

**VILLAGE OF NEW PALTZ PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AUGUST 8, 2006**

Call to order: The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m.

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

Members Late: Ray Curran arrived at 7:10pm; Marion DuBois arrived at 7:20pm

Also present: Maurey Levitz, Rick Alfandre, Frank Mandy, Nancy Vlahoes, David Clouser, Michael Zierler; Village Trustee and Planning Board Liaison, and other members of the public.

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 Present: Susan Woodburn

The applicant said she was selling the house and needed to move the lot line so the existing house will be on one lot. As the house is a pre-existing non-conforming structure, it was noted that the property would become less non-conforming as a result of the lot line revision. There was a brief discussion about the curb cut onto Church Street. The Chair noted that according to the Village code, the driveway and parking has to be within the building envelop. For next month's meeting, the Board asked the applicant to put a note on the plat indicating (1) a future driveway along Church Street within the sideyard setbacks so prospective buyers would not have problems regarding this issue and (2) the general location of the water and sewer line connections from the house to the street. A public hearing will be held next month.

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

Based on the emails between the Chair and the applicant, Mr. Alfandre bought in the following finalized information/drawings dated as of today's meetings including:

- A 3 page drainage report. Page 2 includes the sequencing of the connection of the on-site storm water system to the village municipal storm water system in the event that the municipal system is rehabilitated prior to the construction of the project; if not, the system will need to be connected within 18 months of that rehabilitation unless the applicant returns to the Planning Board and obtains a waiver of that connection based upon on-site observations. There is also a detail, per David Clouser's office, showing clean outs of the infiltration and detention system.
- Elevations, interior floor plan, identification of materials and approximate colors.
- Adjusted plan showing location of the rolling garbage enclosure within the building area; location of a bicycle rack (for 5 bicycles); removal of incorrect grass species (it may be intermixed with white dust clover); and handicapped parking signage per NYS requirements.

Mr. Alfandre conveyed his discussion with Ulster County Planning Board regarding the curb cut. There was a discussion about the applicant's use of a small asphalt swale/triangle (connecting the existing concrete sidewalk in front of the Doctor's office to Cafferty's property) and whether it should be vegetated. After reviewing the situation in detail, the Board decided to leave the material to the applicant's discretion.

A motion was made by Ms. Elwell to approve the application. The application was seconded by Ms. DuBois and passed unanimously by the Board. It was duly noted that this motion included the determination of this project as an unlisted action and will have no significant impact to the environment.

PB03-24: Kingston Regional Health Care System/New Life Management & Development Inc.
Woodland Pond at New Paltz, a proposed Continuing Care Retirement Community,
North Putt Corners Road. [SBL: 86.2-1-7; 86.2-1-2-112; 86.2-1-12.100 (PB and R-1)]
Determination of DEIS "completeness."

Applicants Present: Frank Mandy, NLMD; Nancy Vlahoes, The Chazen Companies

Subsequent to the special meeting on July 25, 2006, the applicant met with Planning Board consultants Dave Clouser and Al Wegener to further discuss the balancing of the site and grading. Mr. Curran attended that meeting.

Grading: Although the applicant did not have a fully engineered plan for the Board to review, he presented a variation to the original site plan indicating a reduction in excess rock and soil. The two major changes included the reduction of the Health Center to two stories (eliminating the need to excavate approximately 170,000 cubic yards of soil/rock) and changing the elevation of one of the apartment buildings by stepping down one of the building wings twice instead of once to better follow the contours of the hill. There would also be some parking rearrangements corresponding to this modification. Mr. Mandy noted these changes actually worked better than the initial design while

substantially reducing the amount of the excess in the back. Given the disturbance of the westerly slope the Chair asked the applicant about the removal of the material and to what aerial extent they would have to fill to accommodate the post elevation distinguishing between (a) the minimum necessary to accommodate construction and (b) the amount they would like to fill to accommodate the disposal of excess material. The applicant will provide this information at the next meeting.

Tree Planting: The applicant will be revising his landscaping plan to incorporate Mr. Wegener's recommendations but would like to modify the amount of amended soil between trees from 30' to 20' based on the significant amount of trees to be planted (450) and the positive growth condition of the soil. If the soil analysis confirmed that it was not conducive to growth, the soil would be amended to provide the proper conditions. He noted that the main planting area would be around the circular road and suggested a 20' wide corridor, 2' deep, on each side of the road where the trees would be planted. Noting the code requirement of 30' between trees, the applicant planned a more formal landscape in the front and asked if the board would be comfortable with a flexible plan for the back of the property to allow more natural tree groupings. There were additional discussions about sub soils, tree selection, and planting. The Chair suggested the applicant include an addendum to the FEIS stating what was proposed, what was recommended, and an explanation of the difference in terms of substance and likelihood of success and economical consideration. Since the plantings and vegetation are different in the transitional areas, the Chair asked the applicant to demonstrate the principals that would be the basis for a feasible re-vegetation plan for this region.

Open Space: Mr. Mandy discussed his meeting with Mr. Zierler and Mr. McGee (Open Space Committee) concerning the Millbrook Preserve. He showed a cross-section of the entire site indicating that the clearest view from the undeveloped area to the project would be standing at the western edge of the pond looking up the hill about 350 yards away. The applicant is currently re-designing a less steep roof line (it is currently in the 15' range) but wants to maintain some pitch (rather than being flatter) for aesthetic purposes and environmental requirements. The finished floor elevation of the cottages would be about 348' and the main floor of the community center would be about 375.'

Mr. Mandy showed that the cottages will not be visible because there are trees of some height at the bottom of the hill. He said the top of a 4 story building would not significantly visible; noting that once you were away from the pond, in a wooded area on a trail, the building would only be visible in fall and winter when there was no vegetation. Mr. Danskin said this was analogous to Mohonk which is a big multiple storied building that is visible from many points on the Mohonk preserve and surrounding areas and offensive to no one.

Mr. Mandy referenced Ms. Rozenberg's letter (which the Board had not yet received) reiterating their commitment to never develop the lower portion of the property, aside from the excavation for the retention/water treatment, regardless of what happens to the creation of a preserve on a broader community level. The applicant will be re-stating their commitment in the FEIS to never develop that portion of the property. Ms. Elwell noted that when the project is under site plan review specific areas can be designated to be under a conservation easement.

Mr. Zierler addressed Mr. Curran's questions regarding the consultants hired by the Open Space committee and the creation of the proposed Millbrook Preserve. He said the consultants would be walking the site for the first time tomorrow. They will determine what areas should be included in the preserve after a number of visits. He felt it was premature to identify the line demarcating the boundary between the end of developed property and the edge of the preserve. He noted that Kingston Regional does not and will not have ownership of the parcel until all the approvals have been finalized.

After the site visit, the consultants will provide a detailed task schedule for their work; Mr. Zierler will advise both the applicant and Planning Board of this schedule. Mr. Zierler felt the applicant has made it clear that under no circumstances will the approximately 40-50 acres of land beyond the currently undefined development line ever be developed; even if the Millbrook Preserve never materializes, they will not develop that land. Mr. Zierler said he was satisfied with this a good first step in the process and Mr. Mandy said he was presenting this information to his depositors at a schedule meeting next week.

Regarding transfer of ownership, Mr. Zierler said when they had more information regarding the baseline parameters of the preserve; the Open Space Committee would make a presentation to Kingston Regional and discuss how the land might be conveyed. He emphasized that this issue is premature at this time since the consultants were recently hired and KR has received no information to date.

Regarding conveyance, the Chair cautioned Mr. Zierler to be alert to the possibility that an absolute transfer of property not violate the legal area requirements for a project of this size. He also noted that the consultants would be looking at the Greenway with the proposed projects as a "given." Mr. Zierler said the consultants are not going to start with any arbitrary boundaries other than the boundaries of the development and walk as much of the 400 acres as possible before submitting an overall assessment of the ecological features. He assumed they would then overlay the proposed developments onto their maps. Mr. Zierler said the Open Space Committee will negotiate with Woodland Pond and advise the Planning Board on its progress.

Roads/Pathways and Elevations: The applicant said the real design challenge is the proximity from building ends to roadways in order to make the project walkable for everyone and in particular, the cottage residents, with easy access to multiple entry points leading to the dining area. Dropping the road and putting in stairs and steep slopes would be counterproductive to this goal. Mr. Clouser said that if all the buildings were raised somewhere between 6'-10' walkability could be maintained while reducing excess cut and fill.

Parking: In response to Bob Chamberlin's concern that parking was oversized, the applicant explained his parking formula: 1.2 parking spaces for independent units (240 spaces for apartments and cottages); 40 for peak staff hours (administrative and kitchen staff), one space for each health care center bed at peak time (100 spaces for assisted and skilled living staff and visitors) and a factor for official visitors (provide meeting spaces for the local community). The Chair asked the applicant to provide a written assessment replying to Mr. Chamberlin's concerns; parking spaces did not have to be located at this time.

Siding: Mr. Mandy started to discuss the siding on the cottages noting that the use of hardy plank, as opposed to vinyl, would have an additional cost of \$250,000. The Chair felt this was a site plan issue rather than an EIS issue. Mr. Mandy said they were trying to incorporate some of the historic architecture influence of the district, including the use of cultured stone around the doorways. He felt that hardy plank looked better aesthetically on the apartment building and healthcare center and was proposing the use of vinyl only for the cottages.

The Chair said it was possible that the FEIS could be accepted at the next meeting if the following items were accomplished:

1. Review of the final grading plan and analysis by Mr. Clouser and Mr. Wegener
2. Submission of the final grading plan (quantifying the volume and extent/dimensions of the site disturbance), building layout and landscaping plan along with the following supplements for inclusion into the FEIS
 - Justification for the proposed amount of parking.
 - Protocol for amending site soils.
 - Principles/techniques for revegetating the transition areas on the western slope.

The Chair outlined the procedure once the FEIS was accepted by the Board:

1. Notice of the FEIS is prepared
2. FEIS is distributed to all involved/interested agencies and community groups
3. The FEIS Notice is published in local newspaper and ENB
4. Ted Fink prepares Findings.
5. Findings are distributed to all involved parties about 10+ days after the FEIS distribution
6. Applicant submits variance application to the ZBA
7. Applicant begins site plan review process

The Chair noted the following areas required further investigation by the Village: identification of inspectors for the large scale construction project (since it was not under the purview of the Village Building Department) and bonding for the on-site work.

The Chair suggested the applicant prepare a written set of findings regarding social and economic conditions for review by Mr. Fink. A meeting was set for October 3, 2006 to determine whether the FEIS was complete and acceptable to the Board.

Other Business:

NYS Planning Federation – Annual Conference

The Chair referenced the NYS Planning News regarding the Annual Conference being held October 8-10th. He asked members wanting to attend the conference contact him by September 1, 2006.

Hudsonia Mapping Wetlands

Ms. Heady said she part was the Hudsonia team hired by the Village of New Paltz to map the wetlands in the village. Although both the Village attorney and the Planning Board's attorney felt there was no conflict of interest, Ms. Heady has removed herself from the project.

Adjournment:

A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Elwell, seconded by Ms. Heady and passed unanimously by the Board at 8:58 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Alison Shestakofsky
Secretary to Village Planning Board
Copies to: Trustee Michael Zierler
Drayton Grant, Attorney
David Clouser, Engineer
Ted Fink, Planner
Bob Chamberlin, Traffic Engineer