

Town of New Paltz Planning Board

Monday, September 23, 2019

Final Meeting Minutes

Call to order by Chair Adele Ruger at 7:01pm

Attendees: Lyle Nolan, Adele Ruger, Amanda Gotto, Matt DiDonna and Stana Weisburd

Absent: Amy Cohen

Also Attending: PB Attorney Richard Golden, PB Architect Kurt Sunderland

Meeting Minutes

Motion 1 by Jane Schanberg to approve the August 12, 2019 minutes. Motion 2 by Stana Weisburd. 4 in favor, 1 abstain by Amanda Gotto. Minutes approved.

Motion 1 by Stana Weisburd to approve the August 26, 2019 minutes. Motion 2 by Matt DiDonna. 4 in favor, 1 abstain by Amanda Gotto. Minutes approved.

Motion 1 by Amanda Gotto to approve the September 9, 2019 minutes. Motion 2 by Stana Weisburd. All present in favor. Minutes approved.

Public Comments

None

Workshop Discussion

PB 19-51 New Paltz Storage Site Plan, 111 Henry W. Dubois Drive

At Chair Ruger's invitation, PB Architect Kurt Sunderland requested more information on the materials at the last meeting with them. Kurt also explained to the Board the difference between commercial vs. residential or vernacular architecture vs. more modern, commercial style. Kurt also noted that in New Paltz's history, from the Huguenots up to the Federal Style, pre WWII, there is a history of architecture in New Paltz. Kurt also mentioned that he felt that the New Paltz Storage application was a continuation of the Town's emphasis on character, noting the PB's work done recently with McDonald's application, on how to make it fit better, then referred back to New Paltz Storage, noting that the new proposed building was a large, rectangular box that has residential features (windows) and if it were in a modern, commercial park, it would fit in, but Kurt feels the (proposed) building is mixed with barnlike doors, with upper residential style window, but is still large, rectangular floating into space. Kurt proposed putting a gambrel roof may make it feel more historic, but noted that the applicant commitment for it to be aesthetically consistent in a way to contribute to the Town's character be considered. Discussion followed on the barnlike features of a gambrel roof, notably on the proposed new firehouse next door, with most Board members liking the barnlike idea. The discussion ended with applicant agreeing to set a meeting up with is architect and Kurt Sunderland to explore ideas with an emphasis from Amanda Gotto to include solar on the building.

Administrative Discussion

Full EAF Part 2 Review

Chair Ruger asked if everyone had their blank Part 2 forms. Attorney Golden noted it would be easier for everyone to understand if they used the Wildberry Part 1 in order to understand how to fill out Part 2 without looking back at Part 1.

Attorney Golden explained to the Board members that the Part 2 is not that long, approximately 10 pages, and when filling it out, they may struggle with some responses, which he would help them with to come to a decision. Attorney Golden also noted that the Part 2 is to be completed by the Board if they are the Lead Agency, by referring back to the Part 1 provided by an applicant, and when completed (Part 2) helps identify the relevant environmental areas that may be impacted by proposed activity. Attorney Golden reviewed several questions on the EAF Part 2 form as to how to answer after referring back to the column *Relevant Part 1 Question(s)* with the answers provided by the applicant in their Part 1. Matt DiDonna asked who fills out the Part 2. Attorney Golden noted it's done differently in

different places, but that the Board could ask their Engineer to fill out the Part 2 for them as a draft to work off of, but it could be done whatever the way the Board would want to do. Chair Ruger noted that in the past, the Board had their Engineer fill out the Part 2 and go over it with them. Stana Weisburd commented now that it has been explained it makes sense. Attorney Golden stated it makes sense for the Board to ask their Engineer to fill out Part 2 to work off of as a draft, and have the input from the Engineer. Discussion followed how long it would take to complete. Chair Ruger stated that it could be done in one meeting.

Matt DiDonna asked what if something changes during the process as this is a process. Attorney Golden responded that it depends on what changes in the magnitude that change is. Attorney Golden noted that this is the first true SEQRA document to help you set your sails in the right direction, and then the next step in this (process) which is done immediately after this, that is actually the intent of the SEQRA which is never done that way, then is to make your determination of significance, saying all this will have a significant environmental impact on at least one item or it won't have any item, adding if it won't on any item, then you're saying Neg Dec, but if you say it on one item it's a Positive Dec but noted that before a final determination is done, the applicant could resolve that one item on how they would take of it by coming back to the Board with more information on how they would mitigate the potential environmental impacts, noting also the Board would then determine if they are mitigated and will give a Neg Dec. Attorney Golden gave an example of Traffic still being a concern, and not mitigated so perhaps the Board would request a very narrow environmental impact study just on traffic. Attorney Golden concluded that if you have not made a determination of significance yet, the Board would have to consider any changes in the process but also added if the determination of significance is made, which he noted was gone over previously with Trans-Hudson/CVS as to what would it take to open up that determination of significance and change it from a negative declaration to a positive declaration, is several elements that have to be satisfied.

After no further questions, Chair Ruger thanked Attorney Golden adding it was very helpful. Attorney Golden next one coming up may be New Paltz Storage, and when they submit Part 1 go ahead and ask the Engineer to work on it.

Chair Ruger asked for a motion to adjourn.

Motion 1 by Stana Weisburd. Motion 2 by Amanda Gotto. All present in favor. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:28pm.