

ANCRAM PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
March 31, 2022
In Person and Zoom

Board Members Present: John Ingram, Bob Roche, James Stickle, Joe Crocco, Ann Rader, Erin Robertson, Colleen Lutz, Palmer Irving

Board Member(s) Absent: Philip Hack

Also Present: John Lyons, Nan Stoltzenburg, George Schmitt

The March 31, 2022 workshop meeting of the Town of Ancram Planning Board was called to order at 7:03 PM by the Chair, John Ingram.

Minutes: A decision was made to postpone acceptance of the previous month's regular minutes until the next regular meeting.

Correspondence: Memos have been distributed to all board members by J. Hoffman

Conflicts Check: None

PURPOSE: For the Planning Board to gather information from our consultants.

Nan

Nan has highlighted the major pieces of the memo and organized it into what the Zoning Law says there needs to be on the site plan.

- ~Names and tax map numbers of adjacent landowners
- ~Agricultural data statement (list of other names in the Ag district)
- ~Sizes of all proposed structures
- ~Lighting plan, some components are missing such as the foot candles
- ~Emergency zones and emergency access
- ~There are things on the site plan but not on the legend
- ~Things that were either not updated, incomplete or an error on the plan.

She has suggested that the Planning Board look at the existing conditions map. Also to have it laid over an aerial photo.

Questions and Concerns –

- ~A 22 car lot for the inn and restaurant use seems inadequate.
- ~Unclear on what the interior circulation is
- ~Septic and storm water basins don't seem to be the right setback
- ~Tents #6 and 8 were not 100 ft. from the property line
- ~A frame labeled 3 and tents 6,7,8 don't show the trails
- ~Water and septic hook-ups for tents are unclear

Other questions and observations about the operation

- ~Will there be any events bringing in outsiders?
- ~What's happening on lots 1,2, and 4?
- ~Questions about the one way in and one way out set up
- ~Continued concerns about emergency access
- ~Pedestrian pathways
- ~Many landscaping improvements can be made
- ~The landscaping plan is not effectively screening from Rte. 82

Questions by the Board for Nan

Palmer – What constitutes a permanent structure?

Erin – How does this fit into the larger picture?

Colleen – Are we requiring 2 separate special use permits? Also, the turnarounds are questionable. The driveways fall within the buffer of the stream and this could become an impact.

Joe – The chart shows a 600 sq. ft. restaurant but the drawing shows a lot bigger. What about the parking requirements, required restrooms and outdoor dining? Also there is a need for sprinklers and handicap accessibility.

George

George has a lot of the same concerns as Nan as well as the following –

- ~Fire, EMS access
- ~On site sewer systems
- ~Laundry services
- ~Concerns about aquifer
- ~Current plan seems to be to use only lot 5, should be community water supply
- ~Subdivision regulations of the town
- ~Lighting should be shown on a larger scale
- ~Landscaping, how many varieties of species
- ~Storm water – is the DEC aware of the infiltration basin
- ~Bioretention vs infiltration practices
- ~Need for soil test results
- ~Water – is there an issue with wells in the area? Erin asked if we could request a study

John

In response to Erin's question about the big picture John said the Planning Board has two responsibilities. 1. You are the lead agency for SEQRA and the state requires the review takes place early then review the requirements pursuant to the Zoning Law.

2. As a lead agency your first step is making a declaration of significance. If a project does not have a single significant adverse environmental impact then you can issue a Negative Declaration and move on to the Zoning Law. If you issue a positive declaration you will be asking the applicant to submit a draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The first step is for the applicant to submit an Environmental Assessment Form (part 1).

The next step is to complete part 2 which breaks down all parts of the project and the impact.

He is recommending that Planning Board members go through EAF Part 2 to see what is missing. Nan added that part 2 is an important part of the review. John agreed as it will force us to evaluate submitted documents.

Questions for John (and all consultants) –

Erin – These are permanent houses. Would we go into our open space planning?

John I – What will be the plans for future development? (Response – Future development is not in the Planning Board’s jurisdiction. However, in approval you could make clear you are only approving this project.)

Ann – Can the PB request a business plan? (No)

Erin – Lot 4 is not being used as part of the retreat, the acreage is included in the EAF. (It should not be). Also, Erin mentioned the farming impacts i.e. water use as local farmers get water from the same aquifer. Another concern is the fact that a lot of the property is sloping down to the stream. (George stated that it is a DEC permit and if the Board wants more information they must send a request to the DEC). Erin also questioned the infiltration basin as it looks very commercial. There is also questions about the flow of arrivals and deliveries to the property.

Joe – Is the patio impervious? We didn’t talk about the pool or a hot tub. Is it commercial or residential, will there be a handicapped lift, what about fencing? He also expressed concern about no control at the entrance as people are nosey and will come to see what’s going on which will also add to traffic.

Jim – Traffic is a question as our numbers were a third higher than the applicant’s studies show. (Nan said the PB could request an impact study).

Ann – The noise is loud. (It is not significant)

John Lyons said the EAF gives guidance to lead agencies. Nan handed out copies of part 2 to the Board Members and suggested everyone look at it, go through it, and come back with your thoughts. There are also tools on the DEC website to help as well as a workbook that can be accessed through a hyperlink. J will email it to everyone tomorrow. The purpose is to identify whether there are impacts, which can be none, small, medium, or large. Also consider these factors – scale, context, time frame, and opportunities for mitigation.

A motion was made by Bob Roche, seconded by Jim Stickles to conduct a second workshop meeting on April 20, 2022 at 7 PM to complete part 2. All were in favor, so carried.

A motion was made by Bob Roche, seconded by Erin Robertson for J Hoffman to work with the applicant to provide another informational circulation. All in favor, so carried.

A motion was made by Bob Roche, seconded to Erin Robertson to adjourn the meeting at 9:05 PM. All in favor, so carried.

Respectfully submitted,
M. McDermott
