



TOWN OF  
**BEEKMAN**  
*New York*

4 Main Street  
Poughquag, NY 12570  
[www.townofbeekman.gov](http://www.townofbeekman.gov)  
(845) 724-5300

**TOWN OF BEEKMAN PLANNING BOARD**  
**Thursday, April 16, 2026**

The following members were present:  
Chairman - Robert Lopane  
Jayson Abbatantuono  
Eric Verhave  
Peter Poltrack  
Faye Garito

Also present:  
Town Engineer - Dan Koehler  
Town Attorney – Michael Towey

**Call to Order/Opening Remarks**

The meeting was called to order with initial housekeeping announcements. Attendees were advised of the locations of emergency exits.

**Pledge of Allegiance and Moment of Silence**

**Approval of Minutes**

**January Meeting Minutes**

Dan Koehler noted that Board members present for the January meeting were Rob, Jayson, and Faye. It was further noted that only members present at the meeting being approved should participate in the vote.

**Motion by:** Rob Lopane, to approve the January meeting minutes.

**Seconded by:** Jayson Abbatantuono

**Vote:** Approved unanimously by eligible members present (Rob, Jayson, Faye).

**Result:** Motion carried.

**March Meeting Minutes**

Dan Koehler noted that Board members present for the March meeting were Rob, Jayson, Eric, and Pete.

**Motion by:** Rob Lopane to approve the March meeting minutes.

**Moved by:** Pete Poltrack

**Seconded by:** Eric Verhave

**Vote:** Approved unanimously by eligible members present (Rob, Jayson, Eric, Pete)

**Result:** Motion carried.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

1. **The Woods at Hemlock Hollow** – Sketch Subdivision  
Hemlock Hollow Rd.  
Grid # 6559-00-748014  
Zone R-90

The Chair opened discussion regarding the application known as *Woods at Hemlock Hollow*. Applicant representative Matt Towne, engineer for the applicant, presented revised plans and addressed comments raised at the previous meeting.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Mr. Towne stated that revised plans had been prepared to conceptually address concerns raised by the Board and public, though a formal submission had not yet been completed.

Key items presented included:

- Completion of a four-hour stabilized drawdown pump test yielding approximately 14 gallons per minute (approximately 20,000 gallons per day) from the proposed well.
- Water quality testing results indicating compliance with New York State Health Department standards.
- Proposed installation of 630-gallon dry wells at each residence to capture roof runoff.
- Reduction of impervious surface through consolidation of driveways for Lots 2, 3, and 4 into a single shared driveway permitted under Town Code.
- Reduction in curb cuts from four to two.
- Relocation of the proposed home on Lot 3 away from steep slopes.
- Retention of approximately 80% of surveyed trees on the property, with approximately 175 of 822 surveyed trees proposed for removal.
- Proposal to install additional evergreen screening trees along portions of the property boundary.

Mr. Towne stated that the proposed rear lots comply with Town zoning requirements and referenced Section 155-41 of the Town Code.

### **Board and Consultant Comments**

The Town Engineer clarified that rear lots are permitted at the Planning Board's discretion and requested additional annotations on future plan submissions showing compliance with lot width and setback requirements.

Discussion followed regarding:

- Shared driveway requirements
- Tree survey criteria
- Stormwater management thresholds
- Fire apparatus turning radii
- Wetland mapping and delineation
- Impervious surface calculations
- Construction staging and traffic impacts

The applicant confirmed that updated impervious surface calculations would be included in the next submission.

## **Opening of Public Hearing**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Planning Board unanimously voted to open the public hearing.

## **Public Comment**

### **Michael Novak – 2 Hemlock Hollow Road**

Mr. Novak requested additional evergreen screening plantings along the shared property boundary to preserve privacy and wooded character.

### **James Moss – 9 Hemlock Hollow Road**

Mr. Moss requested preservation of existing dogwood trees near the frontage area, relocation of the driveway entrance slightly uphill if feasible, and restoration of a historic stone wall disrupted by a prior opening near the well location.

### **Dan DiMassimo – 10 Tower Road**

Mr. DiMassimo expressed continued concerns regarding Lot 3, environmental constraints, steep slopes, mapped wetlands, roadway access, driveway length, septic system configuration, and overall subdivision density. He suggested reducing the number of lots and preserving environmentally sensitive areas through conservation measures.

### **Stephen Dougherty – 11 Hemlock Hollow Road**

Mr. Dougherty expressed concerns regarding stormwater runoff, roadway drainage, proximity of a proposed home to the property line, and potential impacts to neighboring wells.

### **Lindsay Clark – 26 Tower Road**

Ms. Clark requested additional tree buffering along the rear property line to preserve privacy and reduce impacts to adjacent residential properties.

### **Karl Bruning – 30 Tower Road**

Mr. Bruning requested additional screening trees along the rear property line to maintain neighborhood privacy and character.

### **Michael Rothman – 6 Tower Road**

Mr. Rothman inquired about the proposed size of replacement trees and the timeframe required for screening to become effective.

Additional public comments included concerns regarding:

- Fire department access and emergency response capabilities
- Road width and traffic safety
- Construction vehicle parking and staging
- Temporary impacts during construction activities

## **Fire Access Discussion**

Board members discussed current fire response procedures and tanker operations. It was noted that comments from the Fire Advisory Board and Highway Superintendent were still pending and would be considered prior to any Board decision.

## **Adjournment of Public Hearing**

Due to receipt of revised materials immediately prior to the meeting and the need for additional review, the Board determined that continuation of the public hearing was appropriate.

**Motion:** To adjourn and continue the public hearing to the next meeting on May 21.

**Seconded:** Yes.

**Vote:** Unanimously approved.

## **Additional Board Discussion**

Following adjournment of the public hearing, the Board discussed several issues with the applicant, including:

- Expansion of screening buffer plantings along neighboring properties
- Proposed size and species of replacement trees
- Preservation of existing dogwood trees
- Restoration of the historic stone wall
- Wetland delineation methodology and soils mapping
- Road width concerns
- Construction staging and employee parking controls
- Potential site visits by Board members

The applicant indicated willingness to cooperate with additional buffering and agreed to provide updated plans and supporting information.

Board members expressed continued concern regarding:

- Road width and emergency access
- Potential wetland conditions on the site
- Adequacy of supporting environmental documentation

The Board discussed conducting site visits in compliance with Open Meetings Law requirements.

## **Adjournment**

The applicant was directed to submit updated plans and supporting materials prior to the next meeting deadline for continued review.

The meeting then proceeded to the next agenda item.

## **DISCUSSION**

1. **Schindler/Potter Lot Line Realignment** – Lot Line Adjustment  
239 Hynes Rd  
Grid # 6759-00-788612, 796573  
Zone R-45

Amy Bombardieri appeared on behalf of Day Stokosa regarding the Schindler lot line realignment application.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Ms. Bombardieri stated that she had reviewed the draft resolution and had no requested modifications. She advised the Board that most conditions had been satisfied and reported receipt of correspondence from NYSEG indicating that the utility company requested only a copy of the filed map showing the approved lot line realignment. NYSEG did not indicate that modifications to its easement would be required.

Discussion followed regarding:

- Existing utility easements and overhead utility lines
- Minor revisions made to the plans since the prior meeting
- Adjustment of a lot line to eliminate a greenhouse encroachment and avoid the need for a variance
- Notes regarding fencing located on the adjacent Buddhist property
- Existing common driveway easement documentation

The Town Engineer stated that updated plans had been submitted and noted that several items referenced in prior review correspondence may already have been satisfied. He summarized the proposed resolution conditions, including:

- Payment of escrow fees
- Submission of legal descriptions and survey closure reports
- Submission of TP-584 and RP-5217 forms
- Continued coordination with NYSEG
- Review of existing driveway easement documentation
- Verification that no open permits or violations exist on either parcel
- Placement of monuments or iron rods as directed by the Town Engineer
- Submission of County Health Department permission to file
- Filing requirements and submission of certified filed maps and agreements to the Town

Discussion also addressed aquifer overlay standards. The Town Engineer stated that the project involved no physical disturbance, grading, or hydrological impacts and therefore would not substantially impact groundwater or surface waters. Board members concurred with that assessment.

### **Resolution**

A motion was made to grant conditional final subdivision plat approval for the proposed lot line realignment, subject to fulfillment of all conditions stated in the resolution.

**Motion:** Grant conditional final subdivision plat approval for the Schindler lot line realignment.

**Seconded:** Yes.

**Vote:** Unanimously approved.

The motion carried.

## **2. Battery Energy Storage Systems – Proposed Local Law**

This portion of the meeting focused on the proposed local law regulating Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) in the town.

## **Main points discussed**

- The town currently has a moratorium on battery energy storage systems but is preparing to adopt a permanent local law.
- The planning board's role was advisory: review the proposed law and provide comments to the town board before its public hearing and vote.

## **Structure of the proposed law**

The draft law divides battery systems into three tiers:

- **Tier 1** - Small residential or commercial systems (such as home battery backups or EV charging related storage systems).
- **Tier 2** - Medium-scale battery storage systems.
- **Tier 3** - Large utility-scale battery storage facilities supplying power to the grid.

Under the proposed law:

- Tier 1 systems would generally be allowed.
- Tier 2 and Tier 3 systems would be prohibited within the town unless state preemption laws apply.

## **Key concerns raised by board members**

### **Energy infrastructure and future demand**

Some members questioned whether prohibiting larger battery systems could:

- Limit future utility infrastructure
- Affect long-term energy reliability
- Interfere with growing electricity demand from electric vehicles and development
- Create "exclusionary zoning" concerns

There was discussion that utilities may eventually need storage systems to stabilize the grid and manage peak demand.

### **Fire safety**

A major topic was the danger posed by lithium-ion battery fires, especially for:

- Volunteer firefighters
- Emergency response planning
- Unidentified residential battery systems

Members discussed:

- Adding exterior signage to identify buildings containing battery systems
- Maintaining a registry of permitted battery installations
- Ensuring the fire department receives notice from the building inspector
- Integrating that information into emergency response software and procedures

Several participants referenced incidents involving EV and battery-storage fires and emphasized that local volunteer departments may not have the resources to safely manage large-scale battery events.

### **Clarifications from counsel and staff**

- Tier 1 systems could still be referred to the planning board by the building inspector if unusual circumstances existed.
- Multiple smaller battery units would be aggregated together for classification purposes, preventing applicants from avoiding higher-tier regulations by stacking systems.
- Some large energy projects may still bypass local zoning through state preemption statutes.

### **Consensus reached**

The board did not reach a unified position on the overall law, but there appeared to be consensus on recommending:

1. Exterior signage identifying battery storage systems
2. Notification procedures between the building inspector and fire departments

Board members were encouraged to:

- Attend the upcoming town board hearing individually
- Submit personal comments if desired, while only consensus items would potentially be transmitted as an official planning board comment

The meeting then adjourned.