



TOWN OF
BEEKMAN
New York

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

TOWN OF BEEKMAN PLANNING BOARD
Thursday, May 21, 2026

The following members were present:
Acting Chairman – Jayson Abbatantuono
Eric Verhave
Peter Poltrack
Faye Garito

Also present:
Town Engineer - Dan Koehler
Town Attorney – Michael Towey
Planning Secretary – Sheryl Discher

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

April Meeting Minutes

The Chair asked whether Board members had reviewed the minutes from the April 2026 Planning Board meeting.

Motion by: Jayson Abbatantuono, to approve the April meeting minutes.

Seconded by: Eric Verhave

Vote: Approved unanimously by members present (Jayson, Faye, Eric, Peter)

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 noted that the public hearing for the Woods at Hemlock Hollow subdivision remained open from a previous meeting. A motion was made to reopen the continued public hearing.

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

Seconded by: Eric Verhave

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

Applicant Presentation

Project engineer, Matt Towne, presented revisions made since the previous meeting, including:

- Addition of proposed screening trees in response to public comments.
- Relocation of the shared driveway serving Lots 1, 2, and 3 to a wider section of Hemlock Hollow Road to improve emergency vehicle access.
- Creation of a separate driveway for Lot 4.
- Relocation of the proposed residence on Lot 3 away from regulated steep slopes.
- Submission of updated water supply information to the Health Department.

Planning Board Site Visit Discussion

Board members reported conducting a site visit of the property. Discussion included:

- Observation of a depression area near Lot 1 containing vegetation commonly associated with wet conditions.
- Request that the applicant's wetland consultant review the area and provide comments regarding potential wetland characteristics.
- Discussion of roadway width concerns along Hemlock Hollow Road and the possibility of relocating roadway improvements to create additional width while preserving visibility and access.

The applicant agreed to consult with the project wetland specialist regarding the area identified during the site visit.

Town Engineer Review

Dan Koehler reviewed several outstanding items, including:

- Referral of proposed driveway locations to the Highway Superintendent and Fire Advisory Board for review.
- Additional plan notes required to address steep slope regulations and stabilization requirements.
- Referral of the steep slopes portion of the application to the Conservation Advisory Council (CAC).
- Requirements related to the newly proposed shared driveway, including future construction sequencing and legal access considerations.
- Clarification of driveway dimensions and turning radii for emergency and service vehicles.
- Tree preservation and clearing limitations required under subdivision regulations.
- Construction staging, vehicle turnaround areas, and restrictions on construction vehicle parking along Hemlock Hollow Road.

Landscaping and Tree Preservation Discussion

The applicant presented a revised landscape plan showing approximately 29 proposed screening trees intended to supplement existing vegetation and provide buffering between neighboring properties.

Board members discussed:

- The challenges of planting trees within existing woodland areas without damaging mature tree root systems.
- The effectiveness of proposed screening plantings.
- Preservation of existing mature trees where feasible.

Public Comments

Dan DiMassimo - 10 Tower Road

Expressed continued concerns regarding the location of the proposed residence on Lot 3, including:

- The length and impact of the proposed driveway.
- The extent of clearing required for development.
- Impervious surface coverage approaching the zoning threshold.
- A suggestion to reconfigure Lots 2 and 3 to reduce impacts and preserve additional wooded areas.
- Concerns regarding the reduction in the number and size of proposed screening trees compared to earlier discussions.

James Moss - 9 Hemlock Hollow Road

Suggested relocating the proposed Lot 1 driveway to an alternate location that could:

- Shorten the driveway length.
- Reduce traffic impacts near neighboring residences.
- Preserve existing wooded screening.

The applicant agreed to discuss the suggestion with the property owner.

Bill Crane - 254 Gardner Hollow Road

Expressed concerns regarding:

- Removal of approximately 170 - 175 mature trees.
- Loss of wildlife habitat and environmental impacts.
- Preservation of the rural character of the area.
- Consistency with the Town Comprehensive Plan.
- Potential use of conservation easements or other measures to preserve remaining woodland areas.

Mr. Crane encouraged further consideration of alternatives that would reduce tree removal.

Lisa Edelstein - 14 Tower Road

Asked what recourse would be available if drainage, runoff, or erosion problems were to occur on adjacent properties following construction?

The applicant responded that:

- Existing site topography directs drainage away from her property.
- Erosion and sediment control measures would be implemented during construction.
- Stormwater management facilities exceed minimum requirements and are designed to prevent adverse impacts to neighboring properties.

Additional Discussion

The Board discussed:

- Potential review of driveway locations by the Highway Superintendent and Fire Advisory Board.
- Ongoing review of wetland concerns raised during the site visit.

- Recent significant revisions to the site plan and the possibility of additional changes before final action.

Dan Koehler and Mike Towey advised that keeping the public hearing open would allow future agency comments and any additional revisions to become part of the public record.

Adjournment of Public Hearing

The Board determined that additional review by outside agencies was warranted before closing the public hearing.

Motion by: Eric Verhave to adjourn the Woods at Hemlock Hollow public hearing until the June 18, 2026 Planning Board meeting.

Seconded by: Faye Garito

Vote: Approved unanimously by voice vote

Result: Motion carried

DISCUSSION

The Chair called the next agenda item, Diamond Horse Realty Lot Line Realignment.

The applicant was not present when the item was called.

The Board discussed postponing the matter and moving to the next agenda item, with the possibility of returning to Diamond Horse Realty later in the meeting if representatives arrived.

1. **Jett Management** – Site Plan/Special Use
2561 Route 55
Grid # 6759-00-676251
Zone TC

Applicant Presentation

William Besharat, representing the applicant, James Treanor, gives status of application:

- Obtained a zoning variance related to unit size.
- Addressed many site-plan comments.
- Nearly completed approval from the state DOT regarding the driveway/curb cut.
- The remaining technical comments from the planning consultant (Dan) were described as mostly minor and addressable.

Condition of the Building Exterior

The planning board chair expressed significant concern about the building's appearance:

- Located on Route 55 in the town center.
- Exterior described as being in poor condition.
- Concerns included:
 - Incomplete paint work.
 - Missing trim or siding pieces.
 - Overspray on fixtures.
 - Storage and clutter behind the building.
 - General lack of character and curb appeal.

The chair stated that the current appearance was not acceptable and that improvements need to be clearly documented.

Applicant's Response

The applicant and owner argued:

- The building is currently a financial burden.
- The goal is first to make it income-producing by converting it to residential use.
- Once rented and financially stable, they intend to:
 - Potentially add a second floor.
 - Redesign the facade.
 - Undertake larger architectural improvements.

They emphasized:

- They can commit to:
 - Painting.
 - Cleaning up the site.
 - Repairing exterior defects.
 - Landscaping.
 - Installing planters.
 - Building a refuse enclosure.
- They cannot afford major facade reconstruction or architectural additions at this stage.

Architectural Review Concerns

Board members noted:

- The board also functions as an Architectural Review Board.
- Every project in the town center is expected to contribute positively to community character.
- Other applicants have been required to make architectural improvements.

The applicant countered that:

- They are not proposing exterior construction.
- The application is only for a change of use.
- Requiring major facade redesign would create financial hardship.

Special Use Permit Discussion

There was a side discussion regarding:

- Why residential use in the town center requires a special use permit.
- One board member questioned why mixed residential/commercial uses are treated as special uses when the comprehensive plan encourages them.

The town engineer, Dan Koehler, explained:

- The special use permit is simply an additional layer of review.
- It runs concurrently with site-plan review.
- It allows the board to evaluate impacts such as parking, lighting, and compatibility.

What the Board Wants Next

The board requested:

- Elevation drawings for all sides of the building.
- A clearer depiction of how the exterior will look after improvements.
- Responses to all consultant comments.
- A response letter explaining how each comment was addressed.

The applicant agreed to:

- Submit revised elevations.
- Show exterior repairs, painting, cleanup, landscaping, and the refuse enclosure.
- Address all consultant comments before the next meeting.

Outcome of the Discussion

No approval was granted during this meeting.

The board indicated that:

- The applicant must address outstanding comments and submit revised plans.
- If the submission is complete and satisfactory, the board's goal is to move the application toward a public hearing at the next meeting.
- Final approval would still require a future vote by the board.

Overall Tone

The discussion was largely cooperative but reflected a disagreement over one key issue:

- **Board position:** The building's appearance must improve and those improvements need to be formally documented.
- **Applicant position:** Basic cleanup, repairs, landscaping, and painting are feasible now, but major architectural enhancements are financially impossible until the property becomes income-producing.

The meeting concluded with an understanding that revised plans and responses would be submitted before the next review.

2. **Alaina Estates** – Field Changes
Beekman-Poughquag Rd
Grid # 6758-00-642721
Zone R-45

Applicant Presentation

The engineer, George Cronk, appeared on behalf of the developer to explain changes that had been made during construction.

The subdivision already has:

- Four homes under construction.
- Foundations completed.

- Buildings framed.
- Much of the interior work underway.

The issue was that the homes were built at elevations different from those shown on the originally approved subdivision plans.

Why the Plans Had to Change

Because the house elevations changed, several related elements also had to be adjusted:

- Road grades
- Water lines
- Sewer lines
- Fire hydrant locations
- Drainage infrastructure

The engineer explained that:

- The original roadway grade was approximately 6%.
- The revised roadway grade is approximately 9%.
- The code allows up to 10%, so the new design remains compliant.

The modifications also allowed the sewer system to be made somewhat shallower, which was viewed favorably by reviewers.

Drainage and Utilities

According to the presentation:

- Drainage still flows to the same stormwater management facilities.
- Utility alignments remain generally the same.
- Water and sewer elevations were adjusted to match the revised roadway.
- The changes had already been reviewed by the county health department and utility agencies.

The engineer stated that the technical reviewers were satisfied with the revisions.

Why the Board Was Involved

The town engineer, Dan Koehler, explained that:

- Normally many of these types of changes could be treated as field changes during construction.
- However, the road and utility revisions were significant enough that they should be formally documented.
- The county clerk and health department wanted the official subdivision map updated so future owners, engineers, and municipal staff would have an accurate record.

In other words, this was primarily about memorializing what was actually built rather than reconsidering whether the subdivision should exist.

Discussion Among the Board

Board members generally agreed that:

- The changes did not appear to create substantial impacts.
- The revised roadway profile may actually be better than the original design.
- The main objective was maintaining accurate public records.

The town attorney, Mike Towey, suggested that the board formally authorize the chairman to sign the revised map so it could be filed properly.

Motion by: Eric Verhave to approve and authorize the planning board chairman to sign the revised subdivision map.

Seconded by: Pete Poltrack

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

The planning board voted to authorize the chairman to sign the revised map, allowing the amended subdivision plans to be filed and recorded with the county.

The board viewed the request as a technical update needed to ensure that the official filed map accurately reflects the subdivision as constructed.

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

Applicant Presentation

Applicant, Michael Spaccarelli, owner 236 Beekman Poughquag Road/Waterwheel Vineyards.

- A lot line realignment involving the transfer of approximately 1.26 acres from the Ryan parcel to the Diamond Horse parcel.
- After the adjustment:
 - Ryan parcel: approximately 2.74 acres
 - Diamond Horse parcel: approximately 19.51 acres
- No new development or improvements are currently proposed; the transferred land would remain open land.

Dan Koehler's, Planning Board Engineer, Review

- Under town code, a lot line realignment must be reviewed as a subdivision application.
- Several application items were incomplete or missing:
 - Application signatures from both property owners/applicants.
 - Copies of deeds.
 - Complete bulk regulation tables (including items such as impervious coverage and living space requirements).
 - Updated survey.
 - The existing survey appeared dated.
 - Structures visible on aerial imagery were not shown on the survey.
 - A narrative describing current uses and activities on the properties.

Additional Review Items

- The Building Inspector will be consulted to determine whether there are any open permits or code violations on either parcel.

- Because the proposal is simply a lot line adjustment with no planned improvements, Dan suggested it could qualify as a Type II action under SEQRA, meaning no further environmental review would be required.

Board Discussion

- Board members emphasized that the narrative should clearly describe all current activities on the property.
- The board attorney recommended waiting until a complete application package is submitted before moving forward, including proof of ownership and the requested documentation.

Outcome

- No approval was granted at this meeting.
- The applicant agreed to provide the missing materials and address the engineer's comments.
- The application will return for further review once the submission is complete.

EXTENSION

1. **Lennar-Plum Court Lot 9** – Lot Line Adjustment
Plum Ct & Tillman Dr.
Grid # 6758-02-721807, 723793 & 717817
Zone PH

Applicant Presentation

Adam Weckstein (Hocherman Tortorella & Weckstein, LLP), representing Lennar New York LLC. and Mike Caruso (Cuddy & Feder LLP), representing homeowner Michael Sweeney.

This application involves a previously approved lot line adjustment intended to correct a surveying error dating back approximately 16 years.

The proposal would:

- Transfer two small parcels from Lennar to Mr. Sweeney totaling approximately 0.057 acres.
- Transfer approximately 0.05 acres from Mr. Sweeney to Lennar.
- The land transferred to Lennar is ultimately intended for dedication to the Town.
- Reconfigure a sewer and water easement that currently runs beneath Mr. Sweeney's house.

Status Update

- Conveyance documents drafted.
- Tax forms prepared and reviewed.
- Easement revisions completed and approved by the relevant utility authority.
- Health Department approval obtained on the plat.
- Surveyor expected to obtain a ministerial reauthorization of the plat.

Remaining Issue

The primary obstacle is obtaining approvals from Wells Fargo, which holds a mortgage lien affecting the small parcels involved in the transfer.

Required items include:

- Partial mortgage releases.
- Updated title search.
- Appraisal.
- Mortgage modification documents.
- Other lender-required paperwork.

The applicant stated they were approximately 90–95% complete with the lender’s requirements, but Wells Fargo's review process has been slow.

Board Discussion

- Board members acknowledged that progress is being made and the project is not stalled.
- The Town Engineer noted that the application had moved through the Planning Board quickly because it was well-prepared and addressed important right-of-way issues.
- The applicant expressed appreciation for the Board’s cooperation and patience.

Extension Request

The applicant requested an extension through the August meeting.

A timing issue arose because:

- The existing approval expired on the meeting date.
- Under Town law, extensions are limited to 90 days.
- A 90-day extension would end on August 19, one day before the August Planning Board meeting.
- The Town Attorney suggested that the applicants provide the Board with an update via email in July. He indicated that he has no objection to the applicants not appearing at the July meeting if they are requesting another extension.

Board Action

Motion by: Eric Verhave to extend to August 19th with expectation that they can vote on this in July.

Seconded by: Pete Poltrack

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

Meeting Adjournment

Motion by: Jason Abbatantuono to close the Planning Board Meeting for the 21st.

Seconded by: Pete Poltrack

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried