



TOWN OF
BEEKMAN
New York

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

TOWN OF BEEKMAN PLANNING BOARD
Thursday, September 17, 2026

The following members were present:

Rob Lopane
Eric Verhave
Jayson Abbatantuono
Pete Poltrack

Also present:

Town Attorney – Michael Towey
Town Engineer – Dan Koehler
Recording 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

Members were given an opportunity to review the minutes.

Motion by: Eric Verhave to approve the August 2026 minutes

Seconded by: Rob Lopane

Vote: Approved unanimously (J. Abbatantuono abstained)

Result: Motion carried

PUBLIC HEARING

- 1. HVC Recovery-Sober House** – Site Plan/Special Use
237 Hynes Rd.
Grid # 6759-00-796573
Zone R-45

Applicant Presentation

Pat Potter, representing Hudson Valley Collective, addressed the Board and stated that he had prepared written information regarding Hudson Valley Collective, including a flyer containing information about the organization and a site plan requested at the prior meeting.

Mr. Potter stated that Hudson Valley Collective intends to provide a safe, stable, substance-free residence for women in recovery. He emphasized the importance of treating individuals in recovery fairly and respectfully and referenced applicable federal and state housing protections. He stated that the organization intends to be a responsible neighbor and establish a positive relationship with the surrounding community.

Reopening of Public Hearing

The Chair stated that the Board had received a written request from Mr. Potter for reasonable accommodation to close the public hearing. However, because residents who attended the August 20, 2026 hearing had been advised that they would have another opportunity to speak, and because the request had been received only shortly before the meeting, the Board determined that the public hearing should first be reopened to allow those residents to comment.

The Chair reminded members of the public to keep comments respectful and relevant to the application and requested that comments concerning individuals in recovery or those suffering from substance use disorders remain respectful.

Motion by: Pete Poltrack to open the public hearing

Seconded by: Jayson Abbatantuono

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried, the Chair stated that each speaker would generally be limited to three minutes, with additional comments permitted if time remained after all interested persons had spoken.

Public Hearing

Jackie Farmer - 274 Beach Rd

Expressed concerns regarding the proposed location of the sober living residence in proximity to families, children, and local businesses. She stated that she supports recovery but questioned whether the proposed location was appropriate. She cited concerns regarding nearby properties, neighborhood safety, her family's proximity to the proposed residence, and a nearby bus stop. She asked the Board to consider the safety and quality of life of existing residents and businesses.

Britney Attinger – 1146 Route 216

Identified herself as a person with 18 years of recovery, a credentialed alcohol and substance abuse counselor, and a program director for New York State-certified residential programs. Stated that she strongly supports recovery housing but expressed concerns regarding the proposed operating model. She questioned the lack of clinical staff and on-site monitoring and distinguished sober living from more highly structured, licensed residential programs. She raised questions regarding supervision, accountability, drug testing, emergency procedures, relapse or overdose response, psychiatric or behavioral emergencies, medication policies, visitor policies, resident discharge, and independent oversight.

Colleen Hayes - 33 Duncan Rd

Requested additional information regarding the site plan and questioned whether required parking, emergency access, and other site features were adequately depicted. The Town Attorney explained that the larger site plan submitted to the Board depicts parking, the driveway, septic system, well, and other relevant features and is available for review at Town Hall by appointment.

Ms. Hayes also questioned the provision in the Town Code concerning locations housing six or more people and whether such facilities should be located on a state or county highway. The Town Attorney explained that the term "should" is discretionary and that the Planning Board has discretion regarding the location requirement.

Ms. Hayes expressed concerns regarding emergency and fire access, including whether fire apparatus could turn around on the property. The Town Attorney stated that the Fire Advisory Board had reviewed

the site, that members had visited the property, and that the site had been reviewed with appropriate expertise. The Town Attorney stated that an area is available for fire apparatus to turn around and that vehicles can pull off to provide emergency access.

Ms. Hayes also asked about sprinkler requirements. The Town Attorney explained that fire-code requirements are administered under New York State's Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code and that the Planning Board does not have authority to waive those requirements.

Ms. Hayes questioned a photograph of a bar appearing in application materials. The Attorney and applicant clarified that the photograph originated from an earlier online property listing and that the bar had subsequently been removed from the residence.

Jorge Ceballos - 26 Bronson Rd

Expressed opposition to the proposal and concerns regarding neighborhood safety and the potential impact on families. He identified himself as a volunteer firefighter and stated that he believed the proposed use was inappropriate for the residential neighborhood.

Luke Djinaj - 30 Brigadoon Way

Expressed concerns regarding neighborhood safety and the potential precedent that approval of the application could establish for similar facilities. He stated that he supports helping people in recovery but questioned the operation of a recovery residence in a residential neighborhood and raised concerns regarding the applicant's communications with the community.

Barbara Walsh - 5702 Chelsea Cove Dr

Stated that she has 27 years of recovery and continues to participate in Alcoholics Anonymous. She questioned whether there is data demonstrating that residents of sober living homes pose a danger to surrounding communities. She stated that, based on her experience, people in recovery should not be presumed to be dangerous and expressed concern that some opposition appeared to be based on fear or prejudice.

Bill Crain - 254 Gardener Hollow Rd

Spoke in support of the proposal. He stated that he has worked in a psychiatric setting and with individuals experiencing substance use disorders. He expressed the view that people in recovery should be welcomed and supported by the community and stated that he would be proud of a community willing to assist people who are working to improve their lives.

Kristen Baurczarski – 2542 Wingdale Mountain Rd

A Union Vale resident and credentialed alcohol and substance abuse counselor, spoke in support of the proposed sober living residence. She described her professional experience managing and working in residential recovery programs and her own recovery experience. She distinguished sober living from more highly structured reintegration programs and stated that sober living residences generally serve individuals who have already completed a period of treatment.

Ms. Baurczarski stated that women are underserved by recovery housing and that the proposed residence could provide women with an opportunity to recover in a quieter setting. She stated that she had spoken with Mr. Potter regarding the proposal and believed he had plans in place to support residents. She also noted that individuals in recovery may seek opportunities to volunteer and contribute positively to their communities.

John Paul Cantalino - 57 Duncan Road

Stated that he understood the safety concerns raised by residents but emphasized the importance of providing recovery resources. He encouraged residents to become informed about the proposal and stated that communities have a responsibility to help individuals who are struggling with substance use disorders.

John Gilmartin - 30 Bronson Rd

Asked whether any petitions opposing the application had been submitted. He stated that he had recently learned about the proposal and expressed concern because of its proximity to his residence and newborn grandson. He stated that he supports recovery but expressed opposition to the proposed location and questioned the direction of development in the area.

The Board stated that it was not aware of any petitions opposing the application.

Colleen Hayes - 33 Duncan Rd

Asked whether additional information would be provided before the application was decided. She stated that she believed the Board did not yet have sufficient information to ensure that the proposal would be properly implemented. Pete Poltrack explained that written comments could continue to be submitted even though the public hearing was being closed.

Donald Cantalino - 57 Duncan Rd

Identified himself as a licensed pharmacist with 43 years of experience and discussed his experience during the opioid crisis. He stated that many individuals struggling with addiction are otherwise good and productive members of society and emphasized the importance of providing opportunities for recovery rather than turning away from people with substance use disorders.

Lori DeRosa - 161 Palmer Circle

Stated that addiction has affected her family. She expressed concerns regarding the applicant's communication with the community, the operating plan, transportation, employment opportunities, and whether the proposal was primarily a business venture or intended to become an integrated part of the community. She also questioned the applicant's experience operating other sober living residences and the outcomes of those facilities.

Noah Nicholson - 57 Duncan Rd

Discussed her personal experience with a family member who died as a result of alcoholism. She stated that substance use disorders should be treated as a serious health issue. She acknowledged residents' concerns regarding the logistics of the proposal but stated that greater transparency and clarity regarding the operation of the residence would help address those concerns.

Laura Barrett - 1470 Clove Valley Rd

Expressed concerns regarding the potential for residents' acquaintances or former associates to visit the property and the possible effect of such activity on the neighborhood. She stated that she has personal experience with addiction within her family and asked what safeguards would be implemented to prevent unwanted visitors or outside influences from affecting the residence.

The Board stated that the applicant would be asked to address these questions.

Written Comments

The Chair stated that the Board had received several written comments regarding the application. The comments were accepted into the record and were to be reviewed by the Board and provided to the applicant for consideration. The comments were also to be made available for public review at Town Hall by appointment.

Closing of Public Hearing

The Chair stated that residents had been given opportunities to speak at both the August 20, 2026 hearing and the current meeting and that no new information requiring continued public testimony had been identified.

Motion requested by: Rob Lopane to close the public hearing

So Moved by: Eric Verhave

Seconded by: Rob Lopane

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried, the public hearing is closed

Applicant Response

Mr. Potter was invited to respond to questions raised during the public hearing and provide additional information regarding the proposed operation.

Regarding the photograph of a bar appearing in the application materials, Mr. Potter stated that the photograph came from an existing online property listing and was not intentionally included by him. He stated that the bar had been removed shortly after he moved into the property.

Mr. Potter stated that he was not aware of data demonstrating that sober living residences are inherently dangerous. He also stated that he was not aware of any petitions opposing the application.

Regarding his experience, Mr. Potter stated that he had served as a partner and consultant for sober living facilities in California and Florida. He stated that he has approximately 32 years of personal recovery experience.

Mr. Potter explained that the proposed residence would serve women age 18 and older who have completed detoxification or residential treatment. He stated that the residence would have eight beds and would operate on a cash-pay basis, with estimated monthly room-and-board costs of approximately \$5,000 to \$5,500. He stated that the anticipated residents would generally be middle-class or higher-income individuals and that children would not reside at the property.

Mr. Potter described the structure of the program as including household responsibilities, chores, attendance at recovery meetings, employment or educational support, cooperation among residents, work with sponsors, and participation in a 12-step recovery lifestyle.

Regarding safety and staffing, Mr. Potter stated that the residence would have fire alarms, smoke and carbon monoxide detectors, and a monitored alarm system. He stated that staff would have CASAC credentials and that the live-in manager would also be CASAC-certified. Mr. Potter stated that he is a certified drug and alcohol counselor in California and has extensive personal recovery experience.

Mr. Potter stated that the residence would not provide medication management and would focus on individuals with substance use disorders who were appropriate for the program. He stated that residents would not initially be permitted to drive and that vehicle privileges could be considered later.

Mr. Potter stated that the residence would not permit parties or loud music and that he did not anticipate the operation having a significant adverse effect on the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Potter also discussed federal fair-housing protections and stated that he had submitted requests for reasonable accommodations pursuant to applicable federal law. He stated that he had followed the Town's application process and intended to comply with the Town's procedures.

Litigation and Reasonable Accommodation

Pete Poltrack asked about the status of litigation involving the Town.

The Town Attorney stated that he could not discuss ongoing litigation because he represents the Town and had not been authorized to waive attorney-client or other applicable protections.

Mr. Potter clarified that neither he nor his company had filed a lawsuit against the Town. He stated that the United States Department of Justice, through the Southern District of New York, had filed litigation involving the Town and identified himself and Bunk House Recovery Ranch as the aggrieved parties. He stated that the litigation concerned alleged discrimination under federal fair-housing law.

The Board discussed the reasonable accommodation request submitted by the applicant. It was noted that the Board had received the request shortly before the meeting and that the Board was required to consider reasonable accommodation requests under applicable federal law.

Visitors and Resident Interaction

Jayson Abbatantuono asked Mr. Potter to address concerns regarding visitors to the residence.

Mr. Potter stated that visitors, including boyfriends and family members, would not ordinarily be permitted at the residence. He explained that family participation would instead occur through the program's family systems approach and that the purpose of restricting visitors would be to minimize distractions and provide residents with an opportunity to focus on recovery. He stated that the program was anticipated to last approximately 12 months or longer.

Fire, Emergency Access, and Utilities

The Board discussed responsibility for reviewing fire and emergency access.

The Board was advised that the Fire Advisory Board had reviewed the property and provided comments and questions. The Town Attorney explained that compliance with the New York State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code, including applicable fire-safety requirements, falls outside the Planning Board's authority and is addressed through the appropriate state and fire-inspection processes.

The Board also asked about septic and water-supply requirements. Dan Koehler advised that water supply and sewage disposal are subject to review by the Dutchess County Department of Behavioral and Community Health.

Board Deliberation and Next Steps

Following the applicant's responses, the Board discussed the substantial amount of information received during the meeting, including oral testimony, written comments, the applicant's reasonable accommodation request, and information concerning the proposed operation.

The Chair stated that the Board would review the information before making a determination on the application. Staff was asked to prepare a draft resolution for consideration at the next meeting in the event that the Board was prepared to act on the application at that time.

Motion by: Rob Lopane directing staff to prepare the necessary resolution for potential consideration at the next meeting

Seconded by: Jayson Abbatantuono

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

No final decision on the Hudson Valley Collective application was made at this meeting.

DISCUSSION

1. Baker Estates – Subdivision

Baker Rd.

Grid # 6659-00-760142, 842016 & 645225

Zone R-90

Applicant Presentation

Bill Povall, the applicant's engineer, appeared before the Planning Board regarding the Baker Estates subdivision application. He explained that the application was returning to the Board following its prior meeting, at which the Board requested that the Town Engineer review the CAC comments and incorporate the appropriate comments into a draft resolution for consideration.

The Board noted that the application had been under review for more than two years and that the plans had undergone revisions in response to the Board's concerns and recommendations.

Board Discussion

The Board acknowledged the applicant's offer to establish a conservation easement covering approximately half or more of the property, providing permanent protection for a substantial portion of the land and its wildlife habitat.

Rob Lopane also discussed previously identified concerns regarding steep slopes, tree removal, and the extent of the proposed development. The Board recognized that modifications had been made to the plans in response to these concerns.

Jayson Abbatantuono asked whether the draft resolution included adequate safeguards to prevent encroachment beyond approved property boundaries and limits of disturbance, particularly concerning tree preservation and construction activities.

Dan Koehler confirmed that the resolution included provisions intended to address these concerns, including the following:

1. **Construction phasing:** Phase One would include construction of the shared driveway and stormwater management practices. Phase Two would involve development of the individual lots.
2. **Pre-construction meetings:** Pre-construction meetings would be required for individual lots.
3. **Staking of disturbance limits:** The approved limits of disturbance would be staked by a licensed surveyor before construction.
4. **Construction fencing:** Construction fencing would be installed along the staked limits of disturbance, with silt fencing provided where appropriate.

5. **Inspection of fencing:** The installed fencing would be inspected during the pre-construction meeting.
6. **Construction plan notations:** Additional notations concerning fencing and construction controls would be incorporated into the construction and phasing plans.
7. **Inspections and fees:** Inspections and associated fees would apply to each development phase.
8. **Compliance monitoring:** Town consultants and the Building Inspector would have opportunities to inspect the site to verify compliance with the approved plans and conditions.

The Board expressed satisfaction with these safeguards, noting the importance of preventing encroachments and addressing potential compliance issues before construction impacts occurred.

Conditions of Approval

Dan Koehler explained that the draft resolution included administrative and technical conditions to be satisfied before the approval process could be completed. These included requirements concerning subdivision mapping, the filing of easements and other legal instruments, construction phasing, inspections, as-built documentation, and engineering certifications confirming that the improvements were constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

The Board indicated that it was satisfied with the conditions as presented and did not request further clarification.

Board Action

Dan Koehler staff clarified that the resolution addressed both the conditional final subdivision plat approval and the proposed steep-slope disturbances. The Board was advised that both matters could be addressed through a single resolution.

Motion requested by: Rob Lopane to approve the resolution of conditional subdivision plat approval

So Moved by: Pete Poltrack

Seconded by: Rob Lopane

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

Post-Approval Notice

Following the vote, Dan Koehler emphasized that the approval was conditional and that all outstanding conditions must be satisfied. The applicant was advised that the approval was valid for 180 days before an extension would be required and was encouraged to proceed promptly with fulfilling the conditions of approval.

The applicant's representative thanked the Board, and the matter concluded.

2. **Stop and Shop Sign – ARB**
1328 Beekman Rd
Grid # 6759-00-408359
Zone TC

Applicant Presentation

Becky McCormack of Agnoli Sign Company appeared before the Planning Board on behalf of Stop & Shop to present a proposal to update the store's signage to reflect the company's new logo.

The applicant explained that the proposed building signage would replace the existing signs with the new logo and the tagline, “Serving Our Community Since 1914.” The total square footage of the proposed building signage would be less than that of the existing signage.

The applicant also proposed refacing the two existing freestanding monument signs located along Beekman Road and Route 55 to reflect the updated branding and color scheme. The proposal included painting portions of the existing building exterior, including the overhang, in revised colors. No general building renovation was proposed as part of the signage application.

Review of Sign Code Requirements

Town Engineer reviewed the proposal in relation to Chapter 155-57 of the Town Code governing signage and the applicable Town Center design standards.

Town Engineer noted that the existing signage was nonconforming with respect to certain dimensional requirements. Under the sign code, alterations to existing signs must comply with applicable requirements unless the necessary relief is granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).

Town Engineer identified several potential areas of noncompliance requiring further review, including:

- **Wall sign area:** The code generally limits wall signs to 50 square feet, while the existing and proposed principal building signage was approximately 140 square feet.
- **Number of freestanding signs:** The code permits one freestanding sign per lot, whereas the property contains two.
- **Freestanding sign height:** The code generally limits sign height to seven feet above finished grade, and one of the proposed signs was identified as approximately eight feet tall.
- **Sign colors and design:** The proposed color scheme, including a white background on one freestanding sign, differed from the Town Center design standards, which favor darker backgrounds, lighter lettering, and historically based earth-tone colors.

The Town Engineer advised that the applicant would likely need to seek area variances from the ZBA for applicable dimensional and other sign code requirements.

Architectural and Aesthetic Considerations

Board members discussed the proposed signage’s compatibility with the Town Center design standards and the broader visual character of the community.

Several members expressed concern that the proposed bright white freestanding sign would be overly prominent and inconsistent with the softer, earth-tone aesthetic intended for the Town Center. Members emphasized that the design standards were established to promote a consistent architectural appearance throughout the area.

Other members expressed support for allowing the business to update its corporate branding, noting that Stop & Shop is an established part of the community. It was also observed that the proposed building sign would be somewhat smaller than the existing signage and that the building’s setback from the road reduced its visual impact.

The Board discussed the importance of applying the sign code consistently. Members noted concerns about other signage in the Town Center that may not conform to current standards. It was acknowledged that enforcement of existing code requirements is a separate matter from the Board’s review of the application before it.

Guidance Regarding Proposed Revisions

The Board discussed providing the applicant with design guidance before the applicant proceeds to the ZBA.

Members generally favored retaining flexibility regarding the size of the principal building sign, recognizing the scale of the building and the potential visual impact of strictly applying the 50-square-foot limit. However, concerns remained regarding the proposed colors, particularly the bright white background of the roadside signage.

The Board expressed a preference for the following revisions and considerations:

- **Freestanding signage:** Reconsider the bright white background and explore a darker, softer color scheme more consistent with the Town Center design standards.
- **Color palette:** Review the colors identified in Chapter 155-57(D), including the specified historical color collection and comparable alternatives, to identify suitable background and lettering colors.
- **Building signage:** Continue to consider the updated logo and reduced sign area while addressing concerns about compliance with applicable design standards.
- **Lighting:** Clarify that the freestanding signs would remain illuminated by their existing light fixtures and that the proposed tagline would not be illuminated.
- **Variance requirements:** Work with Town staff to identify the dimensional and other code provisions for which relief from the ZBA may be required.

Town engineer referenced Hale Navy as one example of a potentially suitable dark background color and offered to discuss applicable code requirements with the applicant outside the meeting.

Town attorney emphasized that, although the ZBA may grant variances from applicable sign code requirements, the Architectural Review Board retains responsibility for reviewing the appearance of the proposed signage to the extent permitted by law.

Board Direction and Next Steps

The Board recommended that the applicant revisit the proposed signage design and return with revised color options that better address the Board's concerns before proceeding to the ZBA.

The applicant was encouraged to coordinate with Town Engineer regarding suitable colors and the variances that may be required. The Board indicated that reviewing revised designs first would provide clearer direction and could help the applicant prepare for the subsequent ZBA application.

No formal approval or denial of the signage application was recorded during this discussion. The matter remained under consideration pending further design review and resolution of the applicable code requirements.

Conclusion

The applicant acknowledged the Board's comments and thanked staff for the guidance provided. The discussion concluded with the understanding that the applicant would reconsider the proposed color scheme, consult with Town staff as needed, and return with revised signage designs for further review.

3. Cantalino Subdivision – Subdivision

57 Duncan Rd.

Grid # 6759-00-112874

Zone R-90

Applicant Presentation

Brian Watts, with Day Stokosa, appeared before the Planning Board on behalf of the applicant to provide an update on the revised subdivision application submitted the previous month.

The applicant reviewed the proposed driveway configuration, explaining that the design was intended to minimize disturbance to steep slopes and wetlands and reduce potential drainage impacts. The applicant stated that the Town Highway Superintendent had visited the site and was generally agreeable to retaining the existing pervious driveway surface, with the understanding that the Town would not be responsible for damage to that surface. The remaining portion of the driveway would be paved, subject to further review and applicable requirements.

The applicant also reported that drainage revisions would connect to the existing Town drainage system along the roadway. Regarding wetlands, the applicant indicated that the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) had reviewed the proposed work and that a wetland permit application was pending submission of a digital copy of the approved plan.

Additional administrative revisions had been completed in coordination with Town staff, including preparation of easement language and correction of ownership documents to identify the trust as the property owner rather than the individual trustee.

The applicant requested that the Board consider sketch subdivision approval, classify the action under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), initiate lead agency coordination, and schedule a public hearing.

Board Discussion and Technical Review

The Board invited questions regarding the proposed lot line realignment and driveway configuration. No additional substantive questions were raised regarding the overall layout.

A Board member indicated that the proposed driveway alignment was acceptable because an alternative designed to achieve a lesser slope would result in greater disturbance to steep slopes and wetlands.

Town engineer explained that the application materials had not previously been circulated for lead agency coordination because the ownership information was incomplete or inaccurate. Staff outlined the procedural steps necessary to advance the application, including sketch approval, SEQRA classification, declaration of intent to serve as lead agency, and circulation to the relevant agencies.

The agencies identified for circulation included:

- New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC).
- Town or county health department, as applicable.
- Zoning Board of Appeals.
- Town Board.
- Highway Department.
- Conservation Advisory Council.
- Fire Advisory Board.

Sketch Subdivision Approval

Motion by: Rob Lopane to grant sketch subdivision approval

Seconded by: Jayson Abbatantuono

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

SEQRA Classification and Lead Agency Coordination

Town engineer advised that the application should be classified as an **Unlisted Action** under SEQRA rather than a Type I or Type II action. He explained that the Board would need to declare its intent to act as lead agency and direct the Planning Department to circulate the appropriate notices to the identified interested and involved agencies.

The Town attorney discussed the statutory 30-day period for agency responses and the possibility that another agency could seek lead agency status. Town attorney recommended allowing the required period to run before advancing the application further. An alternative was discussed whereby a public hearing could be opened and adjourned while the coordination period remained in effect.

After discussion, the Board elected to proceed with the preliminary SEQRA and lead agency coordination steps.

Board Actions

Motion requested by: Rob Lopane to classify the application as an Unlisted Action under SEQRA and declare the Board's intent to act as lead agency

So moved by: Jayson Abbatantuono

Seconded by: Eric Verhave

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

Motion by: Rob Lopane to direct the Planning Department to circulate the lead agency notice to the identified agencies

Seconded by: Jayson Abbatantuono

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

The Board acknowledged that the statutory coordination period would not have expired by the following month's meeting.

Wetland and Water Resource Review

The applicant reported that DEC had reviewed the proposed wetland impacts and indicated its general acceptance of the plan, with issuance of the wetland permit pending receipt of a digital plan copy.

Town engineer clarified that, independently of DEC's jurisdiction, the Town's own water resource permit requirements would also apply. Accordingly, the applicant would need to address the applicable provisions of the Town Code and provide the necessary information on the plans.

Staff further advised that the public hearing would need to cover both the subdivision application and the Town water resource permit. The two hearings could be conducted concurrently.

Driveway Construction and Drainage Requirements

The Board discussed the driveway improvements, including paving requirements, drainage design, and construction sequencing.

Town engineer explained that the shared driveway would ordinarily need to be brought up to the required construction standards to avoid future disputes over maintenance and paving responsibilities if a lot were sold separately. The applicant would need to propose an appropriate approach for the Board's consideration.

Members also discussed whether final paving should occur before or after construction of the proposed residence. Concerns were raised that heavy construction vehicles could damage newly installed pavement. It was suggested that the final pavement course be installed toward the end of construction, provided the driveway's underlying construction and emergency vehicle access requirements were adequately addressed.

The applicant was advised to coordinate with the Highway Department regarding the required drainage improvements, including roadside swales, sumps, catch basins, and associated connections.

Town engineer emphasized that the plans would need to satisfy the applicable subdivision and water resource permit requirements before the public hearing could be closed and further approvals considered.

Public Hearing Scheduling

The Board discussed whether to schedule the public hearing for October or November, considering the statutory SEQRA coordination period and the additional technical work required.

After discussion, the Board agreed to schedule the public hearing for **November 19**, subject to confirmation of the meeting calendar and required public notice procedures.

Motion by: Rob Lopane to schedule the public hearing for November 19th, for the subdivision application. The motion was subsequently amended to include the Town water resource permit

Seconded by: Eric Verhave

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

The public hearing will therefore address both the subdivision application and the water resource permit. The applicant was reminded to submit the required materials and provide the necessary advance notices within the applicable deadlines.

The Board noted that, following the public hearing, further consideration of preliminary subdivision approval and SEQRA requirements would depend on completion of the necessary technical reviews and satisfaction of applicable requirements.

Next Steps

The applicant was advised to continue coordinating with Town staff and consultants before the scheduled public hearing. Outstanding work includes:

- Completing the required SEQRA lead agency circulation process
- Advancing the drainage and driveway design in consultation with the Highway Department
- Providing the technical information required for the Town water resource permit
- Completing the subdivision plan materials required by the applicable Town Code

- Coordinating the DEC wetland permit submission and remaining documentation
- Preparing and distributing the required public hearing notices

Town engineer indicated that the applicant could submit revised materials for technical review before the next meeting without necessarily requiring a formal appearance before the Board.

Conclusion

The Board granted sketch subdivision approval, classified the application as an Unlisted Action under SEQRA, declared its intent to act as lead agency, and directed the Planning Department to circulate the required notices. The Board also scheduled a public hearing for November 19 to address both the subdivision application and the Town water resource permit.

The applicant thanked the Board, and the matter concluded.

4. Tobin-Wilson Lot Line Realignment – Lot Line Adjustment 433/435 Old Route 55 Grid # 6858-00-098530 & 090498 Zone R-135

Applicant Presentation

Raymond Mckeiver represented the applicant for the Tobin Wilson lot line realignment. The revised map addressed the Planning Board's prior comments and brought the affected lot into compliance with zoning requirements for lot width, side-yard setbacks, and lot area.

The applicant also added a proposed shared-driveway easement, with the legal description still awaiting attorney review.

Board Decisions

Town engineer reminded the Board that they had previously classified the project as a Type II action, completing the SEQR review process without further environmental review.

Motion requested by: Rob Lopane to grant waivers for 130-12(E): Topography and slopes of 15% or greater, 130-12(F): Soil mapping boundaries, 130-12(H): Trees 12 inches and greater in diameter, 130-20(A)(6): Trees 8 inches and greater in diameter and 130-18(F)(12): Topography

So moved by: Jayson Abbatantuono

Seconded by: Eric Verhave

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

Motion by: Jayson Abbatantuono to grant sketch approval

Seconded by: Peter Poltrack

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

Motion by: Rob Lopane to schedule public hearing for October 15th

Seconded by: Jayson Abbatantuono

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

Outstanding Items and Next Steps

- Obtain attorney review of the shared-driveway easement and its legal description
- Submit the revised plans and supporting documentation for preliminary subdivision approval under Town Code § 130-20
- Submit materials in advance of the October meeting, with the stated deadline of September 28
- Obtain Health Department review and the required map sign-off before filing the map
- Provide future plan copies in 11-by-7-inch format, as requested by a Board member

Key Discussion Points

The Town engineer indicated that the applicant had addressed the majority of the previous comments and that the revised layout resolved the zoning compliance issues.

The requested waivers were considered appropriate because the lot line realignment does not involve property disturbance, making the additional mapping and tree-location information unnecessary for this stage.

The consultant recommended completing as much of the preliminary approval requirements as possible before closing the public hearing, so the applicant can avoid delays in the subsequent approval process.

- 5. Selca Accessory Apartment – Site Plan/Special Use**
39 Indian Pass
Grid # 6757-03-059064
Zone R-135

Applicant Presentation

Anna Buckley, representing the owners, appeared before the Board. The property owners and the project's engineer/architect were unable to attend due to being out of town.

The representative indicated that the application had undergone several modifications following prior Board review. The applicant had addressed all but one comment from the previous meeting, with the remaining comment incorporated into the draft resolution of conditional approval.

Board Discussion

The Board reviewed the application and the draft resolution of conditional approval. Members noted that the application had been under review for approximately two years, with delays resulting in part from weather-related meeting postponements and proceedings before the Zoning Board.

No additional questions were raised by the Board. Members indicated that they were prepared to proceed with a decision.

Board Action

Motion by: Rob Lopane to grant site plan and special use permit approval

Seconded by: Eric Verhave

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

Conditions of Approval

The Town engineer advised the applicant's representative that all conditions of approval must be satisfied within 180 days. Failure to satisfy the conditions within that period will result in the approval lapsing unless an extension is granted by the Board.

The applicant may request an extension if additional time is required. A signed copy of the resolution will be provided to the applicant's representative for delivery to the project team.

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

Applicant Presentation

Matt Towne, the applicant's representative, reviewed the status of the subdivision application and revisions made to the plans following prior Board and public comments. The plans remained substantially unchanged, with the addition of a conservation easement and several minor revisions.

Dan Koehler confirmed that Parts 2 and 3 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) had been prepared for the Board's review. The Town engineer also noted that the EAF form had recently been revised by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC), adding questions primarily related to disadvantaged communities. The project site was not identified as being within a designated disadvantaged community.

Board Discussion

The Board reviewed the outstanding comments and discussed the environmental review, focusing on potential impacts related to traffic, natural resources, steep slopes, and drainage.

- **Traffic and Infrastructure:** The Board reviewed the potential effects of additional residential units on the narrow, low-volume roadway. Mitigation measures included a shared driveway to reduce curb cuts, revised driveway entrance radii to improve vehicle access, and restrictions on construction vehicle parking along the roadway during construction.
- **Natural Resources and Steep Slopes:** The Board discussed tree removal and disturbance to steep slopes. Mitigation measures included strategic tree plantings to screen the development from neighboring properties, a conservation easement to preserve trees and portions of the steep slopes, delineation of disturbance limits, and staking of clearing limits before construction. The plans also included provisions for expedited slope stabilization to reduce erosion and sedimentation.
- **Drainage and Erosion:** The Board reviewed proposed measures for managing rooftop runoff through subsurface infiltration rather than surface discharge toward neighboring properties. Erosion and sediment control measures were also incorporated into the plans.
- **Construction Controls:** The applicant confirmed that construction fencing was shown on the plans in areas of disturbance where silt fencing would not otherwise delineate the limits of construction. A detail for orange construction fencing was included in the plans.

The Board expressed satisfaction with the proposed environmental mitigation measures and had no further questions regarding Parts 2 and 3 of the Short EAF. The Board also discussed incorporating tree-removal controls and related conditions similar to those used for the Baker project into the resolution for this application.

SEQRA Determination

Following its review of the Short EAF, including Parts 2 and 3 and the proposed mitigation measures, the Board considered the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action.

Motion by: Rob Lopane to approve the Negative Declaration for the Short Environmental Assessment Form as prepared

Seconded by: Eric Verhave

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

Preliminary Subdivision Approval

Following confirmation that the public hearing had been closed, the Board considered preliminary subdivision approval. It was noted that the application could proceed toward final approval while the remaining outside agency approvals were finalized.

Motion requested by: Rob Lopane to grant preliminary subdivision approval

So moved by: Peter Poltrack

Seconded by: Jayson Abbatantuono

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried

The applicant was advised to return to the Board with the final plat for consideration of final approval.

Adjournment

Motion requested by: Rob Lopane to close the meeting

So moved by: Jayson Abbatantuono

Seconded by: Eric Verhave

Vote: Approved unanimously

Result: Motion carried