



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”

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE APRIL 15, 2020 WORKSHOP/REGULAR MEETING OF THE HYDE PARK PLANNING BOARD

MEMBERS PRESENT VIA LIVE STREAMED MEETING:

**MICHAEL DUPREE, CHAIRMAN
ANNE DEXTER - VICE CHAIR
DIANE DI NAPOLI
CHRISTOPHER OLIVER
BRENT PICKETT
STEPHANIE WASSER
ANN WEISER**

**OTHERS PRESENT: VICTORIA POLIDORO, PB CONSULTING ATTORNEY
PETER SETARO, PB CONSULTING ENGINEER
LIZ AXELSON, PB CONSULTING PLANNER
KATHLEEN MOSS, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
CYNTHIA WITMAN, PB SECRETARY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE #
VERIZON CELL TOWER-ANDERSON	2-7
HUTCHINS STAATSBURG STORAGE ADDITIONAL UNITS	7-25
PLT STORAGE YARD RECONSTRUCTION	25-27
RIVERVIEW RE-SUBDIVISION-LANDINGS-ANDROS	27

Chairman Dupree: Good evening everyone. Welcome to the April 15th meeting of the Hyde Park Planning Board. Before I start the meeting, I want to first thank Supervisor Aileen Rohr and particularly Councilman Neil Krupnick who is also the Town's Webmaster, for providing the technology and the direction under which this meeting will take place and be broadcast. I also will note that this meeting is held under the auspices of executive order 202.1 by Governor Andrew Cuomo, of the State of New York. Let me first call on each member of the board, Vice-Chair Dexter, can you confirm that you are either alone or there's no one there present who will be trying to influence your vote?

The Chairman called on each Board Member for a response.

Vice-Chair Dexter: I can confirm.

Ms. DiNapoli: I can confirm.

Mr. Oliver: I can confirm.

Mr. Pickett: I can confirm.

Ms. Wasser: Confirmed.

Ms. Weiser: I can confirm.

Let me also start the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Dupree commenced the Pledge of Allegiance.

WORKSHOP:

VERIZON CELL TOWER-ANDERSON

Site Plan & Special Use Permit Approvals (2019-37)

Location: 11 Hudson Lane, Staatsburg

Grid#: 6066-02-778644

In Attendance via Zoom:

Scott Olson, Young Sommer, LLC.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. The first item on the agenda tonight is Verizon Cell Tower-Anderson Center for Autism. The applicants are seeking Site Plan approval and Special Use Permit approval to locate a 62ft cell phone tower deep within the confines of the center itself. At the last meeting that we had to discuss this, we decided we would do a site walk because, on the environmental assessment form, it was noted that there is potential nesting habitat for American Eagles. American Eagles are still an endangered species in the state of New York. Last Saturday, members of the Board and I met with

an IT specialist for Anderson Center for Autism who accompanied us. We perused the site with two members of the Conservation Advisory Council, Susan Maresca and Richard Mattocks. All of us concluded after the meeting that there were no nests present. There was only one tree that looked like it would be suitable nesting habitat, which was a pine tree. It's located about 35-40ft northwest of where the trees would be cleared. In addition the area proposed for the tower is located next to an existing cell phone tower and it's highly disturbed around it, with roadways, et cetera. And this is not an area that Eagles usually would like to land on. I wrote up a notice or a Memo of our site walk and sent it out to the rest of the board.

See referenced Memo below:

8 April 2020

To: Planning Office File
From: Michael Dupree, PB chair

Re: Proposed cell tower, 11 Hudson Lane, Anderson Center for Autism

On Saturday, April 4, Vice-chair Anne Dexter, Board members Stephanie Wasser and Ann Weiser, Richard Mattocks and Susan Maresca of the Town's Conservation Advisory Council and I met Greg Paulk, VP of IT for Anderson Center at 11 Hudson Lane, the site of a proposed 62' tall telecommunications tower. The temperature was 51 degrees, with partly cloudy skies.

The purpose of the meeting was to identify any nesting sites for the American bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) a long-lived raptor found near large bodies of open water and old-growth pine trees for nesting. NYS DEC's environmental mapper noted that eagles have been sighted in the area since it closely borders the Hudson river.

The bald eagle is an opportunistic feeder which subsists mainly on [fish](#), which it swoops down and snatches from the water with its talons. It builds the largest [nest](#) of any North American bird, up to 13' deep, and 8' wide. Bald eagles mate for life and return to their nesting site thereafter.

The bald eagle was removed from the [U.S. government's](#) list of [endangered species](#) on July 12, 1995 and then removed from the list of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife on June 28, 2007. While it is no longer on Federal lists, it remains Endangered in New York state.

Bald eagles prefer to nest in undisturbed areas – the proposed site is bordered on the western side by an unpaved trail and the river and on the eastern side with the Anderson Center campus and paved roads. The area in question had no suitable trees nor did we find any eagles' nests. A tall white pine located approximately 35 to 40 feet northwest of the proposed area could be utilized by eagles, but we saw no nests there, and in fact, no birds' nests at all as far as we could see.

After conferring with Ms. Maresca and Mr. Mattocks, we concluded that removal of the trees for the proposed cell phone tower would not result in any further damage to potential habitat for any American bald eagles in the surrounding area.



Chairman Dupree

Chairman Dupree: Does any member of the Board have any questions about that letter? Hearing none. Has everyone had a chance to review the environmental assessment form parts two and three that our consultant with Axelson filled out for us.?

The Board Members indicated in the affirmative.

Chairman Dupree: We're all in agreement. I think we're ready then to conclude SEQR, which should be a determination of non- significance.

RESOLUTION TO ADOPT A DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE

Verizon Cell Tower - Anderson

Staatsburg South Micro

Date: April 15, 2020

Moved By: Ms. Weiser

Resolution #: 2019-37A

Seconded By: Mr. Oliver

WHEREAS, the applicant, Orange County-Poughkeepsie Limited Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Wireless, has submitted an application for site plan and special use permit approvals to construct an approximately 62 foot tall telecommunications tower and pool shade structure on a property located at 11 Hudson Lane, identified as tax parcel no. 6066-02-778644 (the "Property"), in the Waterfront Zoning District (the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, the Project is depicted on plans entitled, "Staatsburg South Micro," Sheets T-1, AD-1, SB-1, C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4 and R-1, prepared by Tectonic Engineering & Surveying Consultants P.C., last revised January 24, 2020 and supplemental submission package from Anderson Center for Autism dated February 7, 2020; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 108-5.14 of the Town of Hyde Park Zoning Law, telecommunications towers and facilities are permitted in the Waterfront Zoning District subject to special use permit and site plan approval; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has submitted a Full Environmental Assessment Form ("EAF") dated May 15, 2019, revised February 18, 2020, pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA"); and

WHEREAS, on February 19, 2020, the Planning Board classified the Project as an unlisted action and declared its intent to serve as lead agency in a coordinated SEQRA review, to which no other agency has objected; and

WHEREAS, members of the Planning Board conducted a site walk to look for the presence of eagle nests and found none in the vicinity of the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has thoroughly analyzed the information concerning relevant areas of environmental concern both submitted by the applicant and gathered by the Board through its consultants and considered the criteria contained in 6 NYCRR 617.7; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has reviewed and completed Parts 2 and 3 of the EAF.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board hereby determines that the Project will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Draft Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared.

Aye Mr. Dupree
Aye Ms. Dexter
Aye Ms. DiNapoli
Aye Mr. Oliver
Aye Mr. Pickett
Aye Ms. Wasser
Aye Ms. Weiser

Involved and Interested Agencies

Town of Hyde Park Zoning Board of Appeals
OPRHP
Town of Hyde Park Conservation Advisory Council

Roll Call Vote 7-0 Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: Motion passes unanimously. I'll also note that we referred the plans to the involved and interested agencies, which included the Town of Hyde Park Zoning Board of Appeals. The applicants need to acquire an area variance because the pole should be located from the rear property line the same height as the pole. It can't be located there, so there'll be going to the zoning board of appeals next. This also went to the Office of Parks, Recreation and Preservation as well as the Town of Hyde Park Conservation Advisory Council. May I next, get a motion to reset the Public Hearing for this Verizon Cell Tower at the Anderson Center for Autism for June 3rd, 2020?

MOTION: Mr. Oliver
SECOND: Ms. DiNapoli

To re-set the Public Hearing for Verizon Cell Tower Anderson for June 3, 2020.

Ms. Witman called the roll.

Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Chairman Dupree

ROLL CALL VOTE 7-0 Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: The motion carries unanimously as well. Thank you very, very much colleagues.

Ms. Polidoro: May I recommend? We do have Mr. Olson in the waiting room. I don't know if you want to see if he has any additional questions or comments for the Board before you move on the next topic.

Chairman Dupree: I'd be happy to entertain. Can we contact Mr. Olson to have him come on? Mr. Olson, Yes, I believe that you were watching this on YouTube so you know what just transpired.

Mr. Olson: I haven't been.

Chairman Dupree: Ah. So we concluded SEQR with a Neg. Dec.

Mr. Olson: Okay.

Chairman Dupree: The memo that I passed on to you about our site walk and noting no potential for, nor nests or suitable trees for nest within the area of which you're proposing to remove them was put into the record and we reset the public hearing for June 3rd.

Mr. Olson: Perfect.

Chairman Dupree: Any questions or comments from you?

Mr. Olson: Uh, no, thank you.

Chairman Dupree: Then, I guess I'll say good night. Thanks for joining us and stay well and stay safe.

Mr. Olson: My pleasure. You too. Thank you.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you.

HUTCHINS STAATSBURG STORAGE ADDITIONAL UNITS

Site Plan Amendment Approval Additional Units (#2019-20)

Location: 4920 Albany Post Road, Staatsburg, NY 12580

Grid#: 6066-02-891661

*In Attendance via Zoom: Robert Turner, Tinkelman Architecture, PLLC.
Scott Hutchins, owner*

Chairman Dupree: Thank you, Ms. Polidoro for making that suggestion. I should also note that we have consultants with us, Mr. Setaro, Peter Setaro from CPL Team, our Engineer. Liz Axelson, also from CPL Team, our Planning Consultant and Victoria Polidoro, of Rodenhausen-Chale-Polidoro, our legal consultant as well as Tad Moss, our Zoning Administrator. The next item on the agenda is Hutchins Staatsburg Storage, the Applicants are seeking a Site Plan Amendment to approve more units, more storage units to be located at 4920 Albany Post Road. This application was first received a while back. It was work-shopped several times. The last workshop resulted in very extensive changes. So at our last meeting we kind of had the training wheels on, this time we're going to take those off. We actually have the applicants with us who are going to do a PowerPoint presentation. The applicants are Robert Turner of Tinkelman Architecture, he'll be walking us through the PowerPoint with the changes, as well as Scott Hutchins, the owner. Can we have Scott and Robert come out of the waiting room now? Hey Scott. Is Robert available?

Mr. Hutchins: Hi. How are you?

Chairman Dupree: Mr. Turner, if you're ready to start the PowerPoint you can or to start your presentation.

Mr. Turner: Okay.

Mr. Turner presented the latest revision, dated March 3, 2020 of the Site Plan via a Power Point presentation.

Mr. Turner: Okay. This of course is Staatsburg Storage. It's for the addition of, additional buildings, storage units, on the property.

If you could go to the next slide. This is the proposed site plan that we now currently have in front of you. We started way back in June of 2019, here we had a total of 10 commercial buildings that were going to be, or I should say seven new buildings are being added to the site where there are currently three existing buildings on the site and so when you add seven to three, we end up with 10 commercial buildings with a total area of 51,075 square feet. We have now cut that down and we've provided this more reduced site plan. It does have a greater number of buildings, but the buildings themselves are smaller. We still have the original three buildings, which would be your main building in the center of the site and we have the two which were built during phase two, which are at the Southern side of the property and we are now proposing, an additional nine buildings that are distributed throughout the site. We have the one, two, three, four, five, six, over on the Northeast. We have the one over on the Northwest and then we have the two smaller ones that are tucked in against the building on the South. That adds up to a total of 50,725 square feet of storage building area for this particular project. With this we've made, as you stated, considerable changes to the site plan in order to accommodate some recommendations and suggestions that were made by the Planning Board.

If you could go to the next slide please. We'll start up in the North Western corner, this is probably the more controversial area because there was a lot going on here. We had a larger building located on this side originally. Actually it was two buildings that were kind of joined together by an overhang and that had a total of 2,400 square feet. We've now reduced building five down to 1,350 square feet. We've also moved building five back so that way it aligns with the rock outcropping that occurs just to the North of that. And also we pushed it away from the building and so that way where it happens to say rock, down more on the lower side of the drawing, that's the location of the existing planting bed that was recommended that we maintain. And so by doing this change we are able to keep the existing plants and there's some smaller trees. In fact, there's some Maples in this area as well that we will be keeping. By maintaining both the landscaping and the rock outcropping, we can use those natural features to somewhat screen the building as well as the parking lot that occurs in the back for these particular units or for uses within the building. Being where it is these would be more towards people using building five or there is a commercial office use, we have a construction company. They do use the front portion of the building. They could use these parking spaces as well.

If you could go to the next slide. This is a central area of the site. Originally, with the initial scheme that we had, we were connecting both the West and the East sides with a circulation drive lane. In doing so we were going to be needing to do a considerable amount of rock removal of that central rock formation that we have. And with this removal of that drive, we're then able to maintain that feature, which then can also be used to screen the buildings which occur on the East side of the property from view, from Route 9. Also in

doing this, I know there were comments that were made about; Are we keeping the rock walls? They happen to occur in that area as well. And so in most cases we're able to keep a majority of the walls. It's just where we get closer to the parking area, on the West side and where we are putting a retaining wall, over near building seven, that we're having to do a little bit of reworking of the walls themselves, but those walls will be maintained as part of the site.

If you could go to the next slide please. This is the East, I will, I'll call it the Northeast corner. In this location we had a fewer number of buildings originally, but the buildings were much larger and so what they were ending up by doing it, they were extending back into the rock outcropping itself and that was going to be requiring rock removal and retaining walls. And so in doing the plan with smaller buildings and in rotating, the upper building, which is building 11, we're able to keep ourselves away from a majority of that land formation. And so we have, we minimize the amount of retaining walls that we do have. And so we're working with a lot of the existing grading conditions, along that particular area. Also, we've added building number...if I was able to read this thing...it's the building down at the very bottom. I can barely read it on my plan. That building was added because we did reduce the size of building five, as well as these buildings, so this square footage was incorporated into this building. Then each of the respective buildings just kind of shifted up a little bit, but we were still able to keep ourselves within the site. The top building, which is building 11, we rotated that, so that way we were able to keep the longer side in the North South direction, which keeps the smaller side of that building facing South Cross Road. So that's going to be the more visible side, so it does minimize the amount of view that you see of the buildings by making that little bit of change. We're maintaining the location of the emergency egress and access gate at the location where the current drive intersects South Cross Road. As we indicated that's going to be having a gate on it that will have an access key pad that the Fire Department will have a key code that they can type into that to be able to gain access to the site or if they need to get vehicles out of the site, they can use that access point as well. In the changes that we made with the building sizes, it's reduced down our area of disturbance to less than one acre. And in doing so, we're able to eliminate any of the bioretention basins that we originally had proposed along the East side, which all were occurring within that wetland buffer area. Also, as per the letter which I attached to the submission, we were able to eliminate the banked and deferred parking that was also occurring alongside of the drive lane that was in that wetland buffer as well. So it does minimize what we're impacting in that wetland buffer area. And the only thing that we're now doing is doing some grading. We're putting the drive lane through and then there is going to be landscaping, as in plantings of trees that were requested by the New York State DEC. If you go to the next page, there hasn't been a lot of change in this particular area. The only thing that happened is that over on the Eastern side of our driveway, we originally had some deferred parking in that location as well. That eliminates those areas and also there was going to need to be

another retention basin in that area, that also was eliminated. And so the only retention basin we are keeping on site is the existing one. And that is for use of the, the phase two development area, which is on the Southern portion of the existing building.

If you could go to the next slide. On this slide, it shows the two smaller buildings that we've added also to accommodate some of the lost square footage from reducing the of the buildings in the upper area, buildings 4A and 4B. This just allows you to see where those occur and that they are behind the existing building, which is tall enough so we completely shield these existing buildings from view, from Route 9. This also shows the current existing vehicular gate, which is going to be remaining and that's your access to all the storage buildings that are on the Southern area and then on the Eastern area of the site.

If you could go to the next slide please. This just, again reflects how the lighting occurs on the property and shows that we are not extending over the property line in any way with the new configuration. Being that all of the new lights are all building mounted and they're kept at a very low elevation, so that way they will specifically be lighting up the drive lanes and asphalt area immediately in front of those respective buildings. And similar to what we're doing with phase two, at a certain point in time the majority of those lights will be shut down and a minimum number will be maintained for just providing some security. I know we've talked about possibly doing motion detectors, so if anyone does enter the site, lights will light up, so that way there would be illumination, but as to which ones, that will need to be determined.

Next slide please. This just shows the landscaping on how we adjusted it to accommodate the new configuration, especially in the area of building five. We did slide things over so that way we were able to maintain that existing planting bed. As per Liz Axelson, I will be identifying what I can in regards to the plants in that area and I will be showing them on the landscaping plan and I'll call them out as existing plants in that location. Next, please. This is the vehicular maneuvering plan. Again, this is to show how, the vehicles, which would be your fire trucks, will be maneuvering on and off of the site. We did show the vehicles coming from the South, which happens to be where the largest of the fire trucks would be coming to any fire that could be occurring on this property. So that's why we were focusing mainly on that southernly direction for the vehicles. Any of the smaller ones are easily going to be able to maneuver around through the property because they're more agile and more, I would say more maneuverable than this particular vehicle. But you can see how they can access both of the existing drive lanes. They would then have to back their way out of the parking area that is where building number five is. And when they access the site to get to the rear side of the property or the East side of the property, that's where they would then access or egress the property through the new gate that's what the Northern portion of the property.

Next slide please. Also as one of the recommendations per Ms. Axelson, we restored the information regarding the Blanding's Turtles and I know Mark Graminski expounded upon the various components that she was looking for. And so this occurs on this page and this page also has the New York State DEC landscaping requirements that they wanted us to provide as part of this project.

Next slide please. This gives me a time just to kind of go over... Liz nicely circulated to us, back at the end of March a Memorandum. And so we've reviewed, those comments that she made and a majority of those comments I'll be able to incorporate the items into our submission set that we will be making. I just wanted to point out that item number three, which was revised sheet PZ 102 to show and label customer access gate for proposed building five and refer to the detail. There is no gate that is going to be occurring at this particular location and so that comment will be addressed as such. Again, four, five, those are things that I need to just add to the drawings. Some of them happen to be shown, but I guess maybe it wasn't as clear, so I'll relocate those notes so that way they are more visible. Number seven is additional notes and need to be added. Number eight, requests a lighting schedule for the existing fixtures A and B, that I will make sure I add and put on that sheet as well. I need to correct the planting count on the landscape plan and I see why I missed those 10 items. We dropped the tag off of one of those, so I'll make sure that's added as well. I'll make reference to the bioretention drawings that are located on DT 102, as well as C7 on that sheet, to assist in locating those. Number 10, which was making reference to DT 102, it requested that a plant list for the bio-retention pond be provided. That happens to be included on that sheet. We're using what's called a New England wetland plants seed mix and there's a schedule as to what plants are all included in that seed mix and is just kind of something that's spread over that area. There's no specific number of plants. It's just whatever will grow from that seed mix is what will come up in that particular location. Item number 11, uh, we did take a look at her recommendation of providing parallel parking spaces in between buildings, seven-eight, eight-nine, nine-10 and 10-11. This would then add a total of 10 new spaces that we're able to provide as part of the project. And so we will put those on the drawings and then I'll make the changes to the scale information. That's also on the proposed site plan sheet because this will change then, our actual scale of the project. Originally that location where we were showing the parking that is provided, not including the deferred and bank parking. It increases us from 58,335 to 59,955. So I'll pick up those changes and show that on the drawing as well. I know number 12 also goes back to discussing about the, the scale of the project. It pretty much covers what I just went over in regards to the addition of those 10 spaces. That also continues on to number 13, I'll pick up the changes regarding the additional 0.78, I'll get that removed from the building and that was item number 14. Then we'll pick up the areas needing to be identified regarding the proposed areas of disturbance on C2, C3 and C4. Then we moved to code related items, showing and label, any

directional signs. All signs that we have on the property right now are the ones that exist and will be occurring. On this sheet, she also asked that we show the property owners that are across South Cross Road from the property. I know currently I have that shown on PZ101, I'll just take that information and add that to PZ102 as well. That pretty much wraps up any of the comments that she has on the project.

Chairman Dupree: Robert, I want to thank you for that excellent summation. I also want to thank both you and Scott for being able to kind of 'turn on a dime' and turn your presentation into a PowerPoint so we could show it on our virtual display. And last, I want to thank you, Scott, Mr. Hutchins, for taking the interest in continuing this development project and particularly during this uncertain economic time. I'm going to here, just insert a quick housekeeping note so that anyone in the town who might be watching on our channel 22 will learn this. We were just informed yesterday that the Sake' Brewery, Sake' manufacturer is being put on hold. They're not abandoning the project, but right now, a lot of their business is tied up in hospitality, because it's more of a high-end Sake'. They don't sell as much through liquor stores. It's through restaurants, tasting rooms, hotels, airplanes, et cetera. So because the hospitality industry income has trickled down to basically nothing, they're going to put this on hold. So if construction can start again, not essential, it will likely take a while before this one gets back up and going. So it's a pleasure to have someone still interested in doing a project. I'm going to go as always to our consultants for comments and let me start as usual with Ms. Axelson, comments?

Ms. Axelson: Yeah, I just wanted to follow up quickly. I know that, I may have discussed this with Michael and a couple of other Board Members. I had read the letter about, deferred parking and what happened in the last round. And that's how I crafted my comments about deferred parking and why we ended up saying, show us a few parking spaces there. Um, and then I guess we're looking for some notation indicating how would the site be examined later to see if additional parking is needed. And my gut tells me there may not necessarily be parking needed, but I know there were concerns about how that would be handled and in particular how the Zoning Administrator, how Tad Moss would handle that. So I know looking for plan notation, but I'm also looking for a little bit of feedback maybe from, from Rob or Scott or also Planning Board Members about their feelings about deferred parking.

Chairman Dupree: If I could leap in here a moment. Scott and Robert, one of the things we discussed at our agenda meeting was we observed, all of us who live here and go by, we've never seen a lot of people park there. We also, when we've done our site walks have noted that people tend to park near the location of their storage unit and that's usually kind of what we'll call temporary parking or short-term parking. So what was discussed was instead of having you show, Robert, the additional spaces which would add to the scale, that

instead perhaps you could show striping of areas where you think people should be parking temporarily with possibly a sign that wouldn't be a defined parking stall. So it wouldn't actually add to your scale. But that way you could kind of, not force, but to gently push people who are coming in and just say, this is where you should park. You could have that advice. Any of the sides of the buildings. I'll note that, myself, when I looked at buildings 7-9, they also have the series of very small East facing units, which means that I would take it, people would park in the North-South access, that North-South access is 25 feet and 1 inch, which means that it can easily accommodate more than one car if people are parked there. Maybe that's something you could also show is some striping in through these areas where you think people will park, logically, where they don't have defined parking like in front of building five. And then we'll ask, as Liz said, for everybody else in the Planning Board to weigh in on their thoughts about parking as well. Robert, you want to add anything?

Mr. Turner: I think that it's a great idea because it's kind of almost like identifying a fire zone. But here it's like a parking zone and those could be easily marked out on the asphalt at the various location and so it does kind of identify, this is where you should park so people aren't just parking wherever they feel like around the site.

Chairman Dupree: Good.

Ms. Polidoro: Can I just jump in for a sec?

Chairman Dupree: Sure.

Ms. Polidoro: So in the past we've reviewed banked parking, which is where the board studied the parking as if it was going to be built, but then we didn't require it to be built. So our whole review incorporated those extra spaces. Moving forward, the applicant has requested that we not include any extra spaces in those study but instead was looking for some kind of mechanism to do that review in the future. And I think that's very complicated and the Board can't approve the future parking without actually studying it. So instead, I'm going to ask the Board Members tonight, and this is following up on what Liz said, to discuss whether you think those extra parking spaces are even needed and you know, Michael, the Chairman has figured out a way with striping of areas where it could go, so do we need those full banked parking spaces in the future or are you willing to waive the requirement for those extra spaces? Because I just don't think that the applicant's suggestion is doable. It sounds good, but it's actually quite complicated.

Chairman Dupree: And I will conclude on this little topic before we go on back to Liz, that what's important to remember is that where the banked parking was proposed to be located will now be the entrance drive to building five.

They've actually added more as parking spaces associated with building five as Robert noted. Mr. Turner noted, they could be used for the office space. That's what those banked parking spaces were initially for, was in case there were more uses in the main building. Last, everyone's had a chance, as I said, to take a look and see how the site's utilized for storage. And it seems as though no one parks for a long, long time. So as Victoria noted, please everyone weigh in on your ideas of parking and the idea of striping to show temporary parking areas, we'll call them. Liz, let me go back to you. Is there anything else you want to add?

Ms. Axelson: Well after we hear about parking, obviously I'll want to know whether or not, if we're just going to dash them and they're not going to be counted towards scale, that's important to know before, you know, Rob and Scott make their submittal. So that input and then I know there's another issue of concern and that had to do with some discussion about...that building five was moved back and I'd like to hear the Board Members weigh in about whether they're satisfied with how it moved back and just with a footnote, there is sort of a rock outcrop that is somewhat visible from the road, but where building five is going is what appears to be a low point in that rock outcrop so that the remaining design looks like it's preserving the ends of that rock outcrop. So I'll be looking for input on that.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. Mr Setaro, any comments?

Mr. Setaro: My comment would be, as everybody was talking about building five and, uh, the rock outcrop...Scott, do you know, where your existing well is for the...

Mr. Hutchins: I don't have a well, we have public water.

Mr. Setaro: Oh, you're public water. Okay. Excellent. Excellent. Okay. I was just concerned about, um, rock excavation and any impact on a well, so. All right. I mean, as far as any other comments, uh, we really don't, don't have any, uh, the site disturbance is less than an acre, so they don't need a storm water pollution prevention plan and Mark Graminski's plan does show soil and erosion control measures. So, you know, at this point I think all the engineering comments that we had before, have been addressed.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. That's wonderful to hear. Ms. Moss, do you have any comments to add?

Ms. Moss: No, no comments. Thank you. I do like the redesign. Uh, it stays further away from the wetland. Uh, the temporary parking has been moved away from the wetland and I think those are good changes to the plan.

Chairman Dupree: Those are good. Those are comments actually said. Thank you for adding them. Ms. Polidoro, any other comments you'd like to add?

Ms. Polidoro: There we go. Sorry. I was, I was muted. Not on the design, but on procedures. If we're at a point where the Board is comfortable sending this to County Planning and sending it to other involved and interested agencies, we have a resolution prepared for that. Uh, but I do want to note that the 30-day time period for circulation, has been waived we believe by the executive order. And so to be conservative we should wait to hear back from the agencies before declaring lead agency.

Chairman Dupree: We agree. I mean, we can't wait forever, but because of the suspension of a timelines by the Governor's executive orders, we will have to give them more than 30 days, necessarily. I will note that the agency that is most probably important, in terms of the response is the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and the applicants have been meeting with them as we know from the correspondence we received with them. So this won't be a new application. And as I recall, one of the last letters that they received said that they were waiting for notice by us to be lead agency. So I'm assuming that we'll move forward fairly quickly, but we don't know about the other state agencies and what their operating terms are right now, how long it takes. So thank you for adding that. Anything else Victoria?

Ms. Polidoro: Not for me.

Chairman Dupree: No. Let me start to my virtual left, if I can call it that and call Ann Weiser first for comments, Ms. Weiser?

Ms. Weiser: So I'm actually quite happy with the new placement of building five. I think that really helped. I really appreciate that you did that. And I also appreciate that you reduced the square footage and given the nature of your business, I don't think we need extra spaces and it's simply fine to stripe them.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. Anything else?

Ms. Weiser: Nope.

Chairman Dupree: That was really succinct. Perfect. Thank you. Mr. Pickett, comments?

Mr. Pickett: There was discussion about having a split rail fence or something around the retention pond to kind of delineate it and maybe protect it a little bit. It was in the area of the shed and I think the shed is south. Any more discussion on that?

Mr. Turner: On our part it's that it's our existing retention pond and if you're concerned about anything going on with that, I'll have to speak with Scott as to how he might want to address that.

Mr. Hutchins: It's not a big deal. If you want to put a fence around it, put a fence around it. Trust me.

Mr. Pickett: Yeah. Now, I don't want to make a big deal out of it. It just, that it was on the South side and there was this discussion about it, kind of protecting that area going towards the wetlands, so, just something reasonable.

Mr. Hutchins: The only challenge, the only challenge in putting a fence there is that snowplowing occurs from a West to East direction and they push all the snow over, honestly into that retention pond. So that's used as snow storage in the winter. So that would be the only problem with establishing a fence in front of it.

Mr. Pickett: Okay. Alright. Right. The other question I had was on building 4A and 4B that you're adding, was there any HVAC work or anything going to be done for that or anything up on the roof that you might see from Route 9?

Mr. Hutchins: No.

Mr. Pickett: Okay.

Mr. Turner: Correct.

Mr. Pickett: Okay. And then the last two comments, I think the parking identification for the temporary guidance is good and I'd waive any requirement for banked parking.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. Are you okay with where building five has been relocated and where it's where it's centered to?

Mr. Pickett: Very much so. Yes.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you Brent. Ms. Wasser, comments?

Ms. Wasser: Yeah, first Rob, that was an excellent presentation. I wish I could've had you walk me through that on these reduced size drawings when I was trying to compare back and forth. It was a lot of changes. I have a question regarding building five. I went through the drawings and I went out yesterday, again, got out of the car, walked around and there are two stakes in the ground delineating building five. What would've been the Western edge of the original submission and what I couldn't tell from the drawings because they're a

reduced set so I couldn't scale it. How far back from those stakes are you proposing that West end of building Five?

Mr. Turner: I'd have to take a look again just to re-verify how far we did sit that whole building back. I can provide that information to you.

Ms. Wasser: I don't have an issue with and I'd be comfortable waiving the requirement on the deferred parking, and I do appreciate that there's less impervious pavement on the whole project. But I am still having a problem with that west end of building five, because if I look at the drawings and I think Peter or Liz just mentioned it earlier and that whole elongated natural berm, it looks like you're siting the building into the low point, but that there's really no way that you're not going to disturb that berm. It's, it's still too close. And I understand the goal is to have that west gable end with the three storage units look very visibly like a storage business. But I'm not comfortable with it, not understanding how much further back from the stakes it is. I'm thinking 15-20 feet back and there's room to shift it back toward that stone wall and still have it visible. So that's my comment on building five.

Mr. Turner: Okay. I know I can take a look at that. I know one of the things that we were working with in that particular area is trying to get it in between so we weren't impacting the existing rock outcropping too much. But we definitely did not want to impact the existing landscaping and so we were kind of splitting it in between both of those particular items. But I will get back to you regarding how far we moved it back. I know it was originally like about 15 feet. I think it was shifted back from its original location.

Chairman Dupree: I just scaled it roughly. So in the original proposal building five was at the same front line as the existing two-story building. It's now been pushed back so that it aligns up with the front of the building.

Ms. Wasser: Well, it's still forward of the building. It's still forward.

Mr. Turner: It's forward of the building.

Chairman Dupree: It's forward of the main portion of the building. The entrance to the most prominent bump out. It looks as though if I measured correctly it's about 16 feet back from where it was originally proposed.

Mr. Turner: That sounds about right from what I can remember.

Ms. Wasser: Liz, were you going to say something that would help me?

Ms. Axelson: I'm just looking at the partial site plan part of the presentation and there's a marker from the front property line. It looks like Robert, you must

have marked it 53.6 feet back from the property line is the front of building five. So it's over 50 feet.

Ms. Wasser: Well yeah, that would be harder for me to just quickly assess going out there. It's been my concern from the beginning and it's still my concern. I wouldn't have a problem moving this on for circulation with the understanding that that is still an open item for me and I'm not done with that. I'm not comfortable with it quite yet.

Chairman Dupree: That's perfect. Any other comments? Anything else Stephanie?

Ms. Wasser: No, that's it.

Chairman Dupree: Vice-Chair Dexter any comments? Anne?

Vice-Chair Dexter: Okay. Am I back? I felt like I was turning it off and it kept turning on. It was very weird. First of all, I want to really thank my colleagues. You have really excellent, excellent input. And first thing I want to cover is the parking. I agree. I think the nature of the business doesn't require additional. I'm a little concerned about striping because I think we're all trained. That striping is a no-no. So you know, I don't know, maybe if you change it a different color, I don't know. I want it to be park here, not, don't park here and block the lane so you know, whatever you can come up with. I think people will naturally...I'm thinking to one of the original storage units here in Hyde Park, which is at the top of Teller Hill, put in here like probably like 40 years ago. I don't think anything is striped through there. I think people just park, you know, they try to get as close as they can to their unit and I'm not even sure you have to tell them where to park. You know, I just think maybe if anything, just say something like don't block the drive aisles.

Chairman Dupree: Good point.

Vice-Chair Dexter: So that's my parking comments. Building five, I really do appreciate that you have pushed it back and I do understand the significance for your business. I think my question is we do have elevations of that one, don't we?

Mr. Turner: Yes. The elevations are included within the set. I did not include them in the PowerPoint.

Vice-Chair Dexter: Okay. I have not been to town hall lately, so I haven't seen that, but I was thinking about that for County Planning as well that they would need to see that. I feel like it's kind of a branding thing and if it's just the one building and it has been pushed back...I do agree with Stephanie if it's pushed back and shifted a little bit, yet you still have to take away some of the rock

outcropping, I would be concerned. But from what I can see, it kind of matches what we asked you to do. So, I think I'm okay with what you've done. And I do really like what you've done in the back, tightening everything up, making buildings shorter. I don't mind that you've added the buildings all the way at the end. I think it makes sense. It'll look neater and more cohesive. So in general I'm really happy. We're a picky bunch...but you guys have really done a lot to meet us where we would like to be. It's hard to make a 100% for anybody, so I'm personally quite happy with this.

Mr. Turner: Because you were asking about the distance, which things were set back off the property line. I had a set of drawings, the thing is I couldn't find a scale, so I kind of worked off of proportions here. Originally when we had buildings, it was 5A and 5B, the Western side of that building was about 20 to 22 feet off the property line and now we're 53 feet, six inches back from the property line. So we've shoved it back over 30 feet from its original location.

Ms. Wasser: You're telling me the stakes that I saw the ground yesterday were 20 some feet back from the property line?

Mr. Turner: Those stakes. I was wondering if maybe those were ones that we put in there during a kind of an in between phase because I knew I have a set of drawings here that shows a building, it was a little bit further forward from where we have it now. And so that probably was that location and we've, I guess we've, we've now shoved the building back even further than where those stakes were. But I'm going to drive by there tomorrow just to check that out.

Mr. Hutchins: Bob. Those stakes were put in for the walk around and then at that point is when we were asked to push it back even further. And we did. I've just never pulled the stakes out of the ground.

Ms. Wasser: Right. And so my question was, you know, because those stakes are sitting right at the outcropping. Right. So the question is how much further back is it from the stakes? Because that's just easier for me to understand because I have a smaller set and I'm going to scale it.

Mr. Turner: So what I can do is I can go and take some measurements and shoot that information over to, I guess I'd send it over to Michael and Cynthia and then they can circulate it around.

Ms. Wasser: Yeah, if you pushed it another 15 feet past those stakes, further East, then I'm probably okay with it. I just couldn't make that decision yesterday. I couldn't tell.

Mr. Turner: Okay.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. Mr. Oliver comments?

Mr. Oliver: Firstly, I'd like to thank the applicant for their redesign efforts. I think that they've done a great job and I'm fine with where building five is and I have no issue with the parking and maybe most importantly I want to thank the applicant for continuing to go forward with this project during these crazy times. So thank you.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you Chris. Ms. DiNapoli comments?

Ms. DiNapoli: Yes. Good evening everyone, in this new world that we live in. Although I'm starting to get used to it. I want to thank Scott and Robert for their amazing job and all of the work that they put into this. It is so refreshing to see someone hearing the comments and going forward with that. With regards to the additional parking, the banked parking, I agree with everyone. I don't think it's necessary. I hadn't thought of it until Anne Dexter mentioned the idea of not even doing the striping. I would be fine with that. There really is no...I don't think it really needs it. I'm going to side track for a second and ask that with these additional buildings, as different, does snow banking storage need to be considered with the new buildings? It was really just a question.

Mr. Hutchins: You're referring to the ones in the Northeast, by South Cross Road?

Ms. DiNapoli: Yes, where it ends at number 11.

Mr. Hutchins: In between those buildings the snow is going to have to be back dragged, back out into the traffic lane and then it'll be pushed to the East.

Ms. DiNapoli: Okay, fine. Thank you for that. Building number five, Robert after you do the measurements, could you go back and stick with the stakes there are there, reposition the stakes so we can see exactly where this new building is? I think that will be tremendously helpful and then if Scott, if you don't mind, if we, you know, just on our own drive by one day and look at it.

Mr. Hutchins: Help yourself. Just wait for Bob to tell you that he's done though.

Mr. Turner: I mean give me a few days. I'll probably have it done by the weekend.

Ms. DiNapoli: There's no rush. Right, because that will help me to decide at my end about this. My other question was driving South from, I should say coming from the North coming South, it seems very bare. Is there a way you can maneuver around some of those plantings so that there are some plantings on the North side between yours and the animal hospital?

Mr. Hutchins: There's going to be a fence there too. Probably think in terms of a black just rail fence like you'd see around somebody's swimming pool. So that'll be on that side. And I think Bob, don't we have some plantings that are going to be along that fence?

Mr. Turner: Well we have some plantings. We have the fence stopping at the face of the building. We don't have it extending all the way back.

Ms. DiNapoli: But on the side and it was just really from the visual point of coming down Route 9, it doesn't go all the way to the end. That would be a waste of time and money, you know, to go way back, but just so that it would soften the vision, the visual would be more appealing.

Mr. Turner: What I'd like to do in regards to, before I give an answer as to what we can and cannot do is because there's a rock outcropping there, we're kind of limited to what types of plants are going to be able to grow in that particular area because they're going to be limited to how deep the roots can get. So let me take a look at that to see. We have the Rose bushes in the area on the West side, maybe those might be able to be extended around to the North, but I'd rather look at the site before I go providing an answer.

Mr. Hutchins: Bob, you might also consider a low-level berm on the West side that's planted on top.

Mr. Turner: I mean that could be the other option. Yeah.

Mr. Hutchins: Right. So that you've put a foot and a half of top soil for something to grow in.

Mr. Turner: I'll look at that. Yes.

Ms. DiNapoli: Okay and thank you Rob. Take your time about coming back to tell us when we can look at the stakes it'll probably be the highlight of our week.

Mr. Turner: Probably!

Mr. Hutchins: Just remember one at a time. Social distancing.

Ms. DiNapoli: Yes. Thank you.

Chairman Dupree: So I have no additional comments. Everything has been covered by my esteemed colleagues as usual and we've also been discussing this application for a long time now. Just to highlight what some of what we've heard today. You heard a majority of the Board say that they're pretty comfortable with the location of building five but two would still like to see it

staked definitely, so we can see how far back it moved. I'm going to take a point here just to note that our code requires that, actually, buildings are supposed to be as close to the front of the property line in every business district, but I think it'd be inappropriate to have it sticking out in front of the whole big massive building. Also we've all agreed unanimously that the banked parking, getting rid of that is fine and that we don't need to have delineated parking spaces. I want to make sure that I credit Vice-Chair Dexter because actually Anne, you're right, when we see striping, we think 'don't park in there, don't go in there.' So it's actually not a good idea to stripe it, you're right. Then maybe to have just signs saying temporary parking allowed here or short-term parking or something like that to encourage people where they should be parking. I'll also note that, again, you put in, I think enough information here that we can circulate tonight; we're prepared with the resolution. I didn't hear from anybody that they weren't prepared to move forward. And Stephanie said that because even if we relocate slightly building five or something else, she's still fine with moving this forward. So, who has this resolution? I'm sorry, I forgot to write that down.

**RESOLUTION TYPING ACTION AND REFERRING THE APPLICATION TO
THE DUTCHESS COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND
DEVELOPMENT**

Hutchins-Staatsburg Storage LLC

Date: April 15, 2020

Moved By: Vice-Chair Dexter

Resolution: #2019-20

Seconded By: Mr. Pickett

WHEREAS, the applicant, Tinkelman Architecture PLLC on behalf of 4920 LLC, has submitted an application for site plan amendment approval to install additional exterior storage units and make other associated site improvements including drainage, parking and landscaping at an existing self-storage facility located at 4920 Albany Post Road, identified as Tax Grid No. 6066-02-891661 (the "Site"), in the Neighborhood Business District (the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, general commercial uses are permitted in the Neighborhood Business District subject to site plan approval; and

WHEREAS, the project is depicted on an amended site plan entitled "Additional Storage Units - Site Plan Amendment, Staatsburg Storage LLC," prepared by Tinkelman Architecture PLLC, dated March 3, 2020, Sheets TS, PZ 101-107, DT 102 and C 1-8 (the "Site Plan"); and

WHEREAS, the applicant has submitted a Short Environmental Assessment Form (“EAF”) dated May 2, 2019, last revised March 3, 2020; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQRA”), said Board is required to determine the classification of the proposed action; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 239-m of the General Municipal Law, projects located within 500 feet of a state highway must be referred to the Dutchess County Department of Planning and Development for a report and recommendation thereon.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby:

1. **Classifies the project as an unlisted under SEQRA.**
2. **Declares its intent to serve as lead agency in a coordinated project review and directs its Secretary to circulate notice to all involved and interested agencies.**
3. **Directs its secretary to refer the application to the Dutchess County Department of Planning and Development pursuant to Section 239-m of the General Municipal Law.**

Aye Mr. Dupree
Aye Ms. Dexter
Aye Ms. DiNapoli
Aye Mr. Oliver
Aye Mr. Pickett
Aye Ms. Wasser
Aye Ms. Weiser

ROLL CALL VOTE 7-0 Motion Carried

Involved and Interested Agencies

**NYS Department of Environmental Conservation
Roosevelt Fire Department
Hyde Park Conservation Advisory Council**

Chairman Dupree: The motion carries unanimously. We need three copies because this will be sent to DEC, Roosevelt Fire Department and Hyde Park Conservation Advisory Council. Four copies, sorry.

Mr. Turner: How many copies now?

Chairman Dupree: Four. I forgot to do this earlier, but I want to point out that the question of the entrance, even though it's an emergency entrance only off South Cross Road, was a subject of much discussion at the very beginning of this application process and that we have the approval of both Roosevelt Fire Department as well as Superintendent Howie Fisher our Highway Superintendent about the location being exactly where it is and it only being used as a gated entry for emergency egress and ingress. That noted...should we just sort of place hold this out for about six weeks, so we give the involved agencies the time to respond?

Ms. Polidoro: Unless the applicant has a question that they want to come discuss prior to that.

Chairman Dupree: Which we can add them any time on that one. Scott and Robert, what would you like to have us do?

Mr. Hutchins: Move on.

Mr. Turner: Yeah, I've going to try to move this thing on as quickly as possible. The only question that I have is if you need four additional copies, is town hall closed? And how do I end up getting copies to you?

Chairman Dupree: There's a drop off box. Let me let Ms. Witman answer this. She probably knows better than me.

Ms. Witman: I think you're correct. There's a drop off box, but we could talk about it offline and figure out arrangements.

Mr. Turner: Okay.

Ms. Axelson: And one more quick note. Rob, you know that my comment 11 to add those parking spaces, you don't need to address that. And accordingly, comment 12 a, you wouldn't need to change the scale in regards to those.

Mr. Turner: Right. Okay.

Chairman Dupree: So what we'll do is, I think we should pencil...let's see...you're going to make changes, Robert, based on Liz's comments?

Mr. Turner: Correct.

Chairman Dupree: So what I suggest we do is wait to put you on until we receive a new submission from your revised submission and then we'll get you on. And at that point it's likely that we can set a public hearing and I hope by that point that we're actually meeting physically, but if not our first dry run for a workshop meeting now that we've had it, I know how it can happen. I think

we're okay and we should be able to have our first public hearing, the first meeting in June for the Verizon cell phone tower at Anderson Center for Autism. That'll give us a public hearing under our belts as well, so we can then move forward if we have to keep doing this virtually. Anybody else have any comments? Hearing none. Then Scott and Robert again, thank you. Thank you for all your efforts. Thank you for your time this evening and we'll look forward to moving this forward.

Mr. Turner: Great. Thank you very much.

Mr. Hutchins: Thank you, really appreciate it.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PLT STORAGE YARD RECONSTRUCTION

Site Plan Amendment & Special Use Permit Approvals (#2019-19)
Location: 501-503 Salt Point Turnpike, Poughkeepsie, NY 12601
Grid#s: 6263-03-221319, -260384

Chairman Dupree: The next item on the agenda is PLT Storage Yard Reconstruction. This is the large building that's located at 501-503 Salt Point Turnpike that was subject to fire. The applicants were given a conditional site plan approval in which to reconstruct the building and make other site plan improvements. They have requested a second time in which to extend to meet those conditions and have offered a nice rationale. No one had any comments on this.

**RESOLUTION GRANTING SECOND EXTENSION OF TIME TO SATISFY
THE CONDITIONS OF SITE PLAN AND SPECIAL USE PERMIT
APPROVAL**

PLT Storage Yard Reconstruction

Date: April 15, 2020

Moved By: Ms. Weiser

Resolution: #2019-19C

Seconded By: Ms. Wasser

WHEREAS, on August 7, 2019, by Resolution # 2019-19A, the Planning Board granted site plan and special use permit approval to the applicant, PLT Associates LLC, to reconstruct and expand a construction yard and recycling center warehouse located at 501-503 Salt Point Turnpike, and to construct a temporary staging area on an adjacent lot at 517 Salt Point Turnpike, as depicted on: a site plan entitled "PLT-Storage Yard Reconstruction, Site Plan Amendment" SP-1, prepared by Berger Engineering and Surveying, dated April 30, 2019, last revised July 19, 2019; renderings prepared by American

Buildings, a NUCOR Company, last revised May 23, 2019; elevations entitled "Gleason Phase 2" sheets RS1, WS5, WS6, WS7, WS8, WS11, and WS12, prepared by the American Buildings, a NUCOR Company, dated May 23, 2019; and elevations entitled "Gleason Annex SSR" sheets RS1, WS5, WS6, WS7, and WS8, prepared by the American Buildings, a NUCOR Company, dated June 10, 2019 (collectively, the "Conditionally Approved Site Plan Set"); and

WHEREAS, Site Plan and Special Use Permit approval are conditioned on satisfaction of eight conditions of approval; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to § 108-9.3E(4)(c) of the Zoning Law, conditional approval of a site plan shall expire 180 days after the date of the resolution granting conditional approval, unless such requirements have been certified as completed; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with § 108-9.3E(4)(c) of the Zoning Law, approval of the Conditionally Approved Site Plan Set would have expired on February 3, 2020 if the conditions of approval were not satisfied; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board, in its discretion, may grant up to two 90-day extensions of time in which to satisfy the conditions of site plan approval; and

WHEREAS, on December 18, 2019, by Resolution #2019-19B, the Planning Board granted the applicant its first 90-day extension of time in which to satisfy the conditions of site plan approval to May 3, 2020; and

WHEREAS, by letter dated February 26, 2020, the applicant requested a second 90-day extension of time in which to satisfy the conditions of site plan and special use permit approvals; and **WHEREAS**, the Planning Board has considered the circumstances warranting such an extension.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby grants the applicant a second 90-day extension of time in which to satisfy the conditions of site plan and special use permit approval to and including August 1, 2020.

Aye	Chairman Dupree
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Aye	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Ms. Weiser

ROLL CALL VOTE 7-0 Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: Yes. The motion carries unanimously. I wish them luck in getting this job done.

RIVERVIEW RE-SUBDIVISION-LANDINGS-ANDROS

Minor Re-Subdivision (2017-11)

Location: 6 Dock Street

Grid#: 6065-04-548172

Chairman Dupree: And the last item on the agenda, we're going to reset a public hearing for Riverview Re-subdivision. As a reminder, this is to create a new parcel on six Dock Street. Also, as a reminder, we set a public hearing for this initially and then we cancelled them under the orders of Supervisor Rohr and the Governor when we were ordered to stop and to start self-distancing. Now that we know that we can do these meetings virtually, I'm going to ask for a motion or I will make a motion to reset the public hearing. Or let me rephrase that. I'll ask for a motion to set the hearing for June 17 2020. This would give us time to have an actual public hearing for Verizon and then a public hearing where we may have public participation. At a virtual meeting today, Councilman Krupnick and Supervisor Rohr, Victoria, Tad, Warren Replansky, the Town attorney and I all had a discussion about how we think this should be handled. We couldn't come to a conclusion yet, about people pre-registered versus people wanting to call in the night of, so we'll work on that a little bit more. In the meantime, who would make the motion to reset the public hearing for June 17th? Mr. Pickett, you're making the motion.

MOTION: Mr. Pickett

SECOND: Mr. Oliver

To re-set the Public Hearing for Riverview Re-Subdivision-Landings-Andros for June 17, 2020.

Ms. Witman called the roll.

Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Chairman Dupree

ROLL CALL VOTE 7-0 Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: And there being no other items on the agenda, may I get a motion to adjourn?

MOTION: Ms. Wasser

SECOND: Vice-Chair Dexter

To Adjourn.

Ms. Witman called the roll.

Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Chairman Dupree

ROLL CALL VOTE 7-0 Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: Thanks all my colleagues. Thanks everyone for tuning in. It's an extraordinary time trying to move the Town business forward. Thank you again.