



Historic Town of Hyde Park

Planning Board
4383 Albany Post Road
Hyde Park, NY 12538
(845) 229-5111, Ext. 2, (845) 229-0349 Fax

“Working with you for a better Hyde Park”

MINUTES OF THE **August 2, 2017** PUBLIC HEARING/REGULAR MEETING OF THE HYDE PARK PLANNING BOARD

MEMBERS PRESENT: MICHAEL DUPREE, CHAIRMAN
 ANNE DEXTER - VICE CHAIR
 CHAN MURPHEY-VICE CHAIR
 BRENT PICKETT
 DIANE DI NAPOLI
 CHRISTOPHER OLIVER
 VICTORIA KANE

OTHERS PRESENT: VICTORIA POLIDORO, PB ATTORNEY
 PETE SETARO, PB ENGINEERING CONSULTANT
 CYNTHIA WITMAN, PLANNING BOARD SECRETARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE #
DOSIO-4 HIGH STREET	2-5
CIRE OF DUTCHESS	5-6
RIVER RIDGE (F/K/A MAPLE RIDGE)	6-9
RIVERVIEW RE-SUBDIVISION	9-28
DYAL, MICHELLE	28-29
APPROVAL OF PB MINUTES APRIL 19, 2017	29
RELEASE OF ESCROW	29-30
PB Attorney and Engineer: CIA Hotel/New Ventures, Park Plaza Combined and Anderson Center Master Plan	
PB Hydrologist: Creekside, Moorgate and Serenity Hills	30-31

Chairman Dupree: Good evening everyone and welcome to the August 2 meeting of the Hyde Park Planning Board. Please take notice of all the exits around the room in case of emergency and now join me as we salute *Old Glory*. *Chairman Dupree commenced the Pledge of Allegiance.*

Thank you. The first item on the agenda is a continued public hearing known as Dosio 4 High Street. This involves a conversion of a single family home to a two family home. May I get a motion to re-open the public hearing?

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING:

DOSIO-4 HIGH ST.

Site Plan Approval (#2017-24)

Location: 4 High Street, Staatsburg

Grid#: 6167-03-095418

MOTION: Mr. Murphey

SECOND: Ms. Kane

To re-open the public hearing for Dosio-4 High Street.

Aye	Ms. Kane
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 7-0 Motion carried

Chairman Dupree: So we had a very lively meeting at the last hearing. I just want to cover a few things. First, much of the testimony concerned rentals versus owner-occupied and the impacts that renters would have on the character of the neighborhood. What I need to point out is that the Planning Board is barred from considering ownership. As long as it's an allowed use and this is an allowed use, it's permitted. It just requires site plan. And certainly the things that we'd be looking at would be adequacy of the septic, whether the parking fits, etc. I believe that the gentleman and his consultants have amply done that. Again, this is not a special use permit, if that were required then we would be free to look at potential impacts to the neighborhood. The second would be that Mr. Dosio's engineer, by letter, verified the adequacy of the septic. Our engineering consultant also confirmed and it's something we all know up here, Department of Health does not require expansion of septic unless bedrooms are being added. As you noted, no bedrooms are being added. It

might seem illogical to your average person that if you're adding a bathroom or a kitchen that it doesn't require septic. It's actually not. Septics, when they're designed, are designed with excess capacity. They are designed, in other words to allow some additions when there aren't new people coming in. In this case, your septic is not that old, I believe you said 10 years old. That's why it's deemed adequate and again you're not adding any bedrooms. I also want to add that you very politely listened to some of the comments that might not have been easy to hear and you were very polite. You also noted that when you redo this, one of the individuals you purchased the house from is going to remain a tenant. And you also pointed out that you're a resident, grew up in the area and still live in Staatsburg, you're from there and want to protect it so you're going to be watching who the renters are. That's probably the best way we can have better tenants, if the landlords observe everything. In the meantime your architect redid the parking lot and it wasn't quite what Mr. Setaro requested. The reason he requested the bump-out was so that people would never have to back out onto High Street. Some of the comments made by the residents that certainly were very valid, were worries about parking on High Street and how much traffic there might be in terms of getting in and out, particularly in the winter. I think that Mr. Setaro's solution was a neat and elegant one and I want to thank your design consultant for working with us, so thank you for your patience.

The consultants, the Board and the public had no additional comments.

We have a resolution prepared tonight to consider for approval. The resolution has a condition noting that they want to make certain that the parking area has been redesigned to Mr. Setaro's specifications.

Mr. Setaro will review the scale of the parking area the following day.

MOTION: Mr. Murphey

SECOND: Mr. Oliver

To close the public hearing for Dosio-4 High Street.

Aye	Ms. Kane
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 7-0 Motion carried

RESOLUTION GRANTING SITE PLAN APPROVAL

Dosio Staatsburg Conversion

Date: August 2, 2017

Moved By: Ms. DiNapoli

Resolution: # 2017-24A

Seconded By: Mr. Oliver

WHEREAS, the applicant, Vincent Dosio, has submitted an application for site plan approval to convert an existing single-family structure on a .55 acre lot located at 4 High Street, Staatsburg, in the Hamlet District, identified as tax parcel no. 6167-03-095418 (the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, two-family dwellings are permitted in the Hamlet District subject to site plan approval; and

WHEREAS, the Hamlet District allows 4 dwelling units per acre and the project site is .55 acres, permitting 2 dwelling units; and

WHEREAS, the Project is depicted on a site plan entitled "Dosio – 4 High Street" prepared by Synergy Design dated May 12, 2017, last revised July 31, 2017 (the "Site Plan"); and

WHEREAS, on June 7, 2017, the Planning Board classified the action as a Type II action under the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA"); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 239-m of the General Municipal Law, the Project was referred to the Dutchess County Department of Planning and Development, which responded on July 20, 2017, that it was a matter of local concern; and

WHEREAS, a duly noticed public hearing on the Project was held on July 17, 2017 and closed on August 2, 2017, during which all those who wished to speak were heard; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board approves the Site Plan for the Project and authorizes the Chair or his authorized designee to sign the Site Plan after compliance with the following conditions:

- 1. Payment of all fees and escrow.**
- 2. Revision of the Site Plan to revise the parking area to provide for a minimum of four off-street parking spaces with enough space to turnaround so that cars do not have to back out of the driveway onto High Street, consistent with the attached drawing by the Planning Board Engineer, to the satisfaction of the Planning Board Engineer.**

Aye Mr. Dupree
Aye Ms. DiNapoli
Aye Ms. Dexter
Aye Mr. Pickett
Aye Ms. Kane
Aye Mr. Murphey
Aye Mr. Oliver

VOICE VOTE 7-Aye 0-Nay Motion Carried

CIRE OF DUTCHESSS

Extension of time to Commence and Complete Construction (#58-08)

Location: 4185 Albany Post Road

Grid#: 6064-02-941754

Chairman Dupree: The next item on the agenda is a continued public hearing for Cire of Dutchess. May I get a motion to re-open the public hearing?

MOTION: Mr. Murphey

SECOND: Ms. Dexter

To re-open the public hearing for Cire of Dutchess.

Aye	Ms. Kane
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 7-0 Motion carried

Chairman Dupree: As a reminder to everyone, this is the site that's across and caddy corner from the Eveready Diner. It's where there's a sign saying 'medical suites coming soon'. The owner of the site asked me to contact the office of Congressman Maloney. I did because they are still considering expansion of a VA Clinic into this site and the owner Mr. Baxter thought that it would be helpful for me to speak to the Congressman because all of these VA Clinics up here are in his District, none are in District 19. I was able to speak to the Congressman and he indicated he would provide support for it because his Poughkeepsie constituents could come to Hyde Park instead of going all the way down south. So that's something good. In the meantime, the reason that we're here is because at the last extension request, we noted that the stone wall had been wrecked and was in bad shape and the applicants are required to keep all elements of site plan in good condition, so we gave him a certain amount of

time in which to repair the stone wall. Today, Mr. Baxter contacted me to note that his stone mason had gone on to another job and promised that he'll be there tomorrow with the final capstone. What I recommend we do is continue the public hearing to give the applicant and his stone mason more time to finish. By the way the capstone, when I went and measured it, it's pretty heavy, they're big capstones and the edges are chipped so there is work to be done on site. Is there anyone from the public that would like to speak on this application?

There were no comments from the public, the consultants nor the Board regarding this application.

Ms. Dexter thanked the Chairman for reaching out to the Congressman. The Chairman also noted that if the VA were to lease this building, then the property would not go off the tax rolls.

MOTION: Mr. Murphey

SECOND: Ms. Kane

To adjourn the public hearing for Cire of Dutchess to September 6, 2017.

Aye	Ms. Kane
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 7-0 Motion carried

WORKSHOP:

RIVER RIDGE (F/K/A MAPLE RIDGE)

Site Plan Extension Approval for Recreation Center (#57-02)

Location: 261 Hudson View Terrace

Grid #: 6066-04-668241

Chairman Dupree: We're now out of public hearing. The next two items are for River Ridge. There's a request for site plan extension for the approval of both the recreation center and for the overall site that has all the town homes on it. The nice thing is that these will run concurrently. Mr. Rothschild the applicant's attorney is here. Would you like to come up and say anything about the application?

Mr. Rothschild: I will say that there have been recent sales, so we're up to 46 units being built and sold and they're actually going to be building Unit T, which has 8 units. Which will really be the first time we're going to have some

custom made units. Everything had been constructed already before the joint venture came in.

Chairman Dupree: Congratulations. That's right. In the different design that we authorized way back. Great. That's fantastic to hear.

Mr. Rothschild: The other thing Mr. Chairman is that you had mentioned splitting the COs.

Chairman Dupree: Yeah, this is something you need to bring up with Ms. Moss because she sees it differently than I did and she's the arbiter, not me.

Mr. Rothschild: Okay.

Ms. Polidoro: She's advised that you need to amend your site plan and provide for phasing.

Mr. Rothschild: Is that what she's saying?

Ms. Polidoro: So if you phase the rec. center site plans so that the pool and clubhouse is phase 1 and the sport court is phase 2, then she would authorize the CO, but with it being all under one site plan she cannot do that. So that's what we need to happen.

Chairman Dupree: Did we phase the town houses themselves? Was that how she was able to give the COs to each individual town house?

Ms. Polidoro: I don't know that answer.

Chairman Dupree: Because this was before us, before we were on the board.

Ms. Dexter: And it's the old zoning.

Ms. Polidoro: They do have phases, different units and buildings, etc.

Chairman Dupree: So each house would be a sub-phase. Any other comments or questions? I've been trying to figure out a way for you to get COs on those so you could utilize them.

Mr. Rothschild: And that's because we expect construction to be finished on the clubhouse and the pool. Both of those to be completed around Labor Day. The sport court...if anything will be built next year, but a lot of the residents are saying they may not even want it. So Jonathan is going to be sitting down with the HOA on that.

Chairman Dupree: It could be removed from the site plan. You'd have an option that way to then amend it with phasing or just delete it from the site plan itself.

Mr. Rothschild: Right, if that's the route they're going to go. Right.

Ms. Polidoro: You just need to call Tad Moss. It's not...site plan amendments are not a huge deal. It's just a submission.

Mr. Rothschild: Can I quote you when I talk to her? *Laughter.*

Ms. Polidoro: Sure. I'll get on the phone. They go as fast as you provide the information.

Chairman Dupree: Site Plans must be referred to Dutchess County Planning under 239m, so while that's not a big deal, there are required steps that we must go through.

Ms. Polidoro: Is the Rec. Ctr. Within 500 feet? We'd have to look at the parcel lines.

Chairman Dupree: Oh right, it may not be because I don't think it's within the required distance to Route 9. It's an HOA parcel so it goes around, never mind.

There were no further comments from the consultants and the Board.

MOTION: Ms. Kane

SECOND: Mr. Oliver

To set a public hearing for the River Ridge Recreation Center for August 16, 2017.

Aye	Ms. Kane
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 7-0 Motion carried

RIVER RIDGE (F/K/A MAPLE RIDGE)

Site Plan Extension Approval Town Homes (#57-02)

Location: Hudson View Terrace

Grid #: HOA-1, 6066-04-809290; P/O HOA-3, 6066-04-668241; P/O HOA-3,

6066-04-762205; HOA-7, 6066-04-748246; HOA-2, 6066-04-808253; 6066-04-735218; 732217; 730216; 728214; 727213; 726211; 724209; 722207; 722230; 720228; 718227; 716226; 715225; 713222; 712221; 709219; 708215; 708212; 707211; 706209; 705206; 705204; 704202; 703199; 721200; 720197; 719195; 718193; 717191; 716188; 707195; 701192; 700189; 700187; 700185; 700182; 718181; 718178; 718176; 719174; 720171; 719169; 720167; 719163; 705171; 704167; 702165; 701164; 699162; 698161; 696160; 694157; 668174; 669170; 669168; 669166; 669164; 670162; 670159; 672156; 688181; 688178; 687176; 687174; 686172; 686170; 686168; 686164; 673193; 673190; 672188; 672185; 672183; 671180; 670212; 670208; 670206; 671204; 671205; 671199; 689224; 688221; 688219; 688217; 687215; 687212; 686210; 686207; 699240; 697238; 695236; 694234; 693233; 691230; 718252; 715250; 713250; 711248; 709248; 707246; 705245; 702244; 710267; 713268; 716268; 718268; 720268; 722268; 724268; 727268; 734263; 737261; 738260; 729258; 751246; 742254

MOTION: Ms. Kane
SECOND: Mr. Oliver

To set a public hearing for the River Ridge Town Homes for August 16, 2017.

Aye	Ms. Kane
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 7-0 Motion carried

RIVERVIEW RE-SUBDIVISION-LANDINGS-ANDROS

Minor Re-Subdivision (2017-11)
Location: 6 Dock Street
Grid#: 6065-04-548172

Chairman Dupree: The next item on the agenda is Riverview Re-subdivision. This is in the Landings District. Mr. Andros is here to represent himself tonight. Since we saw the last application, he’s revised it with a new EAF, revised subdivision application form and he provided an extensive narrative. Again for the audience’s interest, he is seeking to take one parcel, Lot 1 and split that into fairly equal sizes, so there’s a new Lot 1 and Lot 1A. Would you like to add anything else?

Mr. Andros: No.

Chairman Dupree: Okay, then let me go to the consultants first. Mr. Setaro, any comments?

Mr. Setaro: Yup. One of the things that we were concerned about, that we talked about last time, was Lot 1A, the ability to build something there and whether they would be able to locate a sewage disposal system on it. I know that Pete had said in his response that there could be uses such as kayak shop or a fishing instruction type thing. What we typically like to do here and other towns is to make sure when we create lots, we're not going to burden the County Health Department later on with a problematic lot. So I called Peter Marlow today at the County (*Health Department*). So I said if there was a water dependent use, such as a kayak rental place with a low usage, would you allow a holding tank with a pump-out if in fact somebody wanted to have a bathroom that didn't produce a lot of flow for the use. I'd done holding tanks before, but it's normally only been on an existing parcel with an existing commercial use that's been there for years and years. Talking to Peter, he said that'd be fine, that we don't have a problem with that as long as it's a low intensity use. If in fact somebody was to come at a later point in time. Then, he did mention that you had been in to see him, Pete, about the possibility of a 1 bedroom house with the possibility of an enhanced treatment system. So it seemed in talking to Peter, that they wouldn't have an issue with that. My concern as far as putting the Health Department in a bad spot if we were to approve this lot, just from the things that I look at, I really don't have an issue with it after discussing it with the Health Department. It seems like something would be able to be worked out here. They obviously have the right to limit it.

Chairman Dupree: The number of bedrooms down to one or something?

Mr. Setaro: Or the kayak rental shop that's going to produce like 10 gallons a day and they put in a holding tank and they pump it out once the alarm goes off every so often or whatever. As far as the things that we would be concerned about, talking to the Health Department today helped that out. We don't have any further concerns.

Chairman Dupree: What about you can put a septic within 100 feet of...

Mr. Setaro: Well I think when he had met with Peter, they were going to consider a waiver. Again, I don't want to put words in your mouth, but they were going to consider a waiver to allow 90 feet, that you would have other room to put it outside of the 90 feet. Again, I don't want to put words in your mouth.

Mr. Andros: You're not doing bad.

Mr. Setaro: Okay.

Mr. Andros: I'd jump in if I thought we were headed in the wrong direction. We've already been there.

Chairman Dupree: So the concern that we would be creating a lot that would somehow go off the tax rolls and never have any use has been allayed by talking to the Department of Health because it appears that something could go there. Could we get a conceptual letter, something to memorialize this from the Department of Health?

Ms. Polidoro: Generally, Department of Health is not required to approve subdivision plats less than 5 lots, but can in certain circumstances, unique situations, you can ask for them to pre-approve lots. So this may be a case where you want the applicant to go and get some kind of conceptual approval before you grant subdivision approval to ensure that you're not creating a lot that's not buildable, because if he doesn't get the waiver then the lot may not be buildable.

Chairman Dupree: When we've received these letters before, they don't say that you get the waiver, they just indicate that it's possible to get the waiver or something. I haven't seen these in a while, but I know we've had these before, because they're conceptual only. In other words, Mr. Andros is not submitting anything formal, it's based on a discussion.

Ms. Polidoro: I feel the Planning Board could actually make him plan out the septic system as part of the subdivision plat approval. Just as we do with regular realty subdivisions, but that would be up to the Board to make that requirement. But it would be based on section 96-6a which says that before approval of any plat the Planning Board shall require that the lot shown there on is of such character that it can be used safely for building purposes. That would be the statutory authority for that.

Chairman Dupree: Okay. That's something for the Board to consider. Any other comments Mr. Setaro?

Mr. Setaro: No.

Chairman Dupree: Any reply back to what you heard?

Mr. Andros: I want to respond to the notion of getting some sort of conceptual approval. I maintain that you don't necessarily have to have a septic system or water supply to develop the lot. I don't believe for a moment that the lot is going to be undevelopable. There are uses that don't require a sewage disposal system and so I don't think I should be forced to go pursue any kind of approval with the Health Department as part of the subdivision process. Because it isn't a subdivision as far as they're concerned.

Chairman Dupree: Nonetheless, you explored it with them just I'm sure to allay your own concerns. Any other comments Ms. Polidoro?

Ms. Polidoro: I just have one other comment. By your own admission, the new frontage over here, assuming that your facts are correct, that this is a dedicated road for the sake of argument, you still only have 44 feet, where 50 is required.

Mr. Andros: 50 isn't required. The Planning Board in 1992, took care of that side.

Ms. Polidoro: Well, so in 1992, they created a lot, which was combined lots 1 and 1A, but you're changing...

Mr. Andros: That's true, but...

Ms. Polidoro: Hold on, hold on, you're changing the lot now, so now...we can't create a non-conforming lot and so you're changing the lot lines which means that you have to get a variance so that this lot is no longer non-conforming.

Mr. Andros: I don't agree at all on that because in 1992 when that lot was created there was...it was created with a double frontage because of the fact that we have a tidal inlet there and...

Ms. Polidoro: Sure, but it still doesn't...

Mr. Andros: And now I'm going to finish. And the Planning Board did give due consideration to that fact. The fact that there were two frontages and that the frontage requirement was met and continues to be met on the west side. They did not require any bridge to be constructed or any culverts to be put in in order to access that west side of lot 1 because it already had frontage on a public highway and that the access was deemed adequate at that time for that part of the lot. The other part of the lot on Route 41...

Ms. Polidoro: There's a difference for adequate for access and adequate for Zoning, so I don't know what the frontage was in 1992, it's something we can look into, when this was approved. But our Zoning says you need to have a minimum of 50 feet.

Mr. Andros: But that west side is a remainderment of lot 1 and it really isn't even an issue here.

Ms. Polidoro: I'm just giving the Board my opinion that you generally don't create lots with non-conformities and right now frontage is legal and you're going to create 2 lots where one of them will not have adequate frontage and so it's my opinion that a variance for 6 feet at least would be required.

Mr. Andros: In order to get a building permit?

Chairman Dupree: In order to have the lot comply with the frontage requirements.

Mr. Andros: The new frontage requirements.

Chairman Dupree: When we change this lot...I know your argument, your contention is that there's a parent parcel and there is a sort of half parcel that's being created and that therefore the parent parcel is still the old parcel. There's no change to it?

Mr. Andros: None.

Chairman Dupree: But, when we create a new lot, because when we subdivide, we split up one lot into 2, both are new parcels. That's how Ms. Moss has always read it.

Mr. Andros: But there was no requirement that access be provided for County Route 41.

Ms. Polidoro: Access and frontage are different.

Mr. Andros: Well I understand that, but the whole frontage issue was discussed then and I don't feel that lot 1 or the remainderment has really anything to do with the Lot 1A from the standpoint of compliance, other than it's got to have frontage, 25 feet.

Chairman Dupree: We're creating two new lots.

Mr. Andros: I don't see it that way because as we discussed at the Planning...when we met and I asked you, 'what's the recreation fee going to be?'

Chairman Dupree: I didn't think there should have been one honestly because you're not proposing anew residence.

Ms. Polidoro: Well the recreation fee is based proposed new density, so if you have the ability to build...right now you have one lot, so you have the ability to put on let's say one unit there. You're creating...

Mr. Andros: Well recreation fees are per lot.

Chairman Dupree: Or per dwelling unit.

Ms. Polidoro: But you're creating one additional lot so then...it could also be per unit of multifamily...so the rec fee is based on the number of new lots created apart from the parent lot, but that's a different concept than creation of lots generally, because you're creating lots minus the existing lot. It has nothing to do with your lot lines.

Mr. Andros: Well nothing is changing on the west side of the inlet.

Ms. Polidoro: I understand that. This is a very unique circumstance because your lot is bifurcated by water and so they don't have a physical connection. But legally, 1A provides adequate frontage right now even though it might not provide access and you're taking away that adequate frontage.

Mr. Andros: I look at it as an existing non-conformity then, at minimum or maximum.

Chairman Dupree: The only way to resolve this is for Ms. Moss to weigh in because she's the Zoning Administrator and if you don't like her opinion then you go to the ZBA and if you don't like that opinion then the court of appeals. It's been our past practice under the guidance of Ms. Moss, that if we create two new lots, when you say nothing is changing on Lot 1, yes it is, it's shrinking. Making it a new lot. The lot frontage now is 50 feet. I tried to read all the minutes from 1992. There aren't many and they're not complete. I saw discussion about frontage but I didn't see a discussion about what the requirements were for frontage.

Mr. Andros: 25 feet.

Chairman Dupree: That's what I figured.

Mr. Andros: Isn't it 50 feet for a residential use?

Chairman Dupree: The 50 feet is in subdivision law. The 25 feet is in 108-4.4e, which that is really for a building permit issued for a structure on a lot that has less than 25 feet of frontage. You quote that in your letter but that's really just for pulling building permits. That's not for when we do a subdivision. The subdivision laws that the average has to be 75.

Mr. Andros: Now you're into the average density thing.

Ms. Polidoro: The Town only has average density or conservation subdivision. Those are the only two kinds of subdivision available in the Town. I know you disagree, but it's the Town's policy, long-standing policy that the only two types of subdivision are either average density or conservation. So that is how the Code provision is interpreted. So the average density requirements do apply to this subdivision.

Chairman Dupree: So if you go into Chapter 96, the front page, under Article 6 it just says average density and conservation subdivisions. We don't have anything else. I know what your contention is, that because this...first, let me go through these sections. Average density is allowed in every district, it says it straight out in there. It does however, later on refer to and you have as always quoted correctly, that 30% of open space is to be preserved. However, because it's allowed in every district and that 30% open space is only required in two districts. I don't know how we go around saying that this is still not an average density because the truth of it is...I know what you're saying because you're not creating dwelling units, but if you wanted on both new parcels, 1A or 1, if you wanted...I think it's 1/10 of an acre zoning in the Landings. If you wanted to add 8 more houses they could each be 1/16 of an acre as long as the average was 1/10 of an acre for your total density.

Mr. Andros: Well you do have a minimum lot size right?

Ms. Polidoro: No, well it's average density.

Chairman Dupree: You mean overall? I believe there is a minimum lot that we could ever parcel off. I've never found that in the Code but I think there's a Department of Health requirement that a building has to be above a certain size in order for it to be livable.

Mr. Andros: Well if for example, if I owned 5 acres of land and it was in, let's say the Landings district. So that's 10 dwelling units per acre. Absurd, but nonetheless. So I would be allowed 50 dwelling units.

Ms. Polidoro: If you could provide adequate septic and water. On paper yes. I mean, even on your chart you didn't provide a minimum lot size, because there isn't one in this district.

Mr. Andros: No, it's dwelling units per acre. Okay. But, so it's really the minimum lot size would start off with 1/10 of an acre, but then you have to get everything else in so the lot size increases.

Chairman Dupree: The minimum lot size in the Greenbelt is one dwelling unit per 2.5 acres.

Mr. Andros: No, I was talking about in the Landings.

Chairman Dupree: They're all analogous Pete. Every one of them you could go smaller than the 1/10th.

Mr. Andros: If you go average density.

Chairman Dupree: That's all we have in our Code according to Tad.

Mr. Andros: So if I have 100 acres of land in the Greenbelt and there's nothing to deduct.

Chairman Dupree: Open space is required there.

Mr. Andros: There's nothing to deduct and I come in and I want to split that into two 50 acre parcels. Now you're telling me that's an average density subdivision?

Chairman Dupree: It depends on...you split them into 50, they're still average density because you would still...that's to calculate your maximum density. There is nothing else under our definitions that we have except for average density. It's meant to make things fluid. And by the way, if you wanted to take your 100 acre parcel in the Greenbelt and split it, then you'd have to show one house on each site. Or a structure on each site.

Mr. Andros: Okay, okay. So one house on each lot, so we're not into an average density situation.

Ms. Polidoro: I think the trouble here is that you're focusing on the title, 'Average Density'. I mean if it was just called 'XYZ Subdivision', I don't think you'd be having the same issue. It's just the only type of subdivision that the Town allows. It's called average density but that doesn't mean that we're averaging density on every lot or every lot line adjustment. That's just the title.

Mr. Andros: But there's a whole process that you go through for average density.

Ms. Polidoro: Where it's appropriate.

Mr. Andros: It doesn't say that, it says that you go through, you ascertain what land you've got to get rid of and everything else and then you come up with a dwelling unit count.

Ms. Polidoro: Right, so if you were going to come in and do a subdivision and create 2 lots. We would have you identify how much density is allocated to each lot, so that in the future you can't get more density than you're entitled. It's a simple process.

Mr. Andros: I don't see it, I can't even understand it because here I've got 100 acres and I'm going to split it into 50, it's in the Greenbelt so what is it, 1 ½, 3 acres per?

Chairman Dupree: 2.5 acres.

Mr. Andros: 2.5 acres, so you're telling me that when I split this in half.

Chairman Dupree: It's still an average density subdivision.

Mr. Andros: That I got to...I can't split it anymore.

Chairman Dupree: No, we're not saying that. What we're saying is that you haven't done it so far here is right now your parent parcel is let's say 3 acres. You would have to assign how much density will go to the two new parcels each because we can never create new parcels that would then allow greater density than the overall parent parcel.

Mr. Andros: But how do you even assign it?

Chairman Dupree: In your District? You would assign whatever, I believe...

Mr. Andros: First of all it's a mixed use district, it's not a residential district.

Chairman Dupree: Mixed use does include residential the last time I looked.

Mr. Andros: That's true.

Chairman Dupree: Therefore we have to assign a maximum density on both lots.

Mr. Andros: What??

Chairman Dupree: If you're going to shout at me, I'm going to shout right back at you is what I'm trying to say. You have to assign maximum density on each lot. So in your theoretical, when you have the two new 25 acre parcels in the Greenbelt or two 50 acre parcels, we would assign a maximum density.

Mr. Andros: On each one?

Chairman Dupree: On each one.

Ms. Polidoro: So you could put one density on one lot because you want to have yourself surrounded by 25 acres with no one around you and then you could add the 10 or whatever is remaining to the other lot and sell it with 10 potential lots. Although once they subtract driveways and septic they might not feasibly be able to get 10 there, but that's the max that would be permitted.

Chairman Dupree: If it's in the Greenbelt then you have to take off one of those new parcels has to have permanently conserved open space. Or it could be two, as long as it's contiguous it could be a little on each. After that you

would assign where you want your density to go to. We just went through this with The Enclave because they parceled off a section, a piece to be used possibly for a solar farm, a commercial solar array farm. Once you create that new parcel, they're allowed some sort of new density to it, if you want. They kept, I believe a little bit of residential density.

Ms. Polidoro: Maybe 8 units possibly.

Chairman Dupree: 8 units, 6, something. Again, that's because that was the maximum they were allowed under it, so they got their maximum. That's actually a bad example because they got a variance to add, get more density because it's really a cluster subdivision.

Ms. Polidoro: But the variance took into consideration that 8.

Chairman Dupree: So even on this one. I think the best thing I can do to stop all of this...under our by-laws the Chair can require Ms. Moss the Zoning Administrator to be present at our meeting. I might as well have her here so she can weigh in. She's the ultimate arbiter on all of this.

Mr. Andros: On what?

Chairman Dupree: We enforce it, but the interpretation is up to her.

Mr. Andros: Um, who and she was, I didn't catch it.

Chairman Dupree: The Zoning Administrator does the interpretations.

Mr. Andros: Oh, for the Zoning Law.

Chairman Dupree: All we do is enforce it and so we take what we've been told are her interpretations and then try to enforce it. In this case maybe she'd reconsider her interpretation, I don't know.

Mr. Andros: Okay.

Chairman Dupree: But I mean, to her, all we have...conservation, I should say as well...and you're right, that's not really envisioned for your district. Those are really huge, estate-like lots, not for the Landings. So as far as I know all we have is average density, which just means we need to assign some parcels etc., but I think that a lot of this is nomenclature as well because you're not proposing any density. Because we're subdividing and 96.9 requires 50 feet of frontage on a road unless it's a flag lot and you could certainly make that argument to Ms. Moss that it's a flag lot. Then it's I believe...

Ms. Polidoro: I believe you have to have double the...you have to look at the flag lot requirements. If you can show that this lot is a flag lot then the frontage is reduced.

Chairman Dupree: Or by this subdivision we're creating a flag lot. That's how I see it going forward. Any other comments from the consultants?

Ms. Polidoro: On the next iteration, it would be helpful if you showed the existing lot line between your two houses, because I was confused momentarily. I thought maybe you were combining that lot, but I think you're just leaving it out.

Mr. Andros: What, lots 2 and 3 of the old subdivision? Yeah.

Ms. Polidoro: Yeah, I think this new submission resolved some of the issues with the lot line change. It does simplify it. It's just a question of, you know he doesn't have 100 feet so can this be a buildable lot and what's the proper frontage requirement?

Chairman Dupree: Let me start to my left, Ms. Kane any comments?

Ms. Kane: No, I think that we've covered a lot of territory. I think that I'd like some clarification from Ms. Moss about her interpretation.

Chairman Dupree: I think that's probably a good idea. Mr. Murphey?

Mr. Murphey: I agree, I think we all have to sit down and rehash it a little bit and see what we come up with.

Mr. Pickett: Like they said, I think we need interpretations.

Ms. Dexter: Ditto.

Mr. Oliver: No further comment.

Ms. DiNapoli: I think Ms. Moss is a very needed and wanted person and we'll take it from there.

Ms. Polidoro: So how does the Board feel, just so we can give the applicant some guidance, on the septic and sanitation issues for 1A? Is this something that you're comfortable getting a conceptual approval letter from DOH or do you want a real sign off? I mean what level of...

Chairman Dupree: This is all new material to them, why don't we think about this and then discuss it at the next meeting.

Ms. Polidoro: Okay, so it's something to think about.

Mr. Setaro: They won't give any kind of conceptual approval letter. I mean as far as...Pete was going to propose to them a one bedroom house and that required a waiver because they can't maintain 100 feet from the river. That doesn't mean the Health Department has to grant it. They can certainly say no you have to put something there that a very low intense use and we'll approve like a holding tank there. They could certainly tell him no on any kind of a waiver. I could probably send an email. Again, why don't you think about it, but I could probably send Peter [Fadden] an email or like a letter and say this is our understanding based upon our conversation. If you believe differently can you respond or something. I mean they're not going to write a letter saying a conceptual approval of anything. I mean we can ask, but.

Ms. Polidoro: One way to get rid the frontage issue is just to cut off a piece of 1A and leave it with 1, so it still has frontage on River Road. I don't know if you...

Chairman Dupree: Instead of getting a variance.

Mr. Andros: How um...

Ms. Polidoro: Or you can prove it's a flag lot.

Mr. Andros: With a flag lot what do you have to have, 25 feet?

Chairman Dupree: I believe so.

Ms. Polidoro: I can go grab the Code.

Mr. Andros: I think it's 25. We'll look for it. You don't have to do that now. You guys have other things to do.

Chairman Dupree: It's starred somewhere, that's why I should know it

Mr. Andros: Yeah, but it's in there. I saw it too but I can't remember, duh.

Chairman Dupree: Yeah, because it defines flag lots. So to summarize, if I can from tonight. One of the issues that we're discussing is access was discussed in 1992 with the Planning Board. Frontage is a different issue. Its own sort of opinion based on past direction from Tad that we're creating two new lots. Your contention is that Lot 1 as it exists now is not changing, even though it's losing half of itself.

Mr. Andros: I can talk to her about that. Yeah, I'll get with her on that. It's either going to be yay or nay and then we'll have to take a look at the flag lot situation or something like that.

Chairman Dupree: One issue that was discussed last time was the idea about the buildability or somehow use of the lot. If everyone has had a chance to see his response to my comments. By the way, your first response, the building set back lines were on the map. There's a reason why I couldn't see them. If you go back and look at your map you'll see that you have two dotted arrows that look almost exactly the same, that's why I couldn't find it, sorry.

Mr. Andros: It was kind of tough to get all the different line types.

Chairman Dupree: It's got a lot of different lines in there. One of them is 2 dashes and then a dot.

Mr. Andros: One has one dash, dot.

Chairman Dupree: Yes, yes, yes, yes, that's why I couldn't see it there very clearly at first. Mr. Andros does argue cogently to me that there are, he said it here tonight, there are uses that wouldn't necessarily require, that would be a structure that wouldn't require water or sewer.

Mr. Andros: Right.

Chairman Dupree: That might include, by the way, a flag pole. I believe that's a structure under our Code.

Mr. Andros: You can, you can...I went through it with the flagpole, actually. I think I had to get site plan approval waived for a flagpole.

Chairman Dupree: Actually I think we just waived the public hearing. The truth of it is, this is something for the Board to consider whether when we create this second or new Lot 1A, if there is a real concern that it would never be utilized, then as Victoria said, there is precedent for us, based on the uniqueness of the lot being created, to require that there be some proof from the Department of Health that it could be buildable. But again we also need to look since we're looking at the unique nature of the lot, we need to look at the unique nature of the district in which it's in. The district which it's in is the Landings and it's got all sorts of sections that don't apply to any other district in our Town. The most important of which, to me at least what makes it distinguishable, is because it's really aimed at water enhanced and water dependent uses. The rest of the Town if you have a stream, there's a 100 foot buffer that you can't disturb. Except you can in this district. You may not be able to put a septic in it without Department of Health, but there's no protective barrier in this district only. So it does give a little more flexibility for

the idea of mixed use there, in my opinion. I think we need to have a meeting with Ms. Moss. We need to resolve those issues. Really, truly, there's lots of missing minutes from 1992. There is an initial discussion, then nothing and then it's approved. What did all the middle section go?

Mr. Andros: If you look at the minutes, you'll see there was a question about that. There was a question about that.

Chairman Dupree: Yes, there is. At any rate, Cynthia's still looking for me to see if there is anything else she can find. Some of it is summarized and some of its direct testimony, which you don't have one or the other. It makes me crazy because there's So and So discusses this and Mr. So and So discusses this and it's him saying 'I this' and 'da-da, da, da...it's kind of crazy

Mr. Andros: It's kind of ancient history, now. I have to say that if you back to what it looked like down there in 1990, probably wasn't something that would enhance the area. That's why I went to the Zoning Board of Appeals after the subdivision was done and asked them for variances in order to clean up that site and to make it look presentable. Then of course there was the across the street thing. There are some people who thought the houses should be rehabilitated or whatever you want to call it, at the time on the ZBA. *Mr. Andros gave a nod to Ms. DiNapoli.* Laughter. I've tried to invest money in the area and if you really take a hard look at what I'm proposing for a subdivision, I think what you'll see is it's more of a preservation thing than anything else. If you really want to take a moment and look at what the proposal is. I think you'll see as far as preserving the area, that's one of the goals here. As opposed to leaving it the way it is and it somehow getting into the hands of someone who can take advantage of that density. That high density that's allowed down there, but I'll stop my conversation right there.

Chairman Dupree: I should add that the density that's allowed down there is really aimed to allow town homes. If you could ever find the way to do the septic because 1/10 of an acre isn't very big otherwise. The Landings is a tiny district. We have no big Landings district in this town.

Mr. Andros: No, there isn't. There isn't. So take a hard look.

Ms. Polidoro: Mr. Andros, I have another question for you. If that's the goal, the Board could certainly put a restriction on the lot to help preserve it.

Mr. Andros: What, to do what?

Ms. Polidoro: The Board could certainly restrict the lot with a map note, if that's your intention, you know limiting density to a certain number. Then adding the density to the other lot.

Mr. Andros: I guess my question is, we'll go back to the density thing, because I'm, you know acquiescing to that whole thing, but once you do that, it's a density of what? Let's take Lot 1A, density of what dwelling units...it's a mixed use zone. And then when you go dwelling units per acre...

Chairman Dupree: It doesn't matter, there's still density assigned to it. Density only applies to residential.

Ms. Polidoro: So apartments and town houses. That doesn't preclude the commercial aspect.

Mr. Andros: I understand that. If indeed it was to be residential, but unlike other zones of this Town, it doesn't have to be residential. If we do this dwelling unit thing, this density thing, what's the next step? How are you going to get septic on for those? It just keeps going.

Chairman Dupree: That's not the issue, because as you said, you don't want to predesign it and maybe in the future, there's going to be a way to do septic for 50 houses on half an acre. You don't know that neither do I right now.

Mr. Andros: Believe me, that's not going to happen.

Chairman Dupree: When you said unlike most districts it doesn't have to be residential, that is patently incorrect. Go look at the schedule of uses in every district we have. Mixed use is allowed in almost all of them. That noted, here in the Town Center, there is also mixed use allowed. What I'm trying to say is that if you're allowed now on your 3 acres, let's say you have 1 dwelling unit there already. Let's just say that. So you'd be allowed 29. If you want to put all 29 on one parcel, then that's assigned there permanently. It doesn't mean that the other parcel, Lot 1A doesn't get to have businesses or whatever, it means that you wouldn't have any more residential density on that side. That's how Tad treated always these, so that we never get to a point where, like I said, you have more density than is in the original parent parcel.

Ms. Polidoro: But we also want a lot to have...I mean you understand takings jurisprudence. We need to make sure that each lot has one use and so that's why we're talking about at least showing one dwelling unit that it can support.

Mr. Andros: You mean one residential use. Because when you say dwelling unit, it's residential.

Ms. Polidoro: It is. Or use, but most commercial uses...I know hotdog stand, but we don't plan for a hotdog stand because that's temporary. Most commercial uses do require some kind of potable water and or bathroom facility. A true commercial use. That's why we have this requirement to show

that the lot can be built on. Even that's not your intention right at this moment, we don't want to create a lot that doesn't have a future use.

Mr. Andros: But, but I think we kind of talked about...

Chairman Dupree: I'm arguing opposite because I think you can have a commercial use. There's a kayak storage structure there now that doesn't require any running water.

Mr. Andros: Maybe it's going to move. Laughter.

Ms. Polidoro: The Code requires to show that the lot is buildable. If you just want to use it for kayaks, I think you still need to show that the lot is buildable. Otherwise you have to make the lot a little bit bigger so you can put the septic. Or just lease a portion to the kayak.

Chairman Dupree: Let me think about that.

Mr. Murphey: We're not going to solve this tonight.

Chairman Dupree: It depends on what the definition of buildable is in other words.

Mr. Setaro: I think the Health Department would issue a letter that would say that they would approve a holding tank for a commercial use that had a low intense sewer flow.

Chairman Dupree: Then that proves that it's buildable?

Ms. Polidoro: Then we have to restrict the lot to only... *(inaudible as Mr. Andros spoke over her)*.

Mr. Andros: Then email Peter and get it from him.

Mr. Setaro: I mean a residential, like Pete's talking to him about like a 1 bedroom. They may say no.

Mr. Andros: Or an equivalent. It was a flow thing that I talked to him about. It was more of a flow situation, what you could fit.

Mr. Setaro: What you could fit, right, okay.

Mr. Andros: Reality of the situation, it's more than 110 gallons. I think I could get more than 110 gallons, which is more than one bedroom. I don't know whether the kayak building doesn't require any.

Ms. Polidoro: Well to be fair the kayak building strains credulity a little bit because there is no access to the water. So, I think we need to identify realistic uses for the lot.

Mr. Andros: Yeah, there's no access to the water as part of the subdivision.

Ms. Polidoro: Correct.

Mr. Andros: Correct. That doesn't mean there isn't going to be any access to the water.

Mr. Oliver: That would go under site plan right?

Chairman Dupree: He could make an easement, he could grant an easement.

Ms. Kane: Then that would need to be part of this process.

Mr. Andros: Yeah, I'd put some sort of an easement in, but I didn't think we were to the fine tune yet.

Mr. Setaro: Well we cover all the details here.

Mr. Andros: You sure do.

Chairman Dupree: The reason we do this is if we're going to accept for sketch then it needs to be pretty firm about where we're going because that starts setting in dates.

Mr. Andros: I got the part about going to Tad and working that out.

Chairman Dupree: And as long as there is something that can be built on it and somehow utilized, I know your initial contention was that because it always requires site plan that that should be good enough, but that's sort of just kicking the can down. That doesn't mean that anything can ever be utilized there. All of us have been here long enough now that we're trying to think about the future. If you do sell that lot individually, what's the new owner, what he or she could propose that could be realistic. I'm not saying it's residential density either. It could be a low building that you just store canoes in. I don't know, there is no water, I keep trying to think of non-water uses. As long as there's an easement and they could get the canoe in, then you have a use there that's somewhat commercial because you're getting rent from it or something. There are things that I could there, in other words that would satisfy that.

Ms. Polidoro: But we would want a note on the map so that a potential buyer is at least aware that this isn't necessarily a buildable lot.

Mr. Andros: From the standpoint of what, water and sewer?

Ms. Polidoro: Correct.

Mr. Andros: I think I covered that.

Chairman Dupree: He says that it might be appropriate to put a note in.

Mr. Andros: Sure, let's put a note on.

Ms. Polidoro: Let's talk about it, because I honestly think the process is easier if you just show it's buildable because your lots more valuable, the Board is comfortable that there's not going to be a takings claim down the road because someone's not going to buy a lot that has no economic value.

Mr. Andros: So you don't think a note's appropriate.

Ms. Polidoro: I didn't say that. I said my preference is to have a buildable lot, but the note may be the next best thing, if that's where the Board is. The Board makes the policy.

Mr. Andros: Because nobody knows what's going to go on there and at the time that anybody wants to put anything on there, they have to come to the same Planning Board to get site plan approval or a waiver of it.

Chairman Dupree: We can't waive it. It's always Ms. Moss. She has to make a recommendation first. We can't do that over her. We don't have a definition for buildable, I'm just pointing out.

Mr. Andros: And the flag lot might be an answer.

Ms. Polidoro: For one.

Mr. Andros: As far as the frontage is concerned, but quite frankly, I remember reading that part about that flag lot...no, we're not going to go there. This is too much time being wasted.

Ms. Polidoro: I have one question for you to think about.

Mr. Andros: See, more wasted time. Go ahead. *Laughter.*

Ms. Polidoro: My specialty. I don't know if this is going to be an issue for this but for access, I know you gave us a picture of the truck and it looks like you can fit one vehicle in and out. It looks like a long driveway and that you have apartments. So I know there's a standard for having a pull off at some point

and is that going to come into play with the subdivision if the Fire Department, are they going to say it's time for you to add a pull off and if so is that something that you can accommodate?

Mr. Andros: I'm going to fall right back to the fact that, um, the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Planning Board approved the access. Now the Code has changed, but I'm not putting anything new up that would trigger the Building Code issue about the fire, and the Fire Department has never had a problem. If you read my tome you will see that before the fire and water district project was completed, the Hyde Park Fire and Water Department had to depend on drafting from ponds, streams, etc. to fight fires. To get water for firefighting purposes, as well as the hydrants. The whole system, the whole district didn't have hydrants.

Ms. Polidoro: I mean sure, I know that if there's no fence up there's adequate room, but if CSX ever decides, or Amtrak, whoever owns it decides to fence it. I was asking if had (*inaudible as Mr. Andros began to speak concurrently*).

Mr. Andros: Oh no, there's plenty, believe me there's plenty of room. And, and, there's plenty of room to do that if the Fire Department, who really has the say on it, wants it. If the Railroad lease is somehow extinguished, because otherwise...but there's plenty of room.

Ms. Polidoro: I'm just raising the issue, it may come up, so keep that in mind.

Mr. Andros: Yup, plenty of room. As a matter of fact, I think naturally right now there is enough room for a pull off.

Ms. Polidoro: Okay.

Chairman Dupree: Do you want to put this on for the August 16th meeting? Will that give you time to meet with Tad? Or do you want me to have Tad here at the next meeting?

Mr. Andros: No, I'll meet with her and we'll get a decision on it. No need to drag her here.

Chairman Dupree: She used to come, it's her son, Will.

Mr. Andros: The answer will pop out.

Chairman Dupree: Not really if we don't prepare her in advance. You need to give her time to think about it. You know that.

Mr. Andros: Right, so maybe I ought to do it sooner rather than later.

Chairman Dupree: She does not pop out.

Mr. Andros: No, I understand there's a gestation period. *Laughter.*

Chairman Dupree: At any rate, make an appointment, if you would and let us know if you want to keep the place hold for August 16th.

Mr. Andros: Great.

The Chairman and Mr. Andros briefly discussed the Town's grant application for funding to repair the bridge at Dock Street.

OTHER BUSINESS:

DYAL, MICHELLE

Site Plan Waiver (#2017-32)

Location: 16 West Market Street

Grid#: 6065-16-780276

TOWN OF HYDE PARK PLANNING BOARD

Michelle Dyal

6065-16-780276

SITE PLAN WAIVER

Town Code Section 108-9.4 C 2

Date: August 2, 2017

Resolution #:2017-32

Moved By: Mr. Murphey

Seconded By: Ms. Kane

Whereas, an application requesting a waiver of site plan has been made to the Town of Hyde Park Planning Board by Michelle Dyal, on July 31, 2017, for property located at 16 West Market Street, Hyde Park, NY, and

Whereas, the application is to construct a replacement accessory building (garage) associated with the single family home that is located in an historic overlay district, and

Whereas, the change will have minimal impact to the character of the neighborhood as affirmed by the Zoning Board of Appeals on July 26, 2017 and

Whereas, the Planning Board has reviewed the request submitted by the applicant, and has received a recommendation from the Zoning Administrator, and

Whereas, the applicant is required to return to the Planning Board for all other changes to the property, and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town of Hyde Park Planning Board hereby waives site plan requirements for the file entitled Dyal, Michelle, regarding the specific request as received July 31, 2017, and as authorized by the Zoning Board of Appeals, July 26, 2017, and in the building permit application file for this project.

Aye Mrs. Kane
Aye Mr. Murphey
Aye Ms. Dexter
Aye Mr. Oliver
Aye Mr. Pickett
Aye Mr. Dupree
Aye Ms. DiNapoli

Voice Vote Aye-7 Nay-0 Motion Carried

Approval of Planning Board Meeting Minutes for April 19, 2017.

MOTION: Mr. Murphey

SECOND: Mr. Pickett

To approve the Planning Board Minutes for the April 19, 2017 meeting.

Aye	Ms. Kane
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 7-0 Motion carried

Release of Escrow:

Release of Escrow to the following applicants:

Date: August 2, 2017

Moved by: Chairman Dupree

Resolution #: 17-G

Seconded by: Ms. Dexter

PROJECT NAME	ADDRESSES	PROJECT #	ENGINEER/PLANNER	ATTORNEY	TOTAL
CIA Hotel/New Ventures	FAHS Construction, 2224 Pierce Creek Rd., Binghamton, NY 13903	30-10	1,643.70	51.05	1,694.75
Park Plaza Combined	Hydric, Inc., 54 Garden Street, Poughkeepsie, NY 12601	08-07	863.30	385.75	1,249.05
Anderson Center Master Plan	Anderson School, 4885 Route 9, Staatsburg, NY 12580	18-05	111.35		111.35
TOTAL			2,618.35	436.80	3,055.15

Aye Ms. DiNapoli

Aye Ms. Dexter

Aye Mr. Dupree

Aye Mr. Pickett

Aye Ms. Kane

Aye Mr. Murphey

Aye Mr. Oliver

VOICE VOTE 7-AYE 0- NAY 0- ABSENT
MOTION CARRIED

Date: August 2, 2017

Moved by: Chairman Dupree

Resolution#: 17-H

Seconded by: Ms. Dexter

Release of Escrow to the following applicants:

	Project #	Chazen - Hydrologist	
Creekside	13-05	\$4,145.00	Allen Hicks, 282 North Route 303, Congers, NY 10920
Moorgate S/D	20-05	1,692.50	The Lois Family Limited Partnership II, 1176 Route 9, Wappingers Falls, NY 12590
Serenity Hills	03-06	7,679.70	Malt, Serenity Hills, LLC, c/o Lawrence Rezak, 7 Strawberry Patch Lane, Stanford, CT 06902

Aye Ms. DiNapoli
Aye Ms. Dexter
Aye Mr. Dupree
Aye Mr. Pickett
Aye Ms. Kane
Aye Mr. Murphey
Aye Mr. Oliver

Voice Vote 7-Aye 0-Nay 0-Absent Motion carried

MOTION: Mr. Murphey
SECOND: Ms. Dexter

To adjourn.

Aye Ms. Kane
Aye Mr. Oliver
Aye Mr. Murphey
Aye Ms. DiNapoli
Aye Ms. Dexter
Aye Mr. Dupree
Aye Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE: 7-0 Motion carried

*****Approved at the September 6, 2017 Hyde Park Planning Board Meeting****

Motion: Mr. Murphey
Second: Ms. DiNapoli

Abstain Ms. Weiser
Aye Mr. Oliver
Aye Mr. Murphey
Aye Ms. DiNapoli
Aye Ms. Dexter
Aye Mr. Dupree
Aye Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE: 6-0 1-Abstain Motion carried