

**VILLAGE OF NEW PALTZ PLANNING BOARD
WORKSHOP MEETING AUGUST 1, 2006**

Call to order: The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m.

Members Present: George Danskin, Chair; Ray Curran, Ruth Elwell, Laura Heady

Members Late: Marion DuBois arrived at 7:15pm

Also present: Judy Flynn, Trey Daniels, Building Inspector, Michael Zierler; Village Trustee and Planning Board Liaison, and other members of the public.

Approval of Minutes:

- A motion was made by Ms. Elwell to adopt the minutes of the July 18, 2006 workshop/regular meeting as amended with one correction, two grammatical edits (cited by Ms. Elwell), one addition (from Ms. Heady) and an additional statement noting that “Mr. Curran disagreed with Ms. Elwell’s code interpretation concerning the list of drawings required for site plan approval.” The motion was seconded by Ms. Heady and passed unanimously by the Board. .

In the interest of clarification, Mr. Curran will submit his interpretation of the code (Section 212-23) regarding design issues in site plan approval for discussion at the September workshop. Mr. Curran noted section 212-23 A(1)(n) “architectural drawings including floor plans and elevations and an indication of exterior materials”. . .and Section 3 “ . . drawings should be at a scale adequate to show required details.”

- A motion was made by Mr. Curran to adopt the minutes of the July 11, 2006 public hearing for the Stoneleigh Woods DEIS. The motion was seconded by Ms. DuBois and passed unanimously by the Board
- The minutes of the July 25, 2006 special meeting regarding the Woodland Pond FEIS were not available for review.

New Applications:

PB06-24: Susan Woodburn. 70-74 Church Street. [SBL: 86.26-2-12 & 32 (R-3)]

Preliminary Subdivision Plat Review (lot line revision)

Applicant Not Present

The Chair said the Board would review the application this month and hold the public hearing next month. Mr. Daniels, Village Building Inspector confirmed that this is a pre-existing non-conforming situation and the proposed lot line revision would make the property more conforming. There were no additional comments from the Board.

PB06-25: Jen Ippolito & Bill Kay. 56 and 58 Church Street. {SBL: 86.34-5-1 and 2 (R-3)}

Removal of Easement

Applicant Present: Bill Kay

Ms. Heady recused herself as the applicant was her former landlord.

The applicant explained that both houses are currently on the market and the sale of 58 Church is now contingent of the removal of the easement. He wanted to construct another driveway as a safety issue for the children residing in 58 Church. If the driveway was created on the north side of the property, he said the corresponding parking would be on the north side of the house. After some discussion about parking spaces in the front or the back of the house, the applicant said he didn’t want to reduce the size the back yard.

The Chair verified that the legal description of the easement was drawn and filed on both properties and with the mortgage lender and suggested the applicant review this situation with his bank attorney in terms of mortgage requirements.

Last year the applicant had received approval for a lot line revision that included an easement between the two properties at 56 and 58 Church Street. The Chair said the easement was granted to provide both houses with more lawn space and to lessen the number of driveways off Church Street. The applicant needs to have the easement removed by the Board in order to create the second driveway on the property indicated on the revised plat. Before approving the revised plat, the Board must be satisfied that the new driveway meets the village requirements regarding set-backs and on-site parking spaces (3 spaces for a 4 bedroom house). If those areas are not code compliant, the applicant will require an area variance prior to any modification of the sub-division plat.

The Chair reviewed the codes related to driveways, parking and sideyard setbacks of residential property. Section 198-14 states: “parking on residential properties shall be on established not wider than 18’ and not occupy more than 30% of the lot frontage” and that “driveways along sideyards and backyards must be comply with the setbacks requirements for buildings in that district.” Based on the sideyard setback in this district, the driveway would have to be a minimum of 12-1/2’ off the property line towards the interior of the lot or else will require a variance. Code 212-43G1 states that parking must be on the building portion of the same lot (building envelope). Since the house is 30’ from the property line, this plan may require a variance. There seemed to be a potential conflict with code

212-43F concerning road frontage and side setback. Ms. Elwell explained that if the frontage is under 90' he could encroach on the sideyard setback (58 Church); but not if it's over 90' (56 Church). The frontage of this property is about 100 feet.

The applicant raised the possibility of two side by side driveways/curb cuts with grass and trees between the driveways and parking in the back. The chair said that if the applicant's architect/surveyor could rework the scheme to comply with the setback and parking requirements (and not require a variance), the planning board would review the revised drawing at next week's meeting. If a variance was required, the application would be scheduled for the September 26, 2006 meeting of the ZBA. The applicant said he would probably need a variance to preserve the back yard.

Pending Applications:

PB06-07: Maurey Levitz – New Paltz Karate Academy. 22 N. Front Street [SBL: 86.34-1-16.12 (B-1)]
Site Plan/Special Use Permit: Construct a new two story building on an existing gravel lot for use as a Karate Academy with office space on the second floor.

UCPB Review: Required Modifications

Applicant Present: Maury Levitz, Rick Alfandre, Architect

The Chair attended a meeting yesterday with Mr. Alfandre, Mr. Levitz, Bleu Terwilliger (DPW) and Andy Willingham (Clouser and Associates) to discuss drainage issues, minor comments regarding the landscaping and the desirability of a bicycle rack.

Drainage: The applicant submitted a copy of drainage option 2, a revised site plan addressing previous curbing and sidewalk issues and a modified landscaping plan indicating hose bibs, tree caliber sizes and soil information for planting material. A few weeks ago Mr. Alfandre met with Mr. Clouser and Mr. Willingham at the site. At yesterday's meeting they discussed drainage issues at this site and in the neighborhood. Mr. Terwilliger said that adding another connection to the existing dilapidated storm system that goes under the Town & County condos was not a possibility. In consultation with Richard Ruth (Brinnier & Larios), all parties agreed that the construction of the project would use option 2, a catchment system that allows its load disbursement of storm water surface in its current direction with a slight modification to the system that will allow it to be connected to the storm sewer directly when that system is repaired. (Mr. Terwilliger hoped this modification might be completed in the next few months.)

The drawing showed the detention pipes moved slightly north and the catch basin moved slightly to the southerly side of the detention system to allow a direct connection to the storm sewer at a future date. (*The roof water is directed into 8' pipes in the gravel bed below the parking lot; it is slowly released into a catch basin then released into a surface discharge area at the northern part of the site, where the storm water currently exits.*). It was noted that the parking area would be paved. Mr. Alfandre was informed by Mr. Clouser that a gravel parking lot was only a few percent more pervious than a paved parking area.

Landscaping: As requested, the plan now includes a hose bib and proper tree size designations. The applicant may use a Japanese Dogwood instead of a River Birch. Mr. Alfandre said Mr. Wegener approved all the tree calipers. Ms. Heady noted an error on the plan which needed to be corrected.

Bicycle Rack: A bicycle rack has not been located on the site plan and Mr. Alfandre said it was fine to make that a condition of the approval. The Chair instructed him to choose the location.

Curbing/sidewalk: The sidewalk location has been modified slightly, showing a dropped curb and curbing at the entrance. Mr. Alfandre spoke with an Ulster County planner who agreed that commercial curbing was an inappropriate requirement since this was not a county or a state road. However, he wanted to see a defined entrance with curbing. Mr. Alfandre explained that curbing was a difficult demand on this site since it was not an urban driveway with a lot of grade change between the sidewalk and the driveway. He showed that the sidewalk would curve 8' in from the edge of sidewalk, curve down the sidewalk as it slopes down to meet the driveway and curve up the street to blend the sidewalk into the slope of the street. This will define the entrance very clearly. The plan showed a cross section of the actual slope of the sidewalk and (pending the neighbor's agreement) the removal of a portion of the concrete tongue. They would then feather the sidewalk for a smooth transition between the sidewalk and the neighbor's drive and thereby provide a continuous sidewalk from Route 32 to the other side of the doctor's office.

Elevations/materials: The applicant had redrawn the elevation of the buildings (and included the two elevations not previously seen). Mr. Levitz will now be using real field stone (approximately 5' base) to the building with stucco above instead of the split base block previously submitted. He felt this material would be more attractive and blend more aesthetically with the neighborhood of Huguenot Street. The applicant noted that the color of the roof would be brownish red.

The Board had no outstanding issues at time but asked Mr. Alfandre to revise the drawings to include: the color of the roof; the vertical material used on the gables and the location of the bicycle rack. The Chair also wanted to know about the signage for the handicapped parking spaces as he was recently informed that vertical signs as well as the ground demarcations were required. A vote will be taken at next week's meeting.

The Board thanked Mr. Levitz for his patience and positive attitude throughout this process. Mr. Alfandre recommended the Board provide a checklist of requirements to insure time efficiency and consistency among applicant approvals.

PB05-56: Erin Quinn. 26 Prospect Street. [SBL: 86.34-8-17 (R-2)]

Preliminary Subdivision Plat Review

Applicant Not Present

The Chair noted the Board was waiting for a drainage report from Mr. Clouser. He briefly reviewed the complications of creating two individual lots at this location (versus constructing a second house on the same parcel) and the possible need for a variance regarding the rear yard setback, residential parking and lot width.

Woodland Pond FEIS

Board consultants Dave Clouser and Al Wegener will be meeting with Chazen engineers this Thursday to help develop the final plan for the FEIS, they will be focusing primarily on site grading and site layout as it affects grading. Mr. Curran has requested to attend this meeting.

Mr. Chamberlin (RSG Inc) was concerned that there may be too much on-site parking. The chair noted that reducing the parking area may facilitate some on-site modifications regarding grading and excess material.

ZBA Recommendation:

ZB06-23: M & G Services. 29 Main Street. [SBL: 86.34-2-16 (G)]

Area Variance: Install a new non-illuminated blade sign 5'8" x 5'8" with LED Time & Temperature unit

Applicant Not Present

The Chair noted that the existing sign hadn't been functioning in a long time. According to the building inspector, this sign was more than twice the size allowed in the Gateway District, even without the time and temperature components. The application didn't explain why the replacement sign was larger than the current one or why it needed to exceed the allowable limit. Mr. Curran pointed out that a sign of this size was out of character with the relatively small scale setting of the village's urban streetscape. The Board also questioned whether the materials used (plastic sign with stainless steel trim) complied with Gateway standards. It was noted that approving such a large sign would also set a bad precedent for future signage in the village.

The Chair would like to see a replacement sign consistent with the requirements of the Gateway requirements while retaining the time and temperature unit to provide useful information to a large number of individuals on a daily basis.

A motion was made by Ms. Heady to recommend that the ZBA deny the variance. The motion was seconded by Ms. DuBois and passed unanimously by the Board.

ZB06-26: Liam Hughes. 12 Mulberry Street. [SBL: 86.26-1-10.120 (H)]

Area Variance/Front yard setback to build a 45' x 25' post and beam carport with photovoltaic roof

Applicant Present: Liam Hughes

The applicant brought in a copy of survey map issued when the property was brought. They are currently doing structural repairs to this two-family house and would like to include a 4 car carport using some architectural stone work and photovoltaic roofing material. The structure will be larger than originally anticipated due to the larger sizing of the solar slate material. The electricity generated by the roof would go underground via conduits to service the house.

The Chair clarified that the applicant required a variance from the ZBA due to the setback requirement of 50' and approval from the Historic Preservation Commission regarding appropriate architectural and aesthetic considerations.

The location was verified visually by its proximity to Androgyny, the rail trail, and the big lawn and ball field. The applicant said he needed to build 15' off the side road (10' from the property line) and identified the location on the drawing (some shrubs would be removed). From a practical and visual standpoint (based on the orientation of the principal structure) the chair noted it was questionable whether front yard setbacks are the most appropriate to apply in this case. If the proposed structure were considered to be located in the side yard, the setback requirements would be substantially reduced from 50' to 20.'

The Board felt that if treated with proper materials, this structure could fit into the existing context of the neighborhood with no negative impact to the community. A motion was made by Mr. Curran to issue a positive recommendation to the ZBA. The motion was seconded by Ms. Heady and approved unanimously by the Board.

Other Business:

1. Review proposed Local Law Providing for Affordable Housing in the B-2 District- continuation
After attending the recent public hearing on this issue, the Chair believed the Village Board would not be making any decisions on this re-zoning matter for a long time. Although everyone spoke in favor of the concept of affordable housing, most people expressed concern about the scale of the Palladia project, including the ZBA and the Catholic Church. Ms. Elwell said the zoning issue and implications must be addressed before the project can go forward.

Mr. Zierler said Michael Buser (the Board's consultant) and the Village Attorney will be meeting with representatives from Palladia over the next few months to see if they can create some alternatives to a special use approach. Based on this information the Chair felt the Board did not have to review the issue today and would prepare comments for Board discussion at the September workshop.

2. Proposed Millbrook Preserve: Presentation by Michael Zierler, Open Space Committee

Mr. Zierler presented an updated map of the preserve identifying the easement from David Lent and various (existing and proposed) roads. He said this was an important project to the community and although there hadn't been much progress during the past few years, he anticipated the project would now move from the conceptual to the planning stage within the next six to nine months. The Town will be hiring a planner (Audubon International) to create two plans consecutively: (1) a plan to create preserve including trails and related connections (e.g. Moriello Park, rail trail) and (2) a stewardship and management plan (financial and legal mechanism for acquiring, structuring and maintaining the preserve). Sixty-five percent of the project funding will be shared by the Town Open Space Committee Budget and the Village Recreation Fund and thirty-five percent was received from the Hudson Restoration program.

The Open Space committee will be meeting regularly with the consultant(s) throughout this process and meetings with community stakeholders will be scheduled later in the procedure. Mr. Zierler said the consultants would also be available to the planning board to help review Environmental Impact Statement issues related to the preserve (e.g. Woodland Pond) as well as for independent studies. Mr. Zierler noted that next week the consultants have planned a site visit to the preserve and representatives from the Open Space Committee will be updating Frank Mandy (WP) on the status of the preserve.

3. Review proposed Local Law Removing the Density Bonus for Senior Housing. (continuation)

Ms. Elwell presented information based on her research with the Ulster County Planning Department, Ulster County Office for Aging, Pattern for Progress, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. She also discussed the issues with Dorothy Jessup, a senior advocate in the local community senior. Ms. Elwell stressed that the general housing issue in Ulster County and New Paltz is problematic and complex, noting that there is insufficient housing for middle income people as well as seniors. She said that senior housing is designated for only low-income residents throughout the county and that there is no senior housing in New Paltz. The following points were reviewed and discussed: (1) the need for senior housing in New Paltz and Ulster County; (2) the reduced impact of senior housing (in terms of traffic and school); (3) the effect on the general housing market when seniors can and cannot relocate to other alternatives; (4) the status and repercussion of income restricted senior housing projects in Ulster County; (5) the economies of scale and (6) the impact of the Village's affordable housing legislation on senior development. Ms. Elwell also noted there were problems with the existing affordable housing law.

There was additional discussion about the rationale for repealing the senior bonus density (which could potentially be used for high income housing); the creation of a flexible bonus density based on the size (number of bedrooms) and cost of the unit; and the relationship of unit costs and medium incomes related to the Stoneleigh Woods and Victorian Square projects.

The Chair recommended urging the Village Board to review the senior housing component in the larger context of other affordable housing laws and to revisit approaches to the overall density and housing options in the village. The Chair made a motion strongly recommending that the existing law not be repealed but revised in such a way as to have the bonus more proportionally targeted to meet the specific objectives of the village (e.g. unit size, proximity to village center and public transportation). The motion was seconded by Mr. Curran and passed unanimously by the Board.

The Chair will incorporate additional comments from Board members and submit the Board's recommendation to the Village Trustees next week.

Adjournment:

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Curran, seconded by Ms. DuBois and passed unanimously by the Board at 9:50 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Alison Shestakofsky
Secretary to Village Planning Board
Copies to Trustee Michael Zierler
David Clouser, Engineer
Bob Chamberlin, Traffic Engineer

Drayton Grant, Attorney
Ted Fink, Planner