decision. There would be resolutions for the subdivision and special use permit and site plan approval. The site plan resolution would include findings based on the special use standards and also, site plan standards. If the board moves to approve the project most of the findings would track what was already said in the SEQRA negative declaration. If the board chooses to move towards denying the project, he feels that there should be more discussion and more direction from the board on a basis for denial.

Kelly (a part of the applicant's team) said that based on comments received from the last planning board meeting they reduced the size of the building by 40 feet adjacent to the dentist office. The reduction in the building reduced the square footage from 119,250 down to 110,750. The length of the front of the building went from 386 feet down to 346 feet. The number of units was also reduced from 142 down to 119. The building reduction addressed concerns about the trucks accessing the loading area, they created a design that allows the garbage trucks can pull in and back in, and then pull back out. They added a fence, but can remove it if the board wants, the team thought it would be a nice addition for screening purposes. It is an aluminum chain link fence.

Dave asked if Kelly could go over the DOT letter that was received?

Kelly replied that the DOT agrees with the project's concept with minor modifications and that they are giving permission to submit a permit application.

Andy said that the turning movements work for box trucks and tractor trailers who are only going southbound on 9W, but he doesn't see a turning movement for the tractor trailers when they are entering northbound on 9W where it would turn onto Mayer Drive. He is not sure if they would have the same issue as before or not, he assumes they would have issue with the trucks blocking the site entrance from 9W. He suggests that they still have a sign saying no truck access to loading dock from this direction.

Kelly replied that it is still there.

Sal asked if the retaining wall if it could be moved away from the lot to the north to leave some vegetive ground there?

Kelly replied that they could not move the wall back as the grading required would be extreme. They also have landscaping between the property line and the driveway.

Dave asked what the wall would be faced with?

Kelly showed a picture of the ledgestone that the wall would be faced with.

Charly asked if the fence would be closed at all times? He suggested that the fence be run by the fire chief and see what he thinks about it.

Kelly replied that it would be a swing gate with a Knox Box on the fence for emergencies. She said that they could also remove the fence all together if the board would prefer.

Scott asked if they had a picture of it?

Kelly replied that it would be a chain link fence, 6-foot high, black vinyl and they could put slats on it.

Franco suggested that they remove the fence as it would be a hindrance for snow removal, prolongs the entrance and exiting of the trucks.

Scott said that he feels the same way.

Kelly replied that she is inclined to remove it for all the reasons mentioned.

Sal said that he would to see as much as possible from DOT before voting on the project.

Kelly replied that the DOT has it set up this way, so applicants don't have to prepare full plan drawings for DOT while they are before the planning board. She said that in the letter it says to submit State 2 of the PERM 33-COM which is their permit process.

Sal asked so they are just going to review your drawings and approve them?

Kelly replied that DOT is going to review them, this letter states that they have accepted their plans and are giving them permission to move forward with this submission.

Scott asked how the board felt about having staff draft a resolution for next week?

Franco said he agrees with that.

Sal suggested they wait as the have another month.

Larry said to continue on and see what they have next week.

Gerry agrees with Sal that they have another month and why rush it though.

Paul mentioned that the board cannot make it to the October meeting, the board would have to have a special meeting, in order to comply with the 62 days, as the board would be 1 day short.

Franco asked Andy if he thought they were far enough a long to do a draft resolution?

Andy replied yes, as what is left could be addressed by next week or at least be short enough to be conditions of approval.

New Business

Public Hearings

Stewart's: Site plan review: 3733 Route 9W: SBL: 96.9-1-33.100 in Highway Business District

Applicant is proposing a new typical Stewart's Shops convenience store (3,850 sq. ft.) with self-service gasoline.

SEQRA Status: Type II

Review Status: ZBA variance and Stewart's response to CPL comments circulated

Tyler (applicant) mentioned that they have received ZBA approval, and are currently in front of the planning board for site plan approval. They were in front of the Water & Sewer Committee for the water & sewer district extension which was sent over to the Town Board.

Andy said that he needs to see updated plans.

Webex issue part of meeting was not recorded

Bill asked if there was a way to limit the Chapel Hill entrance/exit to only trucks?

Sal mentioned that the weight restrictions on South Chapel Hill Rd, excludes delivery vehicles, so he feels that the tankers could go on that road to deliver the gas to the station.

Webex recording back

Sal suggested that they stripe a left turn lane on 9W northbound to get onto South Chapel Hill Rd.

Dave said that the hiccup with the left turn lane is that it wouldn't only serve the site and DOT might not like the idea.

Rozzi, Thomas-Subdivision; Station Rd., SBL #86.4-3-3.1

Applicant is seeking a 3-lot subdivision on existing 26 acres on Station Rd.

SEQRA Status: Unlisted Action.

Potential Action: None, need applicant response to workshop discussion.

Dave mentioned that there was nothing new, they could make DOH approval conditional as they don't have it yet.

Paul said that he can draft a resolution for next week.

Mountainside Woods-Lot Line Revision, 1 & 3 Emerson Terrace, SBL #87.21-1-25 & 87.21-1-26

Applicant is seeking a lot line revision for purpose of meeting set back requirements.

SEQRA Status: Type II Action

Review Status: Application submitted and circulated to Board.

No Board or staff comments.

Costantino, Raymond- Subdivision, 136 Bellevue Rd., SBL #88.1-3-24.114

Applicant is seeking a two-lot subdivision if a 7.43-acre vacant lot to create a 2.76 acre, and a 4.67-acre parcel with a proposed house, well and septic system on each lot.

SEQRA Status: Unlisted Action

Review Status: Updated map received and circulated to the Board.

Dave mentioned that Patti had removed the bluff line from the plans and made a note that when the house comes in for a building permit that it would be reviewed at that time.

Sal said that he agrees with Patti's decision to remove the bluff line from the map. The rest of the board agrees as well.

AT&T- Lot Line Revision, Illinois Mountain, SBL #87.4-5-24.100 and 87.4-5-4.112

Applicant AT&T Communications is the owner of a 23.09-acre parcel (SBL 87.4-5-24.100) and a 2.81-acre parcel (SBL 87.4-5-4.112) located on Illinois Mountain. It is proposed that the 23.09-acre parcel will convey 0.5 acres to the 2.81 parcel to create an unencumbered vacant 22.59-acre parcel. The resultant 3.31-acre lot contains communication facilities and no new construction is proposed.

SEQRA Status: Type II Action

Review Status: Updated map received and circulated to the Board.

Sal asked if this project has anything to do with moving equipment that was mentioned at the Town Board meeting?

Sue (applicant's agent) said that all she knows is that AT&T is selling land to Scenic Hudson and this needs to be done first.

Dave replied that this is simply to clean up the lots.

JTK Management- Site Plan, 86 North Rd., SBL #88.1-4-21

The applicant proposes construction of two two-family dwellings on the property. It is located primarily in the R-1/2 zone, and is located in a mixed-use area of single-family residences, multi-family residences and businesses. Each dwelling will be serviced by Town of Lloyd municipal water and sewer service.

SEQRA Status: Unlisted Action

Review Status: Application submitted and circulated to Board.

Andy W. (a part of the applicant's team) mentioned that the applicant is proposing 2 duplexes, each with 3 bedrooms, proposing 10 parking spaces, have submitted updated plans showing the water & sewer connection at the road. Showed that a fire truck could do a k-turn to go in and out of the site. The project team also met with the Water & Sewer Committee to talk about the connections.

Andy L. said that he will get his letter out, he would also like to see a landscaping plan. He asked if there was any lighting proposed besides building mounted?

Andy W. said that he was not sure if Patti was going to add any lighting or not.

Andy L. mentioned that he would like to see a photometric plan to make sure no light is going off site and that the parking area is adequately lighted. Also, because a SWPPP is not required he would like to see the roof leaders go into some dry wells though it's required.

Dave said that he would like to see the landscaping depicted on the plans.

Andy W. said that the owner wants to do that anyways and said that they would add it to the next plan.

Larry said that he would like to see visitor parking or overflow parking. He asked what happens if each unit is rented to 6 college students each having their own car?

Dave suggested that they add banked parking. The only hiccup would be that they are close with coverage.

Andy L. said he thinks they are at 0.9-acres, so adding too much more is going to trip them over that line which would then require more stormwater practices.

Franco said that he would like to see a condition to not allow future development to the north of the project.

Andy W. thinks that Patti had said that the proposal is the maximum allowed on this lot.

Scott replied that the board did mention this issue and that Patti said it was the maximum allowed.

Dave said the hiccup is that to the north more development could happen if the zoning changed.

Andy W. said that he would confirm that Patti.

Motion to Adjourn.