



TOWN OF
BEEKMAN
New York

4 Main Street
Poughquag, NY 12570
www.townofbeekman.gov
(845) 724-5300

TOWN OF BEEKMAN PLANNING BOARD
Thursday, June 18, 2026

The following members were present:

Rob Lopane
Jayson Abbatantuono
Eric Verhave
Faye Garito
Pete Poltrack

Also present:

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

Attendance

It was noted that Dan and Sheryl were unable to attend the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

Matt Towne, Engineer for the Developer, reported that there had been no updates to the plans since the previous meeting. The applicant was awaiting comments from the Conservation Advisory Commission (CAC). It was also reported that Dan and the Highway Superintendent had conducted a site visit to review the proposed driveway locations. A review letter from Dan had been received that day and had not yet been reviewed by the applicant's engineer.

CAC and Departmental Comments

The Board reviewed comments from the CAC and discussed outstanding comments from the Highway Superintendent and Fire Advisory Board.

The applicant's engineer indicated that the driveway entrances had been designed to accommodate emergency vehicle turning radii and were wider than the minimum requirements of the zoning code. The following items were discussed:

- A map note will be added stating that driveway entrances shall be constructed as shown, subject to the satisfaction of the Highway Superintendent.
- A truck-turning template will be provided to demonstrate that large emergency vehicles, including fire trucks, can safely access the driveways.
- The plans will include a notation that no pillars, trees, gates, or other obstructions are permitted at driveway entrances where they would interfere with emergency access.
- The Board discussed applicable zoning requirements concerning driveway width and the setback of fences, stone pillars, gates, and similar obstructions from the roadway.

The Board then reviewed the CAC comments in detail. The applicant's engineer agreed to provide additional information and revise the plans, including:

- Adding estimated cut-and-fill quantities to the plans.
- Clarifying proposed slope steepness ratios and related notes.
- Revising the steep-slope notes to clarify their applicability throughout the site.
- Improving the presentation of existing and proposed contours.
- Showing existing trees in a lighter color and clearly identifying trees proposed for removal.
- Clarifying compliance with required setbacks for cut-and-fill slopes and structures adjacent to steep slopes.
- Providing appropriate erosion and sedimentation controls during construction.
- Addressing whether the steep-slope provisions of the ordinance apply to the proposed septic system expansion area for Lot 2.
- Clarifying the limits of disturbance and ensuring that those limits can be effectively enforced during construction.
- Reviewing a potential minor encroachment of the proposed septic area into an area classified as very or extremely steep slope and adjusting the layout if necessary.
- Revising the tree-clearing note to clarify that the specific tree removals shown on the approved plans govern the work to be performed.

The Board emphasized that the approved tree-removal plan should provide a clear and enforceable limit on tree removal. The applicant indicated that the intention is to remove only the trees identified on the plans, while allowing for limited removal of unsafe or damaged trees if necessary during construction.

The Board discussed the possibility of pre-marking trees proposed for removal and installing tree-protection fencing or other barriers to clearly identify the limits of tree removal and disturbance. The Board noted that such measures would assist Code Enforcement in monitoring compliance.

Wetland/Vegetation Investigation

The Board revisited a concern raised at the previous meeting regarding possible wetland indicator vegetation on Lot 1. Board members reported observing vegetation, including skunk cabbage and elderberry, in a depressed area of the site.

The applicant's engineer stated that a professional wetland biologist had previously investigated the property and determined that no wetlands were present. The applicant agreed to request that the biologist conduct an additional field reconnaissance of the area identified by the Board and provide an updated report or confirmation of the findings.

The Board indicated that a supplemental report documenting the additional field investigation would be sufficient.

Roadway Width and Transportation Concerns

The Board discussed the existing width and condition of Hemlock Hollow Road and potential transportation and safety impacts associated with the proposed development.

The applicant's engineer explained that the proposed driveway locations had been moved to the wider portion of the road and that the narrower section farther south would not be directly affected by the development. The plans provide for a shared driveway and pull-off areas to reduce the number of driveway cuts and improve emergency-vehicle access.

The Fire Advisory Board's comments were reviewed. The comments noted that the plans had been amended to show pull-offs, grades, and driveway widths. The shared driveway arrangement was considered beneficial given the existing width of Hemlock Hollow Road. The comments also recommended that pillars, trees, or other obstructions not be placed at driveway entrances where they could restrict access.

The Board expressed concern about the potential increase in traffic resulting from the development and the possibility that future road widening could become a municipal expense. The Board discussed the existing utility poles, stone wall, vegetation, and available right-of-way. The applicant indicated that the property would be dedicated to the Town in a manner that could allow for future roadway improvements, but the applicant did not propose widening the road as part of the current project.

The Board emphasized that public safety and adequate access for emergency vehicles, plowing, garbage collection, and other large vehicles remain important considerations.

Public Hearing

Motion by: Rob Lopane to reopen the public hearing for the Woods at Hemlock Hollow subdivision application.

So, moved by: Jayson Abbatantuono

Seconded by: Peter Poltrack

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

The following members of the public addressed the Board:

James Moss – 9 Hemlock Hollow Road

Expressed support for retaining the existing rural character of Hemlock Hollow Road, including the historic stone wall and narrow roadway in the vicinity of his residence. He stated that he was comfortable with the revised driveway configuration because the proposed development traffic would be directed toward the wider portion of the road. He also expressed greater comfort with emergency access under the revised plan.

Stephanie Dougherty – 11 Hemlock Hollow Road

Raised concerns regarding the location of existing utility poles and whether the poles serve nearby residences. She also expressed concerns regarding traffic, construction vehicles, snowplowing, garbage collection, and the ability of residents at the end of the road to maintain access during construction.

The Board clarified that the proposed subdivision would not relocate the existing utility poles. Ms. Dougherty was advised that she could review the precise pole locations with the applicant's engineer following the meeting.

Dan DiMassimo – 10 Tower Road

Thanked the Board and applicant for considering public comments. He expressed broader concerns regarding preservation of rural character, environmental features, steep slopes, wetlands, septic systems, and the overall intensity of development. He stated that he believed additional information remained necessary and recommended that the public hearing remain open pending further review, including the additional wetland investigation.

The Board noted that broader changes to zoning and protection of rural character would be more appropriately addressed through a future Comprehensive Plan and related zoning review.

Bill Crane – 254 Gardner Hollow Rd

Expressed concerns regarding tree removal and the potential fragmentation of the existing forest. He noted the applicant's estimate of approximately 800 mature trees on the property and approximately 170 proposed removals. He also referenced a previously suggested alternative that could potentially reduce tree removal by changing the configuration or number of proposed lots.

Tree Removal and Mitigation

The applicant's engineer stated that approximately 170 trees are proposed for removal from a site containing more than 800 trees. He noted that the proposed removal is below the maximum amount permitted under the applicable code provisions and that the project has been designed to preserve as many trees as practical.

The applicant stated that approximately 75 percent of the existing trees would remain. Approximately 30 new trees are proposed as screening and mitigation, primarily along property boundaries where visual impacts to neighboring properties would be greatest.

The Board requested additional clarity regarding tree removal and mitigation. It was agreed that the plans would more clearly show the relationship between proposed homes, driveways, existing trees, and trees proposed for removal.

The applicant agreed to add an overlay to the tree-removal plan showing the proposed homes and driveways to provide the Board with a clearer visual representation of the proposed tree impacts.

Construction Impacts

The Board reviewed measures intended to limit construction-related impacts to Hemlock Hollow Road.

The applicant confirmed that the plans identify areas where construction vehicles are required to park within the project site. Signage is also proposed indicating that construction vehicles are not permitted to park on Hemlock Hollow Road. The Board noted that violations could be addressed through the Building Department and applicable enforcement procedures.

Board Discussion and Outstanding Issues

Following the public comments, the Board discussed whether to close the public hearing or continue it to a future meeting.

Board members identified several outstanding matters, including:

1. Receipt and review of comments from the Town Engineer.
2. Additional investigation and documentation concerning potential wetland indicator vegetation on Lot 1.
3. Clarification of the applicability of steep-slope regulations to the proposed septic expansion area.
4. Further review of roadway width, traffic, and transportation impacts.
5. Additional detail regarding tree removal, tree protection, and mitigation.
6. Clear identification of proposed tree removals in relation to the proposed homes and driveways.
7. Consideration of whether reducing the number of proposed lots could reduce tree removal and transportation impacts.

The Chair stated that additional consideration should be given to the relationship between the number of proposed lots, the amount of tree removal, available mitigation opportunities, and traffic impacts. The Chair noted that a reduction in the number of lots could potentially reduce both tree impacts and pressure on the existing roadway.

A Board member also requested that the applicant's revised plans clearly identify the trees proposed for removal.

Motion to Adjourn Public Hearing

Motion by: Rob Lopane to adjourn the public hearing until the next Board meeting in order to allow the applicant and Board to address the outstanding issues and to obtain the Town Engineer's comments.

So, moved by: Jayson Abbatantuono

Seconded by: Faye Garito

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

Follow-Up Items

The applicant/engineer was requested to:

- Provide the requested revisions to the site and engineering plans.
- Add cut-and-fill quantities and clarify slope information.
- Clarify steep-slope and septic-related notes.
- Provide a truck-turning template for the proposed driveways.
- Add appropriate notes concerning driveway obstructions.
- Clarify and enforce the limits of disturbance.
- Revise the tree-removal note.
- Show tree-protection measures and/or barriers.
- Provide an overlay showing proposed homes and driveways in relation to existing and proposed tree removals.
- Obtain a supplemental wetland investigation/report concerning the area identified on Lot 1.
- Continue to address roadway, traffic, emergency-access, and construction-related concerns.
- Provide any additional information necessary for the Board's continued review.

The Board will continue its review of the application and public hearing at the next meeting.

DISCUSSION

1. **Diamond Horse/Ryan Lot Line Realignment** – Lot Line Adjustment
Beekman-Poughquag Rd
Grid # 6758-00-642721
Zone R-45

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Mike Spaccarelli appeared before the Planning Board regarding a proposed lot line realignment involving his property at 236 Beekman Poughquag Rd and an adjoining parcel. Mr. Spaccarelli explained that the purpose of the application is to increase the footprint of his existing property by acquiring a portion of the adjoining parcel.

Mr. Spaccarelli confirmed that the proposal involves no construction, demolition, or physical disturbance of the property. The larger parcel would become larger and the adjoining parcel would correspondingly become smaller.

Town Engineer Comments

The Board reviewed comments from the Town Engineer. The outstanding items discussed included:

- Identification and labeling of the perennial stream shown on the mapping, including the associated stream buffer.
- Provision of soil mapping boundaries on the plan.
- Identification of trees meeting the applicable ordinance requirements.
- Identification of areas of archaeological sensitivity.
- Identification of hedgerows associated with active or former agricultural fields, or a note indicating that no such hedgerows exist.
- Identification of all buildings and other improvements on both parcels, including accessways.
- Addition of impervious/lot coverage information to the bulk table.
- Provision of a narrative describing the current uses and activities on parcel 590688 to confirm compliance with applicable requirements.
- Coordination with the Building Inspector regarding any open permits or existing violations on either parcel.
- Verification of whether an approval or notification from the Dutchess County Department of Behavioral and Community Health is required.

The Board noted that several of the engineer's comments appeared to have been addressed by the applicant's surveyor, while several additional items remain to be completed.

Waiver Requests

The Board considered the applicant's requests for waivers from certain mapping requirements under Chapter 130.

The Board discussed waiving the requirements for:

- **Chapter 130-12(F):** Soil mapping
- **Chapter 130-12(H):** Tree locations

The Board noted that the application involves only a lot line realignment and does not propose construction, demolition, tree removal, or other physical disturbance. The Board further noted that the requested information may become necessary if development or physical disturbance is proposed in the future.

Motion by: Faye Garito to grant the requested waivers from the soil mapping 130-12F and tree location requirements 130-12H.

Seconded by: Peter Poltrack.

Motion by: Faye Garito The Board reserves the right to rescind or revisit the waivers if it is subsequently determined that construction, demolition, or other physical disturbance will occur on the property.

Seconded by: Rob Lopane

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Both motions carried

SEQR Determination

The Board discussed the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) classification of the application. Based on the nature of the proposal as a simple lot line realignment with no proposed physical disturbance, the Board determined that the action qualifies as a **Type II action** under the applicable SEQR regulations.

The Board advised the applicant that the action had been deemed a Type II action and that no further environmental assessment under SEQR is required.

Board Discussion

The Board discussed the proposed realignment and noted that the applicant's stated intention is to maintain the property as agricultural/vineyard land rather than develop it for residential purposes.

The Board also discussed potential future land-preservation options, including conservation easements and the sale of development rights. The applicant indicated that he would consider such options in the future.

The Board noted that there are questions concerning the current use of the property and whether all existing activities comply with applicable zoning requirements. The Board stated that the Town Engineer would investigate any existing permits, violations, setbacks, or other zoning-related issues. The Board emphasized that such issues may need to be resolved before final action is taken on the lot line realignment.

Action Items/Outstanding Matters

The applicant and/or surveyor shall address the remaining comments from the Town Engineer, including:

1. Stream labeling and buffer information.
2. Hedgerow identification or applicable map note.
3. Building and improvement locations on both parcels.
4. Impervious area/lot coverage information.
5. Narrative describing current uses and activities on parcel 590688.
6. Any other outstanding engineering, zoning, or agency requirements.

The Town Engineer/appropriate Town officials will review the properties for existing permits, violations, and related zoning matters.

The Board's waiver of the soil mapping and tree-location requirements remains subject to the Board's reserved right to require that information if construction, demolition, or other physical disturbance is subsequently proposed or identified.

Board Action

Motion by: Jayson Abbatantuono to deem the action Type 2 now that the application is complete.

Seconded by: Faye Garito

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried, the Planning Board unanimously determined that the proposed lot line realignment is a **Type II action under SEQR**.

No final approval of the lot line realignment was recorded at this portion of the meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

Fire Advisory Board Appointment

The Board discussed the Fire Advisory Board's requirement that one member of the Planning Board serve on the Fire Advisory Board.

It was noted that the Fire Advisory Board meets once a month, on the second Thursday at 9:00 a.m. Several Planning Board members indicated that the morning meeting schedule could present conflicts with their work schedules. The Board also discussed whether remote participation or an evening meeting schedule would be possible.

Pete Poltrack indicated that he had previously served on the Fire Advisory Board and was willing to serve again.

Motion by: Jayson Abbatantuono to nominate Peter Poltrack to serve as the Planning Board's representative on the Fire Advisory Board

Seconded by: Faye Garito

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried, Pete Poltrack will serve on The Fire Advisory Board Committee

Approval of May 2026 Meeting Minutes

The Board discussed the May 2026 meeting minutes. Members confirmed that they had an opportunity to review the minutes.

Rob Lopane who was not present at the May meeting abstained from voting.

Motion by: Faye Garito to approve the May 2026 meeting minutes as presented

Seconded by: Eric Verhave

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

Adjournment

Motion by: Rob Lopane to adjourn the meeting

So, Moved by: Eric Verhave

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried, meeting adjourned