

APPROVED
Town of Red Hook Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 3, 2013

CALL TO ORDER/ DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

The meeting was opened at 7:32 p.m., and a quorum was determined present for the conduct of business.

Members present — Chair Christine Kane, members Charlie Laing, Sam Harkins, Sam Phelan, Michelle Turck, and Betty Carr. Brian Walker was absent. Also present was planner Michele Greig and Amy Haight, representing the town engineer.

BUSINESS SESSION

The meeting was called to order by Deputy Chair Charlie Laing. He announced a slight change in the order of the agenda. There were no announcements. Christine Kane arrived to chair the meeting at that point.

The May 20, 2013 draft minutes had been circulated among the members and reviewed. Two revisions were made to the minutes. Michelle Turck made a motion to accept the amended minutes. Sam Phelan seconded, and the motion was passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Helen Dietz & David Mimeles – 203 Barrytown Rd. – Certificate of Appropriateness

Christine Kane read the notice of public hearing regarding the application by Helen Dietz and David Mimeles, 203 Barrytown Road, for a Certificate of Appropriateness as published May 28 in the Poughkeepsie Journal and the Kingston Daily Freeman.

Les Rollins, representing the applicants, described in detail the renovation project, which included raising the roof 4' 3" (corrected July 1, 2013) adding porches and decks, changing windows and adding a glass wall feature.

Christine Kane asked him to describe the siding and roofing materials. He said that the siding would be green vertical board and batten, and the roof would be galvanized and grey in color.

Christine Kane then invited questions from the audience. Paul Roberts, 211 Barrytown Rd., asked for clarification about the presentation photos and the drawings. Les Rollins provided explanations.

Carol D'Aust, 78 Manor Road, asked if the new height of the building would block any of the neighbor's views. Les Rollins replied that it would not.

Paul Roberts asked if there were any plans to change the home to a two or three family home. Mr. Rollins said that there was not. He said the garage and sunroom would probably be removed later.

Sam Phelan asked for clarification regarding these changes. Christine Kane advised that the changes described were not part of the current application, and another application would have to address those changes, should the owner decide to move forward with them.

Christine Kane said the Board had referred the application to the Hamlet Review Committee. She provided a copy of the Committee's report to Mr. Rollins, who said that he was at the site when the HR Committee visited.

Christine paraphrased the HR Committee report, which contained concerns about the overall change to the structure of one of the last examples of this type of barn in the area, and the aesthetics associated with the height of the finished project, particularly on the back side of the home. In fact, the committee wondered if the finished height in the back would exceed local zoning regulations. The committee made some alternative suggestions, including the use of dormers on the barn bays. The committee approved of the siding and natural stone chimney material, suggested possible changes to the glass doors in front, the use of wood materials rather than plastic for the railings.

In conclusion, Christine Kane suggested that because the project would be visible from Barrytown Road and Dock Road, the board would like to encourage the owners to rethink the design before proceeding. Mr. Rollins noted that he had suggested the use of dormers to the owners, but they felt strongly about maintaining the look of a barn, and barns do not typically have dormers.

Sam Phelan stated that the project would clearly affect the front of the house, and the board should be most concerned about the view from the road. He was concerned about the height of the finished building and the installation of significantly different windows. Mr. Rollins said that the front doors would not be sliders, but French doors. Charlie Laing suggested compromising by retaining the roof height and putting dormers on the back so from the road the roofline would look the same. Mr. Rollins replied that change would change the slope of the roof, which was not attractive to the owner or himself, and not conducive to metal roofing plan.

Christine Kane reviewed the zoning code for building height, and asked Mr. Rollins to make sure that the project was in compliance, saying that if it was not, the applicant would have to apply for a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

It was decided that the public hearing would be kept open for the next meeting to address these issues.

REGULAR SESSION – OLD BUSINESS

Devereux 8192 Albany Post Road – Amended site plan and amended special permit

The board continued discussion of applications for amended site plan approval and amended special permit to construct a ten bed intermediate care facility on the 54.4 acre parcel in the Institutional (I) zoning district.

The applicant was represented by John O'Keefe, John Kavanaugh and John Lopez from Devereux as well as engineer Jeff Hogan and architect Chris Smailer

Christine Kane asked if there was anything new. Mr. Smailer responded that plans now reflected details for grading and site work. The new plans had been reviewed by the town engineer. He said that the only thing different was that they proposed to drill a new well for the

building, because the existing well did not have a flow rate adequate for the building. The proposed well site was not on the new plans, but he showed the board where it would be located.

Christine Kane said that the board had received a letter from the fire chief, who reviewed the project and had no issues regarding fire protection. Samples of building materials were exhibited.

Michele Grieg brought up some concerns about landscaping. Discussion about the landscaping, particularly around the parking area ensued. Christine Kane asked the board how they felt about waiving some perimeter landscaping requirements due to the applicants' interior location. Michelle Turck commented that she thought shading the parking lot was important. Mr. Hogan replied that adding shade trees to the parking lot would result in fewer parking spaces. Charlie Laing commented about the neighboring baseball field, and wondered if there should be some plantings there.

Sam Phelan commented that he was generally unimpressed with the aesthetics of the project, particularly the area containing existing facility structures formerly on the back side of the campus, which one must traverse when approaching the proposed new building. She asked the applicants whether they would consider screening some of the existing structures to make it more attractive. Mr. Smaller replied that the structures were not on view from the front of the building, and the main entrance to the building was through the campus. However, they would not be opposed to screening some of the sheds and such.

Amy Haight, representing the town engineer, said that the plan needed a sediment and erosion control plan, based on the town's requirements. Mr. Hogan replied that they did have erosion and sediment notes which included standard silt fencing, since there were no wetlands or watercourses on the site. He said that he would include on the next set of plans that the perimeter be staked out by a licensed surveyor, and that they would put silt and construction fencing on the perimeter.

The applicants increased the aisle width of the parking spaces. It was agreed to allow a 24 foot aisle.

The conversation returned to landscaping. The board and the applicants came to an agreement on a plan of four pin oak trees and one dogwood tree.

Christine Kane reviewed the draft site plan approval. The proposed conditions were noted. Michele Grieg added conditions pertaining to the landscaping issues previously discussed, and Amy Haight added silt fencing and surveying conditions.

A motion to adopt the site plan approval with the added conditions was made by Sam Phelan, seconded by Betty Carr and was unanimously passed.

PUBLIC HEARINGS (continued)

Todd & Maribeth Catlin – 38 North Drive – Minor subdivision Plat

Mark Graminski, P. E., Maribeth Catlin and Todd Catlin were present for continued discussion of an application for subdivision plat approval to create three (3) residential building lots of 2.72 acres, 4.19 acres and 4.34 acres from an 11.26-acre lot in the R1.5 Zoning District.

Christine Kane opened the public hearing for comments. She said the Board had received two letters. The first was from Robert Romano, 71 Manor Rd. Mr. Romano cited water problems and decreased privacy as the reasons he was against the project. The second letter was from Cynthia and Jack Mautner, 63 Manor Rd. Mr. and Mrs. Mautner said that when the original subdivision on North Road was approved, they were assured that there would be no further subdivision of any of the created lots. They said that this assurance was of major importance at the time to the property owners on Manor Road. The letter went on to say that they were further assured that there would be no "multiple-use driveways" and that each driveway would be unencumbered to North Road. They cited other concerns about the Catlins' "in home" business and frequent yard sales as well as construction vehicles and other traffic on the driveway behind their house if the project was approved.

Donna Nebel, 75 Manor Rd., said that she was concerned about privacy, since the Catlins had removed many of the trees that had previously provided a visual buffer. She also cited water problems in her basement and garage, saying that these problems occurred not only when the water table rose. She asked who would install the stormwater system and who would be accountable if this untested system failed. Finally, she drew the Board's attention to covenants and restrictions attached to the original deeds from the Linden Avenue Section 7 subdivision of 1988. She said that one of the covenants prohibited any of the lots from being further subdivided.

Ken Steinmetz, 69 Manor Rd., said that he was concerned about increased traffic behind his house as a result of the new driveway, a lack of screening, and possible fire safety issues for the neighborhood resulting from emergency vehicles travelling down the long shared driveway.

Richard Aldous, 77 Manor Rd., said that he was concerned that the stormwater plan was untested and asked whether the Board had checked with its attorney to see who would be responsible for the system's installation, its maintenance and the consequences if it failed.

Carol D'aoust, 78 Manor Rd., said that water ran constantly in front of her house and that she was concerned about possible contamination of the Sawkill Creek.

Richard Nebel, 75 Manor Rd., echoed concerns about significant water problems, saying that underground springs contributed to the problems and that there was dangerous icing problems in the winter.

Christine Kane said first that, regarding concern about the fire department, the proposal included pull-offs along the driveway and that the driveway would have to be built to support the weight of emergency vehicles. Second, she said that the Board was aware of the water problems and that while the project would not fix existing problems, the Board wanted to make sure that the project would not add to them. Third, she said that the task of drafting a construction and maintenance agreement for the stormwater system had been discussed with the Town Attorney's office but that there was as yet no document to review. She added that the applicant would be responsible for installing the system to the specifications approved by the Town Engineer.

Ms. Nebel asked whether the Board would refer the deed restrictions to the Town Attorney. Christine Kane said yes.

Asked whether the Town would ever construct a road from the proposed Catlin driveway to Manor Road, Christine Kane said she did not believe any such road was included in the Town's official maps.

Amy Haight, representing the Town Engineer, said that based on the submitted Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and confirmed by a review of the calculations, no additional water would leave the project site. She said that any additional runoff created by new impervious surfaces would be handled by the stormwater features.

Sam Phelan asked about the high water table and possible difficulties with the proposed septic systems. Amy Haight said that those issues would be handled by the Dutchess County Health Department.

Mark Graminski said that high groundwater was not as big a problem as depth to bedrock. He said that each new septic system would need 2 to 3 feet of fill and that he had chosen sites that were higher and that had more suitable soils. He said that the water problems stemmed partly from surface runoff and partly from subsurface runoff. He went on to say that the Health Department would test the system continually during installation.

Richard D'aoust, 78 Manor Rd., said that the vegetation that the Catlins had removed had served to take up some of the water. Christine Kane said that at the last meeting, Mr. Graminski had stated that he had taken vegetation removal into account in his calculations. Mr. D'aoust also asked who would be accountable if the system failed. Lastly, he said that the agenda for this meeting had gone onto the Town website at 10 a.m. that morning, too late for people to make plans to attend.

Christine Kane reiterated that a maintenance agreement for the stormwater pollution prevention system would be crafted in the event that the project was approved. She said that the agreement would include cross easements since all three homeowners would be responsible for maintenance.

The website postings are handled by a consultant. The board asked the clerk to contact him to make sure that information is posted in a timely manner in the future.

The Planning Board discussed whether to leave the public hearing open or close it and start the 62-day clock toward a vote on the project. The members agreed that Mr. Catlin should refer the deed restrictions to his own attorney for review and comments, comments which the Planning Board attorney would subsequently review. Mr. Catlin agreed to waive the 62-day time period if the various attorneys had not completed their reviews and submitted their comments to the Board with sufficient time for consideration.

Since there were no additional public comments and since Mr. Catlin had agreed to waive the 62-day deadline if the Board found it necessary to do so, Charlie Laing made a motion to close the public hearing. Sam Phelan seconded the motion, and all members present voted in favor.

The project was tentatively scheduled for the June 17, 2013 agenda.

REGULAR SESSION - OLD BUSINESS (continued)

Hoffman Residential Development – 19, 25 and 45 Old Farm Rd. – Preliminary Plat and Site Plan

Rod Morrison, P.E., Richard Rang, and biologist Michael Nowicki were present for continued discussion of applications for preliminary subdivision plat and site plan approval to create 96 residential units on 50.64 acres in the TND-R (Traditional Neighborhood Development-Residential) Zoning District.

Mr. Rang said that he had a list of items he would like to discuss with the Board.

Lot coverage – Mr. Rang asked whether the recently passed zoning amendments concerning lot coverage gave the Board the latitude to consider the complete original parcel, not the individual proposed lots, as the basis for calculating lot and building coverage. Christine Kane said that the Board would more than likely move in that direction. He asked whether the wetland buffer would be included in the net lot area. Michele Greig said that she would check on that question.

By-right lots – Mr. Rang said he wanted to make sure the Board would have the ability to accept something less than the 95 ft. minimum width. Christine Kane said that the Board had generally agreed to this in previous discussions. Michele Greig said that the Board should formally agree by resolution when the proper time came.

Zero foot lot line – The Board agreed that a zero foot lot line was acceptable.

Sidewalks – Mr. Rang said that he wanted to make sure that eliminating the sidewalk on the outside of the perimeter road was acceptable since reverting to inclusion of that sidewalk would affect the septic system. Michele Greig said that the applicants should submit a plan sheet showing the current sidewalk plan. The Board and Mr. Rang discussed who would be responsible for maintenance of the sidewalks. Sam Phelan said he thought the homeowners' association or the individual homeowners should be responsible. Mr. Rang said that the Town could pass a local law requiring homeowners to maintain the sidewalks in front of their homes.

Roads, Stormwater Pollution Prevention System, Trees, etc– Mr. Morrison said that he needed to talk to the highway department about where the Town's responsibility for these new features would end and the homeowner's, homeowners association or developer's responsibility would begin.

Phasing – Mr. Rang said that the zoning requirement for 3 different housing types would be met during phase 1 and would cumulatively be met as the development was built out but might not be met by the individual intermediate phases. Michele Greig said that was acceptable. Michele Greig said that the applicants should also consider whether to include recreation space in their first phase; otherwise, she said, they would have to pay a recreation fee.

Asked how many phases were planned, Mr. Rang said that depended on water supply, housing demand and other variables. He said that each phase would have to stand alone.

Septic system – Mr. Rang said that the septic system would have several flow paths, so that a portion of the complete system could serve phase 1 and that additional sections could be added as the development was built out. He said that the Health Department would only approve a section with an adequate water supply, so the phase 1 subdivision plat approval would include approximately 24 lots. The site plan approval, however, would cover the entire development. Michele Greig said that the SEQR review would cover the entire development project.

Density – Michele Greig said she would see whether the Town Engineer had checked the applicants' density calculations.

Stephen Hoffman subdivision – Mr. Rang said that the subdivision plat for Stephen Hoffman's lot had already been filed and that subdividing off a parcel for Roger Hoffman's Barn Sale was part of this project. Michele Greig said that she would make sure that Roger Hoffman's lot met the required setbacks, etc.

Housing types – Mr. Rang said that the locations of the multi-family units and duplexes were fixed but that those of the cottages and single family homes were more flexible. The Board agreed with him that the number and type of those homes had to be tracked as building permit applications came in so that the required mix could be achieved. The Board discussed how to prevent the owner of a one-story cottage from adding a second story and making his house a single family type, thereby skewing the ratio. Mr. Rang said that that would be up to the building inspector when the homeowner applied for a building permit for that addition.

Moreover, he said that the development would be planned for a certain capacity and that anyone trying to add on to his home would have to demonstrate that he would have adequate water supply and sewage capacity for the additional bedrooms, which Dutchess County Water and Wastewater might not confirm.

Michele Greig said was concerned that the potential for enlarging the homes might have an impact on SEQR. Mr. Rang said he could not simply assume that the homes would be enlarged and plan for that event because the Health Department would not approve the water supply for the desired number of homes if they were assumed to be larger. Charlie Laing said the zoning required a certain mix of housing types and that it was reasonable to use that mix for SEQR.

Fences and porches – Mr. Rang said that nearly all the homes would have a front porch, but he wondered whether all had to have a fence. He said that the zoning code had a diagram with fences but no language about them and so was not clear about that question. Michele Greig said she would look into it.

Traffic study – Mr. Rang said that in his most recent comments, traffic engineering consultant Bill Fitzpatrick had found the applicants' traffic study satisfactory.

Wetland study – Mr. Rang said that, in his latest review, biologist and habitat consultant David Griggs had indicated the possibility of additional wetlands; yet, Mr. Rang said, a biologist from the NYS Dept. of Environmental Conservation had already reviewed the map prepared by the applicants' consultant Michael Nowicki, walked the project site and accepted Mr. Nowicki's wetland delineation. Mr. Nowicki said that he had examined the area under question and had determined that it was not a wetland. The Planning Board gave its permission for Mr. Griggs to meet with Mr. Nowicki in an effort to come to a consensus.

Habitat study - Mr. Nowicki said that he had looked at the federal list of threatened and endangered species and had found no sighting occurrences on the project site. He said that, together with DEC, he had conducted a trapping program. Mr. Rang said that the applicants had obtained a sign-off from DEC even before submitting their initial plans and now Mr. Griggs seemed to be asking them to look for something else. Michele Greig said that the EAF asked for information on more species than simply those on the threatened and endangered list. Mr. Nowicki said he didn't normally look at common species. Christine Kane said that Mr. Griggs' comments concerned NYS listed species. The Board again gave its permission for a meeting of the two biologists.

Army Corps of Engineers wetlands – Mr. Rang said that the project would not impact any federal wetlands. Michele Greig said that she had included a reminder to contact the Army Corps if a federal wetland would be disturbed because such a reminder was in the NYS DEC response letter.

Water supply and sewage disposal systems – Mr. Rang said that the Town zoning code encouraged connecting to public utilities, which, he said, the applicants were attempting to do. He said that Village would have to conduct more studies before the trustees would know whether the Village wells could help supply the development.

Mr. Rang went on to say that Dutchess County Water and Wastewater Authority needed a letter from the Red Hook Town Board requesting DCWWA to get involved in the project. He asked the Planning Board to send a letter to the Town Board in support of writing that request letter. He said that other options included the formation of a transportation corporation or for the Town to own and operate the facility.

Fire flows – Mr. Rang said that the comment letter from the Town Engineer implied that the development's water system would be required to provide water for emergency vehicles in case of fire. He said that was not the case nor would fire flows be provided. He said that the Health Department would require a letter from the Red Hook Fire Department acknowledging that the department understood that no fire flows would be available. Mr. Morrison said that the hydrants would only flush the system, not hook up to emergency vehicles.

Lighting district – Mr. Rang said that the applicants would petition the Town Board to create a lighting district. He said that the developers would provide the street lighting, the lighting district would maintain it and the power company would provide the power.

Roads – Mr. Rang said that the roads would be owned and maintained by the Town highway department. He noted that the proposed road widths and some other road issues seemed to be in conflict with the current Town highway specifications, and he said that if the proposed road width had to change, the entire project would change. Michele Greig said that the Town had applied for a grant to bring the highway specs more in line with the Greenway guides and the DEC requirements. She said it might be possible for the Town Board to simply revise the road width requirements by resolution. Mr. Rang said that Mr. Morrison would prepare a list of the instances in which the developments proposed road features would deviate from the current town specs.

Alleys – Mr. Rang said that the alleys would be the responsibility of the homeowners' association.

Sight distance – Mr. Rang said that the sight distance at the development's access on Old Farm Rd. met the requirements for 30 mph, which was the current speed limit.

Street trees – Mr. Rang said that the developers would install the street trees and that the trees would become the Town's responsibility from that point on. He said he looked forward to meeting with the chair of the Town Tree Committee to discuss trees that would meet the requirements of the highway department as well as provide a canopy over the street.

Mail – Mr. Rang urged the Planning Board to write a letter to the US Postal Service urging home delivery within the development; otherwise, he said, the applicants would have to design a cluster-type mailbox system.

Stormwater – Mr. Rang said that the drainage system within the Town’s right of way would become the responsibility of the highway department, while the subsurface absorption system would be controlled and maintained by the homeowners’ association.

Hucklebush Trail – Mr. Rang said that the trail was proposed to run through the site. However, he said, each end of the proposed trail culminated at a private lot outside the development, so the trail would not actually go anywhere. Michele Greig said that the applicants could make sure that the part of the trail within the development was not impeded and that they could show on the map where it would connect with the sidewalk system.

Agricultural Data Statement – Christine Kane said that the Agricultural Data Statement would be sent out closer to the public hearing date.

Christine Kane reiterated that the Board’s independent traffic consultant Bill Fitzpatrick had found the applicants’ study satisfactory.

The Board generally agreed to send a letter to the post office regarding home mail delivery. Mr. Rang said he would forward the contact information for the appropriate person at USPS.

The Board also generally agreed to send a letter to the Town Board stating that the ownership of the developments’ sewage disposal system by the DCWWA was the preferred option and that the Planning Board urged the Town Board to send a letter to DCWWA.

Amy Haight asked that the applicants forward any correspondence with the DCWWA. Mr. Rang said that the applicants would draft a Memo of Understanding with the DCWWA once that agency agreed to become involved in the project.

Mr. Morrison said the applicants were conducting production tests on the wells and would begin testing the water for contaminants once the supply wells were established.

The Board and Mr. Rang discussed the school calculations that showed there would be no significant impact from the development on the school district. Mr. Rang said that a review of the calculations actually lowered the likely number of new students and that he would forward the revised numbers.

OTHER BUSINESS

Christine Kane said that the office had received a letter from the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation stating that the Bard College Blithewood Vista project would have no impact on cultural resources in or eligible for inclusion in the State and National Register of Historic Places.

ADJOURNMENT

Since there was no further business to come before the Board, Michelle Turck made a motion to adjourn. Sam Phelan seconded the motion, and all members present voted in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Flood
Paula Schoonmaker

Attachments:

Resolution granting site plan approval to Devereux

Resolution Granting Site Plan Approval to Devereux Campus Intermediate Care Facility

Name of Project: Devereux Campus Intermediate Care Facility

Name of Applicant: The Devereux Foundation

Date: June 3, 2013

Whereas, the Town of Red Hook Planning Board has received an application for Site Plan approval from The Devereux Foundation to construct a ± 4,695 square foot intermediate care facility on the ± 54.4 acre Devereux Campus (Tax Map Parcel No. 134889-6374-00-244300-0000) in the Institutional (I) District and Scenic Corridor Overlay (SC-O) District on Albany Post Road (Route 9) in the Town of Red Hook, Dutchess County, New York; and

Whereas, the applicant has submitted a Site Plan prepared by Praetorius and Conrad, P.C. dated May 24, 2013 and Building Elevations and Floor Plans prepared by SDA dated April 24, 2013; and

Whereas, the proposed action substantially conforms with the Special Use Permit issued for the campus by the Zoning Board of Appeals on May 4, 1988, as amended by the Planning Board on April 18, 2005 and March 17, 2008, and therefore a new application for a special use permit is not required and only site plan review and approval by the Planning Board in accordance with the requirements of Article VII of the Zoning Law is required; and

Whereas, the Planning Board has reviewed the Site Plan application against the requirements of Article VII of the Zoning Law and has found the proposal complies with all applicable sections of the Zoning Law; and

Whereas, the application was referred to the Dutchess County Department of Planning and Development for review under General Municipal Law § 239m and the County Planning Department determined in its review dated May 1, 2013 that the project was a matter of local concern; and

Whereas, on May 6, 2013, the Planning Board declared itself Lead Agency for the purpose of conducting an uncoordinated review of an Unlisted action pursuant to SEQR; and

Whereas, on May 6, 2013, the Planning Board, in consideration of the Full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) dated April 23, 2013 and the 'criteria for determining significance' set forth in 6 NYCRR Part 617.7(c) determined that the proposed project will not cause any potential significant adverse impacts on the environment, and thus issued a Negative Declaration deeming an environmental impact statement need not be prepared; and

Whereas, on May 6, 2013, the Planning Board conducted a public hearing on the Site Plan application at which time all interested persons were given the opportunity to speak; and

Whereas, the Planning Board had deliberated on the application and all the matters before it.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby grants Site Plan approval to The Devereux Foundation to construct a $\pm$ 4,695 square foot intermediate care facility on the $\pm$ 54.4 acre Devereux Campus in accordance with the plans and specifications heretofore submitted upon the following conditions:

1. The following conditions shall be fulfilled prior to the signing of the Site Plan by the Planning Board Chairwoman:
 - A. Addition of a note to the Site Plan stating that “all future replacement bulbs for all on-site outdoor lighting fixtures shall be made with ones of equal wattage to those approved on this site plan to ensure compliance with the Town of Red Hook outdoor lighting regulations found in § 143-27.1 of the Town’s Zoning Law.”
 - B. Verify the front yard setback of Building 2 to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer.
 - C. Add a note to the Site Plan that the ball field will be eliminated.
 - D. Revise the Site Plan to include three (3) Pin Oak trees, one at each end of the proposed parking lot and one near the proposed Dogwood.
 - E. Revise the Site Plan to replace the proposed Sugar Maple with a Pin Oak.
 - F. Revise the Site Plan to show silt fencing, survey staked, at the limit of disturbance, to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer.
 - G. Approval of Dutchess County Department of Health for proposed sewage disposal system and water supply system.
 - H. Submission of correspondence from the Red Hook Fire Chief regarding the adequacy of the emergency vehicle access.
 - I. Submission of Site Plan drawings for stamping and signing in the number and form specified under the Town’s Zoning Law, including all required stamps and signatures.
 - J. Payment to the Town of Red Hook of any outstanding fee amounts and reimbursement to the Town of costs incurred in reviewing the application.

When the above conditions have been satisfied, three (3) sets of the above referenced plans shall be submitted for Planning Board Chairwoman endorsement. One (1) set shall be returned to the applicant, one (1) set will be retained by the Planning Board, and one (1) set will be provided to the Building Inspector. The applicant must return for approval from the Planning Board if any changes from the endorsed plans are subsequently desired.

2. The following are general conditions that shall be fulfilled throughout the construction and operation of the project:
 - A. All representations, proposals, stipulations, restrictions, and similar statements made by the applicant and contained in the Full EAF and the negative declaration adopted by the Planning Board on May 6, 2013 shall be considered conditions of this Site Plan Approval.
 - B. The applicant shall continue to comply with all conditions imposed by any of the outside agencies in their permits.
3. A Certificate of Compliance (CO) will not be issued until all proposed improvements have been completed in accordance with the approved Site Plan. In the event that a CO is requested prior to completion of all proposed landscaping, a cash bond will be posted to ensure completion of the landscaping in accordance with the approved Site Plan.

In taking this action, the Planning Board has determined that no new residential building lots or dwelling units will be created, and thus deems not applicable to this application the requirement for set-aside of recreation or other open space land or the alternative payment of a cash-in-lieu-of-land recreation fee.

On a motion by Sam Phelan, seconded by Betty Carr, and a vote of 6 for, 0 against, and 1 absent, this resolution was adopted on June 3, 2013.

Resolution Certified, Filed with the Town Clerk and Mailed to the Applicant

Paula Schoonmaker, Clerk to the Board

Date