

WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES
TOWN OF LLOYD PLANNING BOARD

Thursday, July 21, 2022

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

Attendance: Board Members: Scott McCarthy, Charly Long, Franco Zani, Larry Hammond, Carl DiLorenzo, Gerry Marion, and Lambros Violaris; Board Staff: Dave Barton, Paul Van Cott, Christian Moore, and Sarah Van Nostrand

Absent: Bill Meltzer and Sal Cuciti

Minutes to Approve at July 28, 2022 meeting
June 16, 2022 & June 23, 2022

New Business:

Saychek, Toni: Special Use Permit: 17 Van Orden Rd., SBL #96.3-3-1.111

Applicant is seeking a special use permit for a ground-mounted solar array.

Shelden (applicant's agent from NYS Solar Farm) said that they walked the property with the owner and found a flat place, that was close to the house and was out of the view of the neighboring properties. They then did some engineering to make sure they could trench to the house for the wiring.

Dave said that this property is not in the Waterfront Bluff Overlay and the rest of the properties around there are wooded. The properties to the north and the east would be the most effect and they are all wooded.

Shelden said that looking south the land slopes downward for about 50-feet before leveling off again.

Board to set public hearing for August 25th at next week's meeting.

New Public Hearings:

Rodeway Inn & Suites: Commercial Special Use Permit: 660 Route 299, SBL # 87.1-3-2

Applicant is seeking a site plan and special use permit to install roof-mounted solar. The solar arrays will be mounted on the northwest and southeast facing roof planes. The total area of the combined arrays is to be approximately 5,909 square feet. Due to the location and 4-degree roof pitch, the flush mounted panels will have minimal impact on the visual character of the area.

Review Status: Abutter letters have been sent out and legal notice has been published in newspaper. Public hearing has been set for July 28, 2022.

SEQRA Status: Type II

No applicant

Chavez Garden Center LLC: Amended Site Plan: 288 Route 299, SBL # 87.2-1-9.223

Applicant is seeking to convert Lakeside Licks, to a garden center.

Review Status: Abutter letters have been sent out and legal notice has been published in newspaper. Public hearing has been set for July 28, 2022.

SEQRA Status: Type II

No applicant

Scott asked if there were any concerns about this project?

Dave replied there were some concerns about paving, he agreed to pave the parking lot. Christian had a question about whether a truck could get in and get out.

Scott asked is the sign the right square footage?

Dave replied the sign is good, it is actually a major improvement to what is there now.

Charly asked with the paving is he going to have to add any drainage structures there?

Dave said that it is all impervious now. It is compacted item 4 now, and the DEC considers that impervious, the site drains to the State ditch that runs along the road.

HHH Property Management LLC: Commercial Site Plan: 24 Main St. SBL: #88.69-9-2.

Applicant is seeking site plan approval to install a 1st floor yoga studio with residential living space above.

Review Status: Abutter letters have been sent out and legal notice has been published in newspaper. Public hearing has been set for July 28, 2022.

SEQRA Status: Type II

No applicant

Scott asked if they have met all the board's concerns?

Dave replied yes, they took away the rear extension therefore they don't need the relief from the ZBA. Therefore, the accessory apartment is off the table as well. Now it is just the existing building with the yoga studio and the two floors for the apartment. He said as a FYI to the board that his department is working with their sprinkler engineer to see what the code calls for as the only thing trigger it is the third floor living space.

Scott asked what about the water lines that the board was concerned with?

Dave said that the one water line feeds the back building.

Christian said that there is a water and sewer line along the southernly property line that goes to the back building.

Charly said that they were going to do a ramp on that side.

Dave replied that they are not doing anything there. The lines he is talking about are the ones that run parallel to the rear of the property. He thinks that the last map he saw had an easement built into it.

Christian said that the CPL comments include that the water main may need to be upgraded for the sprinkler system.

Dave said that they are not sure yet as the engineering is not done for the system yet.

Scott asked were the property lines more defined?

Dave replied that Patti did the survey for the property.

Administrative Business

The Villages of the Hudson Valley: PRRD

Scott said that Town Board has reviewed it and sent it to the Planning Board for comments. Just for clarity the board has done a SEQRA review on this property for the ALF with the conceptual for the PRRD. The board received a letter from Paul requesting that the board look over the negative declaration documents.

Dave said that CPL is going to do a review of what has been submitted and compare it to what was originally submitted. The letter from Paul is the guide of the issue that board had brought up and thought might need more consideration when they got to this point. The board is looking for things that would cause a significant environmental impact that the board has not already considered.

John (applicant's agent) said that for next week he hopes that the board will circulate its intent to be lead agency. He hopes that the board will issue spot some of their concerns and they will come back in August with some more details.

Paul said that the Town Board referred the project to the Planning Board and they are okay with the Planning Board being lead agency. He agrees with John that the board should consider for next week's meeting to recirculate for lead agency. In his memo he states three areas of focus for the board. One is making sure if anything has changed over the past year, that the prior environmental review is still valid. For example, traffic is there anything foreseeable with traffic impacts that should be considered, so for those it would be good for the board to seek updates. Beyond that he has not seen anything new in terms of SEQRA issues. There are areas that the board thought if a PRRD application ever came in that they would need more information.

Dave suggested that Paul go through his memo, so that it is in the record and to hit the main points of it.

Paul said that the first is impacts on land. The board was concerned about the steep slopes. The board may want the applicant to explain how they have avoided steep slopes with their current proposal. Another issue was the design of the retaining walls and stormwater control for potential for failure. With respect to water and wastewater the prior negative declaration showed that there was sufficient capacity and there were mitigation measures that were proposed to reduce that impact. His thinking there was that the board should get confirmation from the Town whether that remains the case. With respect to wildlife and plants, the only note that he has is that there are 12.9-acres of forested area proposed to be affected by the PRRD and that had been identified as potential Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat habitat. He thinks that it would be worthwhile for the applicant to get confirmation from the DEC that the mitigation measures

that are proposed are appropriate. With respect to visual impacts, the applicant has done visual simulations for the board's prior negative declaration. The project has changed a little, so it's probably worth considering to have the applicant do visual simulations, that would be from the same vantage points that the board had studied previously, it would provide an updated idea of what the impacts might be for the PRRD. With respect to open space, the applicant is required to reserve one-third of gross acreage as open space and the applicant is exceeding that, plus or minus 19-acres are required and the applicant is proposing 23-acres and board will need more detail on how they plan to conserve it. With respect to traffic, the board will need an update from the applicant's traffic engineer that takes into account any new or foreseeable development that wasn't considered as of April 2021 and any additional mitigation measure that will be taken as a result of that review. With respect to lights, odors and noise the applicant did provide a landscaping plan, but thinks the board should require a lighting plan as well. The board also indicated that they were concerned about the noise during construction from the project would be limited. Residual orchard soil contamination, the applicant has provided in advance of the negative declaration provided some additional mitigation measures that they thought would be appropriate, the board may consider asking for additional details about those mitigation measures. For both comprehensive consistency and community character consistency, the applicant has provided his perspective on those issues, it may be worthwhile for the board to ask Dave Barton on behalf of the Town's development to check. Lastly the Town Board had indicated that as part of it accepting the application, they felt that including affordable housing as required by the zoning code would be appropriate in the PRRD, but it asked specifically that the applicant can come up with a plan for how it would undertake the affordable housing piece, that is consistent with the zoning code with the affordable housing regulations. In particular with respect to how development would be phased to include affordable housing and also, how the long-term management of the affordable housing would be undertaken, consistent with the Town's regulations.

Scott asked if Amy (a part of the applicant's team) could go over the sheet of paper that was sent around to the board.

Dave said it is the EAF question page that shows the original, the current proposal and the delta change.

John said that the table that was attached just highlights the difference between what was indicated on the EAF when the negative declaration was issued for the ALF and the conceptual PRRD compared to what it is now.

Gerry asked if the number of units went up by 19 or 20?

Dave said that the number of units went up by 18. That is the trade off, when they give us affordable housing in our code, they get one additional unit.

Scott asked so they were meeting their obligation to the affordable housing piece?

Dave replied that is correct.

Gerry asked if the roads were the same?

Dave replied that the only differences are the layout. As the board may remember that some of their concern was visual impacts and keeping away from steep slopes. If you look at the new plan, the houses that were on the 9W side of that curve there behind the storage units have been taken away. Some of the units that were on the bridge circle side, some of them have been reduced as well.

Paul said when the applicant showed up for the pre-application committee the proposal was still at 178 units and they made an effort to keep away from the steep slopes and to minimize the visual impacts. The pre-application committee unanimously thought that the affordable housing should be a component of this project and the Town Board agrees.

Gerry asked do they each have their own driveway and garage, if so, how is snow removal going to work as the lots look tight.

Dave said just to remind the board this is for the SEQRA piece for significant environmental impacts. The Town Board will get the project back for their review to rezone the area, then this board will get it back for site plan and then the board can get to that concern. He asked Paul if a resolution would be needed to recirculate for lead agency?

Paul replied yes.

Dave said that they will draft a resolution for next week's meeting and they will recirculate to all the players.

Motion to Adjourn.