

**VILLAGE OF NEW PALTZ PLANNING BOARD  
WORKSHOP MEETING FEBRUARY 6, 2007**

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

**Members Present:** George Danskin, Chair; Ray Curran, Marion DuBois, Ruth. Elwell.

**Also present:** Frank Mandy, Troy Wojciekofsky, Bob Hughes, David Porter, Michael Zierler; Village Trustee and Planning Board Liaison, and other members of the public.

**Announcements from the Chair:**

The Chair said the only items on tonight's agenda would be Woodland Pond and the Board's discussion of the proposed law for affordable housing planned development district. The other items on the agenda would be addressed as follows:

1. 10 South Oakwood Terrace: Rabbi Plotkin will return to the Board next week with a revised drainage plan addressing the questions and deficiencies raised by the Board's consulting engineer. Mr. Wegener will attend next week regarding his landscaping recommendations to buffer the property. If all the plans are considered to be satisfactory, an approved site plan would include a specific planting time for the buffered area.
2. 123 Main Street: The applicant asked for additional time to complete the drainage study and respond to the report from the Board's traffic consultant. The applicant plans to submit information in time for the March workshop.
3. 127 Main Street: The Chair had met with the applicant's representatives, Ms. Daly and Mr. Caltigorone. They emphasized that since there were different financial backers for 123 Main Street and 127 Main Street, the applicant couldn't necessarily make commitments for one project in relationship to the other. They asked if the Board would be more willing to consider the deck if the catering hall component of the application was placed on hold. The Chair made no commitment and said that his opinion of the deck had not changed. The applicant is expected to return next week. The Chair noted that the Board must first determine the applicability of the moratorium (legal opinions have been received from both the Village and Planning Board attorneys). If not applicable, the Board would then review the off-street parking proposed. The Chair felt that at this point in time, the applicant must provide a more concrete commitment regarding shared parking and/or parking on site, adjacent to the site or on another private parking lot close by.

**Approval of Minutes:**

- A motion was made by Ms. DuBois to adopt the minutes of the January 9, 2007 workshop. The motion was seconded by Mr. Curran and passed unanimously by the Board.
- A motion was made by Ms. Elwell to adopt the minutes of the January 16, 2007 regular meeting as corrected by Ms. Elwell and clarified by Ms. DuBois. The motion was seconded by Ms. DuBois and passed unanimously by the Board.
- A motion was made by Ms. Elwell to adopt the minutes of the January 20, 2007 special meeting as corrected by Ms. Elwell. The motion was seconded by Mr. Danskin and passed unanimously by the Board.

**Pending Applications:**

**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)]

Applicants Present: Frank Mandy, NLMD; Cynthia Rosenberg, KRHCS, Troy Wojciekofsky; The Chazen Companies.

Mr. Mandy said they are scheduled to meet later this week with Al Wegener, to review the landscaping plan, and Dave Clouser, to discuss the development edge on the western side of the development. The applicant plans to return to the Board next Tuesday to discuss the results of those meetings. The applicant submitted an economic benefit analysis of the project entitled "Economic & Social Benefits of Woodland Pond," which includes construction spending, job creation, and political accountability for the pilot negotiations to be discussed with the Town and Village Boards and the School Superintendent.

**Western Slope Detention Ponds/Landscaping:** At one of the meetings between the applicant and the filers of the lawsuit, it was pointed out that one of the detention ponds of the storm water system was partially in the 100' buffer area of one of the wetlands. Since then, Chazen has redesigned the site plan moving the detention ponds northward completely out of the buffers on the lower areas. Mr. Wojciekofsky will discuss the storm water management up on the eastern portion of the site with Dave Clouser on Friday to determine whether it's advantageous to have a small water treatment area close to wetland AA or continue to treat all the storm water at the lower location towards the rear of the site. Mr. Wegener surveyed and flagged significant trees (based on caliber, species and cluster) on the western slope. Mr. Wojciekofsky will prepare a list of those trees and meet with Mr. Wegener to determine if any additional trees can be saved. If resolved by Friday, the applicant would redraw the plan of the western slope for submission to the Board next Tuesday.

The Chair reminded the applicant that the hickory trees should be removed prior to the end of March but wasn't sure how to proceed given the pending lawsuit. The applicant said he would follow up with the current property owner and contact Mr. Danskin about the situation.

Secondary Access Road:

The applicant hasn't yet followed up on Mr. Erman's comments regarding the secondary access road. The Chair said he received some preliminary positive responses from Mr. Chamberlin and Mr. Clouser on Mr. Erman's proposal. The applicant will evaluate Mr. Erman's requirements and the Board's consultants' comments and will be ready to discuss this issue at next Tuesday's meeting.

Other Issues:

The Chair noted that the following items need to be completed prior to site development:

1. Plats for the subdivision
2. Pilot project discussions with the Village and Town Boards
3. Determination of construction oversight by Village municipality.

Other Business:

Proposed Law: Affordable Planned Housing Development (APHD)

The Chair instructed the Board to try to exclude any judgments specifically concerning the Palladia project and concentrate solely on reviewing the proposed law. There was a lengthy discussion among Board members covering a wide range of topics and concerns. Issues included, but were limited to, the following:

1. Zoning Applicability: Members said the proposed APHD should include additional zoning districts and felt the B-1 and R-3 districts would be more appropriate for affordable housing than the B-2 district. The B-1 district is less dense and the R-3 is contiguous to the business district. The Chair pointed out the recently adopted Transportation/Land Use Study identified Main Street, between Prospect and Manheim, as one of the principal areas appropriate for creating significant additional density.
2. Commercial Use: Board members agreed that a commercial component should be included in the proposed law for both the B-2 and B-3 districts, but did not suggest any specific recommendations regarding configurations or location (e.g. ground floor or separate building).
3. Design Standards: The Board agreed that any development proposal must be reviewed in relationship to the existing adjoining parcels (and streetscapes) and present a realistic vision of how current and future development on those adjoining parcels will relate to the AHPD. They felt the law should include principals regarding the design and evaluation in terms of parking, open space, architecture an energy efficiency.
4. Density: There was a lengthy discussion about density, including whether to consider a minimum and maximum density since the proposed law does not include any parameters regarding density, height, lot coverage or set-backs. The Board members felt it would advantageous to focus on unit size (number of bedroom/unit) when calculating density and requested a formula that encouraged smaller units/occupancy (one and two bedrooms) to prevent over-densification, especially in the B-2 district. In general, they recommended that any proposed AHPD not be more than twice the allowable density for the zoning district.
5. Existing Laws: The Board requested clarification regarding how this law related to the current affordable housing provisions.
6. Review Schedule: Members felt the 60 day review period was unrealistic and recommended 120 days with the opportunity to extend by mutual consent when supported by good cause.
7. Other Concerns: The Board requested specific provisions prohibiting preemptive building removal or demotion on potential AHDP sites and recommended that all such projects be limited to rental properties to avoid inappropriate speculative investment or buying for use as market rate rental property.

The Chair will summarize the issues and submit the Board's recommendations in time for the Village Board's public hearing tomorrow evening.

Adjournment:

A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Elwell, seconded by Ms. Dubois and passed unanimously by the Board at 9:10 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