

**ANCRAM PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
Februaury 6th, 2020**

Board Members Present: Joe Crocco, Bob Roche, James Stickle, Dennis Sigler, Erin Robertson, Palmer Irving (alternate), Ann Rader (alternate)

Board Member(s) Absent: John Ingram, Terry Boyles

Others Present: Mo Ibrahim, Paige Wheeler, Steve Olyha, Linda Eckler, Larry Eckler, Herman Meccariello, Wesley Chase

On Februaury 6, 2020, the monthly meeting of the Town of Ancram Planning Board was called to order at 7:05 PM by the Acting Chair, Dennis Sigler.

The minutes from the January 2, 2020 were not completed because of a family health emergency.

Correspondence: The clerk, J Hoffman, stated that the Building and Planning Department had received a Freedom of Information Law (FOIL) request and the clerk had worked with the requestor to make the requested information available. Further, The clerk thanked everyone for attending the training and stated that more training opportunities would be sent out as they were posted.

Conflicts Check: The Acting Chair, Dennis Sigler, asked if there were any conflicts; there were none.

Agenda Items:

OLD BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARING

S A M North LLC

Commercial Site Plan Review

198.-1-5

7373 Route 22

Members of the Planning Board asked the Applicant Mo Ibrahim about the lights. He stated that the lights on the building would be moved and would face downward, include diffusers and minimum wattage bulbs so as to minimize glare on adjoining roadways and properties.

Further, the Planning Board stated that the colors of the proposed sign and canopy should be changed to be more of a natural earth tone rather than the bright blue, which was included in the submission materials.

Lastly, the lights in the canopy should be recessed and the proposed lettering on the canopy should be removed to comply with the Zoning Law.

James Stickle motioned to open the Public Hearing. The motion was seconded by Bob Roche. All in favor, motion carries.

Bob Roche motioned to close the Public Hearing. The motion was seconded by James Stickle. All in favor, motion carries.

The Board reviewed the questions on the Applicant's Environmental Assessment Form:

1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?

No, or small impact may occur

2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?

No, or small impact may occur

3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?

No, or small impact may occur

4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?

No, or small impact may occur

5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?

No, or small impact may occur

6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?

No, or small impact may occur

7. Will the proposed action impact existing:

a. public / private water supplies?

No, or small impact may occur

b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities?

No, or small impact may occur

8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?

No, or small impact may occur

9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?

No, or small impact may occur

10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?

No, or small impact may occur

11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?

No, or small impact may occur

James Stickle motioned to make a negative declaration for the environmental review as the Board's answers to the EAF questions lead to the determination that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impact. The motion was seconded by Bob Roche. All in favor, motion carries.

Erin Robertson motioned to approve the application with the following conditions:

1. The lighting is directed downward and complies with the Zoning Law and Scenic Corridor Overlay Zone law including having diffusers and minimum wattage bulbs so as to minimize glare on adjoining roadways and properties.

2. The sign and canopy comply with the Zoning Law and Scenic Corridor Overlay Zone law including changing the color to a more natural/earth tone, remove the proposed lettering on the canopy, and keep canopy lights recessed.

3. The applicant obtain a building permit

The motion was seconded by Bob Roche. All in favor, motion carries.

PUBLIC HEARING

S. Arterian **Subdivision** **206.-1-2.22** **Simons Road**

Wesley Chase appeared and presented on behalf of the applicant. The existing lot is 70.3 acres. The Applicant plans to sell one lot to the Ecklers and keep Lot 1. After the subdivision she intends to give the Columbia Land Conservancy a conservation easement for the property. There are wetlands on the property and a note. As of now, the floodplains would need to be detailed. He provided a driveway access permit for Lot 2. The Board asked why the stone wall was not used as the boundary. Wesley Chase responded that the existing stone wall was on a steep slope so using it as the boundary was not practical.

James Stickle motioned to open the Public Hearing. The motion was seconded by Erin Robertson. All in favor, motion carries.

Bob Roche motioned to close the Public Hearing. The motion was seconded by James Stickle. All in favor, motion carries.

The Board reviewed the questions on the Applicant's Environmental Assessment Form:

1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?

No, or small impact may occur

2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?

No, or small impact may occur

3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?

No, or small impact may occur

4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?

No, or small impact may occur

5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?

No, or small impact may occur

6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?

No, or small impact may occur

7. Will the proposed action impact existing:

a. public / private water supplies?

No, or small impact may occur

b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities?

No, or small impact may occur

8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?

No, or small impact may occur

9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?

No, or small impact may occur

10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?

No, or small impact may occur

11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?

No, or small impact may occur

Erin Robertson motioned to make a negative declaration for the environmental review as the Board's answers to the EAF questions lead to the determination that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impact. The motion was seconded by James Stickle. All in favor, motion carries.

Erin Robertson motioned to approve the application. The motion was seconded by James Stickle. All in favor, motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS:

Referral from Ancram Zoning Board of Appeals

Steve Olyha

Area Variance/Abbreviated Site Plan Review

197.-1-42

31 Lakeshore Drive

Steve Olyha, the Applicant, presented his general plans to the Planning Board. He had formerly removed a home from the lot and combined lots to create the current lot. Now that he lives on location fulltime he is seeking an area variance to build a garage, which will contain a bathroom and upstairs storage. The garage will connect to the existing septic and the footprint of the garage will be further from the lake than the demolished home was. The applicant felt that increasing the setback and reducing the footprint was an improvement. The Applicant had obtained the DEC permit. The DEC visited the location, found the previous foundation and therefore, the permit was granted. If the DEC had been unable to locate evidence of the previous home the applicant would be limited to a structure 400 square feet or less.

Unlike the applicant, some members of the Board felt that no construction should be allowed within 100 feet of the lake. Further, they believed if the ZBA granted the variance the application would return to the Planning Board for abbreviated Site Plan Review. Lastly, some members of the Board felt that the Applicant should install a raingarden to mitigate runoff and increase the undisturbed vegetative buffer beyond the 4 feet the Applicant currently leaves undisturbed.

A letter which includes the Planning Board's recommendations will be drafted, sent to the Planning Board members for review, and then sent to the ZBA.

Herman Meccariello/Dan Brooks

LLA/Map Correction

219.-1-85

Lot 1A Hall Hill Road

Wesley Chase and Herman Maccariello sought advice from the Planning Board concerning a subdivision map, which was filed with the county, and stated that a lot 1A would be combine via a legal instrument. After filing and prior to the creation of the legal instrument creating the new, combined lot the parcel was transferred while Lot 1A

remained with Meccariello. Meccariello now wishes to sell Lot 1A and insure that the buyer can obtain legal title, and financing for a single-family residence.

Following discussion, the Board determined legal advice was needed. Wesley will provide maps of the parcel and surrounding parcels as well as the titles he is able to locate so the matter can be referred to counsel.

James Stickle motioned to refer the matter to counsel. The motion was seconded by Erin Roberston. All in favor, motion carries.

Referral from Ancram Town Board Integration of SCOZ (LL #1 of 2003) into Zoning Law

The Planning Board reviewed the proposed local law and agreed integration of the Scenic Corridor Overlay Zone into the Zoning Law would make “it easier for all interested parties to find in one source all the information they seek.” Further, the Planning Board noted that the correction of typographical errors improves readability. Lastly, the Planning Board will be better able to interpret and enforce the regulations therein because the Scenic Corridor Overlay Zone will be incorporated into the Zoning Law and the citations have been updated.

A letter in support of the Local Law will be drafted, sent to the Planning Board members for review, and then sent to the Town Board.

Erin Robertson motioned to authorize Dennis Sigler to sign the letter and send it to the Town Board. The motion was seconded by James Stickle. All in favor, motion carries.

James Stickle motioned to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Erin Robertson. All in favor, motion carries.

Respectfully submitted,
J Hoffman, Secretary Town of Ancram Planning Board
